

Liberalism of the Third Force in Republican China:

Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun

By

Lifang Peng

(彭丽芳)

A Thesis

submitted to Victoria University of Wellington

in fulfilment of the requirements for the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

School of History, Philosophy, Political Science &

International Relations

Victoria University of Wellington

2019

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements	ii
List of Abbreviations	iv
Chapter I: The Last Stand of Liberalism in Modern China.....	1
Introduction: Liberalism as an Intellectual Current in China.....	1
1.1 Liberalism in Modern China	3
1.1.1 Liberalism of the Third Force.....	4
1.1.2 Modern Chinese Liberalism and Its Failure.....	6
1.2 Scholarship and Basic Arguments.....	9
1.2.1 Existing Interpretations of Modern Chinese Liberalism	9
1.2.2 Major Arguments.....	11
1.3 Methodology and Conceptual Framework	14
1.3.1 Ideological Morphology	15
1.3.2 Morphology of Liberalism.....	17
1.4 Thesis Structure.....	19
Chapter II: Charting Liberalism in the Age of Ideologies	23
2.1 Conflicts and Interactions between Liberalism and Socialism	23
2.2 New Liberalism	25
2.2.1 Social Liberty	25
2.2.2 Harmony between the Individual and Society.....	26
2.2.3 Enlarged Role of the State	27
2.3 Socialism and Its Varieties	28
2.3.1 Morphology of Socialism	28
2.3.2 Marxism, Social Democracy, and Marxism-Leninism.....	30
2.3.3 Socialism in Republican China.....	34
2.4 New Liberalism in Europe, America, and China	40
2.4.1 The British Case	42
2.4.2 The Chinese Case	42
Chapter Summary.....	43

Chapter III: The New Liberalism of L. T. Hobhouse and Carsun Chang	45
3.1 Two Paths to New Liberalism	45
3.2 Hobhouse's View of the State	47
3.2.1 The State as a Compulsory Form of Social Union	47
3.2.2 Re-evaluation of the Minimal State Theory	47
3.2.3 Limits and Functions of the State	48
3.3 Carsun Chang's Theory of the State	51
3.3.1 The State as the Major Theme of Political Philosophy	51
3.3.2 Western Theories of the State.....	53
3.3.3 Limits and Functions of the State	59
3.4 Liberty Compatible with the Common Good.....	62
3.4.1 Hobhouse: Liberty, Restraint, and Harmony	63
3.4.2 Chang: Individual Liberty and Collective Interests.....	66
3.5 Sources of the Development of New Liberalism	76
3.5.1 Theoretical Sources: Liberalism of Mill and German Idealism	77
3.5.2 Contextual Problems: Capitalism and State-Building	79
Chapter Summary.....	81
Chapter IV: Hobhouse and Chang on Socialism	83
4.1 Socialism and New Liberalism	83
4.2 Hobhouse's Discourse on Socialism	84
4.2.1 Mechanical Socialism and Official Socialism.....	86
4.2.2 Liberal Socialism.....	87
4.3 Chang's Discourse on Socialism.....	89
4.3.1 Marxian Socialism and Social Democracy.....	90
4.3.2 Democratic Socialism.....	91
4.4 Organic Society: Individualism and Collectivism	95
4.4.1 Hobhouse: An Organic Conception of Society	95
4.4.2 Chang: A Functional Theory of Society.....	96
4.4.3 Similarities and Differences	99
Chapter Summary.....	100

Chapter V: Carsun Chang and Constitution-Making.....	103
5.1 Institutional Design: Constitutional Democracy	103
5.2 The 1920s: Draft Constitution of 1922	104
5.2.1 A Republic of Federated Provinces	106
5.2.2 The Legislature, the Executive, and the Judiciary	108
5.2.3 Basic Rights of Citizens	111
5.2.4 The Weimar Constitution and the Constitution of 1922	111
5.3 The 1940s: Constitutional Movements	114
5.3.1 Principles of Revision.....	115
5.3.2 Revision of the Draft Constitution of 1936	119
5.4 Development of Chang's Constitutional Thinking	123
5.4.1 Consistency.....	123
5.4.2 Change.....	125
Chapter Summary.....	125
Chapter VI: Zhang Dongsun on Democracy in the 1940s.....	129
6.1 Zhang Dongsun as a Philosopher and Political Figure	130
6.2 Perception of Democracy before the 1940s	131
6.3 Democracy as a Cultural Conception and a Political System	133
6.3.1 The Conceptual System of Democracy	134
6.3.2 Interaction between Concepts and Society	135
6.4 Liberty, Equality, and Transitions to Democracy	137
6.4.1 Imbalance between Liberty and Equality	137
6.4.2 Economic Growth: The Limit to Liberty and Equality	138
6.5 Applicability of Democracy to China	139
6.5.1 Political Democracy: Democracy of a New Type	140
6.5.2 Economic Democracy: A Mixed Economy	142
6.6 Zhang Dongsun and the New Liberalism in the West	145
Chapter Summary.....	148

Chapter VII: Left Liberalism of Zhang Dongsun.....	149
7.1 Left Liberalism in the Chinese Context of the 1940s.....	149
7.2 Modifications of Classical Liberalism	152
7.2.1 Liberty, Personality, and Restraint	152
7.2.2 Liberalism, Individualism, and China's Path to Democracy.....	155
7.3 A Liberal Perspective on Socialism	157
7.3.1 Socialism and Communism as a Social Ideal.....	158
7.3.2 Marxism and Marxism-Leninism	159
7.4 Zhang Dongsun and His Split with Carsun Chang	162
Chapter Summary.....	166
Conclusion	169
Carsun Chang and the Current Democratic System of Taiwan	173
A Divided Chinese Liberalism in the 1940s	175
Liberalism of the Third Force and Contemporary Chinese Liberalism	176
Appendix I: Chronological Biography of Carsun Chang (1887-1969)	183
Appendix II: Major Books by Carsun Chang.....	187
Appendix III: Chronological Biography of Zhang Dongsun (1886-1973).....	189
Appendix IV: Major Books by Zhang Dongsun	193
Bibliography	195

Abstract

This study investigates the liberal thought of Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun who were core figures of the “Third Force”, those parties who did not align themselves either with the KMT or with the Communists in the 1940s. They developed a distinctive Chinese form of liberalism that contained elements of socialism, German idealism (Hegel and Kant), and the British tradition of liberty (Mill). Though similar in many respects to New Liberalism represented by the British thinker L. T. Hobhouse, this form of liberalism was specifically adapted to Chinese conditions. Like Hobhouse, Chang used German idealism to reconcile liberalism with socialism but he aimed to address Chinese problems including poverty, national sovereignty, and authoritarianism. Zhang subscribed to Chang’s views and agreed that these problems were the obstacles to Chinese democracy and state-building.

I use Michael Freeden’s theory of ideological morphology to establish the distinctive character of Chinese liberalism represented by Chang and Zhang. As an alternative to conventional approaches, it centres around the semantic meanings of a cluster of political concepts which constitute liberalism and socialism rather than specific definitions of those ideologies. This approach successfully explains the variations within liberalism, socialism, and their complex relationship in different cultures and regions, but has not yet been used by other scholars to discuss Chinese political thought. In addition, I also discuss specific textual and contextual aspects of the Chinese liberalism of Chang and Zhang.

Recognising the liberal tradition Chang and Zhang established helps develop a new understanding of Chinese liberalism and Chinese socialism past and present which are conventionally excluded from the narrative of Chinese political history. The Chinese liberalism identified in my research had an overlap with social democracy. It was not a single concept of liberty but a particular configuration of a few concepts such as liberty, equality, progress, justice, welfare, and limited power. This form of liberalism continues to exist in contemporary China. Chinese thinkers of this liberal tradition were and are actively involved in the debates over socialism, liberalism, and their relationships to Chinese problems such as modernisation, democratisation, and social transformation. In addition, this study reveals an ideological cause of a divided Chinese liberalism in the 1940s. Chang was a new liberal whereas Zhang was a representative of left liberalism. Furthermore, this research enables us to understand the continuing influence of the liberalism of Chang on the constitutional thought in Taiwan and its implications for the relationship between Taiwan and mainland China. Chang drafted the Constitution of the Republic of China. His liberal thought had an impact on this constitution that was initially intended to cover mainland China but was only enforced in Taiwan.

Acknowledgements

Modern Chinese liberalism to me is not only an extremely intriguing story about the past but also the embodiment of the soul and the spirit of Chinese thinkers who pursue truth and justice with tremendous courage. I would like to pay tribute to Chinese thinkers who lived in hard times of foreign aggression and civil wars after the collapse of the last imperial dynasty of China. I am indebted to many scholars whose works have aroused my interest in modern China and the political thought of Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun. My study is based on their investigations.

I have benefited from the advice of many academics and friends since I pursued my interest in political science and Carsun Chang during my Master's study. Professor YU Zhangbao (余章宝), Associated Professor SONG Junjian (宋君健), Dr William James, and Dr NIE Anxiang (聂安祥), were my former teachers whose ideas inspired me to study liberalism. I owe them a debt of gratitude for their support over the past few years.

I also would like to extend my gratitude to Associate Professor Ken Perszky and Professor Xiaoming Huang who encouraged me to pursue my doctoral study at Vitoria University of Wellington. I am grateful to VUW for providing me with funds and enabling me to conduct the doctoral research and some archival research in Xiamen, Beijing, and Taipei. While writing the dissertation, I received constructive and useful feedback from my supervisors, Professor Xiaoming Huang and Dr Xavier Marquez. Professor Huang usually attends to the logic and the structure of the whole thesis. Dr Marquez's suggestions have contributed to the revision of the thesis. He read all chapters very carefully. Each chapter was returned to me with his handwritten annotations. The questions Dr Marquez raised about the structure, the argumentation, and some specific political ideas of the Chinese thinkers helped me express my ideas in a more precise and succinct manner. I greatly appreciate the support that my supervisors have offered me over the past three years. In addition to the comments of my supervisors, I benefit from the feedback of Dr Pauline Keating and Dr William James. Dr Keating read chapter 1, chapter 2, and the conclusion carefully. Dr James read chapter 3, the longest chapter of my thesis, which dealt with the liberal thought of Carsun Chang and L. T. Hobhouse. Their annotations helped me polish the writings in terms of clarity and word choices. I would like to express my appreciation.

A large number of the primary sources in my thesis are located in mainland China and Taiwan. I did some archival research in Xiamen, Beijing, and Taipei. My special thanks go to

some academics at Xiamen University, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS), Tsinghua University, Academia Sinica, and National Chengchi University of Taiwan. Professor YU Zhangbao helped me get access to some materials at Xiamen University. Dr WU Minchao (吴敏超), a researcher at CASS connected me with Professor ZUO Yuhe (左玉河), Professor ZHENG Dahua (郑大华), and Associate Professor WENG Hekai (翁贺凯). These experts in the political thought of Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun generously shared their views with me.

I am also indebted to a number of Taiwanese scholars: Professor Chang Peng-yuan (张朋园), Professor Huang Ko-wu (黄克武), Professor Yap Key-chong (叶其忠), Professor Hsueh Hua-yuan (薛化元), and Mr Jiang Ryh-shin (江日新). They sent me some books on Yan Fu, Liang Qichao, Carsun Chang, and Zhang Dongsun. With the help of Professor Hsueh, I was able to access some materials on Carsun Chang and the Constitution of the Republic of China at the Lei Chen Research Centre, National Chengchi University of Taiwan. I owe these individuals a debt.

Special thanks are due to three examiners: Edmund Fung, Leigh Jenco, and Jason Young. They have made insightful comments that help improve the thesis. In addition, I am grateful to the *American Journal of Chinese Studies* (AJCS). The Editor Edward McCord and two anonymous reviewers contributed to the revision of my article “Carsun Chang on Democratic Socialism: Liberalism, Social Democracy, and German Idealism”. This article builds on Chapter IV and some sections of Chapter I and Chapter II. It will be published in October 2019. The final version of my thesis has taken the feedback of the AJCS into account.

