


The Chinese anarchist movement



A history of the Chinese anarchist movement in France, Japan and China itself from 1900 up to the formation of the Chinese Communist Party.

R. Scalapino and G.T. Yu.

Berkeley: Center for Chinese Studies, 1961

Contents

Editor's Note

Preface

The Origins of Chinese Anarchism

Anarchism and the Nationalist Revolution

The Work-Study Movement

The Anarchist Conflict With Marxism

Editor's Footnote

Editor's Note

Chinese Anarchists were inspired by the ideas of Pierre Proudhon, Michael Bakunin, Peter

Kropotkin and Elisee Reclus. Many were exposed to Anarchist ideas while they were students in Europe and Anarchist books were soon translated into Chinese and Esperanto, a popular language among Chinese students. They used the term “Anarchist Communist” interchangeable with the word “Anarchist.” The Chinese words for Anarchist-Communist (Wu-Zheng-Fu Gong-Chan) literally meant “Without Government Common Production” and in no way implied Bolshevism or Maoism. On the contrary, theirs were the Libertarian Socialist ideas of the First International which reflected the traditional Chinese Anarchistic teachings of Lao Tzu while Maoism reflected the authoritarian bureaucracy of Confucianism.

Like the word “communism”, the word “collectivism” also has a different literal meaning in Chinese than when it is commonly used in English: In Chinese, the word for a “collective enterprise” (Ji-ti Qi-ye) literally means an assembly of people in a bureaucracy (a “tree of people”)—very different from our understanding of Michael Bakunin’s Collectivism or a workers’ collective—more like Bolshevism or Fabian Socialism—the Chinese Anarchist Shih Fu substantiated this translation by identifying Karl Marx as the father of “collectivism” in his writings. [1](#)

Historically, Marxism was unable to make inroads into China until after the Russian Revolution of 1917 when Lenin’s followers, bankrolled by the Bolshevik government, began their attacks on Anarchists in Russia and neighboring countries. This book describes some of the early history of Chinese Anarchism up to the period after the Bolshevik counter-revolution when Russia began to send Marxist-Leninist missionaries like Chou En-lai to try to infiltrate and take over the student movements in Europe. It includes some of the ideological debates which ensued between Chinese Anarchists and their Marxist-Leninist adversaries.

Preface

In their memorable 1936 conversations, Mao Tse-tung remarked to Edgar Snow that he had once been strongly influenced by Anarchism. [2](#) Mao was referring to the period at the close of World War I, when he had come to Peking [Beijing] from Hunan province as a part of a student group who hoped to study in France. While some of his colleagues realized this goal, Mao remained in Peking and worked as a librarian in Peking University. But in Peking as in Paris, Anarchism was much in vogue with the intellectual avant-garde of this era. Thus Mao had the opportunity to read Kropotkin in translation, Anarchist pamphlets derived from a variety of Western sources, and the contributions of the Chinese Anarchists themselves. Many discussions with student-friends flowed from the theories and themes contained in these materials.

Mao’s interest in Anarchism was by no means unique. On the contrary, it marked him as a part of the central radical stream of those times. Anarchism preceded Marxism in northeast Asia as the predominant radical expression of the Westernized intellectual. Between 1905 and 1920, Anarchist thought was a vital part of the intellectual protest movement in both Japan and China. Indeed, in many respects, it possessed the coveted symbol among intellectuals of being the most scientific, most “progressive,” most futuristic of all political creeds.

The Origins of Chinese Anarchism **Chinese Students Sent Abroad**

Our story begins in Paris and in Tokyo during the period that immediately followed the ill-fated Boxer Rebellion. Even the decadent Manchu Court had at long last been forced to acknowledge the need for reform, albeit too late. Both the central and the provincial governments of China had begun to send sizeable numbers of students abroad. By 1906, there were over 10,000 Chinese students in Japan and about 500-600 in Europe. [3](#) Japan was the

most logical training area for the majority of students for obvious reasons. It was closer to home and the costs were considerably less than elsewhere. The problem of cultural adjustment was much more simple. In addition, Japan represented the type of synthesis between tradition and modernity that could have meaning to China, particularly since it was a synthesis generally favorable to the values of political conservatism.

Perhaps the motives of Chinese authorities in sending students abroad were not entirely “pure.” Chu Ho-chung, himself sent to Germany during this period, has written that local authorities in the Wuhan area sent student “activists” abroad to get rid of them, with the more radical being dispatched to Europe and the less radical to Japan! [4](#) He also reported that students interested in engineering and mining generally went to Brussels in this period, whereas those studying law, political science, and economics went mainly to Paris. Thus Paris became the natural locus of student radicalism.

The Paris Group

Whatever the factual basis of these remarks, Paris did indeed become the center of the early Chinese Anarchist Movement. When Sun Pao-ch’i went to France in 1902 as Chinese Minister, over twenty government and private students traveled with him. [5](#) Included in this group were Li Shih-tseng and Chang Ching-chiang, both young men from prominent families. Li was the son of Li Hung-tsaio who for some twenty-five years prior to his death in 1897 had been a powerful figure in the national administration. [6](#) Young Li had come to France as an attaché in the Chinese legation, but soon he gave up this position to study biology and promote Anarchism. Chang came from a wealthy business family and thus was able to contribute substantial funds to the revolutionary cause. [7](#)

In 1902, Chang used his money to found the T’ung-yun Company as a Chinese commercial firm in Paris. Between 1902 and 1906, a number of young men from Chang’s village came to Paris with assurances of work while they continued their studies. Some of these, such as Ch’u Min-i, became active workers in the Anarchist ranks. [8](#) A Chinese restaurant-tea house was established under the auspices of Chang’s “Company” as an additional outlet for private students from China.

The entrepreneurial activities of the young Chinese in Paris underwent further expansion in 1906-7. A printing plant (Imprimerie Chinoise) was organized in Paris in 1906 by Chang, Li, Ch’u, and Wu Chihhui. The following year, a Chinese pictorial *Shih-chieh* (The World), was published, with ten thousand copies being widely distributed in many countries. Due to high printing costs and a low income from sales, *Shih-chieh* did not last long; only two issues and one supplement were printed. Meanwhile, in the same year (1907), Li, Hsia Chien-chung, and several others organized the Far Eastern Biological Study Association, with a laboratory alongside the printing plant. Two years later, after various chemical experiments with beans, Li established a bean-curd factory which produced assorted bean products in addition to the traditional Chinese bean-curds. The idea of work-study was prominently involved in this experiment. [9](#) In the evenings and when not on duty, the workers were to practice Chinese and French, as well as studying such subjects as general science. Smoking, drinking, and gambling were strictly forbidden. Initially, five Chinese were employed, but the number eventually reached thirty.

These ventures had their very practical aspect; they represented attempts to finance the education of as many fellow countrymen as possible. But underlying them also ran a strong current of idealism, and the ideological base of this idealism lay in Anarchism as it was currently being propagated in Europe. All of the young Chinese associated with the enterprises noted above became ardent converts to the Anarchist creed. And to espouse this creed, Li, Chang, Ch’u and Wu began the publication of a weekly known as the *Hsin Shih chi*

(The New Century), on June 22, 1907. [10](#) For three years, this journal was to champion the causes of Anarchism and revolution, reaching Chinese students and intellectuals in all parts of the world. Very few copies penetrated China proper, of course, but at a later point, as we shall note, the Hsin Shih-chi message was to reach the homeland through various channels.

Senior in age and experience, Wu Chih-hui became the primary organizer of the Paris Anarchist Group, although Li Shih-tseng was perhaps its driving spirit. Wu was born in 1864 in Kiangsu province. [11](#) His early education was of the traditional Chinese type. He reached the Chih-shih examinations in Peking, but failed. (Li's father was one of the four examiners). For some time after 1894, Wu taught at various schools in Peking, Tientsin, and Shanghai. At one point, he nearly entered the Hupeh Military Academy, not doing so only because he lacked the funds to get there.

In 1901, Wu made a brief trip to Tokyo, returning to Canton in December of that year. The first revolutionary seeds seem to have been planted in his mind during this period. His stay in Canton was unhappy, and in 1902, he returned to Japan. On this occasion, he became involved in a heated controversy with the Chinese Minister over educational policy and radical activities. At one point, Wu became so angry that he jumped into the sea, intent upon a protest suicide, and had to be rescued by the Japanese police. In May 1902, he returned to Shanghai. In October, the Ai-kuo Hsueh-she, "Patriotic Association," was founded. Wu joined and moved into its headquarters. By 1903, this Association was secretly promoting revolution, using the newspaper *Su-pao* as its organ. In May 1903, Chinese authorities moved against *Su-pao*; Chang Ping-lin, to whom we shall later refer, was one of those arrested. But Wu escaped, first to Hong Kong and then to London.

The next several years were spent in London, with one brief trip to Paris. Finally, in 1906, Wu moved to Paris, living with Li and Ch'u Min-i. Li had first met Wu in Shanghai while en route to France in 1902; Chang had visited Wu in London in 1905. It was after Wu moved to Paris that these young men joined Sun's T'ung Meng Hui and organized the Shih-chih-she, "The World Association," to undertake publication activities. In the spring of 1906, Chang had returned home for a visit. En route, he purchased a printing press in Singapore and employed a Chinese printer to go to Paris as operator. [12](#) With these acts, the young conspirators were in a new business—that of turning out revolutionary propaganda.

Influences Upon the Paris Group

Li Shih-tseng has given us some later recollections of the varied influences that played upon him and his colleagues during this period. [13](#) Perhaps these can be divided into three major categories: the Chinese classical philosophers; Darwin and the Social Darwinists; and the radical libertarians, brought up to date by the Anarchism of Proudhon, Bakunin, and Kropotkin. As we shall note, the Paris group were in certain respects fervent anti-traditionalists who decried any attempt to equate Lao Tzu with the modern Anarchists, or the ancient well-field system with modern communism. Yet almost without exception, these were young men who had received an excellent classical education. They had been exposed to a range of political ideas almost as broad as that existing in classical Western philosophy. At the very least, this robbed most contemporary Western theories of their strangeness. It permitted an identification, a familiarity which could contribute powerfully toward acceptance even when the conscious act was that of rejecting traditionalism in favor of progress and modernity. [14](#)

This was the age of Darwinism. Li now recalls how greatly he was influenced by the writings of Lamarck and Darwin, how these men opened new doors for him in history and philosophy as well as in science. The influence was especially strong upon a young man studying zoology, botany and biology, but Li would have felt the Darwinian impact, no matter what

his field. It was the truth—the science—of Darwinism that Socialists (and many non-Socialists) used as a point of commencement from which to analyze man in society, social and political evolution, and fundamental values. One started with Darwin, irrespective of where one ended.

The Paris group of young Chinese ended with Prince Peter Kropotkin and Elisée Reclus whose theories in certain respects constituted a sharp challenge to Darwinism. Their doctrines were those of Anarchist Communism, as originally set forth by Bakunin and subsequently carried forward by Kropotkin and Reclus, first at Geneva and then at Paris. [15](#) The two latter men were the foremost leaders of the late nineteenth century Anarcho-Communist movement. Their journal, *Le Revolté*, was published in Geneva from 1879, and transferred to Paris in 1885. In 1895, a new organ, *Les Temps Nouveaux*, edited by Jean Grave, carried on the movement, publishing its final issue in August 1914. In this connection, it might be noted that the Esperanto title of *Hsin Shih-chi* was *La Tempoĵ Novaj*. And certainly no single work had greater influence upon the young Chinese Anarchists than Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid*. If their movement had a bible, this was it. [16](#)

It is easy to understand how men like Wu, Li, and Chang might make a personal identification with such figures as Bakunin, Kropotkin, and Reclus. Despite the seeming cultural chasm, there were many common bonds. These were aristocrats, by birth as well as by intelligence. They represented the most sensitive and concerned segment of the leisure class. [17](#) Another bond was that of science. All of these men were committed to science—either as a profession or as a way of life. Kropotkin, for example, was an eminent geologist, Reclus a world-famous geographer, Li a budding biologist. Science, not Esperanto, was the true international language of this age. And if both nature and man could be explained, universally and rationally, what was more logical than to apply science to politics, to seek an universal, scientific theory of man in society, one case in an evolutionary mold? There was, perhaps, an additional tie of major proportions between our young Chinese radicals and the Russian Anarchists, that of political environment, Russia and China were the two sick giants of the early twentieth century. That a bond of sympathy should exist between the dissident intellectuals of these two societies was natural. The receptivity of the Paris group to the voices of Russian radicals—indeed, the general influence of Russian revolutionaries upon their Asian counterparts—must be related to this fact. [18](#)

The New Century and its Message

Thus the philosophy of *Hsin Shih-chi* was Anarchist Communism, with some special Chinese emphases. It can best be set forth in terms of “anti’s” and “pro’s.” The young Chinese Anarchists were anti-religion, anti-traditionalist, anti-family, anti-libertine, anti-elitist, anti-government, anti-militarist, and anti-nationalist. They were pro-science, pro-freedom, pro-humanist, pro-violence, pro-revolution, pro-communist, and pro-universalist. To understand the Anarchist position, these numerous themes must be fitted together. It is entirely proper to start with the negative. The Anarchists conceived their immediate task to be that of destruction. Only when the existing state and other artificialities restraining man had been destroyed, could human freedom flow. Indeed, destruction was the most conscious, planned act that the Anarchist could undertake, since freedom would come only in its aftermath, and come as a natural, inevitable consequence requiring no elitist guidance or tampering. In their anti-religious position, the young Chinese Anarchists had some sustenance from their own cultural heritage of secularism. They could also look upon the European scene as detached observers, without deep personal involvement. Thus one seems to sense a somewhat less frenzied tone to the anti-religious articles than that characteristic of certain Western radicals. Their position, however, was clear and unequivocal. Wu Chih-hui remarked that the blind worship of religion had been one of the great historical problems of Europe, but he noted that

a significant change was taking place. [19](#) The separation of church and state in France was cited as one indication of this change.

Perhaps the Hsin Shih-chi position on religion was best expressed by Wu in an exchange between him and a reader from Japan. [20](#) The reader (presumably a Chinese student) wrote that while pro-Socialist, he felt the attacks upon religion were too extreme, thereby alienating would-be supporters. Moreover, he queried, are not the moral standards of the Chinese quite deficient as their educational standards, and is there not a need for religious morality among them? Wu answered by posing the morality of Socialism against that of religion. He asserted that Socialist morality contained all of the basic ethical principles found in religion, without its accompanying superstitions.

It was not sufficient for Chinese Anarchists to attack religion. Confucianism also had to be assaulted. This assault took various forms. In the very first issue of *Hsin Shih-chi*, it was suggested that Confucius lived in an age of barbarism, and that in such an age, it was not difficult for “crafty men” to make themselves into sages and be worshiped by simple folk. [21](#) The more basic attack upon Confucianism, however, was impersonal: that later generations had attempted to turn him into a saint and insisted that his every word be treated as law without regard to changing times and events. Thus the attack upon Confucianism was broadened to include a general criticism of traditionalism in all its forms. “The Chinese seem to be the greatest lovers of things ancient,” complained Chtu Min-i, “so much so that their minds have been wholly bound by traditional customs and thus they have become enslaved by the ancients.” [22](#) Even in recent decades when it has finally been admitted that China must absorb Western learning, there is still the insistence that “the national character” be preserved. And in the following passage, the author put the anti-traditionalist argument forcefully and well:

Quote:

“I say that the reason why China has not been able to progress with the world has been due to its emphasis upon things ancient and its treatment of modern things lightly. And the reason why the West had progressed is because of its opposite attitude... We Chinese also have a tendency to treat all Western things as things which China has long experienced or possessed. For example, we say that China long ago engaged in imperialism under the Mongols...; that China long ago realized nationalism under the Yellow Emperor...; that Lao Tzu was the founder of Anarchism; that Mo Tzu was the first advocate of universal love; and finally, that China long ago practiced communism under the name of the ‘Well-Field System’. Alas! There is reason behind the birth of new knowledge. It comes at the appropriate time, when it has the potential of realization. One cannot take some saying from the ancients and state in effect that all was long ago foreseen, or that all things new must be fitted into existing ancient teachings... There are countless things which even modern man cannot foresee. Thus how much can one expect of the ancients?” [23](#)

This anti-traditional position was important. It symbolized the commitment to modernity, progress, and new ideas that embodied the essence of twentieth century radicalism in the Far East. The anti-traditional, anti-Confucian themes enunciated in *Hsin Shih-chi* and a few other Chinese radical journals of this period were later carried forward by Ch’en Tu-hsiu and many other “progressive” intellectuals. After 1915, as is well known, the *Hsin Ch’ing-nien* (The New Youth), edited by Ch’en, served as the avant-garde journal for the Chinese intellectuals. Its searching criticisms of contemporary Chinese society provided a powerful stimulus to the political events that followed. But many of these criticisms had first been advanced a decade earlier by the Chinese overseas students, particularly by the Paris and Tokyo Anarchist groups. There was a natural connection between the anti-Confucian, anti-traditional themes and that of anti-family. In one of its first issues, *Hsin Shih-chi* called for an “ancestor

revolution.” [24](#) The veneration of ancestors was denounced as a breach of reason, a denial of science. To qualify as a member of the Chinese Revolutionary Party, one’s position on this issue had to be clear, it was asserted. Moreover, in the broader sense, social revolution had to begin with the family, because the family was the primary institution of subjugation and inequality. Thus was one of the earliest attacks launched on the Chinese familial institution, an attack that has finally reached a climax in the events since 1949. [25](#)

It is equally important, however, to note the strong anti-libertine position which the young Anarchists took. Like most “true believers,” the Chinese Anarchists had a fairly rigorous ethical code. Theirs was a call to hard work and hard study, the protection of one’s body, and in general, a Spartan life. The Anarchists were vigorously opposed to visiting prostitutes, smoking, drinking, and gambling, and as we have noted, these activities were prohibited in Anarchist-run establishments. Some Anarchists like Li Shihseng also espoused vegetarianism. Physical exercise was greatly encouraged. The contrast between these rules of personal conduct and those of the orthodox Chinese scholar-gentry class was striking. And in this sense, conversion to Anarchism was similar to religious conversion involving the attempt to follow a whole new way of life. Nor is a strong parallelism with the later Communist movement lacking. But it must be emphasized that for the Anarchist, “conversion” was an intensely personal act. Moreover, the very fact that the Anarchist ethical code, if strictly followed, separated one from the mores of one’s class and society in this period, enhanced the individualism which at root the Anarchists cherished. In these senses, there is a substantial difference from the heavy compulsory element in Chinese Communist morality, from the conscious attempt to create an uniform “moral man” in the Communist mold. The capstone of anarchism is anti-authority. Elitism of all types and in all forms is denounced. It is thus not surprising to find *Hsin Shih-chi* condemning those revolutions conducted by the few as dangerous. [26](#) If the majority of the people did not appreciate the need for revolution and did not support it, its progress would be slow. Only when a revolution had the support of the great majority or the whole of the people could it be considered a true social revolution. [27](#) In a later issue, *Hsin Shih-chi* carried a speech of Liu Shih-p’ei made in Tokyo. [28](#) Liu described the anti-Manchu movement as being supported chiefly by students and secret society members. Hence, its success would be the success of the few, whereas the revolution being proposed by the Anarchists for China would be the product of the many, the struggle of the nation’s peasants and workers, and ultimately, the whole of mankind.

