

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



From Exclusion to the Inclusive Sphere

A Critical Analysis of Sun Yat-sen's (1866-1925) Emancipatory Communication and China's Modernisation

Son, Gyeongtag

Awarding institution:
King's College London

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT



Unless another licence is stated on the immediately following page this work is licensed

under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

From Exclusion to the Inclusive Sphere:

**A Critical Analysis of Sun Yat-sen's (1866-1925) Emancipatory
Communication and China's Modernisation**

G. Kentak Son

**Submitted in partial completion of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Chinese Studies**

King's College London

2017

ABSTRACT

China's social, political and economic modernisation in the first decades of the 20th century has been attributed to Sun Yat-sen (1866-1925), who countered dynastic despotism and foreign imperialism, and to his political philosophy best defined as emancipatory communication. Sun's exposure to Western influence such as Christianity, Western language and medical science inspired him modern rationality, which, he believed, was the key to the nation's modernisation. However, rather than blindly adopting Western advancements, Sun endeavoured to reconcile Chinese and Western values and systems. As a physician, Sun formed a detailed diagnosis of China's ailments, concluding that a revolution was unavoidable in order to save the nation. Sun advocated national unity, which catalysed the 1911 revolution and, eventually, the establishment of the first Chinese republic. The tenets of "Three Principles of the People", Sun's core emancipatory communication, comprise nationalism, democracy and the people's livelihood. Firstly, the *minzu* principle (nationalism) emphasised national unity to preserve Chinese race and its territory. The second principle of the discourse is *minquan* principle (democracy), wherein Sun stressed the imperative for balance between citizens' rights and the powers required of the state, proposed a supporting constitution as the essential framework. Thirdly, the *minsheng* principle (people's livelihood) argued for the equalisation of land to protect tenant farmers' economic rights. In propagating his agenda, Sun focused on the role of print media, public speech and pledging allegiance in order to raise the people's political awareness. Furthermore, Sun's *Tongbao* inclusion, conceived by reconciling Confucian fraternal love and Christian universal love, helped the overseas Chinese overcome their geographical distance and psychological liminality in building transnational patriotism. On the other hand, Sun argued that the absence of national unity was due to the culturally rooted Chinese loyalty to the emperor and family, and he tried to transfer the

people's loyalty to the nation by invoking anti-imperialism and anti-Manchuism. In the process, the racially defined nationalism of Sun's *minzu* principle supported the ethnic majority of Han race, ignoring the rights of ethnic minorities. Moreover, in the *minquan* principle, Sun's proposal of a three-stage national reconstruction plan imposed military operation and political tutelage to be administrated by elites, compromising individual freedom and equal citizenship. Sun's land equalisation plan in the *minsheng* principle created tension with the landlords due to his morally charged assertion that economic harmony was attainable through cooperation in dealing with material conflict concerning landownership. Sun's emancipatory communication brought forth a modern Chinese nation-state, but Sun's struggle in modernising China represented his inner conflict with relinquishing his pedagogical paternalism to the autonomy of Chinese people.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	7
Literature Review	25
Methodology	73
Structure of the Chapters	84
 Chapter I Sun's Language and Communication	
Introduction	87
1.1 Language, Rationality and Unity	89
1.2 Print Media	97
1.3 Public Speech and Public Sympathy	112
1.4 Public Pledging	121
 Chapter II The <i>Minzu</i> Principle (Nationalism)	
Introduction	125
2.1 Race and Nation	127
2.2 Nationalism and Race	139
2.3 National Unity and the Five Race Republic	150

Chapter III The *Minquan* Principle (Democracy)

Introduction	154
3.1 Loyal Duties and Citizens' Rights	156
3.2 Constitutionalism	160
Individual and Collective Rights	166
3.3 Modern nation-state and Women's Citizenship	174
Women's Citizenship	178
3.4 Political Tutelage and Individual Freedom	186

Chapter IV The *Minsheng* Principle (Livelihood of the People)

Introduction	190
4.1 Land and Tenant Farmers	192
Taxation	198
4.2 Emancipatory Inclusion	204
4.3 Land to the Tiller	207
4.4 Sun's Dilemma	213
Time Constraints and Foreign Capital	218

Chapter V The Overseas Chinese and Sun

Introduction	222
5.1 The Overseas Chinese and their Identity	223
5.2 Christian Influence	229
Christianity and Confucianism	233
5.3 The <i>Tongbao</i> Inclusion and Participatory Citizenship	241
5.3.1 The <i>Minzu</i> Principle and <i>Tongbao</i> Inclusion	243
5.3.2 The <i>Minquan</i> Principle and <i>Tongbao</i> Citizenship	246
5.3.3 The <i>Minsheng</i> Principle and Indentured Livelihood	248
Conclusion	250
Notes	259
Bibliography	273

INTRODUCTION

By the mid-1830s, the opium trade became more profitable than any other commodity for Britain. Its trading volume with China grew approximately by tenfold between 1800 and 1839, and correspondingly, the Chinese payment for opium in silver rose from 1,020,012 to 3,743,158 *taels* during the same time period.¹ In 1839, the Chinese efforts to halt the opium trade provided the British with incentive to launch the first Opium War.² China faced a humiliating defeat and opened trading ports under the Nanjing Treaty of 1842. The Opium War was then followed by the Taiping Rebellion led by the Christian Hakka, claiming more than 25 million lives. Both events put the nation in political and economic disarray, leading to the decline of the Qing dynasty.³ Added to these two major disruptions were Nian (1853-1868), Moslem (1855-1873), and Boxer (1899-1901) rebellions, which took place in the latter part of the 19th century.

The politico-economic impact of these historical events was felt throughout China, particularly among the peasants. Since crop taxes were paid in silver and there was almost 100 percent appreciation in the silver exchange value, peasants were forced to sell nearly double the amount of crops in order to pay the same taxes as before. Higher taxes were of concern to both large landlords and small owner-cultivators alike: as a result, local landlords created self-defence militias to oppose tax payment.⁴ Furthermore, the disruptive economic fallout of the opium trade was further compounded by the general influx of foreign goods in the treaty port areas.

It is broadly acknowledged that Sun helped transform China from a pre-modern nation to a republic. By propagating his principles of nationalism, democracy and the people's livelihood, Sun endeavoured to emancipate the socially and economically marginalised Chinese people by including them in his communication. In this thesis, I argue that, even though Sun's emancipatory communication catalysed the first Chinese republic, his exclusionary praxis created a division

among the Chinese citizens, undermining the nation's unity. Nevertheless, by communicating and instigating *Tongbao* inclusion in an effort to establish an all-inclusive modern nation-state, Sun ultimately reconciled his exclusionary praxis. This is significant because Sun's exclusionary praxis had denied the rights of racial minorities and individual citizens as his paternalistic elitism led him to disregard the binary aspects inherent in social, political and economic construct of race, citizenship and land ownership. Through *Tongbao* inclusion, Sun realised that the nation's unity required the inclusion of all Chinese people, and national unity could be achieved only by the coexistence and empowerment of all the citizens rather than exclusion or assimilation of some.

There are two key terms in Sun's political philosophy in relation to China's modernisation: "Emancipatory communication" and "*Tongbao* inclusion". The *Three Principles of the People*, Sun's core political communication, can be best defined as emancipatory because its target group was, from the outset, primarily the socially and economically excluded Chinese people. The objective of Sun's emancipatory communication was to extend equal citizenship to the marginalised groups such as the undereducated, tenant farmers, and the overseas Chinese. Thus the underlying principle of Sun's emancipatory communication was the equality and freedom of all Chinese citizens against class hierarchy through an intersubjective understanding of others' suffering.

The word *Tongbao* was a linguistic breakthrough, which enabled Sun to reconcile the identities between native and overseas Chinese by amalgamating nationalism and cosmopolitanism into a hybrid form of transnational patriotism. Sun realised that the traditional Chinese identity was narrowly defined by geographical centeredness, and as a result, the overseas Chinese were often excluded from Chinese identity, impeding the transformation of the overseas Chinese into autonomous citizens. Thus Sun's *Tongbao* inclusion offered an intersubjective

understanding—between the Chinese on native soil and the overseas Chinese—of the latter’s suffering by the former’s compassion. Christianity was also closely related to Sun’s *Tongbao* inclusion as the latter originated from Sun’s reconciliatory approach to Confucian fraternal love and Christian universal love; Christian love reflected a theistic compassion, which corresponded to Confucian humanistic benevolence.

This thesis is guided by two main research questions. The central question is: “What is Sun’s emancipatory communication and what kind of impact did it have on China’s modernisation?” followed by “What is the significance of Sun’s *Tongbao* inclusion to the establishment of the Chinese modern nation-state?” A supplementary question is “How did Sun utilise language and the media to reconcile the Chinese and Western ideologies and systems in transforming China?” In answering these questions, employing an interdisciplinary research methodology used in political philosophy and communications studies in relation to language and the media helps situate Sun’s emancipatory communication in the history of China’s modernisation.

In addition to Sun’s own writings, the following is an exemplary set of literature that was referenced to address the research questions. For example, on Sun’s political philosophy and the 1911 revolution: Bergère (1998), Chong, K. R. (2010), Jansen (1970), Linebarger (1925), Martin (1970), Schiffrin (1968, 1980), Wang (1981), Wilbur (1976), Wong, J. Y. (1986a, 1986b); on Confucian influence: De Bary (1999), Yao (2011), Levenson (1964), Wang(2003), Metzger (1996), Schwartz (1959, 1985), Bol (2008); on language and communication: Habermas (1984), Bourdieu (1991), Daruvala (2000) Fei (1992) , Elman (1984), Heller (2007); on China’s modernisation: Fairbank and Goldman (2006), Hsü (2000), Wakeman (1975), Rowe (2009), Strand (2011), He (2002); on race and nationalism: Crossely (2006), Duara (1995) Jenco (2010),

Culp (2007)), Tsu (2005), Dikötter (1992), Fogel and Zarrow (1997); on cultural identity: Gellner (1988), Harrison (2000), Rhoads (2000), Leibold (2007), Unger (1996), Standen (2007), Dennerline (1981), Wong, Y. (1989), Ogden (2002), Cohen (1988); on constitutionalism: Chang (1987), Huang (1972), Schwarzmantel (2003); on citizen's rights and duties: Angle and Svensson (2001), Wang (2003), Esherick and Kayal (2006), Marshall and Bottomore (1992); on the media and public opinion: Habermas (1984), Reed (2004), Dikötter (2008), Judge (1996), Lean, Fitzgerald (1996), McQuail (1992), Goode (2005), Garnham (2000); on labour and peasant's land ownership: Callinicos (2004), Gregor (2000), Chong (2010), Nederveen (1990), Elster (1986) Cohen (1988); on Christianity and its influence: Bays (1996), Chong, K. R. (2010), Yan (1976), Ching (1977), Hillier and Jewell (2005); on the overseas Chinese: Yan (1976, 1985), Wang (2000), Lee and Lee, et al. (2011), Nyíri and Saveliev (2002). A more detailed discussion of the literature will be conducted in the section of Literature Review.

Sun's Early Life (1866-1895)

Sun was born into a Hakka family on November 12, 1866 in the village of Choyhung, a district of Xiangshan in Guangdong's Pearl River delta, located fifty miles from Hong Kong and thirty miles north of Macao. Sun was the fifth son of six children, and his father, a tenant farmer with less than half an acre of arable land, had to work various odd jobs to support his family.⁵ In the face of deepening social and economic hardship after the Opium Wars and the Taiping Rebellion, many peasants and coolie labourers, particularly from Sun's native province of Guangdong as well as the nearby Fujian region, had to leave their native land to work on plantations, mines and railway construction in the New World. Many of these coolie labour émigrés (*huagong*) would continue

to stay in their host nations, forming the overseas Chinese (*huaqiao*) communities together with earlier migrants to Southeast Asia, who were more affluent merchants (*huashang*).

In 1879, at the age of 13, Sun moved to Hawaii, where his elder brother Sun Mei had emigrated earlier; Mei was then developing lowlands and running a general store in Honolulu. While aboard the SS *Grannoch*, a British steamship sailing from Macao to Honolulu, Sun witnessed the advancement of Western technology for the first time in his life in its production of the steamship. His profound admiration for Western science and technology began with this long journey across the Pacific.⁶ At the same time, Sun developed a critical view of China's reluctance to adopt Western science and technology by asking himself, "We Chinese could not make the things that the foreigners did, and I immediately felt there must be something wrong with China. Was not the fact that foreigner could manufacture and mount these great metal girders proof that in other respects, too, they might be superior to the Chinese?"⁷

Hawaii provided Sun with a chance to learn the English language and adopt Christianity. According to Bishop Willis of Iolani, a local diocesan school in which Sun was enrolled⁸, Sun was a devoted assistant at Bible classes, duly attending daily morning and evening prayers. Hence, by intention and principle though not by baptism, Sun had already become a Christian at Iolani. Early in 1885 in Hawaii, the American missionary Charles Hager, who had been in Guangdong for some years, is believed to have baptised Sun as a Congregationalist.⁹ However, Sun's father ordered that he immediately return to China to "take the Jesus nonsense out of him", expressing dismay that Sun would "take up with the superstition of the foreign devils".¹⁰

In 1894, after having completed his medical studies in Hong Kong, Sun publicly demonstrated his interest in modernising China by writing a lengthy proposal to the noted official Li Hongzhang, the leading statesman and viceroy of Zhili Province. In this letter, Sun argued that

China should independently develop Chinese industry and commerce. Most importantly, Sun emphasised the importance of education and training experts in the areas of earth sciences and agriculture. He also argued that a key to the nation's wealth and power could be found in the promotion and protection of trade and commerce by developing the transportation network. Li never paid attention to Sun's letter; disappointed, Sun decided to forego his medical career completely in order to concentrate on revolutionary activities and emancipate China from the ill management of the Qing government. Toward the end of 1894, Sun established the "Revive China Society (*Xingzhonghui*)", a secret society, during another trip to Hawaii. However, Sun's first revolt attempt in Guangdong on October 26, 1895 ended in failure and Sun was forced to escape to Japan.

Class Hierarchy, Land and Tax

Since the establishment of the Qing Dynasty (1644-1911), the Manchus founded a Chinese-style government hiring officials regardless of their ethnic background, and the Qing government had become a legitimate state and won the general loyalty of the Chinese by the 18th century. Its government employed the Confucian concept of state to maintain social order, which was highly hierarchical: the emperor was at the top of society with a mandate to control the world (*tianxia*), supported by well-educated civil servants (bureaucrats). Below them were the aristocrats and the literati (unofficial gentry), followed by Manchu bannermen, farmers, artisans and merchants in order of social respect. This also formed social polarity between the officials (*guan*), who served the state, and the people (*min*), including farmers, artisans and merchants, who did not.¹¹ This dichotomy was also a general reflection of the Confucian influence on social division through the implied superiority of governors and inferiority of the governed.

Furthermore, the gentry enjoyed many unique privileges, including reduced tax payment, and the larger part of their income came from private investments, mostly in land and other forms of usury. At the very bottom of the rural community were the hard-working peasants, who worked year-round for hand-to-mouth subsistence. A tenant farmer usually had to pay 50 percent of the yield for rent, and because the rent paid not in grain but in silver, which had to be converted from copper, more pressure was imposed on peasants after the Opium War as the value of silver increased.¹² Sun was well aware of this economic distress of the peasants, particularly of the tenant farmers, from his observations of his own father.

The underlying cause of peasants' destitution and worsening return on harvest during the late Qing era may have been explosive population growth relative to the available arable land. The population reached a new high of 430 million by 1850 from around 272 million in 1779, an increase of almost 200 percent; however, the amount available arable land rose relatively slowly in that time, an increase of about 35 percent. Consequently, the per capita acreage declined by 43 percent to less than half an acre per person.¹³ To make matters worse, about 50 to 60 percent of arable land was held by the rich families of the gentry, another 10 percent by Manchu bannermen and officials, leaving only 30 percent of arable land available to peasants. Accordingly, 60 to 90 percent of people had no land at all. This unfair land ownership motivated Sun to view the tenancy system critically, which also influenced his future argument against the exploitation of peasants. Thus Sun's proposal of land equalisation plan, the core tenet in his *minsheng* principle, was closely related to the hardship of peasants resulting from disproportionate land holdings, including that of Sun's own father.

Reconciliatory Approach

After another China's defeat in the first Sino-Japan War of 1894, reformers such as Kang Youwei and Liang Qichao urged the emperor Guangxu to emulate Peter the Great of Russia and the Meiji Emperor of Japan in establishing not a complete Westernisation, but a hybrid polity of reconciled Chinese and Western elements.¹⁴ Despite his early education abroad and the influence of Western culture and science in his youth, Confucian values often resonated in Sun's political philosophy. In particular, his pursuit of the Confucian ideology of hierarchical collectivism (*tianxia weigong*) was often quoted and is even inscribed on his tombstone. At the same time, Sun also recognised that the Chinese monarchical rule was incompatible with China's political and economic progress toward a modern nation-state; and he started endorsing republicanism as a result. On the other hand, constitutional monarchy was advocated by the reformists such as Liang Qichao and Kang Youwei.

Yao (2011:396) aptly explicates that "the question of Confucian identity did not become pressing until the beginning of the modern age, when Confucian culture was dismantled and devalued by modernity and its associated values". Initially, the foundation of Sun's reconciliatory approach to both Confucian and Western cultures seems closely related to the influence of language. Sun discovered the intrinsic logic of grammar in Western languages, and even though Sun was fascinated by and proud of the historical particularities of the Chinese language, he also identified some of the exclusionary aspects in the Chinese language. In order to include every Chinese in modern education, Sun insisted that the written and spoken Chinese language be merged into one synchronised system, which would eventually help abolish illiteracy and class division. Sun's insistence on the synergetic effect of grammar and logic as well as the unity between the written and the spoken Chinese language ultimately symbolised his belief that a

cooperative and intersubjective communication across all classes of Chinese people would give rise to China's modernisation.

The underlying intention of Sun's critique of Chinese linguistic structure, namely the absence of clearly stipulated grammar and pedagogy, was in fact a manifestation of his desire to help Chinese people communicate logically. Sun discovered that logic was immanent in language and that scientific reflection was a necessary method for awakening the Chinese people, just as grammar served as a bridge to learning correctly. Consequently, Sun insisted that social awakening was attained by means of logic, which could be obtained from a clear understanding of grammar in language. Later, Sun's belief in public opinion and its role in forming a modern nation-state was also closely connected to his argument for the necessity of logic. Sun's political philosophy was also influenced by the logic of inclusion and his desire for the unity of the Chinese people by means of language so that everyone could understand and communicate rationally. He believed this could be achieved through all-inclusive education, which must be made available and accessible to every Chinese citizen, especially the underprivileged and undereducated.

On the other hand, some scholars have suggested that studying medicine inspired Sun's emancipatory intention. Sun himself admitted that medical science served as the kindly aunt who brought him out on to the high road of politics.¹⁵ Sun entered Queen's College in Hong Kong to study medicine in 1884, and after transferring, he graduated from Hong Kong Medical School with the title of "Licentiate in Medicine for Chinese, HK" in 1892. In his writings, he often compared the condition of China to that of human body, and diagnosed that China was suffering from social, economic and political ailments. Sun argued that the people were deprived of autonomy and equality; therefore, only revolution would save China and the Chinese people.

Christianity was also closely related to Sun's personal and political philosophies. The freedom of religion to protect Christianity was one of the reforms he adopted upon his inauguration as President on January 1, 1912, and a series of radical measures taken by Sun can be also interpreted as the influence of his Christian faith. In particular, his reconciliatory approach to Christian universal love and Confucian fraternal love catalysed the transnational *Tongbao* inclusion that empowered the overseas Chinese. On his death, his family held a Christian funeral in private according to his will, followed by a separate official funeral.¹⁶

Nationalism and Race

Under the influence of social Darwinism, Sun became convinced that national unity was the key to preserving the Chinese race; he therefore argued for a racially defined nationalism based on consanguinity. Sun's insistence on the naturally constructed biological race could have been influenced by the positivistic approach to the human body in Western medicine as well as the traditional Chinese ethnocentric framework that differentiated the Han from other ethnic groups.¹⁷ Racism in modern history was first developed in order to justify the systematic use of labour central to the emergence of capitalism as a world system¹⁸. Social Darwinism produced racial hierarchy and justified imperialism as race became a source of prerogatives in the 19th and 20th centuries.¹⁹ The implications of social Darwinism also resonated in China through various debates. In order to maintain national unity against foreign encroachment, Sun insisted that cultural loyalty to family and clan had to be transferred to the nation. However, family consciousness played an important part in sustaining the elements of Confucian ideology, and the Chinese concept of race also seemed to have been originally influenced by Confucianism.²⁰ Even after the 1911 Revolution, the Chinese people were still divided, and Sun realised that an all-inclusive cultural identity was requisite for

national unity and that racially exclusionary nationalism was antithetical to republicanism. Thus Sun proposed a Five Race Republic to include the ethnic minority groups by acknowledging their autonomy.

The Overseas Chinese

National identity is also shaped by primordial elements of shared soil and blood ²¹, and the Chinese social prejudice against the overseas Chinese was formed by the sense of geographical centeredness of the mainland Chinese, who regarded the overseas Chinese as the other. Among the classifications of overseas Chinese, the coolie pattern (*huagong*) derived from the migration of large numbers of labourers, normally men of peasant origin; landless labourers and the urban poor. In Southeast Asia, this was not the dominant pattern: instead, they were largely the merchant migrants (*huashang*). Together with the *huashangs*, many of these *huagong* émigrés stayed on in their host nations and formed the overseas Chinese (*huaqiao*) communities.²²

Many overseas Chinese also shared some of racial prejudices against the Manchus due to the Qing court's treatment of the overseas Chinese, and their dissatisfaction was further strengthened by the Qing government's inability to protect them.²³ Sun consistently relied upon the contribution of the overseas Chinese to finance the revolution after the inception of the *Xingzhonghui*, the secret society he created in Hawaii in 1894, followed by the Yokohama and the Hong Kong chapters in 1895. In later years, Sun referred to the overseas Chinese as the "Mother of the Revolution".²⁴ Naturally, the Qing government, as well as the reformist and revolutionary organisations, all competed for the financial and political support of the overseas Chinese.

Initially, the word and concept of *Tongbao* were used only within the colonised territories of Hong Kong and Macao, but Sun expanded the geographical boundary to Southeast Asia as well as the Americas. In an effort to include the overseas Chinese in the process of building a new Chinese republic, Sun also came up with the *Tongbao* transnational inclusion, which was inspired by both Confucian fraternal love and Christian universal love; it also symbolised Sun's conciliatory approach to nationalism and cosmopolitanism. Sun also empowered the overseas Chinese with participatory citizenship, which eventually brought forward transnational patriotism. Consequently, it was *Tongbao* citizenship that formed transnational solidarity among the overseas Chinese, helping them transcend the geographical barrier and overcome their psychological liminality. *Tongbao* inclusion and citizenship emphasised the autonomous achievement of political and economic citizenship through voluntary participation. Hence, transnational *Tongbao* citizenship was conceived for the overseas Chinese, who were finally included in the collective identity of all Chinese people.

Constitutionalism and the Revolution (1896-1911)

In 1896, Sun was kidnapped and detained in London by the Qing Legation to be shipped back to China for trial and possibly execution. Dr. Cantlie, Sun's mentor at medical school in Hong Kong, appealed to the newspaper *The Globe* as a last resort to release him. By the time of his release, Sun experienced not only the power of the press and public opinion in England, but also the confirmation of his Christian belief. Sun stayed in London eight more months following his release

and, during his sojourn, developed an outline of his idea on *the Three Principles of the People*. Sun also started formulating his own communicational praxis in order to propagate his political agenda.

Sun and his revolutionary alliance founded the monthly journal *Minpao* in 1905, in which Sun frequently debated with Liang Qichao, who also published his scholarly essays in the *New Citizen Journal*. Between 1906 and 1908, an increasing number of uprisings were staged. Sun became *persona non grata* in Japan in 1907; however, after Cixi's death in 1908, public sentiment in favour of the revolution strengthened, further debilitating the already declining Qing government. Between 1907 and 1911, there were seven unsuccessful revolts led by Sun and his revolutionary party. The Xinhai Revolution of October 10, 1911 finally succeeded, taking everyone by surprise including Sun himself.

In an effort to transform the premodern monarchical government to a republic, Sun attempted to shift the people's loyalty away from the Qing monarchy to the newly established republic. The absolute authority of the monarchy, which was based on class hierarchy, had to give way to constitutionalism, which represented a balance of power between the people and the state. In the early 20th century, constitutionalism became the guiding ideology of the modern nation-state and was understood as a formal statement specifying and delimiting the scope of government action, shifting an imperial to a constitutional mode of politics within the rule of law.²⁵ After 1905, constitutionalist societies sprang up in China, and under this political pressure, the Qing court reluctantly announced its intention to promulgate the constitution. To many Chinese, the idea of constitutionalism represented a political transformation to a modern nation.

Regarding the structure of constitutionalism, Sun and other revolutionaries opposed the ideas of Liang and the reformists who tried to cooperate with the Qing court. While Sun insisted

on a republic, Liang originally asserted that the Qing government could accommodate Western political principles if it was reconfigured as a constitutional monarchy.²⁶ In fact, Liang's interest in Western constitutionalism mainly stemmed from the idea that a government should be set up and operated according to a promulgated constitution in which a popularly elected legislature played the leading role. A provisional National Assembly was thus established and convened in Beijing in October 1910, and Liang became the major voice in that institution.

However, when a 13 member cabinet was announced by the reluctant Qing government in April 1911, it turned out that it contained only four Han officials and one Mongol, compared with eight Manchu princes of royal blood. In fact, the Qing's Outline of Chinese Constitution actually gave the throne even greater power than under the Japanese Meiji Reformation. This also demonstrated that constitutionalism was not the Manchu court's true priority nor its intention, confirming the doubts among the people about the true political interest of the Manchu monarchy. Liang later modified his rhetoric to a constitutional democracy after the 1911 revolution.

In fact, the form of government, whether a republic or a constitutional monarchy, was a matter of expediency rather than of principle for Liang. However, given Sun's deeply rooted distaste of monarchy, which was antithetical to his belief in the equality and freedom of the people, any form of monarchy was unacceptable. Apart from the form of government, Liang and Sun also differed in the time frame for establishing the modern nation-state: Given China's political and economic urgency, Sun favoured revolution while Liang felt China was not ready. Liang repeatedly cautioned Sun against rash action and called for gradualism, arguing that the Chinese people did not yet possess the necessary qualifications to be citizens of a modern nation. However, for Sun, the revolution was not a mere matter of political agenda, but the core element of his emancipatory communication to create a Chinese republic.

For Liang, the existence of written law of constitution was the most important element of a modern nation-state. For Sun, however, a republic was an absolute prerequisite. Apart from their political stances, Sun and Liang also differed fundamentally in their cultural origins and educational backgrounds, which was a source of tension between the two. Sun had not received much classical education, while Liang was an accomplished classical scholar and a holder of the *jujen* degree after having passed the state examination at an early age. Consequently, Sun drew most of his support from the socially underprivileged classes of peasants, coolie labourers and the overseas Chinese while Liang appealed primarily to the well-to-do and elites in society.

Liang also argued for the cohesive balance in the individual freedom and rights in comparison with those of collective, promoting the notion of each individual's unselfishly developing his capacities.²⁷ In contrast, Sun's concept of freedom and rights was firmly based on the people for the nation, indicating that the sacrifice of personal freedom was accepted and even encouraged. Eventually, after the revolution of 1911, Sun proposed the Fivefold Constitution. It was a hybrid of traditional Chinese court systems and Western cabinet structures that included the equal membership of every citizen in the republic by law. It also represented China's transformation from a premodern community (*Volksnation*) to the modern nation-state (*Bürger nation*).

Emancipatory Communication

Sun's emancipatory communication had three sequential aims: First, to defy the exclusionary class hierarchy, which was the prerequisite of the Manchu monarchy; second, to build solidarity among the citizens by empowering them with equal constitutional citizenship; finally, to catalyse national unity by including all Chinese citizens through intersubjective communication and cooperative understanding of others' suffering. Nederveen (1989) emphasises that the ultimate goal of

emancipation in the West was for freedom and autonomy. However, it was for the bourgeoisie first, and then for the underprivileged classes of people; the latter's emancipation, in fact, coincided with the advent of rational society. On the contrary, in Sun Yat-sen's emancipatory communication, the target group was, from the outset, primarily the socially and economically excluded group of the people. Thus the objective of Sun's emancipatory communication was to extend the political and economic rights to marginalised groups such as tenant farmers, the overseas Chinese and coolie labourers.

Sun Yat-sen's emancipatory communication also aimed to counter coercive powers by defying the hierarchical subject-object relation: it argued for an intersubjective relationship based on compassion and mutual understanding. To achieve this, Sun relied on public opinion with the help of the press and public debates in order to rationally persuade the citizens and to consolidate their solidarity. Particularly for the overseas Chinese, whose cultural identity and patriotism were influenced by both China and their host nations, Sun empowered them transnationally by means of participatory citizenship. Throughout his public speeches and written communications, the idea of inclusion was often present; Sun regarded the inclusion of socially excluded people as an essential element in the emancipation of China. He also promoted the inclusion of women in public space such as in the military service and voting, thereby defying gender exclusion. However, his logic of inclusion tended to lean toward the majority of the population based on collectivism, resulting in ignoring the rights of individuals and ethnic minorities.

The Early Republican Period (1912-1925)

On January 1, 1912, the first Chinese republic was inaugurated and Sun was sworn in as president in Nanjing. However, Sun acknowledged the unavoidability of securing cooperation from Yuan Shikai, the powerful commander of the Beiyang Army; he therefore offered the presidency to Yuan on the condition that he guarantee the abdication of the Manchu monarchy and accept the principle of republican government. Upon his agreement, Yuan was elected Provisional President of the Republic of China by the Nanjing Senate on February 14, 1912. China then had its first proper constitution, albeit in provisional form, containing a detailed list of citizens' rights with the stipulation of the system of democratic government based on the separation of powers in the cabinet.

From November 1912 to February 1913, national elections were held to form the new House of Representatives and the Senate. In January 1913, however, the results of China's first elections showed that the Kuomintang Party (KMT) had won a smashing victory, much to Yuan's disappointment. After Song Jiaoren, a close ally to Sun and a republican revolutionary, was allegedly assassinated by Yuan, Sun once again had to flee to Japan.²⁸ Yuan forced the parliament to elect him president, and in January 1914, Yuan formally dissolved the parliament in an attempt to build a dynasty of his own. Yuan also attempted to revive state Confucianism but his attempt ended in failure. He formally abandoned the empire after 83 days; he was defeated and then died in June 1916.²⁹

After Yuan's death, Sun returned to China, which was suffering further fragmentation by the rival warlords of regional military cliques. Sun reorganised the KMT party based on both the organisational structure of the Soviet Communist party and the *Three Principles of the People*. Over the years, the details of Sun's Three Principles had changed and the final version, published in 1924, reflected the influence of the Soviet revolution, including Lenin's theory. Furthermore, in

his *Programme of National Reconstruction*, also published in 1924, Sun imposed a three-phase government period that included military operation and political tutelage before a full constitutional government.

However, after a fight with cancer, Sun died on March 12, 1925 in Beijing. On February 20, 1925, Sun (1925:1) communicated his last words:

“For forty years I have devoted myself to the cause of the people's revolution with but one end in view, the elevation of China to a position of freedom and equality among the nations. My experiences during these forty years have firmly convinced me that to attain this goal we must bring about a thorough awakening of our own people and ally ourselves in a common struggle with those peoples of the world who treat us on the basis of equality. The work of the Revolution is not yet done. Let all our comrades follow my "Programme of National Reconstruction," "Fundamentals of National Reconstruction," "Three Principles of the People," and the "Manifesto", and strive on earnestly for their consummation. Above all, our recent declarations in favour of the convocation of a National Convention and the abolition of unequal treaties should be carried into effect with the least possible delay. This is my heartfelt charge to you.”³⁰

Seen from the contemporary perspective, Sun was a *glocal* revolutionary—a global thinker and local reformer—a form of hybridity resulting from his reconciliatory approach. However, these two powerful yet mutually opposing elements of ‘global and local’ symbolised Sun’s persistent dilemma in his praxis of emancipatory communication, juxtaposed with conflicts such as ‘inclusive and exclusionary’, ‘individual and collective’, ‘pedagogical and autonomous’ and the ‘moral and material’ in his modernisation efforts. In fact, they reflected Sun’s inner conflict.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In addition to Sun's political significance as a revolutionary leader, the *Three Principles of the People* has been the central theme in Sun Yat-sen scholarship. While the *Three Principles of the People* still remains the core leitmotif in Sun scholarship, a new set of themes has emerged in an effort to situate Sun in the modern history of China, such as the questions of what inspired Sun China's modernisation, how Sun reconciled traditional Confucian moral values and Western pragmatic approaches, and what the implications of Sun's nationalism and political tutelage were in relation to the rights of the people and the formation of modern rationality.

Fairbank and Goldman (2006) divide China's periods of social and political modernisation into three key stages between 1850 and 1911. The first stage was the success of the gentry-elite in supporting the Qing dynasty against rebels such as the Taiping on the basis of loyalty; the second stage of the post-*Taiping* era commenced when the gentry-elite became active in the revival and growth of Confucian education in academies, managing a wide range of urban welfare and community works until 1890s; and in the third stage beginning in the late 1890s, the rise of nationalism came with the reformist urban elites. During the third period, the economic and political structure of traditional China was exposed to and actively interacted with Western powers, which came with military and material advancements. Fairbank and Goldman (ibid.) claim that the Chinese elites found the Manchus too slow, obstructive, and incapable of leading China toward the modernisation facing foreign encroachment; it was during this third period that Sun's involvement with China's modernisation began, since he felt the Qing was responsible for being unable to protect the Chinese people and its territory from foreign imperialism.

After finishing medical school, Sun wrote an edict to Li Hongzhang with his suggestions on how to modernise Chinese industry and commerce, emphasising the importance of education

and training experts in the areas of earth sciences and agriculture. At this time, Sun was not yet considering overthrowing the Qing dynasty, but he expressed his concerns about the growing power of the West and wished to enlighten Li with Western methodology in industrialising China. Hsü (2000) argues that China's consecutive defeats in the Opium Wars and in the first Sino-Japanese war eventually shaped the need for the rapid modernisation of China by elite reformists such as Kang Youwei and Liang Qichao. They urged the emperor to emulate Peter the Great of Russia and the Meiji Emperor of Japan in imposing a hybrid polity based on reconciled Chinese and Western elements rather than a complete Westernisation. Right after China's defeat in the first Sino-Japanese War of 1895, Sun launched his first uprising against the Qing Dynasty.

Confucian influence on Sun remained strong throughout his political life, and Sun tried to reconcile Confucian moral values with Western rationality in modernising China. There are various views on the implications of Confucian influence on the process of China's modernisation. In terms of its impact on the people's characteristics, De Bary (1999) suggests that Confucianism engendered an attitude of passive acquiescence, if not subservient obedience, to all forms of established authority. He notes that Confucianism, whether as imperial order or as an ethical system, was not questioned, so Confucianism had come under total attack at a later date when the interaction between Western culture and China became more active. De Bary (*ibid.*) further asserts that Confucianism played a role as an absolute and authoritative institution, which might have contributed to China's delay in modernisation as Confucianism resisted the modernisation or Westernisation of China. Furthermore, Yao (2011) claims that the question of Confucian identity became an issue only with the beginning of the modern age when Confucian culture was dismantled and devalued by modernity and its associated values.

Accordingly, the Chinese people's submissive attitude toward social hierarchy also seems to be closely related to Confucian teachings. Judge (1996) argues that the imperial government maintained a policy of keeping the people ignorant throughout Chinese history based on the Confucian principle that "the people may be made to follow a path of action, but they may not be made to understand it". Confucian inculcation became the system for educating and disciplining the masses under hierarchical rule. Sun also reflected this tendency in his political lexes and praxis. In fact, the media in the late Qing period blamed this system for engendering and enforcing weakness in the Chinese character, from insularity to submissiveness, passivity and a lack of self-reliance.

Sun's advocacy of freedom and equality of the people in his pursuit of establishing a republic also seems to have resulted from his opposition to class hierarchy and the dynastic structure of the Qing dynasty, which represented a pre-modern political system. Levenson (1964) provides the underlying reason why Chinese peasantry, for example, still worked under the condition of social hierarchy by referring to Mencius's famous dictum: "Some labour with their minds, and some with their strength. Those who labour with their minds govern others, those who labour with their strength are governed by others; those who are governed by others support them and those who govern others are supported by them". Thus Mencius' teaching broadly represents the internalisation of the intellectual superiority of governors and the importance of the intellectually inferior masses submitting to and accepting social hierarchy. The juxtaposition of Sun's rejection of class hierarchy in monarchism and the traditionally strong influence of Confucian hierarchy represented his future political conflict in modernising China.

For Sun, among many indications of Confucian influence, it seems evident that the ideology of *tianxia weigong* taught him the importance of social order and collectivism.

Additionally, paternalism was implied in the ideology of *tianxia* as people even took the lead in deifying the emperor, calling the emperor their “Heavenly Father” and showing him the same filial devotion owed to ones’ own father. Sun showed a trace of paternalism in his political involvement, such as in the formation of public opinion as well as political tutelage. Confucian society was clearly delineated by the vertical structure of the world or the ideology of ‘all under Heaven’ (*tianxia*), consisting of the taxonomical order of Heaven, the emperor and family. Here collective purpose (*weigong*) overrides that of an individual. This conflicted with Sun’s republicanism, as that principle was based on the freedom of individual citizens and the equality of the people. On the other hand, Judge (1996) insists that since ancient times, Chinese society had been also conceptualised in terms of the dichotomy between the officials (*guan*) and the people (*min*).

As De Bary (1988) points out, despite its hierarchical and divisive aspects, Confucianism also had a unifying element in the ideology of ‘Grand Commonalty’ (*datong*); for example, it inspired Sun to seek economic harmony through his land equalisation program in the *minsheng* principle. Moreover, Wang Gungwu (2003) draws upon the Confucian humanistic relationship, delineated by social roles such as affection between father and son; righteous conduct between ruler and subject; distinction between husband and wife; proper order between the old and the young; and trust between friends. At the same time, Wang (*ibid.*) argues that these relationships were defined mainly by duties imposed on the weaker. Later, these disciplinary duties imposed on the people by Confucian loyalty further inspired Sun to seek the political rights of citizens and constitutionalism.

On the other hand, Huang (1972) claims that, despite the hierarchical and duty-bound society, “primacy of the people” was also the central ideology: Mencius argued that the ruler and his officials were merely servants of the community, and their task was to carry out the wishes of

the people. Angle and Svensson (2001) point out that there was also an ambiguity concerning Confucianism's stance on the officials and primacy of the people; for example, Mencius also indicated that "even though people who act against a bad ruler cannot be blamed for what they do, they still do not act rightly." The ambiguity of Confucianism also corresponded to Sun's conflict with regard to his political praxis.

Metzger (1996) maintains that the influence of the Confucian tradition prevented the full realisation of an individual's potential, while Schwartz (1959, 1985) emphasises its political ambiguity, arguing that dualistic concepts were a characteristic of Confucianism. Wang (2011:82) adds that Confucianism's various manifestations existed in a complicated relationship with the construction of the dynastic system and political legitimacy. Bol (2008), on the other hand, elucidates Neo-Confucianism by comparing its moral values, the essence of which is being true to nature or self-seeking, with the concept of profit-making in Western capitalism. He insists that Neo-Confucianism's purpose was different from the pursuit of power and wealth, instead emphasising becoming moral beings. In fact, Sun agonised between Confucian moral duty and the Western pragmatic approach to material progress, particularly with his land equalisation plan in his *minsheng* principle; he employed both the Confucian ideal of *datong* communalism and Western communism in order to counter the materialistic aspects of Western capitalism.

However, China's traditional reliance on the sole input of human labour rather than technological innovation together with the lack of trade and industry, resulting from the government's strict policy and heavy taxation, ultimately delayed its modernisation. He Ping (2002) notes that the focus of traditional Chinese academic institutions on linguistic, rhetorical and ethical learning instead of on practical issues also deepened the delay in modernisation; thus, compared with the social structure of decentralisation and openness in Europe, the Chinese maintained

unification and monotony. He (ibid.) further argues that science in the West was the history of an intellectual tradition that started with literary recovery of classical science. Sun was aware of these fundamental problems of China associated with its modernisation when he first wrote his edict to Li Hongzhang, who disregarded it because he was occupied with the settlement after China's defeat in the Sino-Japan War of 1895.

Christianity also had a profound impact on the modernisation of China. For example, Christianity influenced the formation of the rebel Hung's ideology in the Taiping Rebellion. Wakeman (1975) argues that, to Hung, Christianity signified that which he admired or feared in the West. Rowe (2009) also points out that the Opium War treaties allowed Christian missionaries to enter the interior of the empire and mandated the protection of Western as well as Chinese converts, increasing the number of legal conflicts and violent incidents with the Qing government. Moreover, Hsü (2000) claims that the Boxer Rebellion was the representation of antipathy of Christianity as the gentry regarded Christianity as a threat not only to social order, but to their imagined cultural superiority. Thus Christianity, as a heterodox faith in China, became a target and representation for anteforeignism.

For Sun, Christianity signified not only a religious belief in monotheism, but also access to Western science and technology in addition to the benefit of political alliance with the Christian revolutionaries. On the other hand, Fairbank (1986) points out that the Christian missionaries played an increasingly important role in Chinese life in the form of print media, which became one of their social and cultural influences. Judge (1996) supports Fairbank's argument regarding the influence of Christian missionaries on the development of Chinese print media by noting that 70 percent of Chinese language newspapers were created by missionaries for evangelisation in the

late Qing period, and the rapid growth of the media was also accompanied by serious political discussions of the Manchu's reform from 1901 to 1911.

The fact that Sun's background is both Hakka and Christian has an interesting cultural implication on his political philosophy. Constable (in Bays 1996) argues that the Hakka's Christian identity does not take a particularly Chinese form, but Christianity allowed Hakka Christians to negotiate their Hakka identity. Thus, for the Hakka, Christianity was not constructed in opposition to Han identity or culture; instead, Christianity could be used and renegotiated in their continued claims to a legitimate Han identity. This may also explain why Sun was able to assertively propagate his racially defined nationalism in mobilising the Han majority. Chong, K. R. (2010) relates Sun's flexibility in reconciling different cultures to his Hakka origin as well as to his Christianity and Western education, arguing that the importance of the Hakka role in the Chinese revolution cannot be overlooked. In regard to Christianity, Chong also insists that Sun's radical measures can be interpreted as manifestations of his Christian faith being reconciled with long-standing Chinese traditions.

Language and National Unity

Daruvala (2000) holds that, since the late Qing dynasty, while the people had been the most important component of the nation, language, and more specifically, the use of the vernacular, was the instrument by which the people's commitment to the nation was to be mobilised. Interestingly, Sun was initially introduced to modern rationality through the grammar and pedagogy of Western language. Consequently, Sun became convinced that the unity of spoken and written Chinese was vital to the modernisation of the nation and he advocated an all-inclusive education, particularly

for women and for the illiterate. For Sun, language was not only a tool for communicative rationality but an essential instrument for national unity.

Elman (1984) maintains that philology was an important cultural element in the late Qing period. For Qing scholars, philology was a required discipline to recover and relearn the past structures of Confucian culture because it made the retrieval of the past possible; philology was therefore not a peripheral or frivolous enterprise. In Neo-Confucian discourses, theoretical issues were usually first reduced to their rational principles before conclusions based on deductive norms could be drawn. Elman (*ibid.*) insists that Qing philology demonstrates that changes in social norms are often responsible for new approaches to knowledge.

In the West, language has been also regarded as a core cultural element that influences and shapes national identity. Saussure once said that language was a collective treasure shared by all members of a community (Bourdieu 1991). Likewise, communication is a collective activity in which language is utilised to convey meaning across populations. Language is thus a necessary tool to achieve intersubjective understanding among all members in communication. Heller (2007) sees language as a set of resources that circulate in unequal ways in social networks and discursive spaces, and whose meaning and value are socially constructed within the constraints of social organisational processes. She argues that hierarchies are not inherently linguistic, but rather social and political; language is thus only one terrain for the construction of relations of social difference, inequality, and social hierarchy. In a similar vein, Bourdieu (1991) maintains that language can neither be analysed nor understood in isolation from its cultural context and the social conditions of its production and reception, indicating the inextricable relationship between language and cultural identity in communication. Language therefore also influences the formation of identity by its binary characteristics of social inclusion or exclusion.

Bourdieu (in Myles 2010) also suggests that wherever spoken language and issues of social inequality arise, either as reported in the media, or as aspects of the media as an institution in society, the concepts of accent, dialect and voice are usually central issues to the debate. He further notes that some argue that the Chinese pictogram writing system is able to represent multiple regional dialects, consonant and vowel sounds with ease, whereas alphabetic systems are highly restricted in comparison, stimulating standardisation and rationalisation more generally, and creating the problem of ‘marking’ regional accents as a consequence. As such, even though some contemporary Western scholars found a positive implication of the Chinese language from the perspective of written language, Sun was acutely aware that an important linguistic element to unite and mobilise the Chinese people was through the synchronisation of written and spoken Chinese.

Furthermore, Bourdieu (1984) identifies the connection between culture and science through language, arguing that language is a social historical phenomenon pre-constructed by a set of social historical conditions. As an example, he notes that, until the French revolution, the process of linguistic unification was bound up with the construction of a monarchical state; regional and purely oral dialects were defined negatively and pejoratively in opposition to the official language. On the other hand, Fei (1992) emphasises that all communicators who share a common culture, language, consciousness and endogamous kinship constitute a distinct ethnic unit. Moreover, he argues that in large groups, people’s experiences are complex and often disconnected, so they have fewer common experiences on which to base their language. However, Fei (ibid.) also suggests that because ethnic identity is both subjective and situational, ethnic identity was based not on a static set of objective criteria, but rather on a constantly evolving network of relationships in specific local conditions.

Liang Qichao, in order to spread knowledge and education, argued for the necessity of synchronising written and spoken language, which was truly radical at the time. (Huang 1972) In fact, Sun, in his book “Memoirs of a Revolutionary”, argued for the importance of the synchronisation of written and spoken Chinese. On the other hand, Strand (2011) stresses the foreign influence on Chinese language from the exile and emigrant communities abroad; furthermore, Hu (1960) insists that the creation of new words and expressions is characteristic mainly of vernacular Chinese, *baihua*, rather than literary Chinese, *wenyan*, or *wenli*, the language of the Chinese classics, as preserved by several scholars.

Wang Hui (in Yeh 2011) suggests that, in setting up a modern nation-state, a general national language along with an artistic forms of language are always among the most important means for building cultural unity; and many scholars have noted the clear historical links between the formation of modern nation-states and the creation of a written language on the basis of a spoken vernacular. Wang (ibid.) further suggests that even though there are evident links between the vernacular and nationalist movements, the former cannot be seen as simply having been based one particular dialect; since it was written language, the replacement of classical language by the *baihua*, or written vernacular, cannot be described as phono-centrism either .

Goldman and Lee (2002) highlight the fact that the vernacular and its function of popular enlightenment had been advocated and practiced by a host of late Qing thinkers. The idea of a literary revolution, which was first conceived by Hu Shi in America, was welcomed enthusiastically by the late Qing, advocates of *baihua* as a medium of popularisation and political education. On the other hand, Schwarcz (1986) insists that Sun was not much of a supporter of the Chinese vernacular, arguing Sun was ill-prepared for his encounter with the Chinese enlightenment

movement. However, it was his prompt appreciation of the significance of student patriotism that prevented him from becoming an enemy of the May Fourth Movement.

Furthermore, there is a connection between language and human labour. Marx's notion of human labour as a necessarily social activity is closely related to his view of language, claiming that language is practical and as old as human consciousness. (Callinicos 2004). On the other hand, Cohen (1988) treats labour and language as social relationships that function through human cooperation in a community. In terms of cooperation and language, Habermas (1984) stresses that the ultimate purpose of language is to understand common meaning among the communicators, insisting that the culture and science are fundamentally and structurally oriented towards the production of mutual understanding and agreement between actors who reciprocally recognise each other by sharing meanings. Sun leveraged the social characteristics of language as a political tool to include all the classes of the people for the common understanding of a modern nation-state, while also acknowledging labour as a cooperative tool to achieve common economic harmony. Sun believed that language was directly related to national unity.

Language and Nationalism

Sun regarded the Chinese language as a cultural fortress that preserved its history as well as its national power through the assimilation of other races. He also noted that during the 4000 or 5000 years of Chinese history, Chinese characters had told the story of all the events that took place, exactly and continuously, arguing that this was an exceptional peculiarity of the Chinese language. Duara (1995) highlights the openness or vulnerability of language as susceptible to strategic appropriations as he asserts that language can be mediated by social reality and political forces. However, Duara (ibid.) also argues that language is not infinitely manipulable: the limits imposed

by the meanings of words do not reflect the unalterable truth of some historical reality, implying the malleability of linguistic function and meaning in different times and places. On the other hand, Culp (2007) considers the efficacy of language in terms of national cohesion when used in textbooks, arguing that textbooks promoted the universalising project of “civilising” and standardising diverse peoples’ cultures, languages and behaviour during the late Qing dynasty and in the early Republican period.

On the other hand, Sun presented linguistic logic as an essential element in the nation’s modernisation by comparing it to scientific rationality. At the same time, he was also aware of the limitations of translation; he therefore recommended not drawing too narrow an interpretation, demonstrating Sun’s reconciliatory approach to an intersubjective understanding between cultures. Rowe (2009) points to the problem with translation as early Chinese translators used Chinese words such as *Shangdi* or *Tian* to render the Christian name God, conflating these meanings and applying them awkwardly between different languages. On the other hand, Judge (1996) maintains that Western concepts became integrated in Chinese culture in the mid- to late 19th century as the Chinese reform discourse became a synthesis of ancient principles and imported ideas. She argues that the new foreign terms were also transformed since they were associated with classical principles, translated into a culturally familiar language and appropriated into the late Qing discourse. Sun also considered the translation and import of foreign ideas as a vehicle to broaden the limits of one’s understanding.

Print Media

Eight months after the May Fourth Movement of 1919, Sun pointed out the importance of raising literacy ratio in China in his speech to the Beijing's progressive and anti-imperialist university students (Reed 2004). Dikötter (2008) asserts that the emergence of many new publications resulted in a decentralisation of power, and textbooks were one of the most efficient vehicles in educating citizens. Culp (2007) adds that the textbooks of the 1910s also sought to establish the historical roots of the Chinese people as Chinese historians adopted the Western historical methods of evaluating sources and constructing arguments, which also formed a path to modernisation. In the late Qing society, newspapers were used as various discourses and practices took place within the society, revealing ways to reconcile new cultural meanings and age-old political practices. Chang and Gordon (1991) point to Sun's use of the media for political propaganda and debates, arguing that Sun's newspaper the *Minpao* became an important source of information for the members of the overseas secret society *Tongmenhui*, featuring debates over the question of revolution versus reform, particularly Sun's arguments against the positions advocated by Liang Qichao and other reformists.

Fairbank (1986) emphasises the relationship between the formation of public opinion and the growth in journalism and publications in the early 20th century; chief innovations were made to distribute Western works in translation and to publish news and comments on public issues. He insists that the rapid growth in the print industry was accompanied not only by the serious political discussion of the Manchu's reform from 1901 to 1911, but also by modern fiction; Liang Qichao, for example, advocated the key role of fiction to awaken people and to change their ideas. On the other hand, Judge (1996) analyses the role of public opinion in Chinese political history and argues that it helped transform elite opinion, which was only within the bureaucracy, to collective opinion

of the common people. The modern phenomenon of public opinion (*yulun*) on government and society thus became a key component in the larger agenda of forcing a transition to a more open mode of politics by the early 1900s. Public opinion then became central to constitutional politics with the role of ensuring that the collective sense of right and wrong in society remained clear to the public.

Sun (1897:220) once pointed out, “In England, public opinion expressed its sympathy with the revolution, but the government was opposed to it”, suggesting the independence of public opinion in England from the political input of the government, and moreover lamenting the absence of public opinion in China. Moreover, Judge (1996) notes that the censorship laws in China, designed to limit the influence of the print media by the Qing court, also indicate how threatened the dynasty felt by the newly emerging public opinion and how ineffective government measures were in silencing it. Therefore, although print media invoked popular power and public opinion as new deterrents to official power, the media also understood that these forces needed to be legally secured and formally institutionalised.