Last but not least, I would like to express my gratitude to my siblings, parents, and friends. My family always support whatever decisions I make to change my life. During my study and life in New Zealand, the following individuals have helped me in various ways: Pauline Keating, Jonette Crysell, Duncan Campbell, Caroline MacDonald, Jason Young, Roseanne Harland, David Harland, Xavier Marquez and his wife, Kaz Bartsch, Thomas Song, Luna Lai, and Mengzhu Yan. They helped me overcome some challenges, which made my life in New Zealand easier and more interesting. My sincere thanks go to them.

List of Abbreviations

ACND	Advisory Council of National Defence
CASS	Chinese Academy of Social Sciences
CCP	Chinese Communist Party
DL	China Democratic League
DSP	China Democratic Socialist Party
FL	Fighting League for Chinese Freedom and Democracy
KMT	Kuomintang of China
NSP	National Socialist Party of China
PCC	Political Consultative Conference (1946)
PRC	People's Republic of China
ROC	Republic of China
SPD	Social Democratic Party of Germany

Note:

I offer an explanation of the use of Chinese in this dissertation. When I refer to Chinese intellectuals, books, and words in the text and appendixes for the first time, I provide Chinese pinyin and Chinese characters. If they appear again, I use only Chinese pinyin. As for footnotes, usually no Chinese characters are used. But in the bibliography, I use both Chinese pinyin and characters to refer to Chinese authors, articles, and books. For Chinese publishers in footnotes and the bibliography, only Chinese pinyin is offered. With reference in particular to the Chinese thinker Carsun Chang (Zhang Junmai) who also published his writings in English and was better known in the English-speaking world as Carsun Chang, I use his English name in the text. But in footnotes and the bibliography, his English name is used only when he published his works with the name Carsun Chang.

Chapter I: The Last Stand of Liberalism in Modern China

Introduction: Liberalism as an Intellectual Current in China

“Great changes are not caused by ideas alone; but they are not effected without ideas”.¹ Gao Chaoqun (高超群), a researcher at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS), said that Chinese history and politics from 1978 (Reform and Opening-Up) to 1989 was characterised by heated debates over economic and political reforms rather than ideological uniformity and these debates had an influence on the political elites who split into two camps—those who were for the Reform and those who were against it.² By debates, Gao alluded to the rise of liberal ideology. The crackdown on the 1989 Tiananmen Square Protests indeed has dealt a great blow to Chinese liberalism. Nevertheless, the intellectual debates over liberalism and its relationship to China’s reform and development, and the role of the state in the transition to a developed country never cease. Some contemporary scholars such as He Li, Gao Chaoqun, Ma Licheng (马立诚), and Liu Jianjun (刘建军) have identified liberalism as one of the major Chinese political ideologies in present-day China.³

Liberalism was believed to be predominant in the intellectual community in the 1980s.⁴ However, the suppression of the Tiananmen Square protests of 1989 forced many intellectuals to shift their focus from political liberalism to economic liberalism (a market economy). Notwithstanding the suppression, the 1990s saw the resurfacing of political liberalism. One prominent liberal was Li Shenzhi (李慎之). As a member of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), a former adviser to the Chinese leadership, and former Vice-President of the CASS, Li in the late 1990s explicitly expressed his support for political

¹ Leonard T. Hobhouse, *Liberalism* (Kitchener, Ontario: Batoche Books, 1998), 23

² Gao Chaoqun, “Dangdai zhongguo zhengzhi sixiang bantu,” [The Landscape of Contemporary Chinese Political Thought] Zhongguo gaige luntan [China Reform Forum, China Institute for Reform and Development], updated 4 February 2012, http://www.chinareform.org.cn/gov/governance/practice/201202/t20120205_133500.htm.

³ He Li is Professor of political science at Merrimack College. Ma Licheng is a public intellectual. Liu Jianjun is Director of Contemporary China Research Centre at Fudan University. For their essays or books on contemporary Chinese political thought, see He Li, *Political Thought and China’s Transformation: Ideas Shaping Reform in Post-Mao China* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015); Gao Chaoqun, “Dangdai zhongguo zhengzhi sixiang bantu”; Ma Licheng, *Dangdai zhongguo bazhong shehui sichao* [Eight Strands of Social Thought in Contemporary China] (Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe, 2011); Liu Jianjun, *Dangdai zhongguo zhengzhi sichao* [Contemporary Chinese Political Thought] (Shanghai: Fudan daxue chubanshe, 2010). There is another English book on contemporary Chinese thought. See Fred Dallmayr and Zhao Tingyang, eds., *Contemporary Chinese Political Thought: Debates and Perspectives* (Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 2012). But the editors only select essays about New Confucianism, New Leftism, and post-Maoism. Books by He Li and Ma Licheng provide a more comprehensive landscape of contemporary Chinese political thought.

⁴ Li, *Political Thought and China’s Transformation*, 17; Fen Lin, Yanfei Sun, and Hongxing Yang, “How Are Chinese Students Ideologically Divided? A Survey of Chinese Students’ Political Self-Identification”, *Pacific Affairs* 88, no.1 (2015): 56.

liberalism, demanding political reforms.⁵ This “Li Shenzhi phenomenon” sparked a debate over the conception of “liberal” among Chinese intellectuals.⁶ Calls for political reforms and debates over liberalism continued in the twenty-first century. The past 19 years of this century have seen a growing consciousness of liberalism among liberal intellectuals who are critical of the Chinese government and put forward proposals demanding constitutionalism and the protection of basic human rights. Some notable articles or proposals are Charter 08 (2008), “Xin gongmin jingshen—Ziyong gongyi ai” 新公民精神—自由、公义、爱 (The Spirit of New Citizens: Liberty, Justice, and Universal Love 2012), “Gaige gongshi changyishu” 改革共识倡议书 (A Proposal for a Consensus on Reform 2012), *Southern Weekly*’s planned 2013 New Year issue with the opening article “Zhongguomeng xianzhengmeng” 中国梦, 宪政梦 (China’s Dream, the Dream of Constitutionalism), and “Women dangxia de kongju yu qidai” 我们当下的恐惧与期待 (Our Fears and Hopes since the Reform 2018).⁷

These calls for constitutionalism and democracy remind us of the liberal tradition in Republican China (1912-1949). The ongoing debates over liberalism and socialism and the concerns of Chinese liberals are rooted in modern China when Chinese liberals put forward the establishment of a constitutional democracy to help national independence, state-building, and modernisation. There are similar conditions in which Chinese liberalism takes shape and seeks to address some similar issues such as authoritarianism and social injustice.

First, there is a diversity of political thought in the intellectual community though both Republican China and the People’s Republic of China are ruled by one political party. Second, almost all major political ideologies during both periods centre around issues related to China’s modernisation and national rejuvenation. Third, there are moments when liberalism is one of the major intellectual currents to compete with its rivals. In the 1940s the liberal force was even politically organised. In the late 1980s and the 1990s, the liberal circle published a large number of works to debunk the arguments of the New Left. Fourth, as an

⁵ For reference, see Li Shenzhi, *Selected Writings of Li Shenzhi*, eds. Ilse Tebbetts and Libby Kingseed (Ohio: Kettering Foundation Press, 2010).

⁶ For a detailed analysis of the resurfacing of liberalism and “Li Shenzhi phenomenon”, see Yinghong Cheng, “Liberalism in Contemporary China: Ten Years after Its ‘Resurface’,” *Journal of Contemporary China* 17, no. 55 (2008): 383-400.

⁷ Charter 08 was signed by more than 300 Chinese intellectuals most of whom were scholars, teachers, journalists, writers and human rights activists. One of the drafters was Liu Xiaobo, the 2010 Noble Peace Prize winner. “The Spirit of New Citizens” was written by Dr Xu Zhiyong, a jurist. “A Proposal for a Consensus on Reform” was drafted by Zhang Qianfan, a professor of law at Beijing University. About 70 liberal intellectuals supported the proposal. “China’s Dream, the Dream of Constitutionalism” was an article by Dai Zhiyong, a journalist. “Our Fears and Hopes since the Reform” was written by Xu Zhangrun, a professor of law at Tsinghua University. The article is a critique of Chinese politics and a response to the constitutional amendment which abolishes the term limits on the Presidency.

ideology liberalism has its market among intellectuals, but its influence on real politics in both periods is limited. In the 1940s Chinese liberals succeeded in bringing about a consultative conference which produced a liberal constitution. However, the civil war and the split within liberalism made the efforts of liberals futile. With reference in particular to the Tiananmen Square protests of 1989, pro-democracy students could have drawn lessons from the constitutional movements in the Republican era to achieve their aims step by step. An attempt seeking substantive political changes and an overnight success in China usually results in limited choices for democrats and liberals; consequently, the possibility for political negotiations is undermined. It usually ends with a zero-sum game in which an authoritarian regime becomes the winner.

Having considered the four parallels between Republican China and contemporary China regarding the liberal tradition and the intellectual debates over specific Chinese problems, I suggest that we revisit liberalism in Republican China to get a better understanding of Chinese liberalism and its relationship to China's economic, social, and political reforms.

1.1 Liberalism in Modern China

A great deal of the scholarship on Chinese politics in the first half of the twentieth-century focuses mainly on the Kuomintang (the Nationalist Party), the Chinese Communist Party, and the power struggle between them, resulting in an interpretation of Republican Chinese politics characterised by a two-party paradigm. In a similar vein, the diversity of Chinese political thought in Republican China has often been overlooked. Some scholars more aware of the intellectual diversity of the period have tried to organise modern Chinese political or social thought into major categories, though often differing in their labels. Chinese scholars have, for example, posited three main categories: liberalism, radicalism (usually identified with Marxism-Leninism), and (cultural) conservatism.⁸ Likewise, Edmund S. K. Fung argues that Republican China was “underpinned by a triad of liberal, conservative and socialist

⁸ Examples of this broad categorisation can be found in: Geng Yunzhi, Zheng Dahua, and Yu Zuhua, “Lishi weishenme meiyou xuanze ziyoushuyi—Guanyu ‘Zhongguo jindai ziyoushuyi’ de duihua,” [Why Was Liberalism not the Choice?—A Dialogue on Modern Chinese Liberalism], in *Jindai Zhongguo shi shang de ziyoushuyi: Ziyoushuyi yu jindai Zhongguo (1840-1949) xueshu yantaohui lunwenji* [Proceedings of the Conference on Liberalism in Modern Chinese History: Liberalism and Modern China (1840-1949)], ed. Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo [Institute of Modern History, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences] (Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe, 2008), 6; Zheng Dahua, *Minguo sixiangshi lun* [An Intellectual History of Republican China] (Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe, 2006), 99; Ren Jiantao, *Zhongguo xiandai sixiang mailuo zhong de ziyoushuyi* [Liberalism in the Threads of Modern Chinese Thought] (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2004), 99; Ouyang Zhesheng, *Ziyoushuyi zhi lei—Hu Shi sixiang de xiandai chanshi* [The Burden of Liberalism—A Modern Interpretation of Hu Shi's Thought] (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1993), 380. Zheng Dahua uses “Westernisation” as a descriptive term for liberalism. Ouyang Zhesheng argues that anarchism, radical populism, and Marxism were all forms of radicalism.

thought.”⁹ In Fung’s study, though, socialism does not just refer to Marxism but to reformist or revisionist socialist thought. Fung directs our attention to the important fact that a Communist-dominated historiography obscures socialist alternatives proposed by “non-Marxist, non-communist intellectuals who had a socialistic impulse.”¹⁰

Indeed, many Chinese liberals in Republican China incorporated some elements of socialism into political liberalism. This suggests that strict attempts to apply broad categories to modern Chinese thought may obscure more than illuminate the ways in which different streams of thought actually interacted. These liberals modified both traditional liberalism and socialism in the hope of establishing a Chinese democracy. Their ideas shaped modern Chinese liberalism which in the 1940s developed into a third force outside the KMT and the CCP. This third force contributed to the birth of the Constitution of the Republic of China. This constitution was intended to cover mainland China but it was only implemented in Taiwan, helping Taiwan establish a democratic system. Xie Zhengdao (谢政道), a Taiwanese scholar of constitutional law, comments that only when mainland China enforces the Constitution of the Republic of China and becomes a democracy will the peaceful reunification of Taiwan and mainland China be possible.¹¹

1.1.1 Liberalism of the Third Force

This dissertation seeks to recover a Chinese form of liberalism developed by Carsun Chang (Zhang Junmai 张君勱) and Zhang Dongsun (张东荪) and explore the pluralism of modern Chinese political thought through a reevaluation of the two thinkers who were key members of the third force. Chang was the drafter of the Constitution of the Republic of China. As core figures of Liang Qichao’s research group and the same political party (National Socialist Party), Chang and Zhang were like-minded liberals before a split after the mid-1940s.¹² This split signified a divided Chinese liberalism which was detrimental to the prospects for a constitutional democracy in China. It marked the last stand of liberalism in the history of modern China.

