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An Appreciation

James P. Harrison

Students in the classes of C. Martin Wilbur never doubted the fascination of Chinese history or their professor's vast knowledge of this engrossing subject. As my experience in his Master's-level seminar in the spring of 1960 well demonstrated, however, they did not always share their professor's mastery of its complications. After some minutes of a rather incoherent presentation I made on the extraordinarily contradictory interpretations of the "truth of the Li Li-san Line" of 1930 in the history of the Chinese Communist movement, I recall well Professor Wilbur's terse comment, "Mr. Harrison has shown well an important lesson of Chinese history—its complexity." He could of course have added "confusion," but I appreciated the lesson, which he so aptly restated in his presidential address to the Association for Asian Studies on March 28, 1972:

It is our job to try to understand Asian societies as they actually were in the past and as they really are today; to see them in great depth, in their multi-faceted variety; to view them with sympathy but with historical perspective and detachment.

Such sensitivity to complexities and historiographical problems, together with its necessary complement of brilliant research to unravel key problems of Chinese history, most distinguish the achievements of C. Martin Wilbur. He has helped to clarify key problems from many centuries of Chinese history for readers, students, and friends; for specialists, he has elucidated with particular skill first a crucial aspect of the social history of the Han dynasty, and later, in a series of writings, the remarkable conjunction of events that occurred in the 1920s (during this period, as the son of YMCA workers, he had been himself a student in Shanghai).

Surely it is testimony to an outstanding talent to be able to write the definitive studies of problems separated by the 2,000 years between the
Han dynasty and the 1920s. The former work, published as *Slavery in China during the Former Han Dynasty, 206 B.C.–A.D. 25* (New York, 1943), grew out of his 1941 doctoral dissertation at Columbia University, the institution where he also earned his Master's degree in 1933 with an essay on "Village Government in China." He did the research for the classic volume on the Han while assistant curator and then curator of Chinese archaeology and ethnology at the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago from 1937 to 1943. A "Contribution to a Bibliography on Chinese Metallic Mirrors" (*China Journal* 20, April 1934) and the "History of the Crossbow" (*Smithsonian Report* for 1936) offered further testimony to his mastery of ancient Chinese matters.

Yet it was the colossal events of modern China that captured the attention of Professor Wilbur's later scholarship. Wartime service with the Office of Strategic Services and service with the Department of State from 1945 to 1947 helped to shift his interests, as, one suspects, did the intimate friendships with Chinese that have run throughout his life. The shift coincided with his assuming the responsibility for modern Chinese history in 1947 at Columbia University, the institution to which he devoted his subsequent career. Naturally, succeeding years demanded elaborate course preparations, and in addition Professor Wilbur gave unstintingly conscientious guidance to a growing number of students. The continuously stimulating nature of his courses and his admirable attention to the problems and progress of his students won the respect of all.


His first major publication on modern China, accomplished with Julie Lien-ying How, aimed to unravel some key problems in modern Chinese history. This was the indispensable *Documents on Communism, Nationalism and Soviet Advisors in China, 1918-1927: Papers Seized in the 1927 Peking Raid* (New York, 1956; republished 1972). There followed important studies on aspects of the early history of the Chinese Communist movement. These included a painstaking study of the founding of the Chinese Communist Party

While producing some of the most careful and informative work on the history of Chinese Communism, Professor Wilbur continued to pursue studies of the Nationalists and warlords in the 1920s. In *China in Crisis: China's Heritage and the Communist Political System* (Ping-ti Ho and Tang Tsou, eds., Chicago, 1968) his "Military Separatism and the Process of Reunification under the Nationalist Regime, 1922-1937" was published. This essay provided the clearest succinct account to date of the intricacies and significance of the myriad military forces that bestrode China in the 1920s, and of the Northern Expedition of 1926-1928 during which Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist armies achieved dominance. The importance of Professor Wilbur's work on the history of the 1920s is evident in the recently published *China in the 1920s: Nationalism and Revolution* (F. Gilbert Chan and Thomas H. Etzold, eds., New York, 1976). He wrote the foreword to the book, which is dedicated to him and includes essays by some of his former students. Professor Wilbur's most recent major work is *Sun Yat-sen: Frustrated Patriot* (New York, 1976). In it, he explores with finesse the late career of the "father" of Nationalist China, giving a clear summary of the earlier years of Sun Yat-sen and a thorough and convincing account of the formation of the alliance with Russia and of the first United Front between the Nationalists and the Chinese Communists. His continuing work in progress promises equally outstanding future contributions to our understanding of this extraordinarily complex period.

C. Martin Wilbur left far more monuments than his impressive publications during nearly thirty years as professor at Columbia University prior to retirement in 1976. His numerous students, including myself, will always be thankful for his teaching of
conscientious scholarship and humility in the face of the complexities of history, nowhere more necessary than in the study of the world’s oldest and largest continuous civilization. Professor Wilbur’s character, shaped in great part by the legacies of that great civilization, as well as by his family, schools (including Oberlin College, B.A., 1931), professors, and friends, provided perhaps the greatest lesson of all. He is a model gentleman appropriate to a tradition that places such great stress on integrity. Special note must be given to the support he has received in all respects from his wife of forty-five years, Kay.

In addition to the accomplishments noted above, C. Martin Wilbur was a founding member of the East Asian Institute, established under George Sansom in 1947, and succeeded Hugh Borton as its director from 1957 to 1964. With Franklin L. Ho he was a cofounder in 1958 of the Chinese Oral History Project, which has created an important addition to the remembrances of historical figures.1

Outside the Columbia community, the esteem in which Professor Wilbur is held led to his election to the presidency of the Association for Asian Studies in 1971-1972. His presidential address to that group on March 28, 1972 (Journal of Asian Studies, August 1972), fittingly described the “need for mutual understanding between China and non-China,” and for the “skeptical eye. This is what we need in the study of China, past and present.” For Professor Wilbur’s skeptical and brilliant scholarship, for his humanity, gentility, and perseverance in studying China with “sympathy, historical perspective, and detachment,” as he put it, we are all thankful.
Introduction

Joshua A. Fogel
and William T. Rowe

One of the most striking aspects of recent American revisionism in modern China studies has been what Samuel Huntington has called, in a more general context, “the change to change.” On the surface, this includes a terminological shift from such value-laden words as “modernization” and “development” to the more neutral concept of “historical change.” More basically, it implies a recognition that if the useful notion of modernization, in its most elemental form as the acceptance of human progress, may still be validly applied to societies other than our own, it may no longer be treated as synonymous with “Westernization.” Thus historians of late dynastic China have been newly conscious of the dynamism inherent in that “changeless” society, and those of the twentieth century have increasingly focused on the adaptation of the inherited social and political culture with a new view to its positive as well as negative legacy.

The present volume incorporates eleven essays that portray various manifestations of this process of change in China since the founding of its last imperial dynasty in 1644. At the same time, it contains examinations of some perspectives taken on China at different points during this same period, in an attempt to highlight the very real role played by point of view in molding our understanding of the processes of Chinese history. One such examination, that of a predictive viewpoint, opens the volume. In this paper Olga Lang offers us a rare glimpse at the expectations held for China in nineteenth-century Russia, the Western nation in longest and most intimate contact with the Central Kingdom. By exploring the contexts and contents of two visions of China’s future, created several decades apart by two widely popular authors, Ms. Lang is able to depict Russia’s shifting conceptions of and attitudes toward China throughout the century, as well as that nation’s own self-perceptions as it passed through an historical phase in certain ways comparable to
that of its southern neighbor. The essay is particularly interesting for
the attention it draws to the continuing interrelationship of historical
scholarship, journalism, and myth.

Five essays then focus on specific institutional forms in Chinese
history. In the first of these, Robert Lee offers a survey of Chinese
attempts at institution-building in the exceedingly complex cultural
milieu of the southwestern borderlands throughout the Ch'ing
period. Mr. Lee shows that this effort reached its peak of intensity on
the very eve of the 1911 Revolution, thereby strikingly reminding us
that processes of "rationalization" and "development" have been
enforced upon perceived inferiors by powerful civilizations outside of
the West as well. The next two papers deal with Ch'ing formal
administrative structures, yet both study these at points of
intersection with evolved patterns of nonadministrative social
organization (the family system and the local community, respecti-
vely). While neither Odoric Wou nor William Rowe takes a
chronological approach, both clearly imply an active process of
indigenous change: a process alternatively of deterioration from
ideal forms in the later reigns of the dynasty, or of constructive and
adaptive evolution, according to one's perspective. The final two
essays of this section discuss more usual candidates for the label
"modernization" in their analyses of Western-inspired programs of
conscious innovation. Thomas Kennedy presents an early example
from the military and economic sphere, and John DeFrancis
evaluates recent and continuing efforts at reform of perhaps the most
basic of Chinese cultural institutions, the written language.