The Anarchists were wanting massive peasant-worker support, and it was the Anarchist Movement that first introduced this concept in its modern form into the stream of Chinese political thought. The early Chinese Anarchists paved the way for all subsequent travelers who chose to worship at the feet of the Proletariat. But the Leninist concept of elitism, of vanguardism, was totally foreign to Anarchist theory. The Anarchists wanted no oligarchy, no inner circle of powerful men to guide the ignorant masses. They believed that any elite would confine and corrupt freedom. The masses must be brought along with the revolution, must be caused to understand and appreciate it, so that in its aftermath, they would be prepared immediately to be free men.

The Anarchist position culminated in a frontal attack upon the state. “All governments are the enemies of freedom and equality” wrote one *Hsin Shih-chi* editor. [29](#) And in a later issue, the Anarchist case was set forth more fully:

Quote:

“The individual is the basic unit in society. Together with others, he forms a village, and with other villages, a country is formed. Society in turn is formed through the process of bringing all countries together. The proper society is that which permits free exchange between and among individuals, mutual aid, the common happiness and enjoyment of all, and the freedom

from control by the force of a few. This is what Anarchism seeks to realize. The governments of today, however, are organized by the few, who in turn pass laws which are of benefit to the few. Thus the state is the destroyer of the proper society. In sum, what we seek is the destruction of the destroyer of proper society.” [30](#)

In such fashion did the Anarchists proclaim their major objectives the elimination of the State and an uncompromising anti-militarism. All governments, of whatever type, were declared the enemies of freedom and equality, coercive devices that protected the few and produced misery for the masses. And it was militarism that served as the brute force to uphold the state, the means whereby the oppressor class retained its supremacy. [31](#)

Unrelenting Anarchist opposition to the State and to organized power in any form produced sharp conflict with the nationalists. An interesting and significant polemic battle between young Anarchists and nationalists was carried out in the pages of *Hsin Shih-chi*. The journal published numerous letters from nationalist readers, with the rebuttal arguments of the editors inserted at intervals into the original text. Simultaneously, it will be recalled, the nationalists were struggling with the K'ang-Liang forces who supported constitutional monarchism. In this era, Chinese nationalism had to do battle on two fronts, and by viewing both fronts, one can glimpse the total Chinese reform-revolution spectrum. The nationalist arguments against Anarchism were many, but two were pushed with special vigor. The nationalists posed their “realistic” view of world politics against anarchist utopianism. As an ideal, Anarchism was excellent, but in the world of reality, it would represent an unchallenged victory for imperialism and despotism. For China to abandon government and her quest for strength would lead to her total conquest by various predatory powers. “If you people know only how to cry emptily that ‘We want no government, no soldiers, no national boundaries, and no state’ and that you are for universal harmony, justice, freedom and equality, I fear that those who know only brute force and not justice will gather their armies to divide up our land and control our people.” [32](#) China must become strong, argued the nationalists, so that none will dare assault it. Indeed, they asserted, without a military force or an organization, one could not even challenge the Manchu tyranny effectively, not to mention the Western imperialists.

Before examining the Anarchist answer, let us advance the second nationalist argument. It might be called the two-stage revolutionary theory in its earliest form. In one letter especially, this theory was spelled out in a most interesting manner. Ordinary societies could be depicted thus:


版史料

Quote:

“Only through the use of nationalism could the Chinese people overcome forces “a” and “b,” and only then would they be able to stand as equals with the world, working for world harmony. The first task was the nationalist revolution, and only after this had been achieved, could a society advance to internationalism.” [33](#)

The *Hsin Shih-chi* answer to this argument carries with it a remembrance of things future. The editor asserted that since the rich and official classes of China do not seek justice, the common people could not unite with them to overthrow the Manchu. The Anarchists were clearly anti-popular front, long before the first Chinese Communists struggled with the

Bolsheviks over this problem. Nor could the Chinese common people jump over barrier “y,” and break the shackles of “a” and “b.” The only answer was total, complete, and simultaneous mass revolution. The Anarchists drew their own diagram:



Quote:

“The inner circle was labeled “the people of the world,” the outer circle was called “all authority,” with the caption. “Unite with the people of the world to burst open authority.” [34](#)

The Anarchists advanced other arguments against their nationalist opponents. They asserted that the maintenance of states and armies did not prevent others from attacking. It was only when concern went beyond one’s own race or nation, when one opposed all enemies of the moral laws of mankind that self-preservation could be attained. [35](#) Rather than merely opposing the Manchu Court, was it not better to oppose monarchy, Manchu or Han? [36](#) Did not those who advocate another state to replace the present one merely postpone the final revolution, and were they not in the same class as the constitutional monarchists? [37](#) If the Han had a right to challenge Manchu control of China, did not the earlier Miao have a right to challenge the Han? [38](#) Was nationalism more than “revengism,” an appeal to irrational hatred and love? [39](#) How long have the Chinese known the meaning of the term “nation,” and does the working class care? [40](#) With such queries did the Anarchists taunt and challenge their rivals.

Sometimes, they too made use of a concept of stages or evolution, but not in the sense of a necessary sequence; rather, in terms of an unfolding of man’s grasp of higher truth and moral law. One writer explained it this way: first came individualism, self-interest; then racial revolution and nationalism, the interest of one’s people; finally, social revolution and universalism, the concern for all mankind. [41](#) Another wrote that man’s evolution was from absolutism to Anarchism. There was little doubt that the Anarchists felt that the age of nationalism was going out of fashion, and could be by-passed in China.

This point may serve as a transition to the Anarchist positive beliefs, and here, one can start with that of science. The strength of anarchist faith in science can be indicated by the remark of Li Shih-tseng: “There is nothing in European civilization that does not have its origin in science.” [42](#) To the Anarchists, science was truth, knowledge, and progress. It was the only legitimate cornerstone of education, the only proper basis of values. [43](#) It separated the barbarian from the civilized man. [44](#)

When the *Hsin Shih-chi* writings are carefully perused, however, it is clear that the young Chinese Anarchists had also acquired a deep conviction in Western humanism, a conviction that did not stem from their reverence for science despite attempts to unite the two. The opening words of *Hsin Shih-chi* proclaimed that the journal would have as its starting point, a sense of kung-li, “common rights,” and liang-hsin, “conscience.” [45](#) In subsequent issues, many articles were sprinkled with words like “justice,” “fairness,” “equality,” and “human rights.” To the Anarchists, the first and last commandment of natural law was that man be free, and that he substitute mutual aid (in Kropotkin’s terms) for ruthless competition and sordid materialism.

The Anarchist attack upon constitutional government flowed partly down this channel. The Anarchists charged that if monarchy was a victory for absolutism, modern democracy was a victory for money and the wealthy class. Both were unnatural and unnecessary forms of coercion, violations of human freedom. Once again, selected aspects of Chinese traditionalism could blend easily with the Western secular humanism to which these young radicals paid tribute. The Anarchists made much of ta-t'ung chu-i, "universalism," but this was surely not a novel term to those trained in the classics, nor were many other terms commonplace in Anarchist literature. This matter must not be oversimplified, however. A term or an idea may be the same in isolated form, but it must be viewed in context if its total meaning and implications are to be understood. In this sense, when the anarchist movement was viewed in its total Western context, it did demand intellectual changes of revolutionary proportions from its Chinese disciples, however much the classics might help in providing some familiar way signs.

Anarchism was based upon a combination of science and humanism. It was an heroic attempt to spell out a theory of progress that would signal man's ultimate triumph over all external coercion and his own internal weaknesses. Naturally, the Anarchists glorified revolution. They argued that the entire movement of mankind from barbarism to civilization was due to revolution. [46](#) They proclaimed the twentieth century as a century of world revolution, from which ultimately no nation would escape. [47](#) And they believed in the use of violence to effect revolution. When accused by nationalist rivals of being inconsistent in advocating anti-militarism on the one hand, but sanctioning violent revolution on the other, the Anarchists refused to admit any contradiction.

Quote:

"Militarism is that by which the strong sacrifice the lives and money of others in order to preserve their own power and that of the state. Thus it is unfair and should be eliminated. Revolutionary assassination, on the other hand, is the sacrifice of the individual to eliminate the enemy of humanity, thereby extending the common rights of the world. These two, militarism and revolutionary assassination, are as different as two things can be." [48](#)

The Anarchists believed that the pistol and the bomb were important means of advancing common rights. One author criticized the young Chinese students in Japan who were committing suicide in protest against Chinese government policies:

Quote:

"If you fellows really see in death the answer to things, why do you not follow in the footsteps of the Russian Terrorist Party by killing one or two thieves of mankind as the price of death. Whether one plunges into the sea or is decapitated (as an assassin), both are the same death. But they are different in their impact. Whereas one has no impact and the person merely dies as a courageous man, the other has a great impact, especially upon the Chinese official class. For the fear of death is one of the special characteristics of Chinese officials. In sum, in this twentieth century, if there is the possibility of eliminating even one thief of mankind and thereby decreasing a portion of dictatorial power, then the year of the great Chinese revolution will be one day closer..." [49](#)

The appeal of assassination to Chinese radicals as a revolutionary technique was due in major part to the problems involved in organizing any effective mass movement in contemporary China, and the difficulties of peaceful change. Assassination was an immediately practical individual action. Other methods seemed utopian, or at best, long range. Still, as we have noted, the Anarchists insisted that a truly successful revolution had to have the support of a majority of the people. To obtain this, they urged a campaign of both propaganda and action at the mass level. This campaign should be directed toward three objects: government,

capitalists, and society. With respect to government, opposition should be concentrated upon militarism, laws, and taxation. Capitalists should be combated by an attack upon the concept of private property. In society at large, religion and the family institution should be exposed. At the action level, assassination should be used against government, strikes against capitalists, and love toward society. [50](#) In another source, *La Révolution*, probably written by Li Shih-tseng and Ch'u Min-i, five means of effectuating revolution were listed: books and speeches "so as to move people"; meetings and gatherings "whereby the people's power may be brought together"; public resistance in the form of refusal to pay taxes; opposition to conscription, and strikes; assassination; and mass uprisings. [51](#)

It is interesting to note one article which urged that the existing Chinese secret societies be converted into vehicles for revolution by the Anarchists. [52](#) It argued that these societies already had a mass base, and had succeeded in implanting an anti-Manchu revolutionary spirit among large numbers of common people. To be sure, the secret societies remained traditionalist and culture-bound, therefore, they did not contribute much to modern China. However, the new revolutionary methods of Western radicalism such as the general strike and anti-militarism might be implanted within the structure of the secret society. If revolution were to succeed in China unions would have to be established, but rather than building anew, why not change the character of the secret societies? Why not cause hundreds and thousands of revolutionary comrades to join these societies, and carry with them the principles of Anarchist-Communism? Then the simple aim of overthrowing the Manchu could be broadened to include the ideas of social revolution and free federation. [53](#)

In the article just cited, the general strike was recognized as a major technique of Western radicalism and a Chinese labor union movement was encouraged. The Paris Anarchist group were emerging at the very time when European Syndicalism was making strides forward, and the general strike was being lauded as the foremost revolutionary method. But considering these facts, the emphasis upon unionism and the strike as a political weapon was rather scanty in the Chinese Anarchist writings. [54](#) The reason was obvious: these factors could not be very meaningful in China under current circumstances. Even the most ardent Anarchist found it difficult to envisage a rapidly growing Chinese labor movement, one that could successfully employ the tactic of the general strike. Revolution via assassination, or via the peasant-worker mass uprising seemed a more promising immediate technique.

The Anarchists were careful to distinguish several types of revolution. They admitted that all revolutions would require some bloodshed, but they argued that actually modern revolutions would be less bloody than those of the past, since resistance to revolution was gradually declining. [55](#) It was important, however, not to be satisfied with a partial or incomplete revolution. Most Anarchists sought to make a basic distinction between "political" and "social" revolution. The former was a limited revolution, one to overthrow the Manchu, but without sufficiently broad socio-economic objectives or mass support. The only complete revolution was a social revolution, one based upon popular support and participation, the principles of political freedom, equality, and a sharing of the wealth. A social revolution had to be underwritten by the practice of Anarchist Communism. [56](#)

Hsin-Shih-chi contained a number of articles that attempted to define and defend Anarchism or Anarchist Communism. A lengthy [57](#) essay, "On Anarchism," ran through many issues of the journal. In this, the authors asserted that Anarchism essentially meant "no authority." Governments used the military to underwrite authority, and hence the Anarchist was opposed to militarism, advocating humanitarianism in its place. Secondly, Anarchism was a theory that no limits should be placed upon man, whereas government limited man by laws and other forms of coercion. Above all, the anarchist respected freedom. In addition, the Anarchist believed in a classless, equal society. He believed in the common sharing of

property, being opposed both to Capitalism and to State Socialism, another form of concentrated political and economic power. Nationalization of industry would only strengthen government and the governing class. The answer lay in the equalization of wealth through communal ownership and communal control, with power centered upon the primary, natural group. Groups, whether in economic or political terms, could be associated with each other through the system of free federation. [58](#)

Precisely when the term “communism” was introduced into Chinese language and thought, we cannot say. It seems likely, however that it occurred during this period, and in connection with the discussions of Anarchist Communism. [59](#) In the *Hsin Shih-chi* issue of November 7, 1908, we find an article by Ch’u Min-i criticizing an earlier article which had been published in the Shanghai *Shih-pao*, a progressive newspaper founded in 1904 by T’i Ch’u-ch’ing, returned student from Japan. That article had been entitled “Why China Cannot Now Promote Communism (Kung-ch’an chu-i).” [60](#) Ch’u in his answer, insisted that all Anarchists were communists, whereas this was not necessarily true of Socialists [The Chinese word for communism “Gong-Chan” literally translates as “Common-Production.”]. There were many false Socialist parties which sought to substitute the power of government (via state socialism) for the power of capitalists. Only communism which ignored the wealth of the nation and its military might, concentrating instead upon the well-being of each individual in the world, could provide justice and achieve universal harmony.

The *Shih-pao* article had equated communism with the ancient Well-Field System, but had asserted that despite the attempt to effectuate communism from time to time throughout Chinese history, it could never be more than empty talk because it ignored reality. At points, this article had used the term, “chn-ch’an,” “equalization of property” for communism, in place of “kung-ch’an” In his reply, Ch’u consistently used the latter term. He denied any relationship between the Well-Field System and modern communism. He insisted, moreover, that one must distinguish between various forms of state collectivism, such as the nationalization of property, and true communism. The latter was based upon common property, with the controls being vested in the small, operative, natural group. Groups were united only in free federation, and there were no coercive instruments of control.

Ch’u admitted that the gap between rich and poor in China had not reached the extremes characteristic of the West. If that fate were to be averted, however, communism would have to be practiced. And in communism, there was only one basic law: “from each according to his ability; to each according to his needs.” No other rules were necessary, and hence there was no need for higher government or a state. When the *Shih-pao* brought social evolutionism into play, Ch’u also had an answer. The *Shih-pao* author had asserted that the world progressed through competition, and thus the struggle between rich and poor, between ruler and people, constituted a part of the inevitable historical process. Responded Ch’u:

Quote:

“Progress did not necessarily depend upon competition and competition did not always mean progress. Mutual aid was also a route to progress—with justice.”