However, with regard to the process of forming public opinion, Fitzgerald (1996) problematizes Sun’s influence on the media, referring to it as the ‘downgrading’ of public opinion in the political discourses of the 1920s. Fitzgerald argues that the development occurred after Sun decided to reorient the Nationalist Party policy away from liberal constitutional politics; Sun deemed the latter unruly for the politics of a disciplined mass party in the first quarter of the 20th century. Lean (2007) adds that while the phrase ‘public opinion’ continued to be used in the 1920s, and 1930s, it lacked the political potential and significance that it had in the late Qing period discussions. On the other hand, Xu (2000) asserts that the ascendancy of journalism would have been a necessary condition for legitimating the expansion of a modern state even in a different

historical context.

Moreover, McQuail (1992) relates the formation of citizen solidarity to the media; the principle of solidarity represents the symbolic extension of sympathy to the individuals or groups in trouble or need, reminding people of their common humanity. On the other hand, Goode (2005) relates the role of media to democracy and citizenship, arguing that an unproblematised hierarchy in communication produces privileges in speech and the printed word; he also asserts that communications technologies such as printing allow citizens some element of connectivity with physically absent actors and social processes through which their experiences and action choices are structured. Goode (ibid.) maintains that the dispersion of communications technologies also enhances the linkages between ‘lived experience and mediated experience’, creating new social relations.

Early on, Sun recognised the political role of the media in catalysing the solidarity of the people and public opinion for modern rationality, publicly acknowledging the media’s contribution to the Chinese revolution in the first issue of the *Minpao*. Garnham (2000) argues that history links the development of mass media by providing an analysis of the key characteristics of the shift from traditional to modern societies within a wider communicational context; this was also accompanied by a shift from coercion to persuasion, followed by the growth in rationality and the scientific worldview. The birth of public opinion catalysed modernity. Garnham (ibid.) claims that modernity became possible through a ‘break with the past’ helped by public opinion, emancipating itself from the fetters of tradition since a part of human autonomy was seen to derive from a reflective critique of tradition.

Public Speech, Sympathy and Pledge

Regarding the public opinion that the print media helped catalyse, Lean (2007) posits that the public sentiment of compassion, or public sympathy (*tongqing*), also contributed to the modernisation of China; specifically by bringing women's presence from the private space of home to the public space of court. She argues through the case of a woman's murdering an enemy man that the collective affects constituted a powerful and new communal form of sentiment based on a long-standing premise of the ethical authenticity of emotions. In fact, the communal sentiment of the public could serve as an antidote to an era of inauthenticity generated by slick mass media, the corrupt factionalism of the Nationalist regime, and the lack of justice in the courts. Thus Lean (ibid.) emphasizes the rawness of *tongqing* sentiments was something like what a spectacle would bring out from the audience. Additionally, *tongqing* signified a transformation from a communal sentiment of *renqing* (sympathy between family members) to the relations of the larger political order of the public, thus an indication of China's political modernisation.

Traditionally, the concept of speech or utterance in China according to Confucius was consisted of four categories: *deyan* (virtuous speech), *xinyan* (trustworthy speech), *weiyan* (upright speech) and *yayan* (correct speech). Lu (2004) argues that Confucius was primarily concerned with the speaker's moral character, which determined the intention and effect of a speech as opposed to its presentation and delivery. Thus, those who excelled at the presentation and delivery of a speech might have been perceived negatively, provoking suspicion and even hostility from the audience.

Public speech, a modern phenomenon, also contributed to the formation of public sympathy. While print media covered geographically hard-to-reach places both in China and overseas,

helping to build public opinion and political awareness among distant citizens, public speech appealed to and relied upon live audiences for a more immediate and intimate effect. In fact, speechmaking became a principal campaign tactic during the national elections of 1912–13. Strand (2011:77-8) explains the origin of public speech in China by relating it to the modernisation of China, arguing that the function of public speech was applied in politics, which helped Chinese society transform from relying on bourgeois opinion to popular opinion; with the help of the media, public speech also helped build national unity. Strand (ibid.) also suggests that Chinese culture, which traditionally discouraged speaking out, had the effect of oppressing public awareness and awakening, possibly with the effect of delaying modern society.

Strand (ibid.) further insists that, in the so-called pre-communist era, ‘a great alliance of the masses’ signified the inclusion of traditional and elite bodies like guilds, native place associations and popular and progressive organisations. Regarding the methodology for engaging in public debates and speech, Liang Qichao called for mutual tolerance while Kang Youwei emphasised social solidarity and socialisation. Thus public speech and debates were believed to have fomented sociability for students through the sharing and exchanging of ideas, catalysing collective intimacy. Hu Shi contributed to the literary revolution in China as he specifically recommended that Chen Duxu not avoid using vernacular words and speech (Goldman and Lee 2002). There is also an implication that Sun reconciled this traditional view on public speech with modern rationality in that Sun delivered his speech with the intention of rationally persuading the audience with his emotional affect.

On transforming a passive audience into a voluntary participant, Garnham (2000) emphasises that, even though a dialogue is initiated by one party, once it has started, neither party is the originator or the receiver: the two parties merge into one. Thus, they both become one and

the other in turn, resulting in a constant and subtly managed shifting interplay of roles. This is when persuasion must come into play. Gellner's (1988) analysis of the shift from coercive power to rational persuasion represents the key characteristics in the transformation from traditional community to a modern society. Garnham (2000) further argues that this process requires the development of formal systems of education as the core of the mode of persuasion, as well as the historical analysis and explanation for the growth of rationality and the scientific world view.

Habermas (1984), in his theory of communicative action, points out that human speech acts can and indeed do tend to enable mutual understanding, agreement and consensus. Humans must also communicate with each other through the use of symbols understood between subjects within communities. Public speech thus requires the notion of competence and a capacity to produce expressions that are appropriate for particular situations. Habermas (*ibid.*) further asserts that participants are motivated to accept or reject a problematic claim on the basis of reasons alone.

Mutual agreement on the communicative act is produced by swearing an oath in public, which symbolises that both parties accept the duties and rights of the citizen by performing citizenship in the form of written and spoken communication. Sun also regarded the public pledging of allegiance as an act of performative patriotism in the synchronised written and spoken language. Tsao (1947) also claims that one of the most important duties of the citizen is allegiance to the state, while Habermas (1984) asserts that communicative action includes the possibility of coming to agreement due to the fact that human beings are part of an intersubjective linguistic community. Furthermore, communicative action is driven by the pragmatic goal of reaching mutual understanding.

Race and Nationalism

Tsu (2005) asserts that nationalism is usually understood as a state-imposed ideology, reinforced by ethnic affinity and mostly examined for its instrumental use for particular political ends. For Sun, both people and territory were two main constituents of a nation, and his choice of the word *minzu* highlights the importance of the people. Sun insisted that the difference between *minzu* (nation) and *guojia* (state) lay in that the former was produced by natural forces and the latter by force of arms; he further noted that the natural formation of bloodline in race was the foremost important element. See Sin Heng (in Lee and Lee, et al. 2011) also analyses the etymological origin of nation (*minzu*) and the state (*guojia*) in nationalism, positing that the word nation connotes the birth of the people in a similar territory, sharing a similar cultural and religious background, whereas the word state refers to the bureaucratic and political machinery that arises within the modern state system. Heng argues Sun's understanding of nationalism was clearly influenced by Western political theory, and his conception of "nation-state" appears to be influenced precisely by this concept of ethnic groups and political entity that is the state.

Emphasising the malleability and abstract nature of race, Dikötter (1992) posits that race is an identifying construct that evolves according to changes in the symbolic universe in the groups. He also argues that group membership can only exist in a relational context, but ethnicity in history cannot be separated from the evidentiary processes by which all history is understood. Crossley (2006), on the other hand, argues that ethnic phenomena are not only dynamic across time, but produced by intertwining acts of naming others and oneself using distinctly "ethnic" institutions of language, religion, economic activity or family organisation, or using solely the impressions of difference and similarity. As a result, these mechanisms produce "centres" and "peripheries", "histories", "nationalities", and "cultural others" that are discernible on social, cultural or

ideological canvases and that play out dominance, submission, resistance, conversion or subversion.

In a similar vein, Duara (1995) claims that race refers to a categorical difference of people engendered by perceived physical and attendant sociocultural differences, which include notions of “blood” or “species”. Thus the construct of ethnicity either includes or excludes others based on the needs of a collective. For example, Banton (1987) demonstrates that different eras have employed different discursive concepts to explain and legitimate this difference such as ancestry, blood, or genetics. Crossley (2006) adds that ethnic categories are constructed, as are lineages, communities, nations; and when ethnic categories are intertwined with these other identities, one finds powerful languages of exclusion. Furthermore, the malleability of geographical boundaries is a central element in the dynamic processes that generate ethnicity.

Evolutionism began to make an impact on the non-Western world as it blended with Darwinism in the end of the 19th century. It represented the underside of Enlightenment rationality since it sustained the hierarchy of “advanced” and “backward” races and justified the destructiveness of imperialist exploitation (Duara 1995). Under the influence of social Darwinism, Sun’s main concern was the possible end of the Chinese race and the partition of Chinese territory by the encroachment of foreign powers. This led him to emphasise the importance of population as a representation of the power of a strong race. Liang Qichao also accepted the social Darwinist vision of ruthless competition in disregarding absolute values or universal ideals of international harmony (Fogel and Zarrow 1997). Although Sun acknowledged social Darwinism, he also argued strongly for cooperation as the core element of human evolution.

Nevertheless, Dikötter (1992) argues that there was not a significant difference between the social Darwinism-inspired race hierarchy and the Chinese racial distinction given the Han perception of the minority Chinese remained embedded in an ethnocentric framework that stressed socio-cultural differences. On the other hand, Duara (1995) disputes that race has to be understood within a wider discourse because social Darwinism represented a closed, mutually defining discourse of history, nation and race in which the only justification for nationhood was whether a race could be shown to fit in with or to advance historical progress. Ultimately, Duara (ibid.) argues that we should not allow these arguments to conceal the extent to which the racism of social Darwinist global discourse formed the intellectuals' view of the world in the period.

Cultural Identity

Harrison (2000) points to the paradox of treating ethnicity and nationalism as separate disciplines in Chinese modern history, namely nationalism by historians and ethnicity by anthropologists. Historians mainly looked at the impact of the West, modernisation and the effect of imperialism focusing on China's progress toward the modern nation-state, while anthropologists examined cultural identity. She points to the invented nature of many of the traditions of nationalism, thus regarding both ethnicity and nationalism as historical constructs. Furthermore, connecting ethnicity and nationalism with cultural identity, Harrison claims that cultural performance is not just a means of social integration but also a means of creating hierarchies of power between communities. Rhoads (2000) explains that the field of Qing studies has complicated our understanding of Manchu identity, demonstrating the persistence of a distinct Manchu ethnic sovereignty and how Manchu identity was central to the expansion, consolidation and ultimate downfall of the Qing Empire.

Sun distinguished between race and nationality, claiming that China is made up of a common race unlike other nations, which were made up of different “nationalities”. Sun thus emphasised that race could not be forged by coercive power of arms, but only by natural force, implying his rejection of the Manchu conquest and the colonisation of China by Western imperialism since both directly represented coercive power of arms. Leibold (2007) claims that the introduction of the concept of race (*minzu*, *renzhong*, *zhongzu*, etc.) set within a global system of territorially bounded and naturally competitive race-states (*guozu*), significantly altered Chinese thinking on ethnic difference. It also represented a transition from China’s premodern empire to a modern nation-state during which both exclusivist ethnocentrism and inclusivist universalism were actively involved in the process of shaping what it meant to be Chinese.

Leibold (ibid.) further argues that ethnic identity was viewed as a set of objective cultural traits and, as Western imperialism forced Chinese nationalists like Liang Qichao to ultimately reject Chinese tradition and embark on the path of modernity, nationalism became a form of identity. In fact, Kang Youwei justified nationalism as a necessary stage in the ultimate achievement of the “great unity (*datong*)” of all peoples of the world. *Datong* was also an ideal that Sun Yat-sen would later employ in his emancipatory communication. Even Liang, who had opposed the racially defined racism of the revolutionaries by calling the nationalism of the Han a narrow nationalism (*xiaominzuzhuyi*) in opposition to his own conception of a great nationalism (*daminzuzhuyi*), could not fully avoid the racist underpinnings of the discourse (Duara 1995).

Unger (1996) examines the replacement of culturalism with nationalism in the late Qing and early Republican periods, insisting that the logical outcome of rejecting culturalism and developing nationalism provided a new basis for China’s defence and regeneration. He also asserts that the culturally based confidence and identity thrown into doubt by political and economic

challenges expedited the disintegration of the empire. At the same time, Unger (ibid.) also emphasises that the Chinese empire was so much more durable than other pre-modern systems because of China's cultural identity. Gellner (1983), on the other hand, argues that the modern nation-state was founded upon bonds of solidarity among its citizens and that it was nationalism that engendered nations, not vice versa. He emphasises education and universal literacy as major prerequisites for the realisation of such a national culture.

Wang S. (1981:31) problematizes Sun's insistence of nationalism based on race, noting that nationalism integrated the traditional Chinese concepts and the Western concept of statism. Townsend (in Unger 1996) maintains that the underlying assumption in the shift from culturalism to nationalism is that a set of ideas labelled culturalism, incompatible with modern nationalism, dominated traditional China and yielded only under the assault of imperialism. However, he also points out that Chinese culturalism did not utterly give way to modern state nationalism, and that this transformation of collective cultural and political identity was a long and traumatic process. Townsend (ibid.) asserts that it was because supreme loyalty was attached to the culture itself, not to the state, arguing that ethnic nationalism is produced when an existing ethnic group strives to attain, enhance or protect its nationhood by unity.

Duara (in Unger 1996) comparatively explores the Chinese nationalist view and the Sinological view of Chinese nationality and argues that the question of the historical nature of the Chinese nation is intimately tied to the question of national identity. By stressing the multiplicity of identities correlated with the variety of histories, the nation is to be understood through different, contested narratives both historically and within the framework of the new nation-state system. Duara (ibid.) further posits that nationalism is rarely the nationalism of the nation, but rather marks the site where different representations of the nation contest and negotiate with each other. The

nation-state is therefore a political form with distinct territorial boundaries within which the sovereign state is said to be “representing” the nation-people.

While Duara (ibid.) claims that nationalism is often considered to override other identities within a society, he also points out the dualistic nature of identity as both subversive and supportive of the nation-state, stressing its ambiguities, changeability and interplay with other identifications. Crossley (2006), in examining the origins of nationalism and cultural identity in China, explores the relationship between the increasingly abstract ideology of the centralising Qing emperorship and the establishment of the concepts of identity before the advent of nationalism. She argues that identity also enables one to locate and make sense of oneself within a range of categories, or to formulate a description and account of who and what one is; by definition, this entails a demarcation of what one is not, a marking out of ‘the other’ and of one’s difference.

Chinese nationalism was also closely connected to its territory. By late 1911, the core provinces of Ming China had broken away from the Qing court, and many of its impoverished peasants sought out new land and opportunities in the remote and formerly sequestered frontier regions. At the same time, the dependencies (*fanshu* or *shudi*), Mongolia, Tibet and Xinjiang sought their political independence from China while England, Russia, Japan and other imperialist powers carved deeper zones of influence in the faltering Qing geo-body empire (Leibold 2007). Toward the end of the Qing dynasty, the nationalists ultimately demanded that the future republic assume the geographical contours of the entire Qing Empire.

Sun initially propagated anti-imperialism against Western capitalism. However, he identified monarchism as directly antithetical to his ideal of republicanism, which was based on the freedom and equality of all citizens. Accordingly, Sun shifted his initial argument from anti-imperialism to anti-monarchism while adding the racial element of anti-Manchuism. Laitinen

(1990) argues that anti-Manchuism was not simply an expression of discontent with the Qing government, but a modern phenomenon and a reflection of modern national ideas. By inquiring about the historical roots of anti-Manchuism from the perspective of cultural prejudice and anti-barbarism, Laitinen (ibid.) argues that modern nationalism in China was born as a result of military, commercial and cultural penetration by the West, and that anti-Manchuism became a demarcation line between revolutionaries and reformers, meaning that anti-Manchu propaganda had little to do with the Manchus.

Wong, Y. (1989) argues that it was Zhang Taiyan who first theorised the anti-Manchu nationalist movement, and that he was responsible for the theoretical expositions of nation, culture and history that led to the adoption of a modern nationalism unique to China. On the other hand, in his analysis of Zhang Taiyan's nationalism, Laitinen (ibid.) claims that his anti-Manchuism was born of his nationalistic concern and was only a practical means for strengthening nationalist spirit. After the 1911 Revolution, however, Sun shifted his argument from a racially defined nation (*guozu*) to a multi-ethnic republic (*daminzu gongheguo*) by advocating equal citizenship for all ethnic groups. Heng (in Lee and Lee, et al. 2011) argues that Sun's aims remained ambiguous because Sun proposed that China could become "one" by consolidating the different groups into one, which subsequently means that China could become "free" by limiting the freedom of the Chinese people.

Regarding the relationship between nationalism and modernisation, Pye (in Unger 1996) maintains that modernisation is an equally elusive subject as nationalism because it was initially confused with Westernisation. Pye (ibid.) further insists that nationalism must also respond to the times, given that the character of nationalism in the particular society can become quite unpredictable when there is a rapid social or revolutionary change. Thus revolution can solidify

nationalism while also producing confusion and disillusion. Duara (in Unger 1996) also points to a built-in ambivalence in modern nationalist ideology toward the historicity of the nation in the writings of Sun, claiming that the ambiguity of Sun's intention is concealed through a political attack on his enemies, transforming it into a problem inherent in Confucian cosmopolitanism.

Loyal Duties and Citizen Rights

In his *minquan* principle (democracy), Sun's main objective was to balance power between the government and the people, which was also the core foundation of constitutionalism. Angle and Svensson (2001) examine the word *quan* in its historical context in an effort to connect it to the present day connotation of rights; they argue that the term that has come to be most widely used to stand for rights is not *quan* but the compound *quanli*, and, given that no one in China in the 1890s advocated full scale democracy, the goal of *minquan* was to advocate an institutionalised, consultative role in a constitutional monarchy. Wang (2003) explains that *quan* means power, influence and privilege, and *li* mean profit and benefit; in this sense, *quanli* was often used in contrast to the Confucian ideal of *renyi*, meaning benevolence and righteousness. *Quanli* expressed more specific rights of freedom, equality and even the autonomy of the individual.

By 1919, the idea of rights had been fiercely debated, and the word *quanli* had come into common language in public. On the other hand, Judge (1996) indicates that journalists did not use *minquan* in its original radical sense as equivalent to *minzhu*, or democracy; instead, they redefined it as the power or authority of the people (*renmin de quanli*). The press advocated the expansion of popular power under the dynasty (*minquan*) while opposing the replacement of dynastic authority by popular power (*minzhu*); the journalists' advocacy of civil rights was thus expressed in the context of the citizens' collective rights rather than the rights of the individual. In fact, Sun

critically analysed the Chinese people's disciplinary loyalty to the emperor and to their own families, accusing it of being the main cause for the absence of national unity. Sun understood that it was necessary to retain the people's loyalty, but contemplated how to shift it to the Chinese state. However, loyalty was traditionally a moral obligation. De Bary (1991) argues that hierarchy is the oldest and most significant Confucian ideology; at the public level, it was the worship of *di* or *shangdi*, the high god with universalist claims, and at a lower level, the worship of one's own ancestors. However, the balance between the rights and duties were unequal, with an overemphasis on performing duties.

Levenson (1964), on the other hand, problematizes the moral conflict over loyalty concerning the Confucian disapproval of the transfer of loyalty from a deposed dynasty to its successor, arguing that the absolute dynastic claim on loyalty may well have been ambiguous. Esherick (in Esherick and Kayal 2006) argues that the intimacy and reciprocity of patron-client relations compensated for the relative impersonality and formality of the hierarchical bureaucratic order; thus, patron-client relations were congruent with complex bureaucratic forms of organisation. Dikötter (1992), on the other hand, argues that the notion of group membership can only exist in a relational context with reference to other groups, and that the nature of the relationship between elite and popular culture is still an important point of debate.

Loyalty was expressed as a kind of moral superiority and virtuous attitude that included generic virtue, filial piety and respect for elders, loyalty, sincerity and all qualities concerning honesty and uprightness. Standen (2007) emphasizes that changing political allegiance automatically implies moral failing. Dennerline (1981) points out that dynastic loyalty, or literally 'loyal obligation' (*zhongyi*) or 'great obligation' (*dayi*), was the language of China's classically educated literati. Thus, the so-called nationalism in imperial China was a patriarchal loyalism, and

national heroes were those who had dedicated themselves to the dynastic cause: they served, fought, and died for their own dynasty (Wong, Y. 1989).

On the other hand, Confucian revivalists (the new Confucians) contend that the Confucian insistence on the priority of socio-political relations embedding the individual may not be incompatible with the Western discourse of human rights; in fact, the Confucian principles of reciprocal moral obligations and duties as the basis for “rights” are based on social hierarchy with differential treatment of individuals depending on rank and relationship to oneself. Thus, the Chinese conceive of the self within the context of a hierarchical community (Ogden, S. 2002).

Furthermore, Liang Qichao (1959) insisted that the right consciousness (*quanli sixiang*) of an individual was to be balanced with that of collective. Liang argued that right consciousness does not merely concern the duties (*yiwu*) that one ought to exercise toward oneself; rather, it is also concerned with the duties that an individual ought to exercise toward a general group (Angle and Svensson 2001). In contrast to Liang’s concept of balanced rights between individuals and the collective, Sun’s concept of people’s rights was for collectivity and for the nation. Wang (2003) again emphasises that Sun described families and clans as rivals to collective Chinese identity, comparing China to a heap of loose sand and arguing that China desperately needed the cement that would catalyse national unity and collective freedom. Sun’s *minquan* principle was for collective power arising from the people, their share in determining China’s destiny and their role in saving it.

Likewise, Tony See Sin Heng (in Lee and Lee, et al. 2011) posits that Sun’s understanding of democracy was “people’s rights” (*minquan*) rather than merely “government by the people” (*minzu*), and that instead of individual rights, Sun was more interested in the rights of the state. Thus, Sun was not advocating the freedom and rights of each individual but rather rights and

freedom for the state. Gregor (2000) supports the assertion that Sun clearly rejected any contract theory of the state that sought to interpret the nation as a voluntary association of individuals. Sun argued that such a conception of rights would weaken the integrity of a nation group, undermine its viability and leave the Chinese exposed to national threats.

In Jenco's (2010) view, democracy captures plural instincts about political action, and its defining characteristics is the recognition of a mass of actors with valid claims to participate in political processes. However, some Chinese intellectuals such as Zhang Shizhao took an approach to politics based not necessarily on collective action but on self-awareness, the use of one's own talent and the accommodation of differences. In a similar vein, Zhang Taiyan's stance on individualism focused on the autonomy of the individual to resist collective demands, denounce universal principles and reject the imperatives of social norms. In an effort to affirm the absolute existence of the individual, Zhang rejected the scientism of material determination and universal law because his concept of an individual was not a corporal and material entity, but a subjective participant (Wang H. in Yeh 2001). Wang (ibid.) argues that Zhang followed a binary logic that placed the individual in exclusive opposition to the nation-state.

De Bary (2008) regards communalism as a higher form of collectivism. Confucianism emphasizes particular forms of human respect, personal responsibility and mutual support that could supplement modern legalistic definitions of human rights. De Bary insists that, without such advocacy, one cannot expect economic development and rising affluence alone to produce a civil society or constitutional order protective of human rights. In relation to collective power and citizenship, Marshall and Bottomore (1992) contend that citizenship grew from civil rights in the 18th century, political rights in the 19th century and social rights in the 20th century. They argue that citizenship in its early form was a principle of equality and that the core of citizenship at this

stage was civil rights. They gave each man the power to engage as an independent unit in the economic struggle as part of his individual status.

Additionally, Strand (2011) points out that the meanings of citizenship, patriotism, rights and justice were shaped by Lenin, and revolutions were carried out by individuals whose modes of expression could influence individual and collective identities as people came to believe in and perform them. In Tsao's (1947) opinion, the rights of citizens correlate to the duties incumbent upon the state under the protection of constitutionalism. This gives rise to passive or negative duty on the part of the state or government, and the correlating citizen's right may be called a passive or negative right of citizenship.

With regard to women's rights, Schoppa (2006:164-7) maintains that, from 1917 to 1921, intellectual discussion and emphasis on individualism reached its highest point along with the rise of youth rebellion among both males and females against patriarchy and social authority. In particular, women writers contributed to individual and gender emancipation, while working women were placed at the bottom of class hierarchy particularly often. Angle and Svensson (2001) explain that Chinese reformers and revolutionaries both were eager to include women among their followers as they believed that the contribution of women was needed in order to complete the mission to save China; Liang even urged men to share natural rights with women voluntarily.

On the other hand, Harrison (2000) analyses the shift of culturalism to modernity through the lens of gender, emphasising women's mobility from private space to public space. She notes the examples of the prohibition on foot-binding and of letting many girls move freely from home to streets, parks, schools and institutions. Furthermore, after the 1911 revolution, women could enter government. Sun even metaphorically compared China's economy to women's bound feet. Chang and Gordon (1991) point out that Sun urged that the discussion of women's political rights

be brought to the parliament for a resolution. On the other hand, Kang Youwei also commented on the condition of women in his Book of the Great Unity (*Datongshu*), wherein Kang claimed that men repressed, restrained, deceived and bound women (Strand 2011).

Sun encouraged the inclusion of women in public service and in the rights and duties of citizens as he emphasised the importance of women's political awareness and participation. From a postmodern perspective, gender is regarded as a performance, and gender identity is not only presumed to be natural, but also to give rise to political activities and to motivate and direct political goals and aspirations. The very identity that is posited as prior to and motivating political activity is actually the effect of a set of actions or performances. Butler (1990) calls gender performative, a doing 'action'; it is not merely a given social or cultural attribute, by introducing the concept of interpellation, the process by which individuals become social subjects rather than autonomous subjects. Thus performativity of gender in combination with women's citizenship produced women's subjectivity.

Constitutionalism

In 1906, when the Qing court announced an imperial edict for constitutional preparation, it was a shared product of the Qing court and exiled intellectuals. However, there were conflicts between Sun and Liang in terms of conceptual differences regarding collective and individual rights, citizenship and constitutionalism. In particular, Sun argued that there were remnants of autocracy in the monarchical constitution since the Manchus used constitutionalism as a camouflage to consolidate their control. Later, Sun proposed the five-power constitution for the new republic by amalgamating both Chinese and Western systems. Chang (1987) suggests that, in Liang's mind,

nationalism was inseparable from democratisation, so freedom of participation and of national independence were essentially two sides of the same coin. For Liang, a constitutional government was pre-eminently a limited government with two essential ingredients: the promulgation of a written constitution and the primacy of the legislative organ in the constitutional government. Chang Hao (ibid.) also notes that Liang's interest in this Western phenomenon ultimately derived from his belief that constitutional government could ensure the political participation of the majority of the people.

On the other hand, Huang (1972) indicates that, for Liang, Sun's plan of overthrowing the dynasty for a republic and Kang's plan restoring the Guangxu Emperor to establish constitutional monarchy differed in their means, not ends. However, Sun's anti-Manchu revolution was not a mere matter of expediency, but the core element of his political philosophy and the future of China. Ogden (2002) suggests that Liang thought freedom, constitutionalism and republicanism were ideal but unsuitable for China, arguing that authoritarian rule was more appropriate considering China's political conditions.

Wakeman (1975) adds that, from the dynasty's point of view, bureaus and assemblies were ultimately intended to build national unity without surrendering imperial sovereignty, and Liang Qichao was disappointed as a consequence. Furthermore, Judge (1996) points out that the government officials not only resisted implementing true constitutional reform that would expand popular power, they also attempted to obstruct the dissemination of the new learning, which threatened Confucian intellectual hegemony. Liang Qichao believed that only a vital and binding unity between the citizen and the nation could counter the lack of cohesiveness that threatened Chinese society. Fogel and Zarrow (1997) also posit that the constitutionalists (*lixianpai*) favoured retention of the Qing in order to avoid the perils of revolutionary chaos, but wanted the dynasty to

become a genuinely constitutional monarchy; on the other hand, the revolutionaries (*gemingpai*) favoured the expulsion of the Manchus in order to establish a republic.

For the Qing government, the Japanese model was not particularly appealing, but some of its contents appealed to the Manchu court, particularly the dominant power it granted the emperor, the restrictions it place on the powers of the Diet and its recognition of imperial decree as above the law. Sun, on the other hand, contemplated both American and the French constitutions as model for the Chinese constitution. Schwarzmantel (2003) compares the essential differences between the American and the French republican models. In America, two methods of union were proposed: one to promote solely the rights of the people, the other solely the rights of the nation. The American Constitution divides power into three branches, namely legislative, judicial and administrative, and Sun partially adopted this system. Regarding the issue of constitutional rights of the citizen, Tsao (1947) also posits that it must be constitutionally provided that the citizen may enjoy freedom and the state is bound by law to abstain from encroaching upon such freedom; for example, the state is under responsibility to provide educational institutions and facilities. Sun's idea of open access to education may have been also inspired by the active right of citizenship.

Schwarzmantel (2003) also maintains the shift from a premodern to modern nation by employing Habermas's (1996a, 1996b, 1997) distinction between *Volksnation* and *Bürger nation*; the former signifies a folk-community while the latter describes a political nation. The idea of a *Volksnation*, a primordial unit, as well as its criteria of identity and membership rest on common descent, such as blood and soil. Thus a *Volksnation* as a community of descent is to be differentiated from a *Bürger nation*, or community of citizens, whose criteria of identity are based on holding political rights in common irrespective of citizens' ethnic origins. Schwarzmantel (ibid.) stresses that what Habermas calls the *Bürger nation*, or a nation of legally empowered citizens, is

certainly more open and less restrictive in its membership than a *Volksnation*. It follows a much more *voluntaristic* logic that all can join, at least in principle, as long as they accept certain standards of tolerance and recognise the rights of others.

Political Tutelage

However, Sun judged that China was not yet ready for a full constitutional government, placing it under the three-phase government programme as he continued to inspire the Chinese people to be prepared to sacrifice their rights for the common good of the nation. On April 12, 1924, Sun completed the draft of the Programme of National Reconstruction, dividing reconstruction into three periods with the second defined as the “tutelage period”. After his death, people believed that the tutelage period of government could be prolonged indefinitely, and that China could be governed without a constitution. Hu Shi argued that genuine protection of human rights requires a legal foundation; Angle and Svensson (2001), on the other hand, assert that Hu Shi neglected to say that Sun was also no defender of unqualified human rights.

Fitzgerald (1996) argues that pedagogy was a style of politics as much as it was a goal of political action for Sun. He further claims that it was a style of the Nationalist state in the 1920s, as Nationalist revolutionaries established a pedagogical polity in which the ethical community was defined not by its awakening, but in the act of being awakened since the political instructors were entitled to rule the country and discipline the people until the community had reached an approved level of self-consciousness. Thus the relationship between a conscious state and an unconscious community was installed in the ideology and programs of both parties through political tutelage. Elitism was also manifested through the hierarchical relation. Jenco (2010) holds that, after the

revolution of 1911, elites remained the centre of political action, and the juxtaposition between elites and the masses was often articulated by both reformers and revolutionaries. However, Jenco (ibid.) also argues for the necessity to differentiate between the particular will (i.e. what people as individuals want) and the general will (i.e. what the individuals as people want) in order to avoid tyrannical imposition.

During the Nationalist rule of Canton, Sun initiated methods that enabled the party to mobilise and discipline the authority of the people, justifying such moves with his theories on corporatist politics and party rule. In the 1920s, when Leninism made its way into the Chinese Nationalist and Communist parties, an awakening to specific forms of consciousness came to substitute for sympathy in conferring the right to represent the people. For Sun, Fitzgerald (ibid.) argues, there was little prospect that Nationalist cadre (the engineers of political practice) would learn anything from their reform of political society (the engineering project).

Furthermore, Lean (2007) points out that Jiang Jieshi argued that, based on Sun's Three Principles, internal consolidation within the regime and the establishment of a corporatist party-state was the equivalent of moving from the military government stage, the first stage of the Nationalist Revolution, to the second stage of tutelage government, a period when the Nationalists would exercise state power on behalf of the people. To secure control over professional societies, the new regime required all groups to register and subjected them to a barrage of new regulations and mechanisms of control.

Arable Land and Tax

Confucius remarked that a wise ruler should strive to achieve social harmony (Wang S. 1981). De Bary (2008) also points to Dong Zhongshu's memorial on land reform illustrating the purpose of the ancient tax system: "The people had wealth enough to take care of the aged and look after their parents, serve their superiors and pay their taxes, and support their wives and loved ones." Accordingly, Feng (1960) explains the significance of agriculture in traditional China, claiming that land was the primary basis of wealth and that throughout Chinese history, social and economic thinking and policy have centred on the utilisation and distribution of land. Feng adds that the peasants were respected as they were believed not to abandon their land in the time of danger.

Despite the traditional Confucian ideology based on an amicable and cooperative relationship between landlords and peasants through a fair system of landholding and taxation, Lin (1997) highlights the actual relation between landlords and tenants in Guangdong between 1870 and 1937 concerning various facets of landlordism and the interests of the landlords. Furthermore, Perry (2002) explains the implication of the tax situation and the people's reaction in the mid-19th century, noting that the proliferation of militias was associated with a dramatic rise in the frequency and scale of tax resistance. As higher taxes were of concern to large landlords and small owner-cultivators alike the newly created self-defence forces, led by local landlords and gentry and staffed by ordinary peasants, constituted an effective vehicle for tax resistance. Accordingly, late 19th-century China saw an outburst of anti-tax riots, several of which developed into significant rebellions against the Qing government.

Sun was also influenced by the Confucian ideology as, in his *minsheng* principle, the government would regulate private capital to put an end to monopolisation in order to narrow the gap between the rich and poor. Sun's *minsheng* principle was originally based on his moral

obligation to peasants from observing their economic hardships, which were caused by unfair land ownership and onerous tax burdens in the late Qing dynasty. Chang and Gordon (1991) suggest that Sun's compassion for the peasants could have been aroused by Peter Alekseyvich Kropotkin, a Russian anarchist whose sympathy for the peasantry and defiance of authority won acclaim in Russian and abroad. Wang, S. (1981) also adds that Sun was impressed by Henry George's theory in his *Progress and Poverty* advocating the public ownership of land since he believed that the more civilisation progressed, the poorer mankind would become because of the imbalance in the economic distribution. Marx's advocacy for the public ownership of capital also appealed to Sun. Wang, S. (ibid.) further insists that Sun noted that the radical socialists advocated the equalisation of wealth as a way to ameliorate economic inequality, believing that social problems stem from economic inequality.

Sun argued for both equalisation of land and redistribution of capital with the downside of creating fear among the landlords and warlords and making them protective of their land. However, Sun did not employ confiscation; instead, he conflated the equalisation of land and the distribution of capital to avoid the negative effects of capitalism, such as class conflict. Chong (2010) reasons that, by refuting the Marxist theory, Sun proposed the plans for the reform of society and industry, public ownership of transportation and communication, direct taxation and collection of taxes and distribution of national wealth on the basis of social and individual needs. Chong (ibid.) further argues that Sun did not completely adopt the Russian political ideology even though enormous Russian aid was given to China. On the other hand, Gregor (2000) suggests that Sun opposed the abolition of private property and private enterprises, arguing that Sun was anti-Marxist, nationalist and class-collaborationist.

Nederveen (1990) points out that when Marxist analysis began to recognise the importance of peasants outside of Europe, the notion of peasants rather than proletarian revolution came to the fore. In fact, in the case of China, the effective contradiction in economic conflict was not between ‘bourgeoisie-proletariat’ but rather ‘landlords-peasants’. Callinicos (2004), on the other hand, points to the layered taxation system in Asia wherein states taxed not only peasants but also landlords, putting a double burden on both sources of tax revenue. Elster (1986) mentions the case of French and English peasants’ active movements: When disappointed with the low level of grain prices on the one hand, and by the growing burden of taxes and mortgage debts on the other, the French and English peasants began to manifest actively so that the governments would take certain measures.

Labour and Exploitation

Cohen (1988) describes four different levels of productive power and the associated forms of society. In the first stage, productive power is too meagre to enable a class of non-producers to live off the labour of producers. In the second stage of material development a surplus appears of a size sufficient to support an exploiting class, but not large enough to sustain a capitalist accumulation process. This is followed by the third stage, wherein the surplus has become generous enough to make capitalism possible. In the final form of society, which is in the stage of non-primitive communism, the modern classless society emerges.

In fact, Sun wanted to achieve the final stage of socialism directly without the negative consequences that occur during the second and third stages. During these stages, Elster (1986) notes that Marx identified three flaws in capitalism: inefficiency, exploitation and alienation, with

the theory of class struggle in the central place of exploitation. Tenancy system in China also represented a systematic exploitation of tenant farmers, which inspired Sun's land redistribution plan in his *minsheng* principle. However, Sun eventually realised that he could not skip the different phases of economic development to directly reach "non-primitive communism", or his ideology of the stage of economic harmony.

Callinicos (2004) also explains exploitation by arguing that it is the appropriation of surplus-labour; that is, it compels producers to work longer than necessary to produce the means of subsistence for themselves and their dependents. (This was also antithetical to the Confucian ideology of communalism, *datong*). Thus exploitation, when perceived by the exploited, provides a motivation for revolt, protest, riot or revolution. As such, it enters into the explanation of class struggle and social change. On the other hand, Callinicos also insists that exploitation is a normative concept and part of a wider theory of distributive justice. In fact, Elster (1986) contends that exploitation can occur in capitalist as well as pre-capitalist societies; for example, it can occur in market and nonmarket economies as well as in class societies and in societies without class divisions. In the pre-modern economic structure of agriculture in China, Sun's *minsheng* principle was targeted to emancipate tenant farmers from economic exploitation and return their surplus labour to them through the equal distribution of arable land.

Land to the Tiller

Regarding the land redistribution efforts made by the early Neo-Confucians, who contemplated the conflict between the practical solution of the land problem and the moral responsibility of the government, Bol (2008) argues that the ultimate question for Neo-Confucians was not whether

they should accept the reality of economic inequality. Their aim was to end the private land market by distributing the estates of landlords in equal proportions to farmers and restoring an egalitarian rural society based on the idealised 'well-field system' of antiquity. The Neo-Confucians' endeavours were meant to be different from pursuing power and wealth and from following the status quo in politics and society. Consequently, Bol (ibid.) notes that the Neo-Confucian emphasis was on becoming conscious of the moral guides innate to us as human beings.

He (2002), on the other hand, points out some of the consequences of conflicts between Confucian morality and economic benefit. He explains that Confucianism discouraged even the educated from the pursuit of wealth, insisting that acquisitiveness was a source of social and personal unrest, unbecoming to one's status and morally dubious. As a result, given that Confucianism deliberately sought to maximize the people's moral wellbeing instead of their economic wealth, and given the absence of ideological and political support from the elite and the government, the rational economic activities of the lower class were kept from developing in full.

Sigren (in Sih 1974) argues that Sun was compelled to discredit the materialistic interpretation of history because Sun believed that only social equality could dissolve the class struggle between the oppressed and the oppressors. However, according to Marx, social forces cannot be explained without the dynamics of the dialectic inherent in the conflicts of each social system. However, Sigren (ibid.) asserts that Sun, after having examined the positive side of the economic progress seen among the Western working class, determined that it was the result of human cooperation, not the class struggle. Sun thus consistently maintained his stance that modern economic progress was the result of economic harmony through human cooperation for the common interests of society.

Hou (in Sih 1974) criticises Sun for eliminating historical necessity by attributing communism to the traditional communalism of ancient Chinese society, and envisioning reviving that past glory instead of seeking a modern nation-state. At the same time Hou (ibid.), argues that the very necessity for such adjustments implies the existence of conflicts, which develop as men continually struggle for existence and simultaneously provide for social progress. Moreover, to accomplish the objective of “Land to the Tiller”, the government would have to acquire a massive volume of farm land for distribution to the tenants. Nevertheless, Sun’s ‘Land to the Tiller’ project was presented without a detailed plan. Hou (ibid.) notes that it was not until 1952 when the problem of financing was solved and land reform was successfully carried about by his followers in Taiwan. Allen (in Sih 1974) claims that “Sun has left this country a legacy of confusion.”

Sun wanted to avoid a violent and coercive method of confiscating the land; instead, he was willing to reconcile the economic interests of both landlords and peasants in a peaceful way. In Sun’s speech titled ‘Land to the Tiller’, addressed to the graduating students of the Institute of Peasants Movement in 1924, he strongly urged a peaceful solution for distributing the land to the peasants. Additionally, Wang S (1981) suggests common characteristics between Sun’s *minsheng* principle and Christian socialism by observing that the latter sympathised with the poor and the weak and advocated social cooperation and moderate and gradual steps to improve labourers’ status and welfare.

Furthermore, Sun’s principle specified that the modern democratic state is not a state belonging to any specific social class, but rather one seeking to reconcile class conflict and promote the interests of the people on the basis of mutual cooperation. On the other hand, Gregor (2000) expands the relevance of Marxism to Sun’s *minsheng* principle from the perspective of racialized global capitalism since Sun’s developmental program was projected on the joint involvement of

private capital and state initiative. Gregor (ibid.) further argues that Sun was convinced that development required an economy governed by market signals, and that it was his idea to make capitalists create socialism in China so that those two economic forces would work side by side in a form of state capitalism.

Christianity and Inclusion

Yan (1976) points out the close relationship between Christianity and Sun's secret society: he insists that the most important element in the solidarity of secret society was the combination of Christian inclusiveness and Confucian brotherhood, since ordinary members could feel that they were organised and guided by older and more experienced members of the society while the egalitarian spirit served as one of the important bases of the organisation. Wang (in Lee and Lee, et al. 2011) also supports the connection between Christianity and the secret society, claiming that Christianity produced solidarity and revolutionary collegiality, pointing out it was at Christian schools that Sun absorbed Christian values and met Christian friends who shared his willingness to harness the institutions of secret societies.

Wang (ibid.) believes that Sun realized that modernity did not need to be separated from a people's heritage, i.e. Confucian tradition. At the same time, Sun believed that Christianity was a powerful belief system that supported Europe's road to modernity as a source of great strengths. Although Sun had embraced a new worldview drawn from Christian concerns for society, he was imaginative enough to adapt a Chinese political organisation for his revolutionary purposes by reconciling Christianity and Confucianism. Sun also believed that Western rationality and Chinese moral values did not have to be mutually exclusive, but could both coexist. Sun's core belief in

Christianity was based on its virtue of understanding others' suffering and helping them, which constituted the main tenet in his emancipatory communication.

Yao (1996) discusses the common aspects of universal love in Confucianism and Christianity by comparing Confucian *jen* and Christian *agape*; the former serves a humanistic purpose while the latter has a theistic function. Yao (ibid.) argues that the similarities between two religious traditions must be placed against the background of their differences, insisting that, without *agape*, there would be no such religion as Christianity; and without *jen*, Confucianism would not be the Chinese tradition as we know it. The initial sympathy between Christianity and Confucianism is grounded in the fact that Christianity as a theistic religion has many humanistic characteristics, while Confucianism as a humanistic religion also has some theistic characteristics. This offers an insight for analysing Sun's motive and purpose of his emancipatory communication, and to a certain extent, his paternalistic style of political praxis.

Ching (1977), on the other hand, argues that both Confucianism and Christianity exercised decisive influence in shaping the beliefs, moral codes and behaviours of large populations. She stresses the importance of comparative study between Christianity and the Jesuit interpretation of the Chinese tradition, which became known as Confucianism, emphasising the compatibility of Confucian rites and Christian beliefs in God. For Ching, Christianity refers to a religion that is historic and contemporary as well as individual and communal, arguing that Christianity and Confucianism are more compatible than other sets of religion.

Some scholars have also made a connection between Sun's medical training and his patriotism. For example, Hillier and Jewell (2005) point out that Sun often referred to medicine as the kind aunt that led him to the high road of politics. For Sun, Christianity and medicine were closely connected. Protestant missionary physicians pioneered the fields of medical education,

research, leprosy treatment and humanitarian services, and during his medical studies, it is known that Sun took a great interest in Chinese classics (Fairbank 1986). Accordingly, Chong (2010) suggests that Sun took a variety of ideas from many thinkers, often in the form of a mixture of both Chinese and Western ideologies, and that Sun reshaped them, often unknowingly, into something totally different; that is, these ideas and institutions.

The Overseas Chinese

Sun's compassion for the overseas Chinese began during his adolescence in Hawaii. Sun's expression that "the overseas Chinese are the mother of the revolution" demonstrates his close relationship with the overseas Chinese communities for their emotional and financial support during his revolutionary efforts. Yan (1976, 1985) emphasises that, even though the Opium War ignited Chinese emigration *en masse*, Chinese migrants were frequently regarded as *other* Chinese; furthermore, the Qing court became suspicious of all who had any contact with foreigners and of their loyalty to China.

Wang (2000) notes that the change in the Qing's attitude took place when the overseas Chinese became aware of the attention that Western powers gave to their own expatriate citizens, and especially when the Qing government as well as reformist and revolutionary organisations courted the overseas Chinese for their financial support. For example, since the overseas Chinese were an important source of political and financial power, both reformists such as Kang Youwei and Liang Qichao and revolutionary party members competed for their support. In this way, the conflict of interest between the revolutionaries and the reformists surrounding the overseas Chinese originated outside China. However, as Wang (*ibid.*) argues, the Qing government did not expect that the overseas Chinese would support Sun Yat-sen's revolutionary party.

Chang and Gordon (1991) emphasise Sun's versatile qualities, arguing that the young Sun learned a great deal about colonialism and imperialism as a student in Hawaii and Hong Kong, along with his conversion to Christianity and his early interest in Darwin's theory of evolution. Moreover, Sun was not only familiarised with republicanism but also developed hopes of including the overseas Chinese communities in the making of a new republic. Bergère (1998), on the other hand, highlights the importance of the geography of China's coastal provinces and the overseas Chinese communities in providing Sun with the cultural awareness to foresee and embrace Christianity and Western technology. In fact, Christianity played an important role in reconciling Confucianism for Sun as he merged the two to form the transnational *Tongbao* inclusion through which Sun argued for empowering the overseas Chinese with the rights of citizens.

Wang (1991) broadly classifies the overseas Chinese into four major patterns: the Trader Pattern (*huashang*), the Coolie Pattern (*huagong*), the Sojourner Pattern (*huaqiao*) and the Descent Pattern (*huayi*). However, at the time of departing their native soil, the intention of the migrating Chinese to settle permanently in their host nation or to return to their homeland was not definitely decided. Cook (in Lee and Lee, et al. 2011) claims that many *Huaqiao* continued to be exposed to anti-Qing rhetoric long after it had died out on mainland China due to their involvement with overseas secret societies, arguing that the overseas Chinese played a critical role in Sun's movement within the Nanyang colonies, combined with increasingly vigorous attempts by Sun to solidify overseas Chinese support.

Nyíri and Saveliev (2002) explain the details of Sun's efforts to include the overseas Chinese by granting them political rights. Wakeman (1975) also claims that Sun started to strengthen his power base among the overseas students with his inclusive rather than exclusionary attitude, which was his appeal. Sun, for instance, succeeded in uniting the exiles of Tokyo under

his leadership. Furthermore, after the 1911 Revolution, the members of the four non-Han ethnic groups residing abroad were also included in the concept of overseas Chinese, and children in overseas Chinese schools were told they were sons and grandsons of the Yellow Emperor and the Emperor Yan (Nyíri and Saveliev 2002).

Yung Wei (in Sih 1974) clarifies that, although a dedicated nationalist, Sun was not totally anti-foreign. Sun, for example, called for the peoples of the world to help China to realise its goal of national independence. Sun also proposed inviting foreign capital for the development of the Chinese economy in his book *The International Development of China*. Thus Yung Wei (ibid.) asserts that the cosmopolitan background of Sun served to moderate his nationalistic zeal and permitted him to cooperate with people from many nations in his revolutionary efforts. In Sun's transnational *Tongbao* identity, there was an interaction between nationalism and cosmopolitanism.

Sun realised that Chinese identity was narrowly defined by geographical centeredness, which impeded the transformation of the overseas Chinese into autonomous patriots. Thus Sun's conciliatory approach to both nationalism and cosmopolitanism gave birth to a hybrid of transnationalism. See Sin Heng (in Lee and Lee, et al. 2011) posits that Sun's emphasis on national unity meant that a rejection of cosmopolitanism. Heng further argues that Sun insisted that China was plagued by the problem of multiple ethnic groups and communities, each serving their own communal interests, resulting in their inability to conceive of themselves as a nation as well as foreign invasion and colonial takeovers of China. Schwarcz (1986), on the other hand, insists that Sun remained ambivalent about the pace and cosmopolitan implications of the cultural movement. However, this may also indicate Sun's praxis of employing cosmopolitanism in a sequential way,

since Sun thought that China urgently needed to achieve a national identity before it could adopt cosmopolitanism.

Sun's concept of participatory citizenship represented a democratic principle of inclusion and expansion of its members rather than exclusion and limits in the conditions of membership of the new Chinese republic. Regarding inclusive citizenship, Tsao (1947) contends that cultural and political bonding is as important as natural affiliation by blood. However, he also emphasises that, if the blood ties were not observed, the culturally loyal overseas Chinese would have felt more affiliated with the host nations. Consequently, Tsao (*ibid.*) stresses the importance of balance between culture and bloodline because it would be a great loss to the Chinese republic if the overseas Chinese lost either of these affiliations. Furthermore, Wang (2013, 1996) suggests that, for ethnic minorities outside China, identity can be determined by the different political, social, economic or religious circumstances an individual faces at any given time. Overseas Chinese identities in, for example, Southeast Asia are difficult to define and, despite many efforts to delineate them, are often dependent on nothing more than self-identification.

From the perspective of the nature and formation of identity, Cohen (1988) insists that identity is the need to be able to say “not what I can do but who I am”, and its satisfaction has been historically found in identification with others in a shared culture based on nationality, race, religion or some part or amalgam thereof. He further argues that the identifications also take benign, harmless, and catastrophically malignant forms as they generate or at least sustain ethnic and other bonds whose strength Marxists systematically undervalue because they neglect the need for self-identity satisfied by them. Therefore, Cohen (*ibid.*) maintains that the need for identity does not generally drive people to seek to achieve an identity because people do not usually lack an identity, rather receiving one as a by-product of the rearing process. Moreover, Schwarzmantel (2003:87)

emphasises that citizens' political aim should be to create a bond of civic community in which people will feel a sense of identification with the political framework, invoking values of shared citizenship and political equality. Kuper (1999), on the other hand, claims that civic identity should be an extension of democratic membership, arguing that civic identity plays a role in uniting people who are otherwise divided by private faith, race, gender, class or ethnic origin.

METHODOLOGY

This thesis is guided by two main research questions. The central question is: “What is Sun’s emancipatory communication and what kind of impact did it have on China’s modernisation?” followed by “What is the significance of Sun’s *Tongbao* inclusion to the establishment of the Chinese modern nation-state?” A supplementary question is “How did Sun utilise language and the media in reconciling the conflict between the Chinese and Western ideologies and systems to transform China?” In answering these questions, employing an interdisciplinary research methodology used in political philosophy and communications studies in relation to language and the media helps situate Sun’s emancipatory communication in the history of China’s modernisation.

In interpreting the contextualised social conflicts during the economic and political collision between China and the West, discourse analysis is particularly useful in identifying the underlying social and cultural tensions, and in analysing how Sun tried to reconcile Chinese traditional values, based on Confucian class hierarchy, with the Western concept of modernity, based on the equality and freedom of the people.