Of course, one of the most important institutional tools in the
hands of those who wish to direct the historical course of a society is
its educational establishment. Despite the fact that C. Martin Wilbur
himself has never chosen to address this connection in his published
researches, it has formed one of the chief themes of his teaching of
Chinese history. Three of his former students here demonstrate the
influence of this emphasis. Treating three roughly successive periods
of Republican China, Anita O'Brien, Ka-che Yip, and Jane Price all
probe the implications of political events on the content and quality
of education, and in turn the heightened importance of educational
institutions within a rapidly shifting environment in shaping the
attitudes of future generations of political actors. The progression in
this sequence seems to reveal a movement from vocational to liberal
and back to vocational emphases—in the final case the vocation being
revolutionary change itself.

Students of Professor Wilbur have frequently considered the
hallmark of his approach to the study of history to be an impartial and critical (Mr. Harrison prefers the term “skeptical”) attitude toward received wisdom in the field, treating the work of earlier scholars of all ideological persuasions with respect, but also with a keen eye for the intrusion of personal or political predilections. This approach of the teacher has quite naturally inspired many of his students to direct their inquiries toward the problem of writing history itself. In this volume, Ms. Lang’s essay takes a step toward revealing the attitudinal framework behind a portion of early European sinology. The two essays that conclude the book focus more specifically on the historian’s craft, analyzing through particular examples the outlooks underlying attempts by two groups of twentieth-century Chinese historians to reexamine their own past. In Joshua Fogel’s article a comparative view of Japanese historiography of China is also offered. While both Mr. Fogel and Li Yuning arrive at conclusions that are their own, rather than necessarily those of their former teacher, they each reveal clearly the legacy of Professor Wilbur’s passionately objective approach.

Professor C. Martin Wilbur seems today to belong to a remarkably distinguished generation of American China scholars—a generation that inherited a tradition of useful but often strongly subjective, intuitive, politically self-serving, or simply anecdotal writing on modern China, and through its own application of devoted scholarship and the techniques of the social scientist forged a view of China that made complex and subtle historical sense. Revisionism indeed is at work in this volume, but it is hardly a fundamental reaction against an earlier generation’s work. Each of the contributors has undergone the stimulating experience of developing a research design under the guidance of Professor Wilbur and thus can attest to his striking academic flexibility. A proposed approach differing fundamentally from his own was never taken as a challenge to his academic correctness, but was rather welcomed as a fresh opportunity for both teacher and student to critically reevaluate current thinking on an historical subject. The quality of Professor Wilbur’s own research speaks for itself. We hope that the diversity and critical spirit apparent in the essays in this volume are fitting tribute to his career as an educator.
Notes

An Appreciation

1. For an example of the utility of the Oral History Project to present and future historians of modern China, see the paper by Ms. O'Brien in this volume.

Chapter 1

1. Yegor F. Timkovskii, *Puteshestvie v Kitai cherez Mongoliu* [Travels to China over Mongolia], 3 volumes, St. Petersburg, 1824. Translated into English, French, and German in the 1820s.

2. Danilevskii's biographer, Sergei Trubachev, said that some of the *Christmas Fantastic Stories* to which "Life One Hundred Years After" belongs were written "in 1879 or later." See his "Biographical Sketch," in *Sochinenii G. P. Danilevskogo* [Works of G. P. Danilevskii], eighth posthumous edition, 24 volumes (St. Petersburg, 1901), 1:86. All subsequent references to Danilevskii's story are to this edition.

3. P. N. Sakulin, *Iz istorii russkogo idealizma: knias V. F. Odoevskii, myslitel', pisatel* [From the history of Russian idealism: Prince V. F. Odoevskii, thinker and writer] (Moscow, 1913), 1, parts 1 and 2. (These two parts are referred to hereafter as Sakulin 1, 1, and Sakulin 1, 2.) This account of the life and work of Odoevskii is brought up to the end of the 1840s, and thus embraces the time when *The Year 4338* was written. A list of utopias preceding Odoevskii's is in Sakulin 1, 1, pp. 181ff.

4. The biography of Odoevskii is based mainly on Sakulin. Also consulted were the entries on Odoevskii by Ivan Kubasov in *Russkii biograficheskii slovar* [Russian biographical dictionary] (St. Petersburg, 1905), volume "Obesianov-Ochkin," pp. 124-50; and by A. F. Koni in *Novyi entsiklopedicheskii slovar* [New encyclopedic dictionary] (St. Petersburg, 1916), 29, columns 294-300.

5. "Odoevskii is one of the best contemporary Russian writers," wrote V.
Notes to Chapter 1


6. I have used the Munich 1967 edition of *Russian Nights*, which is an exact copy of the Moscow 1913 edition.


9. Ibid., p. 344.

10. Ibid., p. 423.


12. The Slavophiles were opposed chiefly by the "Westernizers," who argued that "Russia is a part of Europe and its new civilization is European," and that Russia must learn from Europe because "everything great, noble, human, and spiritual arose, grew up, blossomed profusely, and brought forth luxurious fruit in the soil of Europe." So wrote one of the movement's outstanding figures, V. G. Belinskii. *Polnoe Sobranie sochinenii* [Complete collected works] (Moscow, 1953-59), 8:472 and 5:105.


14. This idea was perhaps suggested to Odoevskii by Timkovskii (see Timkovskii 1:145). He certainly did not get it from Father Iakinf, who even after the occupation of Canton in 1842 still refused to believe in the British victory.

15. Perhaps suggested by Timkovskii 2:359; or by the superficial docility with which the Chinese appeared to bear subordination to the Manchus.


17. Sakulin 1, 2, p. 170.

18. Sakulin 1, 2, p. 184, quoting Odoevskii's notes.


20. Ibid., notes, p. 448.

21. Sakulin 1, 1, pp. 574ff.


23. Ibid., fragments, pp. 440-41.

24. Preface to Tsechnovitser edition, pp. 4-5. The notes and fragments were in many cases written several years later than the published text, and thus sometimes contradict it.

25. This summarizes Odoevskii, *The Year 4338*, text, pp. 414-17.


27. Ibid., text, p. 422. This total denigration of Chinese history and culture could not have been suggested to Odoevskii by Father Iakinf, who
appreciated the old culture highly.

28. Ibid., text, pp. 421-22.

29. Odoevskii’s conception of an International Union was perhaps derived from the ideas of the Abbé Castel St. Pierre, as expressed in his two proposals: Projet pour rendre la paix perpetuelle en Europe [A plan for everlasting peace in Europe] (1713), and Projet de traité pour rendre la paix perpetuelle entre les souverains chrétiens [Draft treaty for the establishment of everlasting peace among the Christian sovereigns] (1717). These proposals for a sort of League of Nations were realized in the alliance of great powers founded in 1815 at the Congress of Vienna, becoming identified with the autocratic system of Metternich. St. Pierre’s ideas became widely known in Russia probably because J.-J. Rousseau wrote a critical summary of them. His proposals were discussed in Russian intellectual circles in the 1820s. See Pushkin, Complete Works (Moscow, 1949), 7:531 and 718n.


31. “Galvanostate—a balloon brought into action with galvanism” (Odoevskii’s note), The Year 4338, fragments, p. 439.

32. Ibid., text, p. 420.

33. Ibid., text, p. 425.

34. Ibid., text, p. 425.

35. Ibid., fragments, p. 442.

36. Ibid., fragments, pp. 442-43.

37. Ibid., text, p. 435.

38. Ibid., text, pp. 433-34.

39. For discussion of a similar institution in late imperial China, see the Rowe article in this volume.

40. Odoevskii, The Year 4338, text, p. 434.

41. Ibid., text, pp. 426-27.

42. Ibid., text, p. 431.

43. Ibid., text, p. 432.

44. Ibid., text, p. 433.

45. Ibid., text, pp. 417-18.

46. Ibid., text, pp. 427-28.

47. Ibid., text, pp. 8, 422-23.

48. The story “Zhizn cherez sto lot” [Life one hundred years after] is included in the collection of fantastic stories Sviatochnye rasskazy [Christmas stories], and appears in Danilevskii’s Works, 19:12-34.