The political theory of the Paris group can perhaps best be summarized by referring to a chart published in the July 27, 1907 issue of *Hsin Shih-chi*. It was entitled “A Comparison of the Three Principles of Nationalism, Democracy, and Socialism.” [61](#) The salient characteristics of nationalism were its anti-Manchu and anti-foreign (Western) qualities. In a limited sense, it was anti-authority: it opposed the transgression of any foreign race upon the Han people, and sought to eliminate the insults to them. It was thus drawn to support militarism as a method of opposing external dangers and strengthening China.

Democracy was characterized by being anti-monarchy and anti-nobility. It too was anti-authority in a limited sense: it opposed the power and coercion of one person (the monarch) or a small group (the officials), and sought to end oppression upon the people. But democracy also supported *tsu-kuo chu-I*, “fatherlandism.” Together, nationalism and democracy sought the well-being of one country or one race. At best, this was a decided minority of world’s people. Hence, in the final analysis, these two movements were dominated by selfishness or self-advantage.

Socialism, on the other hand, was dedicated to opposing all things that were against reason. Thus it was anti-authority without reservation. It was against all political systems. It sought to eliminate injury of whatever type to human freedom and to realize certain universal moral laws. It opposed international as well as national power politics, favoring an end to warfare and the realization of universal harmony. It was for the elimination of evil ways—such as the superstitions of religion (so as to eliminate falseness and realize truth); the obligations of the family (so as to eliminate family bonds and realize love among mankind); and the customs of social intercourse (so as to eliminate falseness and realize practicality). It strongly supported equality in all forms: equality in the economic system (so as to eliminate divisions between rich and poor, and realize common property); equality in moral and political rules (so as to eliminate classes and special privilege). Thus socialism has as its ultimate characteristic universal harmony based upon justice and selfless love of mankind. [62](#) In this fashion, did the Chinese Anarchist seek to distinguish themselves from their rivals and set forth their case.

Sun and the Paris Anarchists

The ideological position of the Paris group should have placed them in sharp conflict with Sun Yat-sen. In fact, however, Sun developed a warm personal friendship with the young Anarchist organizers, induced most of them to join his T’ung Meng Hui, and received various types of aid from them. And in later years men like Wu, Li, and many other young Anarchists gradually affiliated themselves with the Kuomintang. At the end, indeed, some were to be found in the so-called “right wing” of the Kuomintang. How are these seeming contradictions to be explained?

Some critics are prone to see the Paris group as faddists who in their youthful enthusiasm plunged into Anarchism as into all things left-bank French, with tremendous spirit but in an essentially superficial fashion. There is some truth in this evaluation, but it is not wholly fair. Many of the young Chinese in Paris during this era did fall in love with France and did become ardent Francophiles. In a sense, Anarchism for them was only a part of a much broader conversion—a conversion to Western, particularly French, civilization. Li Shih-tseng is an excellent example. Even now, he effects the French manner, down to beret and goatee (though not to food and drink). With him at least the fad endured. But while these faddists may have been superficial Frenchmen, they were not superficial Anarchists. The doctrines which they preached, they understood. In heated argumentation with opponents, they held their own very well. If Western Anarchism in their hands was not particularly enriched, neither was it distorted. To be sure, much of the *Hsin Shih-chi* consisted of straight translations or extensive paraphrasing of Western Anarchist writers; but there were also a goodly number of articles that related Anarchism to the Chinese scene with the same degree of adequacy as characterized Western Anarchists’ attempts to relate their doctrines to the Western scene. Whenever one adopts a life-pattern that is fundamentally foreign to one’s original roots and instincts, to the culture of one’s society, it is difficult to avoid a certain superficiality or shallowness. In defense of the young Anarchists, however, it might be said that by risking such superficiality, by living as “eccentrics” in their society, they were seeking to be true to the individualism which was at the root of their creed. But in any case, the

charge of superficiality is most valid as applied to the “Frenchification process,” not when it refers to the capacity of these young intellectuals to encompass anarchist philosophy.

The more serious charge perhaps is that of opportunism. It is alleged that men like Wu and Li betrayed a basic insincerity in professing Anarchism and yet affiliating themselves increasingly with the nationalist movement, and a centralized political organization, the Kuomintang, which was antithetical to their Anarchist beliefs. Opportunism has been a recurrent charge against many elements within the modern Chinese elite; so frequently has the issue been raised that some might regard it as a cultural defect. Chinese intellectuals of varying political persuasions (and other social classes as well) are accused of taking or abandoning positions of principle too easily, depending upon the opportunities or threats that present themselves, or the current nature of their personal alliances. Sometimes, indeed, the intellectual or the merchant has been accused of having no principles, being like a political litmus paper which reflects the dominant pressures of the society, or its most likely future trend. Thus the charges against Wu and Li are by no means unique. In assessing this general problem, one must remember that the modern Chinese intellectual has faced a supremely difficult problem: how to live decently—perhaps how to live at all—in a period of continuous chaos and upheaval. In such a setting, it is easy enough to criticize almost everyone as “opportunistic,” particularly when there can be no doubt that personal alliances (in the absence of basic social and political stability) have often assumed transcendent importance. However, even when one sets the familial nature of Chinese society aside, for many Chinese intellectuals, the dilemma has been whether to hold rather rigidly to some set of principles, some utopia, achieving only impotence and possibly running serious personal risks; or whether to seek the “lesser evil,” compromising with the real political forces that existed in his environment. Few societies in the world have posed this dilemma more painfully for its elite than modern China.

But what specifics should be added in connection with the Anarchist Movement, and men like Wu and Li? Despite their anti-nationalist position, the young Anarchists could not avoid a natural link with Sun’s revolutionary movement. After all, it did represent the first step: it was anti-Manchu and hence anti-authority in terms of the contemporary Chinese scene. The Anarchists, moreover, always hoped that they could win over this movement to their side, both with respect to tactics (assassination, strikes, and revolution) and with respect to ultimate goals. And in tactical terms, they scored some successes. As we shall note later, the major Anarchist spokesmen did not participate in politics immediately after the revolution. They remained generally aloof, both from power and from party position. Over time, however, men like Wu began to rationalize a closer relation to the Kuomintang and to political office. Wu was fond of saying that it would take many years to achieve Anarchism, and in the meantime, Sun’s Three People’s Principles were an adequate beginning. Moreover, the Anarchists were undoubtedly pushed toward the Kuomintang in the aftermath of the Russian Revolution, and their bitter struggle with the Chinese Communists. In later years, the choice was essentially between the Communists and the Kuomintang. Perhaps it is not surprising that some of the old Anarchists cast in their lot with the latter, especially since it was possible for them to retain a certain “special status,” to pursue a personal creed, an individual way of life, and to hold office (or sinecure) with rather minimal obligations. What quotient of opportunism this transition represented each reader must decide for himself. [63](#)

In any case, if we return to the initial ties between Sun Yat-sen and the Paris Anarchist group, we have to enter the complex world of Chinese personal relations. Such relations constitute that human element of tremendous importance that must be factored into any realistic analysis of Chinese politics rendering the illogical, logical or at least explicable, giving life and uncertainty to what would otherwise be a political scene fully determined by the theories

we have attempted carefully to sketch. Wu Chih-hui may have met Sun in Tokyo in March, 1901, but their friendship dated from the winter of 1904 when they were both staying in London. [64](#) We do not know the frequency of their contact. Sun did introduce Wu to his old teacher, Dr. James Cantlie. It was also at this time that the two men met Chang Ching-chiang. At some point during this period, Chang promised Sun that if he ever needed money, he need only wire, and the two men even worked out a code that would signify the amount required. [65](#) On at least two occasions, once in 1906 and again the following year, Sun took advantage of this offer and obtained substantial sums. Both Wu and Chang also joined the T'ung Meng Hui. Wu joined in late 1905, reportedly because he thought the Sun program was an acceptable partial step and because he was convinced that all revolutionaries should work together. There can be little doubt that Sun's very great eclecticism when it came to Socialist doctrine abetted this position. It is likely that Sun paid considerable homage to Anarchism as an "ideal," especially when he was with the Paris group. Chang joined the T'ung Meng Hui in 1907 in Hong Kong, after it had been agreed that the oath of allegiance could be modified to omit any mention of heaven. As an Anarchist who opposed religion, Chang insisted upon this change. [66](#)

After 1907, Sun and the Paris group were brought even closer together by having a mutual enemy. In the autumn of 1907, Chang Ping-lin (T'ai-yen) and certain other T'ung Meng Hui members in Tokyo launched a movement to oust Sun as head of the revolutionary movement. Sun was in Indo-China, and his chief supporters were gone from Tokyo. Chang became editor of the *Min-pao*. He had always been a somewhat different revolutionary type, being essentially a classicist and a Buddhist, with very little interest in Western "progressive" ideas, and an antipathy toward Socialism. Chang was violently anti-Manchu, but beyond this, he had little in common with the young radicals, or with Sun himself. In October, 1907, Chang Ping-lin, Chang Chi, and some other members of the Tokyo T'ung Meng Hui published a manifesto seeking to remove Sun as leader of the revolutionary movement. Sun was attacked for having taken the title of tsung-li or general leader, it being denied that his influence or ability warranted such an exalted designation. He was charged with the rash sacrifice of lives in hopeless ventures. It was also asserted that he had misused funds and deposited a small fortune to his name in the bank. [67](#) This manifesto was evidently widely circulated among Chinese overseas communities.

As indicated earlier, relations between Wu Chih-hui and Chang Ping-lin had been bad since the 1903 *Su-pao* affair. *Su-pao*, [Kiangsu Journal] had begun in 1897 as a reform newspaper and gradually moved toward the support of revolution. It operated from the Shanghai International Settlement, being registered with the Japanese Consulate in the name of the Japanese wife of the editor, Hu Chang. Among the important writers in 1903 were Wu Chih-hui, Chang Pinglin, and Ts'ai Yuan-p'ei. At this time, Tsou Yung wrote a violently anti-Manchu pamphlet entitled Revolutionary Army which suggested among other things the assassination of the Emperor. Chang not only wrote the preface for this pamphlet, but also reviewed it in the pages of *Su-pao*. Infuriated Chinese authorities obtained permission for a trial before the Mixed Court. But most of the leaders including Wu escaped. Chang, however, was caught, tried, and sentenced to three years' imprisonment. For some reason not clear, Chang blamed Wu for his arrest, and a strong hostility developed between the two men. [68](#)

Thus it was easy for the Paris group led by Wu to defend Sun against an old enemy. For a time, Wu and Chang Ping-lin exchanged attacks through the pages of their respective journals. These have been called excellent examples of Chinese vituperative literature. [69](#) This may be true. Surely they are not excellent examples of anything else. The issues raised were negligible. Chang did attack Anarchist support for the international language Esperanto as an abandonment of Chinese learning. He charged that the Paris group were sycophants of

the West, and that the self-proclaimed scientific basis of their Anarchist philosophy was totally faulty. [70](#) Wu attacked Chang's conservative nationalism and accused him of maintaining connections with traitors to the revolutionary cause. [71](#) And Sun's honor was staunchly upheld in Paris.

In later years, Sun sought to repay these services. He offered positions both in the Kuomintang and in the government to his old Anarchist friends. Initially, these were declined, with most of the Anarchists remaining firm in their refusal to be associated with power. Later, however, some posts were accepted, as the Anarchist Movement faded away before the challenges of nationalism and Communism. But the ideological chasm between Sun and the Anarchists was never bridged. At times, it seemed that Sun was willing to accommodate himself to all doctrines that bore the label "Socialism." And despite their early denials, Anarchists like Wu, Chang, and Li ultimately seemed willing to accommodate themselves to Sun's "Three People's Principles" as a first step in the proper direction as was suggested earlier. In purely ideological terms, however, there could be no easy compromise between Sun's one-party tutelage and the Anarchists' freedom, between his concept of centralized power and their concept of free federation. Theirs was a marriage of convenience and friendship, not of logic.

The Mounting Struggle Against the Government

In addition to defending Sun, Hsin Shih-chi kept up a running battle against government surveillance of overseas students. In early 1907, the Chinese government announced it would send a supervisor to France "to assist" the students in their various activities. On June 18, 1907, the very eve of the first issue of *Hsin Shih-chi*, a meeting was convened by the Chinese students in France, and the matter was discussed. What percentage of the students came is unclear, but the attitude of those present toward this new proposal was very clear indeed. They recommended that any supervisor meet the following conditions:

1. He should know three languages well.
2. He should be well versed in at least one science.
3. He should not be allowed to bring his family.
4. His salary should not be more than the amount paid to three students. [72](#)

If these qualifications could have been applied, the students would not have had to worry about the supervisor's imminent arrival! And there is good reason to believe that the Anarchist group had a considerable role in framing these suggestions. In the course of the meeting, some amendments were proposed. It was suggested that only those members of the official's family with bound feet be prohibited from coming, so as not to disgrace the students. The question of queues was also raised.

The *Hsin Shih-chi* report of the meeting was written in a satirical vein. [73](#) If there were a need for someone to make payments to overseas students, then an accountant should be brought, not a supervisor. Of course, the government really wanted to investigate revolutionary activities. To help the government in this respect, the writer stated that he could announce immediately that the general student sentiment was favorable to revolution; the only opposition came from those who wanted to become officials and acquire wealth. These were already serving as informers, so why waste money on a supervisor who would know so little in any case that he would have to depend upon them after his arrival. The writer made one additional offer to help. Henceforth, he said, we will print more news about revolutionary activities and send the paper free of charge to the supervisor. Then he can stay home and still be well informed. Despite this final offer, the supervisor did arrive. *Hsin Shih-chi* reported his first speech, an address given on May 31, 1908. [74](#) It was a conciliatory talk delivered before

some 60-70 students, but Wu took strong exception to it and sought to read amply between the lines. Meanwhile, pressure upon the revolutionary movement was everywhere on the increase. By the latter part of 1908, Chinese authorities had finally prevailed upon the Japanese government to stop the publication of *Min-pao* and two Anarchist journals, *T'ieni Pao* (Natural Principles) and *Heng Pao* (Measurement). Nevertheless, the 25th issue of *Min-pao* was printed secretly, and at one point, *Hsin Shih-chi* announced that it was serving as publisher. [75](#) There were later indications, however, that this issue which came out late in 1909, was not printed in Paris; it was probably printed “underground” in Tokyo. [76](#)

The editor of the secret *Min-pao* was Wang Ching-wei, an ardent supporter of Sun and one definitely influenced by the Anarchist writings of this period. Chang Ping-lin, now excluded from authority, complained bitterly that this was a false *Min-pao*, but *Hsin Shih-chi*, helping to distribute it, asserted “party members in the East are paying no attention to Chang’s charges.” [77](#) And Wang was to be the final hero of the Paris journal. Its last issue, published on May 21, 1910, might well have been called the Wang Ching-wei special edition, since it was devoted almost entirely to praise of Wang for his attempted assassination of the Manchu Prince Regent. [78](#)

On the eve of the Nationalist Revolution, the Chinese Anarchists had considerable reason for optimism. The revolutionary movement seemed to be adopting their tactics. Assassination and other forms of “direct action” had become the order of the day. Anarchist writings had had an impact upon a number of nationalists, and the leaders of the Paris group had close personal ties with Sun and his supporters. The pro-Sun element, moreover, was now clearly ascendant within the revolutionary camp of China. This element had successfully weathered the Chang Ping-lin storm, and it was moving left, partly as a result of that storm. Finally, the international climate for Anarchism seemed generally good. Anarchism and Anarcho-Syndicalism were much in vogue in European radical circles. Even in the United States, the IWW had created a considerable stir, and American Socialism had to conjure with names like Emma Goldman and William Haywood. In Japan, the Anarchists had captured the commanding heights of the Socialist Movement. Was there not reason to believe that Anarchism represented the wave of the future?

The Chinese Anarchist Movement in Tokyo

Before looking at that future, however, we must turn back to the past. A Chinese Anarchist group had emerged in Tokyo at almost precisely the same time that the Paris group was being organized. The central figures in Tokyo were Chang Chi, Liu Shih-p’ei, and Liu’s wife, Ho Chen. Chang Chi, who became associated with the Paris group as well as with the Anarchist movement in Japan, was one of the earliest Chinese students studying in Japan. [79](#) From a scholarly-gentry family of Hupei, Chang first arrived in Japan in 1899. He soon became active in the nationalist movement and joined Sun’s T’ung Meng Hui upon its establishment in 1905. Chang studied political science and economics at Waseda University. In Japan, he became acquainted with Japanese Anarchists, including Kotoku Sh-usui and Osugi Sakae, and later translated Errico Malatesta’s work on Anarchism into Chinese. [80](#) Liu came from a long line of scholars, had received a thorough classical education, and had demonstrated remarkable ability as a youth. [81](#) He was already teaching at the age of eighteen, and passed his chi-jen degree the following year, in 1903. His conversion to the anti-Manchu cause seems to have been mainly the product of a friendship developed with Chang Ping-lin’ whose background and interests were very similar to those of Liu. In 1904, Liu became a member of the patriotic society, Kuang-fu Hui, “Restoration Society,” in Shanghai, having been introduced by Ts’ai Yuan-p’ei. During this period, Liu gradually became active in revolutionary undertakings, participating in various publications, helping to plan an unsuccessful assassination, and supporting himself by doing some middle school teaching.