I contend that Chang and Zhang developed a distinctively Chinese form of liberalism that contained elements of British liberalism, social democracy, and German idealism without

⁹ Edmund S. K. Fung, *The Intellectual Foundations of Chinese Modernity: Cultural and Political Thought in the Republican Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 2.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 3.

¹¹ Xie Zhengdao, *Zhonghua minguo xiuxianshi* [The History of Revision to the Constitution of the Republic of China] (Taipei: Yangzhi wenhua shiye gufen youxian gongsi, 2007), 537-41.

¹² In 1946 this party was renamed as the China Democratic Socialist Party and it was one of the six parties and groups of the China Democratic League.

abandoning the Chinese tradition of freedom (spiritual freedom as self-autonomy and self-independence). This form of liberalism, though similar in many respects to the contemporary form of the British liberal thought found in L. T. Hobhouse, was specifically adapted to Chinese conditions with a view to the state-building of China.

Recognising the distinctive character of Chinese liberalism represented by Chang and Zhang enables us to understand both its continuing influence on the constitutional thought in Taiwan and its significant role in unfolding a truer picture of Chinese liberalism and Chinese socialism that are conventionally excluded from the narrative of Chinese political ideologies. I show in particular the impact of Chang's liberal thought on the democratic system of Taiwan and its implications for the relationship between Taiwan and mainland China.

Furthermore, this research develops a new understanding of Chinese liberalism and Chinese socialism in both Republican China and in contemporary China. First, the distinctive Chinese form of liberalism identified in my research has an overlap with social democracy as a form of socialism. To be exact, liberalism as established by Chang and Zhang was not a single concept of liberty but a particular configuration of a few concepts such as limited power, liberty, equality, justice, democracy, welfare, and progress.

Second, Chinese thinkers of this liberal tradition were and are actively involved in the debates over socialism and liberalism. This liberal tradition continues to exist in contemporary China. For example, the liberal discourses of Qin Hui (秦晖), Xu Jilin (许纪霖), and Zhang Rulun (张汝伦) highlight not only individual liberty, but also equality, justice, and welfare. They absorb harmonious elements of liberalism and social democracy, attempting to modify Western ideas to address contemporary Chinese problems.¹³ Among the three liberal intellectuals, Qin's discourse is more "indigenous" and this makes him more comparable to the liberalism of the third force in Republican China. In a book on assorted "isms" in relation to Chinese problems, he argues that problems of contemporary China make it imperative to advocate the overlapping values of liberalism and social democracy.¹⁴ Along with Qin, Xu, and Zhang, advocates of other strands of liberalism (economic liberalism and political liberalism) from the late 1980s to the 1990s voluntarily formed a liberal circle to argue with the New Left. They debated modernity, democracy, equality, justice, liberalism, and their relationships to China's political, economic, and social reforms. These ideological

¹³ For an analysis of their arguments and the debates between the New Left and the liberal circle, see pages 171-176.

¹⁴ Qin Hui, *Gongtong de dixian* [Our Common Ground and Bottom Line in the Debate over "Isms" in Relation to Chinese Problems] (Nanjing: Jiangsu wenyi chubanshe, 2013), 9-10.

conflicts and interactions are still underway and the Chinese liberal tradition in the foreseeable future will not cease to exist as long as Chinese intellectuals think that questions on liberalism, socialism, and their relationships to Chinese problems are not yet answered satisfactorily.

1.1.2 Modern Chinese Liberalism and Its Failure

To understand the position of Chang and Zhang in modern Chinese liberalism, it is necessary to review the development of modern Chinese liberalism. I hold that the liberal force represented by Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun developed from an intellectual current into an actual political force to be reckoned with in the 1940s. After the War of Resistance against Japan, this liberal force endeavoured to mediate between the CCP and the KMT both of whom tried to win the support of these liberal intellectuals. Nevertheless, the constitutional movement led by the third force ultimately failed due to several reasons.

The first phase of modern Chinese liberalism began in the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century.¹⁵ Liberal ideas were introduced to China by Yan Fu (严复) and Liang Qichao (梁启超). It was a stage of importation of European liberal political thought, especially British political thinking (John Locke, Adam Smith, and John Mill).

The New Culture Movement (1915-1922) ushered in the second stage of modern Chinese liberalism.¹⁶ This phase extended to the outbreak of the War of Resistance against Japan in 1937. Liberalism in China then developed into a major school of intellectual thought, having its own followers who aired demands for democracy and constitutionalism. Hu Shi, Carsun Chang, and Zhang Dongsun were just three of the notable voices in this period. They drew on Western liberalism to ponder over the problems of modern China.

The period between 1937 and the 1940s, however, marked a breakthrough in the evolution of modern Chinese liberalism in the sense that liberals were politically organised and at some moments they were able to exert an influence on the government.¹⁷ Various political groups or parties which were founded by liberal intellectuals during the war organised a third force. The China Democratic League became the mainstay of this third

¹⁵ Leigh K. Jenco, "Chinese Liberalism," LSE Research Online (2012), accessed 25 December 2015, <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/45300/>; Edmund Fung, *The Intellectual Foundations of Chinese Modernity: Cultural and Political Thought in the Republican Era* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 136; Geng, Zheng, and Yu, "Lishi weishenme meiyou xuanze ziyoushuyi," 6; Shi Bifan, *Jindai zhongguo ziyoushuyi xianzheng sichao yanjiu* [Constitutional Liberalism in Modern China] (Jinan: Shandong renmin chubanshe, 2004), 4-6.

¹⁶ Geng, Zheng, and Yu, "Lishi weishenme meiyou xuanze ziyoushuyi," 4-6.

¹⁷ Ibid.

force which helped make the 1946 Political Consultative Conference possible. This conference was significant and unprecedented in modern Chinese politics because constitutionalism was on the agenda and two armed parties (the KMT and the CCP) with the help of the third force and America, tried to solve differences in a peaceful manner. It is believed that this stage was the peak of political liberalism in modern China.¹⁸ Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun as two key figures of the DL were deeply involved in the constitutional movement of this period. The representatives of the KMT, the CCP, and the DL agreed to select Carsun Chang as the drafter of the Constitution of the Republic of China. Unfortunately, the breakdown of political negotiations between the KMT and the CCP made the proposal of constitutionalism infeasible.

Edmund Fung and Leigh Jenco interpret modern Chinese liberalism in a slightly different way.¹⁹ According to Fung, Yan Fu and Liang Qichao belonged to the first generation.²⁰ The second generation included Hu Shi (胡适), pre-Marxist Chen Duxiu (陈独秀) and Li Dazhao (李大钊), Carsun Chang, Zhang Dongsun and others who were active participants of the May Fourth Movement.²¹ The third generation emerged in the early 1930s and extended to the 1940s and many of them were disciples of Harold Laski.²² Representatives were Luo Longji (罗隆基), Wang Zaoshi (王造时), Chu Anping (储安平) and so on.²³ Leigh Jenco employs a similar approach to describe the development of Chinese liberalism from the late Qing to 1949. She classifies it into two strands. The first strand is “the importation and application of European classical liberal political ideologies by court intellectuals and treaty-port compradors in the late nineteenth century, and the subsequent development of this liberal trend in the early years of the Chinese Republic (1911-1919) and into the 1930s.”²⁴ The other strand is “the rise of liberal individualism during the ‘May

¹⁸ See Geng, Zheng, and Yu, “Lishi weishenme meiyou xuanze ziyoushuizhi,” 6; Shi, *Jindai zhongguo ziyoushuizhi*, 207; Hu Weixi, Gao Ruiquan, and Zhang Limin, *Shizi jietou yu ta: Zhongguo jindai ziyoushuizhi sichao yanjiu* [A Crossroads and the Pagoda: A study of Modern Chinese Liberalism] (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1991), 299; Xu Jilin, “Shehuiminzhuzhuyi de lishi yichan—Xiandai zhongguo ziyoushuizhi de huigu,” [The Historical Legacy of Social Democracy: A Review of the Liberal Tradition in Modern China] in *Zhishi fenzi lichang: Ziyoushuizhi zhi zheng yu zhongguo sixiangjie de fenhua* [The Positions of Intellectuals: Debates over Liberalism and Divisions within Chinese Intellectual Circles], ed. Li Shitao (Changchun: Shidai wenyi chubanshe, 2000), 479. Zhang Dongsun who lived in Republican China also commented that political liberalism reached the peak in the 1940s. See Zhang Dongsun, *Zhongguo jindai sixiangjia wenku: Zhang Dongsun juan* [Library of Modern Chinese Thinkers: Zhang Dongsun], ed. Zuo Yuhe (Beijing: Zhongguo renmin daxue chubanshe, 2015), 592.

¹⁹ See Fung, *Intellectual Foundations*, 136-37; Jenco, “Chinese Liberalism”.

²⁰ Fung, *Intellectual Foundations*, 136.

²¹ Ibid. In the late 1910s Chen Duxiu and Li Dazhao became Marxists and they founded the Communist Party in the early 1920s.

²² Ibid, 137.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ See Jenco, “Chinese Liberalism”.

Fourth' student movement of the 1920s, largely informed by the pragmatic philosophy of the influential social critic Hu Shi."²⁵

However, to divide Chinese liberalism into some generations in the chronological order proposed by Fung and Jenco is unable to describe the features of the liberal thought of some Chinese liberals like Hu Shi, Carsun Chang, and Zhang Dongsun. Fung and Jenco regard them as the second generation (the 1920s) of liberals in modern China, but these intellectuals never stopped advocating liberal values in the 1930s and the 1940s. In addition, the liberalism of Chang and Zhang was different from the liberal individualism the May Fourth movement advocated. Chang and Zhang put equal emphasis on individual liberty and the common good, trying to reconcile Chinese culture with Western democracy.²⁶

I maintain that the political landscape of Republican China from the late 1930s to the 1940s was shaped by the interplay of three major forces represented by the KMT, the CCP, and the third force most of whom were liberal intellectuals. The chance for making China a democracy came in the 1940s when the KMT government was forced to convene the Political Consultative Conference and the Constituent Assembly which would include all political parties and independents. But eventually the third force movement failed and Chinese liberals had to choose sides between the CCP and the KMT.

As a political movement liberalism ultimately failed in modern China and a combination of factors accounted for its failure. A most important factor was the inhospitable environment including foreign invasion (the Japanese aggression in particular), the repression by the KMT, the uncompromising attitude on the part of the revolutionary Communist Party of China, and the military conflicts between the two major parties.²⁷ This political environment created differential capabilities for the KMT, the CCP, and the DL to change the trajectory of Chinese politics. Being sandwiched between two armed parties which did not embrace values of tolerance, compromise, and cooperation in the process of democratisation, the third force without military resources and popular support, was incapable of competing with the KMT and the CCP on the same footing. There was no hope for peace after the mediation of America and the DL culminated in failure. The DL was less than neutral after the PCC was held in 1946. Its pro-communist standpoint was manifest in its decisions to absent itself from

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Chapter III, chapter IV, and chapter VII will illustrate this point.