50. For information on the “Jewish problem,” I have relied mainly on Simon Dubnov, Weltgeschichte das judischen Volkes [World history of the Jewish people], translated from the Russian by A. Steinberg, ten volumes
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51. This mood had evidently erased from his mind his first encounter with a Jew, which was most friendly. A Jewish artisan who came frequently to his father's and grandfather's estates was the person who first tutored him in the Russian alphabet when he was five years old. Trubachev, in Danilevskii's Works, 1:21.

52. Father Iakinf, Kitai: ego zhiteli, nray, obychai, i prosveshenie [China: its inhabitants, mores, customs, and education] (St. Petersburg, 1840), p. 389.

53. Nikolai A. Polevoi (1796-1846) was a brilliant, self-made man. The son of a tradesman, he received no formal education but read extensively on his own. Beginning in 1825, he edited a journal called Moskovskii Telegraf [Moscow telegraph], which was outspokenly liberal and supported the new literary trend toward romanticism. He wrote the widely popular Istoria russkogo naroda [History of the Russian people] (1829). His journal was suppressed in 1834. After that Polevoi was inwardly broken, and during the last years of his life he earned his living by contributing to reactionary journals and writing tawdry patriotic plays popular with the average theater-goer, but dismissed with contempt by the progressive intellectuals. The Chinese War of Theodosia Sidorovna, a work of this sort, was published in the journal Dagerotip [Daguerrotype], nos. 9, 10, and 11 (St. Petersburg, 1842).

54. O. Senkovskii was a complicated man, and the designation "conservative" characterizes him only approximately. His interesting reviews of Father Iakinf's books were published in Library for Reading, nos. 49 and 50 (1841-42) and no. 91 (1848). They were reprinted in Senkovskii's Sobranie sochinenii [Complete works] (St. Petersburg, 1858-59), 6:344-479.

55. "Russian Literature," in the journal Sovremennik [Contemporary], no. 1 (1848), p. 49. This review by Belinskii, expressing a negative view not only of Iakinf's book but of China and the Chinese in general, was not included in the 1953-59 edition of Belinskii's complete works—this was the time of Sino-Soviet friendship.

56. Trudy chlenov rossiskoi dukhovnoi missii v Pekine [The works of the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in Peking], 4 volumes (St. Petersburg, 1852-57).

57. I. A. Goncharov, Fregat Pallada [The frigate Pallas], volumes 6 and 7 of Goncharov's complete works (St. Petersburg, 1896), 7:185.

58. Sakulin 1, 2, p. 184n.

59. Data about Vasiliev are taken from Istoria i kultura Kitaia [The history and culture of China, a symposium in memory of Academician V. P. Vasiliev] (Moscow, 1974), pp. 7-110. The quotation is from p. 15.

60. V. P. Vasiliev, "Kitaiskii progres" [Progress in China], in Otkrytie Kitaia [The discovery of China] (St. Petersburg, 1900). This article was first published in 1883, but there is reason to believe that the author expressed his ideas earlier in intellectual circles where he and Danilevskii could have met. I
have the strong impression that the ideas of Vasiliev were in fact reflected in those of Danilevskii. The paragraphs quoted are from “Progress in China,” pp. 148, 159, 150, 155, 162-63, 163, 158, and 163, respectively.

61. “Droshkies” (dolgushi in Russian) were long vehicles in which passengers could sit on two sides.

62. In the real 1968 the great-grandchildren of Poroshin could have seen a picture no less startling: large crowds of young Frenchmen carrying portraits of a Chinese and holding in their hands little red books containing aphorisms of that man—Mao Tse-tung.

63. A Calendar in nineteenth-century Russia and elsewhere in Europe was a book of reference providing information about various problems of life, adapted to certain days and arranged chronologically. See Slovar’ sovremennogo russkogo iazyka [Dictionary of the contemporary Russian language] (Moscow, 1936-65), 5 (1956), column 705.

64. Danilevskii uses the word monitor after the vessel Monitor used by the Union forces during the American Civil War against the Confederate Merrimac in 1862.


66. Danilevskii attributes these words to Bismarck, but the famous Russian poet Tiutchev, who for many years was in the diplomatic service, quoted them as said by the Austrian Minister of Foreign Affairs von Beist. F. I. Tiutchev, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii [Complete collected works] (St. Petersburg, 1913), pp. 208, 411-12.

67. Danilevskii wrote his story in an atmosphere of great resentment by Russian nationalists, and especially by the Slavophiles, against the Western European Great Powers, who had taken the side of Turkey during the Russian-Turkish war of 1877-78. Russia declared war on Turkey on April 24, 1877, to aid the insurrection of the Balkan Slavs who had been dominated and cruelly treated by Turkey, but also to promote its own interests in the area. The Treaty of San Stephano (March 23, 1878), concluded after the Russian victory, secured great advantages for the Balkan Slavs and for Russia. On the initiative of Austria and Britain, who opposed the growth of Russian influence on the Balkan peninsula, the Berlin Congress (June 13–July 13, 1878) was convened, with Russia, Turkey, Austria, Britain, Italy, and Germany participating, and German chancellor Bismarck playing the role of “honest broker.” The Congress deprived the Slavs and Russia of a great part of the gains won after the Russian victory.

It is obvious that on this occasion Danilevskii recalled also the Russian war with Turkey in 1853-56, when Turkey was very effectively assisted by France under Napoleon III and by England under the prime ministership of J. T. Palmerston (1855-58). At that time Russia was defeated and forced to sign the humiliating Treaty of Paris (March 30, 1856).

68. The exclusion of Turkey from Europe, the Russian conquest of Constantinople, and the creation of a Slavic state on the Balkan peninsula was still an aim of Russian nationalists during World War I. As for the
Russian conquest of India, this idea had very few supporters in the nineteenth century.

69. Throughout this passage, Danilevskii makes too many mistakes even for the writer of a fantastic story. Writing at the end of the 1870s or later he should have known that since 1871 when the German empire (Reich), a federation of single German states (Länder), was founded as a constitutional monarchy, its legislative assembly was known as the Reichstag ("house of representatives"). The Landtag ("diet") was the legislative body operating within each of the separate states. See Brockhaus Enzyklopädie ("encyclopedia"), 17th edition (Wiesbaden, 1966-76), 11:105 and 15:588. The popedom was and is an institution ruling all Roman Catholics of the world, not only Italians; moreover, the Kingdom of Italy was founded in 1861 against the will of the pope. No Gambetta was ever a president of France.

70. The Rothschild family became a great financial power in various European countries in the 1830s. The joke about Rothschild I was launched in France at that time. See Dubnov 9:273.

71. It seems that Danilevskii unknowingly predicts something that is now taking place in the administration of justice in his native land.

72. No Rothschild or any other Jew ever became president of the French Republic in the more than one hundred years of its existence. Danilevskii could not imagine that in 1968 all Frenchmen, and Frenchwomen, would have the right to vote.

73. Danilevskii, "Life One Hundred Years After," p. 31.

74. This was hardly a fair characterization on Poroshin's (or Danilevskii's) part. Justus von Liebich (1803-73) was a famous German chemist whose introduction of mineral fertilizers brought about a great enlargement of the basis of human nourishment (Brockhaus Enzyklopädie, 11:452). Rudolf Virchov was a famous German chemist and an outstanding liberal of the time (ibid., 19:685).


Chapter 2

1. Cheng Hsiang-hsin and Hai Hsi-yen, "A-pa t'ü-chai chih hsien-kuang chi ch'i she-chih wen-t'i" [The present situation in the native villages of A-pa and the problem of their administration], Pien-cheng kung-lun [Frontier Affairs] (hereafter FA) 1, nos. 9 and 10 (1942):35.


8. Ibid.
19. Tafel, My Tibetan Trip, pp. 363-68.
31. T'ang Ying-hua, part 5, FA 4, nos. 4, 5, 6 (1945):34-35.
39. Ibid., pp. 51-52.
40. Ibid., pp. 57-64.
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Chapter 3


4. By lineage, I refer to a consanguineal unilateral descent group whose members trace themselves from a known common ancestor. The relations of the members are definable by precise familial terms.