In 1907, Liu and his wife went to Japan. He had changed his name by this time to Kuang-han (Restore the Han), and his wife also had adopted a new appellation. At first, they lived with Chang Ping-lin. [82](#) Within a few months, they had made contact with Japanese Anarchists, and were obviously much influenced by them. Kotoku Shosui and some of his young disciples did a great deal to convert Liu to the Anarchist cause. In June, Liu and Chang Chi decided to establish a Society for the Study of Socialism. The fifteenth issue of *Min-pao* which was published in July, 1907, carried a brief news item about this study group, with the request for the names and addresses of those interested, and a promise to notify all who responded as to the time and place of the first meeting. [83](#) Meanwhile, Liu and his wife had begun the publication of an Anarchist journal, *T'ien-i Pao*. The first issue came out in June. [84](#)

A detailed report of the first meeting of the Society for the Study of Socialism is available. [85](#) It was held on August 30, 1907. About ninety people attended, and the two major speeches were made by Liu and Kotoku. Liu began by announcing that the purpose of the society was not merely the study of Socialism, but the practice of Anarchism. He then proceeded to advance arguments on behalf of this creed. Like his comrades in Paris, Liu had been strongly influenced by the composite forces of Chinese classicism, Darwinism, and radical libertarianism. The realization of Anarchism in China, he stated, should not be too difficult, because for thousands of years, the Chinese political foundation had rested upon Confucian and Taoist principles of “indifference” and “non-interference.” In practice, moreover, traditional Chinese government had not been close to the people and had not been trusted by them. Laws had been merely formal documents and officials had held only empty positions. No individual had truly possessed power. The government had looked down upon the people, treating them as plants and animals; and the people had viewed the government as repulsive and evil. This historic situation of “indifference” to government could easily be turned into a victory for Anarchism, Liu remarked. Indeed, he argued, China should be the first country in the world to realize Anarchism due to this unique background.

Liu also dealt with Darwinism. To the extent that it represented science, it represented the new truth that should provide the basis for human relations. But Liu challenged the Darwinian thesis that progress came through competition, asserting that that was “the old theory.” The new theory was that of Kropotkin: progress through Mutual Aid. This was an idea that had firm foundations in nature and thus represented a superior scientific truth. And throughout his speech, Liu cited the Western libertarians from Rousseau to Bakunin and Kropotkin. Primitive man had been free until he was enslaved by government. Political authority could have no legitimate basis, either in morality or in need. All forms of authority were types of oppression. Human freedom in the most complete possible form had to be the supreme desideratum of civilized man. Liu sought to build a popular front between “anti-Manchuism” and Anarchism, while at the same time clearly distinguishing between them, and asserting the superiority of the latter. The bond between anti-Manchuism and Anarchism lay in the fact that both were against absolutism and in favor of revolution. Thus they should be able to cooperate. But there were three reasons why Anarchism was superior, according to Liu. First, nationalism—the worship of one’s own race and the casting off of others—could easily be turned into national imperialism. Second, revolution should not have such a private, selfish motive as that of seizing power for oneself or one’s group; it should be dedicated to freedom of all, as was anarchism. Finally, revolution had to have a broad base. The anti-Manchu movement was primarily a movement of students and secret society members, whereas the Anarchist revolution would be supported and underwritten by the whole people, the peasants and workers of the nation. To enjoy lasting success, revolutions had to have a mass basis.

After Liu, Chang Chi made a few remarks, and then a lengthy speech by Kotoku, the Japanese Anarchist, followed. Kotoku's influence upon his Chinese comrades must have been very great. He was probably the most brilliant Japanese radical of his generation. Moreover, his contacts with Western Socialism were extensive, both in terms of the literature and in terms of personal contacts. Kotoku had returned from the United States in mid-1906 with books and the latest ideas. His translations helped to introduce Kropotkin and other Western Anarchists to all students living in Japan. In this respect, as in many others, Japan served as a transmission belt conveying Westernism in all its facets to young Chinese intellectuals.

We need not devote much attention to Kotoku's speech since its main themes have been set forth earlier. He began with an apology for having to speak in Japanese, a language foreign to his audience, but promised that the day of an international language was not far distant. Then he proceeded to give a general historical survey of the European socialist movement, taking his position with the most "advanced" element, that element pioneered by Proudhon, Bakunin, and Kropotkin. [86](#) Like Liu, Kotoku cited the classics in defense of anarchist doctrine and morality, referring to Christianity as well as Confucianism, although he was a strong anti-Christian.

The first meeting of the Society for the Study of Socialism was concluded by the short talk of Ho Chen, Liu's wife and the editor of *T'ien-i Pao*. [87](#) She suggested that among the anarchist movements, that of Russia was the strongest and in its three stages of development offered a guide for China: the first stage was that of speech and discussion, followed by a state of political activity, and climaxed by a period of assassination. Many of the Chinese and Japanese present at this meeting were to have their lives profoundly affected by the attempt to follow these words. In a few years, Kotoku and a number of his students would be dead, executed by the Japanese government on charges of responsibility for a plot against the Emperor Meiji. In Chinese revolutionary circles, also, the trend was toward more extremism. Ho Chen herself, as we shall note, evidently became involved in an assassination attempt.

The Liu magazine, *T'ien-i Pao*, emphasized familiar Anarchist themes. Freedom and equality were made primary goals. Religion was bitterly attacked. Special privileges to rulers and nobility were denounced, as was government in any form. All analysis and argument were cast in a "scientific" mold, and yet values were much discussed and defended. Liu, for example, in one article, defined man's three basic feelings as those of self-interest, hatred and goodness. [88](#) In a manner completely compatible with Confucian thought, he argued that man had the capacity for goodness, and asserted that goodness exceeded even equality as a value. He related it to the concept of Confucian jen, Kantian love, and the theme of mutual aid in Kropotkin's writings. Liu might define goodness in Confucian terms but he did not seek to develop it through Confucian methods. In place of the educative state, he wished to advance the stateless, classless society.

In another article, Liu explored socialism in ancient China, with special reference to the land equalization policies of Wang Mang. [89](#) He paid tribute to Wang, but asserted that his policies failed because he could not eliminate classes nor abolish government, and with an obvious glance in the direction of Sun Yat-sen, he asserted:

Quote:

"Those who today seek to found governments and further deceive the people with a policy of the equalization of land are all of the same sort as Wang Mang." [90](#)

In 1908, Liu split with Chang Ping-lin, and in that same year, the Anarchist journals were ordered to cease publication. Liu and his wife returned to Shanghai. Soon it became known that they were serving as informers for the police, and had entered the service of the Manchu

official, Tuan-fang. [91](#) Liu told the Shanghai International Settlement police of a secret T'ung Meng Hui meeting, with the result that one member was imprisoned. The precise pressures or circumstances that produced this shift in position are not clear. According to rumor, Ho Chen was involved in an assassination plot (Wang Kung-ch'a) and perhaps a deal was made to save her. In any case, this ended their Anarchist careers. In later years, Liu supported Yuan Shih-k'ai. Despite these transgressions, however, Ts'ai Yuan-p'ei, when he became president of Peking University, gave Liu a professorship. Both their old personalities and the fact that Liu was an excellent classical scholar probably entered into this appointment. But Liu died very shortly thereafter, on November 20, 1919, at the young age of thirty-six.

Probably Liu was always closer to Chinese traditionalism than most of his comrades. We have noted his extensive use of traditionalist thought to justify Anarchism. And this illustrates again a most important point. As long as Chinese traditionalism was enlisted, selectively, in the service of Western radicalism, as long as that radicalism could be buttressed by reference to the Chinese past, the political pendulum for some radicals could always swing back under certain conditions, causing them to revert to orthodoxy. The considerable staying powers of Chinese traditionalism were never more clearly illustrated than under such circumstances.

As for Chang Chi, the other participant in the Tokyo anarchist movement, with the increasing police pressure upon the socialists late in 1907, he left Japan for France. Between 1908 and 1911, Chang associated himself with Li Shih-tseng, Wu Chih-hui and the Paris Anarchist Group. His interest in Anarchism continued and he spent the summer of 1908 in a communal village (communisme experimental) in Northern France. [92](#) Upon the success of the 1911 Revolution, Chang returned to China and became a leading member of the Kuomintang. [93](#)

The initial impact of the Chinese Anarchist movements in Paris and Tokyo was almost wholly upon the overseas students. Very few copies of the *Hsin Shih-chi* or T'ien-i Pao could be smuggled into China. In this era, the average Chinese intellectual at home remained completely oblivious to Western radicalism. In many respects, the general circumstances of this period contributed to an enormous gulf between the "old" and "new" intelligentsia. The "old" intelligentsia stayed at home, with the windows of their studies firmly closed to the winds of change from the outer world. The "new" intelligentsia were in that outer world, being swept along by its winds. Their ideas were being formed in a foreign environment, and while they did not need to desert their heritage completely, generally that heritage had to be interpreted and reconciled with Western progress and "truth."

It is most significant that the Chinese intellectuals had so short a time in which to adjust to the political currents of the modern world. For the great majority, "liberation" came only with the 1911 Revolution. Then in less than a decade—and a decade filled with extraordinary political chaos—they were forced to cope with an unending variety of new, often conflicting ideas. Scarcely had liberalism begun to make its impact when the Bolshevik Revolution brought the doctrines of Marxist-Leninism into the land. But even before this, democracy, Socialism, and Anarchism were more or less simultaneously released into the Chinese intellectual stream. Compared to China, the introduction of Japan to Westernism was almost leisurely. The Japanese intellectual had had some four decades of Mill, Locke, Burke and Rousseau before he got the Fabians, Kropotkin, or Marx. Modern China paid very heavy penalties for her tenacious institutions, her self-satisfied intelligentsia, her basic xenophobia—and hence her delayed, kaleidoscopic revolution in which there was no time to undergo an intellectual evolution, to meet ideas in sequence, to separate the past from the present or future, or to develop one's own syncretic political philosophy. But despite the multiple confusions, to be Anarchist in this period was to be truly avant-garde, to leap ahead of the West, as it were, and capture the future. It is not surprising that Anarchism made a

deep impression upon some of the young Chinese intellectuals who were in search of modernity.

Anarchism and the Nationalist Revolution Shih-fu and His Movement



Before Marxist-Leninist-Maoism, Anarchist banners had already been planted in China proper and a much larger circle of Chinese intellectuals had gained some acquaintance with Anarchist theory. One of the first to take the ideas of Hsin Shih-chi into China was Liu Szu-fu, better known as Shih Fu. [94](#) Liu came to Anarchism from Sun's T'ung Meng Hui. Born in 1884 near Canton, he developed into an excellent classical student, but one showing revolutionary tendencies even before leaving China. In 1904, he went to Japan to continue his education, and the following year, he took an active part in the establishment of the Tokyo T'ung Meng Hui. Nor were all of Liu's studies academic. He also studied the art of manufacturing explosives, although as we shall soon see, perhaps he did not master the subject.

In 1906, learning that Sun would attempt an uprising in Kwangtung, Liu along with many other students left Japan for home. Upon reaching Hong Kong, however, Liu accepted the editorship of a local journal and remained there. The following year, it was decided that a successful revolt in Kwangtung would be facilitated by the assassination of either the governor or the naval commander. The latter, Li Chun; was chosen as the target and Liu volunteered to serve as executioner. Due to Liu's carelessness, however, an accident occurred and the bomb exploded prematurely. He was severely wounded, and lost all the fingers on his left hand. This incident also resulted in his arrest, and while the police were unable to determine his exact mission, he spent nearly three years in prison, and was released then only because his literary efforts were so admired by local officials that they petitioned higher authorities on his behalf.

Following his release from prison in 1909, Liu returned to Hong Kong. During his confinement and afterward, he had moved steadily toward anarchism, finally becoming a full disciple of the *Hsin Shih-chi* doctrines. In Hong Kong, Liu and others organized an assassination group dedicated to anarchism and having no contact with the T'ung Meng Hui. [95](#) This group was planning the assassination of the Prince Regent, Tsai-li (Wang Ching-wei's intended victim) when the Revolution of 1911 broke out. After the revolution, the group picked another target, Yuan Shih-k'ai, but according to Liu, "a certain person" asked them not to act in haste. [96](#)

About this time, in 1912, Liu and his followers founded the Hui-Ming Hseh-she, "The Society of Cocks Crowing in the Dark," in Canton. The objective of the new society was to

propagate Anarchism at the mass level, to move from “destructive” to “constructive” work. And for the next three years, until his premature death of tuberculosis in March 1915, Liu was one of the pillars of the active movement. In addition to the Hui-ming Hsueh-she, Liu and his comrades in 1913 founded the Hsin-she, “Heart Society,” in Canton. It was intended to be a preliminary organization to a full-fledged Anarchist Movement. The Hsin-she had twelve conditions for membership:

1. No eating of meat.
2. No drinking of liquor.
3. No smoking.
4. No use of servants.
5. No marriage.
6. No use of a family name (thus Liu changed his name to Shih Fu).
7. No acceptance of government office.
8. No riding in sedan chairs or rickshaws.
9. No acceptance of parliamentary seats.
10. No joining of political parties.
11. No joining of an army or navy.
12. No acceptance of religion. [97](#)

The Society to Advance Morality and its Impact

The Hsin-she had an earlier and more significant model. In January 1912, the Chin-te Hui, “Society to Advance Morality,” had been founded by Wu Chih-hui, Li Shih-tseng, Chang Chi, and Wang Ching-wei. [98](#) Most of the Paris group had returned to China shortly after the 1911 Revolution. They were making their political impact felt in a variety of ways. None was more interesting than the Chin-te Hui. In propagating their Society, Wu and the others argued that basic social reform had to accompany political change. The reason for the corruption of the Ch’ing regime, they argued, was due to the corruption of Chinese society; its most common forms being prostitution, gambling, and the concubine system. Hence China must build a new morality attuned to the new society that had to be created.

As befitted an Anarchist-inspired movement, the Chin-te Hui had no president or other officers, no regulations, no dues or fines. New members were simply introduced by old ones, and had their names recorded on a membership roll. And if a member was discovered to have violated the Covenant of the Society, other members were supposed merely to “raise their hats,” indicate their unhappiness, and “respectfully implore in silence.” Min-li Pao, February 26, 1912, p. 2. [99](#) The full Chin-te Hui regulations were very complicated. There were five types of membership, with increasingly rigorous requirements at each level. “Supporting members,” the lowest level, agreed not to visit prostitutes and not to gamble. “General members” agreed in addition not to take concubines. Beyond this, however, there was a special covenant that established three special divisions of members. The Special A Division members accepted the above restrictions, and in addition agreed not to become government officials. “Some one has to watch over officials” noted the covenant. [100](#) Special B Division members added to the above prohibitions the agreement not to become members of parliament and not to smoke. “Legislators watch over officials ’but someone has to watch over the legislators.” [101](#) Finally, Special C Division members accepted all previous stipulations and also promised not to drink liquor or eat meat. [102](#)

The Paris rules, refined, were being brought home. It is almost startling to discover how widely the new anarchist morality was permeating the “new” Chinese intelligentsia. For example, its influence was apparent in the Chinese Socialist Party, a party established by Chiang K’ang-hu (Kiang Kang-hu), shortly after the 1911 Revolution. Chiang, who had close ties with Sun Yat-sen, was strongly criticized by Liu and other Anarchists, as we shall note. However, he coined the phrase, “The three no’s and the two eaches,” and even organized a 3-2 Study Society. The “three no’s” referred to no government, no family, and no religion. The “two eaches” were from each according to his ability and to each according to his need. In abbreviated form, this was Anarchist-Communism, even if Chiang was not really faithful to that creed. In an effort to be more faithful, one branch of the Chinese Socialist Party headed by Lo Wu and Fen Fen broke away, and proclaimed itself an advocate of Anarchist-Communism while retaining the label Socialist Party. Yuan Shih-kai suppressed both branches shortly, but during their brief life, they were further testimony to the rapidly expanding influence of anarchist thought within Chinese “progressive” circles. There is also an account of Ts’ai Yuan-p’ei founding a Liu-pu Hui, Six No’s Society, with rules akin to the Chin-te Hui, possibly its offshoot: no prostitutes, gambling, concubines, meat, liquor, or smoking. All members were supposed to observe the first three rules; the latter three were optional. [103](#)

There is some indication that the widespread impact of anarchist thought, combined no doubt with the historic “reluctance for power and glory” so deeply implanted in traditional Chinese ethics had a definite effect in limiting the political leadership available to the new revolutionary era. According to the *Min-li Pao*, both Sun and Yuan Shih-k’ai were willing to have Wang Ching-wei as Premier, but since he was a Special B Division member of the Chin-te Hui, he declined. [104](#) And on another occasion, a most interesting letter from a Fukien province comrade was published in *Min-li Pao*. [105](#) Conditions were very difficult, he reported, and one Wang Tzu-yuan was needed to take over the educational system in the province. However, Wang, being a Special C Division member of the Chin-te Hui, refused. Could not Wang’s membership be changed temporarily to the general category, and then, when his task was finished, revert to Special C Division status asked the writer? Wu Chih-hui answered the letter with a flat refusal to consider any such request. He did assert, however, that if Wang wanted to aid the Fukien educational program, he could serve as the head of an educational society, or act as an adviser. In these capacities, a few of the anarchists did begin to assist the Nationalist government, but there can be little doubt that many refused to play the kind of political role that was so desperately needed in a period when trained personnel were extremely scarce in comparison with the tasks at hand. To some extent the anarchist movement must share the responsibility for the rapid collapse of Nationalist aspirations after 1911.