The selection of research data includes primary and secondary sources in English and Chinese written by Sun as well as Sun’s political supporters and opponents. Sun’s own writings of “The Program of National Reconstruction” (*Jianguo Fanglue*),³¹ “The Outline of National Resurrection” (*Jianguo Dagang*)³², and “The Three Principles of the People” (*Sanmin Zhuyi*)³³ are the essential material to examine Sun’s political thought. In particular, “The Three Principles of the People”, first published as a single volume in 1927, is generally regarded as his seminal work, demonstrating the foundation of his political philosophy. It is a compilation of sixteen lectures that Sun delivered in Canton in 1924 as Sun appealed to foreign imperial powers, domestic

oppositional factions as well as his supporters. It was initially conceived as early as 1897, soon after he was released from kidnapping in London, and his first lecture was delivered under the title of “*The Three Principles of the People and the Future of China*” in 1906.

The Three Principles of the People is broadly divided into three parts: the *minzu* principle, the *minquan* principle and the *minsheng* principle. According to Price (in Sun 1930), who first translated Sun’s work, Sun used the word *minzu* with multiple meanings such as nation, nationality or race depending upon the context in his *minzu* principle (nationalism).³⁴ Likewise, the *minquan* principle (democracy or civil rights) sometimes means sovereignty, rights, or, at other times, power or authority; and the *minsheng* principle refers to the economic notion of people’s livelihood. These three principles will be examined to illuminate the formation and development of Sun’s argument for the modern nation-state countering monarchical despotism and foreign imperialism. Specifically, Sun’s concept of race and nation in the *minzu* principle, his thought on freedom and equality in relation to collective rights and duties in the *minquan* principle and his understanding of the economic relationship between landlords and tenant farmers from the perspective of humanistic cooperation provides the key information for the research questions.

“The Programme for National Reconstruction” (*Jianguo Fanglue*), is composed of three works: “The Political Doctrine of Sun Yat-sen” (*Sunwenxueshuo* or *Memoirs of a Chinese Revolutionary* 1927), “The International Development of China” (*Shiyejihua* 1920) and “The Primer of Democracy” (*Minquanchubu* 1917). These three works are also often known as Psychological Reconstruction (*Xinlijianshi*), Material Reconstruction (*Wuzhijianshi*) and Social Reconstruction (*Shehuijianshi*), respectively. In *The Memoirs of a Chinese Revolutionary*, published in first English and then translated into Chinese, Sun explains how to build the modern

nation-state, expounding his famous argument that “Action is easy; knowledge is difficult” against the traditional philosopher Fu Kueh’s argument that “Action is difficult; knowledge is easy”.

In *Memoirs of a Chinese Revolutionary*, Sun’s revelation of Western rationality can be also traced from the linguistic perspective. After having analysed the differences in linguistic structure and grammar between Chinese and Western languages, Sun discovered that a binary aspect of inclusive and exclusionary qualities in the Chinese language was closely connected to Chinese national unity. Exploring the cultural influence of language on Sun’s development of political thought and modern rationality will help to analyse his motives for insisting on the logic of educating the underprivileged classes of people and for arguing for the unity of the spoken and the written Chinese language while critically viewing the exclusionary style of Chinese pedagogy employed by the literati. Theories from social linguistics will be employed to analyse Sun’s argument for the synchronisation of spoken and written Chinese, and for the necessity of universal education as a key element in the making of the modern Chinese nation-state.

The Outline of National Resurrection (Jianguo Dagang) is composed of Sun’s 25 instructions to build a fully constitutional nation-state, which was announced a year before his death. In this outline, Sun reveals his reservations regarding China’s readiness for embracing full constitutionalism and proposes a preparatory government programme in three phases consisting of a first period of military operation, a second period of political tutelage and a third period of constitutional government. The outline will be analysed in order to examine Sun’s political stance and the implications of tutelage government in terms of individual and collective rights.

The Manifesto of the First National Congress of the KMT contains Sun’s assessment of China’s political and economic relationship with Russia and his stance on China’s relationship

with Soviet communism. The manifesto will be an important piece of information in analysing the foundation of Sun's inspiration for communism in his land equalisation plan. Additionally, Sun's correspondence to Li Hongzhang written in 1894, his speeches before and after the revolution of 1911, his lectures and his casual comments will be utilised to explore Sun's relationship with the overseas Chinese and the influence of Christianity on the conception of transnational *Tongbao* inclusion.

My initial approach to assess Sun's political expositions is threefold. First, I aim to analyse the historical events in relation to the formation of Sun's political philosophy, such as the social and economic conditions after the Opium Wars and the Taiping Rebellion: the Qing court's taxation and land holding system, the conflict with tenant farmers, the massive migration of coolie labourers due to expanding imperialism and capitalism, conflicts between the revolutionaries and the reformists surrounding constitutionalism and the structure of the modern Chinese state, ethnic discord over citizen rights and so forth. This may show that these two elements – Sun Yat-sen's emancipatory motives and historical events – are inextricably connected.

Second, I intend to examine Sun Yat-sen's constant attempts to reconcile Confucian and Western values and practices in an effort to break with China's past, not by imitating the West but rather by selectively adopting Western social, economic and political advancements with Chinese particularities in the process of China's modernisation. To this end, I aim to interpret Sun's emancipatory communication as the traces of Sun's cultural and political syncretism of tradition and progress.

Lastly, regarding the social tensions created by political and economic exclusions of the peasants, coolie labourers and the overseas Chinese, I will closely examine the significance of

inclusion in Sun's emancipatory communication. In analysing his embedded cultural and philosophical foundation, I seek to study Sun's persuasive tones in his contextualized doctrines, his arguments for inclusion and reconciliation, and his support for intersubjective relationships and cooperative understanding among the people.

Bennett and Frow (2008) suggest that there are four main traditions central to the forms of cultural analysis. First, they identify a universalist tradition (Williams 1983; Latour 1993) in which culture stands for certain human standards that are universally binding. Second, they describe a tradition that regards culture as relative to time and place, with an emphasis on cultural agency, creativity and multiculturalism (Boas 1982). Third, they include the structural tradition of the late 18th and 19th centuries, which differentiates between and contrasts 'modernity and its others', dividing society into a number of distinct and analytically separable realms (Bourdieu 1991; Luhmann 2000). Finally, they identify a tradition that regards culture as a resource to be invested in (DiMaggio 2010). Therefore, a combination of the second and third options – cultural modernity – seems most useful in order to examine how Sun's communication strove to consolidate Chinese cultural identity and deeply rooted loyalty in the people by analysing the process in which Sun tried to transfer them to the new republic. It also allows to examine how Sun persuaded the overseas Chinese to become transnational patriots in the making of the first modern Chinese nation-state despite their affinity with both Chinese and their host nation's cultures, and against the social prejudice imposed by the mainland Chinese.

Discourse analysis is also an effective method to relate the significance of Sun's emancipatory communication from the cultural perspective to the economic and the political aspects of China's modernisation. It allows me to analyse contextually how Sun tried to shift the deeply inculcated people's cultural loyalty away from the emperor and family toward the newly

established nation-state. Reinterpreting the significance of Sun's emancipatory communication from the contemporary view may also require social linguistics and media studies because "dominant interpretations are subject to change over time as they are reread in new social contexts and in the light of new intellectual concerns and understandings."³⁵

In approaching language and its influence on Sun's political philosophy, the focus will be on what caused Sun to regard language as both the implicit and explicit system of unity and division. First, I aim to situate language and communication in the context of cultural and social unity, and I will attempt to demonstrate the interplay between communicative practices and concrete forms of political life. This may reveal Sun Yat-sen's thought on the structure and vulnerability of the Chinese language and intersubjective communication since it lacked the clearly stipulated grammar and an inclusive pedagogy; and its connotation of linguistic division between those with and without the privilege of education, which was closely connected to social hierarchy until the advent of the Chinese vernacular *baihua*. Cultural theories on language by Chinese writers (Fei Xiaotong, Hu Shi and Lu Xun) and Western authors (Bourdieu, Habermas and De Francis), along with works of other theorists, will be employed to explicate Sun's stance that the national unity and modern rationality of the people were closely linked to language.

In order to investigate the methodology of Sun's emancipatory communication, the role of print media, public speech and public pledging of allegiance will be analysed as the public space of communication for the dissemination of information and political interaction, which was closely related to the advent of the modern Chinese nation-state. With regard to print media, investigations will be made into publications such as *Minpao*³⁶ and other journal articles in order to demonstrate the political utility of the media. I will first discuss Sun's kidnapping in London as Sun's initial

introduction to the power of public opinion in England. Additionally, the implication of censorship will be also analysed in order to explore Sun's political strategy to overcome the barrier.

Sun's public speech, which was employed to transform the illiterate and sceptical audiences into politically active participants, will be studied in light of the communication theories of Habermas (1989) in order to explicate the relationship between the establishment of a modern nation-state and the role of communicative rationality. Subsequently, Sun's public speeches will be examined using Rancière's (1991, 2009) argument with regard to persuasion by both rationality and affect. This may help demonstrate Sun's belief in rationality and his desire for China's modernity through emancipatory communication from a pedagogical standpoint. In particular, both theories on public opinion and public sympathy will be employed to critically view Sun's communicational praxis. Furthermore, the crystallisation of written and spoken communication is achieved in the form of public pledging of allegiance, which will be analysed as a speech act.

With regard to Sun's *minzu* principle (nationalism), first, the etymological origin of *minzu* will be examined including the Japanese neologism *minzoku*, which derived from the German word *Volk*, and the word of *Bürger*, the contemporary equivalent of citizenry, which helped to bring about the modern nation. Then, a critical analysis of Sun's racially defined nationalism will be performed in order to show what it was that influenced Sun to argue for race based on consanguinity. Social Darwinism together with Sun's insistence on preserving the Chinese race and territory while facing the menace of foreign powers will be also considered in order to demonstrate how Sun's racially defined nationalism in fact posed a risk of dividing the people and the nation. Furthermore, Dikötter's historical assessment on race in relation to social Darwinism, Leibold's analysis of the relationship between race and nationalism and Duara's valuation of race in creating a nation-state will be employed to analyse Sun's words and deeds. In analysing the

minzu principle, I also intend to reveal how Sun reconciled the concepts of the natural construct of human body with the cultural elements of race.

In dealing with the *minquan* principle, Sun's thought on constitutionalism and his work to shift the people's loyalty to the new Chinese republic will be explored. In particular, opinions regarding the concept of constitutionalism as discussed by Sun and Liang will be considered by comparing and contrasting their views on the form of government as a republic or a constitutional monarchy, the time frame of establishing it and the readiness of Chinese people. Sun's argument for equality of class and social hierarchy across all occupations will be examined by analysing Sun's thought on the fundamentals of constitution and the motive behind his proposal of the Fivefold Constitution, a conflation of China's traditional court departments and Western cabinets.

Additionally, Sun's argument for the collective rights of citizens in comparison with those of individuals will be examined by demonstrating debates on individual and collective rights in constitutionalism. In particular, Sun's advocacy of the women's rights to serve public service in his communication will be investigated to illuminate Sun's political intention to emancipate women from the restrictive gender practices imposed by Chinese patriarchal tradition and his support for granting women's performative citizenship. The postmodern theorist Butler's theory of gender and performativity will be employed to shed light on women's rights and subjectivity.

With regard to the *minsheng* principle, Sun's stance on the economic value of human labour in relation to land ownership will be examined along with surveying the unfair tax system in the late Qing dynasty, which also contributed to the massive emigration overseas. Sun's conciliatory approach to the Chinese tradition of communal ownership, the communist system of nationalisation of land and his proposal based on the traditional Chinese system of "Land to the Tiller" will be also analysed. Finally, Sun's outright rejection of the negative effects of Western

capitalism such as the Marxian argument of class war will be explored by juxtaposing two elements within the tenancy system: class hierarchy and economic exploitation. This will reveal Sun's ideal of the economic inclusion of tenant farmers by reconciling the Confucian ideal of communal land sharing and equalisation of the land.

In investigating Sun's relationship with the overseas Chinese, the origin of social prejudice against the overseas Chinese will be examined by exploring the construct of Chinese identity, such as the Chinese people's own sense of geographical centeredness. Furthermore, the two main burdens of psychological liminality and geographical distance imposed on the overseas Chinese will be examined in order to reveal how Sun's *Tongbao* inclusion and transnational citizenship were conceived and what triggered the transformation of the psychological and geographical obstacles of the overseas Chinese into transnational patriotism toward the new Chinese republic. Additionally, the conception of *Tongbao* inclusion as reconciling Christian universal love and Confucian fraternal love will be analysed from the perspectives of theism and humanism as well as nationalism and cosmopolitanism. Furthermore, in analysing Sun Yat-sen's Confucian and Christian influences, the concepts of *jen* and agape will be compared and contrasted in an effort to explain the foundation of Sun's intention to emancipate the overseas Chinese.

Anticipated Challenges

In examining and interpreting Sun's political philosophy from the perspectives of historical sociology by cultural analysis, some challenges arise, for the most part linguistic. The first challenge would be how to reflect and delineate the constantly changing boundaries within and between political terms and social concepts such as class, race, identity and citizenship. This is related to historical developments and changes in the usage of concepts and words during the pre-

modern, modern and contemporary transitions in China as well as globally. Price (in Sun 1930:ix-x) aptly mentions the difficulty of translating Sun's work himself: "The extemporaneous style of Dr. Sun's lectures, the constant repetition for sake of emphasis and the looseness of Chinese *baihua* (vernacular) construction make the original quite a lengthy book. Accordingly, there are many redundant expressions in Sun's works in general for the purpose of emphasis or for the reason one Chinese word implied multiple meanings in Western concepts."³⁷ Furthermore, Sun himself talked about the challenge of translating some of the meanings of Western words unknown to Chinese concepts into Chinese as he emphasises the importance of expanding the boundary of meaning or creating a new word by conflating the Chinese and Western concepts. This was briefly mentioned at the beginning of methodology, along with Sun's word choices of "*minzu* (nationalism)" and "*quan* (rights)". As such, it becomes necessary to frequently compare the translated words with the original Chinese vocabulary.

The second challenge of how to handle a word's universal versus particular connotations is also closely related to the semantic boundaries between a word and its concepts. For example, it is a challenge to apply Sun's understanding of freedom and equality to the local Chinese context in the late Qing period when the meaning of freedom and equality in the West may have been either purely conceptual or, at best, imagined through debates among elites during the early modernisation of China. Linebarger (1937:17-19) advises that finding a fine line between the Western interpretation of politics and the Chinese understanding and practice of politics may be key to interpreting Sun Yat-sen's ideology; thus, he emphasised that Sun should not be judged for a seemingly poor interpretation or inexact ideologies as the Chinese ideology cannot be explained in its own terms, which exist only in the Chinese language. Linebarger (1937:11-2) succinctly puts the problem of translation concerning Sun's work as follows: "Sun himself never explained his

philosophy; there remains a vexing problem of choice of method; a systemic condensation of his views cannot survey the same broad ranges. All come back to the problem of translation.”³⁸

The following methods help to overcome the aforementioned challenges. First, while open to changes in meaning and scope in the semantic application of words, this thesis will follow the contemporary usage and understanding of concepts and words, reflecting my authorial perspective as an autonomous citizen in contemporary time and space. Second, both universal and particular approaches will be employed by comparing and contrasting the causes and effects of the social, economic and political conflicts in China. After all, even though Sun’s emancipatory communication and praxis were particular to China, they were also influenced by and interacted with universal conflicts surrounding class and race. Employing both approaches may therefore shed light on the symbiotic nature of universality and particularity. Attempting to interpret Sun’s own reconciliatory approaches to both Chinese and Western cultures and systems may thus provide a better understanding of his hybridity and creative solutions to political arguments and economic plans. Third, English–Chinese and Japanese–Chinese dictionaries published in the early 1900s will be closely consulted in order to observe the effects of neologisms and newly introduced concepts in terms of which new words were derived from and translated into Chinese and how; how they were conceptually and etymologically applied in social, political and economic contexts in China and what kind of effect they produced between Sun’s communication and Chinese citizens.

STRUCTURE OF THE CHAPTERS

Chapter I aims to analyse the influence of Western language on Sun's modern rationality. It explores his inspirations for advocating the synchronisation of spoken and written Chinese, and how his analysis of the structure of Western language and its grammar prompted him to argue for equal and open access to education for the illiterate and the undereducated. This chapter also examines the underlying reason behind Sun's criticism of the absence of clearly stipulated Chinese grammar as well as the exclusionary style of Chinese pedagogy. Apart from the effect of language, this chapter also deals with the methodology of Sun's communicational praxis, including his use of print media, public speech and swearing an oath in propagating his political agenda. From Sun's initial recognition of the political impact of the press on citizen solidarity, he demonstrated his firm trust in the role of print media and public opinion in building a modern nation-state. The effects of public speech are examined from the perspective of both rational and emotional strategies of persuasion. Furthermore, the linguistic aspect of swearing an oath is also investigated as an act of performing citizenship. By examining Sun's usage of print media, public speech and pledging, this chapter analyses how the synchronisation of Sun's written and spoken communication influenced the solidarity and allegiance of citizens.

Chapter II examines Sun's *minzu* principle by analysing his racially defined nationalism in relation to anti-imperialism and anti-Manchuism. By examining Sun's motivation in adopting the exclusionary nationalism that solely supported the ethnic majority of the Han race, it analyses the cause of conflict between Sun's nationalism and his pursuit of the modern nation-state. It also examines the concept of natural and coercive forces, which Sun regarded as the respective powers

that produced race and the state. It further studies the influence of social Darwinism on Sun's nationalism in an effort to reveal the cause of his concern about the possible end of the Chinese race and the partition of its territory. Additionally, this chapter investigates the challenge that Sun faced in persuading the people to transfer their culturally rooted loyalty from the emperor and family to the new Chinese republic, and explores the influences that led Sun to alter his insistence on a nation composed of consanguine race to an all-inclusive Five Race Republic.

Chapter III examines Sun's understanding of citizens' freedom and equality as well as their duties and rights in his *minquan* principle in relation to constitutionalism, a symbol of power balance between the people and the state. It also explores how Sun empowered citizens to participate and perform their citizenship in transforming China from a pre-modern community to a modern nation-state. In particular, it studies Sun's attempts to include women in public space so that they could exercise the rights of citizens such as voting, being educated and doing military service. This chapter also analyses what inspired Sun to conceive the Fivefold Constitution, which was a hybrid of the traditional Chinese court system and Western constitutional structures. The implications of Sun's imposition of a reconstruction plan, including military operation and political tutelage, will be also investigated in relation to constitutionalism and citizens' rights.

Chapter IV analyses the *minsheng* principle concerning Sun's efforts to alleviate the economic hardships of tenant farmers. It examines Sun's motivations for planning the eradication of the unfair land ownership and tax system with his land equalisation program. By studying the economic impact of historical events such as the Opium War on farmers' livelihood and by exploring the taxation system that expropriated the economic rights of tenant farmers, this chapter attempts to reveal how Sun tried to return the value of their surplus labour back to the labourers as well as his inspiration for countering the material conflict resulting from land ownership with the

moral persuasion of economic harmony and cooperation. It also examines Sun's ideas of Confucian communalism and Western communism along with the political and economic influence of the Russian Revolution on Sun's land equalisation plan.

Chapter V examines Sun's motivations for including the overseas Chinese in his emancipatory communication and the ways in which he defied social prejudice against them. By exploring the origin of Chinese emigration and the cultural significance of Chinese identity in relation to geographical centeredness, it analyses the formation of *Tongbao* inclusion from the perspective of Christianity and Confucianism. It examines how Sun's *Tongbao* inclusion transcended the narrow category of theism with a broader humanistic inclusion, and the conditions that made it possible for the overseas Chinese to overcome social prejudice and geographical distance in order to join in making the first Chinese republic. It also demonstrates Sun's own realization of the exclusionary elements in his racially defined nationalism in the process of granting the overseas Chinese participatory citizenship.

CHAPTER I

Sun's Language and Communication

INTRODUCTION

To Sun, the grammar and structure of Western language symbolised modern rationality, and he believed that the absence of national unity among Chinese people was closely related to the separate systems of the written and spoken Chinese language. Sun asserted that the synchronisation in Chinese language would lead to a better understanding of written communication for undereducated citizens, recommending Chinese scholars to educate with a more inclusive and accessible pedagogy.

In this chapter, I argue that Sun advocated the linguistic inclusion of all Chinese people in order to counter the censorship imposed by the Qing court, to form public opinion for the Chinese republic and to raise political awareness for national unity. This is significant because Sun understood the social characteristics of language could be used as a unifying tool and believed that language was directly related to collective power and national unity. Thus Sun employed print media, public speech and pledging of allegiance to persuade and mobilise citizens while trying to include illiterate and reluctant citizens as well. Sun considered an inclusive communication was the bridge to a modern nation-state.

Habermas (1984) stresses that the ultimate purpose of language is to understand common meaning among the communicators, insisting that the culture and science are fundamentally and structurally oriented towards the production of mutual understanding and agreement. Sun's emancipatory communication was composed of a three-step process to political modernisation: first, a critical examination of China's past, laden with despotism and imperialism; second, the

formation of political awareness among the citizens to break with China's past; third, the construction of citizen solidarity with a new inclusive Chinese identity.

1.1 Language and National Unity

The core tenets of Sun's emancipatory communication were *minzu* (nationalism), *minquan* (democracy) and *minsheng* (livelihood), and each principle was closely related to the others in its emancipatory purpose. His communication consisted of four aims. First, he aimed to provide people of all social classes with equal rights to receive education so that they could attain modern rationality and common understanding through open access to both written and spoken communications. Second, he sought the inclusion of all citizens in the process of forming public opinion so that they would attain political awareness of the necessity of national unity. Third, by empowering citizens with legal rights, he aimed to give them the ability to participate in the common political cause of establishing a modern Chinese nation-state. Finally, he sought the emancipation of China and its people from social, political and economic oppressions by granting equality and freedom to all citizens.

In order to attain these aims, Sun's communicational praxis had four stages of implementation. First, he emphasised the importance of national unity by denouncing fragmentation among the Chinese people. Second, he defied the hierarchical subject-object relation in the monarchical system by advocating an equal subject-subject (intersubjective) relation for all citizens. Third, he encouraged the Chinese people to engage in common political struggle to counter dynastic despotism and foreign imperialism to achieve autonomy and citizen rights. Lastly, he empowered citizens with participatory citizenship by including socially excluded classes of people in the making of the republic. The cohesive aims and praxes of Sun's emancipatory communication catalysed the advent of the first Chinese Republic in 1911, marking an end to the monarchical sovereignty of the Qing dynasty.

Sun was open to foreign inspiration such as the Japanese Meiji Reformation for initiating China's modernisation, the advancements of America and England for their political and social institutions and the Russian post-revolutionary methodology for military and economic renovation. In formulating his emancipatory messages, Sun combined various elements of political ideologies, economic principles and cultural values, consequently creating a variety of new concepts and structures, such as the unique Fivefold Constitution, *Tongbao* transnational citizenship and the Five Race Republic.

While Sun considered land and people as the two essential constituents of a nation, he also thought that language was a common sociocultural element that bridged people and the nation. Sun pointed out that language had an assimilating effect in constituting a race, saying that, "A third great force in forming a race is language. If foreign races learn our language, they are more easily assimilated by us and in time become absorbed into our race."¹ Sun was fascinated by and proud of the cultural and historical particularities of Chinese language in which its history is preserved, noting that, "Since the beginning of history, these Chinese characters have told the story of all events which took place during these four or five thousand years, exactly and continuously. This is an exceptional peculiarity of the Chinese language."²

In his speech at a welcome party given by Cantonese Parliament members in Shanghai on July 1, 1916, Sun claimed that language was an essential tool to understand history, without which China's modernisation could not be achieved. He said, "If we wish to reform our country, we must first know history. If we want to know history, we must have a command of the language."³ Furthermore, Sun argued that the Chinese language maintained its cultural connections to the surrounding Asian nations, serving as a medium of common foundations across Asia. As he argued,

“Beyond the boundaries of our country, [Chinese language] influence extends over Japan, Korea and Indo-China, which consider themselves akin to the Chinese in their language.”⁴

However, upon analysing the peculiarities of Chinese language, Sun discovered the division between the spoken and the written Chinese, which, he believed, kept the undereducated from a fair access to knowledge and right expressions in communication. Due to his early exposure to the Western educational system, Sun was aware of the synchronised structure of Western language, noting that “The European (written) languages are phonology-based, and its phonology is closely linked to spoken language; thus when the spoken language changes, these changes can be also reflected in the written language.”⁵ Furthermore, Sun discovered the intrinsic logic of grammar in Western language. He said, “European countries all pursue the learning of grammar, which takes their own language as its research subject, and it is a compulsory subject that every student must take in their education.”⁶

Sun’s comparative analysis of the structural differences between Chinese and Western language continued in his insistence that grammar served as a medium to writing correctly and constituted the foundation of logic. Sun lamented the absence of grammar in Chinese language: “In Chinese, there is no [structured stipulation of] grammar, and that is why those who learn how to write are not able to compose even a single word unless they recite articles by their predecessors and mimic their writing style; thus either they know all about writing, or they know nothing even after 10 years of struggling with it. It has nothing to do with effort.”⁷

Arguing that grammar and logic are closely related, Sun critically analysed the pedagogical methodology in China, insisting that scholars were responsible for their complacency in education. Sun related the absence of a structuralised stipulation of grammar in Chinese language to the lack of logic in Chinese people, recalling the scholars’ responsibilities: “We have no grammar. ... It

would be difficult to find writers whose works could be analysed with a view to determining “what ought to have been” the distribution of words and phrases, and “why” each word was used... If they [scholars] only know that one must act in a certain way, but cannot explain it, they cannot be respected as scholars.”⁸ In fact, the Chinese pedagogical method was concentrated on repetition rather than rational analysis, which may have produced a lack of inquisitiveness and scientific curiosity among the Chinese people: “The common people who study the classics constantly use the passage that I quoted in a conventional way, but they repeat the words without seeking their interpretation and with no idea of their deeper meaning.”⁹

Moreover, Sun confessed that he had to rely upon Western translation to understand the Chinese classics. He pointed out the futile role of Chinese pedagogy in a speech given to Cantonese Parliament members in Shanghai on July 15, 1916: “Like other village students, I too recited the Four Books and Five Classics in a singsong manner for several years, but I forgot most of it later....So I obtained Western translations of the Four Books and Five Classics and the histories and read them. To my surprise, I was able to understand them [better].”¹⁰ Accordingly, Sun encouraged autonomy in learning, breaking with the ancient way of learning: “[Learning] should not only be appraised at its true worth [set] by scholars but also utilized by them. If it be utilized in the proper way, and if we make use of the ancient scholars, they will not lead us astray.”¹¹

Sun suggested a more progressive methodology to Chinese scholars, arguing that the responsibility and criteria for being a scholar must be based on logic: “When unable to answer what makes a good composition, the scholars would resort to the idea of some mysterious power, saying that some individuals possess some mysterious gift (talent) that enables them to be enlightened all of a sudden; doesn’t this response actually expose how ignorant our scholars are about their language?”¹² In a direct criticism, Sun further challenged Chinese scholars’ illogical

method of reasoning and ignoring the greater responsibility of educating the people and helping them with gaining logic: “Any scholar who deserves the name should know not only what a thing should be, but also why it should be so; if he is not capable of explaining why, then he should not be considered a real scholar.”¹³

On the surface, Sun seems to be challenging the structural problems associated with the Chinese language and its pedagogy, such as the absence of grammar and its consequent lack of logic among the people. However, Sun was, in fact, problematising the absence of national unity and modern rationality due to the structural particularities of Chinese language as well as the exclusionary attitude of scholars. In fact, Sun was communicating the necessity of universal education to abolish social hierarchy from the linguistic perspective, and his concern for the beginners in education ultimately stemmed from his compassion for the illiterate and the undereducated. Sun emphasised that “[for these pupils in Western countries], regardless of the depth they have achieved in their studies, when they set out to write, some can convey abstruse ideas, while others are only able to convey simple messages; however, they all succeed in conveying their information logically and fluently in terms of language.”¹⁴

Sun noted that unspoiled Chinese tradition and culture were maintained by secret societies, an important aspect of spoken language. He emphasised the inclusion of the undereducated class in society because they carried the untainted Chinese cultural identity that had been preserved for centuries in their spoken language. Sun’s argument also reveals his intention to form national unity: “The true national spirit is with the lowest class of society...Thus no matter how despotic the Manchu government became in the last two centuries, the national spirit was kept alive in the verbal codes transmitted by these secret societies...So they rallied the secret societies, whose

organisation and initiations were simple and adaptable, and intrusted to them the preservation of nationalism, not through literature but through oral language.”¹⁵

The structure of Chinese language was closely related to Sun’s nationalism, as Sun’s argument for the unity in the written and spoken Chinese language laid an early foundation for pursuing national unity. In fact, Sun felt that the logic of linguistic inclusion through understanding both written and spoken Chinese was necessary for the unity of the people; furthermore, Sun had compassion for the undereducated, who had difficulty learning the written Chinese language. Sun recognised that grammar served as a structured set of guidelines to overcome the hindrances faced by the undereducated in learning, saying, “Because of the lack of grammar, beginners cannot find an efficient way to proper writing. This is just like when there is no bridge leading to the other side of a river; you have to travel ten times or hundreds of times more distance as you detour in order to cross the river.”¹⁶

Sun empathetically argued that the scholars must share their responsibility for those who really need the bridge (a metaphor for grammar) to logic through education, thereby showing his sympathy to the undereducated in society. He said, “Those scholars who already know how to write properly no longer need to learn grammar. This is just like a man who has already crossed the river; he does not need to find a bridge.”¹⁷ Hence Sun’s emphasis on education was aimed at including those who needed to navigate with the help of grammar in gaining logic. Sun was also convinced that the synchronised Chinese language was a prerequisite for solidarity among Chinese people, and moreover, for modern rationality. He said, “Thus if we have a set of established grammatical rules that help to regulate spoken language and that can be attained by all people in this country as common knowledge, then everybody can learn grammar through everyday

speech...In that case, the coherence between the spoken and the written language can be finally restored.”¹⁸

By recognising that a translated word can have various meanings, Sun emphasised the differences in perspective within the expression such as with the word ‘logic’, which can be translated as either ‘deduction’ or ‘argumentation’. Through this ‘linguistic reflection’, Sun implies that an intersubjective understanding in language and communication is what is most needed when interpreting new concepts derived from foreign cultures. In particular, Sun’s concept of intersubjectivity came from his innovative extension of the boundaries of meaning. Sun implied that mutual understanding comes from broadening the boundaries of meaning. He presented an opposite case of narrowing of meaning: “The definition of logic in these two translations (science of deduction and science of argument) gets narrower and narrower, then they cannot capture the true meaning of logic.”¹⁹

As language is a reconciliatory media for communicative understanding, the synchronised Chinese language would mediate for the unity of the people. Sun’s emphasis on the importance of grammar and its connection to logic supports his argument that an intersubjective understanding of words can expand the boundaries of meaning. Consequently, Sun regarded logic as immanent in language: “What is the rationality of writing (文理)? It is what Western scholars call logic. Here I translate logic as *wenli* (the reasoning in an article), not because it is the most accurate translation, but because when you apply logic to an article, you are dealing with its reasoning.”²⁰ Furthermore, Sun presented linguistic logic as an essential element in the nation’s modernisation by connecting it to scientific rationality. As he was aware of the limitations of translation, he avoided too narrow an interpretation, demonstrating Sun’s reconciliatory approach to an intersubjective understanding: “Based on Yan Fu’s translation of the term “logic” as “the science

of deduction” or “the science of argumentation”, one sees only a part of the truth. Nominalism is one of the two currents in the medieval ages in Europe, the other is practical learning.”²¹

For Habermas (1984, 2001), the very fact that we use language means that we are communicatively able to reach an understanding of one another, arguing that modern society is based on rationality rather than on tradition. Furthermore, Habermas (ibid.) believes that an adequate account of our ability to learn and use language would have to take the phenomenon of mutual understanding as its fundamental object of explanation, rather than the speaker’s understanding of a language. Thus, in addition to access to language, mutual understanding in communication is the key to rationality. Ultimately, Sun’s insistence on the importance of grammar and the synchronisation of written and spoken Chinese language points to the necessity of including the socially excluded classes of the illiterate and undereducated in order to create mutual understanding. Sun believed that the method to attain logic should be clearly communicated in such a way that everyone could comprehend it within a synchronised language. The underlying intention of Sun’s critique of Chinese pedagogy and the absence of grammar was also to encourage and enable Chinese people to understand and communicate logically. Thus, for Sun, language signified coexistence by including the *other*. Ultimately, Sun’s understanding of language and its inherent logic as an essential tool for China’s modernisation catalysed his emancipatory praxis to reconcile the exclusionary mechanism of language that divided Chinese people and its nation.

1.2 Print Media

Sun's earliest experience of the power of print media took place on October 11, 1896 when he was kidnapped and detained at the Chinese Legation in London. Sun was lured into the legation by a group of Chinese men and kidnapped to be shipped back to China to be tried and executed for treason. By the time Sun was released on October 23 with the help of Dr. Cantlie, his mentor at the medical school in Hong Kong, he personally witnessed the power of the press: it formed public opinion strong enough to pressure Sir Halliday Macartney, the main inventor of the plot and close collaborator with the Qing government, to release Sun.

At the same time, Sun also noted the role of the press, which maintained its independence from the politico-economic interests of the Qing government and England. Later, Sun (1897:220) succinctly pointed out, "In England, public opinion expressed its sympathy with the revolution, but the government was opposed to it", lamenting the absence of public opinion in China. His subsequent correspondence with newspaper companies demonstrated Sun's acknowledgement of the importance of the media and its protection by the constitutional law. Sun's own letter to the newspapers written on October 24, 1896, thanking the press for what they did, says, "I have also to thank the Press generally for their timely help and sympathy. ... Knowing and feeling more keenly than ever what a constitutional government and an enlightened people mean, I am prompted still more actively to pursue the cause of advancement, education and civilisation in my own well-beloved but oppressed country."²²

Sun continued to critically evaluate the absence of public opinion in China and the Qing government's oppressive censorship, which, he believed, ultimately impeded the modernisation of China: "I regret very much to record the fact the whole youth of China suffers from this defect of

thought. Consequently, there is no public opinion leading civilization along the path of progress, but an exactly opposite phenomenon is to be observed. By such ways, we can scarcely find the true path for the political and economic regeneration of China.”²³ In fact, the character compound used for public opinion (*yulun*) dates back to at least the third century and has been used throughout Chinese history to describe elite opinion within the bureaucracy. Judge (1996:68-70) points out that, in the early 1900s, the publicists advanced this old term with a new political meaning, redefined as the collective opinion (*gonglun*) of the common people (*yiban renmin*) about government and society. Meanwhile, *yulun* became a key component in the larger agenda of forcing a transition to a more open mode of politics. Public opinion was central to constitutional politics, and the role of public opinion was to ensure that the collective sense of right and wrong in society remained clear.

Interestingly, Wong (1986a) problematized the politics of London concerning its relationship with British mass media by citing the fact that, even though Dr. Cantlie had urgently reported the incident of kidnap to *The Times*, it did not publish the story immediately, possibly due to a political conflict. On the other hand, *The Globe*, which was then a newer and less established newspaper, willingly and promptly featured the story the very day while the original article was still sitting at the desk of *The Times*. Sun clearly recalls picking up a copy of *the Globe* in his detention room at the Chinese Legation: “On October 22nd, Cole (the servant and who secretly informed Dr. Cantlie of Sun’s detention) directed my attention and I picked up a clipping from a newspaper, which proved to be *The Globe*. There I read the account of my detention, under the heading of ‘Startling story! Conspirator Kidnapped in London! Imprisonment at the Chinese Embassy!’ And then followed a long and detailed account of my position. At last the press had interfered, and I felt that I was really safe.”²⁴

Sun's comment shows his firm trust in the role of mass media and public opinion in a modern nation-state such as England. Even with regard to Sir Halliday Macartney, Counsellor of the Chinese Legation at that time and the man who plotted to send Sun back to China, Sun (ibid.:90) commented with his forgiveness, revealing his confidence in public opinion that equalled human conscience. He said, "It is not for me to discuss the behaviour of Sir Halliday Macartney; I leave that to public opinion and to his own conscience. In his own mind, I have no doubt, he has reasons for his action; but they seem scarcely consistent with those of a sane man, let alone the importance of the position he occupies."²⁵

During its revolutionary movements, the secret society's involvements with the press also characterised Sun's strategy to publicise political sentiments against the Qing government, which interdicted public gatherings or debates. The *Tongmenghui*, known as the Chinese Revolutionary Alliance or the Chinese United League, was a secret society and underground resistance movement founded by Sun Yat-sen, Song Jiaoren and other revolutionaries in Tokyo on August 20, 1905. In light of what Sun had learned earlier about the power of print media in England, he started to publish a monthly journal titled *Minpao* (民报), which featured Sun's writings and lectures in support of the *Tongmenghui*.

In the first issue of the *Minpao* on November 26, 1905, Sun explained the purpose of establishing *Minpao*, saying, "Within any group, there are always a few who, possessing an enlightened outlook, spur on the rest, applying the most appropriate principles of government to our people, and then applying those principles that have advanced our people to the rest of the world. This is the heavenly duty of those who are prescient and the reason for our establishing *Minpao*."²⁶ Sun thus recognised early on the political role of the media in catalysing the solidarity of the people, yet, from a pedagogical and elite point of view.

Sun also commented on the power of print media and its influence on politics, publicly acknowledging the media's contribution to the Chinese revolution. On his visit to *Min-li Pao* on April 16, 1912, Sun said, "That the revolution has finally succeeded today is due to the power of the press. The press enjoys this power because it is able to instil ideals in people's minds."²⁷ The press not only represented the people's opinions, but also served as a forum for mapping new modes of social interaction, new levels of social integration and new strategies of social mobilisation.²⁸ Sun was aware of the role of print media in propagating his political ideas in order to mobilise citizens. He recalls in *A History of the Chinese Revolution*, published on January 29, 1923, that "Thereafter, impelled by the same motives, party branches in various places began publishing magazines, daily newspapers, and books. In addition, pamphlets were secretly distributed in the interior to promote my ideas...Those pamphlets were eagerly copied and circulated in the schools, cities and marketplaces despite the interdictions of the Qing government."²⁹ As such, Sun's utilisation of print media, though informal, had begun even before his kidnapping in London, dating to as early as his first attempted uprising in 1895. Sun only reconfirmed the power of the press on the occasion of his kidnapping.

National Unity

Schiffrin (1980) argues that the Boxer Rebellion brought forward the crucial erosion of Confucian values; and that China started to get access to Western values and political ideologies as political philosophy was debated between the revolutionaries and reformists through print media. The press challenged imperial authority and expressed popular opinions, encouraged debate over government policies and educated their compatriots about the urgent need to reform the structures

of dynastic power. Lenin also argued that newspapers were both substance and symbol of the revolutionary cause; the French Revolutionary journalist Jacques-Pierre Brissot claimed that without newspapers, the American Revolution would never have succeeded. Liang Qichao also declared in 1912 that the establishment of the Republic of China was the result of a revolution of ink, not a revolution of blood.³⁰

Moreover, Dikötter (2008:23–5), specifically suggests there is a correlation between the growth in print media and the 1911 revolution, noting that there were more than 100 newspapers in circulation by 1907, and that the reformist and revolutionary press thrived because there were ample opportunities for readers to have access to writers who urged revolution against the ruling Qing dynasty. Dikötter (*ibid.*) also stresses that the wide circulation of newspapers was made possible by modernisation in the postal service system as, by 1908, there were nearly 36 million items of newspapers and printed matter for delivery, suggesting a close relationship between efficient communication and the modernisation of transportation.

An immediate corollary of the rapid expansion of print media, which overcame the geographical vastness of China through advances in transportation, was the building of political solidarity among geographically distant citizens. Sun also commented on how communication through print media could overcome geographical distance: “Our members, however, are scattered in many locations, some in remote border areas, and some in distant coastal regions. Mountains and rivers impede communications. These factors have made it impossible to achieve uniformity of opinion.”³¹ Sun also fully utilised the benefits of speed and coverage area of print media to form unity among the people.

Strand (2011:52) also asserts that political activists in China were reasonably well informed about the role played by political parties in the West and Japan either from study abroad or exile

experiences, or from reading magazine and newspaper accounts of American and European party politics. For example, in newspaper articles during the outbreak of the revolution, Sun was referred to as ‘the leader of the revolution’ in captions beneath his photograph, and also as the ‘Great Revolutionist’ (*Geming Dajia*). *The Shanghai Minpao* praised Sun’s ‘moral purity’ and decades of devotion to the revolution, describing him as ‘the Chinese George Washington’.³² Sun himself highlighted how he leveraged the effect of the press politically in his writing, titled *History of Chinese Revolution* on January 29, 1923: “In 1895, I instigated an uprising in Canton; unfortunately, it failed. Several years later, I instructed Chen Shao-pai to found the *Zhungguobao* (China Daily) in Hong Kong for the purpose of publicizing the Revolution. After 1900, revolutionary propaganda spread like wildfire.”³³

As such, Sun’s employment of various forms of print media as communicational methodology had an effect not only on catalysing citizen solidarity, but also on the strength of his political image. Sun fully recognised the political benefits of the press as he constructed himself politically as a national hero and promoter of solidarity among citizens. On the other hand, the print media also created scepticism as the incident of his own detention in London involved two newspapers, and the underlying role of the press in releasing Sun may have formed both trust and distrust towards the media and its role in politics. This was because, even though information about Sun’s detention was first offered to *The Times* by Sun’s mentor Dr. Cantlie, the newspaper delayed the publication of the article, possibly due to the bureaucracy and conflict of government interests. On the other hand, *The Globe*, then relatively small and new, promptly reported the incident of his detention, influencing public opinion in support of Sun’s release. Therefore, even though print media generally is understood to have contributed to the rise of public opinion, discrepancies between reports also generated distrust of print media.

Nevertheless, rather than focusing on the negative aspects of the press, Sun strongly argued for the unique role of the media, namely the formation of public opinion as well as uniting various opinions of the people. Sun even reprimanded the press if it did not emphasise the latter function. Sun openly talked about polemics and anti-dynastic discourses through the press, and his intention seemed to produce public opinion that was uniformly united toward reconstructing a modern Chinese nation-state. However, Sun seemed frustrated as he could not directly control the press and the sentiment of readers. Sun argued that the media must erase scepticism by strengthening its function of forming unity in his speech delivered to the reporters of Canton Newspapers on April 27, 1912: “The recent overthrow of the Manchus in China was achieved by the military, but popular support for it was the result of endorsements it received by the press. The reason why the newspapers were able to accomplish this was the press was united. Now, although we have a Republic, our situation is still not really stable. In order to achieve genuine stability, there must be unification.”³⁴

McQuail (1992:263) suggests that media solidarity is formed in such a way that there is support from media for the aspirations and identities of sub-groups in society and the solidarity refers to all those aspects of mass media performance, which involve the symbolic extension of sympathy from a small base to a larger group. Sun also commented on the role of the press in relation to the formation of citizen solidarity, emphasising that the role of the press should include helping people understand that the reward of a republic takes time. Sun’s comments revealed his paternalistic point of view, literally and metaphorically: “Today’s newspapers must change their policy in order for there to be unanimity in public opinion. Today people often remark that a republic is worse than a dictatorship. They do not realize that it will take ten years for the benefits

of a republic to become apparent. Analogously, although it is gratifying to raise a son, it takes 20 years before that nurture is rewarded.”³⁵

On the other hand, Sun also argued that the role of print media should comprise recording, informing and ultimately uniting the citizens. However, high illiteracy rates exacerbated by the delayed formation of a Chinese vernacular hindered Sun’s efforts to keep the citizens of the Chinese republic properly and promptly informed. Strand (2011:82) explains that during the May Fourth Movement, literacy rate estimates ranged around 45 percent for men and 10 percent for women, making it necessary to raise the literacy rate. Accordingly, spoken communications gained popularity as a result of the low literacy rate. Eight months after the May Fourth Movement of 1919, Sun pointed out the importance of raising the literacy rate in China in his speech to the Beijing’s progressive and anti-imperialist university students.³⁶

In addition, the Qing government’s imposition of censorship impeded access to information, functioning as a direct barrier to the dissemination of information, the formation of public opinion and ultimately China’s modernisation by delaying the development of political awareness among the public. In history, various political leaders have utilised a similar tactic to control subjects. The Qing government had attempted to restrain the press by passing a series of edicts in 1898 and again in 1901, although these measures were largely ineffective.

In July 1906, the Qing Special Law on Printing was announced, regulating printed matter including newspapers; it stipulated that works of journalism must first be inspected before they were printed. In 1908, another stricter Press Law was made dictating that newly founded newspapers were required to pay a deposit, and all copy had to be submitted for censorship by midnight before the publication date.³⁷ Reed (2004:269) points to the fact that, in 1912, the post-Qing and nominally republican government of Yuan Shikai (1859–1916) also issued a new press

regulation and revised stipulations for textbooks, which were reinforced, in one form or another, by subsequent national and warlord governments.

Censorship of the media was antithetical to the formation of public opinion and, consequently, the modern nation-state. Censorship was, by nature, a form of coercive exclusion in communication that served as a backbone to maintain Qing sovereignty. Given that the illiteracy rate was already high in China, censorship further obstructed access to information and the formation of public opinion. Furthermore, the prohibition of public gatherings impeded social and political mobilisation. Countering the censorship imposed by the Qing dynasty, Sun sought alternative methods for disseminating information, such as printing and distributing at night. Furthermore, Sun's inclusive communication and his creative use of print media helped to form public opinion. Sun believed the power of public opinion together with participatory citizenship would be the key to China's modernisation.

On the other hand, Sun also demonstrated his tendency to "consolidate" public opinion for national unity instead of allowing the autonomy of the press. In doing so, Sun's paternalistic attitude toward the newspapers often suggested that the press should not attack the government: "In dictatorial times, the newspapers were accustomed to attacking the government, but this was because the government was not a government of the people. In republican times, however, newspapers should not attack it, because the government now belongs to the people. Its officials are public servants."³⁸ Furthermore, Sun emphasised the unifying role of print media and its contribution to the Chinese republic in a speech in Canton on April 26, 1912: "Eventually, all minds will come to embrace the accuracy of these tenets. Precisely because newspapers have this capacity to mould political opinion, they should do their utmost in the coming reconstruction to hold fast to a single truth. This is what I expect of the gentlemen of the press."³⁹ Thus Sun did not

believe that public opinion was to form autonomously based on free debates and arguments among the citizens; instead, he argued that the press had to cooperate with the government in uniting public opinion for the sake of national unity.

It is interesting to note that Sun believed in a single truth in forming an opinion, which may reflect his dogmatic stance on the function of the press. Furthermore, Sun's stance on print media was that it had to create a unified "public opinion" in cooperation with the government. Sun did not agree that print media would provide different views to the readers; furthermore, he regarded the divided public opinion as the result of ignorance. Arguing against divisive newspaper articles, Sun commented the function of newspaper should be solely on uniting the people: "Yet, timid elements in our party have begun to say, 'once the revolutionary uprising begins, the revolutionary party can fade away', and such remarks are being openly published in the newspapers. This is strange indeed. It is rooted both in ignorance of the nature of our interests and in a hazy grasp of our party's principles. Are these words of scholars? They are so worthless as to be hardly worth a smile."⁴⁰ Sun's understanding and utilisation of the print media initially symbolised the advent of the modern Chinese nation-state: the construction of the Chinese republic. But instead of allowing an independent and autonomous functioning of print media in forming public opinion, Sun understood that it was the press's responsibility to unify public opinion in cooperation with the government.

Gellner (1988) points to the key elements that helped the shift from traditional to modern societies: in addition to the development of formal systems of education as the core of the mode of persuasion, it was historical analysis, the growth of rationality and the scientific world view that made this transition possible. In the case of Sun, print media was also responsible for spreading his idea of inclusive education and teaching the scientific world view in an effort to politically

awaken citizens in the process of transforming China from a premodern dynasty to a modern nation-state. In this regard, school textbooks also served as effective print media. Culp (2007:59) explains that textbooks of the 1910s also sought to establish the deep historical roots of the Chinese people by recounting myths of the sage kings, the legendary heroes credited with founding Chinese culture. Additionally, Sun felt it was also necessary to awaken the people with political awareness through print media.

Accordingly, Sun looked to print media for its function of influencing and persuading readers in the process of constructing a new Chinese identity. In his 1920 essay titled “First Steps of Local Self-Government” (*Difang zizhi kaishi Shixingfa*), Sun identified the primary tasks of local self-government as the practical work of census taking, assessing land value, repairing roads, reclaiming wasteland and establishing schools.⁴¹ For example, in contrast to Chinese history textbooks’ narrative of assimilation and inevitable national unity, Republican period Chinese geography textbooks raised serious doubts about ethno-cultural cohesion; and most geography textbooks of the Republican period included discussions of the Chinese national community’s effort to establish its intrinsic unity, albeit the basis for national cohesion varied widely among textbooks.⁴² Thus textbooks as a category of print media played an important role in informing, educating and consolidating citizens.

An Imagined Community

Goode (2005) argues that communications technologies such as printing allowed some element of connectivity between physically absent actors and citizens, producing social processes through which their experiences and action choices were structured. Sun also recognised the advantages of

print media, which helped include those who were residing in the places of geographical distance such as the overseas Chinese. Accordingly, with the help of print media, political awareness and participatory citizenship among the overseas Chinese were formed, and the *imagined community* of the new Chinese republic was shaped transnationally. Sun's communicational praxis with print media was to leverage a wide circulation overseas, such as with *Minpao* and other political journals. Subsequently, communications technologies enhanced connectivity between the mainland Chinese and the overseas Chinese, effectively instituting inclusive communication between physically absent actors and citizens through which Sun's arguments for the Chinese republic were actively disseminated and discussed.

Sun offered a blueprint for the future republic, connecting the image of a free and equal society to the people, whose imagined society was created with the help of print media. Benedict Anderson (1998:4) explains nationalism or *nationness*, which describes cultural artefacts of a particular kind and why they command such profound emotional legitimacy. He aptly posits that, in essence, a nation is an imagined political community: that is, a nation is 'imagined', not 'imaginary'. For Sun, print media helped create the imagined community of the future Chinese republic, even for distant people, including the overseas Chinese, by linking them to the new Chinese republic. Goode (2005:93) further asserts that the dispersion of communications technologies also enhances the linkages between 'lived experience and mediated experience', creating new relations.

On the other hand, Garnham (2000:26–9) stresses the influence of the media in relation to nation-state formation, insisting that public communication and the subsequent formation of public opinion catalysed the modern nation-state. In this regard, Sun's emancipatory communication of employing print media for the overseas Chinese also helped them overcome exclusion by social

prejudice due to geographical distance, as eventually the overseas Chinese contributed to the formation of public opinion and the establishment of the first Chinese republic. Sun emphasised that print media was responsible for helping China constructing a new Chinese nation-state by breaking with its past, which was tainted by despotism and imperialism; he argued the press had to maintain a single truth. In a speech in Shanghai on April 16, 1912, Sun commented, “Although the real issues were obscured at first by confused opinions, journalists persisted, holding fast to basic principles, regardless of the spiritual, professional, material, and personal sacrifices entailed, so that the truths I cherish remained unshaken, like a great boulder in the rapids.”⁴³

When Sun sought to break with China’s past, he did not simply deny its past, but rationally analysed the underlying causes, persuading citizens to participate autonomously in the process. Sun argued that in order to reconstruct China, a clear understanding of China’s own history was necessary, along with a new Chinese identity. Calhoun (1995: xxii) also recommends a similar methodology to Sun’s, saying that “breaking with the immediate givenness and immediate facticity of the social world calls not only for historical knowledge as a precondition of theory but for a continual engagement with history and rethinking of historical assumptions.” Thus the concept of modernity grew out of the awareness of historical development, and print media played a crucial role in the process. Habermas (1989) also insists that modernity was born out of the acute sense of a historical break and a new and heightened sense both of history as tradition from which it was necessary to break free, and of history as a break with the past, the understanding of which might orient action towards the future. Hence modernity became possible only through a ‘break with the past’ as it emancipated itself from the fetters of tradition, since a part of human autonomy was seen to derive from a reflective critique of tradition through rationality.

Public Opinion

The journalists equated the politics of public opinion with constitutional politics, and considered the free expression of the *vox populi* to be the key to the strength and power of the “advanced” Western nations.⁴⁴ In the late Qing period, progressive publicists and constitutional reformists such as Liang Qichao envisioned public opinion as an ideal of reason and progress that could serve as a means to force the Qing dynastic government toward more open politics.⁴⁵ Strand (2011:182) also asserts that the new capacity of public opinion to evaluate, celebrate and denounce what was visible in person or in print was palpable in the early 20th century, especially to foreigners who had previously viewed China through their own lens as a polity without a public.