6. I wish to express my thanks to Richard G. Fox of Duke University who called my attention to such a unit at the ACLS Workshop on "Elites and Political Decision-making in Chinese History," organized by Robert M. Hartwell, June 12-25, 1976.


8. Sometimes members from collateral branches are all included at the end.

9. For example, great-grandmother, Surname X, granddaughter of A; eldest daughter of B, sister of C, D, E; and aunt of F.

10. For example, aunt, married Surname X, son of Y.

11. Except Shantung 1859. The *Shantung t'ung-kuan lu* (1859) [The Shantung official directory] does not contain information on officials higher than the rank of circuit intendant.

12. For instance, *Chiangsu t'ung-kuan lu* (1880).

13. See *Honan t'ung-kuan lu* (1837), *Shantung t'ung-kuan lu* (1859), *Anhui t'ung-kuan lu* (1871), *Chiangsu t'ung-kuan lu* (1880), *Honan t'ung-kuan lu* (1898), and *Chifu t'ung-kuan lu* (1904).


15. Sometimes the common unilineal ancestry of a clan may not be traceable genealogically even though all members of the clan accepted the
line of common descent.


20. *Ta-Ch’ìng hui-tien shih-li* [Statutory amendments to the collected institutes of the great Ch‘ing dynasty], edited by Li Hung-chang (Shanghai: Shang-wu yin-shu-kuan, 1908), 1220 chūan.

21. This was the temporary residence set up by migrants in an area away from their native district. According to the Chinese Regulations for Residence (*hu-chî fa*), one who set up a residence for six months or more in a district or town outside his native district would have to report that district or town as his temporary residence. This law also applied to those having resided in a place for more than six months who had no native district or whose native district was unclear.


24. Ibid.


28. *Ta-Ch’ìng hui-tien shih-li*, chüan 84, Board of Civil Appointment, Regulations for Punishment, see section on Official Avoidance.

29. *Chung-chou t’ung-kuan lu* (1898), 1st tse.

30. The deceased progenitors were identified by the word “confer.” To “confer” posthumously a distinction is “t’seng” in Chinese, as distinguished from the word “to confer,” “shou,” to a living official. But not all of one’s progenitors had distinctions. We have no way of finding out exactly how many of them were deceased.


32. *Chung-chou t’ung kuan lu* (1898), 1st tse.
33. Titles of honor were frequently conferred by the government upon the officials themselves or their wives or were granted posthumously to their deceased progenitors for the service they rendered or because of particular merit. Similar to official ranks, titles of honor were divided into nine rankings, each subdivided into two classes. See H. S. Brunnert and V. V. Hagelstrom, Present-Day Political Organization of China, translated from the Russian by A. Beltchenko and E. E. Moran (Shanghai: Kelly and Walsh, 1912), pp. 495-97.

34. Our impression of the proliferation of purchasers in the period usually comes from the statistics on official degree holders. There may be more nonofficial degree holders who obtained their degrees through the civil examination, which would thus decrease our percentage. This percentage therefore has to be cross-checked with other sources in the future.

35. Hsu Ta-ling, Ch'ing-tai chüan-na chih-tu [The purchase system in the Ch'ing period] (Hong Kong: Lung-men shu-tien, 1968), pp. 159-61.

36. For a list of ranks and classes, see Robert Marsh, The Mandarins, pp. 206-35. Also see H. S. Brunnert and V. V. Hagelstrom.


Chapter 4


Curiously, while general treatments of pao-chia in English have usually appeared in the context of studies of Chinese formal administration, in Chinese and Japanese works the context is frequently a critique of local autonomy in China. See, for example, Li Tsung-huang, Chung-kuo ti-fang tzu-chih kai-lun [A general treatise on local autonomy in China] (Taipei: Cheng-chung, 1949), and Wada Sei, Shina chihō jichi hattatsu shi [History of the development of local autonomy in China] (Tokyo: Chūka Minkoku
hōsei kenkyūkai, 1939). Kuhn's work seems to have introduced this perspective into English-language scholarship.

3. *Shen-pao*, Kuang-hsü 4th year/9th month/1st day. Subsequent citations follow this format. The Shanghai daily *Shen-pao*, first published in 1872, maintained a reporter in Hankow and is a major source for this chapter. While owned by a foreigner, it was managed by a Chinese and in my opinion reflected a thoroughly Chinese point of view. I have used the forty-volume reprinted edition prepared by Wu Hsiang-hsiang (Taipei: Hsueh-sheng shu-chū, 1964).

4. Hu Lin-i, *Hu-wen-chung-kung i-chi* [Collected works of Hu Lin-i], *chüan* 14: page 2. Subsequent citations follow this (*chüan*:page) format. A typical Western impression in this regard was recorded in the 1850s by the Abbé Huc, *A Journey through the Chinese Empire* (New York, 1859), 2, p. 142.


6. See, for example, the collective roughhousing of sedan-chair bearers in Hankow (HKCCT, 2:5), and the local antagonisms generated by groups of Anhwei and Kwangtung natives in the city (*Shen-pao*, Kuang-hsü 2/4/2; *North-China Herald*, June 29, 1872).


16. The 1883 revamping of security systems in Hankow included devotion of much attention to local pao-chia operations, and to this extent the present essay concerns chiefly conditions prior to that year. Most conclusions reached here, however, are equally applicable to the later period.


18. Joint memorials of Yü-t'ai and Shao Ping-yen, Tao-kuang 21/12/23, Tao-kuang 22/12/28, etc., Ch'ing palace archives, National Palace
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Museum, Taipei.


22. Some of the requirements for native place registration in Hanyang hsien are listed in *Shen-pao*, Kuang-hsu 1/10/16. One of a vast number of possible examples of individuals who were for all intents and purposes Hankow natives, but who for reasons of business maintained registration elsewhere, may be found in the biography of the Shensi merchant Hung Hsi-lu, *Han-yang hsien-shih* (1884) (hereafter 1884 HS), 3 hsia:7.


24. 1818 HC, 12:17.

25. 1818 HC, 12:10.

26. Memorial of Hukuang Governor-general Na-erh-ching-o and Hupeh Governor Chou Chih-ch’i, Tao-kuang 17/2/3, Ch’ing palace archives, National Palace Museum, Taipei.

27. 1818 HC, 12:10.


29. Thomas Taylor Meadows observed of Canton city in 1847 that while the pao-cheng were still to be found, these lower-level headmen had been consigned fully to the realm of legal fiction. Meadows, *Desultory Notes on the Government and People of China, and on the Chinese Language* (London, 1847), pp. 120-21.


Despite the generally negative portrayal of pao-chia by Hsiao Kung-ch’uan, and my own findings for Hankow presented here, it would be a mistake to underestimate the presence of the system’s enrollment mechanisms in nineteenth-century urban China. We have seen that in Hankow they were consistently employed to produce census figures, however unreliable. Moreover, Professor Imahori Seiji has presented concrete evidence of an enrollment system effectively in force in Pa-hsien, Szechuan (incorporating Chungking) in 1827. The enrollment process there differentiated between residential (min-hu) and commercial (p’u-hu) households, and in the case of the latter clearly sought to bring under pao-chia control the urban population’s mobile merchant elements. To this end the chronologically senior investing partner was arbitrarily designated “head of household,”
regardless of that individual's native place or actual residence. Enrollment certificates were submitted to the administration upon the opening of the business, and the form of this certificate survives today. In addition to the "head of household's" name, age, and residence, the names of all employees and partners, the location of the business by pao, chia, and p'ai, and the name of the local pao-cheng, the form called for the names of the cognizant pao, chia, and p'ai level functionaries of the county's li-chia system. Imahori, "Shindai ni okeru gōka no kindaika no hasu-toku ni toku ni tōka bukateki keitai ni tsuite" [The slant of modernization of partnerships in the Ch'ing dynasty, especially as regards the shape of the separation of tung and huo], Tōyōshi kenkyū, 17, no. 1 (1956):5.

Nevertheless this does not demonstrate (nor does Imahori maintain) that the originally intended collective responsibility principles underlying pao-chia were in force, or even that the frequently absentee proprietor who was thus enrolled had any idea who his fellow p'ai or chia members were. In light of the prominent inclusion of li-chia personnel on the enrollment form, it is likely that this procedure's chief utility was in aiding the tax-collection process. It is particularly noteworthy that while the terminology of "household" was maintained, it was clearly the physical premises that were being enrolled (see below, note 40 and related text).