Anarchist-Communist Themes

By 1913, a number of intellectual groups were cultivating Anarchist theories and values, especially in south China. But the most active movement, and the great bulk of publications during this period, came from Shih Fu and his Hui-ming Hsueh-she. As its organ, the *Hui-ming-lu*, “The Voice of the Cock Crowing in the Dark,” began publication on August 20, 1913. [106](#) It used the Esperanto name, *La Voco de La Popolo*, and after the first few issues, changed its Chinese title to *Min Sheng*, “The Voice of the People.” In this journal and also in separate pamphlets, were reprinted various original articles and translations from Hsin Shih-chi. In this manner, Anarchist thought was widely disseminated. The names of Proudhon, Bakunin, Kropotkin, and Malatesta—and some of their theories—were now introduced into the mainstream of Chinese “progressivism.” In mid-1914, a Society of Anarchist-Communist Comrades was established in Canton. [107](#) Anarchist associations were also formed in

Nanking, Shanghai, and several other centers. Communication was established with the international anarchist movement; indeed, in August, 1914, Shih Fu wrote a report to the International Anarchist Congress on the past history and current condition of the Chinese Anarchist Movement. [108](#) Exchanges were established with such foreign Anarchist Movements as those in Japan and the United States. [109](#) To facilitate this international exchange and to support universalism in all respects, the Esperanto movement was strongly pushed, and Shih Fu actually became an officer in the International Esperanto Association.

While the Anarchists may have benefited occasionally from the near-chaotic conditions in China, this was scarcely an era of political freedom. Shih Fu and his comrades were kept almost constantly on the move. When the southern armies were defeated and Lung Chi-kuang entered Canton, the Hui-ming Hseh-she was closed. Shih Fu, whose arrest had been ordered by Yuan Shih-k'ai, moved his operation to Macao. Here the third and fourth issues of his journal were published, but heavy pressures were put upon Portuguese officials, and once more Shih Fu was forced to move. Shanghai, and especially the International Settlement, provided the greatest safety for subversive movements during this era. Min Sheng continued to be published there until its final demise, with issue number twenty-nine, on November 28, 1916. [110](#)

The Hui-ming-lu opened with a declaration that it would be the voice of the people, speaking as their organ. [111](#) Having set forth this ambitious goal, Shih Fu proceeded to assert that the evil nature of social organization was responsible for public misery, and that only by carrying out a basic world revolution and destroying all present social authority, would the people attain the true happiness of freedom. "Our principles are communism, anti-militarism, Syndicalism, anti-religion, anti-family, vegetarianism, an international language, and universal harmony. We also support all the new scientific discoveries which advance man's livelihood." [112](#) The Anarchist-Communist creed could not have been put more succinctly. In the first major article, Shih Fu attempted a simple explanation of Anarchism, drawing upon Hsin Shih-chi and such Western sources as Kropotkin. [113](#) By the abolition of government and the institution of communism, classes will be equalized and the struggle for money will cease. Then life will be free, and the society of contention will become one of mutual love. If we could eliminate the struggle over property and over lust by wiping out the institutions of private property and marriage, argued Shih Fu, 80-90% of all killings could be eliminated. Evil and immorality were due to society not to man. Only through Anarchist-Communism, asserted Shih Fu, could the fruits of science be properly utilized for the benefit of all. If education could be available to everyone without patriotic and militaristic indoctrination, then every man could have a knowledge of science and it would no longer be a monopoly of the few, to be used for capitalistic material gain. [114](#)

Another significant article seeking to define Anarchist-Communism was written by Shih Fu in April, 1914. [115](#) Since both the terms "Anarchism" and "communism" were new to the Chinese language, many misunderstandings had resulted, he stated. Anarchism advocated the complete freedom of people, unrestrained by any controls, with all leaders and organs of power eliminated. "The great teacher of Anarchism, Kropotkin had put it simply: 'Anarchism means no authority.'" And, said Shih Fu, the most dangerous authority in modern society was capitalism, hence Anarchists must also be Socialists. "Socialism advocates that the means of production and its products must belong to society." Two major Socialist factions existed, according to Shih Fu, communism and collectivism. Communism advocated the common ownership of production and products with each working according to his ability and taking according to his needs. Collectivism advocated the public or state ownership of production, but private ownership of the basic essentials of livelihood [like the word "communism", the word "collectivism" also has a different literal meaning in Chinese than when it is commonly

used in English: In Chinese, the word for a “collective enterprise” (Ji-ti Qi-ye) literally means an assembly of people in a bureaucracy (a “tree of people”)—very different from our understanding of Michael Bakunin’s Collectivism or a workers collective—more like Bolshevism or Fabian Socialism—Shih Fu substantiates this translation by identifying Karl Marx as the father of “collectivism.”]. Shih Fu took his position with communism. [116](#)

The Anarcho-Communist society spelled out more fully by Shih Fu in one of his last major articles. [117](#) All means of production would be socially owned, but producers (presumably everyone) would have the right to use them freely. This would be a classless society where all would work. There would be no government, no armies, no police, and no jails; no laws or regulations, only freely organized groups to adjust jobs and production, to supply the people with their needs. There would be no institution of marriage. Mothers and children would be taken care of in public hospitals. All children from six years to the age of twenty or twenty-five would receive free education. Upon graduation they would work until the age of forty-five or fifty, and then be taken care of through public old-age homes. Religion of all types would be abolished, and in its place, “the natural morality of mutual aid” would be allowed to develop fully. Each person would work between three and four hours daily. Education would be given in Esperanto; “native languages” would be slowly eliminated. How was this Utopia to be achieved? First, all media of public communication were to be used to spread these ideas to the people—newspapers, books, speeches, and schools. During the period of propaganda, several additional methods were to be employed: resistance to taxes and military conscription, and also strikes. Assassination was also to be employed. When the time was ripe, a popular revolution to overthrow the government and capitalism should be produced. And a popular revolution had to mean a world revolution. This world revolution would start in Europe, in such areas as France, Germany, England, Spain, Italy, and Russia where the ideas of Anarchism were already widely advanced. Then it would spread to South and North America, and finally to Asia. China had to hasten and catch up, lest she become a drag on world progress.

Shih Fu first tackled the problem of backsliders. He was shocked by the fact that Chang Chi had allowed himself to be elected to parliament, and even accepted the office of parliamentary president under the Republic in 1913. Chang had violated the Chin-te Hui agreement, wrote Shih Fu, in querying Wu Chih-hui about this matter. [118](#) Wu defended Chang Chi in his reply by asserting that since Chang had already been a member of parliament when the Chin-te Hui was organized, he had become only a Special A Division member of the society and therefore had not broken any rule. [119](#) Shih Fu was not satisfied with this answer, insisting that a true Anarchist could not legitimately accept any public office. [120](#)

Shih Fu’s main battle, however, was against Sun Yat-sen and Chiang K’ang-hu, especially the latter. [121](#) He admitted that most people believed that these were the two leading Socialists of China, and he proclaimed himself touched that they had the courage to speak out. But he denied that either was a bona fide Socialist. Sun was principally a political revolutionist, and the study of socialism was not his speciality. [122](#) “But his heart is drunk with the teachings of Henry George and he wants to put the single tax into practice in China.” [123](#)

Georgism, said Shih Fu, was social reform, not socialism. He acknowledged that Sun claimed to advocate “collective” Socialism, and that at a meeting of the Chinese Socialist Party, Sun had paid great homage to Das Capital by Marx, the father of “collectivism.” But Shih Fu insisted that Sun’s attempts to fuse George and Marx, his assertion that their theories were mutually compatible, were erroneous. Sun had confused social reformism with Socialism.

Chiang K'ang-hu, according to Shih Fu, was also a social reformer rather than a Socialist. To be sure, Chiang had written some laudatory passages about communism. But Chiang's program called merely for legal reforms, arms limitations, the land tax, and equal education; it did not involve public ownership of the means of production. Shih Fu argued that in reality, Chiang was closer to Saint Simon. He regarded him as hopelessly confused, and sprang to the attack more than once. [124](#) Nor was Lo Wu's "Pure Socialist Party" acceptable. While its constitution might advocate Anarchist-Communism, the very fact that it acted as a conventional party barred it from orthodoxy. "We have no work except that of overthrowing the present authority," asserted Shih Fu:

Quote:

"We are not like other political parties which have plans and policies. Following the overthrow of governments and the attainment of Anarchism, there will be no Anarchist party." [125](#)

Later, Wu Chih-hui was to write:

Quote:

"Since the death of Shih Fu, the Anarchist Party of China has been scattered and indifferent. It seems as if Shih Fu's death from tuberculosis has caused the Chinese Anarchist Party to suffer also from this disease." [126](#)

The death of Shih Fu removed a dynamic figure from the Chinese Anarchist Movement and certainly damaged it severely. However, organizational efforts not only went forward between 1916 and 1920, but in some respects, anarchist thought had its greatest influence upon young Chinese intellectuals during this period. Anarchist societies continued or were formed in Peking, Nanking, Shensi, and Shanghai. [127](#) During this period, anarchist thought and writings penetrated deeply into student circles at Peking University and elsewhere. Student journals such as Chin-hua (Evolution), Hsin ch'ao (New Currents), and Kuo-min (The Citizen), carried the admixture of Anarchist, Socialist, and democratic ideas that were now flowing into China. [128](#) A lack of funds and governmental restrictions made it difficult to keep the student and intellectual journals alive. It was possible, however, to have study groups, reading circles, and individual correspondence. And Peking [Beijing] was now unquestionably the center of such activities. Through these channels, Anarchism was a strong force, perhaps the dominant one, among the radical avant-garde as World War I ended. Indeed, when the Bolsheviks made their first overtures to the Chinese intellectuals, it was inevitable that they would have intimate contact with the Anarchists in China, just as they did in Japan. [129](#)

The Work-Study Movement

A New Project

In this same period, the Paris Anarchist Group were engaged in another work-study project to send Chinese students to France. While this project in some senses was related only peripherally to the Chinese Anarchist Movement, still no study of that movement would be complete without giving attention to the new French program.

As we noted earlier, some of the young Paris Anarchist Group, notably Chang Ching-chiang and Li Shih-tseng, had used family funds to launch a few enterprises in the period after 1905. Thus they enabled the employment of comrades from home who could simultaneously acquire an education. As has also been indicated, men like Chang and Li came home from Europe as Francophiles in addition to being Anarchists. They continued to harbor the hope that as many Chinese students as possible would have the opportunities for a French education. It is interesting to note some of their arguments as to why France was an ideal area for Chinese overseas education. [130](#) First, French education, they asserted, had long been

separated from the superstitions of monarchy and religion. In France, the monarchy had vanished and the French Revolution stood as a monument to human liberty. Moreover, the required study of religion had been abolished in 1886, with a further separation of church and state being initiated in 1907. [131](#) Also, French education was relatively cheap and the French people were generous to foreigners. In terms of “deep knowledge,” moreover, while each Western country had its speciality, the French were most famous for the wide range of their scholarship and its originality. The pre-eminence of French science was illustrated by the nearly universal use of French measurements and the large roster of famous French scientists. But French achievements were equally noted in the humanities; where else could one find men like Montesquieu and Rousseau? [132](#)

“Frugal Study” in France

To forward their causes Wu Chih-hui, Wang Ching-wei, Li Shih-tseng, Chang Ching-chiang, Chtu Min-i, Chang Chi, and Chi Chu-shan founded the Liu-Fachien-hsueh Hui. “The Society for Frugal Study in France.” in 1912. The second phase of the overseas work-study movement had begun. The purpose of the Frugal Study Society was to promote simple living and low costs for the students, thus enabling them to find the means to go to France and remain there for the time necessary to complete their studies. There was no compulsion upon the student to work, incidentally, if he had the necessary funds. The Society also undertook to provide some advance language training and indoctrination for life and study abroad. [133](#)

A preparatory school was established in Peking [Beijing], with Chi Chushan in charge and one Frenchman was hired as an instructor. Fortunately, Tsai Yuan-p’ei was currently serving as Minister of Education with the Peking [Beijing] government, and he provided the school with quarters. To join the Society or participate in the school, one had to be over fourteen years of age unless he was in the company of parents. In good Anarchist fashion, the Society had no officers. Instead, a few “workers” were selected by the members to carry out specific functions. Nor were there any dues other than the necessary educational costs and needed expenses which were supposedly met through the “mutual aid” of all comrades. In some respects, this was another scheme for anarchism in action.

Students were to travel to France via the Siberian railway. The trip took about eighteen days, and cost approximately two hundred dollars. Food and lodging were to be arranged either through the school or in some other organized quarters. The full costs were set at five or six hundred dollars yearly, although this sum included travel and clothing. Students were expected to commit themselves to at least three years of foreign schooling and the type of education they were to undertake was determined by the number of years they agreed to spend abroad. The emphasis, however, was to be upon science and technical subjects, not upon politics, law, or military studies. Students were not to visit prostitutes, smoke, drink, or gamble. The regulations concluded with the hope that through this program, scholars would be created who were frugal in their living habits, pure in their character, and possessed of skills to match their intelligence. [134](#)

It is not difficult to see the Anarchist themes shining through. The Peking [Beijing] Preparatory School opened in the spring of 1912. It had some interesting rules. The curriculum consisted of French (taught by the Frenchmen), Chinese, and mathematics. Various comrades (notably the Paris veterans) were invited to speak before the school. The term was fixed at six months, with an examination at the conclusion. Those who passed were to be sent to France under the auspices of the Society. Expenses would be assumed by the comrades. The tuition for the Peking [Beijing] school was determined by the number of students each term; if there were twenty students, each would pay eight dollars per month, but if there were forty, the tuition would be reduced to six dollars per month. As might have been expected, French proved a difficult language for the students to master, and a number

became discouraged. However, almost one hundred individuals were sent to France before political changes in 1913 forced Ts'ai out as Minister of Education and caused the school to be closed. [135](#) A Frugal Study Society had also been established for England, and some twenty students sent there. This project was initiated by Chang Ching-chiang, and managed by Wu Chih-hui in London during part of this period.

The failure of the nationalist revolution and the rise of Yuan Shih-k'ai seriously interfered with the Frugal Study Movement. Moreover, with the outbreak of the European war, Chinese students could not be sent to France. Hence, organized activities in China were largely abandoned although Li and some others continued to propagate the cause. As the war dragged on, however, France began to face an acute manpower shortage. Consequently, the French government negotiated with the Chinese government for Chinese workers. Tens of thousands of laborers were sent. Under these circumstances, Li and his friends saw another opportunity whereby they could recruit students willing to work in order to study abroad. The hope was that for each year's work, a Chinese student would be able to afford two years' study.

The "Diligent Work-Frugal Study" Movement

Thus in June 1915, the old Paris Anarchist Group and their supporters organized a new society, Ch'in-kung chien-hseh Hui, "The Association for Diligent Work and Frugal Study." [136](#) In the earlier Society, as was noted, there had been no special premium upon the students working if funds could be acquired by other means. This new program was specifically geared to a work-study movement. However, other categories of students continued to go to France: those with private means and a few with government scholarships. [137](#) In 1916, Li was able to conclude an agreement with French authorities for his own recruitment program. Once again, preparatory schools were opened in Peking [Beijing] and elsewhere. The Diligent Work-Frugal Study Association also established branches in various Chinese cities. In addition, certain Frenchmen cooperated with the old Paris group to found the Sino-French Educational Association. Ts'ai was made head, and Li served as secretary. In France, this Association was to make arrangements for the students, and help them with their problems. In China, it was to help in recruitment and general cultural relations. Headquarters were established in Peking [Beijing], with branches in Canton, Shanghai, and other areas.

By 1917, the work-study movement had spread to a number of Chinese provinces, and had widespread intellectual support. Moreover, prospective students, thrilled by the possibility of overseas study, were willing to do almost anything to get this opportunity. Ho Ch'ang-kung has written an account of particular interest concerning his own experience in the work-study movement of this period. [138](#) In the winter of 1917, he was attending a technical school in Changsha, Hunan province, one term away from graduation and worried about the future. Suddenly, his elementary school teacher and friend, Lo Hsi-wen, returned from Canton, having made contact there with the work-study branch office and Huang Ch'iang, who was operating it. Immediately, Lo wrote Ts'ai and Li in Peking. They responded by urging Lo to found a preparatory school in Hunan, but the provincial government at Changsha refused to help.