Sun expected the press to have a united role in forming solidarity among citizens by producing a single public opinion in cooperation with the government. Sun showed his dissatisfaction with a different level of cooperation from the press because he understood that the role of the press was to unite public opinion. In his speech given to reporters of Canton Newspapers on April 27, 1912, Sun objected to the press’s tendency of not fully supporting the government, arguing it was even irrational. Here Sun demonstrated his understanding of modern rationality, which was supporting the government with a single truth for the sake of solidarity rather than a rationality based on the coexistence of various facts and opinions. He argued that public opinion was required for national unity, and it was also the responsibility of the press: “A recent reading of various newspapers in Shanghai reveals that the opinions they express lack of unity. On my return here to Guangdong, I have seen that the opinions expressed in various newspapers are even more confused, contradicting objective reason and attacking the government.”⁴⁶

Fitzgerald (1996:206-15) refers to the political influence on public opinion as the ‘downgrading’ of political discourses of the 1920s, suggesting that this development occurred after Sun decided to reorient Nationalist Party policy away from liberal constitutional politics, and designated the latter as unruly in the first quarter of the 20th century, to the politics of a disciplined mass party. Previously, newspapers had been agents and beneficiaries of the greater prominence of public opinion in the late Qing and early Republic, when national and provincial governments conceded a legitimate role for the press, chambers of commerce and philanthropic associations in public life. Journalists themselves believed the press to be a central institution in the functioning of a democratic polity, and their newspapers reflected the variety of public opinion they professed to represent.⁴⁷

However, Fitzgerald (ibid:208) emphasises that eventually newspapers and magazines became a virtual propaganda machine as the Nationalist Party subsidised major newspapers in Shanghai and Guangzhou, as well as dozens of smaller magazines throughout the country. For example, from its foundation in 1915, *The Shanghai Republican Daily* served as a mouthpiece for the parliamentary factions associated with the Nationalist movement. Lean (2007:216) also explicates that, while the phrase ‘public opinion’ continued to be used in the 1920s and 1930s, it lacked the political potential and significance that it had in the late Qing period discussions. Xu (2000:16) adds that the mutual need between the journalists and the state shaped the political culture of the time and fostered a negotiated mutual tolerance and cooperation between the Republican state and professions, from which both sides benefited to some degree. As such, the gap between the autonomy of the press and Sun’s plea for cooperative responsibility to the press in producing a united public opinion represented the conflict between Sun and the press in shaping the modern Chinese nation-state.

1.3 Public Speech and Public Sympathy

Strand (2011:63-4) explains that the phrase ‘public speech’ was originally commonly used for oratory (*yanshuo* in Chinese), including the act of explaining something orally or in writing and, alternatively, the practice of storytelling. Even reformers in China suggested that oratory be taught as a school subject as a means of quickening the pace of change as it was one of the most visible and widespread elements in a leader’s and a citizen’s repertoire. Some scholars have also argued that the interdependent relationship among print media, mass culture and public gathering places brought forward the ideal of public speech and debate. Sun’s public speech catalysed a different effect from that of print media as it was instantaneous, emotionally charged and even responded spontaneously to the audience. In fact, on many occasions during popular movements of the 1910s, 1920s and 1930s, radical young people and others wept and acted out their feelings with highly expressive emotionalism when moved by Sun’s speeches (ibid: 63–77). Their reactions were the manifestation of emotional compassion to Sun’s speech, similar to Lean’s (1997) description of public sympathy.

While public opinion (*yulun*) evolved from the exclusionary elite opinion with the help of print media in the course of China’s modernisation, Lean (2007) argues that although the advent of public sentiment of sympathy (*tongqing*) indicated the modernising process of China, its more prominent aspect bringing women’s presence from the private space of home into the public sphere. In reference to the case of Shi Jianqiao’s murder of an enemy, Lean (ibid.) argues that the collective public sentiments constituted a powerful, new, and communal form of ethical emotional authenticity; it also served as an antidote to an era of inauthenticity generated by slick mass media, corrupt factionalism and a lack of justice in the courts. The rawness of *tongqing* sentiments was thus somewhat like what a spectacle would inspire in the audience, signifying a transformation

from a communal sentiment of *renqing* (sympathy between family members) to the relations of the larger political order (ibid.:5), thus indicating China's political modernisation. She further asserts that, in the early Republican period, public sympathy was like the public spectacle of Shanghai opera, which draws from real life events in contrast to the Beijing opera, which was highly stylised.

While print media reached geographically distant places both in China and overseas, helping to transform the premodern nation to a modern nation-state through engendering public opinion and political awareness among its citizens, Sun's public speech appealed to and relied upon a live audience for its immediate effect. In fact, speechmaking became a principal campaign tactic during the national elections of 1912–13, and Sun's speech at a welcome reception in Canton on April 26, 1912 demonstrates how his selection of words invoked patriotism and personal sacrifice for the unity of the nation and the people: "As military men, you must sacrifice your own freedom and equality in the pursuit of freedom and equality for our 400 million compatriots. It is the divine mission of our military men to enable our 400 million compatriots to enjoy the benefits of freedom and equality."⁴⁸

Apart from the instantaneous and interactive nature of public speech and debate, Sun's speech also had what print media lacked – the inclusive membership of the illiterate and undereducated. While print media provided literate Chinese with access to participate in a common political cause, Sun realised that a great part of the Chinese masses who were illiterate and largely excluded from the written communications of print media. Hence, Sun employed public speech in order to include and transform the illiterate and undereducated audiences into actively participating citizens. Furthermore, to achieve national unity, Sun's speech often included the topic of universal education, particularly for children and women. Sun's public speech also signified a

synchronisation of written and spoken forms of communication, which rationally persuaded both literate and illiterate Chinese citizens with great efficacy. This was, in fact, a realisation of his early argument that unity in both spoken and written Chinese was essential for the unity of the people: he synchronised his written and spoken communication through the combination of print media and public speech.

Sun was a pioneer in public speech for his time as he incorporated print media into an integrated form of communication. The combined power of the persuasive rationality of written communication and affective appeal of his public speech provided Sun with the crucial tools to present a blueprint for China's future. Sun's speechmaking was more than just talk in the sense that "his purpose was to move the nation forward by seizing the imagination of his fellow citizens – creating an imagined society with the help of the media in spoken language."⁴⁹ Sun's particular methodology was to portray the future Chinese republic while inviting political participation of citizens in debates and argumentations, which were also closely related to the methodology of forming modern rationality.

It is also relevant to observe how Sun's style and content in his public speeches changed before and after the 1911 Revolution. Sun was both authoritative and inspirational in arguing for national unity and patriotism, and one can first see Sun's early pursuit of racially defined nationalism in a speech given in Tokyo to celebrate the first anniversary of the *Minpao* on December 2, 1906. Sun advocated nationalism by emphasising the natural construct of the consanguine Han race: "A person always recognizes his parents and never confuses them with strangers. Nationalism is analogous to this. It has to do with human nature and applies to everyone.... Han vs. Manchus.....Even as children we Han would certainly not mistake the Manchu for fellow Han. This is the root for nationalism."⁵⁰

After the successful revolution of 1911, however, Sun's speech reflected his altered stance on nationalism through the ideology of *datong*, emphasising law and social order along with the equality of every citizen. In the speech at the reception by the Rotary Club of Guangdong on May 6, 1912, Sun argued: "Now that we have entered the era of Grand Unity (*datong*) and the nation has become a republic, of course, there is no longer any need for such secrecy. Self-esteem is a valuable thing. It must be recognized that a nation cannot survive without law and that the government must use the law to punish all violations of the law... Everyone should know how to choose. Everyone should strive to be a patriotic citizen."⁵¹ Five years after the revolution, his speech to Xiaoshing Business Association on Aug 23, 1916 was inspirational with his appeal to balance citizen rights and duties, which later became a tenet of his *minquan* principle (democracy): "I am a citizen of this republic, and once my goal is fixed, 'mountains can shift, but my will can never change'; now that our nation has become a democratic country, I will fulfil my obligations as one of its citizens."⁵²

Understanding the Agreement

The topics of Sun's public speech varied, ranging from Chinese collective identity to the industrialisation of China as he presented an outline of how to construct the Chinese republic. However, the most pressing task for him was to break with the negative and humiliating past, which was most relevant for reconstructing a positive self-image of the Chinese. The performativity of Sun's speech was particularly significant in that it was his act of deconstructing China's past tainted by national division. This was clearly articulated in his speech of January 1923, recalling the campaign of 1911: "The results of this campaign have been first, the eradication of

more than 260 years of shame and humiliation, according complete equality to all of the nation's ethnic groups, so that no longer will one group lord it over the others, and the second, wiping out every trace of a monarchical dictatorship that had lasted for more than four thousand years, so that democratic government would hence be introduced.”⁵³

His speech worked as collective reasoning for the public, creating a space of communicative understanding. Habermas (1984) emphasises that the term “understanding” means, at the minimum, that at least two speaking and acting subjects understand a linguistic expression in the same way. In the case of Sun's speech, when the hearer understood and even agreed with Sun's argument, the actual act of breaking with the negative and humiliating past of China was successfully achieved. Hewlett (2007:98) aptly introduces the usage of Roman language system between patricians and plebeians in terms of understanding each other: the patricians regarded utterances made by plebeians as meaningless, and therefore the plebeians were obliged not only to argue their case, but also to frame what they were saying in such a way that patricians would recognise their words as endowed with meaning in the first place.

Sun's speech often reflected the plebeian approach, albeit his pedagogical and elite mannerism, in an effort to include and recognise the socially excluded classes of the people such as tenant farmers, the overseas Chinese and coolie labourers. In his speech to the Institute for the Study of Farmers' Movement in Canton on August 21, 1924, Sun's plebeian inclusiveness is clearly manifested: “Farmers form the largest majority of the Chinese population. Without their participation, our revolution would have no foundation. Farmers are the foundation of the revolutionary movement. Since farmers make up the majority of China's population, they constitute the largest class in China.”⁵⁴

Sun's favourite topic also included universal education, as he felt all Chinese citizens could gain political awareness from it. He often shared his own experience of education in Hawaii, remembering that Western language and pedagogy inspired him to join the emancipatory cause. In a speech made at Ling Nan School on May 7, 1912, Sun recalls, "As a child, I attended a village school, where I learned very little. Later, I was able to go to Hawaii, where I attended a Western school. Perceiving that the teaching there was far superior to that in our country, I often met in spare moments after classes with schoolmates from my own country and we discussed our innermost thoughts. Out of this, arose a desire to reform our motherland and rescue our compatriots."⁵⁵

Sun's speech also emphasised the necessity of transnational trade and cultural exchange, urging China to open to new opportunities and interact with foreign nations. While not oblivious to the negative impact of imperialism in the past, he focused on the pragmatic and rational side of China's national interests and self-reliance, revealing Sun's cosmopolitan influence toward transnational trade and cooperation. Sun (1994:101), in his speech at a meeting of the Chinese World Student Association in Shanghai on 10 October 1912, argued, "Traditionally, our country has closed its doors and refused to communicate with foreigners. Later, after China began trading with foreign countries, people were often misled into continuing to exclude foreigners. Both excluding and fearing foreigners are wrong. We ought to know that, whatever may happen, we must adhere to the right way (*kung li*). If we are bold and self-reliant in the observance of this principle, we will not have the slightest reason to be afraid."

Furthermore, Sun argued for the importance of communication and its infrastructure in a speech given on Oct 12, 1912 at the Shanghai Newspaper Guild. He stressed that national infrastructure and mobility were an important element in China's modernisation, emphasising

communicational connectivity to overcome geographical barriers: “Without communications, the nation will lack the apparatus for dynamism, which will delay every one of the numerous aspects of reconstruction. Thus communications are to a nation what hands, feet, and limbs are to a man, for a man must have these before he can move or perform tasks.”⁵⁶

The combination of both demonstrative and rational elements in Sun’s speech played an important role in emancipating the emotionally distant Chinese subjects; in fact, both elements became complementary to each other rather than conflicting. Sun’s rational persuasion was enhanced by his affective speech, which evoked and transformed the emotional passion of the audience into patriotism. Sun’s persuasive speech also helped reduce psychological distance, particularly that of the socially underprivileged. The style of Sun’s speech was raw and spontaneous, evoking the dormant patriotism of the audiences, and he was often described as ‘Sun the Cannon’⁵⁷ as his improvised speeches and informal conversations represented performative emancipatory communications rather than carefully structured theatrical repetitions. In Strand’s (ibid.) expression, Sun “authored his own story, stitching together the episodes of his life by deftly turning his many defeated attempts to incite rebellion into a grand revolutionary narrative”.

Consequently, Sun relied not only upon rational persuasion, but also upon affective evocation. Sun believed public debates to help form public opinion, supporting the transparency of public communication. Sun often debated with and refuted, for example, the case against the *Baohuangtang* (Protect the Emperor Party) when Liang Qichao took Sun’s loyal followers away and influenced them with the idea of constitutional monarchy. Once Sun commented, “Since his [Liang’s] knowledge is groundless, I fear that if error is allowed to pass unchallenged, it will confuse people and do serious harm...Today I deliberately expose all this so as to submit it to the opinion of the nation.”⁵⁸ Sun was concerned about the disunity of the nation as he demonstrated

his pedagogical paternalism to shield the people from the “variety of wrong information”.

Persuasion

Rancière (2009:4) suggests that there are two strategies for emancipating passive spectators: first, they must be roused from the stupefaction of spectators enthralled by appearances in favour of the empathy that makes them identify with the characters on the stage; second, the spectator’s rational distance must be abolished. Sun’s approach to the emancipating aspects of public speech combined both of these: it was affective, and at the same time, it used rational persuasion, reaching an optimal level of cognitive negotiation to ultimately transform the Chinese audience into a participatory actor. Sun reconciled the elements for effective praxis of communication: rationality and affect.

Sun in fact employed three strategies in his communication: rational persuasion through print media, patriotic affects through his public speech and the combination of both rational persuasion and emotion by utilising both print media and speech. This effectively produced what Rancière (2009:5) would call ‘the logic of the pedagogical relationship’ between Sun and the Chinese audience, helping to replace the latter’s emotional distance and fear with the former’s persuasive guidance and emotional appeal to their political participation for national unity. Sun’s approach to public speech signified China’s shift to a more inclusive and open space of intersubjective communication by persuasion.

Sun’s communicational praxis also contained three fundamental elements that catalysed communicative rationality: First, it encompassed communicative reconciliation; for instance, Sun supported and maintained a reconciliatory approach emphasising cooperation. Second, it included communicative performativity; Sun emphasised the importance of argumentation and debate in

the inclusive space of communication. Third, the combination of print media and public speech were an effective mode of synchronised communication. Habermas (1984) argues that the performative attitude that participants in communicative action must adopt regulates the transition between different political phases while retaining a consistency of meaning. Strand (2011) also claims that social actions, such as producing and performing in the public space, are effectively present in different geographical locations and classes in the form of mass media and public speech.

Rancière (2009:13) claims that emancipation begins when we challenge the opposition between viewing and acting; that is, when we understand that the self-evident facts that structure the relations between saying, seeing and doing themselves belong to the structure of domination and subjection. What matters the most in an emancipatory communication is therefore encouraging the formation of autonomy among the participants, who would eventually develop a critical mind to analyse and bring up different opinions concerning what they see and experience. Through this process, the exchange of positionality between the performer and the viewer would result in an intersubjective identification.

Although Sun's speech transformed the silent and distant viewers into participating political actors by 'abolishing exteriority', which represented a shift from purely insisting on subjectivity to accepting intersubjective understanding, the pedagogical relationship based on the hierarchy of, for example, teacher and students, father and son or governor and the masses continued. However, intersubjectivity refers to a commonly understood point of view between equal communicators with a common aim of, for instance, constructing the Chinese republic. The purpose of an emancipatory communication must lie in the transformation of the Chinese people from passively observing spectators to autonomous citizens participating in the common political cause.

1.4 Public Pledging

Another type of communicational public performance that demonstrated mutual understanding and agreement between the communicators was that of taking an oath, which also represented an act of allegiance. Tsao (1947:71-2) asserts one of the most important duties of the citizen is allegiance to the state and it implies that every citizen of the republic has a positive duty to defend the country against foreign invasion. In Sun's *Outline of the Fundamentals of National Reconstruction*, Article 8 stipulates that, during the transitional period of political tutelage, the average citizen must pledge himself to carry out the revolutionary principles; only then is he or she entitled to exercise political rights.⁵⁹ Sun argued that taking an oath stressed the allegiance to the state and adherence to his three principles; those who joined the army were required to take an oath that pledged allegiance to the four goals of driving out the Manchus, restoring Chinese society, establishing a republic and equalising land ownership. For example, the secret society members put their left hands on a Christian bible and raised their right hands to say "earnestly ask God to be my witness" before taking the oath.⁶⁰

To swear an oath in public was to perform patriotism by synchronising written and spoken communication; at the same time, it was an utterance of allegiance and commitment to the core element of both the rights and duties of a citizen. Sun (1927:140) emphasised the effect of uniting the people by swearing an oath: "If we desire to collect these 400 millions of scattered individual grains, and create out of them a united State, strong in its unity, we cannot reject the idea of an oath... the answer depends entirely on whether our fellow-countrymen willingly or unwillingly perform the ceremony of an oath of allegiance to the Chinese Republic. Chinese patriots, follow my example!" Sun regarded swearing an oath as a patriotic commitment to the establishment of the new republic. He argued that every official and new citizen must take an oath, thereby declaring

their resolve to defend the rights of the people and to advance the people's livelihood. He emphasised that all those who took this ceremonial oath would be able to enjoy all the rights due to a citizen of the republic, otherwise, they would be regarded as still servants and subjects of the Qing dynasty.⁶¹

For Sun, taking an oath to the new republic implied defying the absolute power of monarchical hierarchy; as such, Sun (1994:213) stressed that taking an oath was to realise the modern Chinese nation-state: 'Thus, servants and subjects of the Qing dynasty who transfer their loyalty to the Republic should first demonstrate their "straight heart" (*zhongxin*) and "sincere mind" (*zhongyi*) by taking an oath'. For Sun, swearing an oath was both a demonstration of sincerity and a performance of patriotism, and he argued that the absence of an oath would be directly related to the failure of a new republic: "Now, when our party was created, we solemnly practiced the ritual of swearing an oath. This ceremony, which is at the root of the rule of law, was abolished with the founding of the Republic. This is the major reason for the failure of our revolutionary construction."⁶² The success of speech is judged upon whether the intended act is successfully achieved, and Sun's argument for taking an oath in order to deliver a truthful utterance contributed to the solidarity of the people. And, an oath had to come from the own volition of the articulator.

Sun recognised that patriotism must be performed first by articulation, arguing that words and acts must be in agreement in fulfilling both the rights and duties of a citizen. Sun's (1927:140) articulation of these thoughts also demonstrates his idea of performative citizenship: "It is necessary to express by means of an oath, one's loyalty to and respect for the State into which one is entering, and to express recognition of its constitution and readiness to bear all the obligations arising there from." Sun's concept of participatory citizenship also required taking an oath and pledging allegiance publicly to demonstrate one's commitment to patriotism. Accordingly, by

taking an oath during his presidential inauguration, Sun performed his own citizenship. Sun reiterated his declaration as an act of patriotism: “I, Sun Yat-sen, truthfully and sincerely take this public oath that from this moment, I will destroy the old and build the new, and fight for the self-determination of the people, and will apply all my strength to the support of the Chinese Republic, the realisation of democracy through ‘the three principles’, and to carry into effect ‘the Fivefold Constitution’ for the progress of good government, the happiness and perpetual peace of the people, and for the strengthening of the foundations of the State, in the name of peace throughout the world.”⁶³

Patriotism is thus performed through the articulation of allegiance. Sun’s concept of participatory citizenship required an inclusive and intersubjective communication, and to perform autonomous citizenship, it was necessary to reject the passive identity of the oppressed self as the two – autonomous citizenship in the modern nation-state and subjugated identity under the monarchy – were antithetical. Participatory citizenship was achieved by the act of articulating one’s allegiance in a political community where mutual understanding between communicators was its fundamental objective and interest. Unity in the written communication of pledged patriotism and the articulation of one’s allegiance represented Sun’s intention to synchronise words and deeds for an intersubjective understanding among the citizens of a new Chinese republic. However, the act of articulating one’s allegiance had to be on a voluntary basis, not by coercion.

Sun’s concept of participatory citizenship required an inclusive and intersubjective communication. However, performing citizenship has to be a voluntary act of an autonomous social actor, and just as it was necessary to reject the passive identity of the oppressed self under the monarchy, it was necessary to perform an autonomous citizenship of the modern nation-state because volition and coercion in terms of announcing ones’ allegiance were intrinsically

antithetical. Voluntary participatory citizenship was to be achieved by the act of articulating one's allegiance in a political community where mutual understanding between communicators was its fundamental objective and interest. After all, unity in the communication of pledged patriotism and the articulation of one's allegiance represented Sun's intention to synchronise words and deeds for an intersubjective understanding among the citizens of a new Chinese republic. And, the act of articulating one's allegiance had to be on a voluntary basis not by coercive imposition.

CHAPTER II

The *minzu* principle (Nationalism)

INTRODUCTION

Sun argued that common blood, language, custom, religion, and livelihood were the five essential elements that constituted a nation, insisting that the greatest among all was common blood because it was formed by natural forces. Under the influence of social Darwinism, Sun reckoned the social and cultural forces could possibly override the innate characteristics of race and he was concerned about the possible extinguishment of the Chinese race and the partition of its territory by foreign encroachment. Accordingly, Sun emphasised the importance of growth in population, believing that the strength of consanguine Han race produced by natural forces would counter the coercive forces of foreign imperialism. Sun employed racially defined nationalism by invoking anti-monarchism and anti-Manchuism in support of political efficacy and efficiency in overthrowing the Qing dynasty.

In this chapter, I argue that Sun's insistence on the consanguine Han race produced a dilemma in his own emancipatory communication as Sun's racially defined nationalism and the principle of republicanism were mutually exclusive since the latter was based on the equal political rights of all citizens regardless of their ethnic background. This is significant because a modern nation-state is constituted by both naturally inherited and culturally acquired qualities of the people rather than consanguinity in race alone, and by the coexistence of ethnic minorities and majorities, not by the assimilation or exclusion of the other. In fact, even after the 1911 Revolution and the establishment of the first Chinese Republic, Chinese people were still divided as Sun's racially defined nationalism in support of the ethnic majority Han caused racial conflict with ethnic

minorities. Consequently, Sun had to resort to the argument that the absence of national unity was due to the culturally rooted Chinese loyalty to family and clan in an effort to transfer the people's loyalty to the nation.

2.1 Race and Nation

In his *minzu* principle, Sun explained the origin of the word *minzu*: “The English word for *minzu* is "nation"; the word "nation" has two meanings, race and state. Although this word has two meanings, they are very distinct and must not be confused. Many Chinese words have double meanings.”¹ Accordingly, Sun’s concept of *minzu* carried etymologically binary meanings of race and state. Price (in Sun 1930), who first translated Sun’s work, explains that the word *minzu* had multiple meanings in that Sun used the word *minzu* in the sense of nation, nationality or race, depending upon context. Elaborating upon the principle of nationalism, Sun acknowledged that the concept of nationalism was particular to China, since it concerned both the nation and the state: “What is the Principle of Nationalism? Looking back over the history of China's social life and customs, I would say briefly that the Principle of Nationalism is equivalent to the doctrine of the state. My statement that the principle of nationalism is equivalent to the doctrine of the state, is applicable in China but not in the West. Foreigners make a distinction between the nation and the state.”² Therefore, Sun clarified that the word *minzu* was etymologically derived from a foreign language, but its meaning was particular to China.

The word *minzu* is etymologically derived from the Japanese word *minzoku*, which was originally translated from the German term *Volk* in the late 19th century.³ The German term *Volk* connoted a premodern form of society composed of mainly consanguine people; later, the word *Bürger*, a contemporary equivalent of citizenry, appeared along with the advent of modern nation-state. According to Habermas (1996a, 1996b, 1997), the *Bürger* nation (nation of citizenry), was formed mainly by the voluntary participation of citizens who strove for the common political cause of establishing a modern nation-state. Dikötter (1992:108-10) highlights that, when the word *minzu* first entered the Chinese lexicon in the late 1890s, it initially referred to the people of foreign

countries, and only after the first decade of the 1900s did the idiom become commonplace within Chinese writings to refer to the people of China. This also indicates that the concept of race was not frequently discussed among Chinese people until the political and economic opening of China, which increased their exposure to foreigners. The word also delineated the political structure and territory of a nation.

In its composition, the word *minzu* was a combination of *min* (people or nation) and *zu* (race), signifying national race and comparable to other words such as *guojia* (state) or *guozu* (racial nation).⁴ Sun (1930:5) clarified the difference between nation and the state, saying, “How shall we distinguish clearly between the two? The most suitable method is by a study of the forces which moulded each. In simple terms, the race or nationality has developed through natural forces, while the state has developed through force of arms.” Hence, according to Sun, the distinctive difference between *minzu* (nation) and *guojia* (state) lies in that the former was produced by natural forces while the latter by force of arms.

For Sun, people and territory were the two main constituents of a modern nation-state, and his choice of the word *minzu* highlighted the importance of the people. Fitzgerald (in Unger 1996:66) explains that terms such as ‘Han race’ (*Hanzu*) and ‘Chinese race’ (*Zhonghua minzu*) connoted that the nation was neither more nor less than those people who would be represented when the state was established. Therefore, *minzu* mainly signified the people of a nation-state. Rowe (2009:253) also emphasises that the state in the early 20th century referred not to a place, but to a deliberately created organisation that claimed ultimate control over a particular territory, while “nation” denoted a group of people, defined variously depending on circumstances. Thus members of a nation may be identified as persons sharing a common “race” or gene pool, a common language, a common delimited territory or a common history, and he emphasised both

naturally inherited and culturally acquired qualities in the people of a nation. In comparison, the state referred to political structure and territory.

Natural Race

In terms of what constitutes the race, Sun argued that bloodline was the most important element, followed by the cultural elements of livelihood, language, religion and customs: “The forces which developed these races were, in general, natural forces, but when we try to analyse them, we find they are very complex. The greatest force is common blood. Chinese belong to the yellow race because they come from the blood stock of the yellow race. The blood of ancestors is transmitted by heredity down through the race, making blood kinship a powerful force.”⁵ Sun’s concept of *minzu* thus corresponded to the nation based on consanguine race, which was created by natural forces, in opposition to the state produced by coercive forces, such as the Manchus and Western imperial powers.

Coercive powers represented political power and armed forces, which were diametrically opposed to what Sun believed to be the natural forces that created race: “The development of a race or nationality is quite different: it grows entirely by nature, in no way subject to force... Therefore, we say that a group united and developed in the royal way, by forces of nature, is a race; a group united and developed by the way of might, by human forces, is a state. This, then, is the difference between a race or nationality and a state.”⁶ In Sun’s understanding, race was naturally produced and a state was politically created by coercive forces, which revealed his belief in the juxtaposition of natural and armed forces. Sun also assigned a political value to both, conceiving of the supreme eminence of natural forces in comparison with the condemnable armed forces.

With regard to race and its natural qualities, Sun often discussed the human body in relation to a nation-state. For Sun, who was a physician, the function and structure of the human body corresponded to those of a nation-state: “The ancient sages used to say that man is ‘the universe in miniature’ but we should rather say that one is a ‘little State’, since the stomach and intestines with their appropriate functions, really resemble State institutions transacting the affairs of their country...As for the various parts of the body, the perfection of their organism and the rapidity of their action are quite unattainable by State institutions.”⁷ Sun’s admiration of the human body was, in fact, his admiration of natural forces, which, he believed, created consanguine race.

Furthermore, regarding the means of curing China’s ailments, Sun insisted that the treatment should be based on China’s particularities, since the treatment had to differ with each patient’s particular symptom: “Different people have different natures, and this, of course, must be taken into consideration before prescribing for anyone a specific diet. A thing which is suitable for one man may not suit another. In the same way, the method of curing various illness cannot be uniform or generalised.”⁸ In Sun’s view, the human body and the nation corresponded to each other. Accordingly, he insisted that in the case of China, the particular prescription was to overthrow the Qing dynasty by revolution, and any other remedy would not be effective: “It is like applying electrotherapy to a paralyzed patient and making his hands and feet jump up and down a bit. By no means is the patient thereby restored to health.... Do not let what the Manchus are doing misguide your judgment of world affairs or delude you into thinking there is still hope of rescuing the Qing dynasty.”⁹

Sun argued that the Chinese nation, which was produced by natural forces, was unfortunately conquered by coercive forces; and he emphasised the importance of regaining China’s sovereign autonomy from monarchical despotism and foreign imperialism. Sun also

implied that ailing Chinese race was caused by the coercive force of arms: “To study the cause is like diagnosing a sick man. Whatever disease a man contracts can be traced back either to a poor constitution or to some weakness before he was taken sick. Before China lost her sovereignty, these were already roots of disease in her system which, as soon as she suffered conquest, caused her national mind to decay.”¹⁰ In Sun’s conception, the formation and preservation of the nation were inextricably connected to the innate (*xiantian*) qualities of race, such as consanguinity. Meanwhile, cultural constituents such as language, religion and social customs were acquired (*houtian*) in a common social environment and complemented the innate qualities of race. Sun highlighted the effects of the innate qualities of race by negating the coercive forces of despotism and imperialism in order to regain China’s autonomy.

Cultural Race

Culture was one of the most essential elements that produced racial identity in Chinese tradition, and the Chinese often considered that it was the absence or lack of culture that made the barbarian race. This was in contrast to Sun’s argument that innate qualities, such as consanguinity, were the most important elements in race because they were produced only by natural forces. Furthermore, culture was what enabled the Chinese to imagine the physical body of other races, and the Chinese perspective of race was established on the basis of a cultural pecking order: those who had the most civilisation at the top, and those who were considered to have none – ‘primitives’ – at the bottom. Cultural qualities were thus closely related to the formation of the Chinese concept of the bodies of other races rather than naturally inherited qualities.¹¹ The innately received physical differences of racial body were thus also defined by culture in the Chinese tradition.

Dikötter (1992:5–6) stresses that cultural intolerance of outsiders was associated with a feeling of physical discontinuity, as with the colour and shape of the body. Even geographical territory was defined by culture, with China representing the geographical centre, and the barbarians living beyond the realm of Chinese civilisation; they were even portrayed as dehumanised. Therefore, in contrast to Sun's argument of natural forces as the primary producer of race, Chinese tradition emphasised culture as the supreme element in the production of race and territory. Cultural construction drew a racial boundary between the Chinese and the uncultured: the latter were imagined to have colours and bodies radically different from those of the Chinese, and the only way to become racially Chinese was to become culturally assimilated. Leibold (2007:133) argues that the idea that "pure races" exist is a myth because all human races have been melding for hundreds of thousands of years, expounding the interrelated connection between the natural and sociocultural components of a race. Leibold (*ibid.*) asserts that although humans descended from the same pair of primate ancestors, environmental differences have produced innumerable differences in culture and habits.

On the other hand, Duara (in Unger 1996:34) views Chinese culturalism not as a form of cultural consciousness *per se*, but rather as a specific culture of the imperial state and Confucian orthodoxy, serving as a criterion that defines a community. Membership in this community was thus defined by participation in the rituals that embodied allegiance to Chinese ideas and ethics. Thus cultural performance was the vehicle in forming Chinese people and their collective identity; furthermore, beliefs and myths were also synthesised in the process of producing the concept of the Chinese race as well as other races. According to Yao (1997), in the Chinese cultural concept of humans, there is only one origin or source from which all beings and humans come, which is

Heaven (*Tian*). This kind of cultural concept of the human race and its origin, based on conflated beliefs and philosophy, established a kinship lineage among the Chinese.

Dikötter (1992:3) also points out that physical composition and cultural disposition were conflated in Chinese antiquity: physical composition was thus subject to cultural disposition, and barbarians were sometimes compared with animals not because of their physical appearance, but because of their lack of culture. Accordingly, culture became a racial barometer for inclusion or exclusion in relation to the Chinese racial identity, drawing a strict spatial distinction between the barbarians and the Chinese on Chinese cultural soil. The cultural boundary was therefore identified with the territorial boundary between the Chinese and others (ibid:4). Culture therefore not only produced race, but also formed a nation with its territorial boundary from the Chinese perspective. Crossley (2006:20) also comments upon the malleability of boundaries in the process of constructing race, arguing that the range of ways in which actors reinforced or subverted these boundaries, whether in the ideological, economic, social or political realms, is striking. Racial identity was therefore malleable, based on particular needs and methods of the time, in terms of natural, cultural and even spatial boundaries.

Leibold (2007:133), on the other hand, explains the Chinese concept of race from the perspective of evolution: race has to do with the “innate” (*xiantian*) characteristics of skin colour, physical makeup, bone structure, etc., while the characteristics of language, religion, customs, etc. are acquired (*houtian*). Thus both naturally inherited and culturally acquired elements are important in “constructing” the race. In addition, the cultural influence of religions such as Taoism played an important part in the Chinese understanding of the physical construct of the body in connection to the imagining of a race, contributing to the conflation of cultural and natural constructions of race. The division between natural and cultural was therefore blurred, however,

in Sun's view, there was a clear hierarchy: natural power was most prominent in constructing race, followed by cultural elements.

Social Darwinism and Race

Banton (1988) asserts that different eras employed different discursive concepts to explain and validate differences in ancestry, blood or genetics, implying that race is also influenced and constructed socially and culturally. For example, in 18th-century Europe, race was implicated with lineage and was used primarily to identify a common descent of people; in England, for example, the word 'race' was first used as a folk concept, and began to acquire an analytical or scientific characteristic only in the 19th century. Duara (1995:21) points out that by the end of the century, when social Darwinism began to make an impact on the non-Western world, it represented the underside of Enlightenment rationality or, more appropriately, its *monster* child by which racial hierarchy was sustained and imperialist exploitation justified.

However, what Darwin fundamentally emphasised in his *Origin of Species* or *the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* (1859) was that there were no permanent forms of nature and with regard to race, scientific evidence indicated that socially significant group differences were culturally, not genetically, transmitted. In a lecture to educational circles at Hu Kuang Clubhouse on Aug 30, 1912, Sun showed his disapproval of Darwin's original theory due to the lack of civilisation in theorising the evolution of human beings: "Under its influence, every nation rested for a time on the concept of superiors dominating inferiors and the strong devouring the weak, to the point that naked force replaced universal law. To be sure, this theory was

appropriate during the first stage of the advancement of European civilization, but by today's standards, it is tantamount to barbarianism.”¹²

Meanwhile, Western scientific discourse played an essential role in the production of the modern construct of race, and Duara (*ibid.*) claims that race could also refer to a categorical difference of people engendered by perceived physical and attendant sociocultural differences, including “blood” or “species”. Consequently, social Darwinism was broadly interpreted as claiming that social and cultural elements could also produce race along with natural elements. In Sun's terms, this could be also interpreted as saying that social and cultural elements such as coercive forces could collaborate with natural forces, and that the acquired social and cultural forces could possibly override the innate characteristics of race.

Sun's firm belief in the superiority of natural forces that produce consanguine race would be threatened if the relationship between consanguine race and natural forces in constituting a nation were to be dominated by the political and cultural forces. Initially Sun did not seem to be content with social Darwinism, particularly because it compared the evolution of animals with that of humans; this interfered with Confucian teachings that placed human beings higher than animals. Sun (1953a:73) insisted on the superiority of human evolution: “They even want to apply these laws of the animal world to mankind but they do not understand that it only applied to a transitional period in the history of mankind that the evolution of man has outgrown this principle which governs the world of animals”. However, Sun's pride in the superiority of human evolution was based on their socially and culturally acquired qualities rather than naturally inherited ones.

Social Darwinism also coincided with a newly emerging trend of nationalism in the late Qing period. When Kang Youwei initiated his modern ideology of Chinese nationalism and the nation-state, the national community he had in mind was established on Confucian cultural

principles that would include ethnically non-Han peoples such as the Manchus as long as they had accepted Chinese cultural principles.¹³ On the other hand, Zarrow (in Fogel and Zarrow 1997:18) points out that Liang Qichao accepted the social Darwinist vision of ruthless competition at the level of nations, which he believed would result in a dynamic system of autonomous states rather than the domination of the many by one victor. Rhoads (2000:5) further argues that Liang Qichao not only helped introduce the concepts and terminology of social Darwinism to the Chinese reading public, but also wrote the first reasoned critique on it.

While many Chinese writers constructed their understanding of human evolution and the birth of modern nation from the perspectives of racial taxonomy and competition under the influence of social Darwinism, Sun's reaction to social Darwinism was directed toward how to prevent the possible termination of the Chinese race and the partition of the Chinese territory by foreign powers. This led him to emphasise the importance of population. For Sun, a large population stood for strong racial power, and a rapid growth in population in the West alarmed him: "When I compare their increase with that of China's, I tremble. Look at the United States: a hundred years ago it had a population of only nine millions, now it has over one hundred millions; at the same rate it will have one thousand millions at the end of another century."¹⁴

Sun believed that an increase in the Chinese population would counter the power of Western nations and, furthermore, the threat of social Darwinism. Sun took the example of America, insisting on the importance of race and population in maintaining a nation: "Although natural forces work slowly, yet they can exterminate great races. ...Two or three hundred years ago, the American continent was entirely the land of the red aborigines. They were scattered everywhere in large numbers, but after the arrival of the white man on the continent they slowly disappeared until now they are almost extinct. Here we see natural selection exterminating a great

race.”¹⁵ Sun’s focus on population still reflected his belief in natural forces that produce race in comparison with armed forces, which could be regarded as part of social and cultural power.

For Sun, the growth of the Chinese population mattered in order to preserve the Chinese race. However, after a series of natural disasters such as flooding and droughts, the growth of the Chinese population had been stagnant. Sun then emphasised the importance of science, arguing that its development was directly related to the growth of population in the West: “The large gain [in population in the West] has been due to the advance of science, the progress of medicine, and yearly improvement of hygienic conditions, all of which tend to reduce the death rate and augment the birth rate. What is the significance for China of this rapid growth of other populations?”¹⁶ To preserve the Chinese race, Sun concluded that China needed modern science to maintain the growth in the Chinese population. However, Sun’s argument revealed a gap in his logic with regard to science and population: science, such as agricultural technology, medicine and hygiene, highlighted human beings’ social and cultural achievements rather than the naturally inherited qualities. Hence, science, which represented social and cultural forces rather than natural forces, was closely associated with the innate qualities of human race.

At this point, it is pertinent to explore what influenced Sun in his relentless argument for natural forces in relation to race, and how this inspired Sun to advocate racially defined nationalism. Sun’s insistence on consanguine race was closely related to his belief that only the innate qualities of race produced by natural forces could counter the armed forces, such as foreign imperialism, and thereby preserve the Chinese race and nation. Sun believed natural forces to be superior to armed forces; thus when the existence of naturally produced race was challenged by social forces, as in the case of social Darwinism’s acknowledgment of the validity of coercive forces, Sun’s belief in consanguine race and natural forces was threatened. Accordingly, Sun felt compelled to

argue for the authenticity of natural forces, and population symbolised a direct manifestation of the strength of natural forces that would preserve the Chinese race and nation against the sociocultural forces of the West. Sun argued, “A hundred years hence, if their population increases and ours does not, the more will subjugate the less, and China will inevitably be swallowed up. Then China will not only lose her sovereignty, but she will perish, the Chinese people will be assimilated, and the race will disappear.”¹⁷

On the other hand, Sun also demonstrated his trust in cooperation among humans, believing that humanistic virtues would bring about civilised human evolution. He expressed his criticism of social Darwinism, which ignored positive human qualities but instead emphasised on fierce competition: “From the time that Darwin discovered the principles of evolution, the survival of the fittest-scientists began to treat morality, love, justice and friendship as a mirage, and to regard the law of the struggle for existence as the reality.”¹⁸ Sun’s belief in human cooperation would become a core tenet in his emancipatory communication, resonating in the *minquan* and *minsheng* principles. However, the contrast between Sun’s belief in the cultural qualities of human beings, such as morality and love, and his argument for natural qualities in consanguine population in order to compete for survival among different races formed a conflict within his *minzu* principle. The binary aspects of natural and cultural forces further complicated Sun’s argument for consanguine race in his *minzu* principle.

2.2 Nationalism and Race

Unger (1996) posits that Chinese nationalism was initially anti-imperialist until the early years of the 20th century, emphasising that 19th-century xenophobia and turn of the century anti-Manchuism blended into the more fully developed ideas and movements of the May Fourth era. Both Chinese revolutionaries and reformists sought to mobilize the nation through the discourse of nationalism; and around 1905, anti-Manchuism was to become the central tenet of Chinese nationalism. Sun also initially instigated nationalism along with anti-imperialism to counter the threat of the possible end of the Chinese race and the partition of its territory.

Sun's initial propagation of anti-imperialism was influenced by the historical events such as the Opium Wars and the unequal treaties, wherein the coercive forces of Western imperialism profited from China's woe. Callinicos (1994) stresses that racism in modern history first developed in order to justify the systematic use of slave labour in the great plantations of the New World, which were central to the original emergence of capitalism as a world system. Racism thus formed as part of the process through which capitalism became the dominant social and economic system, underscoring a close relationship between capitalism and racism. Countering imperialism, Sun (1930:11) expounded, "Our position now is extremely perilous; if we do not earnestly promote nationalism and weld together our four hundred millions into a strong nation, we face a tragedy—the loss of our country and the destruction of our race. To ward off this danger, we must espouse nationalism and employ the national spirit to save the country. If we are to do this, it is essential first to know wherein the danger to our nation lies, and the best way to make this danger clear is to compare the Chinese people with the peoples of the Great Powers."

The initial stage of Sun's anti-imperialism reflected Sun's intention to preserve the Chinese race against the imperial powers and the colonisation of China. Sun evaluated the conflict

between natural and coercive forces under the influence of social Darwinism, saying, “But political and economic forces work more rapidly than the forces of natural selection and can more easily extirpate a great race. China, if she were affected only by natural selection, might hold together another century; but if she is to be crushed by political and economic power, she will hardly last ten more years.”¹⁹

Sun also expressed his disapproval of imperialism and capitalism by showing his support for the Russian movement: “Russia's new policy aims not only at the destruction of Russian imperialism but also at the overthrow of imperialism in the whole world. Furthermore, it aims at the overthrow of the capitalism of the world. For, in every country, although the apparent power is in the hands of the government, real control is with the capitalists; the new Russian policy would smash this control, and so the capitalists of the world are panic-stricken.”²⁰ Sun’s comment demonstrates his denunciation of the coercive forces of imperialism, which conquered and threatened the existence of the Chinese race in the form of capitalism.

Nationalism was pursued through various approaches during the years before the 1911 revolution. Jenco (2010:33) points out that not all parties articulated nationalism in ethnic terms: Zhang Shizhao, for example, opposed race-based nationalism. On the other hand, revolutionists such as Zhang Taiyan, a supporter of anti-Manchuism, articulated an image of a new community that was persuasive and modern.²¹ With regard to Zhang Taiyan’s exclusivist position in the future Chinese state, Crossely (1999:344) asserts that, since Sun seemed to have been sympathetic to exclusivist views in his own early days as a nationalist leader, geopolitical factors ultimately led Sun to accommodate a conciliatory plan of the Five Race Republic after the 1911 revolution, which Zhang abhorred.

Kang Youwei, on the other hand, inherited the Confucian culturalist notion of community even though he was influenced by Western ideas. Traditionally, the Confucian concept of great unity (*datong*) represented the most fundamental ideology in China, and Kang Youwei justified nationalism as a necessary stage in the ultimate achievement of the “great unity (*datong*)” of all the peoples of the world. *Datong* was also an ideal that Sun would later emphasise in his land equalisation plan as expressed in the *minsheng* principle. In the Qing dynasty, where new definitions of loyalties and identities were constantly produced, the Confucian concept of *datong* served as an ideal principle for the foundation of nationalism as well.

In the process of propagating his anti-imperialism, Sun also brought up the necessity to overthrow the Manchu monarchy, blaming it for not having protected China and the Chinese people from foreign encroachment. Consequently, Sun concluded that his ideal of establishing a republic was in direct conflict with the monarchical system of the Qing Dynasty; the principle of a republic was the equality of every citizen, while the monarchy was based on a system of class hierarchy. Sun thus regarded monarchism as directly antithetical to republicanism, and the establishment of a republic presupposed the overthrow of the Qing dynasty. Consequently, Sun’s nationalism shifted from anti-imperialism to anti-monarchism and anti-Manchuism. Sun defied monarchism in favour of republicanism, yet he relied on support from the ethnic majority of the population, the Han race. Sun insisted that nationalism had to be defined on the basis of the majority of the population.

In Liang Qichao’s view, however, the Chinese people had to make a choice in committing to nationalism of either aiming to build up China as a modern state or allowing themselves to be carried away by a narrow revengeful spirit against the Manchus. Liang’s stance on nationalism was in favour of the construction of a Chinese modern nation; however, Liang also felt that

nationalism, while important, was not the only way to achieve statehood. In Liang's vision, it was the citizenry that was the essential condition for China as a modern state, which would also include the Manchus and other ethnic minority groups.²²

Underlying Sun's propagation of nationalism were dual motives: to protect Chinese race from coercive powers of Western imperialism, and to subvert Manchu monarchy to establish a republic. However, Sun expressed that the core intention was not about revenge against the Manchus, but rather maintaining Chinese autonomy and its culture: "My principle of Nationalism takes our ancestral legacy and develops it to greater brilliance. Toward the Manchus, I do not seek revenge, urging rather that we coexist with them within China on terms of equality...Toward the other peoples of the world, I have urged that we preserve our independence, develop our traditional culture, and at the same time, absorb and further develop the culture of the world to greater brilliance, in the hope of advancing in step with other nations and of eventually achieving world unity. This is how the Principle of Nationalism will be used to deal with the various nations of the world."²³ Here Sun indicated that the principle of nationalism was to maintain coexistence with the Manchus as well as to preserve Chinese culture, thus implying a symbiotic relation between culture and race.

However, given that China consisted of many ethnic groups, Sun's racially defined nationalism in support of the ethnic majority Han caused racial conflict with ethnic minorities. Crossley (1999:342) suggests that ethnicity had not been a primary cause of political or social unrest before, and "racial invective was typically appended to the rhetoric of troubles that had decipherable proximate causes", arguing that even the *Taipings* did not unequivocally hypothesize racial qualities. Sun's racially defined nationalism, however, destabilised the existing cohesion

between the ethnic majority and minorities, and Sun's main purpose of nationalism to unite the nation was defeating its purpose.

Bol (2008:13) notes that the ethnic difference of the Han race was originally made when a few Song documents distinguished between peoples who lived intermingled along the frontiers by referring to them as "Han people" (*hanren*) and to other tribal peoples as border (*fan*). On the other hand, Leibold (2007) posits that Sun dismissed ethnic minorities as numerically insignificant and evolutionarily unfit, arguing that the vast majority of China's 400 million people were entirely *Hanzu* when compared with the fewer than 10 million non-natives (*wailai*). Sun's argument for nationalism hence largely reflected his insistence on the scale of population as well as his belief in the superiority of naturally produced power of race in opposition to coercive forces. However, Leibold (*ibid.*) asserts that Sun's appeal to racially defined nationalism might very well have turned out to be a barrier rather than a catalyst for the unity of a multi-ethnic China, putting Sun in a dilemma.

Laitinen (1990), on the other hand, argues anti-Manchuism was not simply a sign of the discontentment with the present government, but was rather a modern phenomenon and a reflection of modern national ideas. By analysing the historical roots of anti-Manchuism from the perspective of cultural prejudice and anti-barbarism, she points to the late Qing revolutionaries' claim that anti-Manchuism was inherited from the late Ming Chinese literati and gentry, who opposed the invading Manchus and refused to serve the alien Qing Dynasty. Laitinen (*ibid.*) asserts that modern nationalism in China was born as a result of military, commercial and cultural penetration by the West; moreover, anti-Manchuism became a demarcation line between revolutionaries and reformers, meaning that anti-Manchu propaganda had little to do with the Manchus but rather with the Chinese. In her analysis of Zhang Taiyan's nationalism, Laitinen

(ibid.) claims that Zhang's anti-Manchuism, for example, was a practical means for strengthening nationalist spirit, pointing out that anti-Manchuism faded while anti-imperialism became stronger after the 1911 Revolution.

Sun's support of the Han ethnic majority in establishing a modern nation-state could be explained partly by time constraints given Sun diagnosed of China's condition of political illness facing foreign encroachment and domestic despotism. Sun thus wanted to leverage the collective power of the majority ethnic groups. Duara (1995:140), however, does not think that these arguments should be allowed to conceal the extent to which the racism of social Darwinist global discourse formed intellectuals' view of the world, arguing that Sun's racially defined nationalism was a racist one and a product of the constitutive discourse of the survival of the fittest races, in which race was the principal source of value as much as it was a historical inheritance or political expediency. Thus Duara (ibid.) strongly argues against the notion of time constraint that Sun faced to explain the fact that he turned to the racial majority in building nationalism.

Sun (1994:42) clarified that his logic of his nationalism was for political autonomy, saying, "On the other hand, we should recognize that nationalism does not mean discriminating against people of a different nationality. It simply means not allowing such people to seize our political power, for only when we Han are in control politically we have a nation. If that political control is in the hands of people of another nationality, then there is no Han nation." At issue for Sun was the idea the nation had to be in control of the majority of the population, which, he believed, was produced by natural forces, and the Han race was the ethnic majority of the population. Nonetheless, the conflict of his proposition was based on the exclusion of the ethnic minority groups, who also had equal rights in the modern nation-state of the Chinese republic that Sun strove to establish.

Cultural Loyalty and Nationalism

Initially, Sun believed that employing anti-Manchuism would facilitate the transfer of deeply rooted people's loyalty from the emperor to the new Chinese republic. In fact, Sun's employment of anti-Manchuism was to mobilise the ethnic majority for political efficacy; Sun believed the ethnic majority of the people were produced by natural forces while monarchism by coercive forces. Sun also regarded the Qing monarchy was based on social hierarchy, which caused the people's submissive attitude toward the authorities, impeding their equality and autonomy.

At the same time, Sun argued for the necessity of cultural loyalty among Chinese people in order to fend off the influence of foreign culture, which, Sun believed, entered China through coercive forces. Sun thus wanted to leverage the cultural power of loyalty, which he regarded as particular to China, to counter the external power of armed forces, saying, "Since our domination by alien races, and since the invasion of foreign culture which has spread its influence all over China, a group intoxicated with the new culture have begun to reject the old morality, saying that the former makes the latter unnecessary. They do not understand that we ought to preserve what is good in our past and throw away only the bad."²⁴ Sun's comment also represented his modern rationality in selectively maintaining the positive while discarding negative elements in Chinese traditions.

Harrison (2000) posits that understanding the invented nature of many of the traditions of nationalism began to influence the way we think about ethnicity, connecting race and nationalism with cultural identity. She claims that if ethnicity and nationalism are to be examined together, then rituals and ceremonies should be examined to look at the changing nature of Chinese identity. She stresses that cultural influence such as ritual is not just a means of social integration but also a means of biasing power, creating hierarchies of power between communities. The tradition of

loyalty to the emperor and filial piety to the father had a strong influence on Chinese cultural identity, and Chinese cultural loyalty was cultivated through rituals and ceremonies.