36. Han-yang hsien-chih (1867) (hereafter 1867 HC), 8:35.
37. My evidence here is inferential. Lin used these tactics (notably the registration of transients at all inns, etc.) in Kwangtung, where he almost certainly was imitating those he had employed so successfully in his immediately preceding tenure in Hukuang. See Frederick Wakeman, Strangers at the Gate (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1966), p. 35.

38. Rowe, "A Note on Ti-pao," Ch'ing-shih wen-t'i (December 1977). On the separate origins of these two institutions, the most persuasive analysis is Saeki Tomi, "Shindai no kyōaku-chihō ni tsuite—Shindai chihō gyōsei hitokusuri" [On the hsiang-yüeh ti-pao in the Ch'ing dynasty—a scene of Ch'ing local administration], Tōhōgaku, 28 (July 1964):91-100.

40. The assignment to pao-chia units of territorial rather than human parameters was probably of necessity demanded in all of nineteenth-century urban China. A Hankow native's lengthy description of Nanking in the 1860s, for example, repeats the formula, "The 8th chia is (such and such a) street. . . . The 15th chia is (such and such an) alley. . . . etc." Wang Pao-hsin, Hsu Han-k'ou tsung-t'an [The Hankow compendium, continued] (1992), chüan 2. In Hankow itself, by at least the beginning of the Tao-kuang reign, a marginal strip of urban area outside the four formally constituted wards of the city was referred to administratively as the "five outer chia," leading one to suspect that division into chia was maintained throughout the town. Fan K'ai, Han-k'ou tsung-t'an [The Hankow compendium] (1822), 2:2.
41. *Shen-pao*, Kuang-hsu 4/7/19, Kuang-hsu 4/6/26, Kuang-hsu 2/4/2. Mr. Chang Wei-jen of the Academia Sinica, Taipei, who has collected and analyzed several thousand Ch'ing dynasty criminal cases, informed me that in his materials from all parts of China, it was nearly universally true that the crime had first been brought to official attention through the medium of a local headman.

42. Hukuang Governor-general Pien Pao-ti to Tsungli Yamen, Kuang-hsu 10/10/5, Tsungli Yamen archives, Academia Sinica, Taipei (hereafter TLYM).

43. Hukuang Governor-general Li Han-chang to Tsungli Yamen, Kuang-hsu 3/11/21, Kuang-hsu 3/12/13, etc.

44. Hukuang Governor-general Hsu Ts'ung-ying to Tsungli Yamen, T'ung-chih 9/3/5, TLYM; *Shen-pao*, Kuang-hsu 3/11/21, Kuang-hsu 3/12/13, etc.


50. Those cases cited here are drawn from reports of Hukuang governors-general to the Tsung-li Yamen dated Kuang-hsu 8/8/1, T'ung-chih 11/5/4, T'ung-chih 13/10/20, T'ung-chih 6/1/29, and T'ung-chih 7/12/15, TLYM. Many others could also be cited. Sweeten describes similar cases culled from Tsungli Yamen materials on Fukien Province.

A bizarre example of the Hankow headman's responsibility as "knower" of his neighborhood may be seen in the 1885 case of the flogging of one such functionary as punishment for the suicide of a local man who had been falsely accused by his employer of embezzlement. It would appear that, in the same way that the county magistrate was personally liable for losses of life or property by fire, pao-chia personnel were held personally accountable for the lives and security of their charges. In this case, for example, the accusing employer was not similarly punished—no criminal action had occurred. The headman was simply being "sanctioned" for his negligence in allowing the situation to deteriorate so far without intervention and proper investigation. See Thomas Gillison, *Report of the London Missionary Hospital at Hankow, for the Years 1883-1885* (Hankow, 1885), p. 11.

51. Meadows, *Desultory Notes*, p. 117.
52. Hukuang Governor-general Li Han-chang to Tsungli Yamen, T'ung-chih 13/10/20, TLYM.
53. Li to Tsungli Yamen, Kuang-hsu 3/10/28, Kuang-hsu 5/14/4, TLYM.
54. 1884 HS, kung-k'uan-pu, p. 5.
56. Hukuang Governor-general Weng T'ung-chüeh to Tsungli Yamen, Kuang-hsu 1/13, TLYM.
58. 1747 FC, 12:2.
60. Meadows, Desultory Notes, pp. 119-20.
63. 1747 FC, 12:2. I am grateful to Mr. Su Yun-feng for bringing this passage to my attention.
64. Hsiao, Rural China, pp. 79-82.
65. 1747 FC, 12:2.
67. This same phenomenon, that of lineage connections within pao-chia and other types of subadministrative local leadership, is noted by Philip Kuhn in the early Republican period. Kuhn, however, apparently considers it a new development of that time. Kuhn, "Local Self-Government," pp. 293-94.
69. Shen-pao, Kuang-hsu 5/7/1.
70. Shen-pao, Kuang-hsu 4/11/16.
71. Lifeboats, Chinese enclosures, pp. 31-33.
72. 1884 HS, 2:22.
73. For a catalog of the pao-cheng's formal duties within the Ch'ing
political order, see Hsu, *Powers of the hsiang magistrate*, p. 216ff.
75. Shen-pao, Kuang-hsu 8/12/20.

Chapter 5


8. HPKC, “shou-chih ke-k'uan ssu-chu ch'ing-tse”: shou-k'uan hsiang-hsia’: “huo-k'uan hsiang-hsia’”.
10. HPKC, “ke-hsiang hsiang-hsi ch'ing-hsing”: “yuan-shih yen-ke ch'ing-hsing,” “p'ao-tan-ch'ang ke-hsiang ch'ing-hsing” [conditions at the gun ammunition plant], “ch'ou-tan-ch'ang ke-hsiang ch'ing-hsing” [conditions at the projectile casting shop], “p'ao-tan t'ung-ke'ch'ang ke-hsiang ch'ing-hsing” [conditions at the cartridge plant], “p'ao-chia'ch'ang ke-hsiang ch'ing-hsing” [conditions at the gun carriage plant].
13. HPKC, “ke-hsiang hsiang-hsi ch'ing-hsing”: “ping-kung kang-yao liang-ch'ang yung-jen ch'ing-hsing” [personnel conditions in the arsenal and steel and powder works].

15. CCKT, 3:244-245. HPKC, “ke-hsiang hsiang-hsi ch'ing-hsing”: “yung-jen ch'ing-hsing.” In the spring of 1906 there were reported to be twenty Japanese in the arsenal employed as foremen and in other positions. Effective control was alleged to rest with Colonel Ikata of the Imperial Japanese Army, Chang’s artillery advisor. National Archives Microfilm Publications M862, Numerical and minor files of the Department of State 1906-10, Roll 217, numerical file case nos. 2106-2108/89, “The Chinese Army,” September 21, 1906, pp. 336-38.


26. HPKC, “shou-chih ke-k'uan ssu-chu ch'ing-tse”: “chih-kuan hsi anghsia” [expenditures].

27. HPKC, “ke-hsiang hsiang-hsi ch'ing-hsing”: “ch'iang-ch'ang ke-
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2. It may be noted in passing that Mao uses the archaic term yanyu for "language" or "speech" instead of the modern term yuyan.
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hsiang ch'ing-hsing": "liao-wu" [matériel], British Public Record Office: Foreign Office files 371/34, 16763 (May 16, 1906).
29. HPKC, "ke-hsiang hsiang-hsi ch'ing-hsing": "yung-jen ch'ing-hsing."
30. HPKC, "ke-hsiang hsiang-hsi ch'ing-hsing": "ch'üan-ch'ang ching-fei ch'ing-hsing" [financial data for the whole arsenal].
31. HPKC, "shou-chih ke-k'uan ssu-chu ch'ing-tse": "chih-k'uan hsiang-hsia."
33. HPKC, "li-nien chi hsuan-t'ung yuan-nien tsao-ch'eng po-chieh shih-tsun ke-hsiang hun-huo piao-tse" [various types of munitions produced, distributed, and stored through 1909], British Public Record Office: Foreign Office file 405/126 No. 28, 405/120 No. 8, 405/12 No. 33, 405/128 No. 60, 405/122 No. 29. NCH, November 20, 1903, January 15, 1904, February 25, 1904.
34. HPKC, "li-nien chi hsuan-t'ung yuan-nien tsao-ch'eng po-chieh shih-tsun ke-hsiang hun-huo piao-tse."
35. NCH, October 14, October 21, December 2, and December 9, 1911.
37. For a discussion of political factors that influenced Chang's role as a reformer particularly in the years from 1898 to 1900, see Daniel H. Bays "Chang Chih-tung after the '100 Days': 1898-1900 as a Transitional Period for Reform Constituencies," in Reform in Nineteenth Century China, edited by Paul A. Cohen and John E. Schrecker (Cambridge: Harvard University, East Asian Research Center, 1976), pp. 317-25.