Discouraged, Lo and a friend, Tai Hsun, decided to go directly to Peking [Beijing] in February 1918. During the spring, they had conversations with Li on how funds could be obtained to aid the students from Hunan who wanted to go overseas. Ultimately the overseas Workers Department of the government agreed to loan some money. Thus, in the summer of 1918, a message went out to the students back home to come to Peking [Beijing]. Several groups arrived as quickly as they could make arrangements; and the group of twelve that arrived on July 19 included a young man named Mao Tse-tung [Ze-dong].

Shortly thereafter, Ts'ai, Li, and other representatives of the Sino-French Educational Association met with representatives of the Hunan students to discuss schooling and funds. Li told the students that the overseas Workers Department had been willing to extend funds to the Association because of the large number of Chinese laborers in France and their need for educational guidance; otherwise, foreigners would get a bad impression of Chinese. Since the government could not afford to send teachers abroad, the most simple method was to loan some transportation funds to students, who would be expected to continue their studies and teach the Chinese laborers in France. When the first class of thirty students (northerners) had repaid the loan (Li hoped it would be within five months after their arrival in France), then the next class could follow. In this manner, two classes a year would be able to go to France.

The number of Hunanese students who sought entry into preparatory school was actually so large according to Ho that three classes had to be established, one at Peking, the others at Pao-ting and Ch'ang-hsin-tien. Mao was in the Peking class; Liu Shao-hti was one of the sixty Hunanese at Pao-ting along with Li Wei-han. Of course not all of the students went abroad; neither Mao nor Liu made the trip. Ho reports that he spent one year at Ch'ang-hsin-tien, and that their schedule was to work in the mornings, attend school in the afternoons, and study in the evenings.

When Ho finally arrived in France in early 1920, he found some three hundred "diligent work-frugal study" students already in France. He recalls that there were several types of work-study arrangements. Some students worked part-time and studied part-time; others would work for a short period, three or six months, and then study until their savings were exhausted; some brought a small amount of money with them, studied until it was gone, and then sought a job. Ho's arrival coincided with the flood-tide of students. At one point, they were arriving at the rate of one hundred per month.

The Decline of the Work-Study Movement

By the latter half of 1920, however, economic conditions in France had become troubled. There were problems of postwar dislocation and serious inflation. Unemployment was mounting. At first, the Sino-French Educational Association tried to take care of the unemployed Chinese students. But by the beginning of 1921, there were over 1000 students in France, the majority of whom had insufficient funds and little or no work. The Association did not have the money to provide for this number. ¹³⁹ Many of the students suffered real hardships, going without proper food or clothing, and living under miserable conditions. Some even lived in tents in the garden of the Association's Paris headquarters. Bitter conflicts ensued. Li Shih-tseng had returned to China in December 1919; Chang Chi also went back in June 1920. Ts'ai Yuan-p'ei came to France just in time to inherit the most difficult problems. As head of the Association, he finally announced on January 16, 1921, that they would no longer assume financial responsibility for the "diligent work and frugal study" students. Then the students sought help from the Chinese Legation in Paris. The Chinese government offered only to pay transportation costs home for those unable to raise these funds. The provincial governments at home also refused to help.

On February 28, 1921, several hundred Chinese students came to their Legation demanding that the government give them four hundred francs a month for a period up to four years. The French government at this point undertook to give some support to the student cause. In May, a special French-Chinese joint committee was founded to aid the worker-students. Funds were secured from various sources with both the Chinese and the French governments making contributions, as well as private donors. For a time, some eight hundred students received aid, in the amount of five francs daily. New complexities and disputes arose. Shortly, French and Chinese authorities combined to put pressures upon many students to return home, and to safeguard themselves in the future, the authorities also insisted upon a

5,000 Yuan guarantee from each prospective student. The “diligent work-frugal study” idea was ending rather badly. In September 1921, the joint committee was abolished and financial aid was stopped on October 15.

Meanwhile, another incident had occurred in connection with “Lyons University,” the so-called Chinese overseas university in France. This project, initiated by Wu Chih-hui, had the support of Ch’en Chiung-ming and others. The idea was to establish a special institution for Chinese students in France, and Wu was to serve as president. A dispute arose over who should be allowed to attend. Wu insisted that this project was separate from the “diligent work-frugal study” movement, partly because the money for Lyons University was being put up by certain provinces, and so only students from those areas, selected by him, were eligible. Wu arrived with his students at the end of September, 1921. At about the same time, over one hundred of the work-study students left Paris for Lyons, determined to obtain quarters on the campus. They included Ts’ai Ho-shen, Li Li-san, Li Wei-han, and Ch’en I. When they arrived in Lyons, they forced their way into the “University” houses. Lyons police removed them, and put them temporarily in some military barracks. Negotiations with Wu began, but while these were going on, the French police suddenly rounded up the detained students, shipped them to Marseilles, and put them forcibly aboard a ship sailing for China. One hundred and four students, including Ts’ai Ho-shen, Li Li-san, and Ch’en I were returned in this fashion.

These experiences, quite as much as contact with Western ideas, may have induced radicalism among the Chinese overseas students of this period. It is interesting to read the memoirs of yet another student, Sheng Ch’eng. [140](#) Sheng departed from Shanghai for Europe on October 22, 1919. When he reached Paris, he quickly observed that Li Shih-tseng was in complete charge of the work-study movement. But he received little aid from the Sino-French Educational Association. In this period, a student got a tent in their garden and a small “maintenance fee.” Everyone naturally wanted to get out of a tent, reported Sheng, and thus any announcement that a few workers were needed somewhere was always greeted with joy. But a worker-student had to pass a very rigorous test before being accepted for employment. Sheng recalled that all the students had great respect for Li, but most were dissatisfied with the Association, largely because it seemed to have few contacts and could not find them employment.

Although Sheng received some funds from home, these were insufficient and so he went to work in a lumber factory. But he spent his evenings reading Marx, Kropotkin, and other revolutionaries who gave him “theoretical guidance” to match his practical experience. “I was slowly turning into a Socialist with a bent toward Anarchism,” he wrote. [141](#) Soon Sheng lost his job, and joined the ranks of the unemployed. In June 1920, Wu Chih-hui came to Paris, and Sheng reported that the students looked to him for salvation. But no salvation was forthcoming. Wu insisted that a distinction had to be made between the work-study movement and the Sino-French Educational Association on the one hand, and the Lyons University project on the other. The former, Wu asserted, was the responsibility of Li and his associates; the latter was his program. It was at this point that the students set up their own organization and among other things, requested the Sino-French Education Association in China to stop sending more students to France. But little came of these actions. Wu returned to China and more students continued to come.

Sheng gave a graphic account of the mounting tension in 1921 among the Chinese students in France. When the Association washed its hands of the students, he reported, the French government provided some assistance. But the February demonstration before the Chinese Legation resulted in violence, and Chinese students battled with French police. There was also fighting in June. The students were becoming more militant and more radical. Both

French and Chinese authorities were becoming more hostile. And according to Sheng, “Lyons University” was nothing but a few houses which cost seventy thousand yuan. A nine year lease had been signed, but the houses were never used for more than living quarters:

“In the fall of 1922, the Peking government finally sent one hundred-thousand Yuan to the Paris Sino-French Educational Association to aid the students. Now the Association, which had previously been little more than an address to which one had one’s mail sent, suddenly became active. Under its secretary, Li Kuang-han, a committee was established to distribute the money. Unfortunately, Li pocketed some of the money and disappeared. But on the whole, the conditions of the students improved.” [142](#)

In the February, 1923 issue of *Hsin Chiao-y*, (The New Education), there appeared an interesting letter from the headquarters of the Chinese Students Association in Paris. [143](#) According to its authors, the basic problem remained French industrial decline, and the difficulty under these circumstances of competing with French workers, especially when attempting to go to school. Over one hundred Chinese students had died during the past three years as a result of conditions, asserted the writers. Since the government sent one hundred thousand yuan last year (out of two hundred thousand yuan appropriated), there had been some relief. About nine hundred students had been helped, each receiving approximately one thousand francs; but this represented only one-half of the amount needed.

The letter asserted that a census taken in the fall of 1922 indicated that there were some 920 worker-students currently in France. All had graduated previously from Chinese high schools. Since arriving in France, they had been able to obtain two to three years schooling after engaging in work. This amount of time, the writers maintained, was insufficient. Five years of education should be a minimum. Chinese government students were receiving eight hundred francs a month, it was stated. If the worker-students could receive one-third of that amount, and hope for some additional provincial government support, they would be satisfied. The letter ended with a proposal that the Boxer Indemnity Fund which France had lately agreed could be used for Sino-French educational purposes, be allocated to this cause.

The Anarchist Conflict with Marxism

Ou Sheng-pai vs. Ch’en Tu-hsiu

These problems with the work-study movement in France were complicated when Marxist-Leninists began to try to take control of the Chinese student movement. The Anarchists had hoped that many students would feel the pull of the same ideological and political currents that had captured them a decade or more earlier. The impact of this program was very substantial and some of the students of this period did gravitate toward Anarchism.

But, according to Liang Ping-hsien, the Chinese Communist Party began to organize in France during this period. [144](#) By 1922, the chief worker-student organization, the Work-Study Mutual Assistance Group, was controlled by Communist students. [145](#) In the winter of 1921, certain worker-students led by Wang Jo-fei, Chao Shih-yen, and Ch’en Yen-nien, organized a Socialist Youth Corps in Paris. It attracted a number of members and immediately established contact with the embryonic Chinese Communist Party which had held its first Congress in July 1921. In August 1922, this Corps served as the nucleus for the organization of a Main Branch of the Chinese Communist Party in Europe. [146](#) Chou En-lai came from Germany to Paris especially to participate in the founding meeting, and was elected a committeeman along with such other students as the three Youth Corps leaders mentioned above. The Chinese Anarchist students engaged the Communists in heated debates, but the latter were steadily gaining ground.

Indeed, after 1920, Communism became a truly formidable opponent to Anarchism, and the crescendo of debate within “progressive” circles rose. For the Communists, Ch’en Tu-hsiu

quickly emerged as the leading spokesman. He fought one lengthy literary duel with the Anarchist Ou Sheng-pai, and fortunately their exchanges have been preserved. [147](#) To read them is both fascinating and instructive.

Let us first examine some of Ch'en's major arguments against Anarchism as presented in these writings. One line of attack was that Anarchism had neither the capacity to wage successful revolution nor the capacity to hold power successfully in the aftermath of a revolution. [148](#) Revolution, he argued, could not be advanced by reliance upon separate, atomized units of undisciplined men. And if in the aftermath of a revolution, Kropotkin's system of free federation were adopted instead of Lenin's dictatorship of the proletariat, the Capitalists would soon regain their position. Frequently, Ch'en concerned himself with the nature of man and the basis of authority, those two most central questions to all political theory. Both he and Li Ta found the Anarchists too optimistic regarding human nature and too pessimistic regarding things political. [149](#) Not all men tended to be good, and even among those with such proclivities, many could not be reached by education during the Capitalist era. Some men were evil and reactionary; they could not be reformed. Until such men had been extinguished, any attempt to rule by virtue and education alone was unrealistic. Moreover, even people who could be salvaged eventually, were not to be trusted immediately after the overthrow of the old order. Thorough enlightenment—proper education—these things were not possible while militarists, tyrants, and Capitalists were in control. [150](#)

Ch'en made some surprising statements about mass movements and revolutions truly in the hands of the common man. He acknowledged that the "May 4th Movement" had had beneficial results. But most mass movements were ugly and irrational, like the Boxer Rebellion. Mass psychology was a blind force. "No matter how great a scientist one may be, once he is thrown in with the masses, he loses all sense of reason." [151](#) Ch'en was attempting to answer the Anarchist argument that a free society should be controlled not by laws but by the public will, as developed through "town hall" meetings and voluntary associations. "The public will," argued Ch'en, thrives on emotionalism and can be built up through the skillful application of pressures. What is enlightened about the collective judgment of ignorant men?

Some of Ch'en's most trenchant remarks were directly aimed at the Chinese people. They were guilty of corruption and backwardness. If they were to be saved, there had to be "strict interference" in economic and political matters. There had to be an "enlightened despotism" both in name and in fact. The chief obstacle to this was the "lazy, wanton, illegal sort of free thought that forms a part of our people's character." [152](#)

Ch'en was Leninist in his rather extensive defense of authority and the state, and in his conspicuous doubts concerning the common man. Above all, he was Leninist in his espousal of vanguardism, an intellectual vanguardism that would shape and guide the common man until he could be trusted. There is no better way to see the authoritarian elements in Communist theory than to read the Communist polemics directed against the Anarchist. Ch'en pursued another theme with vigor: Anarchism would have man return to primitivism. Economically, it would take him back to the era of handicraft industries. Politically, it would remove him to the days of tribalism. [153](#)

Ou Sheng-pai struck back at Ch'en forcefully. He argued that Syndicalism was a feasible method both of conducting revolution and of maintaining post-revolutionary power. Anarchism did not hesitate to use violence against evil. Why did Anarchists assassinate officials and seek to overthrow capitalist societies? But Anarchism was opposed to institutionalized power and law, because these forces inevitably resulted in indiscriminate oppression. Laws were dead. They were the fixed instrumentalities of the ruling class. Did laws stop officials from robbing people? [154](#)

Anarchism had as its central quest the freedom of every man. Ou, however, distinguished himself from the individualist branch of Anarchism. Freedom, as Bakunin had indicated long ago, did not have meaning without relation to society. It was not to be equated with rampant individualism. But freedom in society could be obtained only when law had been replaced by free contracts based upon common will. There was no conflict between freedom and association, argued Ou, because the key lay in Kropotkin's concept of free contracts, and in the idea of free federation. And because each man would be free to join and free to withdraw, modern society could function without disruption.

Ou insisted that most men were "stubborn" because they had insufficient knowledge, and he professed much greater hope in education, both before and after the revolution than Ch'en. If an offender persisted in wrong-doing in an Anarchist society, Ou asserted, he would be asked to leave; and he insisted that there were no men so shameless as to disregard such a demand from the whole society. In answer to Ch'en's remarks about mass movements and their motivating forces, Ou asserted that with the progress of science, the force of emotionalism among mankind would recede. [155](#) He looked toward a more rational man and a more rational world.

A summing up

Despite his contempt for "bourgeois democracy" and his unwillingness to accept some of its cardinal rules, Ou was on the side of the angels with respect to many central democratic themes. This is especially clear when one sees his arguments placed in juxtaposition to those of Ch'en Tu-hsiu. On the other hand, the needs and nature of contemporary Chinese society gave some heavy advantages to the theories of Ch'en. It was not easy for a Chinese intellectual, looking at his people and the state of political affairs, to subscribe to an optimistic appraisal of the common man. Indeed, the ignorance and indifference of that common man stood out in sharp perspective against the ruins of the nationalist revolution, the dreams of Western-style parliamentarism. Why was there any reason to believe, therefore, that he could be easily trained for anarchism, for a truly "public meeting" style of democracy? The gap between science and superstition would not be closed by a show of hands. And without centralized power, authority, and coercion, could the militarists, landlords, and various "feudal remnants"—as the "progressive" intellectuals saw them—really be threatened?

A theory of tutelage came naturally to the Chinese intelligentsia. It was in their philosophy, their culture, and their appraisal of their role. To be sure, a theory of tutelage has come naturally to all the so-called late-developing societies of the twentieth century. It is the one theory that has cut across all ideological lines, from right to left. Leninism offered more than a theory of tutelage of course. It also represented a concept of inevitable progress, an optimistic philosophy that promised backward societies that they could go through the same stages as the advanced West. Indeed, if they would only acquire an early consciousness of their fate, they could go through these stages at an accelerated pace. And Leninism made its peace with nationalism. In Asia, this was supremely important. It is not surprising that under this impetus, Communism soon pulled well ahead of the anarchist movement. There were other vital factors, of course. Anarchism was declining rapidly in the Western world, in the area of its greatest strength. It was being overwhelmed by the centripetal tendencies current in politics, economics, and all phases of society. And while it was suffering a series of humiliating political defeats, Leninism was electrifying the world with its success in Russia. For Chinese radicals weary of revolutionary failure, Leninism seemed to point the way in its tactics and strategy to a new science of successful revolution. The dynamism and initiative in the world of radicalism, slipping from anarchist hands, was now gravitating toward the Communists, and Asian radicals everywhere were quick to see the new light from the West.

Notwithstanding these facts, however, Chinese Communism owes the anarchist movement a debt of gratitude which it will probably never acknowledge. Many of the fundamental ideas which underlay the Communist movement in China were first planted by the anarchists, as we have noted. First, it gave priority to destruction, and for a society like China, was not a massive amount of destruction necessary? In its forceful position of anti-family, anti-religion, and general anti-traditionalism, the anarchist movement provided a powerful challenge to the old order, the kind of challenge that caused intellectual vibrations everywhere, and benefited in some measure the general revolutionary cause. But it was also the anarchist movement that laid down the first broad commitment to modernity and progress—to the future—and to the West. From it came the strong emphasis upon science, democracy, and mass-movement revolution. In it also was to be found that broad streak of puritanism that is the hallmark of most truly revolutionary movements, a "new" but strict morality, that in some measure the Communists copied. Even the now famous work-study movement was first fashioned by the Chinese anarchists, as we have seen. To be sure, the non-anarchist nationalist elements of this era deserve recognition as having introduced at least some of these concepts. But few of the nationalists covered this whole range of values and ideas, and few also carried the same fervor or penetrating radicalism.