²⁷ Roger Jeans and Edmund Fung also regard this factor as a cause of the failure of the third force movement. See Roger B. Jeans, ed., *Roads Not Taken: The Struggle of Opposition Parties in Twentieth-Century China* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1992), 10-11; Fung, *In Search of Chinese Democracy*, 260.

the Constituent Assembly and to expel Carsun Chang and his followers because they decided to attend the Assembly that would promulgate the democratic constitution Chang drafted. It turned out that the political reality was most advantageous to the CCP which succeeded in preventing the DL from cooperating with the KMT to form a coalition government despite the fact that the KMT did reserve seats for the DL and the CCP. In addition, scholars also agree that limited membership, lack of a supportive civic society (popular support), financial difficulties, inadequate organisational structures of the DL (lack of leadership and cohesion), factionalism within Carsun Chang's party and the DL (mutual rivalries and differences among party leaders), and moderate personalities of Chinese intellectuals like Chang who advocated rationality and the doctrine of the "golden mean" in an extreme environment of revolution all combined to cause the failure of liberalism in modern China.²⁸ This research will focus mainly on the ideological level and reveal an ideological cause of the failure of Chinese liberalism in the 1940s. This ideological analysis distinguishes my research from the studies of Roger Jeans and Edmund Fung that centre on the causes mentioned above. The causes they have identified are also essential to our understanding of modern Chinese liberalism.

1.2 Scholarship and Basic Arguments

1.2.1 Existing Interpretations of Modern Chinese Liberalism

While discussing liberalism in Republican China scholars develop three typical interpretations of Chinese liberalism in this period. One interpretation discusses Chinese liberals in terms of their similarity to canonical liberals. Many PRC scholars tend to invoke Locke and Hayek who are thought to be canonical liberals. They refer to their version of classical liberalism as the pure liberalism which prioritises the value of individual liberty and free markets.²⁹

A second interpretation stresses the unique characteristics of Chinese liberalism. For instance, Yin Haiguang (殷海光) and Ouyang Zhesheng (欧阳哲生) take the Chinese context into account. Yin prescribes six characteristics of modern Chinese liberalism: castigation of Confucianism, promotion of science, the pursuit of democracy, aspirations for freedom, progressiveness, use of vernacular Chinese; any modern Chinese intellectual who

²⁸ Jeans, *Roads Not Taken*, 10-20; Edmund Fung, "The Alternative of Loyal Opposition: The Chinese Youth Party and Chinese Democracy, 1917-1949" in Roger B. Jeans, *Roads Not Taken*, 259-260; Fung, *In Search of Chinese Democracy*, 260, 309-316.

²⁹ Hu, Gao, and Zhang, *Shizi jietou*, 300; Liu Junning, *Gonghe minzhu xianzheng—Ziyoushuixi sixiang yanjiu* [Republic, Democracy, and Constitutionalism] (Shanghai: Sanlian shudian, 1998), 341.

possesses four of those six traits is a liberal.³⁰ Ouyang, however, argues that Yin's definition is too broad because it may include those who are radicals (revolutionaries).³¹ Ouyang lists four features of Chinese liberalism: individualism, reformism and gradualism, advocacy of science and cultural pluralism.³² According to this interpretation, whether Chang and Zhang were liberals is disputable. Chang and Zhang did not castigate Confucianism. Neither did they agree that science could solve questions of morality and metaphysics.

Another interpretation suggests that Chinese liberalism bears both indigenous characteristics and universal features. Some of the widely accepted tenets of liberalism are limited government, the protection of civil liberties, and a belief in democratic institutions.³³ The influence of Confucianism is identified as an indigenous feature.³⁴

Scholars who interpret Chinese liberalism in the first two ways conclude that most modern Chinese liberals misunderstood liberalism because their understanding of liberalism deviated from the version of liberalism that stressed individual liberty.³⁵ Moreover, these scholars judge that Chinese liberalism failed to address the problems of modern China due both to the flaws of the creed itself and to the elitism of Chinese liberals.³⁶ I maintain that these two interpretations fail to explain the variations within liberalism across time and they suppose an antithesis between all variants of liberalism and socialism. These two interpretations represent the mainstream view that excludes Chang and Zhang from liberalism. My study will show that Chang and Zhang developed a Chinese form of liberalism, similar to New Liberalism which contained elements of socialism. Thinkers of this liberal tradition in both Republican China and in Britain agreed that liberalism and socialism were not necessarily antithetical.

³⁰ Yin Haiguang, "Ziyouzhuyi de quxiang," (The Tendency of Liberalism) in *Jindai zhongguo sixiang renwu lun—Ziyouzhuyi* [Modern Chinese Thinkers—Liberalism], eds. Zhou Yangshan and Yang Suxian (Taipei: Shibao wenhua chubanshe, 1980), 19-97.

³¹ Ouyang, *Ziyouzhuyi zhi lei*, 340.

³² Ibid.

³³ Jenco, "Chinese Liberalism"; Edmund S. K. Fung, "Were Chinese Liberals Liberal? Reflections on the Understanding of Liberalism in Modern China," *Pacific Affairs* 81, no.4 (2008): 557-76; Huang Ko-wu, "Jindai zhongguo de ziyouzhuyi: Yuanqi yu yanbian," (Modern Chinese Liberalism: Origin and Evolution) in *Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo, Jindai zhongguo shi shang de ziyouzhuyi*, 27-43; Benjamin C. Tsai, "Enemies of the Revolution: Ideology and Practice in the Making of Chinese Liberalism, 1890-1927" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2000), 2; Jerome B. Grieder, *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1970), 344.

³⁴ Jenco, "Chinese Liberalism"; Fung, "Were Chinese Liberals Liberal?," 563; Grieder, *Hu Shih*, 344.

³⁵ Zhang Qing, *Hu Shi paixue renqun yu xiandai zhongguo ziyouzhuyi* [The Hu Shi Group of Scholars and Modern Chinese Liberalism] (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2004), 20-22; Ren Jiantao, *Zhongguo xiandai sixiang mailuo zhong de ziyouzhuyi*, 280; Hu, Gao and Zhang, *Shizi jietou*, 70-72; Xu, "Shehuiminzhuzhuyi," in Li Shitao, *Zhishi fenzi lichang*, 475; Liu, *Gonghe minzhu xianzheng*, 341-42; Yin, "Ziyouzhuyi," 21; Chang Hao, *Liang Chi-chao and Intellectual Transition in Modern China, 1890-1907* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971); Benjamin I. Schwarz, *In Search of Wealth and Power: Yen Fu and the West* (Cambridge Massachusetts.: Harvard University Press, 1964).

³⁶ Zhang, *Hu Shi paixue renqun yu xiandai zhongguo ziyouzhuyi*, 500; Ren, *Zhongguo xiandai sixiang mailuo zhong de ziyouzhuyi*, 280; Hu, Gao, and Zhang, *Shizi jietou*, 70-72.

The third approach pays attention to the diversity of liberalism in different contexts. However, a lack of an appropriate methodology to deal properly with the conceptual problem of liberalism and its relationship to socialism results in confusing conclusions about Chang and Zhang. Thus, Roger Jeans portrays Chang as a constitutionalist, a socialist, and a democrat.³⁷ Edmund Fung contends that Chang and Zhang were simultaneously liberal, democratic, and socialist.³⁸ Zheng Dahua concludes that Chang was an advocate for political liberalism and a socialist economy.³⁹ Soonyi Lee describes Chang and Zhang as thinkers of socialism.⁴⁰ Weng Hekai, however, argues that Chang's theory of democratic socialism did not deviate from constitutionalism or liberalism.⁴¹ Leigh Jenco and Xue Huayuan (薛化元) also refer to both or either of them as liberals.⁴² These differences about the labels applied to Chang and Zhang remain unsolved. My research will use ideological morphology developed by Michael Freeden to understand the liberal and socialist arguments by Chang and Zhang. This research avoids the debates that often arise based on different definitions of the labels (liberal or socialist) applied to Chang and Zhang and therefore seeks to resolve some of the differences seen in previous scholarship regarding these labels.

1.2.2 Major Arguments

I make four arguments in this research. First and foremost, I argue that, instead of misreading liberalism, Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun developed a Chinese form of liberalism that was akin to British new liberalism to respond to Chinese issues including national

³⁷ Roger B. Jeans, *Democracy and Socialism in Republican China: The Politics of Zhang Junmai, 1906-1941* (Boulder: Rowman and Littlefield, 1997), 9-48.

³⁸ Edmund S. K. Fung, "State Building, Capitalist Development, and Social Democracy in China's Modern Transformation, 1921-1949," *Modern China* 31, no. 3 (2005): 318.

³⁹ Zheng Dahua, "Lun Zhang Junmai zhengzhi sixiang de yanbian jiqi dangdai yiyi" [The Development of Zhang Junmai's Political Thought and Its Contemporary Significance] *Guanchazhe* [Observer], updated 22 August 2013, https://www.guancha.cn/ZhengDaHua/2013_08_22_158305.shtml.

⁴⁰ Soonyi Lee, "Culture and Politics in Interwar China: The Two Zhangs and Chinese Socialism" (PhD diss., New York University, 2014), 6-21; Xiao Gongquan a prominent scholar and a contemporary of Carsun Chang also considered Chang as a representative of socialism. See Xiao Gongquan, *Jindai zhongguo sixiang renwu lun—Shehuizhuyi* [Modern Chinese Thinkers—Socialism] (Taipei: Shibao wenhua gongsi, 1980). The Taiwanese scholar Sun Shanhao uses "constitutional socialism" to depict Chang's political thought. See Sun Shanhao, "Zhang Junmai de xianzheng shehuizhuyi," [Zhang Junmai: Constitutional Socialism] *Tengxun wenhua* [Tencent Culture], updated 18 July 2013, <http://cul.qq.com/a/20130718/015913.htm>.

⁴¹ Weng Hekai, "Xiuzheng de minzhu zhengzhi bianxi—Chongshen Zhang Junmai 1930 niandai de minzhu guannian he zhidu sheji," [An Analysis of the Theory of Modified Democratic Politics—A Re-evaluation of Zhang Junmai's Political Thought about Democracy and Institutional Design in the 1930s], in *Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo, Jindai Zhongguo shi shang de ziyoushuyi*, 430; Weng Hekai, *Xiandai zhongguo de ziyou minzu zhuyi—Zhang Junmai minzu jianguo sixiang pingzhuan* [Liberal Nationalism in Modern China: A Commentary on Zhang Junmai's Political Thought of Nation-Building] (PhD diss., Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, 2006).

⁴² Leigh K. Jenco, "Chinese Political Ideologies," in *Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*, eds. Michael Freeden, Lyman Tower Sargent, and Marc Stears (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 644-60; Jenco, "Chinese Liberalism"; Xue Huayuan, *Minzhu xianzheng yu minzuzhuyi de bianzheng fazhan—Zhang Junmai sixiang yanjiu* [Dialectic Development of Democracy, Constitutionalism, and Nationalism—A Study of Zhang Junmai's Thought] (Taipei: Daoxiang chubanshe, 1993).

sovereignty, poverty, and authoritarianism. They held that democratic politics, a mixed economy, and a German conception of the state would help China deal with these problems. My research builds on the arguments made by Edmund Fung, Benjamin Tsai, and Weng Hekai. They challenge the mainstream view that Chang and Zhang misread liberalism. Fung argues that Chang and Zhang did not misinterpret liberalism and that Chinese conceptions of freedom developed by them are similar to those of T. H. Green and L. T. Hobhouse.⁴³ Tsai contends that Liang Qichao's research group (Liang Qichao, Carsun Chang, and Zhang Dongsun) "presented the most coherent and systematic defence of a liberal constitutional order throughout modern China".⁴⁴ Weng maintains that Carsun Chang's theory of "modified democratic politics" conformed to the principles of liberalism and constitutionalism and it contributed to China's political transition and state-building.⁴⁵ My study will support and extend their arguments.

I contend that the imperative of different contextual problems led to similar responses among both Chinese and British liberal thinkers who modified different traditions of liberty in their societies and that these thinkers converged on a variant of liberalism with some elements of socialism and German idealism. Capitalism associated with classical liberalism was Britain's malaise. Therefore, liberal thinkers there modified the British tradition of classical liberalism. They found that some socialist elements (human welfare, state intervention, public property) and an organic conception of society were remedies for classical liberalism. The priority for China, however, was state-building. The solution Chang and Zhang put forward was a composite of democratic politics, a mixed economy, and German idealism. Democratic politics, they argued, was indispensable to the establishment of a modern state. Poverty and a concern for social justice made them develop the conception of a mixed economy combining socialism and capitalism. In addition, a German conception of the state was introduced by Chang to highlight the positive role of the state in safeguarding China's sovereignty and in building a nation-state. Zhang also subscribed to this German conception of the state and supported Chang.⁴⁶ Their political thought turned out to be a system that had some similarities with British new liberalism but it also possessed a flavour of nationalism.