Chapter 6


2. It may be noted in passing that Mao uses the archaic term yanyu for "language" or "speech" instead of the modern term yuyan.


Note that the term “New Writing” was written as “Sin Wenz” in the latinization transcription of the 1930s and 40s, and is now written as “Xin Wenzi” in the Pinyin system used in the People’s Republic.


6. Ibid.


9. J. V. Stalin, Concerning Marxism in Linguistics (London: Soviet News, 1950), pp. 3-8 and passim. For a discussion of how Stalin’s (and Mao’s) views were used in the retroactive criticism of an early Chinese Communist writer on language reform problems, Chü Ch’iu-pai, see Chapter 11 in this volume.


12. “Zhongguo wenzri gaige yanjiu weiyuanwei juxing di-sanci quanti huixi” [Third Plenary meeting of the Committee for Research on Chinese Writing Reform], Zhongguo Yuwen (June 1953), p. 34.

13. Li Chin-hsi, Wenzri gaige gaishuo [Sketch of writing reform] (n.p., 1972), pp. 8-9. I am indebted to Constantin Milsky for drawing my attention to this work and kindly providing me with a copy.

In the scheme advanced by Li Chin-hsi, who in the 1920s had participated in the creation of the system of tonal spelling known as Gwuoyeu Romatyn, this idea was advanced again in a particularly bizarre form, that of indicating tones by the varied use of capital and small letters, e.g., 1st tone MA, 2nd tone mA, 3rd tone ma, 4th tone Ma. Viviane Alleton has reported that when she visited the PRC in the summer of 1977 she was informed by linguists whom she questioned about the system that it was a private initiative by Li Chin-hsi that received little support. See “La transcription alphabetique du chinois: forme et pedagogie du pinyin en République populaire de Chine” Cahiers de linguistique, d’orientalisme et de slavistique, no. 10 (1978), note 3.


15. Chou En-lai, Dangqian wenzri gaige de renwu [Current tasks in writing
16. *Mao Zedong wansui* [Long live Mao Tse-tung], p. 31. Although this work has no indication of where, when, or by whom it was published, it was apparently produced in Taiwan from documents smuggled out of mainland China. I am indebted to Helmut Martin for drawing my attention to this work and kindly providing me with a copy of the talk from which my quotation is derived.


19. See note 11.


21. *Jianhuazi zongbiao jianzi* [General index of simplified characters] (Peking, 1964), and *Jianhuazi jianzi* [Index of simplified characters] (Peking, 1974).


24. See note 17.


26. For a discussion of this complex sociolinguistic problem before 1949 see DeFrancis, *Nationalism and Language Reform in China*, chapters 6, 11, and passim.


29. This directive is quoted much more often than the other instructions forming part of a statement on language policy presented by Mao as item 46 in his “Sixty Points on Working Methods,” submitted to the Politburo on January 31, 1958. The whole of item 46, as given in Jerome Ch’en, *Mao Papers* (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), is as follows (bracketed material added by Ch’en):
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30. In this connection it may or may not be significant that Lu Hsun’s declarations made in the 1930s in support of dialect romanization were
included in a 1974 reprint of his scattered writings, in which he came out strongly for the replacement of Chinese characters by a latinized system of writing. *(Lu Xun lun wenzi gaige* [Lu Hsun on writing reform], (Peking: Wenzi gaige chubanshe, pp. 23-24 and passim.)


33. The last complete citation of Mao's remarks that I have seen was made by Kang Lang, an opponent of the use of Latin letters, in 1957. *(Hanyu pinyin fangan cao'an taolun ji II* [Volume 2 of discussions on the draft scheme of Chinese orthography] (Peking: Wenzi gaige chubanshe, 1957), p. 141.

34. BBC Summary of World Broadcasts, June 5, 1975, p. FE/4921/15. I am indebted to Helmut Martin for drawing my attention to this item, which is reproduced in his *Chinas Sprachplanung 1588-1975 aus komparativer perspektive* (in press), p. 377.


38. Constantin Milsky had noted that "the militants of the Cultural Revolution, while showing their hostility towards *pinyin*, appeared as defenders of script reform, so far as simplification of characters was concerned." "New Developments in Language Reform," *The China Quarterly*, no. 53 (January-March 1973), p. 126.

39. I am indebted to Helmut Martin for drawing my attention to the two *Guangming Daily* items.

**Chapter 7**


6. Ibid., p. 111.


8. Conflicting reasons have been put forth for the demise of the early academies. Li Shou-k'ung notes that the Tientsin Academy was a victim of the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895, while Biggerstaff says it continued to operate until being destroyed in the Boxer uprising. Chang's academy closed in the early 1890s, only to be reopened and divided in 1902 into separate naval and military establishments (Biggerstaff, Earliest Modern Government Schools, pp. 63-64).


10. Ayers, Chang Chih-tung and Education Reform, pp. 117-18.
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Chapter 8

1. The eight government colleges and universities were: National Peking University, Peking Higher Normal School, Peking Women Higher Normal School, College of Law and Politics, College of Industry, College of Agriculture, College of Medicine, and College of Art.
2. For documents on this incident, see Shu Hsin-cheng, *Chin-tai Chung-kuo chiao-yü shih-liao* [Historical materials of modern Chinese education] (Shanghai, 1928), pp. 146-76.


5. For the names and tenure of the ministers, see Ch’en Hsi-chang, *Hsi-shuo Pei-yang* [A detailed discussion of the Peiyang period] (Taipei, 1971), 3:541-60.
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25. These arguments were summed up well in a memorandum submitted to the Ministry of Education by the National Educational Association in 1925. See Chung-hua chiao-yü chieh, 15:6 (December 1925), section on educational news in China, p. 1.
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38. I have identified eighteen such cases from Ch’ang Tao-chih’s study; Yang Chung-ming’s article, “Min-kuo shih-i-nien chih hsüeh-ch’ao” [Student storms in 1922], Hsueh-sheng tsa-chih (February 1923); and other contemporary sources.

39. See “Ts’an-yü hsiao-wu yun-tung” [The movements to participate in school affairs], Chung-kuo ch’ing-nien [China’s youth] (September 1925), pp. 632-37.


42. Quoted in Ronald Cheng, Financing of Public Education, p. 119.


Chapter 9

1. On the origins of K’ang-ta see T’ung-i ch’u-pan she, ed., Chung-kung


6. Ibid., p. 97. See also Chung-kung chih chiao-yü, p. 49; and Wang Chien-min, *Draft History of the CCP*, 3:280.


8. For example, the principal study materials for political and economic subjects were *Political Common Knowledge* (a Soviet translation); *Outline of Politics* by Lin Po-ch'ü; *Political Economy* by Ch'en Chih-yuan; *The February Revolution and the October Revolution* (a Soviet translation); *History of the Development of Human Society; Imperialism; and People's United Front* (all edited by the K'ang-ta Education Committee); Lenin's *Left-wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder; Inevitability of Proletarian Revolution* (a Soviet translation); and *Party Principles* by Chang Wen-t'ien.
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15. Production campaigns were a response of the Communist border regions to the reimposition of the Nationalist blockade in May 1939 and the Japanese “Three-All” campaigns launched in 1941. See Harrison, *March*, pp. 316-17. On the trials of the various K’ang-ta classes and their solutions see *K’ang-ta tung-t’ai*, pp. 18-22, 40-42.
17. Niu K’o-lun, “The Smelting Furnace,” p. 34. As evidence of the length to which this principle was carried, Niu cited Liu Ya-lou’s class on the element of surprise in guerrilla warfare and night attacks. In the middle of the following night, students were mustered out of bed to take up positions on a ridge outside Yenan.
19. Ibid., pp. 206-8, 213.
20. On supplementary forms of discussion meetings, see ibid., p. 111.
21. “Revolutionary competition” involved students competing in groups rather than individually for first place in academic work, discipline, or cultural activities. It had been a feature of CCP political education since the Kiangsi period.
22. Salvation Rooms were Soviet-inspired culture and entertainment centers for Communist army troops. Before the Sino-Japanese War they were called Lenin Clubs.