In contrast to his opinion against Chinese loyalty to the monarchy, Sun asserted that the tradition of filial piety was a unique characteristic of Chinese culture, and recommended that the Chinese keep this positive tradition in order to maintain their cultural identity. However, Sun also indicated the desirability of collectivising and “regulating” Chinese loyalty to family and clan on a national level, foreshadowing his future endeavour to promote the transfer of the people’s individual loyalty toward the nation. In examining the implications of filial piety in terms of Chinese cultural identity, Sun (1930:115) also assessed the negative implication of family and clan in relation to national unity, saying, “Because China lays emphasis upon the family as well as upon the individual, the family head has to be consulted on all matters, a system which some approve and some criticise. But I think that in the relation between the citizens of China and their state, there must first be family loyalty. Such a system, expanding step by step, will be orderly and well-regulated and the relationship between the small and large social groups will be a real one”. Sun asserted that only voluntary loyalty to the nation could produce national unity as well as a collective Chinese identity. Sun thus insisted on preserving the positive culture of filial piety in the private space of the home in order to maintain Chinese moral values. On the other hand, Sun insisted on transferring the loyalty to the nation: “Loyalty to the nation is namely loyalty to the people and it is the Chinese responsibility toward the nation.”²⁵

Sun realised that his task was to maintain the people’s loyalty while trying to shift it toward the new republic. Sun spoke about his observation of the people’s loyalty at an ancestral temple, expressing his concern about that Chinese loyalty was disappearing. Sun emphasised on the importance of maintaining both kinds of Chinese loyalty, filial piety and loyalty to the nation: “I

saw on the right hand side that character for “Filial Devotion” but on the left side, [there was] a blank where there must have been previously, I think, the character for “Loyalty” (to the emperor, or to nation). This shows the thinking of a certain type of people today: because we have a republic, we need not to talk about loyalty.”²⁶ Sun argued that, just like filial piety, the people’s loyalty must be preserved, not for the emperor, but for the nation; at the same time, he noted that Chinese cultural identity based on the family and clan represented solely a closely knit collective, not the nation. Sun felt that it was necessary to maintain the Chinese tradition of loyalty for the sake of national unity: “But the Chinese people have only family and clan groups; there is no national spirit. Consequently, in spite of four hundred million people gathered together in one China, we are in fact, but a sheet of loose sand.”²⁷

Sun (1930:4) accordingly observed that the loyalty of Chinese people was overly committed to family and clan, arguing that it impeded national unity: “The family and the clan have been powerful unifying forces; again and again Chinese have sacrificed themselves, their families, their lives in defence of their clan....But for the nation, there has never been an instance of the supreme spirit of sacrifice. The unity of the Chinese people has stopped short at the clan and has not extended to the nation.” Furthermore, Sun debated the reasons why loyalty had to be utilised in order to build a new Chinese republic for the nation of 400 million Chinese people instead of one monarch. Sun argued that it was much nobler to be loyal to one nation than to one person, stressing the collective purpose of a nation. His message was that the Chinese republic still required loyalty, not to the emperor and family but rather to the new nation and its people, which also supported the equality of all citizens: “They say that in former days, loyalty was shown to princes, and in a democracy, loyalty is not needed and can be cast aside. Such an argument is

certainly due to misunderstanding: we do not want princes in the country, but we cannot do without loyalty. If we say that loyalty is outworn today, what about the nation?"²⁸

To Sun, the nation was a greater cause than family and clan; the latter could be sacrificed for national unity, as he argued, "We must utilize China's ancient social groups, as the family and the clan, and consolidate them to form a great national body."²⁹ Sun concluded that loyalty to family and clan in the private space of home interfered with the formation of nationalism since these two competing objects of loyalty threatened to undermine the building of China's nation-state. Sun urged that they transfer their loyalty to the nation because China required nationalism for national unity: "China is the oldest, the largest and the most civilized of the nations and the one with the greatest powers of assimilation. But although there is a vast nation, there is no nationalism."³⁰

Sun argued that Chinese cultural loyalty to national unity was necessary in order to avoid fragmentation, like scattered sands, and to preserve the Chinese race: "Where the individual is the unit, there will be at least millions of units in a country, four hundred millions in China; the knitting together of such a huge number of separate units would naturally be very difficult."³¹ Sun's argued that loyalty to individual families and clans, which represented an individual cause, had to be sacrificed for the collective purpose of the nation by cementing the sheet of loose sand into a solid national unit.

In directing the people's loyalty to the nation, however, Sun realised that family and clan also served as a core foundation of Chinese cultural identity, and that the Chinese people's concept of nation was shaped around the concept of family and clan. Family was thus the origin of the nation from the perspective of Chinese culture. Even though Sun tried to govern family and clan under the umbrella of the nation, family was the foundation of Chinese cultural identity. Linebarger

(1937:39) aptly asserts that family consciousness played an important part in sustaining certain elements of Confucian culture because it oriented the individual not only philosophically but also socially, arguing that family was therefore synonymous with concepts such as nation and human beings. As such, to Chinese people, the nation was a cultural extension of family and clan.

Sun thus faced a dilemma in his attempt to persuade people to transfer their loyalty from family to nation because it was analogous to arguing for establishing the political framework of a nation without the cultural content of the people. Sun asserted, “If we all combined, we could become a great national union – the Republic of China – and that with such a union we need not fear outside adversaries or our inability to revive the state.”³² Regarding the logic of shifting loyalty from family and clan to a national level, Sun argued for the benefits of collectivity over individuality. This was the same logic that Sun employed when he supported the ethnic majority over minority groups for political efficacy. However, individual families were the foundation of cultural identity of the Chinese, and the nation required both people and its cultural identity.

2.3 National Unity and the Five Race Republic

Sun's propagation of racially defined nationalism resulted in excluding the ethnic minority in the process of building the modern nation-state. Consequently, even after Sun's nationalism brought forth the 1911 Revolution and ultimately the Chinese republic, the nation remained fragmented. Eventually, Chinese revolutionaries promptly announced the establishment of a new Republic of China and declared their intention to assert sovereignty over all the former subjects and territories of the Qing Empire. However, Sun's ethnically defined nationalism remained antithetical to the principle of a republic, which Sun was trying to build.

Sun thus shifted to employ a more ethnically inclusive policy encompassing the autonomous rights of ethnic minorities by altering his earlier argument. Sun realised that an all-inclusive sociocultural identity for the Chinese people was requisite for the solidarity of the Chinese republic; furthermore, racially defined nationalism and republicanism were mutually exclusive. Ultimately, Sun proposed the Five Race Republic, shifting from the previous ethnic majority Han-led nationalism by acknowledging the autonomy of diverse ethnic constituents. This symbolised a unity in national identity inclusive of ethnic diversity as well as a change in Sun's insistence on a nation that is based on, from a naturally produced race to a more culturally constructed race. Sun thus admitted the possibility of national unity between the ethnic majority and minority of population through cultural coexistence.

On the other hand, See Sin Heng (in Lee, L. T., H. G. Lee, et al. 2011:35) points to Sun's methodology of consolidating China into a one nation from the multi-ethnic groups, problematising Sun's reduction of the 56 different ethnic groups into five major ones. Heng argues that Sun's declaration that all of these Chinese people could be considered to be Han Chinese showed his intention of unifying the Chinese by assimilation. Heng (ibid.) further asserts that the

five ethnic groups were chosen based on numbers representing the majority of population, which may have also implied absorbing the minorities into the majority rather than maintaining ethnic diversity. Even though Sun's intention was to include ethnic minorities in the project of national unity, Sun also acknowledged that the logic of inclusion was from the perspective of the Han people, the majority of the nation: "It is for the Han people to sacrifice the separate nationality, history, and identity that they are so proud of and to merge in all sincerity with the Manchus, Mongols, Muslims and Tibetans in one melting pot to create a new order of Chinese nationalism..."³³

Ultimately, Sun shifted his argument from a racially defined nation (*guozu*) to a multi-ethnic republic (*daminzu gongheguo*) by advocating for the equal citizenship of all ethnic groups in the new republic. Taking from the example of the multi-ethnic republics of America and Europe, Sun realised that the ethnically inclusive republic was the way not only to survive, but also to prosper. Sun recognised an all-inclusive political nation-state constituted by different ethnic groups with their distinctive lifestyles, languages, religions and economic ways of life. Sun explained the essence of his revised aim of the nation and its government in terms of race and national unity: "The government should undertake to render assistance and protection to the racial minorities in the country so that they may be able to exercise their right of self-determination and self-government, while resisting oppression and invasion from foreign countries. The government should, at the same time, revise the treaties with foreign countries in order to secure national independence and international equality."³⁴

Pye (in Unger 1996:89) aptly maintains that developing a coherent and inspiring form of nationalism from the all-embracing concept of Chinese ethnicity has not been easy; however, he also posits that although Sun sought to articulate an early version of Chinese nationalism, *The*

Three Principles of the People soon became merely the orthodoxy of a partisan political party. Pye (ibid.) insists that nationalism must also respond to different times as he evaluates the implications of revolution and modernisation: the former produced confusion and disillusion while nationalism and modernisation called for a heightened level of consciousness, a capacity for empathy and a break from the rigidities of traditional orthodoxy.

Sun had previously encouraged modern rationality and political consciousness among the people for their political participation, trying to shift the people's cultural loyalty to the nation for the solidarity of the people. However, it was not until Sun realised that a nation based solely on racial exclusion could not consolidate collective identity nor culturally rooted loyalty for national unity, thus he decided to recognise diversity in ethnic backgrounds. Jiang (in Chang 1988) rightly suggests that while the people of a country must cherish a common loyalty to the nation, this does not mean excluding identification with any other sub-groups such as ethnic, religious, regional or economic ones; rather, loyalty to the nation-state must be regarded as paramount and be able to provide a common ground for the resolution of the differences that may arise among these subgroups.

In shifting his approach to a more culturally and politically inclusive Five Race Republic, Sun acknowledged the autonomy of the ethnic minority groups and demonstrated a more inclusive stance toward national unity: "The basis for nationalism has been sometimes a common ethnicity and religion, sometimes a shared history and tradition, or, more rarely, a common language and literature. But the loftiest and most civilized nationalism of all is rooted in common aspirations."³⁵ Sun's comment also reflected his acknowledgement that racially defined nationalism was antithetical to republicanism, and that it risked to reverse the trajectory of China's modernisation from a modern nation-state led by political citizens (*Bürger nation*) back to the premodern

community composed of common descendants (*Volksnation*). Furthermore, the individual unit of family did not have to be sacrificed for the sake of the nation but; both were instead mutually dependent for their coexistence, and together they formed national unity.

As a result, Sun's reconciliatory approach to the conflicts of exclusionary and inclusive nationalism catalysed a broad nationalism (*da minzu zhuyi*) rather than the narrowly defined anti-Manchuism. Sun realised that the key to the national unity was to maintain the coexistence of the people by acknowledging their ethnic diversity and autonomy rather than excluding or coercively assimilating them. Sun also reconciled the cultural and the natural construction of race by accepting that a nation was established on an interdependent relationship between naturally produced and culturally developed elements as well as between individuals and collective. As a result, equal citizenship among the members of different ethnic groups was granted by empowering them with participatory citizen rights, which Sun later advocated in his *minquan* principle. Finally, national unity was defined not by racial qualities, but for the coexistence of all the people.

CHAPTER III

The *Minquan* Principle (Democracy)

INTRODUCTION

Sun argued for the equal rights and freedom of the people as the two main tenets in his *minquan* principle, identifying the absolute power of the Qing monarchy as the main enemy of democracy. In an effort to shift the monarchy's imposed duties to the rights of the people, Sun advocated constitutionalism in order to maintain a balance between the power of the people and of the government, and between citizens' duties and rights. Sun proposed the Fivefold Constitution, a hybrid of China's traditional court departments and Western constitutional system to protect the people's rights.

In this chapter, I argue that the fundamental principle of democracy to protect citizens' rights and freedom was threatened when Sun imposed the three-phase national reconstruction plan, which included periods of military operation and political tutelage, and this was closely related to Sun's paternalistic elitism. This is significant because the political modernisation of China was delayed as individual rights and citizens' freedom were infringed upon by overwhelming government power, and the citizens' equality was disrupted by elitism, destabilising the fundamental tenets of constitutionalism as well as Sun's own *minquan* principle.

Beneath the conflict between citizens' freedom and Sun's pedagogical politics, the equality of citizen was in direct conflict with elitism. Paternalistic elitism was present in the form of political hierarchy between the tutoring officials and the masses. During the process of establishing a Chinese modern nation-state, even though Sun and the reformist Liang Qichao agreed on the necessity of constitutionalism, their main differences were in the form of government and the

bearer of rights. Sun argued for republicanism and collective citizens' rights, while Liang argued for constitutional monarchy and balanced individual and collective citizens' rights. Sun emphasised participatory citizenship, proposing the inclusion of women in the military service and voting rights. In effect, Sun's argument for constitutionalism and participatory citizenship symbolised China's political transformation from a premodern community (*Volksnation*) to a modern nation-state (*Bürger nation*).

3.1 Loyal Duties and Citizens' Rights

The Chinese traditional notion of loyalty included various interpretations such as hierarchical duties between monarchs and subjects, rulers and ministers and even fathers and sons. Dennerline (1981:14) points out that two major Chinese words used to convey loyalty were *zhong* (忠) and *xiao* (孝), loyalty to ruler and to father respectively, both of which carried an equation of absolute authority on the part of the ruler and the total submission of the subject. On a state level, imperial loyalty was literally 'loyal obligation' (*zhongyi*) or 'great obligation' (*dayi*). Confucius commented on the reciprocating relations of loyalty, writing, "The ruler should employ his subject according to the rules of propriety (*li*); the subject should serve his ruler with loyalty (*zhong*)."¹ Thus loyalty was mainly associated with performing a duty on the part of the subject. On the other hand, Sun regarded loyalty as a moral standard rather than the obligation to perform: "As for China's old moral standards, they are not yet lost sight of by the people of China. First come Loyalty and Filial Devotion, then Kindness and Love, then Faithfulness and Justice, Harmony and Peace."²

Santangelo (2012:299) refers to the original meaning of loyalty in the word *zhonghou* (忠厚), which is one of many expressions that can be rendered as 'honest and upright', while Standen (2007:32–3) emphasizes that changing political allegiance implied automatic moral failing and disloyalty. Thus the structure of hierarchical loyalty was established through propriety, which was to be the ruler's quality in response to the absolute loyalty of the subject. On a family level, loyalty stressed the importance of performing familial duties based on parental virtue and filial piety. The juxtaposition of the emperor and father represented absolute authority in public and private spaces respectively.

Regarding the obligation associated with loyalty, Wang (2003:20) stresses that the word for duty was translated as *yiwu* (義務), combining the character *yi*, meaning righteous, with *wu*, meaning essential action or task. He also points out that the conventional connotation of *yi* (duty) probably explains why, in modern times, less attention has been paid to the concept of duty in comparison with the concept of right; the latter has been often used to “encourage a new public-spiritedness or civic consciousness” with the rise of modern citizenship and, subsequently, the modern nation-state. As such, performing one’s duty was an essential part of loyalty before it became associated with the acknowledgment of citizens’ rights in modern times. Instead of hierarchical loyalty, which represented submission of the subject by duty, Sun argued that it was necessary to empower the people with equal rights: “*Minquan* is the second watchword of our Revolutionary Party, and corresponds with the watchword ‘Equality’ of the French Revolution...The term of equality is generally used interchangeably with the term Liberty. The truth is that men are born equal; the inequality caused by oppressive rulers is an artificial inequality.”³

However, the absence of written stipulations with regard to protecting legally the rights of the people allowed the Qing monarchy to govern the people with absolute power (*qiangquan*). Sun stressed that absolute power was an exclusionary right of the monarchy, while democracy (*minquan*) was the inclusive right of citizenry. Judge (1996:63) emphasises that some journalists in the late Qing period did not use the word *minquan* (the people’s power in direct translation) in its original radical sense as equivalent to *minzhu* (democracy); instead, they redefined it as the power or authority of the people (*renmin de quanli*), distinct from *minzhu* or popular sovereignty (*renmin zuozhu*). Wang (2003:28) qualifies that the word *quanli* connotes a particular attitude towards the idea of rights, even though Chinese legalists used the idea of *quan* as the standards

fixed by the ruler alone. Consequently, the concept of rights tended to belong to the rulers and governors, while performing duties was relegated mainly to the subject. Sun reconfirmed the principle of democracy in light of people's rights: "The foundation of the government of a nation must be built upon the rights of the people."⁴ Sun's comment also reflected his will to bring about political modernisation of China by balancing the duty and right of the people.

However, performing duty was a complex process of maintaining hierarchical loyalty. De Bary (1991:68) outlines the moral quality of reciprocity in performing duties: "Filiality, brotherliness and commiseration are common principles of what is right and proper; to be loyal is to perform duties well." Confucius also commented on the role of ruling figures in office and at home: "When the ruler is ruler and the subject is subject, when the father is father and the son is son, there is government."⁵ Consequently, the means of reciprocating loyalty often resulted in inequality on the rights of the governor and the duties of the people. Wang (2003:22-3) adds that, even though the subject had the right to expect his or her ruler to perform the duty of being benevolent, enlightened, righteous and observing the proper rites, the notion of reciprocity still revealed an unequal obligation. Additionally, similar qualities of reciprocity in hierarchical relationships were observed in the mechanism of patronage. Porter (in Wakeman, Esherick, et al. 2006) points out that the culture of patronage was an intrinsic part of the Confucian social order of hierarchical relationships, which was performed with particular moral obligations associated with relative positions in society.⁶

Even though Sun rebuked the premodern practice of hierarchical loyalty to the monarchy, he still argued for the necessity of selectively maintaining the positive elements of loyalty to the nation and to the people: "The ancient teaching of loyalty pushed to its limit meant death. To say that ancient loyalty was due to kings and, since now we have no kings, we do not need loyalty and

as can do as we please, is absolutely wrong.”⁷ Sun believed that while loyalty to the monarchs supported class hierarchy, it could also produce solidarity among the people if properly transferred to the nation. Furthermore, Sun discovered that class hierarchy originated not only from the monarchical structure, but also from culturally rooted occupational taxonomy. The traditional order of *shi*, *nong*, *gong* and *shang* (warrior, peasant, artisan and merchant) was understood in descending order of social respect, and class hierarchy was inculcated as natural and essential to social order under the influence of Confucianism.

In his defiance of class hierarchy, Sun demonstrated his intention to challenge the traditional occupational taxonomy as well. Sun recognised both monarchy and occupational taxonomy as pillars supporting class hierarchy, and he argued passionately for the equal rights and freedom of citizens, which were the essential elements of a republic: “We must not look upon these experts as stately and grand presidents and ministers, but simply as our chauffeurs, as guards at the gate, as cooks, physicians, carpenters, or tailors...Professionals should not be considered as honourable and respectable as a president of a nation; they should be treated equally with a car driver, a policeman, a cook who prepares meals in the kitchen, a medical doctor, a carpenter or a tailor; it does not make any difference that one is a (simple and manual) worker, as all occupations are equal.”⁸ Sun argued for the equality of all human beings regardless of their occupation and for their valuable contributions to the nation, demonstrating the influence of Western rationality and pragmatism. Moreover, the equality of every member of society regardless of his or her occupation inspired Sun to see the necessity of a legal system that would protect the equal rights of the people.

Sun identified despotic monarchy as the main enemy of a republic and he argued for the need to raise the Chinese people’s political awareness, stressing the importance of resistance and struggle against the absolute power of monarchism. Sun criticised inactive political participation,

arguing that the monarchy's absolute power had to be challenged to gain power for the people: "The Chinese have two proverbs; one is 'He who is not in power does not trouble about government'; the other is 'the common people do not deliberate'. This indicates in the past all power was in the hands of the Emperor. Today our advocacy of democratic rule means that the authority is in the hands of the people."⁹ Sun's argument demonstrates his emphasis on citizens' rights through political participation, implying the need for the Chinese constitution to counter the absolute power of the Qing monarchy and maintain the balance between the rights and duties of the people.

3.2 Constitutionalism

Wang (2000) points out that the constitutional movement was a shared product of the Qing court and exiled intellectuals during the reform era. By the early 20th century, foreign political ideologies had risen to prominence, and the Qing court eventually acknowledged the need to study the feasibility of implementing its own constitution.¹⁰ Zarrow (in Fogel and Zarrow 1997:22) maintains that the constitutionalists (*lixianpai*) favoured retaining the Qing monarchy in order to avoid revolutionary chaos, but wanted the dynasty to become a genuinely constitutional monarchy. On the other hand, Sun and the revolutionaries (*gemingpai*) favoured the expulsion of the Manchus to establish a republic. A proposal of the first Chinese constitution was approved by the royal commission of the Qing dynasty and endorsed by the Empress Dowager Cixi on September 1, 1906. However, the Qing court announced it would promulgate it in 1917, more than a decade later. Sun as well as other reformers were equally frustrated with the delay, which showed the reluctance of the Qing monarchy to put the constitution into effect. Shortly after the 1911

revolution, a very brief constitution titled ‘General Plan for the Organisation of the Provisional Government’ was promulgated on December 3, 1911 with 21 articles.

Sun and the reformist Liang Qichao, both exiles, first met in the early spring of 1899 in Japan. Sun had been in Japan since his failed first uprising in 1895, while Liang, who arrived in Japan after the failure of the *One Hundred Days’ Reform* in 1898, was in contact with Japanese modernisers and widely read translations of Western philosophy and political thought. Especially after Kang Youwei had been forced to leave Japan, Liang maintained close contact with Sun. Liang fervently embraced nationalism and also advocated such concepts as liberty and equality as the essential rights of the people. Sun and Liang were said to have joined in publishing two issues of a journal entitled Secret History of China (中国密史), and had begun to develop plans for a merger of the revolutionary party and the reformist party, in which Liang was to be second-in-command to Sun. However, the plan was not carried out, as Kang ordered Liang to leave for Hawaii to strengthen the foothold of the *Baohuanghui* (Protect the Emperor Party) toward the end of 1899.¹¹

Judge (1996:151) points out that Qing government officials not only resisted implementing true constitutional reform that would expand popular power, but also attempted to obstruct the dissemination of the new teachings, which threatened Confucian intellectual hegemony. As discussed earlier, the Qing court censored the press and prohibited public gatherings in order to obstruct public communication, while Sun defied its censorship by urging scholars to include the undereducated and illiterate in their pedagogy so that they could understand and perform the political rights of citizens. Sun stressed the balance of power between sovereignty and the people, but the absence of constitution meant the right of the people was not protected: “When people and sovereignty are linked together, we have the political power of the people. Government is a thing of the people and by the people; it is control of the affairs of all the people. The power of control

is political sovereignty and where the people control the government we speak of the people's sovereignty."¹² Tsao (1947:50-3) argues that constitutional rights of the citizen correlate with the duties incumbent upon the state, and, if it is constitutionally provided, the citizen shall enjoy freedom, while the state is bound by law to abstain from encroaching upon such freedom. Thus, in those democratic countries where a written constitution is adopted, the term fundamental rights of citizen generally refers to those rights enjoyed by the citizen as envisaged by the constitutional law.

While there are similarities as well as differences between Sun and Liang with regard to their thoughts on constitutionalism for a modern Chinese nation-state, the most distinctive difference between them was regarding the time frame and political structure. In terms of the time frame, Sun felt that China was in urgent need of an immediate revolution to establish a Chinese republic, while Liang insisted that China had to first accept the prerequisite of equality and liberty of the citizens as part of a gradual process of reform. The primacy of establishing the structure of a republic mattered the most for Sun, while, for Liang, the fundamental principle of a modern nation-state had to be attained first before the Chinese modern nation-state could be established. Thus their difference represented the juxtaposition of pragmatic approaches and principles, yet both also shared part of each other's political particularities.

Most significantly, Liang believed China was not ready for a truly democratic and representative government, making constitutional monarchy a more feasible goal. Liang even showed his doubts about implementing democratic practices in China by saying, "Freedom, constitutionalism, republicanism, these would be like wearing summer garb in winter, or furs in summer; beautiful to be sure but unsuitable."¹³ While Liang's gradualism represented his political

prudence, Sun's political urgency to establish a republic reflected his concern about foreign encroachment and the necessity of national unity facing the possible partition of China.

On the other hand, Liang was fascinated by Western constitutionalism as an effective antidote to traditional despotism, believing that a constitutional government could ensure political participation most people. Accordingly, Liang's ultimate concern was the formation of a cohesive and strong nation-state as he expounded his ideas on constitutionalism in his journals such *The Public Opinion (Chingpao)* in 1898-1902 and in *The New People's Miscellany (xinmin zhongpao)* in 1902-07.¹⁴ On the other hand, Sun opposed the constitutional monarchy, pointing out that it embodied a remnant of class hierarchy and despotism and failed to reflect the Chinese political particularity of the time: "Thus constitutional monarchy may be temporarily viable in other nations, where the animosity between the people and their rulers is not so intense, but it is out of the question in China."¹⁵

In addition to their approaches to constitutionalism, Sun and Liang also differed conceptually in their stances on nationalism. In Liang's mind, nationalism was inseparable from democratisation, so freedom of participation and national independence were essentially two equivalent elements.¹⁶ However, for Sun, nationalism was crucial for the unity of the people and the autonomy of China against foreign encroachment and its threat of partition of Chinese territory; the political rights of the people would be granted through the constitution only after these two propositions were achieved. For Liang, however, a constitutionalist government was pre-eminently a limited government with two essential ingredients from the outset: the promulgation of a written constitution and the primacy of the legislative organ. Furthermore, by citizenry, Liang meant a group of people who were not only a political body, but also had an organic and corporate capacity to express their own will and perform their own rights.

Sun regarded the establishment of a republic as not a mere matter of the form of government, but rather the core element of his *minquan* principle, which was intended to empower Chinese citizens by expelling the absolute power of the Qing monarchy and bring about the people's freedom and equal rights in a modern nation-state. On the other hand, to Liang, constitutional monarchy was a matter of pragmatic political structure with an optimal solution. Ogden (2002:64) suggests that Liang harboured serious doubts about implementing democratic practices in China, maintaining his stance that, even though Sun's thought of freedom, constitutionalism and republicanism were ideal, it was unsuitable for China. Liang argued that the Chinese people had to accept authoritarian rule for the time being, since they could not enjoy freedom. Compared with Liang's pragmatic assessment, Sun's opposition to constitutional monarchy reflected his personal distrust of the Qing monarchy.

In terms of empowering the citizens, the right to vote represented the participatory citizenship of a modern nation-state. However, Liang opposed universal suffrage, arguing that the right to vote should be limited to the small percentage of the adult population who were literate. Liang's stance was based on political elitism and pragmatism in contrast to Sun's insistence in principle on equality in terms of citizens' rights. It also demonstrated Sun's intention to selectively adopt Western political advancements such as universal suffrage; Sun also intended to include women in the right to vote: "What are the newest usages in the world for the exercise of democratic rule? First there is the right of suffrage. Apart from the right to elect, the second newest thing is to recall the vote. When people have this right, then they have the power to recall. These two rights give control over the officials."¹⁷ Sun's pursuit of equal and inclusive political citizenship represented the fundamentals of constitutionalism, compared with Liang's pragmatic but exclusionary elitism.

Sun was inspired by the models of constitutions in America and France. However, Sun insisted that China should not entirely abandon its own political traditions, proudly discussing to adopt the Chinese traditional court systems, in particular, the unique merits of ancient Chinese civil service examination and censorial departments. Instead of an outright imitation of the Western constitutional system, he insisted on amalgamating both Chinese and Western features in his proposal of a reconciled Chinese constitution. By adopting the structure of the separate executive, legislative and judicial powers, Sun argued that both the Chinese traditional court departments and the Western constitutional system should be combined to create a five-power Chinese constitutional system: “The principle of the People’s Rights (*minquan*) has democracy as its primary element and as its second element the idea that a dictatorship cannot work and a constitution is necessary for a good government... Therefore I proposed that the legislative, judicial, and executive powers be complemented by branches charged with the powers of examination and censorship, all combining into a five power constitution.”¹⁸

Sun accordingly proposed the Fivefold Constitution, in which the traditional Chinese departments of civil service examination and censorial departments were combined with the three Western constitutional departments. Sun explained that the amalgamated structure of the newly proposed Chinese constitution was intended to maintain the balance of power between the people and the state: “With regard to the government, there must be five phases of authority. ... with this kind of government system, the power of the people and that of the government is equally balanced.”¹⁹

The Fivefold Constitution or, as Sun fondly referred to it, the Five Brothers Constitution, was a conflation of the Chinese and Western systems, demonstrating Sun’s view of the foundations of the Chinese constitution. Sun’s vision of the Chinese modern nation-state was of a republic in

which citizens were legally protected and empowered by the constitution to perform their citizenship. Habermas (1996a, 1996b, 1997) claims that the difference between the premodern community of *Volksnation* and the modern state of *Bürger nation* lies in the latter's acts of voluntary participation of citizens for a common political cause. Furthermore, the modern nation-state follows the logic of inclusion that every citizen can join as long as they accept certain standards of tolerance and recognize the rights of others. For Sun, the common political cause was to attain the autonomy of China by establishing the first Chinese republic. Sun's conceptualisation of the Chinese constitution was to protect the rights of Chinese citizens in countering the absolute power of the monarchy. Sun empowered them with participatory citizenship, which was eventually extended to the overseas Chinese as well as to ethnic minority groups. Citizenship had to be protected by constitutionalism.

Individual and Collective Rights

Marshall and Bottomore (1992:20) explain that citizenship in its early forms was based on the principle of equality and that citizenship grew by enriching the body of rights. The core of citizenship at this stage was composed of civic rights, and citizenship represented the notion of participation in public life as it involved not only autonomy, but also judgment, loyalty, entitlements and obligations. Thus citizenship implied the concepts of both citizens' rights and duties. In particular, Marshall and Bottomore (ibid.) emphasise that the civil element is composed of the rights necessary for the individual freedom of the person, freedom of speech, thought and faith, the right to own property and to conclude valid contracts and the right to justice. Individual rights are thus stressed in comparison to collective rights; and in relation to collective power and

citizenship, civil rights gave each citizen the power to engage as an independent unit in the economic struggle as part of his or her individual status.

For Sun, civil rights were understood in the context of citizens' collective rights rather than those of the individual. Accordingly, See Sin Heng (in Lee and Lee, et al. 2011:36-37) points out that even though Sun consistently pushed for a republican mode of political order, Sun's analysis of democracy was about "people's rights", and the liberal conception of politics was about the equality of *all* citizens. Sun (1994:125) explained, "Right is a concept possessed by all men, and since I cannot exclude myself from mankind, how can I alone forget rights? So rather than praise me for sacrificing my rights, it would be close to the truth to praise me as one who has thought deeply and broadly about the concept of rights and in whom the concept of rights is of the deepest, greatest concern...I am confident that I can still see in the two words *quanli* [rights] the highest measure of common good and the highest degree of greatness." Sun's concept of democracy and people's rights (*quanli*) was therefore understood in terms of the rights of the people (*minquan*) rather than individual rights; furthermore, in Sun's opinion, the rights of the people also corresponded directly to the rights of the state.

Liang Qichao, in his 1902 document "*Lun quanli sixiang*", insisted on the interaction between individuals and the collective, arguing that the consciousness of rights was also concerned with the duties that an individual ought to exercise for a general group. He further argued that rights are continuously disturbed and harmed from without (external threat) and that one must continuously exert one's inner strength in resistance, emphasising the balance between the internal and external strengths of the self.²⁰ The contrast between Sun and Liang with regard to the concept of citizens' rights seemed to be due to the modern influence on the relationship between an

individual and society regarding whether the former was a component of the latter, or if each coexists interdependently in a modern nation-state.

Jenco, (2010) points to Chinese intellectuals, such as Zhang Shizhao, who emphasised on the rights of individual citizens: Zhang argued that self-awareness, the use of one's own talent and the accommodation of differences could be undertaken by all individual citizens to craft not only their own citizenship, but the polity itself.²¹ Moreover, Weatherley (2014:13-5) argues that since human rights refer to the rights of human beings and only individual persons are human beings, human rights can only be the rights of individuals; if we accept the idea that human rights are grounded in our human dignity and moral worth, then this too is consistent with the belief that human rights are possessed exclusively by individuals.

From the Confucian perspective, however, Fitzgerald (1996:7-8) emphasizes that in one of Sun's frequently used maxims, "*tianxia weigong*", and the term *weigong* had not yet lost this sense of collective ownership for most people. In the Republic, the word "for all" (*weigong*) was frequently used to denote organisations or functions poised, as it were, between the individual and the state. However, Fitzgerald (ibid.) claims that communal ownership was not quite what Sun had in mind when he used the term: Sun was making a competing claim on the term by conflating the concepts of government and public in the idea of a world in which the people would rule, or a democratic state. On the other hand, Sun was conflating the relationship between individuals and communities with that between citizens and the national state.

In fact, Sun's understanding of political rights signified the collective power of the state. Wang (2003) emphasises that Sun even described family and clan as rivals to a collective Chinese identity as Sun urged that China desperately needed national unity and collective freedom. Sun's idea of the *minquan* principle was therefore ultimately based on the collective rights of the people

in society and of the nation. Sun explained: “When men gather, they constitute a group; that group’s prosperity or decline often depends on the progress or deterioration of the men who compose it. Although larger than a tribe, the group that constitutes a nation is nonetheless a group.”²² In contrast to Liang’s concept of balanced rights between individuals and the collective, Sun’s concept of citizens’ rights was of the collective rights of the people and the state rather than individual citizens.

Sun insisted that the Chinese people historically enjoyed, to an extent, an excessive level of individual liberty, which resulted in the absence of national unity: “On no account must we give more liberty to the individuals; let us secure liberty instead for the nation. The individual should not have too much liberty, but the nation should have complete liberty. When the nation can act freely, then China may be called strong. To make the nation free, we must each sacrifice his personal freedom.”²³ Gregor (2000:60) asserts that Sun clearly rejected any contract theory of the state that sought to interpret a nation as a voluntary association of individuals, as Sun argued that such a concept of rights would weaken the integrity of a nation, undermine its viability and leave the Chinese exposed to every threat. He pedagogically insisted that just as each grain of sand must lose its freedom if the sand were to be solidified in cement, the Chinese individual must also give up his or her freedom if Chinese society was to become strongly organised. In his judgment, China required organisation, discipline, loyalty, and disposition among its citizens to sacrifice unto death for the national community. In Sun’s view, the individual right of freedom impeded social stability and national unity.

Wang (2003:33-4) also holds that Sun emphasised people’s rights (*minquan*) were not about personal or civil liberties; instead, Sun argued that China desperately needed unity and national liberalisation. However, Sun insisted that citizens’ rights were not merely those of the

state, but included those of scholars and the literati and other social groups as well as those of merchant guilds, local organisations and extended families. Sun's interpretation of collective rights therefore also implied the equality of all citizens regardless of social status and occupation. *Minquan* thus represented the collective power due to the people, their share in determining the destiny of China and their role in saving China. Sun conceived of collective rights and duties as strictly for the purpose of national unity, and the aim of Sun's emancipatory communication was to counter the social, economic and political oppressions by the absolute power of the monarchy. In Sun's pursuit of collective power, however, individual rights had to be sacrificed.

With the *minquan* principle, Sun's political intention was to achieve China's transformation from a monarchy into a modern nation-state. Sun contemplated how best to balance the power between the authority and the people, concluding that the collective power of the people was essential to the constructing of a republic. Sun claimed that the *minquan* principle was about protecting the collective power of the people, and the balance of power between the people and the government had to be achieved through the constitution. However, in a modern nation-state, citizenship represents the balance between a powerful state and less powerful citizens, while constitutionalism exists in the cohesive relation between collective and individual rights. In Sun's concept of collective and individual rights, however, the latter had to be sacrificed for the former for the sake of national unity; in the same vein, Sun's understanding of constitutionalism was solely to protect the collective rights of the people.

At this point, it is important to examine constitutionalism in relation to individual rights and duties in the modern nation-state. Miller and Rose (2008:48) maintain that it was political rationality, which began in the first half of the 20th century that constituted the citizen as a social being whose powers and obligations were articulated in the language of social responsibilities and

collective solidarities. Consequently, the individual was to be integrated into society in the form of a citizen with social needs, but in a contract in which individual and society had mutual claims and obligations. As such, the concept of social contract between the individual and the state was what protected individual rights in a modern constitutional nation-state. However, in Sun's view, the constitution existed exclusively to protect the collective rights of citizens from the absolute power of the monarchy.

Weatherley (2014:13-4) posits that early ideas about human rights, more specifically natural rights, are derived from the Hellenistic and Roman Stoic conception of natural law, which guided the implementation of state law and restrained the exercise of state power. Later thinkers like John Locke suggested that natural law not only imposed specific duties on people to treat others respectfully, but also invested them with the rights necessary to fulfil these duties. Weatherley (ibid.) argues that one of the most basic liberal assumptions about human rights is that they are the rights of human individuals, and the idea has been popular since early European and American declarations of rights enshrined the rights of man and the rights of the citizen.

Sun's understanding of political equality and freedom in the form of civil rights was interpreted originally from the concept of a balance of power between the people and the state, not between an individual and the state. The *minquan* principle thus symbolised not only the manifestation of Chinese civil rights but also the recognition of citizens as an important constituent of collective power. Sun explained the essence of the *minquan* principle by saying that "equality and our principle of democracy are also the same, because the principle of *minquan* maintains that the people, as far as government is concerned, ought all to have equal status, and that monarchical rule must be broken in order to bring that about. Therefore we say that *minquan* rule corresponds with equality."²⁴

Sun's pursuit of citizens' equality and freedom was also for the entire Chinese people rather than each individual citizen. Sun's approach might be deeply related to the Confucian influence of collective well-being through *datong* ideology. However, Angle and Svensson (2001:xxiv) point out that during the early 20th century, the harmony of interests between individual and collective was regarded as both attainable and desirable, although some, like Sun, believed that the Chinese people had too much freedom and that national salvation required the sacrifice of their individual freedom.

Liang, on the other hand, insisted that the citizenry was a collection of individuals and that sovereignty was based on the rights of individuals. Liang further argued for the correlation between individuals and a nation by claiming that "if one wants to seek the consciousness, feelings, and actions of individuals, one will never find that for which one looks and where its people have rights, one finds a nation with rights; where its people have no shame, one finds a shameless nation."²⁵ Alternatively, Zhang Shizhao's approach to politics, for example, does not depend on the belief that social action must always imply collective action, which may be one reason why he rarely invokes such terms as "commoners" or "masses" as political actors; for Zhang, *min* (the people) possess ruling authority, but political actors are almost always referred to as "persons" (*ren*), implying that anybody can participate successfully in changing shared environments.²⁶

On the other hand, collective power had its usefulness in consolidating citizens' power. Marshall and Bottomore (1992:40) regard the outcome of collective power as one of the main 19th century achievements of political solidarity since the growth of trade unionism enabled the workers to use their civil rights collectively. Thus collective power was also applied in protecting the rights of labourers. Sun extended his support of collective power to labour unions in opposition to the class conflict resulting from capitalism: "The largest organized bodies in the world today are the

labour unions which have grown up after the revolutions when liberty was won. Workers were dissatisfied with labour conditions, and proclaimed the inequality of capital and labour, the need for organisation, and the duty of resistance against nobles and capitalists...Only the negative weapon of non-cooperation through strikes, but it has been more deadly than any military weapon. If the workers make requests to the state or to the capitalists which are not granted, they can unite and strike as one man.”²⁷

Brødsgaard and Strand (1998:17-8) point out that the history of civil society in the West was propelled by a discourse of rights, especially individual rights, and the formation of a social realm outside the state; however, in China, the relevant discourse is one of relatedness and obligations, implying the importance of relations within collective. In the *minquan* principle, Sun elaborated the autonomy derived from collective rights of the people with the reflection of Confucianism with any mention of individual rights being largely missing: “When Confucius said the exercise of the great principles of the great empire for all, it was to advocate a united world under the rule of the people.”²⁸ Sun’s understanding of citizenship reflected the traditional Chinese concept of collective action for the ultimate purpose of achieving equality and freedom for the people and for the nation.

Sun strove to amalgamate the Confucian ideal of collective rights and the Western constitutional system; however, his insistence on collective rights was in conflict with the constitutional principle protecting individual rights. Sun was thus faced with the task of reconciling the conflicts between individual and collective rights concerning constitutionalism. While the balance between citizens’ rights and duties was the principle of citizenship, the coexistence of individual and collective rights was the principle of constitutionalism. Previously, Sun’s reconciliatory methodology had resorted to assimilating a weaker element to the stronger

constituent, e.g., the ethnic minority to the majority or family and clan to the nation, for political efficacy and efficiency. For Sun, citizens' equality and freedom were contingent upon the existence of the nation and democracy was for the people, not for the individual. However, individual and collective rights were not mutually exclusive but interdependent in constitutionalism, and Sun had to recognise the need for their coexistence.

3.3 Modern Nation-State and Women's Citizenship

Habermas (1996a, 1996b) distinguishes the *Volksnation* from the *Bürger nation* by pointing out that the former stands for the pre-modern nation as a folk-community (i.e., racially defined consanguine community) and the latter for a modern nation as political community (i.e., a republic established by politically aware citizens). Habermas (1997) also examines the relationship between loyalty and cultural identity by insisting that, while it is true that a political unit requires a collective identity, if it wants to settle its conflicts without violence, it [has to] accept majority rule and practise solidarity.²⁹ Furthermore, Schwarzmantel (2003:100) posits that the *Bürger nation*, or a nation of the legally empowered by citizenship, is certainly more open and less restrictive than a *Volksnation*: it follows a much more voluntary and inclusive logic. All can join the *Bürger nation*, at least in principle, as long as they accept certain standards of tolerance and recognition of the rights of others as the condition of holding rights for oneself or one's own group, which is the appeal of a civic nation.

On the other hand, Liang distinguished between the modern nation and the traditional state by arguing that nations were not collections of individuals, families or tribes but were rather

composed of a people (*minzu*), which, in modern times, had to become a citizenry (Fogel and Zarrow 1997:18). Therefore, citizenship was a central element in making a modern nation-state, which both Sun and Liang seemed to have agreed upon. Zarrow (ibid.:3-5) argue that citizenship was a necessary element of citizens' active rights that shifted premodern rulership to a modern nation-state; he also stresses that citizenship has proved to be a key concept in the rise of republicanism as subjecthood has evolved from the rulership, acknowledging citizenship as the source of active agency of citizens.

Sun's advocacy of the rights of voting and recall in his Fivefold Constitution clearly demonstrated his support for participatory citizenship. Sun interpreted that to vote was to perform participatory citizenship for the nation, and the right to recall protects citizens' ability to exercise their collective power against any despotic authority with absolute power. Sun discussed his future plan of full constitutionalism for China: "All this is the consequence of the citizens of this Republic enjoying equal and direct electoral rights. Regarding this country from the aspect of international policy, we see that it was the first to establish equal and direct electoral rights for all the population."³⁰ Therefore, both Sun and Liang stressed the importance of the citizenry in establishing a modern nation-state, and Sun in particular emphasised the equal rights of citizens.

Zarrow (ibid.) posits that citizenship developed in modern China by meeting certain needs to define membership in the national community to establish rights and duties or to give a certain protected status for these members as well as encouraging some kind of participation in state and society, illustrating the close connection between the ideas of citizenship and democracy. Sun emphasized the sequential order of implementing constitutionalism; first, national unity had to be attained, and only then could democratisation be implemented by granting citizenship. Thus, while each element of democracy was important, a degree of importance in terms of implementation was

based on the particularity of Chinese political situation. Taking a public oath, Sun announced the aim of the Chinese constitution on January 12, 1919, stating, “I will destroy the old and build the new, and fight for the self-determination of the people, and will apply all my strength to the support of the Chinese Republic, the realisation of democracy through ‘the three principles’, and to carry into effect ‘the Fivefold Constitution’ for the progress of good government, the happiness and perpetual peace of the people, and for the strengthening of the foundations of the State, in the name of peace throughout the world.”³¹

Sun strove to establish a republic because he believed that the monarchy was founded upon class hierarchy and demanded the people’s submission to its absolute power; on the other hand, a republic represented the establishment of a modern nation-state by the power of the people. As discussed earlier, Sun initially considered two models of republican government: the American and the French models, both created after revolutions and by their citizens. Schwarzmantel (2003:74–6) highlights the essential differences between the American and the French republican models: the American founding fathers accepted conflict and division as American republicanism rejected classical ideas of civic virtue; whereas the French model was more unitary with a fear of division, factions and excessive pluralism, and French republicans saw the nation and the republic as synonymous. The French republican model thus gave greater importance to the state since the centralized state was seen as the interpreter and guarantor of the common interest, autonomous from society.

Sun emphasised that America was the first country to carry out the principle of a separately established three-fold authority in the form of a written constitution. Sun stressed the importance of balance between state power and citizens’ rights in the *minquan* principle, showing his confidence in the new Chinese constitution: “We will use our Principle of the People’s Sovereignty

and remake China into a nation under complete popular rule, ahead of Europe and America. To realise this aim, we must first study democracy until we understand it with perfect clarity.”³² This demonstrated Sun’s reconciling style and willingness to study and adopt the positive elements of Western political structures in order to apply them to the Chinese context.

Sun argued for the political hybridity of the Chinese constitution because a direct imitation of Western model would ignore China’s particular political context. Sun insisted, “We had taken the materials of European and American history, not with the intention of copying these countries and of following in their steps, but we advocate our principle of democracy in order to re-create China and make it a nation where the people have entire control, a nation which will be superior to either Europe or America.”³³ Sun also preferred a reconciliatory system because he was aware of the negative by-products of Western political system, “Every emigrant after living some time in America enjoys the rights of citizenship. After emancipation of the blacks, the latter were also given rights of citizenship of America. But the American politicians took advantage of this and committed abominable misdeeds for a number of years, until a law was passed that illiterates were deprived of many civic rights.”³⁴

Unlike monarchy, each branch of a modern constitutional government maintains independence because constitutional branches have to be clearly defined so that there is no encroachment of one upon the other. Hence, the autonomy of each branch was the key to unity between the people and the government. After all, the balance of power between the people and the government depends upon the balance between autonomy and control within law. In a similar way, Sun’s *minzu* and the *minsheng* principles also emphasize Chinese cultural and economic autonomy while adopting positive elements from the West. Sun explained the reason for his selective adoption of Western political structure: “Democracy in its path of progress has met with

many obstacles. So we cannot take the foreign methods of exercising democratic rights as our standard; its guidance is not good enough... If we copy foreign government, thinking that it has advanced like physical science, we shall make a great mistake.”³⁵ Even though both French and American models of government influenced Sun in constructing the new Chinese nation-state, China’s autonomy and its cultural and political particularity were the main elements that he considered.

Women’s Citizenship

The main enemy of participatory citizenship, according to Rose (1999:254), is any form of exclusion. The political doctrine of universal citizenship did not in itself eliminate the demand that a boundary be drawn between those who could and those who could not be citizens. Membership was open to every individual, and the risk of supporting solely collective rights lay in excluding each individual from the group. Tan (2005:1) stresses that citizenship is key to understanding the political problems of group membership and individual identity; it is also characteristic of the modern era, given that citizenship used to be the privilege of the few and has been used to exclude the entire groups of people on the basis of gender, religion, class, property, ethnicity, place of origin and age.

Schoppa (2006:164-7) maintains that from 1917 to 1921, intellectual discussion and its emphasis on modernising China reached its apex with the rebellion of young men and women against the cultural traditions of patriarchy and social hierarchy. Kang Youwei also comments on the condition of women in his Book of the Great Unity (*Datongshu*) in which he claims that men repressed, restrained, deceived and bound women. In fact, Chinese reformers and revolutionaries

were eager to include women among their followers as they believed that the contribution of women was necessary in order to save China.³⁶

However, despite impassioned calls for the introduction of women's rights in China, they were conspicuously absent from the political reforms implemented by the Qing administration.³⁷ Sun, who collaborated with many women in the Revolutionary Alliance, proposed to encourage the inclusion of women in the public space and politics. Sun declared, "Given there are many talented women, who were members of the *Tongmenghui*....it is inevitable that women in the future will enjoy their political rights."³⁸ On the other hand, Liang urged that men's rights be surrendered before they were taken away, suggesting that men should share natural rights with women voluntarily. Moreover, Harrison (2000) emphasises the symbolism of women's moving from private space to public space when the practice of foot-binding became prohibited and many girls moved from their homes to streets, parks, schools and institutions; furthermore, after the 1911 revolution, women could enter government.

Sun even metaphorically compared the constrained China's economy to women's bound feet.³⁹ Sun recounted the harmful physical effects of foot-binding, saying that it limited women's activities by preventing them from participating in the public space, and forbade the practice throughout China, promising an "appropriate penalty" to those who defied it. Additionally, Sun encouraged women to receive modern education and job training. On March 28, 1912, the provisional government gave the right to vote to women who could pass a test of education. Sun critiqued exclusionary gender practices for their negative effects, challenging those who opposed the voting rights of women and pointing to the example of suffrage in the West: "General voting rights are limited to being a privilege of men. In the last seven to eight years, women in England, then in America, fought successfully for their voting rights."⁴⁰ Chang and Gordon (1991) point out

that, even though Sun was vague about the time frame of doing so, he urged that the discussion of women's political rights be brought to the parliament for a resolution in an executive order. On the other hand, Liang and other early reformers believed the vote should be limited to the small percentage of the adult population who were literate.⁴¹ This represented a difference between Sun and Liang in terms of women's equality: Sun wanted universal suffrage in an attempt to give political citizenship to women.

The Chinese tradition of ignoring women's rights and freedom in the public space hindered political awareness and citizenship for women. Sun's political support and inclusion of women in public space corresponded to his pursuit of freedom and equality of all human beings; it also symbolised his belief in universal inclusion, which catalysed solidarity among the people. Sun critically analysed unfair gender practices in China and compared them to the political advances of women in the West. Sun further explained how and why women successfully gained their voting rights in the West, saying, "During the European War, the majority of men went to the war front, leaving few men behind, and women made up for the poor availability of men. Since that time, men, who once opposed the extension of voting rights to women by saying that 'women are not able to do men's work', have become unable to maintain that excuse."⁴² Sun thus argued that it was only logical as well as pragmatic that women be given citizens' political rights for national unity. His proposal of including women represented the empowerment of women by opening up public space in which women could perform their participatory citizenship.

Previously, Sun regarded unity in language as a crucial vehicle for including both learned and illiterate people in the project of national unity because language allowed for an intersubjective understanding among the citizens. Sun was aware of the binary function of language in that it could either include or exclude the people in uniting or dividing the nation. Likewise, gender also had a

crucial role in producing national unity or division. China had been excluding women from political rights, which, Sun felt, impeded the modernisation of China. Therefore awarding women the rights of citizenship corresponded to a balance of women's rights and duties in accordance with constitutionalism.

Without public space to perform their political citizenship, women initially communicated the need for their rights in language. Specifically, women writers contributed to the rise of individual and gender emancipation. From 1917 to 1921, women writers contributed to the rise of individual and gender emancipation while working women were often placed at the bottom of the class hierarchy.⁴³ Women's own rejection of this social prejudice and exclusion is clearly manifested by Shi Cuntong, who wrote *Against Filial Piety* wherein she attacked the coerciveness of the Confucian traditional value of filial piety and argued against paternal dominance and arbitrariness. Schoppa (ibid.) presents the example of the female writer Ba Jin, who wrote a novel during the May Fourth Movement in which some parents were known to pressure their daughters to kill themselves in order to reap praise from the community.

The inclusion of women in the project of participatory citizenship signified Sun's intention to bring about the equality of women's political rights by emancipating them from the restrictive practices of traditional patriarchy. In addition to Sun's support for women's right to vote, he advocated their participation in military service and their right to receive education. His emancipatory lexes argued rationally for the inclusion of women and demanded their equal political rights, not simply because they were beneficial to the nation, but also they were regarded as necessary for women to live as autonomous persons and fulfil their humanity.⁴⁴

Sun's support for women's equality also included encouraging them to perform their voluntary citizenship and thereby carry out the balanced duties and rights of a citizen. Giving

women the right to receive education reflected his belief in equality of gender, allowing women to build political awareness through intellectual achievement. Sun emphasised the importance of women's education in his speech to the Guangdong Women Teachers' School in 1912, saying, "It is indeed imperative for our colleagues to establish this school at this moment, given that, although there are more than 200 million women in China, women's education has never been taken seriously, and consequently, women intellectuals are rather rare. Thus the most pressing matter at this moment in Chinese education is to advocate women's education."⁴⁵

The underlying reason for Sun's argument for the inclusion of women was also closely related to an emancipatory motive for all human beings. His emphasis on the universal education also reflected it because Sun regarded the importance of the people as the core element of the nation regardless of gender. The authors of the 1905 Citizens' Reader also reflected a similar idea to Sun's in their assertion that political knowledge should be commonly available to all citizens. They wrote, "The nation is collectively owned by the people. It is not true that only officials can take care of national matters and that these matters are of no relevance to the rest of the people. Furthermore, the argument that patriotism is based on all of the people sharing common knowledge in order to equate the people's interest to the national interest was also prevalent."⁴⁶ On the occasion of the political declaration of the Nationalist Party in April 1913, Sun further demonstrated his support for women's education in relation to women's voting rights, saying, "Women's education is to expand women's knowledge and to support women's rights."⁴⁷ Accordingly, Sun regarded education as an important component of citizens' rights, reaffirming his belief in gaining knowledge through science and logic as core elements in China's modernisation.