⁴³ Fung, "Were Chinese Liberals Liberal?," 576; Edmund S. K. Fung, "The Idea of Freedom in Modern China Revisited: Dual Conceptions and Dual Responsibilities," *Modern China* 32, no. 4 (2006): 321-22, 453-55, 474.

⁴⁴ Tsai, "Enemies of the Revolution," 1.

⁴⁵ Weng, "Xiuzheng de minzhu zhengzhi bianxi," 430.

⁴⁶ This was reflected in the political platform they co-authored in 1932. See Jizhe (Editor), "Women suo yao shuo de hua," (Our Parole) *Zaisheng* 1, no.1 (20 May 1932): 1-60.

Second, most past studies on Chang and Zhang portray them as exemplars of reformist socialism (social democracy) and I hold that the designation of these Chinese thinkers as social democrats is too narrow to describe the pluralism of modern Chinese political thought and the complexity of their thought which was influenced by different strands of thought including liberalism, socialism, and German idealism.⁴⁷ Both British thinkers (Thomas Hill Green, Leonard Hobhouse, and John Hobson) and these Chinese thinkers (Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun) tried to synthesise these different strands of thought to meet the needs of their societies. Chang, for instance, developed a distinctive discourse on democratic socialism that bore a strong resemblance to Hobhouse's conception of liberal socialism rather than European social democracy. The liberal socialism was an essential part of Hobhouse's political philosophy of New Liberalism and thus Chang's discourse on democratic socialism might be best described as New Liberalism.

Third, the two democratic constitutions Chang drafted in Republican China are evidence that Chang was a committed liberal and constitutionalist. Previous scholarship on Chang ignores his constitutional thought and some significant differences between Chang's constitutional thought and the Weimar constitution. I will illustrate Chang's constitutional thought and its relationship to Taiwan's democratic system and highlight the differences between his constitutional thinking and other Western constitutional law, the Weimar constitution in particular. These differences are important for us to understand Chang's views on the applications of presidentialism, parliamentarianism, federalism, and direct democracy in China. He disapproved of a powerful president and the implementation of direct democracy in China at an early stage of democratisation.

Finally, I argue that an ideological divergence developed between Chang and Zhang after the mid-1930s and it eventually caused a divided Chinese liberalism including the split within the DL and the party led by both Chang and Zhang. Their political thought represented two conspicuous streams of Chinese liberalism in the 1940s, new liberalism and left liberalism. Chang remained a new liberal while Zhang became a left liberal who finally supported the CCP and believed that the CCP would make China a democracy.

⁴⁷ For major works on the reformist socialism of Chang and Zhang, see Jeans, *Democracy and Socialism in Republican China*; Fung, "State Building, Capitalist Development, and Social Democracy in China's Modern Transformation"; Fung, *Intellectual Foundations*; Lee, "Culture and Politics in Interwar China".

1.3 Methodology and Conceptual Framework

I use Michael Freeden's theory of ideological morphology to establish the distinctive character of Chinese liberalism represented by Chang and Zhang. Unlike conventional approaches, ideological morphology centres around the semantic meanings of political concepts rather than a specific definition of liberalism. This approach has successfully explained the variation of liberalism in different contexts and the relationship between liberalism and socialism, but has not yet been used by other scholars to discuss liberal thought in China. In addition, I also discuss specific textual and contextual aspects of the liberal thought of Chang and Zhang.

When constructing liberalism, political theorists usually adopt two methodological strategies, either individually or in combination: stipulative and canonical.⁴⁸ Stipulative methods "employ definitional fiat to demarcate the legitimate boundaries of liberalism: only those adhering to a particular cluster of assumptions and arguments count as properly liberal".⁴⁹ Canonical methods "distil 'liberal' theoretical structures from exemplary writings" by renowned thinkers such as Locke, Kant, Mill, and Rawls.⁵⁰

Both strategies have their merits but neither can accommodate and explain the plurality of actually existing liberalisms, past and present, in our political debates.⁵¹ Many of the typical interpretations of Chinese liberalism fall into these strategies. To be exact, scholars who sanctify the liberalism of Locke, Hayek or Mill as the "pure" form of liberalism use canonical methods. The stipulative approach is used by Yin Haiguang and Ouyang Zhesheng. The third interpretation of modern Chinese liberalism recognises the diversity of liberalism in different contexts but it does not provide a methodology for us to deal with the conceptual problems of liberalism and socialism. This lack of an appropriate methodology leaves some questions about Chang and Zhang unresolved.

My research seeks to address the problems that remain by using ideological morphology. This new methodology identifies the political concept (liberty, equality, etc.) as the unit of analysis and presents ideologies as particular configurations of a cluster of political concepts the meanings of which can be decoded through a systematic investigation

⁴⁸ Duncan Bell, "What Is Liberalism?," *Political Theory* 42, no.6 (2014): 686.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid

⁵¹ Ibid, 687.

of political language.⁵²

1.3.1 Ideological Morphology

The approach of ideological morphology is “a general method of investigating and decoding the internal structure of ideologies, highlighting the central role of that structure in fashioning the semantic fields of all ideologies, and offering a revealing insight into the ways ideologies consequently construct the political and navigate through it.”⁵³

According to Michael Freeden, “prevailing traditions of studying political thought have focused on truth and epistemology, ethical rightness, logical clarity, origins and causes, prescriptions, purposes and intentions”.⁵⁴ The morphological approach, in contrast, highlights the semantic. It distances itself from some misconceptions about political ideology. One misconception is to suppose that the boundary between ideologies is rigid and ideologies are totally antithetical or incompatible with each other.⁵⁵ A second misconception is the “postulation of one-to-one relationship between party and ideology”.⁵⁶ The ideology of a liberal party does not amount to liberalism.

Morphological analysis identifies proximity, permeability, proportionality, and priority as among the most salient features of ideologies.⁵⁷ Proximity refers to the conceptual environment in which a concept is located; the conceptual meanings within an ideology are interrelated.⁵⁸ Permeability implies that ideologies are not mutually exclusive; they may intersect and clear boundaries may not be discernible.⁵⁹ Proportionality means the relative weight of the conceptual components within an ideology. More to the point, it suggests that “ideologies are to be distinguished not by the presence of a concept, but by the impact and centrality attributed to it within one ideology in contrast to its downplaying in another”.⁶⁰ Thus, a single concept such as equality cannot be regarded as socialism. The fourth feature indicates the ranking order of priority accorded to core over adjacent and adjacent over

⁵² Michael Freeden, “The Morphological Analysis of Ideology,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*, eds., Michael Freeden, Lyman Tower Sargent, and Marc Stears (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 115.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Michael Freeden, *Ideologies and Political Theory: A Conceptual Approach* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 3.

⁵⁵ Michael Freeden, *Liberalism Divided: A Study in British Political Thought, 1914-1939* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 2.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Freeden, “The Morphological Analysis of Ideology,” 134.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

peripheral concepts.⁶¹ This proposition of core, adjacent, and peripheral concepts is central to the morphological analysis of an ideology.

Cores, Adjacent, and Peripheral Concepts

A core concept of an ideology is durable and it is present in all known instances of a particular ideological family; core concepts are indispensable to an ideology's ideational content.⁶² For example, the concept of liberty is one of the indispensable core concepts of liberalism. But liberty alone is not sufficient to compose liberalism. The morphological approach gets rid of reducing an ideology to merely one central concept (e.g. liberty for liberalism or tradition for conservatism).⁶³

“Adjacent concepts are second-ranking in the pervasiveness and breadth of the meanings they impart to the ideology”.⁶⁴ Unlike cores, they are not present in all cases of an ideology. Nonetheless, they occupy a key position in refining the core and solving the problem of indeterminacy regarding semantics. A liberal core can be surrounded by different adjacent concepts: democracy, welfare, equality, and property. But combinations of those concepts will produce different versions of liberalism. A liberal core with the adjacent concepts of democracy, equality, and welfare generates the welfare state which makes the state responsible for the development of individuals whereas a liberal core with democracy and private property as adjacent concepts leads to a version of liberalism stressing entrepreneurship that attaches importance to free markets.

Peripheral concepts exist on two dimensions: margin (significance) and perimeter (the interface with time and space).⁶⁵ They change at a faster pace than adjacent concepts of an ideology. Margin refers to “ideas and concepts whose importance to the core...is intellectually and emotionally insubstantial”.⁶⁶ They are ephemeral culturally and diachronically. Empire, elitism, localism, and ethnicity are examples of peripheral concepts of liberalism. Perimeter involves the interplay between the conceptual arrangement and social practices or contingencies.⁶⁷ For instance, climate change, mass migration, terrorism and financial crisis will affect the development of an ideology such as liberalism and socialism.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid, 124.

⁶³ Freeden also explains those views in *Ideologies and Political Theory*. See Freeden *Ideologies and Political Theory*, 84.

⁶⁴ Freeden, “The Morphological Analysis of Ideology,” 124.

⁶⁵ Freeden, *Ideologies and Political Theory*, 78

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Freeden, “The Morphological Analysis of Ideology,” 126.

To put it succinctly, perimeter pertains to “specific ideas or policy-proposals rather than fully fledged concepts, lacking the generalisation and sophistication associated with a concept”.⁶⁸

The morphological approach regards ideologies as particular permutations of several core, adjacent, and peripheral concepts which are related to each other within the conceptual environment.

1.3.2 Morphology of Liberalism

From the perspective of ideological morphology, liberalism is comprised of a liberal core of seven ineliminable political concepts. They are liberty, individuality, rationality, limited and accountable power, sociability, progress, and the general interest.⁶⁹

Differences among liberalisms arise because each political concept has more than one meaning; furthermore, the internal structure of the configuration of the seven concepts may differ in the sense that the weight assigned to each concept is not equal.⁷⁰ Adjacent and peripheral concepts set limits to the choices of the meanings and the internal structure of the liberal core. An example of this would be the difference between classical liberalism and British New Liberalism. The latter distinguishes itself from the former by including adjacent and peripheral concepts of justice, equality, human welfare, and state intervention. The former, however, has a distinctive adjacent concept of private property.

Historically liberalism has at least five temporary layers that are empirical manifestations of the ideology.⁷¹ They are: a theory of limited power seeking to protect individual rights (layer 1), a theory of the free market (layer 2), a theory of human progress (layer 3), a theory of state welfare (layer 4), and a theory of tolerance for different group life styles (layer 5).⁷² The five layers interact and are linked in patchy continuities. It should be noted that “there is no clear-cut chronological sequence between those layers”.⁷³ Moreover, “no actual variant of liberalism exhibits all five layers”.⁷⁴ Layer 2 is conspicuous in classical or neo-liberalism while layer 4 stands out in New Liberalism. Layer 5 is noticeable in communitarianism.

⁶⁸ Freeden, *Ideologies and Political Theory*, 80.

⁶⁹ Michael Freeden, *Liberalism: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 15.

⁷⁰ *Ibid*, 15-16.

⁷¹ Layers are a composite of accumulated, discarded, and retrieved strata of key tenets of liberalism in continuously fluctuating combinations. See Freeden, *Liberalism*, 37-38.

⁷² *Ibid*, 13.

⁷³ *Ibid*, 45.

⁷⁴ *Ibid*, 39.

On the whole, Freedman's theory illustrates how various narratives of liberalism are constructed and why observers may confuse neighbouring ideologies that possess overlapping concepts. Based on a morphological approach to liberalism, I put forward three propositions to understand modern Chinese liberalism.

First, the key to understanding liberalism is the liberal core (seven political concepts): liberty, individuality, rationality, limited and accountable power, sociability, progress, and the general interest.

Second, classical liberalism, being one layer of liberalism, does not encompass all manifestations of liberalism. Neither is it an axiom that Chinese liberalism developed in the same chronological order as Western liberalism did. It is not correct to exclude modern Chinese liberalism from the family of liberalism because it did not begin with classical liberalism but another layer of liberalism like the new liberalism.⁷⁵

Third, one misconception about modern Chinese liberalism should be eschewed. There is a tendency to equate a party ideology (including the label of the party) with the political thinking of an individual member of a party because many Chinese liberals from the 1930s were also leaders of various parties. I hold that a distinction between the agent as a liberal and the agent as a member of a political party should be made. This does not imply that there is no association. I mean that to examine only the party ideology is not sufficient to understand the individual thinker. For example, it is a misconception to equate the political thought of Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun with state socialism or social democracy just because the name of their party was National (State) Socialist Party or Democratic Socialist Party. In fact, these party names were not subject to their literal meanings. My analysis of Chang and Zhang is based on the original works by them and their own interpretations of their ideas.