30. Hao Chung, “Tse-yang chin Shen-pei kung-hsueh” [How to enter the North Shensi Public School], Shen-pei ti ch’ing-nien hsueh-sheng sheng-huo [Life of young students in North Shensi], edited by Lo Jui-ch’ing and Ch’eng Fang-wu (Shanghai: Chien-shu pan she, 1940), p. 5.


33. On the staff and organization of Women’s University, see Kusano Fumio, pp. 87-88; Ma Chi-ling, Shen-pei niao-k’ao [A bird’s eye-view of North Shensi] (Chengtu: Cheng-chih, 1941), p. 91; and Edgar Snow, Scorched Earth, 2 (London: Victor Gollancz, Ltd., 1941):263-64.

34. Ibid., p. 263 and Ch’en Shao-yü, “Tsai Yen-an Chung-kuo nü-tzu ta-hsueh tien-li ta-hui shang ti pao-kao” [Report on the opening ceremony of Chinese Women’s University in Yenan], Kung-fei fan-tung wen-chien hui-pien [Collection of reactionary Communist bandit documents], Yushodo Microfilms, reel 18, p. 128.


37. Headed by Communist P’eng Hsueh-feng, this institution was set up by the Eighth Route Army in cooperation with Shansi warlord Yen Hsi-shan. It trained “national salvation cadres” to work with Yen’s New Army and in enemy areas. Its curriculum and learning format were similar to K’ang-ta and other CCP united front schools. See T’ao Fen, “Ch’i-t’a kuan-yü Min-tsu ko-ming ta-hsueh” [Another concerning the National Revolutionary University], K’ang-chan chiao-yü tsai Shen-pei, pp. 92-105; Evans F. Carlson, Twin Stars of China (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1940), pp. 61-63; and Donald Gillin, Warlord: Yen Hsi-shan in Shansi Province, 1911-1949 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), p. 274.

38. The North Shensi Public School merged with the Youth Training Class and Work School of the Lu Hsun Academy of Arts in 1939 to form North China United University. Chinese Women’s University merged with the Tse-tung Youth Cadre School and parts of other schools to form Yenan University in September 1941. It is likely that the struggle between Ch’en Shao-yü and Mao Tse-tung, which resurfaced during the cheng-feng movement, also had some bearing on the closing of the school. See Chung-kung chih chiao-yü, p. 68.

39. On the institute, see idem. Enrollment figures for 1943 show 180
students in the "preparatory" department and 80 in the "standard" department.

40. On Worker's University see ibid., p. 69; and Wang Chien-min, Draft History of the CCP, 3:282. On Motor University, see Ma Chun, "North Shensi Public School," p. 22.

41. On the Lu Hsun Academy see Chung-kung chih chiao-yü, p. 70; Wang Chien-min, Draft History of the CCP, 3:283; and Kuo, Analytic History, 3:234 and 243.

42. This school had been set up after the Long March at Wayaopao and later Paoan and was headed prior to 1937 by Tung Pi-wu. On the leadership of the Central Party School, see ibid., p. 38; Kuo, Analytic History, 4:576; and Nym Wales, Red Dust (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1952), p. 43.

43. In other words, cadres above the local committee level if civilian, and above the regimental level if military.

44. On the student composition and enrollment at the Central Party School, see Chung-kung chih chiao-yü, p. 38; Ma Chun, "North Shensi Public School," p. 22; Lu P'ing, "Four Yenan Schools," p. 131; Kuo, Analytic History, 3:233; and Wales, Yenan Notebooks, p. 104.


49. In other words, Party branch leaders could no longer interfere directly with school administration as in the past. They were restricted to recommendations or criticisms within regular Party channels and an auxiliary role in implementing the schools' education plans.


51. It was first formed via a merger of Chinese Women's University, the Tse-tung Youth Cadre School (founded in May 1940), and part of the North Shensi Public School. In 1943 it combined with the Natural Sciences research Institute, Lu Hsun Academy of Arts, Nationalities Academy (founded July 1941), and New Character Cadre School (founded April 1941). The 1944 reorganization involved incorporation of the Administration Academy (founded July 1940). On the history of Yenan University, see Yen-an ta-hsueh kai-k'uang [General situation at Yenan University](n.p., mimeo, June 1944), p. 1.

52. Only thirty students were identified as of proletarian background and 163 of poor peasant background. The largest groups came from "small
property owners" (330), middle peasants (303), and landlords (270). There were 773 enrolled in the Administration Academy; 314 in the Lu Hsun Arts Academy; 72 in the Medical Department; 49 in the Natural Sciences Academy; and 74 in a special "Female Section." See ibid., pp. 13-14.


55. The most noteworthy on intraorganizational behavior were Ch'en Yun's "How to Be a Communist Party Member" (1939), and Liu Shao-ch'i's "Training of the Communist Party member" (1939) and "On the Intra-Party Struggle" (1941). All are reproduced in Compton, Mao's China.

56. On ideological tendencies see in particular Mao Tse-tung, "Reform in Learning, the Party, and Literature" (February 1, 1942), "In Opposition to Party Formalism" (February 8, 1942), "The Reconstruction of Our Studies" (May 5, 1941), "In Opposition to Liberalism" (September 7, 1937), and "In Opposition to Several Incorrect Tendencies within the Party" (December 1929). All are available in Compton, Mao's China.

57. The most noteworthy pieces for this area are the CCP Central Committee's "Resolution on Methods of Leadership" (June 1, 1943) and "Resolution on Investigation and Research" (August 1, 1941), and Mao Tse-t'ung's "Second Preface to Village Investigations" (March 17, 1941). All are available in Compton, Mao's China.

58. "Commandism" and "tailism" are terms employed by the Chinese Communist Party to describe deviations from proper cadre work style. "Tailism" is defined as the practice of blindly following popular demands and "commandism" is one of the terms for overly arrogant and authoritarian behavior.


61. This campaign involved the transfer of a large number of outside activists to local areas.


63. Chang Ting-ch'eng, "Cheng-feng tsai Yen-an Chung-yang tang-hsiao" [Rectification at the Yenan Central Party School], Hsing-huo liao-yuan [A single spark can start a prairie fire], 6 (Peking: Jen-min wen-hsueh ch'u-pan she, 1962):15. See also Kuo, Analytic History, 4:566, 575.

64. Chang Ting-ch'eng, "Rectification," p. 7; Kuo, Analytic History
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3. Arthur Hummel, "Ts'ui Shu," in Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period (1644-1912), edited by Hummel (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1943), p. 773. This short essay on Ts'ui is the best I have seen in any language. Hummel was apparently really taken with Ts'ui. Professor Chaoying Fang, who did a great deal of work on the Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period project, told me that he added to or touched up virtually every entry in that volume except Hummel's on Ts'ui, to which he made no alterations whatsoever. See also Hummel, "Portrait of a Scholar," in There is Another China: Essays and Articles for Chang Poling of Nankai (New York: King's Crown Press, 1948), pp. 131-50.

4. Hung Yeh (William Hung) et al., eds., Ts'ui Tung-pi i-shu yin-te (Index to the collected works of Ts'ui Shu) (Peiping: Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Series, no. 5, 1937). Considering all the truly seminal works in Chinese culture that still have no indexes, this index for Ts'ui's works stands out remarkably; it reflects the kinds of concerns surrounding this whole project, which I shall discuss presently.

5. Ch'ien Mu's introduction deserves special mention for its typically brilliant command (even forty years ago) of all sorts of materials; and his conclusion that Ts'ui Shu, like Chinese people and thinkers in general, always suffered from an overabundance of reverence for antiquity, is the hallmark of his famous Chung-kuo chin san-pai-nien hsueh-shu shih [Chinese intellectual history over the past three hundred years] (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1936). Ch'ien Mu, "Hsu [Introduction] to Ts'ui Tung-pi i-shu, edited by Ku Chieh-kang (Shanghai: Ya-tung t'u-shu-kuan, 1936), 1:15-17. Every subsection of this work has its own pagination.

Ku reveals later in other prefatory notes, comments, and by the inclusion of various essays that he was fully aware of the Japanese edition, and Hu Shih knew of it many years before, but Ku chose to ignore it here.