Sun's idea including women in the project of universal education also resonated within *Tongmenghui*, the secret society he founded in order to establish a Chinese republic. He believed that universal education represented equal citizenship and would prevent gender conflicts. This also reverberates in his *minsheng* principle, reflecting Sun's belief that a fair distribution of intellectual wealth would prevent class conflict. Sun's insistence on women's education also corresponded with his belief in women's autonomy through the acquisition of knowledge, encouraging women to believe in their autonomous selves: "Women should, at the beginning, establish their own organisations for women's education in order to endow women with knowledge and to strengthen their power; only then can they begin to compete with men, and they are bound to win; do you believe so? And I have one more suggestion to offer, that is, not to rely on men to undertake this project, in case it becomes exploited by men to benefit their own interests."⁴⁸ This speech, given in 1912, reveals that Sun was forward-thinking: not only did he criticise gender inequality in education, but he also endeavoured to ease gender conflict by supporting women's interests and position in society in order for them to attain political and economic autonomy.

Regarding the public opinion of Chinese women labouring during the early republican period, Schoppa (2006:160) stresses that working women were often placed at the bottom of the class hierarchy. He further notes that Chinese tradition included cruel practices against women, such as female infanticide and foot-binding; and that China's female suicide ratio was double that of Japan and ten times that of Sweden. Sun acknowledged that the geographical and social immobility of women also caused their political and economic exclusion because women were often confined to the private space of home. Indeed, spatial immobility kept not only women but also other oppressed classes such as the disabled, the elderly and minors from entering public space to perform their citizenship. Sun's praxis of emancipatory communication included all strata of

excluded citizens, encouraging them to be a part of the new China. However, he also made it clear that such inclusions were contingent upon women's performance of citizens' duties, highlighting his principle of maintaining a balance between citizens' rights and duties. He indicated that those who failed to meet citizens' obligations would forfeit their rights as well.

Sun (1994:240–1) promoted the well-being of pregnant women, the elderly (those over 50 or 60), the disabled and the sick, intending that they would receive local medical treatment, care and support. Furthermore, he also included minors; depending on their locality, he advocated that they should be protected by law and entitled to a local education. He also stressed children's education and its funding, reflecting his compassion for the underprivileged and vulnerable. He declared, "Promote the popularisation of education; develop child-oriented education, restructure the schooling system; increase educational investment; and secure its independence."⁴⁹

Women were often conditioned by rigid gender narratives, which encouraged female piety and implicitly supported male dominance. Furthermore, Confucianism discouraged women from performing economic and political citizenship in public space. Women therefore waged a struggle to participate in patriotic and public affairs, succeeding in joining Sun's revolutionary cause and organisations.⁵⁰ This demonstrates that women managed to contribute publicly in their own way to the establishment of the new Chinese republic. In the process, Sun encouraged women to perform citizenship in public spaces. For Sun, women represented oppressed and excluded citizens, and without their inclusion, a new all-inclusive China could not be achieved. However, his efforts to include women were also confronted by challenges from the Confucian tradition of patriarchy, of which main aim was to maintain social order by the powerful constituents of society. Sun needed to redress the unfair treatment of women, and the solution was to encourage women to perform

their citizenship by providing them with space and the rights of citizens, legally protected by constitutionalism.

From a post-modernist theoretical point of view, Sun's act of granting women their citizenship resonates what Butler (1990) refers to as performative gender, which is a *doing action*; it is not about following a given social or cultural attribute, but rather is about constructing gender by performance. Butler (ibid.) claims that the subject is 'performatively constituted' by autonomous acts, including acts that signify a particular gender. In the same vein, Sun helped women perform their citizenship and gender rights. This was also a process of subjectifying women against their inscribed traditional gender role, and against its 'ritualised production, a ritual reiterated under and through constraint, prohibition and taboo.'⁵¹

Sun's emancipatory communication strove to provide women with social and geographical mobility to perform their citizenship. It also endeavoured to emancipate women from the restrictive space of the traditional gender hierarchy and social practices by giving them political rights such as voting, education and undertaking military service. Sun's emancipatory efforts also challenged the fundamentals of Confucianism and Chinese traditional duties imposed on women. Sun's emancipatory lexes thus corresponded to the reconciliatory praxis through which both citizen's duty and gender right were balanced. Sun's emancipatory communication empowered women with participatory citizenship, representing China's political modernisation.

3.4 Political Tutelage and Individual Freedom

Twelve years after the establishment of the first Chinese republic, Sun concluded that China was not yet ready for a constitutional government. On April 12, 1924, Sun completed his draft of the *Programme of National Reconstruction*, wherein he gave special attention to the role of the government in educating the people. Sun's *minquan* principle was also altered to facilitate the competence of the people in their knowledge of politics; accordingly, Sun instructed the government to train and guide the people so that they would know how to exercise their rights of election, recall, initiative and referendum.⁵² For example, article eight of the *Programme of National Reconstruction* stipulated that, during the period of political tutelage, "the people must be able to fulfil their duties as citizens, and must pledge themselves to carry out the principles of the revolution."⁵³

Sun continued to encourage the Chinese people to be prepared to sacrifice their rights for the common good of the nation: "On no account must we give more liberty to the individuals; let us secure liberty instead for the nation. The individual should not have too much liberty, but the nation should have complete liberty. When the nation can act freely, then China may be called strong. To make the nation free, we must each sacrifice his personal freedom."⁵⁴ His comments clearly demonstrate that Sun considered individual freedom to be an enemy to national unity.

Sun instructed that, in the first phase of military operation, the entire country be subject to military rule and that, to hasten the unity of the country, the government employ military force to conquer all domestic opposition and propagate the principles of the party so that the people might be enlightened. Upon the completion of the military operation, the period of political tutelage in a province should begin, and military rule should cease as soon as order within the province is completely restored. During the period of political tutelage, Sun emphasized that "the government

should dispatch trained officers who have passed the examinations to the different districts to assist the people in making preparations for local self-government.”⁵⁵

Sun began to allow political parties to mobilise and exercise the authority of government organisations and justified such actions in his theories of politics and party rule. It represented the intervening power of the state over individual rights. This trend of limiting individual freedom continued even after Sun’s death in 1925 through the period of political tutelage, in which the KMT would educate the Chinese masses in the practicalities of democratic local self-government until they were able to fully understand and operate within such a system. Consequently, Sun’s efforts to enlighten the people politically produced the effect of denying the political rights of the people in the process of tutoring the masses.

In 1929, the year the period of political tutelage was to begin according to Sun’s instruction, Hu Shi, in his essay in *Xinyue*, argued that a genuine protection of human rights required a legal foundation that applied impartially to all, including members of the military and the government. Hu argued that Sun’s writings pointed to the need to promulgate the provisional constitution: “Sun initially completed it in 1906, and it was subsequently repeatedly revised, and wrote his Sun’s Theory in 1919, and in the sixth chapter, he repeatedly emphasized the importance of a transitional period and speaking very clearly, stated that by this time, we should have a Provisional Constitution in order to instruct the people how to implement regional autonomy.”⁵⁶ When the National government issued an order concerning the protection of human rights, Hu Shi (ibid.) argued that human rights were protected by law in every country in the world and that a foundation for the rule of law (*fazhi*) needed to be established.

Fitzgerald (1996:20) correctly notes that the purpose of pedagogical politics was not simply the awakening of the people, but also the establishment of a state structure that would portray itself

to its citizens as a political teacher. Pedagogy was thus a style of politics as much as it was a goal of political action in centralising authority over its operations, extending its authority over the community at large and promoting tighter discipline within the party and society. Fitzgerald (ibid.) indicates that Sun infringed upon the rights and freedom of the people through political tutelage, noting that awakening people involved teaching workers, peasants, merchants, women and students where their real interests lay. On the other hand, Fitzgerald (ibid.) points out, the political tutelage was carried out as forcefully as possible, and a variety of rationales was put forward to explain the representative relationship between leaders and followers in tutelage politics.⁵⁷

With regard to the pedagogical implication of hierarchical relationship between the teacher and the pupils, Weatherley (2014:15) calls attention to the fact that the universality of human rights was threatened by political tutelage. By advocating for the collective rights of citizens and the state, Sun let political tutelage override individual rights. Furthermore, Sun resolutely demonstrated his intention to teach the people by comparing the politically inchoate people and nation to a child: “China today needs the Republic just as a child needs school... enlightened despotism has as its end an absolute monarchy, whereas our period of preparation and training has as its end the creation of a republic.”⁵⁸ From the paternal perspective, Sun concluded that the emergent stage of China as a modern nation-state might take more time and that it had to be taught to achieve the status of autonomy in order to enjoy full constitutionalism.

Beneath the conflict between citizens’ freedom and pedagogical politics, there was another problematic aspect concerning Sun’s imposition of political tutelage: the equality of citizen was in direct conflict with elitism. Elitism was present in the form of political hierarchy between these tutoring officials and the masses. Jenco (2010:49) explains that even though the people came to occupy an unprecedented position of sovereignty and agency, the elites remained at the centre of

both. Even though the division between the elites and the masses was often articulated by both reformers and revolutionaries, Jenco (2010) points out that the elites remained blind to the contributions of non-elites because “the levers that elites once exclusively maneuvered can remain in their control even as they attempt to *democratise* literature by eliminating classical language.”⁵⁹

Political tutelage is antithetical to constitutionalism because the latter is based on the balance of power between the people and the state, and the constitutional principle of the equality of citizens precludes a hierarchical relation between elites and the masses. As Sun’s political tutelage was juxtaposed against the rights of individual citizens, Sun’s interpretation of constitutionalism represented the idea that the condition of individual freedom could be sacrificed for national unity by the state. Accordingly, the equality of citizen was also precluded by political tutelage based on the hierarchical relation between tutor and pupil or between elites and the masses, which was also a replica of Mencius’s well-known inculcation that produced social division between governors and the governed. Duara (1995:100) aptly describes the government stance on guiding the people as, “the radical nationalists declared that in the period of political tutelage, the masses had to be shown the path to rational progress”. However, the hierarchical relation between the people and the Qing government was exactly what originally motivated Sun to overthrow the Qing monarchy to establish the Chinese republic.

CHAPTER IV

The *Minsheng* Principle

INTRODUCTION

Sun's *minsheng* principle (livelihood of the people) was aimed to protect the economic rights of tenant farmers from unjust tax systems, the unequal distribution of capital and, most importantly, unequal land ownership. Sun believed that rise in the value of land was created by people's labour that the profit should be given back to those who generated it: the labourers. Accordingly, Sun proposed a land equalisation plan through which the government would buy back land from landlords at market price for redistribution.

In this chapter, I argue that Sun's *minsheng* principle represented Sun's moral obligation to include tenant farmers in the economic rights of livelihood rather than a concrete economic plan to solve the cause of their economic exclusion. This is significant because it revealed a gap in Sun's land equalisation plan between his emancipatory inclusion of the peasants and the reality of economic conflict involving the exclusionary system of land ownership. Sun's plan advocated his belief in economic harmony through communal cooperation and sharing, countering Marx's interpretation of material history wherein class conflict in economic struggle created human evolution. Consequently, Sun's land equalisation plan was challenged by both landlords and farmers as it lacked sufficient funds and a detailed plan.

Sun's *minsheng* principle also demonstrated his reconciliatory approach to Confucian *datong* communalism and Western communism in order to protect tenant farmers from economic exploitation. In his effort to reach socialism directly by bypassing the necessary phases of economic development, Sun rejected the negative effects of capitalism while trying to adopt its

positive elements of individual land ownership and economic incentives at the same time. However, both cooperation and struggle were a natural mechanism during a nation's economic modernisation.

4.1 Land and Tenant Farmers

China was traditionally an agrarian country, so land was a primary source of wealth. Social and economic activities accordingly evolved around the use of land and the distribution of goods. In the hierarchical composition of traditional Chinese society, the most respected were scholars, who were usually landlords; farmers were assigned the next level of social respect, followed by artisans and merchants. This reflected the importance of agriculture in society and the common belief that farmers would not abandon their country in times of danger.¹ Sun also commented on the importance of farmers, emphasising the necessity to protect them and their livelihood: “Since the production of food in China depends on the peasants, and since the peasants have to toil so bitterly, we must have the government make regulations by law for the protection of peasants if we want to increase the production of food.”²

However, even though agriculture was regarded with more respect than commerce, for example, farmers were constantly challenged by economic hardship. Sun’s principle of livelihood was conceived by witnessing the hardship of peasants, including his own father, with the intention of helping farmers achieve a desirable livelihood by equalising land ownership and regulating capital. However, Sun expressed frustration when his *minsheng* principle was not well understood in comparison with his earlier *minzu* and *minquan* principles: “After thirteen years of changes in our democratic government and after thirteen years of experience, our comrades have all come to understand clearly the principles of nationalism and democracy; however, regarding the principle of livelihood, they don’t comprehend.”³ Sun (1930:422) firmly declared that the underlying purpose of his land equalisation plan in the *minsheng* principle was to return the value of surplus labour to the labourers, not to the landowners: “This proves that rise in land values should be

credited to all the people and to their efforts; the landowner himself has nothing to do with the rise and the fall [in land values].”

According to Sun’s *minsheng* principle, landowners could set the value of land for sales autonomously. If the value was set excessively high, then the landowner would have to pay higher taxes in proportion to the land value; if the landlord set the value too low, then the government would buy the property at the price they had set. From this point on, all increases in land value would go to the community and help defray the costs of government. Sun’s proposal also revealed the influence of both traditional Chinese communalism and Soviet style communism as he advocated for state-regulated capital as a means of promoting industry. Sun explicated the structure of his plan: “Our Principle of Livelihood is a form of communism. It is not a form that originated with Marx but a form that was practiced when primitive man appeared upon the earth.”⁴

Sun’s 1894 letter to Li Hongzhang, then the viceroy of Zhili Province, reveals Sun’s early economic assessment on agriculture and peasants’ livelihood in China. Sun’s primary concern was developing new technologies and economic innovations to strengthen China and to augment peasants’ livelihood, arguing that the fullest exploitation of natural resources would bring about China’s national economic strength. On the other hand, Sun asserted that the key to a strong China lay not in importing and manufacturing armaments such as ships and guns, but rather in the development of the economy, including agriculture. Of particular importance to Sun was the need to increase agricultural productivity through the use of modern machinery and underdeveloped arable land. Sun appealed to Li, saying, “Man cannot eat soil, but soil can produce the five grains and the hundred fruits to feed man. Man cannot eat grass but grass can nurture the six animals, which provide meat for his table. When one says, ‘the land has unused benefits, and the people

have excess strength' it means that the soil for growing crops is not fully cultivated and that the forests and waters are not fully tapped. How can we achieve wealth in this fashion?"⁵

Sun also addressed the issue of farmers' livelihoods by explaining his concerns regarding the disproportionate structure of Chinese population in farming: "There are only about 50 million people to be found in China engaged in productive labour. And so it turns out that in China, out of eight people, only one is engaged in productive labour. It is not to be wondered at that our country is poor. The Chinese proverb has it: "One peasant tills the soil, six eat rice" or "the worker works alone but six people consume the fruits of his labour."⁶ Regarding the unfair landownership in the Qing Dynasty, Hsü (2000) explains that a high concentration of land was owned by the socially privileged class as "about 50-60 percent of arable land was in the hands of the gentry and another 10 percent was possessed by the Manchu bannermen and officials, leaving only 30 percent of the available arable land to the rest of the four hundred million Chinese people. Consequently, 60 to 90 percent of Chinese farmers had no land at all, and the life of landless peasants was extremely onerous despite their hard work. What made the peasant's life even harder was the fall in grain price, which was estimated to have dropped by about one-half between the years 1815 and 1850."⁷

This economic disarray and its impact on the peasants continued; for example, between the early 1820s and the early 1840s, the price of rice fell 50 percent, and cotton prices also declined significantly, in part due to a decrease in demand with the influx of less expensive foreign products after the Opium War. The Qing government accordingly imposed surcharges and raised conversion rates as the effective rate of taxation steadily climbed.⁸ Moreover, Sun noted that foreign trades also had a negative impact on the livelihood of the peasants: "Foreign nations use the treaties to bind China's customs and *likin* taxes; neither the customs nor the *likin* stations are free to raise the tariff rate on foreign goods, but they can increase duties at will upon Chinese goods... It is clear

that if we want Chinese industries to flourish, we must follow the protective policy of the United States and of Germany, resist the invasion of foreign goods and protect our native goods.”⁹

In the face of economic hardship and political chaos, Sun suggested an innovative option in his speech at the Institute for the Study of the Farmers’ Movement in 1924, saying, “In solving problems concerning the landowners, we can make the landowners pay a heavy tax on the value of their land. If the landowners refuse to pay this tax, we can confiscate their land, make it public land, and give it to the farmers so that they will own the land they till.”¹⁰ In fact, the underlying cause of unfair landownership and the resultant economic adversity for peasants was inextricably connected to the ratio of available arable land to population. Mounting population pressure on both physical and government resources, a worsening state fiscal crisis, foreign encroachment and growing local disorder all began to strain social structures throughout China. By the 1840s, the political and economic turmoil was accompanied by a marked rise in popular resistance to rents and taxes.¹¹

It is relevant to explore the Western discourse on land and agriculture, which emphasized that land was the source of individual wealth. For example, Tribe (1978) maintains that Western discourse on the land in the 19th century encouraged peasants to exploit more of the earth, explore the possibilities of land and create a structure constituted by the concepts of capital, profit, exchange, production and distribution. Tribe (ibid.) further claims that “the agriculture process of production, from ploughing to sowing to reaping, is conceived as the outcome of the conscious activity of the individual, without whose intervention nothing takes place.”¹² His remarks suggest that the Western understanding of agriculture was a direct and cooperative performance between the autonomous labourer and land. Furthermore, the Western glorification of machinery and the advancement of agricultural tools also demonstrate human beings’ will to explore, develop and

eventually exploit the land, indicating its support for the employment of technology and scientific applications for pragmatic purposes of improving the livelihood of farmers. This was the main driver of economic development in the West.

In contrast, Chinese discourse on land emphasised a relationship of respect, placing the labourer in a position of subjugation to the land. The land was an object of superstition, something to worship and respect, and harvests were produced seasonally and naturally rather than through the intervention of machinery: “Grains and fibres, on the other hand, are produced from the land, nurtured through the seasons, and harvested with labour; they cannot be gotten in a day.”¹³ In addition, the Confucian taxonomy of class and occupation internalised the normativity of the social hierarchy; for example, the great sage Mencius said that manual labourers were bound to be governed by the intellectually higher governors.¹⁴ Labour and its reward were thus separately retained.

Arable land therefore represented an economic and social division between landlords and peasants. Labour ethics emphasised quotidian labour, encouraging peasants to work around the clock without making a sustainable living. A popular traditional narrative reveals how to control the people with their livelihood from the perspective of governors: “The way of the people is this; when they have a constant livelihood, they will have constant minds, but when they lack a constant livelihood, they will lack constant minds. When they lack constant minds there is no dissoluteness, depravity, deviance, or excess to which they will not succumb.”¹⁵

Even though discourses on land differed in their themes and purposes between China and the West, the system of tenancy and the burden of taxation seemed to be a common source of economic conflict between peasants and landlords. Tribe (1978:92) examines the tenancy system in the West by describing the agony of farmers resulting from the unfair equation of the system:

“The farmer is an undertaker who promises to pay to the landowner, for his farm of land, a fixed sum of money (generally supposed to be equal in value to the third of the produce) without the assurance of the profit he will derive from this enterprise”. His comment summarizes and problematizes the repercussions of the tenancy system. At the same time, Tribe (*ibid.*:92) argues against the tenancy system, insisting that the rent is a derivative of land and the tenancy system is a contract where land is inserted; thus the unspoiled relation between human labour and land is damaged by the tenancy system. On the other hand, Sun pointed out the hereditary aspect of occupation in the West, particularly for the peasants: “[in Europe] the occupations of the common people were also hereditary; they could never do anything else. If a man was a tiller of the soil, his children and grandchildren would be farmers. A labourer’s children and grandchildren would have to do bitter toil.”¹⁶

In China, the power of the landlords also interfered with the autonomous relationship between human labour and land. Although there were various relationships between landlords and tenants involving the tenancy system, Lin (1997:136) points to the exploitation of poor tenants by unscrupulous landlords, who “arbitrarily increased rent, practiced usury, manipulated crop prices and exercised tyranny over their tenants”. Lin (*ibid.*) further stresses that such exploitation did not necessarily generate “class awareness on the part of the oppressed tenants”, emphasising the possibility that the delay in modern citizen awareness among the peasants in China might have been related to the tenancy system. Lin’s observation confirms that the Confucian discourse on land and agriculture produced docile tenant farmers resigned to the tenancy system and consequent hardship; thus “the landlords, irrespective of their social backgrounds, were predominantly of the parasitic rather than the managerial type, living on rents which were often turned into commercial or usury capital.”¹⁷ This had a detrimental effect on peasants’ livelihood and on the economic

development of agriculture. Hence tenant farmers' economic hardships represented an externality of the tenancy system in farming and class division by land ownership.

From a Marxist perspective, Elster (1986:315) argues that land implies a medium for the autonomous relationship between human labour and nature, insisting that the instruments of labour must be elevated to the common property of society. Furthermore, he asserts that the whole of labour must be regulated on a cooperative basis to ensure a just distribution of the products of labour. Elster (1986:162) also suggests that peasants' rights and duties should be balanced in their connection to nature through land ownership; tenancy thus interfered with the natural relationship between peasants and the land as it imposed a sense of duty to remain and work, which ultimately benefited the landlords. Sun's appeal corresponds to Elster's point: "Most of the fruit of a year's unremitting toil goes finally to the landowner. As a result, great numbers of farmers are abandoning their farms and many fields are becoming waste and unproductive... unless we can solve the agrarian problem, there will be no solution for the livelihood problem."¹⁸ Tenancy thus represented a systematic dichotomy between autonomous labourers and tenant peasants, requiring land ownership by the labourer. This was what inspired Sun's conception of the land equalisation plan in his *minsheng* principle.

Taxation

Cohen (1984) elucidates how the tax system in agriculture caused the tenancy system to persist in China: "For the state, the need for agrarian rent reduction was left unheeded because it was still taken for granted that agriculture was the only truly important sector of the economy and major government's tax revenue."¹⁹ Callinicos (2004) additionally notes that a particular quality of the East was that states characteristically tax not only peasants but landlords as well, at least in that

they take a percentage from the surplus the landlord has extracted. Thus one arena in which tax is opposed to rent exists in the structural antagonism between the state and the landed aristocracy. Furthermore, Elster (1986:310) maintains that taxes are, in both the East and the West, the source of life for the whole apparatus of executive power; strong government and heavy taxes are thus identical and tax creates a uniform structure of relationships and people.

The tax system in the late Qing period was onerous. One press article in October 1904 described the heavy tax that people were forced to pay at every turn: “They were taxed twice when transmitting goods - once upon entering the city and once upon leaving the city, and they must pay again if they lead an ox past a checkpoint. In addition to these direct levies, and even more difficult to enumerate, are the indirect taxes such as household taxes, electrical taxes, and pawn shop taxes.”²⁰ This was in contrast to the Confucian ideal of *datong* communalism, which presented a different aspect of the concept of taxation. For example, Chinese political thought regarded *datong* (Great Harmony) as the goal of China’s rulers ²¹, who were morally obliged to provide the people with an ideal environment in which there was enough wealth for family and tax payment.²² On the other hand, Chong (2010:193) argues that the definition of *datong* Confucian ideology could be also translated into such terms as anarchism, universalism or utopianism, and Sun’s ideologies often reshaped them into a hybrid.

Tax revenue from the peasants was significant to the Qing government. The method of collection was the “single-whip system”, which consolidated all taxes into one compound sum to be paid twice a year; a tenant farmer had to pay 50 percent of the yield for rent. The rent was paid not in grain, but in silver taels. Adding to the pressure on the tenant farmer, the Qing conversion ratio for one silver tael to copper currency, which used to be 1:1,000 before the Opium War, soared as high as 1:1800 by 1846.²³ What made matters worse was the corruption among the

bureaucrats and gentry. Judge (1996) explains that the level of corruption was such that only 20 percent to 30 percent would enter the bureaus' coffers while 60 percent to 70 percent served the officials and the deputies; another portion was expropriated by the gentry managers and still more was embezzled by the clerks. Whatever was left over was sent to the great managers and to all imperial general inspectors; they in turn gave the soldiers some 10 to 20 percent of the sum that they had received.²⁴

Sun's proposal on land taxation was influenced by the single tax concept proposed by Henry George (1839-97), an American economist and land reformer best known for his book *Progress and Poverty*. Under his single tax concept, the government would tax all unearned income resulting from rising land values and the scarcity of land caused by economic development. The revenues from such a single tax would be so large as to make possible the abolition of other taxes. Sun (1927:233) explained his plan: "In the event of this principle being applied, the two following conditions must be observed: taxation according to the value of the land and compensation according to the declared value. In China, up to this day, the so-called three grade system of collection of land taxes has been preserved, but owing to the weak development of transport and industry, land values were not as high in the past as they are today." The influence of Karl Marx was also evident, who advocated the public ownership of capital and insisted that society has to provide appropriate rewards for labour, but that capital accruing from the machine should be owned by the public. Both Marx and George believed that social problems stem from economic inequality. Sun was impressed by George's theory of public ownership of land and by Marx's theory of public ownership of capital; he initially combined the two theories in order to apply to China's specific economic needs.

However, after a general introduction to Marx, Sun rejected Marxist theory. Gregor (2000:xi) adds that Sun rejected Marxism entirely because he saw it as having little to say about the problems that the revolution was compelled to contend with; Gregor (ibid.) further argues that theoreticians in the first quarter of the 20th century even denied the direct relevance of Marxism to China. Sun explained why he argued against Marx's assessment: "Marx's materialistic theory did not set forth any law of social progress and cannot be a determining factor in history; Marx, in his investigation of the social problem, emphasized [only] the material side."²⁵ Sun rejected Marx's argument due to its pessimistic view of human nature, which went against his belief in a more moderate and cooperative process of human evolution. This rejection led to Sun's future economic policy, which was intended to bypass the negative effects of capitalism.

Eventually, Sun explicitly stated that he would not abolish all other taxes. Hou (in Sih 1974:106) stresses that the idea of the single tax was conceived and expressed by Sun between 1907 and 1912, but he did not reject it until 1924 in his lecture on the *minsheng* principle. Sun observed, "The burden of miscellaneous levies upon the common people is too heavy; they are always having to pay out taxes and so are terribly poor...The reasons for the heavy burdens upon the poor are the unjust system of taxation practiced by the government, the unequal distribution of land power, and the failure to solve the land problem."²⁶ Sun instead proposed that the government adopt four methods to cope with the social and economic problems of the time: first, reform plans for society and industry; second, public ownership of the means of transportation and communication; third, direct taxation and collection of taxes; and fourth, distribution of national wealth on the basis of social and individual needs. However, Sun's proposal of these four methods presented a basic sketch that reflected his compassion to augment the economy and people's livelihood rather than a specific economic policy.

Sun recognised that the underlying problem of agriculture and land ownership impeded China's modernisation. For example, when the harvest was poor, the peasant had to sell his freeholding land to a landlord, resulting in the ever-increasing concentration of landholding among the rich. As such, Sun's main argument of land equalisation in his *minsheng* principle was inspired by the economic hardship faced by the peasants resulting from unfair land ownership. As discussed earlier, after the Opium War, many displaced and unemployed peasants moved to the cities while many others went abroad for coolie labour as the continuous shrinkage of individual landholdings put yet more pressure on peasants and their livelihoods. Sun argued for farmers' rights and the fair distribution of land so that they could maintain the return on their labour: "If we are to increase the production of food, we must make laws regarding the rights and interest of the farmers; we must give them encouragement and protection and allow them to keep more of the fruit of their land...The protection of the farmers' rights and the giving to them of a larger share in their harvests are questions related to the equalisation of land ownership."²⁷

Sun was keenly aware of the confiscation of land after the Russian Revolution. In a speech to the First Graduating Class of the Institute for the Study of the Farmers' Movement in 1924, Sun explained the post-revolution Soviet taxation system: "Now that Russia has reformed its agricultural policies, landowners have been eliminated and the nation's farmland has been distributed to ordinary farmers so that they may own the land they farm. When farmers own the land they till, all they have to do is to pay taxes to the government; no longer will landlords come to collect their rents."²⁸ However, Sun initially showed his reluctance to directly replicate the Soviet system of confiscating land, considering the particularities of the Chinese economy and culture. He preferred a reconciliatory approach, which was his political philosophy, to using coercive power.

However, Sun's rejection of the Soviet land nationalisation methodology led to a delicate situation given that China had received financial and military aids from the Soviet Union. This may have been due to Sun's intention to maintain China's autonomy from Russian political influence over his land equalisation plan. Sun claimed that his land equalisation plan was intended to bring about the traditional Chinese ideology of "Land to the Tiller", explaining that his plan suited China's particular needs at the time: "The methods for the solution of the land problem are different in various countries, and each country has its own peculiar difficulties. The plan which we are following is simple and easy – the equalization of landownership."²⁹ Sun also expounded on land distribution in his *minsheng* principle, explaining that it would be based on the mutual agreement of the involved parties rather than by coercive force: "What is our policy? We propose that the government shall buy back the land, if necessary, according to the amount of land tax and the price of the land."³⁰

4.2 Emancipatory Inclusion

Sun frequently argued that class struggle could be overcome through economic harmony and cooperation among citizens, believing that they functioned as a catalyst of positive social change. For Sun, society progressed through economic cooperation among humans; it was therefore necessary to include the economically excluded classes of people in his *minsheng* principle. Sun's proposal suggested easing the class conflict by means such as reconciling economic interests and offering an alternative. He declared that social evolution arose from economic rebalancing for the majority of the people, not from the conflict of that majority; therefore economic reconciliation was to the economic benefit of the majority.³¹

Rather than class conflict and class warfare, economic reconciliation through cooperation between landlords and peasants was the central aim of his *minsheng* principle. Sun argued, "Here is a reconciliation of the interests of capitalists and workers, rather than a conflict between them. Society progresses then, through the adjustment of major economic interests rather than through the clash of interests. If most of the economic interests of society can be harmonised, the majority of people will benefit and society will progress."³² Here, Sun's comment implies that his methodology would deny, avoid or skip the negative consequences of an economic system by resorting to his firm belief in economic harmony through cooperation to counter material conflict. This also represents a gap between the material conflict and Sun's ideal of economic harmony with regard to land ownership.

Sun asserted that capitalism mistakenly regarded materialism as the centre of economic history, thereby causing social chaos; he instead argued that social chaos could be solved by rectifying the historical mistake so that materialism would not be the centre of history. In fact, the framework for Sun's *minsheng* principle demonstrated his desire for preventative action against

the possible negative effects of Western capitalism because he was concerned about the conflict between rich and poor, which might lead to a class war. Sun believed that the appropriation of land and capital was the central cause of the negative effects of Western capitalism, and he specifically identified two main causes of economic conflict: first, the landlords' monopoly on land, and second, their appropriation of the profit from surplus labour generated by peasants. As such, people's livelihoods were mostly involved with material economy, however, Sun tried to persuade the people with his morally charged appeal by addressing fair land ownership, distribution of wealth and economic rights. The juxtaposition of materiality and morality thus conflicted in Sun's land equalisation plan.

Sun also wanted to bypass certain stages in economic development; however, these stages were necessary for a pre-modern economy such as China's to go through. According to Marx, social forces are inextricably connected to the dynamics of the dialectic inherent in the conflicts of each economic system; nevertheless, Sun insisted that almost all of the complex theoretical arguments of Marx were unrelated to the particular economic circumstances of China. As a result, even though Sun was concerned about the economic exclusion of the tenant farmers, he refused to confiscate the land from the landlords because it represented coercive power, and it was against his political philosophy. On the other hand, abandoning his land equalisation plan would forego the emancipation of the tenant farmers, and, if the system of tenancy continued, then Sun feared class war might occur.

Sun thus wanted to reach a peaceful agreement with the landlords through a cooperative understanding for the sake of improving the livelihoods of tenant farmers. Sun argued, "The rise in value of the land becomes a public fund as a reward to all those who had improved the community and who had advanced industry and commerce around the land."³³ Sun's comment

reconfirmed his moral obligation to his *minsheng* principle, which was intended to ease the economic suffering of the tenant farmers by returning their surplus labour to them in the form of the economic right of land ownership. Sun reemphasised the importance of the *minsheng* principle by insisting that peasants must be given the economic right of land ownership and that the exploitation of labourers had to be stopped. Sun also accepted the autonomy of landlords in setting the land price, suggesting that the price first be set by the landlords in order to reflect social improvements and the progress of commerce and industry. This indicated that Sun's political tendency was also conciliatory to both parties rather than reconciling them.

Sun acknowledged the correlation between land price and industrial progress, which represented free market economy. However, Sun's methodology represented his resolute intention to reject the Marxist argument, which insisted on the inevitability of class struggle and conflict during the development of a pre-modern economy. In fact, Sun absolutely denied the effects of capitalism. Furthermore, in addition to Confucian *datong* ideology and the shared production of communism, Sun's proposal reflected the influence of Christian socialism, which sympathised with the poor and the weak, advocating social cooperation in order to improve the status and welfare of the marginalised. Accordingly, Sun's conflation of economic systems in the land equalisation plan revealed a tension between the market economy and centrally controlled economy.

4.3 Land to the Tiller

Confucius once remarked that poverty would vanish where there was an equal distribution of wealth in society, so a wise ruler should see to it that the rich possessed their wealth without arrogance, while the poor possessed sufficient means of subsistence without suffering, so that social harmony could be attained.³⁴ Sun tried to replicate the Confucian ideal, believing that regulating private capital would put an end to monopolisation and narrow the gap between rich and poor. Bol (2008:29) emphasises that some early Neo-Confucians also proposed such radical policies as ending the private land market, distributing the estates of landlords in equal proportions to farmers and restoring an egalitarian rural society based on the idealised ‘well-field system’. In a similar vein, Sun argued against profit making, insisting that it destabilised social harmony: “Since the production of food aims at profit, when food prices are low in the native country, the food will be shipped for sale and greater profits abroad. Even when there is famine, when the people are short of food and many are starving, these private capitalists are not concerned... With such methods of distribution, which aim wholly at profit, the problem of livelihood can never be well solved.”³⁵

Sun admitted that his emancipatory communication was based on Chinese traditional moral values with a particular emphasis on agriculture and redistribution of land. Sun argued that the *minsheng* principle would bring economic harmony through moral evolution instead of through class conflict: “What really is the principle of livelihood? In my last lecture, I revealed a little of what it means; I said that *minsheng*, or livelihood, has been the central force in the cultural progress of society, in the improvement of economic organisation, and in moral evolution.”³⁶ Similarly, the question for Neo-Confucians was not whether they should accept the reality of economic

inequality, but what morality would mean in a world in which economic power operated independently of political power.

The Confucian ideal of “Land to the Tiller” represented a moral obligation rather than a concrete economic plan. Likewise, Sun’s plan to improve the people’s livelihood and to ensure the equitable distribution of wealth reflected Chinese traditional moral values rather than serving as a concrete economic plan. Sun reemphasised the expected consequences of the plan: “When the *minsheng* principle is fully realised and the problems of the farmer are all solved, each tiller of the soil will possess his own fields – that is to be the final fruit of our efforts.”³⁷ In Sun’s speech titled ‘Land to the Tiller’, addressed to the graduating students of the Institute of Peasants Movement in 1924, he also urged a peaceful solution to distribute land to the peasants.

Sun’s idea of “Land to the Tiller” came originally from the first Ming emperor, who had come to the throne in part as an agrarian reformer, breaking his estates up under a “Land to the Tiller” policy that ushered in an era of small freeholding proprietorship.³⁸ However, over the course of the Ming Dynasty, the trend was toward re-concentration in the hands of fewer owners, though not in the same form as before. Rowe (2009:96) explains that the peasant war of the Ming-Qing transition improved the position of tenant farmers as landlords granted willing and capable tenants permanent tenancy rights or surface ownership of land. This arrangement gave tenants a sense of security and an incentive to make capital improvements and experiment with new crops; and the amicable agreements between the landlords and tenant farmers in redistributing land provided a precedent showing that the livelihood of farmers could be achieved through cooperation. Therefore, the “Land to the Tiller” policy was historically created partly due to economic pragmatism from the side of landlords and partly due to the economic struggle that the tenant farmers engaged in with the landlords. Consequently, their economic conflict was reconciled

through cooperative negotiation by both parties. This showed that the land equalisation plan required both mutual understanding and negotiations.

Even though Sun was also aware of and influenced by the economic developments in the West, such as the British industrial revolution, the Russian socialist revolution, and the ideas of philosophers such as Karl Marx and Henry George, Western material history did not dominate Sun's moral commitment to economic harmony. Rather, a conflation of various ideologies, for example, Confucian economic harmony, cooperative labour and shared production, formed the core of the *minsheng* principle. Sun firmly insisted that he would not imitate the Western social system outright, pointing out the political problems in the West: "Many Chinese scholars, who have been absorbing all forms of Western knowledge, have thought that we could solve our problem by imitating the West without realising how divided are the socialist parties of the West upon social questions, and how far away they still are from a single course of action."³⁹

Even after receiving economic and military aid from the Soviet Union, Sun is known to have argued against Marxism, the economic and political foundation of the newly established Russian nation-state. Allen (in Sih 1974) points out that Sun, after having carefully examined the materialist interpretation of history and the Marxist doctrine in relation to communism, argued that class war was a social disease. Furthermore, *The Joint Manifesto*, which was announced on January 26, 1923 in conjunction with Adolf Joffe, the Russian envoy in Beijing, explicitly stated that, "the communist order or even the Soviet system cannot actually be introduced to China."⁴⁰ Sun insisted that the evolution of humankind was based neither on class war nor on coercive power, but through cooperation and reconciliatory effort to share economic benefits among human beings. Sun's *minsheng* principle was, therefore, in defence of the Chinese traditional moral obligation to protect economic harmony among the people.

It is apparent that the methodology of land nationalisation during the Russian Revolution generated a negative impression on Sun, who wanted to avoid confiscating land by violent and coercive means; instead, he was willing to reconcile the economic interests of both landlords and peasants through peaceful negotiation. Accordingly, Sun did not agree to embrace communism completely as the core Chinese economic system. At the same time, Sun was aware of the benefits and negative effects of capitalism in the West. It is interesting to observe that Sun did not reject outright capitalism even though he adopted part of it; he also denounced imperialism although both capitalism and imperialism are closely connected. Sun rejected only the possible negative consequences of capitalism, such as the inevitability of class war in the process of human and economic evolution. Additionally, while Sun's aim was to reach socialism, Sun was also aware of the defects of socialism, so he resorted to, what Linebarger (1937:254-5) referred to as, a "grudging admiration" for socialism.

Sun constantly reflected upon the Chinese traditional ideology that social progress could be achieved through harmonious cooperation as he rebuked the Marxist analysis, arguing, "Class war is not the cause of social progress, it is a disease developed in the course of social progress. The cause of the disease is the inability to subsist, and the result of the disease is war. What Marx gained through his studies of social problems was a knowledge of diseases in the course of social progress. Therefore Marx can only be called a social pathologist."⁴¹ Sun concluded that Marx's methods were not applicable to the Chinese economic situation and instead supported state capitalism by encouraging state industries.

However, there was a gap between Sun's pursuit of economic harmony based on human cooperation and what was a realistically feasible economic policy. Hou (in Sih 1974:96) points out that Sun's "Land to the Tiller" plan was presented without a sufficient source of funds and details

on land distribution. For example, in Sun's publication of "The International Development of China", the six programmes he presented had little data for evaluating his development plan; furthermore, individual projects in terms of technical or engineering feasibility, internal consistency and cost-benefit analysis were missing, and he did not make any systematic estimate on the input requirements or the effects on the national product.

Consequently, questions remained as to how Sun would accomplish the objective of "Land to the Tiller" and how the government would acquire an enormous amount of farm land for distribution to the tenant farmers. Ultimately, the conflict in Sun's land equalisation plan was between his moral obligation and material viability. Although Sun's economic policy was based on the economic communalism of Confucian *datong* ideology in order to satisfy his moral obligations, it did not offer a concrete economic plan to solve the material conflict concerning land redistribution. Moreover, even though Sun strongly denied the negative effects of capitalism, he was also aware that his *minsheng* principle required a certain condition of capitalism that acknowledged the rise in value of land in order to return it to the tenant farmers. And that was why Sun did not reject capitalism completely.

After Sun resigned as provisional president of the Republic of China in 1912, he reiterated his stance on the future of China's tax system in a speech to members of the *Tongmenghui* at a farewell party in Nanjing on April 1, 1912. This time, Sun (1994) admitted the challenge that his land equalisation plan was facing: lack of government funds in proportion to the massiveness of the plan. This finally revealed the gap between his moral ideals and material reality: "Several decades in the future, all those who own land will effortlessly enjoy the rights of having been here first. So to collect tax according to acreage of land brings you to the inequality of land rights. Some of those who seek laws that correct these inequalities advocate the nationalisation of land. But it

is probably beyond the powers of a nation to buy up the land in the entire country.”⁴² Consequently, Sun’s admission based on a realistic assessment of the land equalisation plan affected the landlords’ attitude, who then became resistant to the plan.

Another challenge to Sun’s *minsheng* principle was how to morally reconcile the conflict between economic harmony and profit making. Sun’s method of reconciliation previously depended upon combining positive elements from the Chinese and Western values and systems into a hybrid. However, in dealing with the dissimilarity between profit making and economic harmony in his *minsheng* principle, Sun tried to counter the material conflict involving landownership and tenancy by propagating mutual cooperation between landlords and tenant farmers based on the idealised systems, such as the principle of “Land to the Tiller” and the Confucian ideal of *datong* communalism supplemented by Western communism; this was in an effort to “pre-empt” the class war by emphasising the moral obligation of cooperation: “If this becomes true, the people will not only have a communistic share in state production, but they will have a share in everything. When the people share everything in the state, then will we truly reach the goal of the *minsheng* principle, which is Confucius’ hope of a Great Commonwealth (*datong*).”⁴³

However, Sun’s moral persuasion was defended without a detailed plan, and consequently, as Mao Zedong once commented, “Sun left this country a legacy of confusion.”⁴⁴ Sun (1930) instead focused on the future possibilities upon the completion of his land redistribution plan, by arguing, “If we attack the problem now, we can solve it; but if we lose the present opportunity, we can never find a way out. The discussion of the land problem naturally causes a feeling of fear among the landowners, but if the Kuomintang policy is followed, the present landowners can set their hearts at rest.”⁴⁵

4.4 Sun's dilemma

Sun's land equalisation plan was a hybrid of communism and communalism inspired by the Confucian *datong* ideology of economic harmony through cooperative labour and common production. The plan innately opposed the aspects of self-interest and labour exploitation that capitalism represented. However, his plan also had the elements of capitalism in that rises or falls in the price of land, which fluctuated, were based on the mechanism of market economy rather than a centrally controlled economy. This represented a conflict within Sun's plan because the effects of capitalism that Sun wanted to avoid at all costs were the condition of his land equalisation plan. Moreover, Sun did not agree with the concept of profit making, the core principle of capitalism and free market economy, because he believed it was antithetical to the moral principle of Confucian *datong* communalism and to that of communism.

In fact, Sun did not deny capitalism altogether because he wanted to maintain some of its positive elements, such as individual incentives and private land ownership; however, these were antithetical to the principle of communism. Sun defended communism in relation to the *minsheng* principle: "We cannot say that the theory of communism is different from our *minsheng* principle. Our *Three Principles of the People* mean government of the people, by the people and for the people – that is, a state belonging to all the people, a government controlled by all the people, the rights and benefits for the enjoyment of all the people."⁴⁶ Sun made an effort to explicate the *minsheng* principle in relation to communism by arguing that the *minsheng* principle and communism were mutually harmonizing. He claimed that both shared the same values and purpose, emphasising that the only difference was in methodology since the *minsheng* principle was proposed to accommodate the particular situation of China. Sun stressed the compatibility of the two: "So, not only should we not say that communism conflicts with the *minsheng* principle, but

we should even claim communism as a good friend. The supporters of the *minsheng* principle should study communism thoughtfully.”⁴⁷

Sun’s proposal faced further challenges as the surplus labour of tenant farmers was appropriated by landowners. It demonstrated the conflict of interest between the two classes, which was exactly what Marx argued. However, Sun solely insisted on human cooperation to counter the material conflict. This is one of the reasons why Sun rejected the Russian method of confiscating properties from the landlords: Sun refused to use coercive power because he believed in peaceful negotiations. Sun explained that his land redistribution plan was different from nationalisation because his principle was exclusively for the livelihood of the people, and the purpose and methodology of his land equalisation plan was about human cooperation in service of economic harmony.

Sun demonstrated his adherence to ideology and personal beliefs: “It is a very different thing from what is called in the West *nationalisation of property*, confiscation for the government’s use of private property which the people already possess. Our plan provides that land now fixed in value shall still be privately owned. If the land problem can be solved, one half of the problem of livelihood will be solved.”⁴⁸ Sun also stressed the uniqueness and authenticity of amalgamating the two ideologies of Chinese traditional communalism and Western communism. Sun’s argument was based on the “communistic” or “communal” livelihood of human beings to reach socialism directly without suffering the “negative effects” of capitalism during the process of economic development. However, the *minsheng* principle required a specific economic plan to manage the material aspects of conflict of interests rather than persuading solely with moral duties. Sun instead provided a rather idealistic goal of his plan: “The *Minsheng* principle’s method of distribution will

aim not at profit but at supplying the people with food. Our *Minsheng* principle aims at the destruction of the capitalistic system.”⁴⁹

In fact, Sun underestimated the level of interest conflict and potential discontentment between landowners and tenant farmers. These were the very negative effects of capitalism that Sun had relentlessly rejected from the beginning. Sun confessed, “As soon as the landowners hear us talking about the land question and equalisation of landownership, they are naturally alarmed, just as capitalists are alarmed when they hear people talking about socialism and want to rise up and fight it.”⁵⁰ Nevertheless, Sun’s logical solution of overcoming the conflict of interest between the landlords and tenant farmers was not offered. Instead, Sun hoped to bypass the negative stages of economic development of capitalism and reach socialism directly. In the process, Sun tried to reconcile material conflict with mutual cooperation as he believed the latter was a quality that inherently existed in all human beings. Sun explained his stance in relation to the origins of communism: “The first society formed by man was a communistic society and the primitive age was a communistic age Their system of living is entirely communistic, which proves that the society of our primitive ancestors must have been communistic.”⁵¹ Thus Sun hoped to counter the material conflict with the persuasion of moral duty.

Sun urged for cooperation between the tenant farmers and the landlords to help the government solve the conflict concerning land ownership, fearing opposition to his plan or even revolts to take place. Accordingly, Sun’s conciliatory approach was criticised by some as compromising or weak, at best. Moreover, even though he sought to eliminate economic hardship of tenant farmers, he did not want to repeat what the West experienced during its economic development: inequality in wealth. Since Sun was concerned with economic equality, his plan of equalising land and the control of private capital was designed to ensure equitable distribution of

income and wealth. However, Sun did not want pure socialism because he did not advocate for the state to own all means of production; nor did he advocate for pure capitalism, for he never trusted capitalists who, he believed, would control the economy to the detriment of the people unless restrained.⁵² Sun's principle thus conflated various ideologies concerning the betterment of the people's livelihood, yet he did not take a clear stance on the nation's economic structure.

Gregor (2000:104) also notes that, although Sun advocated state management of those undertakings that exceeded the capacity of private enterprise, he also insisted on the legal protection of property and the exercise of private initiatives as essential to China's rapid economic growth and industrialisation. Therefore Gregor (ibid.) claims that, even though at the heart of Sun's developmental ideology was a combination of anti-Marxist, nationalist, class-collaborationist and productivistic theories of productive forces, a recognition of the critical role played by the material forces in the history of nations was central to Sun's *minsheng* principle. Sun needed to solve the material conflict concerning landownership through specific economic policies rather than by moral persuasion based on cooperative understanding between peasants and landowners because land equalisation was about the material economy.

Sun amalgamated multiple economic approaches into a hybrid plan in his *minsheng* principle. Sun did not deny capitalism outright because his land equalisation plan employed part of capitalism, nor could he avoid the necessary effects of economic development without a concrete plan. Sun accordingly advocated a kind of regulated capitalism in which private enterprises with competition and state ownership with monopolistic power coexisted: another hybrid form. His economic policy called for the government's close guidance. With his opposition to the Marxist argument and capitalism, Sun had to find a reconciliatory solution to maintain the particularities of the Chinese economy. Sun argued, "China may have to find the answer within

rather than from the Western cases. Western nations have not yet found any satisfactory methods to deal with these evil practices arising out of the land question.”⁵³

In Sun’s philosophy, only social equality through land redistribution could dissolve the class conflict. However, Sigren (in Sih 1974) argues that Sun employed a social interpretation instead of the materialistic interpretation of history, asserting that Sun was compelled to discredit the materialistic interpretation of history because he could not accept its corollary of class struggle, which he personally observed during the social and economic development in the West. On the other hand, Sun insisted that the *minsheng* principle and its land redistribution programme had to be achieved without causing class conflict, arguing that cooperation and mutual understanding between tenant farmers and landowners would bring about economic harmony and progress. Hence, Sun’s dilemma lay in the gap between his ideology and China’s economic reality.

Sun’s *minsheng* principle represented his ideal economic plan for solving the material conflict. However, Sun wanted neither pure socialism nor pure capitalism; he wanted to eliminate poverty, but he did not want to repeat the negative consequences of economic development. At the same time, Sun claimed that the *minsheng* principle was communism, arguing that there was no real difference between the two. The only difference, he claimed, lay in the methods by which they are applied. Sun’s intention with his land equalisation plan was to give people a better livelihood by bypassing class conflict and reaching state socialism directly by selectively conflating the ideologies of communalism and communism. However, the underlying structure of Sun’s land equalisation programme carried the mechanism of capitalism because an increase in the value of land derived from people’s surplus labour, and the government’s purchase of land at the market price meant it recognised the market economy, a central mechanism of capitalism.

Time Constraints and Foreign Capital

Sun's land equalisation plan faced resistance from landowners. Moreover, Sun realised that his plan had to depend upon foreign capital, provoking concern regarding China's political sovereignty as well as economic autonomy amid foreign encroachment. Indeed, Sun's insistence on China's cultural and economic particularity did not persuade well the international lenders. Hou (in Sih 1974:101) argues that Sun was very clear about the issue of time constraint and the necessity of foreign capital as he argued that, despite using foreign capital, China's sovereignty would never be compromised and China would be always in control. Sun defended his plan and even implied the possibility of confiscating land in certain cases, implying a change in his methodology in land equalisation: "This criticism is not entirely correct. In the manifesto of the First National Congress of the Kuomintang in 1924, it was clearly stated that the state should distribute land to land-lacking tenants. The state may acquire such land for distribution by buying land from landlords (according to the equalisation of land rights programme) and by confiscating land from those landlords who fail to pay land value tax or who possess uncultivated wastelands."⁵⁴

However, the issue of time constraint interfered; Hou (in Sih 1974:101) points out that Sun did not want to accept the strict demands of the foreign lenders, which required a lengthy process of negotiation. This demonstrated an element of Sun's naivety with regard to the demands of international financial institutions. Hou (ibid.) also insists that Sun regarded the borrowing of foreign capital as a business transaction, not a concession to foreign exploitation or the domination of China by imperialist powers. Sun believed that China could advance the people's livelihoods by tapping into foreign capital; however, Sun did not investigate the intention of lenders from political perspectives, which would inevitably threaten China's economic independence. Sun again showed he lacked a detailed strategic plan in seeking international loans, as he pursued his own

economic plan inspired by his compassion to better the livelihood of the people. Thus Sun's moral obligation and compassion to people's livelihood overlooked the political conditions of borrowing foreign capital.