This involves other methods adopted in my research. I also use detailed readings of these texts (including key journals) and explore their context to show how these thinkers developed their own versions of liberal thought. Chang and Zhang were major contributors or editors of two journals: *Jiefang yu gaizao* 解放与改造 (Emancipation and Reconstruction) and *Zaisheng* 再生 (The National Renaissance) in particular.⁷⁶ By context, I mean the intellectual

⁷⁵ Chinese liberal scholars like Xu Jilin and Ren Jiantao agree that modern Chinese liberalism is "revisionist liberalism" or "utilitarian liberalism". I prefer the term "new liberalism" to the terms they use. For the views of Xu and Ren, see Xu, "Shehuiminzhuzhuyi," 475; Ren, *Zhongguo xiandai sixiang mailuo zhong de ziyoushuyi*, 301.

⁷⁶ *Jiefang yu gaizao* was founded by the research group (Liang Qichao, Carsun Chang, and Zhang Dongsun) in 1919. In 1920 its name was changed into *Gaizao* (Reconstruction). Due to financial circumstances it was closed in 1922. *Zaisheng* was founded by Chang and Zhang in 1932.

debates over China's state-building and the ideological battles on liberalism, socialism, capitalism, and communism that occurred in the first half of the twentieth century.

1.4 Thesis Structure

The thesis is divided into three parts (seven chapters). Part I consists of chapter I and chapter II. This part adopts ideological morphology to analyse liberalism, socialism, their relationship and varieties in different countries such as Britain and China in the first half of the twentieth century with a view to a new understanding of the Chinese liberal tradition developed by Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun. Part II is composed of chapter III, chapter IV, and chapter V. It discusses Carsun Chang's liberal thought and his perspective on socialism. I systematically compare Chang and Hobhouse and analyse their discourses on the state, liberty, socialism, and an organic conception of society. Part III is made up of chapter VI and chapter VII. It specifically deals with Zhang Dongsun's political thought, covering his theory of democracy, his views on socialism and liberalism, and his divergences from Carsun Chang. These chapters illustrate the features of left liberalism in the Chinese context and reveal an ideological cause of a division within the third force as a whole.

Chapter I is this introduction to modern Chinese liberalism, especially the liberal thought of the third force represented by Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun.

Chapter II examines the ideological landscape in which liberalism clashed with and interacted with socialism from the late nineteenth century to the 1940s in order to illustrate the distinctive features of the political thought of Chang and Zhang who were actually influenced by the broad international intellectual community in their time when both socialism and liberalism were revised and developed in new directions. These Chinese liberals embraced the strand of liberalism that contained fundamental tenets of political liberalism, some elements of socialism, and German idealism. In this sense, it was similar to the liberal tradition British new liberals developed. The liberal thought of these Chinese thinkers and British new liberals embodied a new development of the liberal thought at that time. Contrary to the mainstream view, I argue that Chang and Zhang adapted both a Chinese tradition of liberty (spiritual freedom as self-autonomy, independence, and freedom of the mind) and Western political ideas to Chinese conditions without detracting from the values of core concepts of liberalism.⁷⁷ Though this Chinese liberalism was comparable to British new liberalism, it differed from the latter in terms of its genesis (contextual problems) and the way

⁷⁷ For details about the Chinese tradition of liberty, see section 3.4.2 in chapter III.

liberal thinkers modified the political traditions of their societies. In addition, the contextual problem of state-building added a flavour of nationalism to Chinese liberalism.

Chapter III presents a comparative study of the liberal thought of L. T. Hobhouse and Carsun Chang in order to understand the liberalism of Chang. Their theories about the state and liberty and sources of the development of their liberal thinking are investigated. Notwithstanding the vastly different cultural, political, and economic institutions in Britain and in China, Hobhouse and Chang developed similar forms of political thinking to respond to different problems of their societies. Their common intellectual influences were John Stuart Mill and German idealism. The other factor which helped shape their liberal thought pertained to contextual problems such as capitalism and state-building. They infused into their societies some particular concepts that were ignored or downplayed by the different political traditions before. Hobhouse thought that the British tradition of liberty (classical liberalism) must be supplemented with moral conceptions of social freedom and the common good so as to redress economic and social injustice caused by capitalism. Therefore, he advanced Green's idealism which developed the concepts such as social freedom and the common good based on German idealism. Chang, however, found that traditional Chinese politics and ancient Chinese thought were lacking in theories of the state, constitutionalism, and liberty as political and civil rights. Accordingly, he combined the Chinese tradition of freedom (a moral concept) with British liberalism and the German conception of the state, developing a variety of liberalism that aimed at the state-building of China.

Chapter IV compares Hobhouse and Chang as regards their perspectives on socialism to develop a new understanding of Chang's discourse on socialism. It is a further elaboration of chapter III, which illustrates the liberal and socialist components in the tradition of the new liberalism. Both Hobhouse and Chang used a theory of an organic society to solve the tension between liberalism (individualism) and socialism (collectivism) and thereby developed their distinctive discourses on "liberal socialism" and "democratic socialism". They opposed Marxian socialism in general because they held that Marxist view of history or society was too mechanical to accommodate moral and liberal values. Nonetheless, they advocated a liberal or democratic form of socialism. Hobhouse's conception of liberal socialism was similar to Chang's theory of democratic socialism in terms of economic thinking, but there was a distinct difference between the two. While economic justice was essential to Hobhouse's liberal socialism, democratic politics (political liberalism) was central to Chang's democratic socialism. In addition, the way they applied idealism (an organic conception of

society) was different. Chang aimed to counterbalance the impact of Marxism on Chinese intellectuals whereas Hobhouse sought to deal with capitalism.

Chapter V examines the liberal thought of Carsun Chang and its relationship to two constitutions in Republican China: *Guo xian yi* 国宪议 (The Draft Constitution of 1922) and the Constitution of the Republic of China (1946) enforced in Taiwan. It revises the mainstream view which considers Chang as an exemplar of social democracy. In addition, it corrects Edmund Fung's view that Chang overlooked the flaws of the Weimar constitution. Instead, I argue that Chang embraced constitutional liberalism and he did not neglect the weaknesses of the Weimar constitution. Indeed, there were some resemblances between the Weimar constitution and *Guo xian yi* regarding a semi-presidential system, the legal system, and economic and social policies. However, Chang abandoned some German ideas when conceiving of the future political system for China. To be precise, Chang adapted the democratic systems of the Weimar Republic, Britain, America, and Canada to Chinese conditions without detracting from fundamental values of liberalism (the separation of powers, a responsible government, federalism, and the protection of basic liberties) in order to establish a Chinese democracy.

Chapter VI offers an analysis of a particular theory of democracy and its applicability to China proposed by Zhang Dongsun in the 1940s. His theory of democracy was a configuration of a cluster of core concepts of liberalism and socialism and it was more similar to the family of liberalism. Hence, to understand the liberal thought of Zhang, it is necessary to dissect his theory of democracy. Zhang regarded democracy as a conceptual system of the following ideas: liberty, rationality, individuality, progress, equality, tolerance, justice, and human rights. This conceptual system interacted with real societies. Zhang argued that while building a modern democracy a country should attach equal importance to liberty, equality, and progress. He maintained that China's future political system should be "Democracy of a New Type". This system was characterised by a parliamentary system, a multi-party system, a mixed economy, and the protection of basic freedoms. Nevertheless, he neglected some significant differences between his conception of "Democracy of a New Type" and Mao Zedong's theory of new democracy.⁷⁸ This neglect partially accounted for his trust in the CCP after the mid-1940s.

⁷⁸ The Chinese terms for new democracy which appeared in the writings of Zhang and Mao are "新型民主" (xin xing minzhu) and "新民主主义" (xin minzhu zhuyi). Zhang used the former and Mao used the latter.

Chapter VII further explores the political thought of Zhang Dongsun and his split with Carsun Chang. I will investigate Zhang's views of liberalism, socialism, and his divergences from Chang. The developing gulf between Chang and Zhang signified a destructive division within Chinese liberalism as a political force that might otherwise have united to force the CCP to join a coalition government and to propel the process of democratisation of China. Unfortunately, along with Zhang, many of the third force stood on the side of the CCP and the capability of the liberal force to establish a constitutional democracy was undermined. I identify two forms of Chinese liberalism after the split between the two thinkers: left liberalism and new liberalism. Zhang became a left liberal while Chang remained a new liberal. This chapter discloses an ideological cause of a divided liberalism within the third force. I argue that the split was not much attributable to left liberals' beliefs in the political ideology of the CCP but to divided opinions on the nature of the CCP and its relationship to Marxian socialism in general, and Russian Communism in particular. Zhang and those who supported the CCP changed their views of the CCP, believing that the CCP was committed to democracy whereas the KMT was not at all trustworthy. But to their despair, the CCP after the founding of the PRC did not keep promises about democracy and human rights, which had been made by the party in the 1940s.

In the conclusion, I review the significance of the liberalism of the third force and its relevance to contemporary China. This conclusion shows in particular the relationship between Carsun Chang's liberal thought and Taiwan's current democratic system, and the intellectual debates over modernisation, democracy, and equality between the New Left and the liberal circle (three strands of Chinese liberalism) in contemporary China.

Chapter II: Charting Liberalism in the Age of Ideologies

2.1 Conflicts and Interactions between Liberalism and Socialism

This chapter employs the morphological approach to examine the ideological conflicts and interactions between liberalism and socialism in order to get a new understanding of the Chinese liberalism represented by Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun. These Chinese liberals embraced a liberalism which had some features of socialism (welfare, public property, state intervention) and German idealism. This liberal tradition was exemplified by British new liberals such as Thomas A. Green, Leonard T. Hobhouse, John A. Hobson and Bernard Bosanquet whose names appeared in the works of Chang and Zhang. Among these British new liberals, however, both Chang and Zhang discussed only Hobhouse' political theory in detail, suggesting an intellectual influence on both men. Hence, to understand the liberalism of Chang and Zhang, it was important to refer to the political thought of Hobhouse. A comparison with Hobhouse will illuminate how these Chinese thinkers developed a Chinese form of new liberalism to meet what they perceived to be China's particular needs and conditions.⁷⁹ Notwithstanding some similarities, there were a few distinct differences regarding the genesis of their liberal thought and the way of adapting different traditions of liberty. While British new liberals attempted to redress injustice caused by capitalism, Chinese liberals regarded the state-building of China as their primary task. In addition, the British thinkers modified the British tradition of liberty (classical liberalism) by infusing it with conceptions such as social freedom and the common good. The Chinese thinkers, however, added to the Chinese tradition of liberty (an ethical concept) the German conception of the state and the British tradition of liberty as political and civil rights. They absorbed some Western ideas and discarded others according to Chinese conditions so as to address poverty and authoritarianism in China.

I will first examine the fresh conceptions (social liberty, harmony, and an active state) that British new liberals added to the earlier liberalism, making New Liberalism a variant of liberalism. Then, I will subject socialism to a morphological analysis that accounts for the diversity of socialism and an overlap between social democracy and the new liberalism regarding some political concepts such as democracy, liberty, welfare, and equality. Marxism,

⁷⁹ Zhang was a new liberal until the mid-1930s but in the 1940s he became a left liberal who had positive views of Karl Marx and the CCP.

social democracy, and Marxism-Leninism as three influential variants of socialism will be explicated. Moreover, one section is devoted to some Chinese liberals' involvement in the debates over socialism before 1949. These debates showed the features of the liberal thought of Carsun Chang, Zhang Dongsun (before 1935), and Hu Shi who had a positive view of social democracy or liberal socialism but disapproved of Marxism, Marxism-Leninism, and their applicability to China. In the last section, I compare briefly the trend of the new liberalism in Europe, America, and China, arguing that the liberalism of Chang, Zhang, and Hu Shi was comparable to Western new liberalism and that it also displayed a strong flavour of nationalism.