7. This side of the story has yet to be told straight through with full accuracy. For partial accounts, see: Hashimoto Masayuki, “Sen-Shin jidai shi” [History of the pre-Ch’in period], in Meiji igo ni okeru rekishigaku no hattatsu [The development of historiography from the Meiji period], edited by Rekishi kyōiku kenkyūkai (Tokyo: Shikai shobo, 1933), pp. 407-09; Tam Yue-him, “In Search of the Oriental Past: The Life and Thought of Naitō Konan” (Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1975), pp. 171-74; Naitō Konan, Shina shigaku shi [History of Chinese historiography], in Naitō Konan zenshū [Collected works of Naitō Konan], edited by Naitō Kenkichi and Kanda Kiichirō (Tokyo: Chikuma shobo, 1969-76), 9:393-94. This last source is the most accurate.

8. Miyake Yonekichi, “Bungaku hakase Naka Michiyo-kun den” [Biography of Professor of Literature Naka Michiyo], in Naka Michiyo, Naka Michiyo isho [The remaining (i.e., as yet unpublished) works of Naka Michiyo], edited by the Ko-Naka Michiyo hakase kōseki kinenkai (Tokyo: Dai Nihon tosho, 1915), pp. 32-33; and Goi Naohiro, Kindai Nihon to Tōyoshigaku [Modern Japan and East Asian studies] (Tokyo: Aoki shoten, 1976), p. 52. The story goes that at a meeting in 1894 of middle and upper normal school teachers, Naka proposed a division of the generic course, “Gaikoku rekishi” [History of foreign countries], into “Seiyōshi” [Western history] and “Tōyōshi” [East Asian history]. His proposal was accepted and so the term Tōyōshi was born. For Naka it meant all East Asian nations (except Japan) with China at the center. By 1897 the Mombushō had recognized Naka’s proposal and a textbook bearing the title Tōyōshi soon followed. The terms Seiyō and Seiyōshi predate this episode, as does the expression Tōyō.

9. “Kōshinroku no honkoku” [Reprinting of the K’ao-hsin lu], Shigaku zasshi 11, no. 12 (December 1900):127. Mencius, “Liang Hui wang,” hsia, 11, no. 2. James Legge, The Chinese Classics, Vol. II: The Works of Mencius (London: Trübner and Co., 1861), p. 47. In this passage, Mencius referred to an incident from the Shu-ching to illustrate how anxiously and excitedly the people viewed the great work being done by T’ang—later, in the same section, Mencius says, “it was like rain falling at the right time, the people were ecstatic” (jo shih yü hsia, min ta yüeh).

10. This account of Ts’ui’s ideas is fascinating and oddly never previously attracted anyone’s attention (so far as we now know). It describes Ts’ui’s distinctive historiographic approach, which we shall examine shortly, and goes into considerable detail. See Li Yuan-tu, Kuo-ch’ao hsien-cheng shih-lüeh (Taipei reprint: Wen-hai ch’u-pan-she, n.d.), 36:1651-61. As an aside there is also an entry (from two sources) on Ts’ui in the Kuo-ch’ao ch’i-hsien lei-cheng ch’u-pien [Biographies of Ch’ing venerables and worthies, arranged by categories], compiled by Li Huan (Taipei reprint, 1966), 14:8232; this predates all rediscovery efforts by at least a decade, the whole collection having been completed in 1890. I have rapidly gone through the works of Naitō Chisō that I could locate and have found no reference to Ts’ui Shu; my
guess is that the communication to Konan was either in a letter or done orally. For a brief introduction to Naitō Chišō, see Takasu Yoshijirō, “Kaidai” [Explanatory preface], in Mitogaku taikei [Compendium of the Mito school] (Tokyo: Ida shoten, 1941), 7:15. Chišō was a Kangaku scholar from Edo-han who lived into the mid-Meiji era. His principal work was the multivolume Tokugawa jūgodai shi [A history of the fifteen generations of the Tokugawa].


12. Hashimoto and Tam, following Hashimoto, say that Naitō prepared a biography of Ts‘ui (in this essay), which was based on rare works (Tam, “In Search of the Oriental Past,” p. 173), and explicated the K‘ao-hsin lu (Hashimoto, “History of the Pre-Ch‘in Period,” p. 408). In actuality, Naitō merely translated the Ts‘ui section of the Kuo-ch‘ao hsien-cheng shih-lüeh, not at all a rare source. Implicit in his doing such a translation, I believe, is criticism of the Shigakkai sōsho project, because there are sections in the source translated that refer to works by Ts‘ui that the Shigakkai sōsho people did not have.


16. Sai Tōheki isho [The collected works of Ts‘ui Tung-pi], edited by Naka Michiyō, four volumes (Tokyo: Meguro shoten, 1903-4).


19. From his lecture notes for the Shinchō shi tsūron [General history of the Ch‘ing dynasty], we can see that he had planned to discuss Ts‘ui, but simply overlooked this note during the lecture: “Wang Fu-chih, Fang Pao, Ch‘en Hou-yao, Ku Lien-kao, Wang Mao-hung, and Ts‘ui Shu: they came out of the Sung school and later became followers of the Han school,” Naitō Konan zenshū, 8:459. See also Naitō Kenkichi, “Atogaki” [Afterword] to Naitō Konan zenshū, 8:493.

20. Miyake Yonekichi, “Biography of Naka Michiyō,” p. 37. A scholar of Japanese history and contemporary of Naka, Miyake was famous for his innovative use of an interdisciplinary approach to the study of history, and as such is considered along with several others to have set down the roots of a modern historiography and pedagogy in Meiji Japan. He was also a


A brief comparison of the original *Ts'ui Tung-pi hsien-sheng i-shu* compiled by Ch'en Lü-ho (with an afterword dated 1825) with the Naka edition and the Ku Chieh-kang edition seems in order at this point. I was fortunate enough to have the opportunity to look through a rare copy of one of the original editions at Kyoto University library and to make use of Professor Kuwabara Jitsuzō's (1870-1931) own copy of the Naka edition, replete with Kuwabara's red-penciled notes and place markers throughout the text (his *Toyōshi* collection was donated to the Bungaku-bu library at Kyoto University by his son, Professor Kuwabara Takeo). Naka Michiyō's work entailed a reprinting on excellent paper of the contents of the original Ch'en edition with the addition of punctuation and a certain amount of textual analysis for errors. In essence, Ku Chieh-kang did the same. Aside from general clause and sentence breaks, however, the punctuation systems differ. Naka, of course, inserted Kambun *kariten*, which usually indicate the precise order in which a given clause is to be read in Japanese and thus may specify subjects, objects, verbs, and even particles. On the other hand, Ku used Western punctuation with periods, commas, even adding question marks, exclamation points, and most significantly indications of place names, text names, and personal names. (Compare *Ts'ui Tung-pi hsien-sheng i-shu*, compiled by Ch'en Lü-ho, 55 *chüan*, afterward dated 1825; Naka Michiyō, editor, *Sai Tōheki isho*; and Ku Chieh-kang, main editor, *Ts'ui Tung-pi i-shu*). The major difference between these two editions, aside from numerous prefaces and reprinted material not by Ts'ui himself in the Chinese one, was the discovery by William Hung of a lengthy poetry collection of Ts'ui's, the *Chih-fei chi* [The knowing fallacy collection], which he found in the Yenching University library in 1931, over a decade into Ku's project. It had been listed in Ts'ui's own original table of contents, but, when Ch'en Lü-ho later compiled this edition of Ts'ui's writings, the *Chih-fei chi* was not included and thus was supposedly lost. It and several other bits and pieces presumed lost were similarly punctuated, edited, and included in the thirteenth *ts'e* of the Chinese edition. (See Ku, "Hsu" [Introduction] to Ts'ui's *Chih-fei chi*, in *Ts'ui Tung-pi i-shu*, 13:2-3 and 16. Hu and Ku did discover several other hitherto "lost" Ts'ui poems and essays, also inserted in this volume of the collected works. This is the major contribution of the Chinese edition.)


24. Hu Shih, “K'o-hsueh te ku-shih-chia Ts'ui Shu,” reprinted in Ts’ui Tung-pi i-shu, 2:3.
25. Chao Chen-hsin, in Ts’ui Tung-pi i-shu, 1:55.
26. Schneider, Ku Chieh-kang, p. 94.
28. For an explanation of why the title of this work is to be translated in this way, see Ojima Sukema, quoted by Naitō Kenkichi, “Atogaki” [Afterword] to Naitō Konan zenshū, 1:687.
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