Sirgen (in Sih 1974:124) argues that social change in history necessarily takes the form of open conflict and painful transition. Sun might have rejected the Marxist arguments of the negative effects of capitalism in order to bypass them. Sirgen (ibid.) further suggests two possible methods for solving such social questions: one is the peaceful method of evolutionary socialists and the other, the revolutionary method of the communists, arguing that only the former was satisfactory for Sun's purposes because "the old system cannot be changed in a minute and it must be reformed gradually". Sun believed that, if there were no reconciliation or harmony through peaceful cooperation, there would have been no human evolution.

Sun persistently emphasised that economic progress could be achieved, not through the conflict of interests or selfish motives, but rather by sharing and maintaining communal harmony through cooperation. However, Sun ultimately acknowledged the irreconcilable relationship between material conflict and morally inspired cooperation, concluding that struggle was the answer: "What is the cause of social evolution? Judging by Marx's theory, we would have to say that social change is caused by class struggle, and class struggle is caused by the capitalist oppression of workers. Since the interests of capitalist and workers inevitably conflict and cannot be reconciled, struggle ensues and this struggle within society is what makes for progress."⁵⁵

Sun had previously refused to acknowledge that both negative and positive aspects of competition and struggle exist in the history of human evolution and economic development. However, it was necessary for Sun to realise that not only economic harmony but also conflict existed during economic growth, and that each did not necessarily have to, or could not be

assimilated into the other, but they rather coexisted. The role of the government is at its best when providing the people with specific plans to prevent or mitigate the potential negative effects of an economic system because material conflict is as natural as humanistic cooperation during an economic development. Conflicts are produced when men continually struggle for their survival and economic progress. Conflicts could not be simply avoided by skipping the necessary phases of economic development. Both cooperation and struggle are thus required to improve the livelihood of humans as a part of human evolution.

At this point, it is also important to observe a change in Sun's political style, which used to put emphasis on time-efficient revolution to gradual reform. Prior to the 1911 revolution, Sun relentlessly supported the revolution as a matter of political urgency to save China; the time constraint thus played an important role in propagating his emancipatory communication. For example, while Sun was promoting ethnically defined nationalism in his *minzu* principle, he resorted to coalescing with the ethnic majority of the Han race for political efficacy and time efficiency in overthrowing the Qing dynasty. He also supported collective rights and the power of the state over the individual rights for a similar reason in promoting constitutionalism. After the revolution of 1911, however, Sun started supporting the time-taking method of peaceful negotiations in purchasing land despite having to depend on foreign funding instead of the time-efficient Soviet style of confiscating land. Sun's moral principle of economic harmony and cooperation took the priority instead of the time efficient method of confiscation in the case of land equalisation plan.

The change in Sun's political praxis may be explained by the binary aspects of conflicts between economic reality and moral ideals in his *minsheng* principle. For example, his moral obligation to improve the livelihood of the people inspired by the traditional Chinese ideology was

challenged by the reality of material conflict in the economic modernisation of China. Capitalism's potentially negative effects, such as material conflict and class war, were contrasted with its positive mechanism of private ownership and individual incentive of the market economy. The ideal methodology of land equalisation by the time-consuming process of peaceful negotiation was juxtaposed with the time-efficient methodology of confiscating land. However, Sun preferred to employ multiple ideologies for a hybrid of methodologies: "Socialism, communism and the doctrine of livelihood agree on the principle, but differ in the methods of realising that principle."⁵⁶ Sun insisted that cooperation was the ultimate driving force of human evolution in countering the negative effects of capitalism. Accordingly, Sun's intersubjective understanding of others' suffering and his moral obligation to ease their economic hardship were in conflict with material reality, lack of concrete plan and shortage of funding in his *minsheng* principle.

CHAPTER V

The Overseas Chinese and Sun

INTRODUCTION

Sun often claimed that the overseas Chinese were the mother of the 1911 Revolution for their emotional and financial support, and he was compassionate about including them in the process of establishing the first Chinese republic. Sun (1927b) argued that the psychological distance among the Chinese people was shaped by the perception of their own geographical centeredness. As a consequence, the overseas Chinese were considered the *other* Chinese because they had deserted the two most essential geographical elements: the Centre Kingdom and its native soil. Furthermore, their psychological liminality regarding China was closely related to the indefinite duration of their sojourn.

In this chapter, I argue that *Tongbao* inclusion helped reconcile Sun's own exclusionary political praxis as well as the geographically centred Chinese identity, and its corollary was transnational patriotism among the overseas Chinese. This is significant because, first, *Tongbao* inclusion was based on Sun's reconciliatory approach to Confucian fraternal love and Christian universal love, and by amalgamating nationalism and cosmopolitanism into a hybrid form of inclusive citizenship; second, it represented Sun's belief that all Chinese were born from the same womb of *Mother China*, symbolising broadened inclusiveness in Chinese identity. Consequently, transnational citizenship strengthened the overseas Chinese to voluntarily participate in building a modern Chinese nation-state as it transformed them into autonomous patriots regardless of their geographical distance from China.

5.1 The Overseas Chinese and their Identity

One of the approaches to analysing the basis of Chinese identity is to examine the Chinese words that Chinese people frequently use to describe themselves. For example, the Chinese word *gen* (roots), metaphorically meaning ground, is a familiar word which may appropriately describe Chinese identity, implying that it is rooted in Chinese soil. However, this geographically defined identity inevitably excluded those who had left the native soil, such as the overseas Chinese. Loyalty to the native soil was, thus, an essential constituent of Chinese identity. Like many other cultural constructs, Chinese identity also contained a binary aspect of inclusion and exclusion: while it included those who loyally remained on the native land, it excluded those who left. Thus the greatest challenge for Sun was to construct a new collective Chinese identity that would include the overseas Chinese.

Sun critically examined the social prejudice against the overseas Chinese, which “was shaped by the [mainland] Chinese perception of their own geographical centeredness”¹, suggesting that Chinese self-satisfaction and self-perceived cultural superiority might have been caused by their own view of China as the centre of the world while locating others at the periphery. Sun further analysed the consequences of this attitude: “[the Chinese] would not tolerate the thought of any other superiority over themselves, or of allowing others to correct their mistakes.”² This self-righteous attitude, Sun claimed, made the Chinese narrow-minded and undoubtedly hindered their economic progress and political modernisation. Thus the sense of geographical centeredness in Chinese identity produced psychological distance from others.

Accordingly, Schoppa (2006:11–2) suggests that even the homes of many ethnic minorities, such as Mongols, Tibetans and Uighurs, were geographically peripheral, while the Chinese home was centred in China, the site where one’s ancestors were buried and where eventually one would

oneself be interred. Schoppa (ibid.) further claims that a shared native place is also one of the most important practical bases for connections and networks. In turn, the connections and networks of one's native place play a crucial role in forming collective identity. Thus the combination of functionality and conceptuality concerning home and native soil further strengthened the notion of Chinese roots, which were closely connected to the geographically fixed quality of the Chinese identity.

Before 1893, when the Qing government formally lifted the punishments for those who had left China, the authorities often expressed concerns about political conspiracy among the overseas Chinese and migrants were regarded as deserters, criminals, potential traitors or political conspirators.³ Worsened social and economic hardship after the Opium Wars and the Taiping Rebellion forced many coolie labourers, particularly from Sun's native province of Guangdong and the nearby Fujian region, to leave China to work in plantations, mines and railway construction in the New World. Between 1838 and 1870, more than 500,000 healthy Chinese labourers with an average eight-year contract were sent to Latin America, the Caribbean and eventually North America.⁴ Many of these coolie labour émigrés remained in their host nations and formed the overseas Chinese communities.

Wang (1991: 6) explains the sojourner pattern among the overseas Chinese, which broadly refer to traders (*huashang*) and coolies (*huagong*); the word *huaqiao* came to apply not only to all those previously known as *huashang* and *huagong*, but also to teachers, journalists and other professionals. Thus the scope of *huaqiao* was expanded to include various occupational categories of migration. Wang (ibid.) clarifies that the coolie pattern derived from the migration of large numbers of men of peasant origin, landless labourers and the urban poor; and the term coolie was associated with the beginnings of industrialisation in North America. On the other hand, in

Southeast Asia, coolie labour was never the dominant pattern, but was largely composed of the *huashang* pattern of migration.

From early on, Sun showed his affinity to the overseas Chinese, possibly because he was influenced by his earlier experience with the *huagong* immigrants in Hawaii. Sun's description of the overseas Chinese as the 'mother of the Chinese revolution' serves well to indicate the contribution of the overseas Chinese networks to the establishment of the first Chinese republic through their emotional and financial support for Sun's revolutionary efforts. Even though Sun was also supported by the wealthy *huashang* communities, the most significant emotional support came from the coolie labourers of *huagong* Chinese, who were known to have contributed their hard earned wages to Sun.

In his letter to Li Hongzhang in 1894, Sun pleaded for Li's compassion for the condition of the overseas Chinese labourers and their suffering. Sun insisted that the Chinese migrants were often forced to move by war, natural disaster or economic distress, challenging the prejudice of Chinese society against them. Sun wrote in his letter, "I am most familiar with the piglets (labourers) who are exported at the rate of nearly 400,000 a year. Seldom do we see any of these returning safely home. I know that, unless we completely eradicate the vicious political system, the citizens of China will not only have no rights of their own to talk about, but even if they should be among the fortunate ones themselves, they will not be able to leave the rewards of their labour to their descendants."⁵

After Sun's first revolt failed in 1895, he and other revolutionaries had to flee to Japan, As did many other reformers after the Empress Dowager Cixi's successful coup against the Emperor Guangxu's *One Hundred Days' Reform*. Since the overseas Chinese possessed a good source of political and financial power, both reformists such as Kang Youwei and Liang Qichao and the

revolutionary parties including Sun tried to win support from the overseas Chinese. This was how the conflict between the revolutionaries and reformists surrounding the overseas Chinese originated. The revolutionary and reformist parties competed by setting up new organisations such as reading clubs, night schools and drama troupes to disseminate their own messages in addition to print media such as newspapers, magazines and booklets propagating their political arguments.⁶ For example, in Singapore, against Kang Youwei's the Protect the Emperor Party, the revolutionaries launched a fierce attack on the ideology of the reformist organ; in particular, the disappointment among the overseas Chinese with the increasingly strong economic domination by foreign powers and the Qing government's poor political management in protecting China led them to support Sun and his revolutionary party. Wang (2000:68-70) notes that the Qing government did not expect the overseas Chinese to be willing to support Sun's nationalism and its spread among the poor and illiterate beyond China.

Many overseas Chinese shared some of the prejudice against the Manchus, and this prejudice was further strengthened by the Qing government's refusal to protect its overseas subjects and its inability to defend Chinese territory against foreign encroachment. Cook (in Lee and Lee 2011:172) points out that many *huaqiaos* continued to be exposed to anti-Qing rhetoric long after it had died out on mainland China due to their involvement with the overseas secret societies. This led many overseas Chinese people to accept the revolutionaries; and later they were absorbed into the mainstream of the revolutionary movement. Accordingly, anti-Manchuism became one of the central characteristics of nationalism among the overseas Chinese. Finally, when intellectuals in the treaty ports and young overseas students followed Sun's revolutionary party, the revolutionaries gained more influence over Kang Youwei's Protect the Emperor Party, whose base supporters were originally the intellectuals and established *huashangs*.

Wang (1991:7) points out that these overseas Chinese were increasingly conscious of the weakness of the Qing government and its unfair treatment of them. Thus they started questioning their citizen's rights, and furthermore, voluntarily sought to modernise their motherland; in particular, for those with wealth in Southeast Asia, their interest in investing in modern business and industry were strong. At this point, Sun saw the prospect of turning the growing nationalism among the overseas Chinese into a powerful transnational patriotism in order to establish a new Chinese republic. In defying the exclusionary aspect of Chinese identity, which was defined on geographical centeredness and social prejudice against the overseas Chinese, Sun sought to empower them with citizens' rights so that they could autonomously participate in the process of constructing the new Chinese republic. Sun believed that there had to be comparable political rights for the overseas Chinese so that they would perform their duty of patriotism transnationally.

Consequently, while contemplating how to include the overseas Chinese politically, Sun realised that it was necessary to first create an inclusive Chinese identity, which would help overcome their psychological liminality and sense of geographical distance. In the process, Sun realised that his own nationalism was also narrowly defined in terms of geography and race, impeding the inclusion of the overseas Chinese as autonomous participants. Sun thus sequentially reconciled exclusionary nationalism with cosmopolitanism, creating the hybrid of transnational inclusion. This was Sun's vision of *Tongbao* inclusion.

In the process, Sun altered his racially charged nationalism to transnationalism in order to encompass all overseas Chinese and the ethnic Chinese minorities living overseas, while maintaining their allegiance to the motherland under the umbrella of common Chinese identity. Wang (1991:7) asserts that even though Sun's emancipatory communication was primarily driven by nationalism, it was also enhanced as a transnational alternative of a conscious migration policy

that brought both the *huashangs* and the *huagongs* together under a common Chinese identity. Thus the *huashangs* and the *huagongs* were united under the status of common *huaqiao* citizens. As a result, the integrated pattern of *huaqiao* gave the highest priority to patriotism and the transmission of nationalist ideals to all Chinese abroad.⁷

Yan (1976: xvii), on the other hand, asserts that many of the overseas Chinese were patriots, and their patriotic feeling was due to concern for their kin and their native place in China. Consequently, the overseas Chinese, despite their place of work and residence, became part of China and associated with its people. Sun's transnational inclusion accommodated their concerns by offering an inclusive Chinese identity and extending a transnational citizenship, both of which played a significant role in the 1911 Revolution. On September 30, 1916, when Sun delivered a speech in Shanghai to a group of overseas Chinese soldiers, he commended the contribution of the overseas Chinese to the fall of the Qing monarchy: "The Overseas Chinese was really one of the most powerful forces when imperial rule was abolished."⁸ Additionally, in *A History of the Chinese Revolution*, Sun acknowledged his gratitude to the contribution of the overseas Chinese, academics and members of the secret societies: "Those who generously contributed money to the army were mostly overseas Chinese. Those who enthusiastically spread the word were mostly academics. Those who charged in front and defeated the enemy were soldiers and members of secret societies."⁹

5.2 Christian Influence

Upon his inauguration on January 1, 1912 as President of the first Chinese Republic, Sun proclaimed the adoption of the first republican form of government in Asia, the freedom of religion to protect Christianity and an outright ban on foot-binding for women, opium smoking and superstition or idol worship. Upon his death, his family held a Christian funeral in private according to his will in spite of opposition from both conservative right-wing nationalists and radical left-wing communists.¹⁰ Given Sun's education at mission schools, Sun's Christian belief was initially influenced by the teachings of missionaries. He believed that China's modernisation, political or industrial, could be achieved by taking after the Western model even though Sun maintained Chinese traditional values at the same time. Yan (1976:148-9) argues that it would be wrong to claim that Sun's political philosophy was derived entirely from one or two particular Western traditions; likewise, it would be equally wrong to say that his thought was a mere extension of Confucianism.

It is clear that the formation of Sun's emancipatory communication was drawn from the syncretism of various social and political ideologies such as liberalism, socialism, Marxism, and social Darwinism in reconciliation with Confucianism. Even though Sun specifically demonstrated the influence of Christianity and appreciated its effect on Chinese modernisation, he did not copy Christian values and practices outright, but constantly reconciled them with Chinese tradition. Nevertheless, Sun's idea of China's cultural, political and economic modernisation was closely related to Christian influence; in particular, Christianity introduced scientific knowledge such as medicine.

According to De Bary (2008:774), the scientific contribution of Christianity in the late Qing period includes the Protestant missionaries' special attention to building new colleges, which

contributed significantly to the development of modern education, medical training and studies in the humanities and social sciences. Moreover, the missionaries were also involved with the press; 70 percent of existing Chinese language newspapers were created by the missionaries for evangelisation, while 80 percent of English newspapers in 19th century China were established by foreign merchants.¹¹ On the other hand, medical missionaries also aimed to preach and convert the Chinese to Christianity in the process of healing the patients as some Chinese people suspected that missionaries were serving their own countries' military and commercial interests.

Christianity also had an altruistic influence since Sun's Christian belief was in helping others through humanistic cooperation. Sun stressed the common traces of human kindness in both Western and Chinese cultures: "Since our interaction began [with the foreigners], some people have thought that the Chinese ideal of kindness and love was inferior to the foreigners' because foreigners in China, by establishing schools and carrying on hospitals to reach and relieve the Chinese, have been practicing kindness and love...yet kindness and love are old qualities of Chinese character..."¹² Sun once referred to Western medicine as the kindly aunt that led him to the high road of politics, reminding of Hume's phrase: "The Superior doctor serves the nation; the middle doctor the individual; the inferior treats physical ailments."¹³ Furthermore, Dr. Cantlie, who saved Sun from kidnapping in London, was Sun's teacher at Hong Kong Medical School run by missionaries. Sun later confessed his Christian belief in a letter to a friend in Hong Kong after his dramatic release from the kidnappers: "It was due to God's help because I prayed hard for His mercy."¹⁴

Furthermore, Sun's Christianity combined with his Hakka ethnic background helped to broaden his Chinese identity. In terms of ethnicity and religion, Christianity was not received and constructed by Hakka Christians in opposition to Han identity or culture. Instead, Christianity was

used and renegotiated in continued claims to legitimate Han identity because Christianity allowed Hakka Christians to reassert, reinterpret and to some extent reinforce their Hakka identity.¹⁵ For Sun, a Hakka and Christian, the combination of his ethnic and religious background also allowed him to conceive his future nationalism defined by the ethnic majority of Han race without causing him much moral conflict. It might have been natural for Sun to identify with the Han based on his negotiated identity. However, Sun's Christian values also caused a dilemma at a later time as Sun realised that the inclusive love of Christianity and his racially exclusionary nationalism were in conflict.

Most importantly, Christianity was a powerful tool in forming political alliance for Sun. When combined with the Confucian element of brotherhood, it formed a strong solidarity. Sun had several Christian friends as his closest political allies, and Christianity provided political alliance during Sun's first two attempts at revolution in 1895 and 1900: two of his closest allies – Lu Haodong and Zheng Shiliang – were Christians.¹⁶ On September 5, 1912, in a welcome reception held by the churches of Beijing, Sun argued that religion and politics were complementary forces in a nation: "Religion and politics are interrelated, and religion is indispensable as a remedy for a nation's political shortcomings, for a religion is rich in virtue. I hope that everyone will apply their religious virtues to compensate for their political imperfections."¹⁷

In the political activities of secret societies, both traditional Chinese fraternity and Christian universal inclusion were reflected in maintaining solidarity and egalitarianism among citizens. Hsü (2000) notes that Sun won support from secret societies, whose members were mostly socially excluded classes and overseas Chinese; on the other hand, scholars and the gentry generally followed Kang Youwei and Liang Qichao. Yan (1976: 15) explains that perhaps the most important element in the solidarity of a secret society were those inclusive Christian brothers and

fraternal officers, who were addressed as Elder Brother, Second Brother and Third Brother; thus ordinary members could feel that they were governed and guided by people who were older and more experienced in the society. All other members were generally known as *xiongdi*: brother and comrade. Besides, swearing oaths at secret societies was a well-known ritual: the oath was given for the first time while members put their left hands on a Christian bible raising their right hands, and before taking the oath, they say, “I earnestly ask God to be my witness”. At the secret societies, Sun led the oath and the others would follow.¹⁸

This egalitarian and fraternal spirit of Christianity and Confucianism served as one of the important bases of solidarity for the secret societies in narrowing the gap between the ruling and the ruled, enabling ordinary members to feel solidarity within the organisation. The spirit of brotherhood was a principle of both obedience and unity, representing the duties and rights of the members. Its membership was open to everybody, making it universal and fraternal, and based on equality for all citizens. Sun explained universal inclusion and fraternity, which were the central concept behind *Tongbao* transnational inclusion in his lecture to the Christian Alliance of Canton on May 9, 1912: “In the eyes of the Church, my brothers and sisters, all of you are believers; as far as the nation is concerned, you are all citizens.”¹⁹

Christianity and Confucianism

Ching (in K  ng 1989:74) points out that Confucian teachings were oriented toward improving the political order as a means of achieving universal love, promoting generations of scholars to strive towards participation in government. Ching (ibid: 89-91) further asserts that Confucianism had to confront the challenges of Western science and technology, and respond to political and social challenges at the same time. For example, Chong (2010:71) points out that, although lacking knowledge of the Confucian classics, Christian school graduates in Hong Kong and elsewhere were full of Western knowledge and enthusiasm for change, political or otherwise. Chong (ibid.) insists that mission school graduates were ready and quick when it came to taking action as they believed that a strong will or faith was a powerful source of action.

While nationalism was spread and inculcated as a religion, Confucianism represented a cultural universalism based on the harmony of the natural and social orders and the sanctity of family life unlike Marxism, which argued for the triumph of human effort over the natural universe and the sanctity of labour.²⁰ In this regard, both Christianity and Confucianism greatly helped Sun in propagating his emancipatory communication as his reconciliatory approach to both religions turned out to be an effective tool to cement transnational unity among the overseas Chinese; it shaped a broader Chinese identity that willingly included the overseas Chinese. Ching (in K  ng 1989:86) argues that nationalism is innately selfish, a kind of collective egoism, whereas Confucianism makes important universal assertions about the moral and social orders. Here, the influence of Christianity also helped Sun objectively assess his own nationalism. This was evident when Sun altered his argument in his *minzu* principle from insisting on the narrowly defined nationalism based on consanguinity of race to a more inclusive Five Race Republic, which also brought forward political benefits such as securing Chinese territories.

Ching (ibid.) insists nationalism and Confucianism are not mutually exclusive because the two need each other and have helped each other in history. Situated between nationalism and Confucian influence, Christianity broadened Sun's political scope through its emphasis on compassion and the emancipatory cause, allowing the possibility of reconciliation with exclusionary nationalism and balancing the influence of nationalistic Confucianism. Having realised the shortcomings of the exclusionary aspect of racially defined nationalism that he had propagated during his early revolutionary efforts, Sun broadened the boundary of nationalism to a transnational context by including all overseas Chinese, such as the ethnic minorities living overseas. In fact, Sun's belief in the equality of all citizens had to do more with the influence of Christianity because Confucianism was more inclined to social hierarchy. Sun argued that both the overseas Chinese and overseas ethnic minorities should be politically empowered as equal citizens of China. He thus proposed providing the overseas Chinese with passports, establishing Overseas Chinese Commissions at national, provincial and local levels, giving overseas Chinese voting rights and appointing overseas Chinese delegates to national and provincial legislatures.²¹

On the other hand, Yao (1997) compares and contrasts the concepts of Confucian *jen* and Christian agape. He (ibid.:21) argues that, while agape can be translated in English as love, it is in fact more than love in that it defines the relationship between Christians and their God and between Christians and their neighbours. On the other hand, *jen* in Chinese is not the translation of love but is essentially love, both ethical and religious, in that it defines that relationship between Confucians and their transcendental pursuit. Yao (ibid.) further maintains that Confucianism and Christianity are two different traditions with certain important similarities.²² Central to their difference is the distinction between humanism and theism: in Confucianism, the first principle of this heritage is that of the unity between *Tian* (Heaven) and human beings, followed by the unity between

ancestors and descendants, while Christian agape has a wider application and meaning, describing a generous action by one person for the sake of others.

In reconciling the differences and similarities between Christian theistic love and Confucian humanistic love, Sun also discovered a binary aspect of universal inclusion and theistic exclusion in Christianity. The claim of Christian universality by missionaries represented a particular world view privileging the Christian religion as the only path to truth. Furthermore, since Christianity is monotheistic, its claim of universality is accompanied by the exclusion of other cultural and religious traditions that are deemed incompatible. In this binary claim of exclusion and universality that lay the origins of contempt for and rejection of non-Christian culture.²³ Sun's conciliatory approach to Christianity thus transcended the exclusionary side of theism by emphasising the inclusion of people from a humanistic perspective, which shows the influence of Confucianism. Thus both Christianity and Confucianism influenced the formation of Sun's emancipatory communication with their similarities and differences. However, the ultimate effect of synchronising the characteristics of agape and *jen* was Sun's conception of *Tongbao* inclusion, in which theistic love transformed into Sun's humanistic compassion demonstrated by recognising and including overseas Chinese.

On the other hand, Ching (in Kung 1989) emphasises that Confucius' central doctrine is always concerned with human relationships, asserting that it is associated with loyalty (*zhong*) to oneself and reciprocity (*shu*), or respect and concern for others; the latter referring more to social behaviour, and the former to the person's inner orientation.²⁴ Ching emphasises that *jen* is also translated variously as goodness, benevolence, humanity and human-heartedness. The person with *jen* loves all and everyone. Furthermore, Ching (ibid.) asserts that Confucianism acknowledges the moral autonomy of the individual conscience, even if traditional Confucianism tended to subject

individuals to the collective, sacrificing individual freedom for the sake of the collective. With regard to the collective and the individual, Sun's central ideology of inclusion was for the collective purpose and unity of the nation, thus individual rights and citizenship were to be sacrificed for the nation. His maxim of *tianxia weigong* also argues for collective rights and entitlements. In the same way, *Tongbao* inclusion was also conceived on the basis of collective Chinese living abroad rather than individual overseas Chinese.

Ultimately, under the influence of Christianity, Sun realised that his pursuit of a racially defined exclusionary nationalism came into conflict with his belief in Christian universal love. Accordingly, *Tongbao* inclusion, an act of humanistic reconciliation of universal love and fraternity, replaced the racially charged nationalism and eventually catalysed a transnational patriotism. Sun commented on the interactive and mutually influencing aspect between Christianity and politics: "Christians should therefore give full play to their religious faith, helping to shoulder the national responsibilities so that we can attain perfection in both politics and religion."²⁵ Its motive was Sun's compassionate inclusion of the overseas Chinese.

Sun also believed that Western rationality and Chinese traditional values did not have to be mutually exclusive, arguing that both could coexist through reconciliation. Sun made a similar argument, alleging that modernity did not have to be separated from the Chinese people's heritage even though Christianity was a powerful belief system that supported Europe's road to modernity and a great source of its strengths.²⁶ Sun's struggle was therefore to adopt modern values without abandoning Chinese traditions; as a result, he conflated the positive elements of Western economic and political advancements and Chinese moral values for the primacy of the people. Wang (in Lee and Lee 2011:14) further argues that Sun was able to challenge differences by turning them into a hybrid. Christianity strengthened Sun's respect for certain Chinese values and his will to further

employ Western knowledge. Sun explained his idea of broadening the scope of knowledge through reconciliation in a speech in Beijing on September 5, 1912: “Because the political system has changed and we are in a period of transition, all citizens must pool their ideas and efforts in an attempt to resuscitate the nation. Such a revival is a matter of expanding popular knowledge.”²⁷

Sun’s reconciliatory approach to Christianity and Confucianism resulted in broadening the scope of inclusion. Yao (1997) introduces the idea of expanding the concept of family towards neighbours in Christianity, explaining that “neighbour refers to an open relationship between individuals and between communities; thus anyone who follows Christ is a brother or a sister Brothers and sisters are symbolic terms for the family of God. Anyone who has faith in Jesus Christ is recognised and treated as a brother or a sister in this big family.”²⁸ Thus, by including neighbours as brothers and sisters, *Tongbao* inclusion extended the object of inclusion to multi-ethnic groups, and even to Sun’s lifelong enemy, the Manchus as the equal member of the republic. This could be interpreted as the influence of Christianity according to what Yao (ibid.) describes as “perfection cannot be attained by loving only one’s friends: much more important is one’s love for one’s enemies.”²⁹ Ultimately, Sun supported a Five Race Republic, reflecting the broadening of his policy of inclusion.

Finally, Sun found a common element between Confucianism and Christianity: the inclusion of everyone through kindness and love. In his *Three Principles of the People*, Sun reflects on Confucian and Christian love: “In the past no one discussed love better than Motze. His “love without discrimination” is the same thing as Jesus’ “universal love”. The ancients applied the principle of love to government, saying, “Love the people as your children,” and “be kind to all the people and love all creatures”. Love was used to embrace all duties, from which we can see how well they put kindness and love into effect.”³⁰ From Confucian perspective, Sun’s praxis of

conciliatory efforts contains an element of universal love (*boai*), which transcends class, race and gender; and Sun's underlying attitude also represents another significant Chinese tradition: benevolence (*renai*). Thus in both Confucianism and Christianity, the ethic of humanity culminates in the love of fellow human beings, including others, neighbours and enemies; in Confucianism, the love of others remains an entirely natural feeling for familial and national ties, while in Christianity, love is understood not as feeling emotion, but rather as selfless, active goodwill, respectful of the other.³¹

Alternatively, Yao (1997) explains inclusive love in relation to Christian agape and Confucian *jen*, and between humanism and theism.³² Sun's ultimate decision to include ethnic minorities, especially the Manchus, signifies Sun's principle of forgiving oppressors of the past. This also demonstrates Sun's praxis of breaking with the past in order to construct a broadened Chinese identity. More importantly, Sun demonstrated his belief that both Christianity and Confucianism shared a common love. Küng (1989) adds, "Jesus Christ proclaimed a personally involved love. This love includes those who suffer and those who are oppressed, the sick and the guilty, but also the opponent, the enemy. It is a universal love and an entirely active doing of the good."³³

At this point, Sun's reconciliatory attitude was accentuated by his assertion that the essence of Confucian benevolence was also found in Western culture in the form of universal love. Sun showed his respect for benevolent deeds regardless of cultural or national origin, such as the endeavours of Western missionaries in China, who established educational institutions and hospitals in order to educate and ease the suffering of the socially excluded Chinese. Sun therefore asserted that universal love was present both in the East and the West and that it encompassed everyone. An inclusive Chinese identity was an essential element for the solidarity of the Chinese,

and Sun explained love and kindness, emphasising the importance of acting on them: “In the practical expression of the fine qualities of kindness and love, it does seem as though China were far behind other countries, and the reason is that the Chinese have been less active in performance...as we study other countries, let us learn their practical methods, revive our own kindness and love, the spirit of ancient China, and make them shine with greater glory. Love is not understood as feeling emotion, rather as active goodwill (thus action).”³⁴

At the same time, Sun’s love could be interpreted as paternalistic: it reflected both the Christian emancipatory compassion to save the people and the sense of the Confucian governor toward those who were governed. Judge (1996:140) claims that the principle of paternalism and dependence in Confucianism was the defining nature of relations between the rulers and the ruled that determined the nation’s social history for centuries and that during the era of modernisation, the idea was constantly contested. On the other hand, Yao (1997:80-1) explicates an example of benevolent paternalism from Mencius’s teaching that describes how when one saw a child was about to fall into a well, one could not help feeling alarmed and compassionate. Yao (ibid.) argues this showed one’s *jen* with the child, a transcendence by compassion. Thus Sun’s paternalistic approach may be an instinct to save the child by feeling unity with the child. The natural impulse is to rescue the child and following this impulse is an act of compassion. It is possible that under the influence of Confucianism, Sun might have extended both kinds of paternalistic love – love for the governed and for the children - toward the people of the nation.

The scope of Chinese identity, which had originated within the narrowly defined geographical centeredness of China, was finally broadened and expanded in terms of the objects of inclusion and its geographical boundary under the influence of Christianity. Accordingly, the exclusionary social prejudice against the overseas Chinese was transformed into an inclusive

acceptance. However, the inclusion of the overseas Chinese also required an active acceptance and empowerment rather than a purely intellectual understanding and tolerance. In effect, *Tongbao* transnational citizenship catalysed an active embrace by empowering overseas Chinese with participatory citizenship. Sun did not merely argue for inclusion of the overseas Chinese but acted upon it by proposing *Tongbao* citizenship and granting them the rights of citizens.

Confucian fraternal love and Christian universal love, which became *Tongbao* inclusion, produced *Tongbao* citizenship through Sun's action of empowering the overseas Chinese with participatory rights. It not only required transcending the narrow confines of the geographically centred Chinese identity, but also transnationally included Chinese people regardless of their ethnic background or political stance. K  ng (1989) comments that both Christianity and Confucianism were challenged to extend their ethical reflections beyond the individual relations and pay closer attention to the social dimension of action.³⁵ For Sun, *Tongbao* inclusion was a way to bring about collective rights and justice for the unity of the Chinese people.

5.3 The *Tongbao* Inclusion and Participatory Citizenship

The concept of *Tongbao* was a linguistic breakthrough in which transnational Chinese identity was conceived based on Christian universal love and Confucian fraternal love, linking the Chinese who had never left their native soil to the *other* who left it: the overseas Chinese. Sun's concept of transnational *Tongbao* inclusion and citizenship offered the overseas Chinese a chance to relinquish their psychological liminality and join the political comradery by transcending the geographical boundaries of native soil for a common political cause. However, Sun's initial task in extending *Tongbao* inclusion to the overseas Chinese was to reconcile the local particularism of the host nations' culture and the particularity of Chinese culture. Being loyal to the motherland and working in the host nation, the overseas Chinese were affected by the qualities of both cultures. In order to overcome the exclusion experienced by the overseas Chinese in their host nations, Sun was convinced that it was crucial to develop an inclusive Chinese identity for the overseas Chinese in order to unite their collective power.

Sun carried out the following process of inclusion for the overseas Chinese. First, Sun reconfirmed the *Tongbao* inclusion by fully acknowledging the necessity of their emigration from China, simultaneously destabilising the fixity of the geographically centred Chinese identity. Second, Sun defied the narrow boundary of the traditional exclusionary Chinese identity by supporting the transnational fluidity of *Tongbao* inclusion. This also recognised the cultural *particularities* of the overseas Chinese, which were based on both Chinese and the host nations' cultures. Third, Sun extended transnational citizenship to the overseas Chinese so that they could participate in building a modern Chinese nation-state. Consequently, the empowered overseas Chinese joined in making the Chinese republic in solidarity through the newly conceived inclusive collective identity regardless of the geographical location of Chinese people as the transnational

Tongbao citizenship helped achieve cultural and political unity among the overseas Chinese. It united the dichotomised Chinese identities since participatory citizenship was based on the autonomy and volition of the actor rather than a passively received identity based on geographical centeredness.

Habermas's (in Habermas and Cooke 1998a) notion of 'national consciousness' provides the cultural basis for solidarity among citizens, and he argues for the necessity of plural identities and differences.³⁶ His argument also corresponds with Sun's praxis to form an all-inclusive Chinese cultural identity that reached beyond geographical confines. Furthermore, Sun's concept of *Tongbao* transnational citizenship catalysed solidarity among Chinese citizens on the basis of political participation. The production of unity through an inclusive cultural identity was a corollary of Sun's reconciliatory approach to Confucian fraternal and Christian universal love. Schwarzmantel (2003) claims that central role of national identity in cementing common citizenship provides the political cohesion necessary for a democratic community, as he argues that "an awareness of shared history and being members of an on-going community with a particular public culture supplies the basis for overarching political identity."³⁷ Likewise, Sun's endowment of participatory citizenship to the overseas Chinese represented the reconciliation of their cultural identity and political autonomy within the concept of *Tongbao* inclusion.

As previously discussed, the essence of the differences between Confucian *jen* and Christian agape is that the former is humanistic and centred on human progress and self-transcendence while the latter is theistic and centred on divine salvation. Humanity is the source of all forms of Confucian *jen*, while God's charity is the source of all forms of Christian agape. However, the message of emancipation is present in both theistic and humanistic inclusion by love, and one of the central tenets of Christianity is that one must treat others as one would like to be

treated oneself in social practice between an individual and other people. Sun was well aware of this because he himself wanted to be included in Chinese common identity; Sun was regarded being not too Chinese by the mainland Chinese, but too Chinese by the overseas Chinese. Sun realised that the ethnic minorities had the same need, and *Tongbao* inclusion was extended equally to all those who participated in the common cause of establishing the Chinese republic. However, regarding the view that Sun was an elite who might have taken advantage of the overseas Chinese for their political and financial support, it is necessary to examine the objective and object of Sun's emancipatory communication. *Tongbao* inclusion and transnational citizenship were conceived for the overseas Chinese so that they could autonomously join as free and equal members.

5.3.1 The *Minzu* Principle (Nationalism) and *Tongbao* Inclusion

The psychological liminality of the overseas Chinese was, as Chan (2005) comments, like the symptom of the stranger's lack of feeling for distance: "He is oscillating between remoteness and intimacy, his hesitation and uncertainty, and his distrust in every matter."³⁸ On the other hand, Chan (ibid.) also argues that the possibility of *translocality* shows that he or she can, in a certain sense, be in more than one place at the same time³⁹; simultaneity is thus a defining characteristic of transnationalism, opening up the possibility of hybridity in geographically oriented identity.

The liminality of the overseas Chinese could be due to their sense of belonging and loyalty to both places - the motherland and the host nation. The prefix 'trans' in 'transnationalism' thus corresponds to some of the characteristics of cosmopolitanism in that it goes beyond loyalty to the boundaries of a place. Sun also conceived of transnational *Tongbao* inclusion by reconciling cosmopolitanism and nationalism. Nationalism often excluded *others* on the basis of the consanguine race and territorial space. *Tongbao* inclusion offered the possibility that ethnic

difference and geographical distance would not undermine the solidarity of the people, emphasising that transnational patriotism could be achieved by voluntary participation. Sun's *Tongbao* inclusion signified that the overseas Chinese finally became autonomous citizens.

Yung Wei (in Sih 1974) emphasises that, although a dedicated nationalist, Sun was not totally anti-foreign since he called for the peoples of the world to help China to realise its goal of national independence.⁴⁰ Sun (1953a) also proposed inviting foreign capital for the development of the Chinese economy: "We must welcome the influx of large scale foreign capital on the largest possible scale, and also must consider the question of attracting foreign scientific forces and highly trained experts to work in our country and train us. Then in the course of the next ten years, we shall create our own powerful large scale industry and shall accumulate technical and scientific knowledge."⁴¹ On the other hand, Tony See Sin Heng (in Lee and Lee, et al. 2011) insists that Sun's emphasis on national unity and the importance of racial and ethnic solidarity also meant that he rejected cosmopolitanism. Heng (ibid.) points out that Sun argued that cosmopolitanism was still inappropriate for China because it lacked national identity.⁴² However, what Sun really meant was that China needed to implement two ideologies in a sequential order; first, achieving a sense of national identity, and then seeking cosmopolitanism for the benefit of modernising China.

Sutherland (2012) argues that in relation to the juxtaposition of nationalism and cosmopolitanism, ethical cosmopolitans tend to emphasise what people have in common, whereas cultural cosmopolitans highlight their diversity.⁴³ However, Harvey's (2009) survey of 'adjectival cosmopolitans', who attempt to reconcile 'respect for local differences with compelling universal principles',⁴⁴ may be the most appropriate to describe the nature of Sun's transnationalism. Harvey's 'adjectival cosmopolitans' are interested in what links territory as a basis for political organisation with the emotional power invested in people's sense of place. On the other hand,

Calhoun (1995) rejects a purely dichotomous view of cosmopolitanism and nationalism, pointing out that the national has never been entirely national, but is instead always embroiled with immanent cosmopolitan orientations, suggesting the possibility of the complementary coexistence of the two. Likewise, the hybrid of nationalism and cosmopolitanism in the form of the transnational patriotism of the overseas Chinese offered the possibility of the two to coexist. Sun led the sociocultural and political components of citizenship to an inclusive patriotism. *Tongbao* transnational inclusion thus symbolised a reconciled nationalism and cosmopolitanism, thereby producing Chinese unity.

Sun initially challenged the usefulness of cosmopolitanism by arguing that the Chinese were not qualified to talk about an internationally oriented ideology. However, Sun did not oppose cosmopolitanism altogether; instead, he favoured a sequential progression wherein cosmopolitanism could be introduced once nationalism had taken a strong foothold among the Chinese people. Sun argued that one could discuss cosmopolitanism only after the coercive power of imperialism was overthrown and individual selfish ambitions had disappeared. Furthermore, *Tongbao* transnational inclusion played a crucial role in mobilising political, economic and social resources across frontiers to form transnational patriotism among the overseas Chinese.

Chan (2005) emphasises that cosmopolitan status means that “one is allowing oneself to be inhabited by the other, while still recognising the other, [and it] thus does not, and should not, absolve [one of] attachments based on locality, because such attachments provide the individual, however cosmopolitan, with a spiritual anchor.”⁴⁵ Sun’s transnational *Tongbao* inclusion was made possible by transcending the confined geographically centred identity based on the proximity to native soil in favour of an all-inclusive Chinese identity. Autonomous and participatory *Tongbao*

citizenship therefore played a pivotal role in consolidating a new Chinese identity; furthermore, Sun's transnational patriotism symbolised his departure from his earlier exclusionary nationalism.

5.3.2 The *Minquan* Principle (Democracy) and *Tongbao* Citizenship

Sun's notion of membership in the new Chinese republic was based on participatory rights rather than passively received entitlements, and the transnational *Tongbao* identity also provided the political cohesion necessary for granting participatory citizenship. Thus *Tongbao* transnational citizenship, a symbol of membership of a newly established Chinese republic, directly defied the narrowly defined citizens' rights that excluded the political participation of the overseas Chinese based on geographical distance. Schwarzmantel (2003) asserts that citizenship should be divorced from nationality because of its inability to maintain itself an open democratic community.⁴⁶ Sun's *Tongbao* transnational citizenship corresponds to this concept because it rejected the exclusionary aspects of Chinese identity and instead accepted the autonomy of the overseas Chinese as long as they were willing to voluntarily contribute to building the Chinese republic. Sun's concept of transnational *Tongbao* citizenship thus opened a new way to political participation for the overseas Chinese.

Sun's concept of participatory citizenship represented the logic of inclusion and expansion of its members rather than exclusion and limiting in the conditions of membership. Consequently, the two separate identities – the passively received identity based on geographical centeredness and the actively achieved identity based on patriotic participation - were reconciled in the form of transnational *Tongbao* citizenship. Furthermore, Sun's concept of participatory *Tongbao* citizenship represented the equality of citizens' rights regardless of geographical distance,

producing collective identity and political consciousness among the overseas Chinese. For Sun, the inclusion of the overseas Chinese demonstrated not only his compassionate will to empower them politically but also his appreciation for their involvement in the process of establishing the Chinese republic.

Tongbao citizenship was also an extension of the *minquan* principle in that both aimed to grant equality and freedom to all Chinese people. In particular, the effect of the *Tongbao* citizenship was the collective power of *huagong* coolie labourers. Sun (1930) argued in the *minquan* principle that the only weapon of non-cooperation [for the labourers] was an absolute refusal to engage in work, and this manifested itself that strikes were much more formidable than the weapons of war. Sun (ibid.) further asserted that, “if the workers made demands of the nation or capitalists which were not granted, the workers could all unite and strike as one man.”⁴⁷ *Tongbao* citizenship thus effectively helped to consolidate collective power among the *huagong* labourers.

Sun’s vision of the membership in the new Chinese republic was based on political participation. Participatory citizenship as a membership of a newly founded republic also directly defied exclusion by occupation or geographical location. Schwarzmantel (2003) emphasises that citizens’ political aim should be to create a bond of civic community in which people feel a sense of identification with the political framework, invoking values of shared citizenship and political equality.⁴⁸ Accordingly, *Tongbao* citizenship inspired transnational patriotism and granted the overseas labourers equal rights in participation for a common political cause.

5.3.3 The *Minsheng* Principle (People's Livelihood) and *Tongbao* Labourer

Transnational *Tongbao* citizenship, in particular, transformed indentured overseas Chinese *huagong* coolie labourers into autonomous citizens and patriots. This helped them overcome the absence of their citizens' rights in the host nations by becoming overseas Chinese citizens. By stressing the importance of the autonomy of overseas citizens regardless of their location and the nature of their occupations, *Tongbao* citizenship was an attempt to provide *huagong* labourers with moral and legal entitlements to participate in the political movement for China's modernisation. For Sun, it was crucial to develop an inclusive identity to consolidate Chinese collective power for the unity of the people.

As transnational inclusion also required a broader collective identity, Sun employed performative citizenship in connection to their labour power. Sun (1930) stressed that labour was an active movement, thus work constituted an element of active citizenship, pointing out that, in order to struggle more effectively, the people had naturally organised themselves and realised the value of organisation. Sun's comment inspired the *huagong* labourers collective consciousness through political awakening as he asserted that "the largest organised bodies in the world today are the labour unions"⁴⁹, encouraging the *huagong* labourers to form unions to oppose inequality in their work conditions. By stressing the importance of labour regardless of the nature of work or geographical location, Sun also proposed moral and legal entitlements to the *huagong* overseas Chinese.

Transnational *Tongbao* citizenship also symbolised the emancipation of indentured coolie labourers from economic exploitation. Recognising collective rights in the host nation through participatory citizenship transformed the *huagong* labourers from mere indentured labourers into autonomous citizens. This, in turn, produced collective citizen power among the overseas Chinese.

Tongbao citizenship hence achieved what the *minsheng* principle strove for: the possibility that the labouring Chinese who were away from their native land to sustain their livelihood, could achieve the same citizen status as Chinese patriots equal to that of the Chinese on Chinese soil. Sun advocated workers' rights by emphasising their collective power, which ultimately helped them achieve citizens' rights by performing their citizen's duties of patriotism. Miller and Rose (2008) aptly illuminate the labourer's a new identity and his autonomy; "Finally, a worker is given a new identity as an active and motivated individual only when he seeks autonomy, control, variety and a sense of worth and his new identity for the worker....."⁵⁰

CONCLUSION

This thesis has explored how Sun's emancipatory communication played a crucial role in establishing the first Chinese republic and modernising China. Sun believed that modern rationality was an essential element for political awareness, arguing that a democratic state belonged to neither any particular social class nor to a monarchy embodying absolute power, but rather to the people. Sun also insisted that an intersubjective understanding of others' hardship was the driving force of human evolution. The primary methodology of Sun's modernisation of China focused on synthesising positive approaches in both Chinese and Western values whilst sustaining social and political attributes particular to Chinese society and history.

Habermas (1984) holds that we are communicatively able to reach mutual understanding because human beings are part of an intersubjective linguistic community. Among the various influences that shaped Sun's reconciliatory approach, it was Western language that awakened Sun to the necessity of inclusive education. Sun was also influenced by the Western style of pedagogy, which introduced him to modern rationality by encouraging an inquisitive mind rather than repetitive memorisation, which was typical of Chinese pedagogy. Reflecting upon the Western linguistic structure, Sun argued for the synchronisation of spoken and written Chinese in order to eliminate the linguistic *othering* of those who were excluded from access to written Chinese communication. Sun understood that national unity required linguistic inclusion and equal access to education, which he believed would serve as catalysts for modern rationality and political awareness among Chinese citizens, both of which he considered prerequisites of a modern nation-state. Sun accordingly urged the literati and scholars to share responsibility for the education of the socially excluded.

Furthermore, Sun's concept of *Tongbao* citizenship demonstrated his determination to include the overseas Chinese by granting them full citizens' rights based on condition that they materially and voluntarily participate by contributing to the development and advancement of the first Chinese republic. In fact, Sun relied upon their financial contributions and he was sympathetic to the sufferings of overseas Chinese for the lack of their legal protection, freedom of mobility and livelihoods in their host nations, making him eager to grant them citizen's rights. Sun also saw an opportunity to draw large numbers of talented and wealthy overseas Chinese. Ideologically, Sun's *Tongbao* inclusion of overseas Chinese was formed by reconciling Confucian fraternal love (closely connected to humanistic collectivism) and Christian universal love (emancipatory theism), and its corollary was the transnational patriotism of the overseas Chinese.

Sun's logic of inclusion had its goal: the unity of the nation. In Confucianism, love for others remained oriented mainly toward familial and national ties; on the other hand, in Christianity, every human being could become his or her neighbour.¹ Through his reconciliation of Confucianism and Christianity, Sun was able to transform the theistic approach to the understanding of human suffering. Consequently, the concept of Confucian love of the family, which had been confined to the geographical boundaries of China, expanded under the influence of Christianity in terms of its object and border by reaching out to enemies and beyond Chinese territory. This humanistic and theistic reconciliation eventually led Sun to include the ethnic Chinese minorities in their host nations as well as in China by promulgating the Five Race Republic.

In order to counter the absolute power of the monarchy and empower Chinese people with citizens' rights, Sun also proposed the Fivefold Constitution, a hybrid of the Western constitutional structure and the Chinese traditional court system. Sun believed the constitution was necessary to balance the power of the state and the rights of the people so that the former would not encroach

upon the freedom of the latter. The Fivefold Constitution also represented a balance between the rights and duties of the people. Habermas (1996a) suggests that constitutional principles cannot become the driving force for creating free and equal persons until they are situated in the historical context of a nation of citizens in such a way that they link up with those citizens' motives and attitudes. Sun believed that the constitution would be also a vehicle for transferring the Chinese people's cultural loyalty from the monarchy and family to the new republic by granting them the participatory citizenship to perform their rights.

However, Sun's emancipatory communication often faced conflicts caused by the binary elements inherent in an ideology or a system, and Sun mainly relied on amalgamating multiple values and systems into hybrids in his reconciliatory praxis. For example, the Five Race Republic, the Fivefold Constitution and *Tongbao* inclusion were the result of reconciling binary concepts, i.e., the naturally or culturally constructed race in propagating nationalism; the individual or collective rights in proposing the constitution; an inclusive or exclusionary function of Chinese identity. However, during the process of amalgamation, Sun's syncretism oftentimes depended upon assimilating or merging the weaker and smaller groups and individuals into more powerful and dominant constituents and collectives, and the consequence was the exclusion of the former in spite of their nominal inclusion. Furthermore, the inclusion of *some* represented the exclusion of the *other*, yet the inclusion of the *other* must be based on the coexistence of both dominant and weaker parties. As a result, Sun's reconciliatory inclusion destabilised the coexistence of diverse constituents through his *coercive* methodology of assimilation. Ironically, Sun's emancipatory communication was originally conceived in opposition to the coercive power of imperialism and despotism.

In the case of the *minzu* principle, Sun's nationalism was confronted by the binary concept of naturally or culturally constructed race when Sun opted to propagate a racially defined nationalism supporting the Han ethnic majority, arguing that the Chinese nation-state be constructed based on consanguine race. Consequently, Sun's emancipatory praxis solely included the ethnic majorities by effectively excluding the ethnic minority groups in his efforts to establish the Chinese modern nation-state. After the revolution, Sun eventually proposed the coexistence of ethnic majorities and minorities after having accepted both naturally inherited and culturally acquired qualities of race when he announced the Five Race Republic.

Sun's initial insistence on the naturally constructed race seems to be closely related to the reason of political efficacy. However, his employment of racially defined nationalism breached the fundamental principles of a modern nation-state as well as his own logic of inclusion, which required the equal rights of all citizens. Sun believed that the collective power of the "naturally produced" ethnic majority Han race could effectively counter the encroachment of foreign imperialism. However, his insistence on naturally constructed race as the sole constituent of the nation negated the culturally formed Chinese identity, which was based on diverse ethnic backgrounds, thus destabilising the coexistence of ethnic majority and minority groups, and ultimately undermining the national unity that Sun strove to achieve.

After the 1911 revolution, Sun shifted to a more racially inclusive Five Race Republic (*wuzu gongheguo*); and in 1925 just before his death, Sun (1925:33) declared, "the government should undertake to render assistance and protection to the ethnic minorities in the country so that they could exercise their right of self-determination and self-government while resisting oppression and invasion from foreign countries." Sun thus finally recognised the importance of symbiotic relations between ethnic majorities and minorities by advocating the autonomy of

various ethnic minority groups, believing that, only all-inclusive citizens' equality and political rights could result in the unity of the people. Similarly, Sun also announced in the *Manifesto of the First National Convention of the KMT* that nationalism advocated both seeking national liberation and promoting equality among the various ethnic groups in China.² In so doing, Sun altered his emancipatory praxis in order to maintain the coexistence of ethnic diversity, which is the principle of inclusion. Sun's action corresponds to Habermas's (1997:262) argument that what unites a nation of citizens as opposed to a *Volksnation* was not some primordial substrate but rather 'an intersubjectively shared context of understanding' among the citizens.

With regard to his *minquan* principle, Sun also faced the challenge of balancing between individual and collective rights concerning constitutionalism. Sun argued mainly for the collective rights and the empowerment of the state over the rights of the individual citizens, and his subsequent imposition of military force against opposition and reliance on political tutelage threatened the constitutionalism he embraced. However, the reason Sun originally advocated constitutionalism was to ensure and protect citizens' rights, devolving from the absolute power long imposed by the Qing monarchy. Nevertheless, in the process of supporting collective rights, individual rights were negated: this was particularly salient when Sun promulgated the three-phase national reconstruction program, consisting of military operation and political tutelage prior to the constitutional government, and his emancipatory praxis breached the principle of individual rights and freedom. The resulting political consequences were antithetical to the constitutionalism upon which the Chinese republic was to be established.