Before exploring British new liberalism, I would like to describe the ideological landscape of socialism and liberalism because it helps understand Chinese liberalism. In the course of history from the latter half of the nineteenth century, liberalism and socialism were two influential political ideologies which had conflicts as well as interactions. The presence of socialism, especially Marxism, changed the ideological map because the Marxian discourse spearheaded a widespread campaign against capitalism. It was believed that capitalism was synonymous with laissez faire liberalism which was the root cause of the social ills of Western societies. In this sense, socialism was an alternative to liberalism.

Two World Wars and totalitarianism between the intervals of the Wars had an extensive impact on the development of socialism and liberalism. In fact, economic planning was first applied in the First World War. All belligerent governments attempted to control the economy and resources. The Treaty of Versailles was believed to mark the acknowledgement of liberal principles at least in the West, but this proved to be wrong. The decline and crisis for liberalism came in the 1930s. The economic crisis, fascism, and Nazism in Europe forced intellectuals to rethink liberalism and socialism. Several socialist practices (nationalisation, state control or economic planning) displayed their strengths, appealing to a number of intellectuals in both Western democracies and non-democracies where nationalism and anti-imperialism touched the hearts of those nations.

The liberal principles were not reaffirmed in the West until the end of the Second World War. Meanwhile, permeability between liberalism and social democracy was a distinctive phenomenon. Some Western liberal thinkers and governments infused socialistic elements into their traditions of liberty while democratic socialists absorbed liberal values into the socialist tradition. These attempts were related to the contextual problems of particular times.

It was against this background that Chinese liberalism developed and faded away in the pre-Communist era. The Chinese case reflected the ideological conflicts and permeability between liberalism and socialism. Chinese liberals held that there were conflicts between liberalism and Marxism-Leninism and that a democratic form of socialism was compatible with liberalism. The liberal thought of Carsun Chang, Zhang Dongsun, and Hu Shi was parallel to the new liberalism in Britain and America. L. T. Hobhouse and John Dewey were two Western new liberals whose works were invoked by these Chinese intellectuals.

2.2 New Liberalism

The ideological competition over the control of public political language prompted liberalism to develop into “New Liberalism” in order to respond to the contextual problems of labour and capitalism in the twentieth century. The British thinkers Thomas Hill Green, Leonard T. Hobhouse, and John A. Hobson were representatives of the new liberalism. They combined a theory of limited and accountable power, a theory of human progress, and a theory of welfare in order to make liberal principles more applicable to Britain in the new age. They achieved this aim by absorbing at least three essential elements which were not salient in the earlier liberalism. These elements were social liberty or freedom, harmony between the individual and society (an organic conception of society and the common good), and a positive conception of the state.

2.2.1 Social Liberty

To free liberalism from an atomistic and individualist conception, the new liberals asserted social liberty by acknowledging the social dimension of liberty. Green claimed that every right had its origin in some social relation.⁸⁰ No one could have a right “except (1) as a member of a society, and (2) of a society in which some common good is recognised by the members of the society as their own ideal good, as that which should be for each of them.”⁸¹ Hobhouse further extended these ideas and developed a positive conception of liberty.

Liberty then becomes not so much a right of the individual as a necessity of society. It rests not so much on the claim of A to be let alone by B but on the duty of B to treat A as a rational being. The rule of liberty is just the application of rational method. It is the opening of the door to the appeal of reason, of

⁸⁰ T. H. Green, *Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation and Other Writings*, eds. Paul Harris and John Morrow (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 110.

⁸¹ *Ibid*, 25.

imagination, of social feeling, and except through the response to this appeal there is no assured progress of society.⁸²

In a similar vein, Hobson argued that to conceive liberty merely as negative was defective.⁸³ A positive conception of liberty and the recognition of social liberty had implications for the role of the state and the relationship between the individual and society. It implied that a social association such as a community and the state could set a limit to individual freedom. It was justified for the community to impose restrictions on individual freedom for the sake of the common good.

2.2.2 Harmony between the Individual and Society

By recognising the social attribute of freedom, the new liberals aimed to preach a theory of harmony between the individual and society. The common good helped to achieve this kind of harmony. Green argued that the development of morality and society presupposed the idea of the common good.⁸⁴ The “only good in the pursuit of which there can be no competition of interests, the only good which is really common to all who may pursue it, is that which consists in the universal will to be good—in the settled disposition on each man’s part to make the most and best of humanity in his own person and in the persons of others.”⁸⁵ Hobhouse followed this line of argument and proposed a conception of social harmony which was connected with his ideas of good and progress. In his opinion, the common good lay in the manifold and harmonious development of life. Social progress consisted “in the movement by which such harmony may be realised.”⁸⁶ There existed no right that conflicted with the common good.⁸⁷ Enlightened self-interest would coincide with the public interest.⁸⁸ These arguments helped new liberals establish a positive notion of the state with enlarged responsibilities. If actions taken by the state were aimed at the common good, state control was legitimate and necessary.

⁸² Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, 53.

⁸³ John A. Hobson, *The Crisis of Liberalism: New Issues of Democracy* (Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1974), 92.

⁸⁴ Green, *Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation*, 264, 267.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 278

⁸⁶ Leonard T. Hobhouse, *Social Evolution and Political Theory* (New York: Columbia University Press), 92, 93, 185.

⁸⁷ Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, 55.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 26-27.

2.2.3 Enlarged Role of the State

Green's *Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation* was a justification for state intervention and for individuals' moral duty to obey the law. Hobhouse went beyond Green to justify necessary state control. His argument was that the realisation of social freedom and social progress required necessary regulations of individual activities.

Social freedom, then, for any epoch short of the millennium rests on restraint. It is a freedom that can be enjoyed by all the members of a community and it is the freedom to choose among those lines of activity which do not involve injury to others. As experience of the social effects of action ripens, and the social conscience is awakened, the conception of injury is widened and insight into its causes is deepened. The area of restraint is therefore increased.⁸⁹

Apart from social freedom, the other reason for state intervention was social progress. Because social associations played a significant role in social progress and the state was one form of social associations with its distinct feature of coercive power, Hobhouse argued that it was justifiable to accord a role commensurate with its power to the state for the sake of the wellbeing of humans.⁹⁰ State control in this sense was not a danger but an effective means for securing the external conditions in order to secure the value of liberty.⁹¹

Hobhouse intended to attenuate old liberalism's hostility to the state by assigning new responsibilities to the state. The general principle for the role of the state was to secure common ends including necessary economic conditions (the rights to work and to a living wage) which enabled a normal person to develop himself and his family so as to achieve full civic efficiency and a good social order.⁹²

These new conceptions of liberty, the state, and relations between the individual and society were also articulated by Hobson who announced that the old laissez faire liberalism was dead.⁹³ His new conception of the state was the one "as an instrument for the active adaptation of the economic and moral environment to the new needs of individual and social

⁸⁹ Ibid, 40.

⁹⁰ Ibid, 57-58.

⁹¹ Hobhouse, *Evolution and Political Theory*, 202.

⁹² Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, 68.

⁹³ Hobson, *The Crisis of Liberalism*, 3.

life, by securing full opportunities of self-development and social service for all citizens”.⁹⁴ He said that New Liberalism was preparing to put this philosophy of the state into practice.⁹⁵

As has been discussed, new liberals infused the earlier liberalism with new meanings of liberty, society, and the state. By reformulating the liberal principles, the new liberals made two ideas run in parallel: liberty and welfare. The development of the new liberalism paved the way for social reforms towards a welfare state. A number of reforms had been carried out under the Liberal Party before the 1920s. They adopted legislation regarding income tax and health and unemployment insurance. When the Labour Party took office, these reforms were reinforced and expanded.⁹⁶

2.3 Socialism and Its Varieties

When liberalism developed into the new liberalism, socialism was pulled in diverging directions in different cultures. In some countries such as China, Marxism-Leninism finally became dominant though Chinese liberals including Carsun Chang, Zhang Dongsun, and Hu Shi tried to oppose it by introducing ideas of social democracy or liberal socialism. However, socialism in Britain differed from the socialist movement in China. Different cultures produced a variety of configurations of the socialist concepts (core, adjacent, and peripheral concepts) and this variety accounted for the diverging directions socialism developed in different regions.⁹⁷ I will examine the morphology of socialism and three influential variants: Marxism, social democracy, and Marxism-Leninism.

2.3.1 Morphology of Socialism

Socialism hosts five core concepts: the constitutive nature of the human relationship, human welfare as a desirable objective, human nature as active, equality, and history as the arena of beneficial change.⁹⁸

The first core concept refers to group membership. Individuals are living in communities and their interrelationship is a salient feature of human life.⁹⁹ Usually “the community is both historically and scientifically elevated above the individual as focal unit of analysis.”¹⁰⁰

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Ibid, 4.

⁹⁶ For details of social reforms under New Liberalism and the practice of the new liberalism in Britain, see Michael Freedon, *Liberalism Divided; The New Liberalism: An Ideology of Social Reform* (Oxford, Oxfordshire: Clarendon Press, 1978).

⁹⁷ For definitions of the core, adjacent and peripheral concepts, see section 1.3.1 in chapter I.

⁹⁸ Freedon, *Ideologies and Political Theory*, 425-26.

⁹⁹ Ibid, 426.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

The second core concept, a high standard of welfare, is based on the elimination of poverty and optimally on the satisfaction of a wide range of other human needs (physical, cultural, and social).¹⁰¹

The third core concept of socialism regards human nature as productive and creative; work or labour is a principal component of productivity and creativity.¹⁰²

Aside from active human nature, all socialisms assert and extol equality. It has various formulations. It could be equality of wealth, equal participation in politics or ethical equality (equal opportunities of education, development, etc.). Therefore, the single concept of equality cannot be regarded as the socialist core because “in its different formulations, it is incapable of carrying socialist ideology on its own, just as liberty cannot perform that task for liberalism.”¹⁰³ “Only in conjunction with notions of community, welfare, and the creative-cum-productive view of human nature can socialism gain sufficient breath for its profile to emerge.”¹⁰⁴

The fifth core concept of socialism is linked with the Hegelian-Marxist views of history which reify socialism as “a particular patterned advance of reason in society, culminating in the complete universalisation of reason and the realisation of freedom as self-mastery or de-alienation.”¹⁰⁵ Not only did the Hegelian and Marxist conception of history contain purpose but it gave the agency of human beings a special place in changing the world and human relationships. This produced at least two different understandings of history as movement and social advancement: evolutionary socialism (gradualism) and dialectical or historical materialism.¹⁰⁶

These five concepts constitute the socialist core, but adjacent and peripheral concepts surrounding the core help to form a particular version of socialism in a given culture and society. Democracy, control (social control over the dynamics of an industrial economy), class, state, property, liberty, and rationality can be adjacent concepts of socialism.¹⁰⁷ Often these values can be inferred from the core concepts. For example, equality requires that individuals have equal participation in politics and democracy is thought to be intermeshed with this kind of politics. However, democracy can also be derived from liberty and thus it is

¹⁰¹ Ibid, 427.

¹⁰² Ibid, 429.

¹⁰³ Ibid, 433.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid, 434.

¹⁰⁶ For an explanation of the two different understandings of history, see section 2.3.2.

¹⁰⁷ Freedman, *Ideologies and Political Theory*, 438.

also an adjacent concept of liberalism. The overlap should not confuse us because in the liberal morphology democracy is more associated with the notion of self-determination or self-realisation whereas the socialist morphology confines democracy to more communitarian or egalitarian tendencies.¹⁰⁸ Concerning the socialist periphery, it includes trade unionism, nationalisation, regulation of working conditions, and the redistribution of wealth.¹⁰⁹

Freedden notes that, “Cultural factors of a temporal and geographical nature play a decisive part in selecting the specific paths which connect the core and adjacent concepts...”¹¹⁰ For instance, German social democrats shifted two interdependent concepts in liberalism—controlled power and equal political participation—to slightly different internal locations and combined them with community to produce a new defence of parliamentary democracy.¹¹¹ Bolsheviks and Chinese Communists combined democracy with theories of class (the proletariat or the peasantry), redistribution of land, and the abolition of private property.