Chinese anarchism suffered from two massive defects, however, in terms of its society, quite apart from the question of world trends. Firstly, despite the seeming ambivalence of some of its leaders, it was a movement forced by its most essential theories to denounce and by-pass nationalism in an era when nationalism represented the wave of the future. No political movement in modern Asia has succeeded unless it has been able to use nationalism.

Anarchism, moreover, had a deep aversion to power and authority. The very concept of an Anarchist Party was to the true anarchist a contradiction, and thus he saw his opponents organize and progressively destroy him. Yet the philosophic point itself caused the Chinese intellectual serious question. Without coercion, how was the discipline and sacrifice necessary to rapid progress to be attained? Could persuasion—free federation—be the whole answer, when for China the premium upon speed was so great? Without centralized planning, a national image, and charismatic leadership, how was a rapid industrial revolution to be consummated?

But anarchism, whatever its utopian qualities for modern China, was in many respects also naturally Chinese. It was the other side of the Confucian, educative, centralized, authoritarian state. It was the scholar in contemplation and out of office, the peasant out of reach of his landlord, the wanderer beyond the outstretched hands of the state. Indeed, it was the imperishable goal of all men at all times--complete freedom for self realization within the limits of social justice, to the limits of one's capacity.

Editor's Footnote

The authors of this text originally used the word "tutelage" for what Anarchists refer to as vanguardism. In the true sense of the word, "tutelage" is the practice of educating people to prepare them for revolution and not the practice of the Marxist-Leninist who advocated "enlightened despotism" because people were too stupid and lazy to instigate a revolution on their own. This is the elitist language of vanguardists who claim that dictatorship can create Socialism while, throughout history, it has only created tyranny.

The authors commented that "tutelage" was a part of Chinese culture, which it is. Chinese philosophical and religious systems (including those that were attacked by the Anarchists) are based on the teachings of people like Lao Tzu and Confucius who were regarded as great scholars by different groups of people. Tutelage was enlightenment through education.

This “tutelage” was part of the attractiveness of the Work-Study Movement and it was exploited by Marxist-Leninists who infiltrated the study groups to spread their doctrine. Maoism turns “tutelage” on its head through its “preceptorial” method of indoctrination and social control. “Preceptorial” means a system based on teaching. In Maoism, Mao, the Part, or those in Authority are right and if you don’t agree with them there is a contradiction which can only be solved by persuading you to agree with them. This is the basis for the idea of political “re-education” camps. The object is to get a person to recant their beliefs much like what was done by the catholic Church during the Inquisition.

The Maoist method of recruiting uses a similar tactic. The person who the Maoist is trying to recruit is asked to recite their beliefs and then persuaded that working toward the objectives of the Maoist (Communist) Party will fulfill that person’s beliefs and desires. The objective is to persuade you to do more and more until you are actually following the Maoist leaders at the expense of your original values, desires, work projects, etc.. Once they get you into their movement, they begin the process of trying to reeducate you by challenging your beliefs until you think like they do. It is a kind of brainwashing similar to that used by some religious cults.

The Chinese Communists used the same lies as the Bolsheviks to attack Anarchism. In 1922 they were accusing Anarchists of being primitivists while only a few years earlier Anarcho-Syndicalist propaganda had helped instigate worker self-management in Russia and Anarchist slogans had been parroted by the Bolsheviks. They claimed that Chinese people were technologically simple people, but the Russians had also been technologically simple people—defying Marx’s claim that revolution must happen in industrialized nations where workers are more technologically advanced.

The Chinese Communists claimed that people are incapable of managing their own affairs without despotism while Anarchists in the Ukraine had established an autonomous area of collectivized farming, worker self-management and free economic exchange from 1917-1921, a year before the Chinese Communist diatribes against Anarchists in Paris!

The Chinese Communists claimed that people couldn’t overthrow tyrants without their leadership when the Anarchist partisans had defeated the occupying armies of Germany and Austria-Hungary, aborted a counterrevolution by Ukrainian Nationalist troops, and defended their accomplishments against the attacks of the Russian Red Army under the command of Leon Trotsky. Trotsky sent inexperienced troops up against Anarchist partisans who had been engaged in guerilla warfare for 9 years—he told them the guerillas were merely “bandits.” The Anarchists were able to kill seven Red Army soldiers for every one of their losses until they finally ran out of troops and had to seek refuge in France.

This is a slightly edited version of the one found here
http://www.raforum.info/article.php3?id_article=1730

Footnotes

- [1.](#) “The Socialism of Sun Yat-sen and Chiang K’ang-hu,” Min Sheng, No. 6, April 18, 1914, pp.1-7.
- [2.](#) ‘Edgar Snow, Red Star Over China’, London, 1937, p.149.
- [3.](#) A recent study of Chinese students in Japan is entitled Chukokujin Nihon ryugaku shi (An History of Chinese Students Studying in Japan) by Saneto Keishu, Tokyo, 1960. This is an essentially factual account.
- [4.](#) Chu Ho-chung, “The Record of the European T’ung Meng Hui, in Lo Chia-lun, (ed.), Ke-ming wen-hsien(Documents of the Revolution), Vol. II, Taipei, 1953, pp.

251-270. See also Feng Tzu-yu, "Chinese Students in Europe and the T'ung Meng Hui—Ho Chih-ts'ai's Account of the Beginning and End of the European T'ung Meng Hui," in Ke-ming i-shih (An Informal History of the Revolution), Vol. II, Taipei, 1953, pp.132-141.

- [5.](#) Shih-chieh-she (Le Monde), ed., L-Ou chiao-y yn-tung (The Educational Movement in Europe), Tours, France, 1916, p. 49. This is an extremely valuable source for the study of the Chinese student movement in France, particularly the Anarchist-sponsored work-study movement.
- [6.](#) For an excellent, brief biography of Li Hung-tso, see the account written by Fang Chao-ying in Hummel, Arthur, (ed.) Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period, Washington, 1943, pp.471-2.
- [7.](#) Chang was born in Chekiang province. His father became a successful Shanghai business man, and when the elder Chang died, his son received a sizeable inheritance. Physically, the young man was not strong, but he had passionate political convictions. According to Feng Tzu-yu, he secured the position of commercial attache in the Chinese Legation in France by bribery. While Chang soon became acquainted with Western Anarchism and secretly called himself a Chinese Anarchist, some students feared that he might be a spy because of his government connections. This was untrue, however. For these and other details of Chang's life, see Feng Tzu-yu, "The Master of the Hsin Shih-chi, Chang Ching-chiang," Ke-ming i -shih, op. cit., pp. 227 - 230.
- [8.](#) Chu, also a native of Chekiang, went to Japan in 1903, studying political science and economics. He traveled to Europe in 1908, with Chang, and shortly thereafter, became involved in the Anarchist Movement. Chu was to remain in France until shortly after the outbreak of World War I, when he returned to China. But a few years later, he went back to Paris to study medicine and pharmacy. In this period, he participated in the establishment of the "University of Lyons" which will be discussed later. Chu's life ended in tragedy. After many years of service to the Kuomintang, in 1939 he threw in his lot with his old friend, Wang Ching-wei, and accepted the post of Minister of Foreign Affairs in Wang's Nanking government. After the allied victory in 1945, Chu was arrested and put to death.
- [9.](#) The Educational Movement in Europe, op. cit. , p. 50. For the results of Li's research on soya beans see Li-Yu-Yung (de la Societe Biologique-d'I Extreme-Orient, Chine) Le Soja Essay Culture: Ses Usages Alimentaires, Therapeutiques, Agricoles et industriels, Paris, 1912, p.150.
- [10.](#) A complete collection of 'Hsin Shih-chi' (The New Century), together with some of the pamphlets published by the Paris group, were reprinted in four volumes, in Shanghai, 1947. All citations from 'Hsin Shih-chi' are from this edition.
- [11.](#) A full account of Wu's life is given in Chang Wen-po, 'Chih-lao hsien-hua' (Chit-Chat About Old Chih), Taipei, 1952. For a few special details that pertain to Wu's relations with Sun Yat-sen, see a series of articles by Yang K'ai-ling, "The Father of Our Country and Mr. Wu Chih-hui," published in the magazine 'San Min Chu I pan-veh k'an' (Three People's Principles Semi-Monthly), Nos.1-4, May 15—June 15, 1953.
- [12.](#) Chang Wen-po, op. cit., p. 24.
- [13.](#) Interview between the senior author and Li Shih-tseng, Taipei, July 16, 1959.

- [14.](#) To stress the importance of the classics upon their thinking, Li in the interview recalled that Wu had once painted a picture to depict the following ancient Chinese tale: during the Chou dynasty, two philosophers were each asked by the Emperor to be his successor. The one put his ear into some water, saying “I must clean my ear after hearing such a thing”; the other said, “Do not let my oxen drink the water in which you have cleaned your ear.”
- [15.](#) For a general survey of the European Anarchist Movement, see G. D. H. Cole, ‘A History of Socialist Thought’, 3 Vol., London 1955-57; and Carl A. Landauer, European Socialism, 2 Vol., Berkeley, 1959.
- [16.](#) ‘Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution’ was published in 1902, and quickly had a world-wide impact. The Paris group of Chinese Anarchists undoubtedly read it shortly after their arrival there. Li translated it serially for the ‘Hsin Shih-chi’. Kropotkin was to be translated into Japanese and Chinese many times during the next two decades. His theme that mutual aid was as much a law of nature as mutual struggle, and more significant for the progressive evolution of mankind was central to the Anarcho-Communist creed.
- [17.](#) Professor Olga Lang has pointed out to us that aristocrats like Bakunin and Kropotkin did, however, have a powerful appeal to men not of their class as well, namely an important segment of the European working class.
- [18.](#) Professor Lang has agreed with this point, but has reminded us that perhaps Bakunin and Kropotkin are not the happiest examples of Russian influence, since their impact upon Russian revolutionary thought was perhaps less than that upon Western Europe.
- [19.](#) Wu Chih-hui, “Degrees,” ‘Hsin Shih-chi’, No. 2, June 29, 1907, p. 1.
- [20.](#) Wu Chih-hui, “Answering the Writing of a Certain Gentleman,” Ibid., No. 42, April 11, 1908, pp. 2-3.
- [21.](#) “This is Known As a Chinese Sage,” Ibid., No. 1, June 22, 1907, p. 3. (Only a few authors can be identified in ‘Hsin Shih-chi’. Sometimes pen-names are used, but frequently no designation whatsoever is given).
- [22.](#) Ch’u Min-i, “Looking at the Past,” Ibid., No. 24, Nov. 30, 1907, p. 2.
- [23.](#) Ibid, p. 2.
- [24.](#) Li Shih-tseng, “Ancestor Revolution,” Ibid., No. 2, June 29, 1907, pp.3-4. See also Ch’u Min-i, “On Anarchism,” Ibid., No.36, February 29, 1908, pp.3-4.
- [25.](#) We are indebted to Professor Joseph Levenson for pointing out that K’ang Yu-wei had written some tracts attacking the family system as early as the 1880’s, although these remained unpublished. Hoover Library has on microfilm his ‘Shih-li kung fa’, and somewhat later, a similar position was expressed in Ta t’ung shu.
- [26.](#) Chiu Min-i, “General Revolution,” Ibid., No.17, Oct.12, 1907, pp. 2-3.
- [27.](#) Ibid., p.3. The Anarchist distinction between “political revolution” and “social revolution” will be discussed later.
- [28.](#) Speech of Liu Shih-p’ei (Kuang-han) at the first meeting of the Socialist Study Group in Tokyo, taken from ‘T’ien-i Pao’, printed in ‘Hsin Shih-chi’, No. 22, Nov.16, 1907, p.4.
- [29.](#) “A Letter with Answers,” Ibid., No. 6, July 27, 1907, p.1. Answers by Li Shih-tseng.

- [30.](#) “A Letter to Hsin Shih-chi from a Certain Individual, with Answers,” Ibid., No.8, August 10, 1907, pp. 2-3. Answers by Li Shih-tseng.
- [31.](#) “A Letter with Answers,” op. cit., p.1.Ibid., p.1.Ibid., p.1.Ibid., p.1.
- [32.](#) Ibid., p.1.
- [33.](#) Ibid., p.1.
- [34.](#) Ibid., p.1.
- [35.](#) “A Discussion with a Friend Concerning Hsin Shih-chi,” Ibid., No.3, July 6, 1907, pp.1-2.
- [36.](#) “A Letter to Hsin Shih-chi from a Certain Individual, with Answers,” op. cit., p. 3.
- [37.](#) “Anarchism Can Be Steadfastly Matched Against the Sense of Responsibility of the Revolutionary Party,” Ibid., No. 58, August 1, 1908, pp.10 -13.
- [38.](#) “An Extended Discussion on the Differences and Similarities of Nationalism, Democracy, and Socialism, and another Reply to the Letter on the Interesting Meaning of the Opening Statement of Hsin Shih-chi,” Ibid., No. 6, July 27, 1907, pp.3-4.
- [39.](#) Ibid., p.4.
- [40.](#) “National Extinction?” Ibid., No. 48, May 23, 1908, pp.1-2.
- [41.](#) “An Extended Discussion etc.,” op. cit., p.3.
- [42.](#) “A Letter to Hsin Shih-chi from a Certain Individual, with Answers,” op. cit., p.3 Li Shih-tseng, “On Knowledge,” Ibid., No. 7, August 3, 1907, p.2.
- [43.](#) “On Anarchism” (Continued), Ibid., No. 43, April 18, 1908, p.4.
- [44.](#) One article berated the Chinese Minister to Italy for allowing the body of his wife to lie unburied for a period of time, in accordance with Chinese custom. It charged that this kind of superstitious, unscientific, barbaric custom subjected the Chinese to ridicule in the eyes of Europeans. See “The Chinese in Europe,” Ibid., No.15, September 28, 1907, p.3. For still another use of science, see “The End of Imperialism,” Ibid., No. 63, September 5, 1908, pp.10-12. Said the author: “I dare say that ten years from now, death will come to the robber-kings of the world and universal well-being will be achieved. I hope that the youth of China will learn more science and make more bombs, each working according to his own heavenly conscience to expel the barbarians and prevent imperialism from sprouting in China.”
- [45.](#) “Hurried Thoughts At the Advent of Hsin Shih-chi,” Ibid., No.1, June 22, 1907, p.1.
- [46.](#) “On Anarchism” (Continued), Ibid., No.34, February 15, 1908, pp.3 -4.
- [47.](#) “International Revolutionary Currents,” (Comments by Li Shihtseng), Ibid., No.32, February 1, 1908, pp.1-2. We are indebted to Mr. Michael Gasster for pointing out that one Hsin Shih-chi reader argued that in their advocacy of revolution, the editors were violating the evolutionary principles of one of their heroes, Darwin. To this argument, Wu responded by asserting that there was a difference between biology and human affairs, for the latter were subject to control (and hence acceleration) by human action.
- [48.](#) “A Rejection of Hsin Shih-chi Writings on Revolution” (with answers by Li Shih-tseng), Ibid., No. 5, July 20, 1907, pp.1-2.

- [49.](#) “On the Uselessness of Jumping into the Ocean,” *Ibid.*, No. 6, July 27, 1907, p.2.
- [50.](#) “General Revolution,” *Ibid.*, No.17, October 12, 1907.
- [51.](#) Li Shih-tseng and Chiu Min-i (?), ‘La Révolution’, Paris, 1907, (8 page pamphlet), republished, Shanghai, 1947.
- [52.](#) “Go and Join Ranks with the Secret Societies,” ‘Hsin Shih-chi’, No. 42, April 11, 1908, pp.1-2.
- [53.](#) *Ibid.*, p. 2.
- [54.](#) A few articles on unionism and its objectives were published in Hsin Shih-chi. For example, see “Labor Unions,” *Ibid.*, No.4, July 13, 1907, p. 2; and Ch’u Min-i, “The Strike,” *Ibid.*, No.92, April 10, 1909, pp. 5-8. Also, Professor Lang has pointed out to us that Chang Chi translated Arnold Roller’s General Strike (Lo-lieh Tsung t’ung-meng pa-kung) in 1907, Canton.
- [55.](#) *La Révolution*, op. cit.
- [56.](#) *Ibid.*
- [57.](#) Ch’u Min-i, “On Anarchism” began in issue No. 31, January 25, 1908 of the Hsin Shih-chi, and continued through issue No. 60, August 15, 1908.
- [58.](#) “On Anarchism” (Continued), *Ibid.*, No. 60. August 15, 1908, pp. 5-9.
- [59.](#) Of course, the word “socialism” (she-hui-chu-i) had been introduced much earlier, possibly by Liang Ch’i-chiao in his Ch’ing-I Pao (Public Opinion Journal) in 1899.
- [60.](#) Ch’u Min-i, “Rejecting the Shih-pao’s ‘Why China Cannot Now Promote Communism,’” *Ibid.*, No. 72, November 7, 1908, pp.7-14.
- [61.](#) “A Comparison of the Three Principles of Nationalism, Democracy, and Socialism,” *Ibid.*, No. 6, July 27, 1907, p.1.
- [62.](#) *Ibid.*, p.1.
- [63.](#) When posed with this general question, Li Shih-tseng asserted that in each era, one struggles for freedom and the liberation of the individual spirit in a different manner, relying upon different tactics and approaches—but that the fundamental struggle is still the same. Interview, July 16, 1959.
- [64.](#) Yang K’ai-ling asserts that Sun met Wu in Tokyo, but others state that the London meeting was the first. See Yang, “The Father of the Country and Mr. Wu Chih-hui,” op. cit., No.1, pp. 28-29.
- [65.](#) Feng Tzu-yu, “The Master of the Hsin Shih-chi, Chang Chingchiang,” op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 227-230.
- [66.](#) *Ibid.*, p. 229.
- [67.](#) For an account of this and other events of this period in English, see T’ang Leang-li, ‘The Inner History of the Chinese Revolution’, London, 1930, pp.40 ff. (p. 62) For a discussion of the manifesto, see “Advice,” ‘Hsin Shih-chi’, No. 115, November 13, 1909, pp. 4-11.
- [68.](#) The Su-pao Affair is discussed in T’ang, op. cit., p. 42; and ‘History of The Press and Public Opinion in China’, 1936, p.102. Mr. Richard Howard has informed us that some authorities claim that the enmity of Wu and Chang dates even before the Su-pao affair.
- [69.](#) This was Lin Yutang’s remark. *Ibid.*, p.102.