Sun argued that the individuals in China had to give up their freedom if Chinese society was to become a strong and unified nation. In his judgment, individual freedom represented an impediment to national unity because he firmly believed that China required the system of

government, discipline, loyalty, and disposition among its citizens by sacrificing themselves for the sake of the nation. Sun further insisted that Chinese people had enjoyed historically an excessive level of individual liberty, which had fostered an absence of national unity. Accordingly, Sun urged his revolutionary comrades to sacrifice their personal freedom. However, the principle of constitutionalism does not advocate the power of the state to supersede individual rights; on the contrary, constitutionalism allows both individual rights and state power to coexist, which is also the condition of a modern nation-state. Habermas (1996a:496) points out that [within the constitution] each and every person should receive equal protection and equal respect in their integrity as irreplaceable individuals, and as members of the political community. Sun's argument for the sole collective rights was again antithetical to constitutionalism and the principles of the modern, democratic nation-state that he had originally envisioned.

With his *minsheng* principle, Sun was similarly challenged by the conflict between an ideal economic principle based on traditional moral obligation and a pragmatic methodology of material economy in bettering the livelihood of the people. Sun's proposal of a land equalisation program was based on the government's purchase of land at market value for redistribution, and it was based on the conflation of two very different economic systems: market economy and centrally controlled economy. While Sun's proposal reflected the traditional Chinese ideology of communal cooperation for economic harmony, it rejected the Soviet style of coercive nationalisation, in which confiscated land from landlords would be redistributed amongst the peasants. Sun's *minsheng* plan was mainly intended to realise the Confucian ideology of *datong* utopia with communal production and equal distribution; therefore, it was not land nationalisation.

However, Sun's pursuit of communalism was ultimately challenged by the economic conflict concerning private land ownership. He returned to the power of rhetoric to summon

support for the state's programmes in the imperative of economic harmony on terms that the state would deem morally compelling. Sun denied the class conflict as described by Marx and selectively borrowed elements of capitalism, particularly individualised profit incentives and private land ownership. However, the pre-modern economy that was China's political-economic legacy served to constrain Sun's role in a radical transformation. His government could have implemented a specific economic plan after an intellectual analysis of the cause of class struggle to help mitigate the most negative effects that would result from even modest economic development, rather than negating it outright.

Most of all, Sun's conflict concerning his emancipatory praxis was closely related to the nature of his pedagogical role even though Sun's modern rationality was initially inspired by the linguistic inclusion of Western pedagogy. Sun needed to shift his role from tutoring the politically inchoate citizens at the early stages of a modern nation-state to abdicating his authority to the growing autonomy of the people. However, Sun's pedagogical character combined with his paternalistic elitism continued to govern China's political modernisation rather than carefully nurturing the growth of the people's autonomy.

Moreover, in calling for national stability and social justice, Sun classified people into three categories: leaders or innovators, transmitters or disciples, and performers. Sun reconfirmed his pedagogical role by putting himself in the first category, the political party in the second, and the people in the third group.³ It demonstrated that Sun's paternalistic elitism was deeply rooted in his motive to emancipate the people; at the same time, his belief that "people may be made to follow, but may not be made to understand"⁴ also represented the remnants of his unreconciled notion of the traditional Confucian class hierarchy that negated the autonomy of the people.

Consequently, the juxtaposition of growing need of autonomy for Chinese citizens and Sun's adherence to pedagogical guidance caused an internal conflict within Sun's emancipatory communication. The absolute power of the republican government returned to failed aspects of monarchical despotism characteristic of the Qing government that Sun's emancipatory communication had overturned. The Confucian hierarchical relationship between the superiority of those who govern (elites) and the inferiority of the governed (the masses) therefore had a divisive effect on the social, economic and political aspects of the people. It allowed government power to supersede the rights of individual citizens and to undermine the principle of constitutionalism, which was intended to maintain a balance between the power of the government and the rights of the people.

Habermas (1989) claims that the advent of a modern stage of social order is brought about by the argumentative account of ideologies as well as by the appeal to universal norms and principles based on science. Sun also emphasised the role of print media and universal education to encourage modern rationality, regarding public opinion and enhanced political awareness of the citizenry as necessary attributes of a modern nation-state. However, Sun's insistence on his pedagogical role served to impede both political autonomy and the formation of a modern rationality amongst the people. Citizens were implicitly discouraged from debates and denied a role in forming autonomous public opinion. Instead, Sun asserted that public opinion should be formed and disseminated based upon state-determined priorities consistent with the objective of national unity. Accordingly, the media were discouraged of playing an independent role in forming public opinion as Sun openly stressed the media to assume a pedagogical responsibility in consolidating public opinion supporting the government in the interest of fostering national unity. Sun held a paternalistic regard for the role of the media in society as well.

However, public opinion was to form autonomously through the independent formation of the citizens' awareness and rationality through public debates and arguments, free from the intervention of the political tutelage of the government. Consequently, despite Sun's argument for the logic of inclusion and modern rationality, Sun's role in the production of public opinion impeded the autonomy of the press and delayed the people's political awareness. Instead, Sun's pedagogical role combined with paternalistic elitism commanded hierarchy and loyalty. Consequently, it undermined China's political modernisation. Sun's emancipatory communication brought forth the first Chinese republic, yet the process of transforming China into a modern nation-state still continued.

NOTES

Introduction

1. Hsü, I. C. Y., 2000:223-4
2. Wong J., 2002
3. De Bary, 2008:629-77
4. Perry, 2002:33
5. Schiffrin, 1980:13. Agriculture in Sun's rocky and sandy hometown was limited, thus, Sun's father Ta-cheng also worked in Macao to make some extra income to support his family as he had no more than half an acre to farm.
6. Chen and Payne, 1946:11-12. The SS *Grannoch*, a British ship of two thousand tons, sailed from Macao to Honolulu with the usual cargo of indentured Chinese coolie labourers for the sugar plantations in Hawaii.
7. Rigby, 1980:6
8. Sharman, 1968:21. Iolani was founded mainly for Hawaiian and part Hawaiian young pupils also accepted a limited number of Chinese.
9. Chong, 2010:64.
10. Martin, 1970:22
11. Judge, 1996:146
12. Hsü, I. C. Y., 2000:223
13. Rowe, 2009:150
14. Bunnin, 2002
15. Sun, 1953a:143
16. Chong, 2010:78
17. Dikötter, 1992:13. The Chinese discovered Europeans in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries with the same apprehension with which the Europeans encountered blacks during their exploration of Africa.
18. Callinicos, 1994:1-4
19. Duara, 1995:139
20. Linebarger, 1937:39

21. Gellner, 1983
22. Wang, 1991a: 6
23. Yan, 1976 xxi
24. Wang and Hutters, 2011:51
25. Judge 1996:144
26. Jenco, 2010:31
27. Fairbank, J. K. and M. Goldman, 2006:259
28. Fairbank, J. K. and M. Goldman 2006:251. Song Jiaoren was a republican revolutionary, political leader and a founder of the Kuomintang together with Sun. In March 1913, Yuan had him assassinated and then went on to intimidate and abolish the parliament.
29. Hsü, I. C. Y., 2000:482. Yan suddenly died of uraemia on June 6, 1916 at the age of fifty six.
30. Sun, 1925:1
31. Sun, 2010
32. Sun, 1940
33. Sun, 2012
34. Sun, 1930:ix
35. Ritzer and Barry, 2001:4
36. Sharman 1968:100. *Minpao* (民报, People's Paper) had two editors – Hu Hanmin, a member of the Nanking Government of 1928, and Wang Ching-wei, a peculiarly persuasive radical – and it always had a following among the young Chinese students in Japan.
37. Sun, 1930:ix-x
38. Linebarger, 1937:11-2

Chapter I

1. Sun, 1930:3
2. Sun, 1953a:40
3. Sun, 1994:126
4. Sun 1953a:38

5. My translation from *Jianguo Fanglue*: 抑歐洲文字基於音韻，音韻即表言語，言語有變，文字即可隨之 (Sun 2010:23)
6. My translation from *Jianguo Fanglue*: 泰西各國皆有文法之學，各以本國言語文字而成書，為初學必由之徑 (Sun 2010:24)
7. My translation from *Jianguo Fanglue*: 中国向无文法之学，故学作文者非多用功于咿唔咕哝，熟读前人之文章，而尽得其格调，不能下笔为文也。故通者则全通，而不通者虽十年窗下，仍有不能联词造句以成文，殆无造就深浅之别也) (Sun 2010:24)
8. Sun, 1953a:43-4
9. Sun 1930:135
10. Sun, 1994:126
11. Sun, 1953a:40
12. My translation from *Jianguo Fanglue*: 至其窮無所遁，乃以“神而明之，存乎其人”自解，謂非無學而何? (Sun 2010:23-4)
13. My translation from *Jianguo Fanglue*: 夫学者贵知其当然与所以然，若偶能然，不得谓为学也 (Sun 2010:24)
14. My translation from *Jianguo Fanglue*: 故學童之造就無論深淺，而執筆為文，則深者能深，淺者能淺，無不達意，鮮有不通之弊也 (Sun 2010:24)
15. Sun, 1930:59-60
16. My translation from *Jianguo Fanglue*: 以無文法之學，故不能率由捷徑以達速成，此猶渡水之無津梁舟楫，必當繞百十倍之道路也 (Sun 2010:24)
17. My translation from *Jianguo Fanglue*: 然既通曉作文，又何所用乎文法？是猶已繞道而渡水矣，更何事乎津梁？ (Sun 2010:24)
18. My translation from *Jianguo Fanglue*: 夫有文法以規正言語，使全國習為普通知識，則由言語以知文法，由文法而進窺古人之文章，則升堂入室，有如反掌，而言文一致亦可由此而恢復也 (Sun 2010:24)

19. My translation from *Jianguo Fanglue*: 而其范围尤小，更不足以括逻辑矣 (Sun 2010:25)
20. My translation from *Jianguo Fanglue*: 文理為何？即西人之邏輯也。作者于此姑偶用“文理”二字以翻邏輯者，非以此為適當也，乃以邏輯之施用于文章者，即為文理而已 (Sun 2010:24)
21. My translation from *Jianguo Fanglue*: 至於嚴又陵氏所翻之《名學》，則更為遼東白豕也。夫名學者，乃“那曼尼利森”也，而非“邏輯”也。此學為歐洲中世紀時理學二大思潮之一，其他之一名曰“實學” (Sun 2010:25)
22. Sun, 1897:133
23. Sun, 1897:89
24. Sun, 1897:94
25. Sun 1897:90
26. Sun, 1994:40
27. Sun, 1994:70
28. Judge, 1996:79
29. Sun, 1994:258-9
30. Judge, 1996:4
31. Sun, 1994:55-6
32. Strand, 2011:246
33. Sun, 1994:258
34. Sun, 1994:73
35. Sun, 1994:74
36. Reed, 2004:270
37. Judge, 1996:144-5
38. Sun, 1994:74
39. Sun, 1994:70-1

40. Sun, 1994:57
41. Culp, 2007:116
42. Culp, 2007:65
43. Sun, 1994:70-1
44. Judge 1996:69
45. Lean 2007:7
46. Sun, 1994:73-4
47. Nathan 1976:140
48. Sun, 1994:71
49. Strand, 2011:240
50. Sun, 1994:42
51. Sun, 1994:78-79
52. Sun, 1994:130
53. Sun, 1994:260
54. Sun, 1994:267
55. Sun, 1994:79-81
56. Sun, 1994:103
57. Strand, 2011:242–3
58. Sun, 1994:35-6
59. Sun, 1925:34
60. Chang and Gordon, 1991:25
61. Sun, 1927b:126
62. Sun, 1994:212
63. Sun, 1927b:110

Chapter II

1. Sun, 1930:5-6
2. Sun, 1930:4
3. Leibold, 2007
4. Leibold 2007:8
5. Sun, 1930:9
6. Sun, 1930:8
7. Sun, 1927b:26
8. Sun, 1927b:32
9. Sun, 1994:26
10. Sun, 1930:67
11. Dikötter, 2011
12. Sun, 1994:85
13. Duara in Unger 1996
14. Sun, 1930:22
15. Sun, 1930:32
16. Sun, 1930:22
17. Sun, 1930:27
18. Sun, 1953a:73
19. Sun, 1930:32
20. Sun, 1930:17
21. Duara in Unger, 1996:41-2
22. Chang, 1987
23. Sun, 1994:252
24. Sun, 1930:126
25. Sun, 1930:127

26. Sun, 1930: 126-7
27. Sun, 1930:4
28. Sun, 1930:127
29. Sun, 1930:124
30. Sun, 1994:223
31. Sun, 1930:115
32. Sun, 1930:118
33. Sun, 1994:225
34. Sun, 1925:33
35. Sun, 1994:224

Chapter III

1. Legge Vol. I: 161
2. Sun, 1930:126
3. Sun, 1930:65-6
4. Sun, 1930:318
5. Legge Vol. I: 256
6. Porter in Wakeman, Esherick, et al. 2006: 213–4
7. Sun, 1930:127-8
8. Sun, 1930:318
9. Sun, 1930:84
10. Yeh, 2000
11. Huang, 1972:91
12. Sun, 1930:152-3
13. Ogden, 2002:64
14. Judge, 1996:94
15. Sun, 1994:253

16. Chang, 1971:260
17. Sun, 1930:84
18. Sun, 1994:253
19. Sun, 1927a:85–6
20. Angle and Svensson, 2001:10-11
21. Jenco, 2010:23
22. Sun, 1994:57
23. Sun, 1927a:76
24. Sun, 1927a:65
25. Angle and Svensson, 2001:13
26. Jenco, 2010:27
27. Sun, 1930:239-40
28. Sun, 1927a:48
29. in Gowan and Anderson 1997:262
30. Sun, 1953a:181
31. Sun, 1953a:110
32. Sun, 1930:278
33. Sun, 1927a:82
34. Sun, 1927b:132
35. Sun, 1930:288
36. Angle and Svensson, 2001
37. Weatherley, 2014:28
38. Chang and Gordon, 1991:45
39. Harrison, 2000:76

40. My translation from *sanmin zhuyi*: 但是这种普通选举，只限于男人才能够享受，至于女子，在一二十年前还是没有这种普通选举权。欧美近二十年以来，女子争选举权的风潮非常激烈 (Sun, 2012:117-8)
41. Ogden, 2002:64-5
42. My translation from *sanmin zhuyi*: 是由于当欧战的时候男子通同去当兵，效力战场，在国内的许多事业没有男人去做。像兵工厂内的职员、散工，街上电车内的司机、卖票，和后方一切勤务事宜，男子不敷分配，都是靠女子去补充。所以以前反对女子选举权的人，说女子不能做男子事业，到了那个时候便无法证明，便不敢反对，主张女子有选举权的人才完全占胜利 (Sun, 2012:117-8)
43. Schoppa, 2006:164-7
44. Angle and Svensson, 2001: xxii
45. My translation from *Guofu Quanji*: 今諸君發起此校，誠得要務，因中國女子雖有二萬萬，為於教育一道，向來多不注意，故有學問者甚少。處於今日，自應以提倡女子教育為最要之事 (Sun, 1989 vol. 3:49)
46. Judge, 1996:106
47. My translation from *Guofu Quanji*: 女子教育，所以增進女子知識，發達女權 (Sun, 1989 vol. 2:41)
48. My translation from *Guofu Quanji*: 今日女界宜專由女子發起女子之團體，提倡教育，使女界知識普及，力量乃宏，然後始可與男子爭權，則必能得勝也，未知諸君以為然否？更有一言奉獻，切勿依賴男子代為出力，方不為男子所利用也 (Sun, 1989 vol. 4:260)
49. My translation from *Guofu Quanji*: 厲行教育普及，以全力發展兒童本位之教育，整理學制系統，增高教育經費，並保障其獨立 (Sun, 1989 vol. 2:139)
50. Schoppa, 2006:124
51. Butler, 1990:25
52. Sun, 1925:33

53. Sun, 1925:34
54. Sun, 1927a:76
55. Sun, 1925:34
56. Angle and Svensson, 2001:130
57. Fitzgerald, 1996:323
58. Sun, 1927b:133-4
59. Jenco, 2010: 97

Chapter IV

1. Feng, 1960:17-8.
2. Sun, 1930:455
3. Sun, 1930:427
4. Sun, 1930:429
5. Sun, 1994:7
6. Sun, 1953:131
7. Hsü 2000:223. The grain price was estimated to have dropped by about one-half between the years of 1815 and 1850, which put more pressure to the livelihood of the farmers.
8. Bernhardt, 1992:47
9. Sun, 1930:504
10. Sun, 1994:271
11. Bernhardt, 1992:43
12. Tribe, 1978:58
13. De Bary, 2008:196
14. Levenson, 1964:82
15. De Bary, 2008:80
16. Sun, 1930:223
17. Lin, 1997: 137

18. Sun, 1930:457
19. Cohen, 1984:23
20. Judge, 1996:123
21. Ogden, S. 2002:44
22. De Bary, 2008:197
23. Hsü, 2000:61
24. Judge, 1996:149
25. Sun, 1930:384
26. Sun, 1930:436
27. Sun, 1930:456
28. Sun, 1994:269
29. Sun, 1930:431
30. Sun, 1930:431-2
31. Sun, 1930:391
32. Sun, 1930:391
33. Sun, 1930:434
34. Wang, S. 1981:32
35. Sun, 1930:477
36. Sun, 1930:427
37. Sun, 1930:456
38. Rowe, 2009:96
39. Sun, 1930:409
40. Allen in Sih 1974
41. Sun, 1930:391
42. Sun, 1994:66
43. Sun, 1930:444
44. Allen in Sih 1974:150

45. Sun 1930:431
46. Sun, 1930:444
47. Sun, 1930:428
48. Sun, 1930:435
49. Sun, 1930:478
50. Sun, 1930:431
51. Sun, 1930:429
52. Hou in Sih 1974:112
53. Sun, 1930:430
54. Sun, 1930:111
55. Sun, 1930:390
56. Sun, 1930:125

Chapter V

1. Sun, 1927b:166
2. Sun, 1927b:166
3. Yan, 1985:xiv
4. Barnes, 2005:215
5. Sun, 1994:125
6. Yan, 1976: xxiv
7. Wang 1991:8
8. Sun, 1994:125
9. Sun, 1994:260
10. Chong, 2010:78
11. Judge, 1996:19
12. Sun, 1930: 129
13. Hillier, S. and J Jewell, 2005:17

14. Chong, 2010:79
15. Constable in Bays 1996:158
16. Wang in Lee and Lee et al. 2011:13
17. Sun, 1994:88-89
18. Chang and Gordon, 1991
19. Sun, 1994:81
20. Ching in Kung 1989:86
21. Nyiri and Saveliev, 2002:210
22. Yao, 1997: 66
23. Xu in Bell and Nathan, 2001
24. Ching in Kung 1989:69
25. Sun, 1994:81-82
26. Wang in Lee and Lee, 2011:13-4
27. Sun, 1994:82
28. Yao, 1997:196-7
29. Yao, 1997:200
30. Sun, 1930:128
31. Kung, 1989:118
32. Yao, 1997:208-9
33. Kung, 1989:113
34. Sun, 1930:129
35. Kung, 1989:120
36. Habermas and Cooke, 1998a:100
37. Schwarzmantel, 2003:86
38. Chan, 2005:9
39. Chan, 2005:1
40. in Sih 1974:68

41. Sun, 1953a:133
42. in Lee and Lee, et al. 2011:35
43. Sutherland, 2012:11
44. Harvey, 2009:114
45. Chan, 2005:13
46. Schwarzmantel, 2003:87
47. Sun, 1930:239-40
48. Schwarzmantel, 2003:87
49. Sun, 1930:239
50. Miller and Rose, 2008:186

Conclusion

1. Yao, 1997
2. Sun, 1925:38-50
3. Schiffrin, 1980:195
4. Schiffrin, 1980:196. It is originally quoted from the Analects 12.19

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(1957). Dr. Sun Yat-sen: commemorative articles and speeches by Mao Tse-tung, Soong Ching Ling, Chou En-lai and others. Peking, Foreign Languages Press.

Anderson, B. R. O. G. (1998). The spectre of comparisons: nationalism, Southeast Asia, and the world. New York, Verso.

Anderson, B. R. O. G. (2006). Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism. London; New York; Verso.

Angle, S. C. and M. Svensson (2001). The Chinese human rights reader: documents and commentary, 1900-2000. Armonk, N.Y., M.E. Sharpe.

Anschel, E. (1984). Homer Lea, Sun Yat-sen, and the Chinese revolution. New York, Praeger.

Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Avineri, S. and A. De-Shalit (1992). Communitarianism and individualism. Oxford England; New York, Oxford University Press.

Balakrishnan, G. (1996). Mapping the nation. London, Verso.

Banton, M. (1977). The idea of race. London, Tavistock Publications.

Banton, M. (1983). Racial and ethnic competition. New York, Cambridge University Press.

Banton, M. (1987). Racial theories. Cambridge Cambridgeshire; New York, NY, USA, Cambridge University Press.

Banton, M. (1988). Racial consciousness. London; New York, Longman.

Barnes, L. L. (2005). Needles, herbs, gods, and ghosts: China, healing, and the West to 1848. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

Barry, B. (2001). Culture and equality: an egalitarian critique of multiculturalism. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

Baumler, A. (2001). Modern China and opium: a reader. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.

Bays, D. H. (1996). Christianity in China: from the eighteenth century to the present. Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press.

Bello, D. A. (2005). Opium and the limits of empire: drug prohibition in the Chinese interior, 1729-1850. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Asia Center: Distributed by Harvard University Press.

- Bennett, T. and J. Frow (2008). The SAGE handbook of cultural analysis. Los Angeles; London, SAGE.
- Benton, G. (2007). Chinese migrants and internationalism: forgotten histories, 1917-1945. London; New York, Routledge.
- Berg, M. and S. Wendt (2011). Racism in the modern world: historical perspectives on cultural transfer and adaptation. New York, Berghahn Books.
- Bergère, M.-C. (2010). Shanghai: China's gateway to modernity. Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press.
- Bergère, M. C. and J. Lloyd (1998). Sun yat-sen, Stanford Univ Pr.
- Bernhardt, K. (1992). Rents, taxes, and peasant resistance: the lower Yangzi region, 1840-1950. Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press.
- Bernhardt, K., P. C. Huang, et al. (1994). Civil law in Qing and Republican China. Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press.
- Bidet, J. (2007). Exploring Marx's Capital: philosophical, economic and political dimensions. Leiden; Boston, Brill.
- Boas, F. (1982). Race, language, and culture. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Bol, P. K. (2008). Neo-confucianism in history. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Asia Center : Distributed by Harvard University Press.
- Bolton, K. (2003). Chinese English: a sociolinguistic history. Cambridge, UK; New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Bottomore, T. B. (1992). Between marginalism and Marxism: the economic sociology of J.A. Schumpeter. St. Martin's Press; New York
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. and J. B. Thompson (1991). Language and symbolic power. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- Briggs, A. and P. Burke (2009). A social history of the media: from Gutenberg to the Internet. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA, Polity.
- Brødsgaard, K. E. and D. Strand (1998). Reconstructing twentieth-century China: state control, civil society, and national identity. Oxford New York, Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press.

- Brokaw, C. J. (2007). Commerce in culture: the Sibao book trade in the Qing and Republican periods. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Asia Center: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Bunnin, N., Ed. (2002). Contemporary Chinese philosophy. Malden, Mass., Blackwell Publishers.
- Bunnin, N. and J. Yu (2004). The Blackwell dictionary of Western philosophy. Malden, MA, Blackwell Pub.
- Butler, J. (1990). Gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity. New York, Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1997). Excitable speech: a politics of the performative. New York, Routledge.
- Calhoun, C. J. (1992). Habermas and the public sphere. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.
- Calhoun, C. J. (1995). Critical social theory: culture, history, and the challenge of difference. Oxford, UK; Cambridge, Mass., Blackwell Pub.
- Callinicos, A. (1994). Marxism and the new imperialism. London; Chicago, Bookmarks.
- Callinicos, A. (2004). Making history: agency, structure, and change in social theory. Leiden; Boston, Brill.
- Callinicos, A. (2009). Imperialism and global political economy. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA, Polity Press.
- Cantlie, J. and C. S. Jones (1912). Sun Yat Sen and the awakening of China. New York, Chicago etc., Fleming H. Revell Company.
- Cervetto, Arrigo (2013). Lenin and the Chinese Revolution. Montreuil-sous-Bois, Editions Science Marxiste.
- Chan, A. K. and S. Tan (2004). Filial piety in Chinese thought and history, Routledge.
- Chan, K. B. (2005). Chinese identities, ethnicity and cosmopolitanism. London; New York, Routledge.
- Chan, W. K. K. (1977). Merchants, mandarins, and modern enterprise in late Ch'ing China. Cambridge, East Asian Research Center, Harvard University: distributed by Harvard University Press.
- Chang, H. (1971). Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and intellectual transition in China, 1890-1907. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- Chang, H. (1987). Chinese intellectuals in crisis: search for order and meaning (1890-1911). Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Chang, H.-H. and L. H. D. Gordon (1991). All under heaven--: Sun Yat-sen and his revolutionary

thought. Stanford, Calif., Hoover Institution Press.

Chang, H.-H. and L. H. D. Gordon (1998). Bibliography of Sun Yat-sen in China's republican revolution, 1885-1925. Lanham, Md., University Press of America.

Chang, K. (1988). Political and social changes in Taiwan and mainland China. Taipei, Taiwan: Institute of International Relations, National Chengchi University

Chen, S. and R. Payne (1946). Sun Yat-sen, a portrait. New York,, The John Day Company.

Ching, Julia. (1977). Confucianism and Christianity: a comparative study. Tokyo. Kodansha

Chiu, M (1986). Mind, body, and illness in a Chinese medical tradition. Harvard University, U.M.I. Dissertation Information Service

Chong, K. R. (2010). Sun Yat-Sen and the West: western influence on his life and thought. Lewiston, N.Y., Edwin Mellen Press.

Chung-kuo chin tai shih ts'ung shu pien hsieh tsu. (1976). The Revolution of 1911. Peking, Foreign Languages Press.

Cohen, G. A. (1988). History, labour, and freedom: themes from Marx. Oxford New York, Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press.

Cohen, P. A. (2003). China unbound: evolving perspectives on the Chinese past. London; New York, Routledge Curzon.

Cook, D. (2004). Adorno, Habermas, and the search for a rational society. London; New York, Routledge.

Cooke, M. (1994). Language and reason: a study of Habermas's pragmatics. Cambridge, Mass, MIT Press.

Crossley, P. K. (1999). A translucent mirror: history and identity in Qing imperial ideology. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Crossley, P. K., H. F. Siu, et al. (2006). Empire at the margins: culture, ethnicity, and frontier in early modern China. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Culp, R. J. (2007). Articulating citizenship: civic education and student politics in Southeastern China, 1912-1940. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Asia Center

Daruvala, S. (2000). Zhou Zuoren and an alternative Chinese response to modernity. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

De Bary, W. T. (1988). East Asian civilizations: a dialogue in five stages. Cambridge, Mass.,

Harvard University Press.

De Bary, W. T. (1991). The trouble with Confucianism. Cambridge, Mass.; London, England, Harvard University Press.

De Bary, W. T. (2008). Sources of East Asian tradition. New York, Columbia University Press.

De Bary, W. T., I. Bloom, et al. (1999). Sources of Chinese tradition. New York, Columbia University Press.

DeFrancis, J. (1972). Nationalism and language reform in China. New York, Octagon Books.

DeFrancis, J. (1989). Visible speech: the diverse oneness of writing systems. Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press.

Dennerline, J. (1981). The Chia-ting loyalists: Confucian leadership and social change in seventeenth-century China. New Haven, Yale University Press.

Dijk, T. A. v. (1993). Elite discourse and racism. Newbury Park, Calif., Sage Publications.

Dikötter, F. (2011). Racism in the modern world: historical perspectives on cultural transfer and adaptation. M. Berg and S. Wendt. New York, Berghahn Books:

Dikötter, F. (1992). The discourse of race in modern China. London, C. Hurst & Co.

Dikötter, F. (2008). The age of openness: China before Mao. Berkeley, University of California Press.

DiMaggio, Paul (2010). Art in the lives of immigrant communities in the United States. New Brunswick, N.J., Rutgers University Press

Dirlik, A. (1978). Revolution and history: the origins of Marxist historiography in China, 1919-1937. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Douw, L., C. Huang, et al. (1999). Qiaoxiang ties: interdisciplinary approaches to 'cultural capitalism' in South China. London, Kegan Paul International in association with International Institute for Asian Studies.

Duara, P. (1988). Culture, power, and the state: rural North China, 1900-1942. Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press.

Duara, P. (1997). "Nationalists among transnationals: overseas Chinese and the idea of China, 1900–1911." Ungrounded empires: The cultural politics of modern Chinese transnationalism: 39-60.

Duara, P. (1995). Rescuing history from the nation: questioning narratives of modern China. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Ebrey, P. B. (2010). The Cambridge illustrated history of China. Cambridge; New York, Cambridge University Press.

Elliott, M. C. (2001). The Manchu way; the eight banners and ethnic identity in late imperial China. Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press.

Elman, B.A. (1984). From philosophy to philology: intellectual and social aspects of change in late imperial China. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University.

Elster, J. (1985). Making sense of Marx. Cambridge Cambridgeshire; New York Paris, Cambridge University Press.

Elster, J. (1986). An introduction to Karl Marx. Cambridge Cambridgeshire; New York, Cambridge University Press.

Esherick, J., H. Kayal*, et al. (2006). Empire to nation: historical perspectives on the making of the modern world. Lanham, Md., Rowman & Littlefield.

Esherick, J., M. B. Rankin, et al. (1990). Chinese local elites and patterns of dominance. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Etō, S. and H. Z. Schiffrin (1984). The 1911 Revolution in China: interpretive essays. Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press.

Fairbank, J. K. (1986). The great Chinese revolution, 1800-1985. New York, Harper & Row.

Fairbank, J. K. and M. Goldman (2006). China: A new history, Harvard University Press.

Fairbank, J. K., K.-C. Liu, et al. (1980). Late Ch'ing, 1800-1911. The Cambridge History of China Vol 11, Pt 2. New York, Cambridge University Press.

Feng, Y. and D. Bodde (1960). A short history of Chinese philosophy. New York, Macmillan.

Fei, X., G. G. Hamilton, et al. (1992). From the soil, the foundations of Chinese society: a translation of Fei Xiaotong's Xiangtu Zhongguo, with an introduction and epilogue. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Fitzgerald, J. (1996). Awakening China: Politics, culture, and class in the nationalist revolution, Stanford Univ Press.

Fogel, J. A. and P. G. Zarrow (1997). Imagining the people: Chinese intellectuals and the concept of citizenship, 1890-1920. Armonk, N.Y., M.E. Sharpe.

Garnham, N. (2000). Emancipation, the media, and modernity: arguments about the media and social theory. Oxford; New York, Oxford University Press.

Gasster, M. (1969). Chinese intellectuals and the revolution of 1911; the birth of modern Chinese radicalism. Seattle, University of Washington Press.

Geertz, C. (2000). Available light: anthropological reflections on philosophical topics. Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.

Gellner, E. (1983). Nations and nationalism. Oxford, Blackwell.

Gellner, E. (1988). Plough, sword and book: the structure of human history. London, Collins Harvill.

Godley, M. R. (1981). The Mandarin-capitalists from Nanyang: overseas Chinese enterprise in the modernization of China, 1893-1911. Cambridge Eng.; New York, Cambridge University Press.

Goldman, M. and L. O.-f. Lee (2002). An intellectual history of modern China. New York, Cambridge University Press.

Goldman, M. and E. J. Perry (2002). Changing meanings of citizenship in modern China. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

Goode, L. (2005). Jürgen Habermas: democracy and the public sphere. London; Ann Arbor, MI, Pluto Press.

Gould, C. and P. Paquino (2001). Cultural identity and the nation-state. Lanham, Md., Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Gowan, P. and P. Anderson (1997). The question of Europe. London; New York, Verso.

Gregor, A. J., M. H. Chang, et al. (1983). Essays on Sun Yat-sen and the economic development of Taiwan. Baltimore, Md., School of Law, University of Maryland.

Gregor, A. J. (2000). A place in the sun: Marxism and Fascism in China's long revolution. Boulder, Colo., Westview Press.

Habermas, J. r. (1984). The theory of communicative action. Boston, Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1987). "The idea of the theory of knowledge as social theory." Knowledge & Human Interest.

Habermas, J. (1989). The structural transformation of the public sphere: an inquiry into a category of Bourgeois society. Cambridge, Mass. Cambridge, England, MIT Press; Polity Press.

Habermas, J. (1993). Citizenship and National Identity. The Condition of citizenship. B. v. Steenbergen. London; Thousand Oaks, Calif., Sage: vii, 180 p.

Habermas, J. r. (1996a). Between facts and norms: contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (1996b). The European Nation-State. Mapping the Nation. G. Balakrishnan. London; Verso.

Habermas, J. (1997). Reply to Grimm. The Questions of Europe. Gowan, P. and P. Anderson (1997). London; New York, Verso.

Habermas, J. r. and M. Cooke (1998a). On the pragmatics of communication. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.

Habermas, J. r., C. Cronin, et al. (1998b). The inclusion of the other: studies in political theory. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.

Habermas, J. r. (2001). On the pragmatics of social interaction: preliminary studies in the theory of communicative action. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.

Hao, Y.-p. (1970). The comprador in nineteenth century China: bridge between East and West. Cambridge,, Harvard University Press.

Harrison, H. (2000). The making of the Republican citizen: political ceremonies and symbols in China, 1911-1929. Oxford; New York, Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D. (2009). Cosmopolitanism and the geographies of freedom. New York, Columbia University Press.

He, P. (2002). China's search for modernity: cultural discourse in the late 20th century. Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York, Palgrave MacMillan in association with St. Anthony's College, Oxford.

Heller, M. (2007). Bilingualism: a social approach. Basingstoke England; New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

Hewlett, N. (2007). Badiou, Balibar, Rancière: rethinking emancipation. London; New York, Continuum International Pub. Group.

Hillier, S. M. and J. A. Jewell (2005). Health care and traditional medicine in China, 1800-1982. London, Routledge.

Hsu, L. S. and Z. Sun (1933). Sun Yat-sen, His Political and Social Ideals: A Source Book, University of Southern California Press.

Hsü, I. C. Y. (2000). The rise of modern China. New York, Oxford University Press.

Hu Chang-Tu. and Hsiao Hsia. (1960). China: its people, its society, its culture.

- Huang, P. C. (1972). Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and modern Chinese liberalism. Seattle,, University of Washington Press.
- Isin, E. F. and G. M. Nielsen (2008). Acts of citizenship. London; New York, Zed Books Ltd. ;
- Jacobs, R. N. and E. R. Townsley (2011). The space of opinion: media intellectuals and the public sphere. New York, Oxford University Press, USA.
- Janoski, T. (1998). Citizenship and civil society: a framework of rights and obligations in liberal, traditional, and social democratic regimes. Cambridge, U.K.; New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Jansen, M. B. (1970). The Japanese and Sun Yat-sen, Stanford University Press.
- Jenco, L. (2010). Making the Political: Founding and Action in the Political Theory of Zhang Shizhao. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Judge, J. (1996). Print and politics: "Shibao" and the culture of reform in late Qing China. Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press.
- Jung, M.-H. (2006). Coolies and cane: race, labor, and sugar in the age of emancipation. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kindermann, G. K. (1982). Sun Yat-sen: founder and symbol of China's revolutionary nation-building. München, Günter Olzog Verlag.
- Kuhn, P. A. (2002). Origins of the modern Chinese state. Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press.
- Küng, H. and J. Ching (1989). Christianity and Chinese religions. New York, Doubleday.
- Kuper, A. (1999). Culture: the anthropologists' account. Cambridge, Mass, Harvard University Press.
- Laitinen, K. (1990). Chinese nationalism in the late Qing Dynasty: Zhang Binglin as an Anti-Manchu propagandist. London, Curzon Press.
- Latour, B. (1993). We have never been modern. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- Lean, E. (2007). Public passions: the trial of Shi Jianqiao and the rise of popular sympathy in Republican China. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Lee, L. T., H. G. Lee, et al. (2011). Sun Yat-Sen, Nanyang and the 1911 revolution. Singapore, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Legge, J. (1970) Chinese Classics - Volume 1 Confucian Analects. S.l., s.n.

Leibold, J. (2007). Reconfiguring Chinese nationalism: how the Qing frontier and its indigenes became Chinese. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

Levenson, J. R. (1964). Confucian China and its modern fate. London,, Routledge and Paul.

Levenson, J. R. (1968). Confucian China and its modern fate: A trilogy, University of California Press.

Liang, Q. (1930). History of Chinese political thought during the early Tsin period. London, K. Paul, Trench, Trubner.

Liang, Q. (1959). Intellectual trends in the Ching period (Ching-tai hsüeh-shu kai-lun). Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Lin, A. (1997). The rural economy of Guangdong, 1870-1937: a study of the Agrarian crisis and its origins in southernmost China. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Macmillan.

Linebarger, P. M. (1925). Sun Yat Sen and the Chinese Republic, the Century Co.

Linebarger, P. M. and P. M. A. Linebarger (1937). The ocean men; an allegory of the Sun Yat-Sen revolutions. Washington, Mid-nation Editions.

Linebarger, P. M. A. (1937). The political doctrines of Sun Yat-sen; an exposition of the San min chu i. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins press.

Liu, L. H. (1995). Translingual practice: literature, national culture, and translated modernity--China, 1900-1937. Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press.

Lu, X. (2004). Rhetoric of the Chinese Cultural Revolution: the impact on Chinese thought, culture, and communication. Columbia, S.C., University of South Carolina Press.

Luhmann, N. (2000). The reality of the mass media. Cambridge, UK, Polity Press.

Lum, Y. M. and R. M. K. Lum (1999). Sun Yat-sen in Hawaii: activities and supporters. Honolulu, Hawaii Chinese History Center and Dr. Sun Yat-sen Hawaii Foundation.

Marshall, T. H. and T. Bottomore (1992). Citizenship and social class. London, Pluto.

Martin, B. (1970). Strange vigour; a biography of Sun Yat-sen. Port Washington, N.Y. Kennikat Press.

Marx, K. and J. Elster (1986). Karl Marx: a reader. Cambridge Cambridgeshire; New York, NY, Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

May, S. (2001). Language and minority rights: ethnicity, nationalism, and the politics of language. Harlow, Essex, England New York, Longman.

McQuail, D. (1992). Media performance: mass communication and the public interest. London; Newbury Park, Calif., Sage.

Meagher, A. J. (2008). The coolie trade: the traffic in Chinese laborers to Latin America 1847-1874. Philadelphia, Pa., Xlibris Corporation.

Mencius and D. C. Lau (1970). Mencius. Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Metzger, T. A. (1996). Transcending the West: Mao's vision of socialism and the legitimization of Teng Hsiao-ping's modernization program. Stanford, Calif., Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University.

Miller, P. and N. S. Rose (2008). Governing the present: administering economic, social and personal life. Cambridge; Malden, MA, Polity.

Mittler, B. (2004). A newspaper for China: power, identity, and change in Shanghai's news media, 1872-1912. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Asia Center: Distributed by Harvard University Press.

Miyazaki, T. t. (1982). My thirty-three years' dream: the autobiography of Miyazaki Tōten. Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.

Miyazaki, T. t., R. s. Miyazaki, et al. (1971). Miyazaki Tōten zenshū.

Myles, J. (2010). Bourdieu, language and the media. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

Nathan, A. J. (1985). Chinese democracy. New York, Knopf: Distributed by Random House.

Nathan, A. J. (1976). Peking politics, 1918-1923: factionalism and the failure of constitutionalism. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Nederveen Pieterse, J. (1989). Empire & emancipation: power and liberation on a world scale. New York, Praeger.

Nyíri, P. and I. Saveliev (2002). Globalizing Chinese migration: trends in Europe and Asia. Aldershot, Ashgate.

Ogden, S. (2002). Inklings of democracy in China. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Asia Center: Distributed by Harvard University Press.

Perry, E. J. (1980). Rebels and revolutionaries in north China, 1845-1945. Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press.

- Perry, E. J. (2002). Challenging the mandate of Heaven: social protest and state power in China. Armonk, N.Y., M.E. Sharpe.
- Polachek, J. M. (1992). The inner Opium War. Cambridge, Mass., Council on East Asian Studies/Harvard University: Distributed by the Harvard University Press.
- Price, D. C. (1974). Russia and the roots of the Chinese revolution, 1896-1911. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- Pye, L. W. (1976). Politics, personality, and nation building: Burma's search for identity. Westport, Conn., Greenwood Press.
- Rancière, Jacques. (1991). the ignorant schoolmaster: five lessons in intellectual emancipation. Stanford, Cal., Verso Stanford University Press.
- Rancière, Jacques. (2009). The emancipated spectator. London, Verso
- Rankin, M. B. (2000). Social and Political Change in Nineteenth - Century China. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- Reed, C. A. (2004). Gutenberg in Shanghai: Chinese print capitalism, 1876-1937. Vancouver, UBC Press.
- Reed, I., J. C. Alexander, et al. (2007). Culture, society, and democracy: the interpretive approach. Boulder, Paradigm Publishers.
- Reinecke, J. E. and S. M. Tsuzaki (1988). Language and dialect in Hawaii: a sociolinguistic history to 1935. Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press: Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawaii.
- Rhoads, E. J. M. (2000). Manchus & Han: ethnic relations and political power in late Qing and early republican China, 1861-1928. Seattle, University of Washington Press.
- Rigby, R. W. (1980). Sun Yat-sen. St. Lucia Australia. Hemel Hempstead, Eng., University of Queensland Press ;
- Rose, N. S. (1999). Powers of freedom: reframing political thought. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Rowe, W. T. (2009). China's last empire: the great Qing. Cambridge, Mass., Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Rowe, W. T. (1989). Hankow: conflict and community in a Chinese city, 1796-1895. Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press.
- Santangelo, P. (2012). Laughing in Chinese. Roma, Aracne.

Schiffrin, H. Z. (1968). Sun Yat-sen and the Origins of the Chinese Revolution, University of California Press Berkeley, CA.

Schiffrin, H. Z. (1980). Sun Yat-sen, reluctant revolutionary. Boston, Little, Brown.

Schoppa, R. K. (2006). Revolution and its past: identities and change in modern Chinese history. Upper Saddle River, N.J., Pearson Prentice Hall.

Schoppa, R. K. (2008). East Asia: identities and change in the modern world, 1700-present. Upper Saddle River, N.J., Pearson/Prentice Hall.

Schwarcz, V. (1986). The Chinese enlightenment: intellectuals and the legacy of the May Fourth movement of 1919. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Schwartz, B. I. (1959). Some polarities in Confucian thought.

Schwartz, B. I. (1985). The world of thought in ancient China. Cambridge, Mass., Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Schwartz, B. I. (1996). China and other matters. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

Schwarzmantel, J. J. (2003). Citizenship and identity: towards a new republic. Routledge; London; New York

Sharman, L. (1968). Sun Yat-sen, His Life and Its Meaning. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Shaw, Y.-m. (1987). Reform and revolution in twentieth century China. Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China, Institute of International Relations, National Chengchi University.

Sih, P. K. T. and American Association of Teachers of Chinese Language and Culture. (1974). Sun Yat-sen and China. Jamaica, N.Y., St. John's University Press.

Smart, B. and G. Ritzer (2001). Handbook of social theory. Thousands Oaks, CA, SAGE.

Standen, N. (2007). Unbounded loyalty: frontier crossing in Liao China. Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press.

Strand, D. (1989). Rickshaw Beijing: city people and politics in the 1920s. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Strand, D. (2011). An unfinished republic: leading by word and deed in modern China. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Sun, Y.-s. (1897). Kidnapped in London: being the story of my capture by, detention at, and release from the Chinese legation, London. Bristol, J. W. Arrowsmith; etc.

- Sun, Y.-s. (1920). The international development of China. Shanghai, Commercial Press.
- Sun, Y. (1925). Dr. Sun Yat-sen: His Life and Achievements. The Publicity Department of the Central Executive Committee. Shanghai.
- Sun, Y.-s., F. W. Price, et al. (1927a). San min chu i. The three principles of the people. Shanghai, China,, China Committee, Institute of Pacific Relations.
- Sun, Y.-s. (1927b). Memoirs of a Chinese revolutionary, a programme of national reconstruction for China. London,, Hutchinson & co. Ltd.
- Sun, Y.-s. (1929). Fourth anniversary memorial of Sun Yat Sen. Washington, D.C., Acme printing
- Sun, Y.-s., F. W. Price, et al. (1930). San min chu i. The three principles of the people. Shanghai, China, The Commercial Press, Ltd.
- Sun, Y.-s. and L. S.-l. Hsü (1933). Sun Yat-sen, his political and social ideals; a source book. Los Angeles,, University of Southern California press.
- Sun, Y.-s. (1940). Chien kuo da gang.
- Sun, Y.-s., L.-l. T'ang, et al. (1941). China and Japan: natural friends--unnatural enemies; a guide for China's foreign policy. Shanghai,, China united press.
- Sun, Y.-s. (1942). San min chu i; The three principles of the people. Calcutta, Calcutta Office, Chinese Ministry of Information.
- Sun, Y.-s. (1943). The international development of China. Chungking,, Ministry of information of the republic of China.
- Sun, Y.-s., Z. B. Toong, et al. (1945). Fundamentals of national reconstruction. Chungking, China, Chinese Ministry of information.
- Sun, Y.-s. (1953a). Memoirs of a Chinese revolutionary; a programme of national reconstruction for China. Taipei, Taiwan. Sino-American Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Sun, Y.-s. (1953b). The principle of livelihood. Taipei,, China Cultural Service.
- Sun, Y.-s. (1953c). The principle of democracy. [With Chinese text]. Taipei,, Chinese Cultural Service.
- Sun, Y.-s. (1953d). The principle of nationalism. [With Chinese text]. Taipei,, Chinese Cultural Service.
- Sun, Y.-s. (1953e). The vital problem of China. Taipei,, China Cultural Service.
- Sun, Y.-s. (1953f). Fundamentals of national reconstruction. Taipei, China Cutural Service.

Sun, Y.-s., X. Qin, et al. (1989). Guo fu quan ji. Taibei Shi, Jin dai Zhongguo chu ban she: Jing xiao Zhong yang wen wu gong ying she.

Sun, Y.-s. and K.-s. Chiang (1989a). The three principles of the people: San min chu i. Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China, China Pub. Co.

Sun, Y.-s., J. L. Wei, et al. (1994). Prescriptions for saving China: selected writings of Sun Yat-sen. Stanford, Calif., Hoover Institution Press.

Sun, Y.-s. and Historical Commission of the Kuomintang. (2003). San min chu i : the three principles of the people. Taipei, Taiwan, China Cultural Service.

Sun, Y.-s. (2010). Jianquo fanglue. Beijing. Zhongguo Chang An Chu Ban She.

Sun, Y.-s. (2012). San min zhu yi. Beijing. Jiuzhou Press.

Sutherland, C. (2012). Nationalism in the twenty-first century: challenges and responses. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

Tiedemann, R.G., Ed. (2001). Handbook of Christianity in China. Leiden, Brill.

Tiles, J. E. (1992). John Dewey: critical assessments. London; New York, Routledge.

Tribe, K. (1978). Land, labour, and economic discourse. London; Boston, Routledge & K. Paul.

Tsao, Wên-yen (1947). The Constitutional Structure of Modern China. Melbourne. Melbourne Univ. Press

Tsu, J. (2005). Failure, nationalism, and literature: the making of modern Chinese identity, 1895-1937. Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press.

Unger, J. and G. Barmé (1996). Chinese nationalism. Armonk, N.Y., M.E. Sharpe.

Wakeman, F. E., J. Esherick, et al. (2006). Empire, nation, and beyond: Chinese history in late imperial and modern times: a festschrift in honor of Frederic Wakeman. Berkeley, Calif., Institute of East Asian Studies.

Wakeman, F. E., C. Grant, et al. (1975). Conflict and control in late Imperial China. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Wang, G. (1991a). China and the Chinese overseas. Singapore, Times Academic Press.

Wang, G. (1991b). The Chineseness of China: selected essays. Hong Kong; New York, Oxford University Press.

Wang, G. (1996). The revival of Chinese nationalism, IIAS, International Institute for Asian Studies.

Wang, G. (2000). The Chinese overseas: from earthbound China to the quest for autonomy. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

Wang, G. (2013). Chineseness: The Dilemmas of Place and Practice. Sinophone studies: a critical reader Global Chinese culture. S. Shi, C.-h. Tsai and B. Bernards. New York, Columbia University Press: xi, 460 p.

Wang, G. (2003). Ideas won't keep: the struggle for China's future. Singapore, Eastern Universities Press.

Wang, H. and T. Hutters (2011). The politics of imagining Asia. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

Wang, S. (1981). The thought of Dr. Sun Yat-sen. Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China, Li Ming Cultural Enterprise Co.

Watson, J. L., E. S. Rawski, et al. (1988). Death ritual in late imperial and modern China. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Weatherley, R. (2014). Making China strong: the role of nationalism in Chinese thinking on democracy and human rights. New York, Palgrave Macmillan

Weber, M. (1968). The religion of China: Confucianism and Taoism. New York, Free Press.

Weber, M., H. H. Gerth, et al. (1946). From Max Weber: Essays in sociology. New York, Oxford university press.

Weber, M. (1991). The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism. London, Harper Collins Academic

Wilbur, C. M. (1976). Sun Yat-sen, frustrated patriot. New York, Columbia University Press.

Wilbur, C. M., J. A. Fogel, et al. (1979). Perspectives on a changing China: essays in honor of Professor C. Martin Wilbur on the occasion of his retirement. Boulder, Colo., Westview Press.

Williams, R. (1983). Keywords: a vocabulary of culture and society. London, Fontana Paperbacks.

Wong, J. Y. (1986a). The origins of an heroic image : Sun Yatsen in London, 1896-1897. Hong Kong; New York, Oxford University Press.

Wong, J. Y., Ed. (1986b). Sun Yat Sen: His international Ideas and International Connections. Sydney Wild Peony.

Wong, J. Y., Great Britain. Foreign Office. et al. (1983). Anglo-Chinese relations, 1839-1860: a calendar of Chinese documents in the British Foreign Office records. Oxford; New York, Published for the British Academy by the Oxford University Press.

Wong, J. Y.-w. (2002). Deadly dreams: Opium and the Arrow war (1856-1860) in China,

Cambridge University Press.

Wong, Y.-t. (1989). Search for modern nationalism: Zhang Binglin and revolutionary China, 1869-1936. Hong Kong; New York, Oxford University Press.

Xu, X. (2000). Chinese professionals and the republican state: the rise of professional associations in Shanghai, 1912-1937. Cambridge England; New York, Cambridge University Press.

Yan, Q. (1976). The overseas Chinese and the 1911 revolution, with special reference to Singapore and Malaya. Kuala Lumpur; New York, Oxford University Press.

Yan, Q. (1985). Coolies and mandarins: China's protection of overseas Chinese during the late Ch*ing period (1851-1911). Singapore, Singapore University Press, National University of Singapore.

Yao, X. (1996). Confucianism and Christianity: a comparative study of Jen and Agape. Brighton, U.K. Portland, Or., Sussex Academic Press;

Yao, X. (2000). An introduction to Confucianism. New York, Cambridge University Press.

Yao, X. (2003). Routledge Curzon encyclopedia of Confucianism. London; New York, Routledge.

Yao, X., T. Weiming, et al. (2011). Confucian studies 4 vol set
Confucian studies: critical concepts in Asian philosophy. London, Routledge.

Yeh, W.-H. (2001). Becoming Chinese: passages to modernity and beyond. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Yúdice, G. (2003). The expediency of culture: uses of culture in the global era. Durham, Duke University Press.

Zarrow, P. G. (2012). After empire: the conceptual transformation of the Chinese state, 1885-1924. Stanford, California, Stanford University Press.

Zhang, X. (2007). The origins of the modern Chinese press: the influence of the Protestant missionary press in late Qing China. London; New York, Routledge.