- [70.](#) For some of Chang's "open letters," see "A Just Discussion on Anti-Manchuism," *Min-pao*, No. 21, June 10, 1908, pp. 1-12; "Refuting the Argument Regarding China's Adoption of the International Language," *Ibid.*, pp. 49-72; "The Taiwanese and the Hsin Shih-chi Correspondent," *Ibid.*, No. 22, July 10, 1908, pp. 31-35; "To Advise Hsin Shih-chi," *Ibid.*, No. 24, October 10, 1908, pp.41-65. Wu's open letters to Chang appear in 'Hsin Shih-chi', Nos. 28, 44, and 63. See also the important article, "Advice," *Ibid.*, No. 115.
- [71.](#) See Wu's article "Party People," *Ibid.*, No. 117, January 22, 1910, pp.1-10. Here Wu reported that the anti-Sun manifesto, circulated in the names of T'ung Meng Hui members from seven provinces, was reported to have been written by T'ao Ch'eng-chang. He argued that if Sun were wealthy why did his son work in Honolulu to earn tuition, and why were the expenses of his mother, near death in Hongkong, being met by friends. He urged the anti-Sun forces to furnish proof of their charges. Then he furnished "proof" of Chang Ping-lin's association with Liu Kuang-han and his wife, in the form of five letters, the implication being that Chang was still close to him who by this time had deserted the Anarchist and revolutionary cause.
- [72.](#) "Meeting of the Overseas Students to Oppose a Supervisor," 'Hsin Shih-chi', No. 1, June 22, 1907, pp. 3-4.
- [73.](#) *Ibid.*, p 4.
- [74.](#) "Record of the Supervisor's Speech at the Association of Overseas Students in France," *Ibid.*, No. 50, June 6, 1908, pp. 2-3.
- [75.](#) See the advertisement on page one of Hsin Shih-chi, No. 114, October 16, 1909.
- [76.](#) See *Ibid.*, No. 116, December 18, 1909, p. 1. In this advertisement, it says "We have received our copy; three hundred more are on the way here." There is also other evidence to indicate secret publication in Tokyo.
- [77.](#) *Ibid.*, p. 1
- [78.](#) *Ibid.*, No. 121, May 21, 1910.
- [79.](#) Chang Chi, 'Chang P'u-ch'an hsien-sheng ch'an-chi' (Collective Works of Mr. Chang P'u-ch'an). Taipei, 1951, pp. 220-235.
- [80.](#) *Ibid.*, p. 236. Fang Chao-ving has informed us that the first mention of Anarchism in Chinese literature was probably through the translation of two Japanese works, Shakaito (the Socialist Party), by Nishikawa Kojiro and Shakaishugi gaikyo by Shimada Saburo, both published in Chinese in 1903, thus introducing Anarchist concepts.
- [81.](#) For two brief accounts of Liu and his wife, see Ts'ai Yuan-p'ei, "A Brief Account of the Activities of Liu Shen-shu," in Liu Shenshu i-shu ('Posthumous Writings of Liu Shen-shu'), 1936, pp. 1-3, and Wu Chih-hui, "Titbits," Hsin Shih-chi, No. 109, August 21, 1909, pp. 13-14.
- [82.](#) Liu contributed a number of articles to 'Min-pao' during Chang Ping-lin's editorship of that journal. He used the pen name of Wei I. See 'Min-pao', No.13, May 5, 1907, pp.1-16; No.14, June 8, 1907, pp. 23-28 and pp.39-111; No.15, July 5, 1907, pp.19-34 and pp.35-62; and No.18, December 25, 1907, pp.1-26. See also Chang T'ai-yen (Ping-lin), "A Preface to Anarchism," 'Min-pao', No. 20, April, 1908, pp.129-130, in which Chang makes some generally favorable remarks in connection with Chang Chi's translation of Errico Malatesta.

- [83.](#) Ibid., No.15, July, 1907.
- [84.](#) Certain articles from the T'ien-i Pao are reprinted in the 'Hsin Shih-chi'. The Kuomintang Archives near T'aichung Taiwan contain issues 4 and 5 (July 25, August 10, 1907), and the authors have had the important articles copied from these two issues. No issues have yet been discovered in Japan.
- [85.](#) 'Hsin Shih-chi' No. 22, November 16, 1907, p.4, No. 25, December 7, 1907, pp.3-4, and No. 26, December 14, 1907, p.4 carry the events and major speeches of this first meeting as recorded in 'T'ien-i Pao'.
- [86.](#) Ibid., No. 25, p.3.
- [87.](#) Ibid., No. 22, p.4.
- [88.](#) Liu Kuang-han, "Views on the Equality of Anarchism," 'T'ien-i Pao', No.4, July 25, 1907, pp.7-20.
- [89.](#) Liu Kuang-han, "An Examination of the Development of Socialism in the Western Han Period," op. cit., pp. 20-29. and No. 5, August 10, 1907, pp. 27-30.
- [90.](#) Ibid., No. 5, p.30.
- [91.](#) Ts'ai Yuan-p'ei, op. cit.
- [92.](#) Ibid., pp. 236-237.
- [93.](#) Shortly after his return to China, he attempted to secure from the revolutionary government Ch'ung-ming Island at the mouth of the Yangtze River "as an experimental area for world Anarchism." Min-li Pao (The People's Independent), Shanghai, China, January 26, 1912, p. 2.
- [94.](#) A brief biography of Shih Fu appears at the beginning of his collective works, 'Shih Fu wen-ts'on' (Collective Works of Shih Fu), Canton, 1927. See also his biography in the Anarchist publication 'Ko-ming hsien-ch' (the Vanguard of Revolution), Shanghai, 1928. For a sketch in English, see H. E. Shaw, "A Chinese Revolutionist," 'Mother Earth', Vol.X, No.8, October, 1915, pp.284-5.
- [95.](#) Shih Fu wen-ts'un, op. cit.
- [96.](#) Ibid.
- [97.](#) Ibid. See also Feng Tzu-yu, op. cit., Vol.II, pp. 207-211.
- [98.](#) For a detailed description of the Chin-te Hui, see Chang Hsing yen, "On the Chin-te Hui", Min-li Pao, February 26, 1912, p. 2, and the special Chin-te Hui section which was subsequently carried in that newspaper. See also Wu Chih-hui's reply to Shih Fu in Min Sheng, No. 2, August 27, 1913, p.10.
- [99.](#) "Covenant of the Chin-te Hui", *Min-li Pao*, February 26, 1912, p. 2.
- [100.](#) Ibid., p. 2.
- [101.](#) Ibid., p.2.
- [102.](#) From time to time, lists of members were given in 'Min-li Pao'. General members included Ts'ai Yuan-p'ei, Chang Hsing-yen, and according to a new list of March 1, 1912, Hu Han-min among others. Special A Division members included Chang Chi, Chang Ching-chiang, Tai Chi-tiao and many others. B Division members included Wang Ching-wei and Chiu Min-i. C Division included Wu Chih-hui and Li Shih-tseng.
- [103.](#) Ibid., March 2, 1912, p.3.

- [104.](#) Ibid., March 6, 1912, p.3.
- [105.](#) Ibid., April 21, 1912, p.2.
- [106.](#) A complete set of these papers is available and has been used by the authors.
- [107.](#) For its declaration, see “Declaration of the Society of Anarchist Communist Comrades,” ’Min Sheng’, No.19, July 18, 1914, pp. 6-9.
- [108.](#) See Shih Fu’s “Letter to the International Anarchist Congress,” ’Min Sheng’ No.16, June 27, 1914, pp. 4-8. This is a valuable source, especially for current developments.
- [109.](#) For example, in ’Min Sheng’, No. 21, August 2, 1914, the receipt of one of Emma Goldman’s books is acknowledged, and her picture is printed. In the same issue, is a note stating that despite the seizure and suppression of Osugi Sakae’s new journal, ’Heimin Shimbun’ (The Commoner Newspaper), Min Sheng has secretly received a copy of issue No.1. Scarcely an issue of ’Min Sheng’, moreover, was without news of some foreign anarchist party or movement. In issue No.13, an advertisement appears on p. 12 for a Chinese socialist and Anarchist journal published in Burma called ’Cheng Sheng’ (The Voice of Justice).
- [110.](#) Shih Fu lived until after the publication of issue No. 22. It is reported that after every issue, he became ill from over-exhaustion. Following his death, ’Min Sheng’ was changed to a bi-weekly, and the last few issues were published very irregularly. At a later point, the Anarchists began to publish the magazine again.
- [111.](#) “Declaration, “ Hui—ming -lu, No. 1, August 20, 1913, pp. 1—2.
- [112.](#) Ibid., p. 2.
- [113.](#) “A Simple Explanation of Anarchism,” Ibid., pp. 2-8.
- [114.](#) Ibid.
- [115.](#) “Explaining the term ’Anarchist-Communism’,” ’Min Sheng’, No. 5, April 11, 1914, pp.1-5.
- [116.](#) Ibid.
- [117.](#) “The Aims and Methods of the Anarchist-Communist Party,” Ibid., No.19, July 18, 1914, pp. 6-9.
- [118.](#) “First Letter of Shih Fu to Wu Chih-hui,” Ibid., No. 2, August 27, 1913, pp.9-10.
- [119.](#) “Wu Chih-hui’s Reply,” Ibid., No. 2, August 27, 1912, p.10.
- [120.](#) “Shih Fu’s Letter to Chang Chi,” Ibid., pp.10-11.
- [121.](#) See especially “The Socialism of Sun Yat-sen and Chiang K’ang-hu,” Ibid., No. 6, April 18, 1914, pp.1-7, and Chiang K’ang-hu’s “Anarchism,” Ibid., No.17-18, July 4-11, 1914, pp.6-7; 5-7.
- [122.](#) “The Socialism of Sun Yat-sen and Chiang K’ang-hu,” op. cit., pp.1-7.
- [123.](#) Ibid.
- [124.](#) “Argument Against Chiang K’ang-hu,” Ibid., No.14, June 13, 1914. pp.159-167, continued in No. 15, June 20, 1914, pp.171-177. See also “The Anarchism of Chiang K’ang-hu,” Ibid., No.17, July 4, 1914, pp.6-7, continued in No.18, July 11, 1914, pp. 5-7.

- [125.](#) See Shih Fu's "In Answer to Lo Wu," *Ibid.*, No.7, April 25, 1914, pp. 9-11; and his "On the Socialist Party," *Ibid.*, No. 9, May 9, 1914, pp.1-6.
- [126.](#) Wu Chih-hui, "Remembering Mr. Shih Fu," in *Wu Chih-hui ch'an-chi* (The Complete Works of Wu Chih-hui), Shanghai, 1927. Vol.8, pp.115-117.
- [127.](#) See Yang Ch'uan, "Social Reform Thought of the Last Thirty Years in China," *Tung-fang tsa-chih*, Vol. 21, No. 17, September 10, 1924, pp. 50-56.
- [128.](#) *Ibid.*
- [129.](#) See Liang Ping-hsien (using the pen-name Hai-y Ku-X'e) "Special Memoirs of the Liberation," *Tzu-yu Jen* (The Freeman), Hong Kong, Nos. 73-86, Nov. 14—Dec. 29, 1951. Liang was a member of the Hui-ming Hseh-she and these are an exceedingly valuable series of articles pertaining to such questions as the origins of the Chinese Communist movement, and the relation of the Anarchists to its opening stages.
- [130.](#) For one valuable account of the French work-study movement, see a Chinese book published in Paris: Shih-chich-she, comp., 'L-Ou chiao-y yn-tung' (The Educational Movement in Europe), Tours, France, 1916, 123 pp. See especially the section entitled "Reasons for Leaning Towards French Education," pp. 63-65.
- [131.](#) *Ibid.*, p. 63.
- [132.](#) *Ibid.*, p. 65.
- [133.](#) *Ibid.*, pp. 50-55.
- [134.](#) *Ibid.*, p. 55.
- [135.](#) *Ibid.*, p. 55.
- [136.](#) Shu Hsin-ch'eng, 'Chin-tai Chung-kuo liu-hseh shih' (A History of Students Abroad in Modern China), Shanghai, 1933, p. 88.
- [137.](#) See Li Shih-tseng, "A Speech on Going to France to Study" (pp. 59-66) in 'Liu-Fa chien-hseh pao-kao shu', (Report of Frugal Study in France) put out by the Kwangtung Branch of the Sino-French Educational Association, Canton, 1918. This little volume contains some twenty items relating to the work-study movement in France up to 1918, including essays by its leaders, descriptions by participants, and a few documents and news reports.
- [138.](#) Ho Ch'ang -kung, 'Ch'in kung chien-hseh sheng-huo hui-i', (Recollections of Diligent Work and Frugal Study Life), Peking 1958. A very interesting work by a veteran Communist.
- [139.](#) Pien Hsiao-hsuan, Editor, "Sources on Diligent Work and Frugal Study in France", 'Chin-tai-shih tzu-liao' (Contemporary Historical Materials), No. 2, April, 1955, Peking, pp.174-208. Shu Hsin-ch'eng, *op. cit.*, says there were 1700 unemployed Chinese by the beginning of 1921. p.94.
- [140.](#) Sheng Ch'eng, *Hai-wai kung-tu shih-nien chi-shih* (A True Record of Ten Years of Work and Study Overseas), Shanghai, 1932.
- [141.](#) *Ibid.*, pp. 52-54.
- [142.](#) *Ibid.*, pp. 56 ff.
- [143.](#) "Letter Regarding Plans for the Fundamental Solution of the Diligent Work-Frugal Student Movement," *Hsin Chiao-y*, Vol. 6, No. 2, February, 1923, pp. 239-242.

- [144.](#) Liang Ping-hsien, op. cit., No. 85, December 26, 1951, p.4.
- [145.](#) Sheng Chieng, op. cit., pp. 68-69.
- [146.](#) Ho Ch'ang-kung, op. cit., pp. 74-75.
- [147.](#) A collection of writings, including the Ch'en-Ou exchange was published by the Editorial Department, New Youth Society, entitled 'She-hui chu-i t'ao-lun chi' (Discussions on Socialism), Canton, 1922.
- [148.](#) Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Speaking on Politics," Ibid., pp.1-16.
- [149.](#) For example, in a speech before the Canton Public School of Law and Politics, entitled "Criticism. of Socialism," Ch'en said:"From the political and economic aspects, Anarchism is absolutely unsuitable. Anarchism is based upon the assumption that man is by nature good and that education has been popularized. But the rise of political and economic systems is precisely due to the fact that men are not all good by nature and popular education has not been realized. What we need is to reform slowly the political and economic institutions so as to make men good and popularize education." op. cit., pp. 74-96. See also Li Ta, "The Anatomy of Anarchism," Ibid., pp. 219-238.
- [150.](#) "Another Answer by Ch`en Tu-hsiu to Ou Sheng-pai," Ibid., p. 119.
- [151.](#) See Ou's answer in "Another Reply of Ou Sheng-pai to Ch'en Tu-hsiu," Ibid., pp. 125-6, and Ch`en's reply, "Ch'en Tuhsiu's Third Reply to Ou Sheng-pai," Ibid., pp. 137-138. "Another Answer by Ch'en Tu-hsiu to Ou Sheng-pai," op. cit., p.125.
- [152.](#) See Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Chinese Style Anarchism," 'Hsin Ch'ing- nien', Vol.9, No. 1, May 1, 1921, pp. 5-6.
- [153.](#) "Ch`en Tu-hsiu's Third Reply to Ou Sheng-pai," op. cit., pp. 140 –1.
- [154.](#) "Ou Sheng-pai's Answer to Ch'en Tu-hsiu," Ibid., p. 118. See also "Another Reply of Ou Sheng-pai to Ch'en Tu-hsiu," op. cit., pp. 127-128.
- [155.](#) Ibid., p. 119.