2.3.2 Marxism, Social Democracy, and Marxism-Leninism

The development of socialism saw the emergence of a diversity of socialist strands, with Marxism, social democracy, and Marxism-Leninism as the most influential.¹¹² Proto-socialism (“utopian socialism”) and anarchism represented by Pierre-Joseph Proudhon are sometimes also considered by many political scientists as socialist ideologies. Under the morphological analysis, all these varieties of socialism share five socialist core concepts, but the meanings of the core concepts and the permutations of the core, adjacent, and peripheral concepts are not the same.

On the first core concept of the constitutive nature of human relationships, Marxism and Marxism-Leninism confined group membership to classes with conflicting interests. A particular class like workers, peasants or the proletariat was usually depicted as the oppressed and exploited who should be united to change the existing social order. In contrast, social democracy as exemplified by Eduard Bernstein or the Fabians did not highlight the struggle between two opposing classes. Social democrats did articulate that the rights of workers should be protected but they discussed workers’ interests within the framework of a community and the general interest. They recognised that there were other classes whose

¹⁰⁸ Ibid, 439.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid, 450-54.

¹¹⁰ Ibid, 438.

¹¹¹ Ibid, 440.

¹¹² I use Russian Communism and Marxism-Leninism interchangeably.

interests did not necessarily conflict with those of workers. Bernstein argued that “democracy is not just a form of government; it is absence of class government; no government has a political privilege which is opposed to the community as a whole.”¹¹³

As for the concepts of human welfare and human nature as active, social democracy emphasised material conditions and ethical well-being as well. Marxism-Leninism accorded too much weight to the economic base. Though Karl Marx endeavoured to free people from alienation and he considered labour as creative and productive, welfare in his theory was an abstract ideal to be realised in the future. Marx did not trouble to explicate concrete measures or policies regarding welfare. Social democrats, however, adopted specific policies to achieve this aim. With respect to equality, Marxism-Leninism possessed egalitarian leanings which were not very salient in social democracy.

Furthermore, social democracy departed from Marxism and Marxism-Leninism concerning the conception of history. Social democrats’ view of history was evolutionary socialism or gradualism that abandoned the Marxian dialectics (Marxist prediction for logical necessitarianism) and economic determinism.¹¹⁴ British Fabianism and German revisionist socialism represented by Bernstein were representative of gradualism.¹¹⁵ The other conception of history in socialist thought, however, highlighted Marxian dialectics and materialism. This view of history was followed by Marxists and Communists, including some Communist regimes such as the Soviet Union and the Soviet Regime of China established by the Chinese Communists in the 1930s. Socialists in these Communist regimes usually regarded revolutions as a necessary means for social advancement. The concept of history combined with the third concept of human nature as active in the morphology of Marxism and Marxism-Leninism gave human agency a significant role to play in changing the existing economic and social order. Accordingly, revolution occupied a crucial position in the transition to communism. Indeed, in his late years Marx weakened this position. He thought that England, Holland, and perhaps America might do this without revolution but violence was necessary elsewhere in the transition from capitalism to socialism.¹¹⁶

Associated with the idea of revolution was the theory of class dictatorship. Marx viewed it as a transitional political system and did not discuss it in great detail. But Vladimir Lenin

¹¹³ Eduard Bernstein, *The Preconditions of Social Democracy*, ed. Henry Tudor (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 140.

¹¹⁴ Freeden, *Ideologies and Political Theories*, 436-38.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid*, 436-37.

¹¹⁶ Leon P. Baradat, *Political Ideologies: Their Origins and Impact* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1979), 164-65.

and Mao Zedong extended the idea of revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to lead communist revolutions. Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Mao all believed that revolution would ultimately produce benefits, leading to a promising future with more freedom and equality. This was a key point that separated social democracy and Marxian ideologies. Social democrats preferred democratic means such as a parliament, political parties, and universal suffrage. Bernstein held that to organise a social democratic party which could participate in parliamentary politics was practical and efficient; outside the parliament, the labour movement was a good option to strive for the interests of the working class.¹¹⁷

The differences between social democrats and Marxists were related to their divergent opinions of the adjacent concept of democracy. In Bernstein's idea-system, democracy was an end as well as a means. Democracy contained ideas of justice and freedom. "The more democracy prevails and determines public opinion, the more it will come to mean the greatest possible degree of freedom."¹¹⁸ Social democrats' idea of democracy was not just an abstract principle. There were political activities which helped to generate peripheral concepts such as trade unionism, regulation of working conditions, and the redistribution of income.

Compared with social democrats, Marx had a vague idea of democracy. He did not envisage the concrete political system after the Civil War in France. Marx did mention that the transitional political system was the class dictatorship.¹¹⁹ While the theory of the class dictatorship was discarded by theorists of social democracy, it was developed by Lenin and Mao. They intermingled democracy with the class dictatorship and the product was a democratic dictatorship. Under this political regime, political power was exercised by the communist party in the name of the people. Though social democrats and new liberals subscribed to a certain degree of control and state regulation in some areas, the end of restraint was not directed towards maintaining political power in the hands of a particular party or group who represented the people.

The comparison of the morphology of the three variants of socialism shows that social democracy deviated from Marxism and Marxism-Leninism in many respects. Due to the political, cultural, and socio-economic circumstances, not all instances of socialism were prevalent in a given culture or region. In Britain, it was social democracy that gained an

¹¹⁷ Bernstein, *The Preconditions of Social Democracy*, 143.

¹¹⁸ Ibid, 141.

¹¹⁹ Baradat, *Political Ideologies: Their Origins and Impact*, 165.

upper hand from the outset. The Fabians contributed a lot to the political ideology of the Labour Party. Continental Europe, however, was somewhat different. There were protracted conflicts and struggles between Marxist tenets and reformist doctrines. Nonetheless, by the beginning of the twentieth century on the Continent, Marxism gave way to social democracy. After the First World War, “Bernstein-style democracy had greater currency within the labour movement”.¹²⁰

Meanwhile, in Russia, the Bolsheviks ultimately became the winner in the struggle with the Mensheviks, the Social Revolutionary Party and other left forces. Thereafter, Marxism-Leninism was established as the official ideology. A similar result appeared in China in terms of the practice of socialism. But the story of the rise and success of the Chinese Communists hardly reflected the intellectual thinking on socialism in Republican China, especially the views of Chinese liberals. The Chinese liberals’ discourse on socialism will show that there is an affinity between their liberal thought and social democracy. The morphological approach can be particularly successful in explaining this complex relationship between social democracy and the new liberalism in particular.

Within the family of socialism, social democracy (as a particular variant of socialism) is the one that overlaps most with New Liberalism in terms of some core, adjacent, and peripheral concepts. This is especially true as a result of fresh meanings conferred on liberalism in the late nineteenth century by Thomas H. Green, Leonard T. Hobhouse, and John A. Hobson in their construction of New Liberalism. As a variant of liberalism, New Liberalism has seven core political concepts: liberty, individuality, rationality, limited and accountable power, sociability, progress, and the general interest. But these British liberals re-interpreted liberty as a social concept that required state intervention or some restraints of individual liberty in order to achieve progress, social harmony, and the common good. In other words, they highlighted the value of sociability (the notion of interdependence among people), assigning equal weight to individual liberty and the community. In addition, they advocated the expansion of state responsibilities so as to improve the welfare of the working class. Accordingly, these British liberals added the following concepts to the old liberalism: equality, welfare, state intervention, public property, and the redistribution of wealth.

Some of the concepts moulding New Liberalism, however, are also constitutive concepts of social democracy. As a variant of socialism, social democracy hosts five core concepts,

¹²⁰ Ben Jackson, “Social Democracy,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*, eds. Freedom, Lyman Tower Sargent, and Marc Stears (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 351.

namely the constitutive nature of the human relationship, human welfare, human nature as active, equality, and history as the arena of beneficial change. The meanings assigned to the general interest, sociability, and progress in the morphology of New Liberalism are similar to some core concepts of social democracy. To be precise, human welfare is a core concept of social democracy but New Liberalism also emphasises welfare (and this played an important role in the establishment of a welfare state in Britain). Moreover, both progress and history as the arena of beneficial change promise the betterment of society in the future. Likewise, some concepts (justice, democracy, property) can be adjacent to New Liberalism as well as social democracy. Finally, a third dimension of intersection between social democracy and New Liberalism involves peripheral concepts. State regulations of economic activities, the redistribution of wealth, and nationalisation are concrete policies proposed by both social democrats and new liberals.

However, the different permutations of a set of concepts and other different core concepts make social democracy and New Liberalism two different ideologies. Chinese liberalism in the Republican period reflected this complicated relationship between liberalism and socialism. For instance, Liang Qichao, Carsun Chang, Zhang Dongsun, and Hu Shi, developed distinctive discourses on socialism, which were akin to the socialist discourse of Western new liberals.

2.3.3 Socialism in Republican China

The earliest Chinese translation touching upon European socialism was believed to be published in the 1870s.¹²¹ The Chinese intellectuals who first introduced Marx and Engels to China were not Marxists but advocates of constitutionalism such as Liang Qichao. Before the founding of the Chinese Communist Party, Liang and his research group including Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun had introduced different forms of socialism to Chinese audiences.¹²² As revolutionary socialism found its counterpart in Republican China in the 1910s, Liang and his followers attempted to resist the application of Marxism in China because they held that China did not have the economic and social conditions for socialism. Nevertheless, they had a positive opinion of reformist socialism in Britain and Germany. I will discuss key debates over socialism between Chinese liberals and Marxists in three periods of time: pre-1919, the 1920s, and the 1930s.

¹²¹ See the section “Pre-1919”.

¹²² For details, see the section “The 1920s”.

Pre-1919

The conception of a harmonious community that pursues equality, especially an equal distribution of wealth or land, is not a modern idea in Chinese thought. If this idea is considered to be socialist, ancient Chinese thought does contain this communal principle. Confucianism and the philosophy of Mozi (Mohism) are two instances.¹²³ Liang Qichao was the first Chinese intellectual to notice these similarities between Marxism and Mozi's philosophy.¹²⁴ But these ideas did not thrive under the monarchy.

The earliest Chinese translation that mentioned communism was news about the rebellion of the Paris Commune in 1871. *Jiaohui xin bao* 教会新报 (*Church News*) was believed to be the first Chinese newspaper to publish the reports.¹²⁵ It was run by the American missionary Young John Allen. Later another Chinese newspaper *Hua zi ribao* (华字日报) published the news. In 1873 Wang Tao (王韬), one of the editors of *Hua zi ribao*, translated into Chinese *The Franco-Prussian War: The German Conquest of France in 1870-1871*.¹²⁶ In this book, he mentioned the Paris Commune. In addition, the Qing government in the late 1860s established the Jiangnan Arsenal whose translation department employed some American, British, and Chinese translators or interpreters.¹²⁷ These people translated the term Communists into Chinese in 1873.¹²⁸ But their translation could not convey the meanings of “communist”. They just found a Chinese homophone whose pronunciation was similar to the English pronunciation of “communist”. It was not until 1899 that references to Marx and other socialists by name appeared in the Chinese-language press. *Wanguo gong bao* 万国公

¹²³ Ma Kefeng, “Chuantong moxue yu xiandai shehuizhuyi,” [Ancient Mohism and Modern Socialism] in *Zhongguo jindaishi shang de shehuizhuyi* [Socialism in Modern China], eds. Zheng Dahua and Zou Xiaozhan (Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe, 2011), 29-39; Yu Zuhua and Zhao Huifeng, “Shehuizhuyi: Xiandai zhongguo san da sichao de gongtong quxiang,” [Socialism: A Common Orientation of Three Main Social Currents in Modern China] in Zheng and Zou Xiaozhan, *Zhongguo jindaishi shang de shehuizhuyi*, 40-56; Fung, *Intellectual Foundations*, 219-20.

¹²⁴ See Liang Qichao, *Yingbinshi heji* (Complete Works of Liang Qichao), vol. 37 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989), 22; *Yingbinshi heji* [Complete Works of Liang Qichao], vol. 39 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989), 20.

¹²⁵ Martin Bernal, *Chinese Socialism to 1907* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1976), 34; Zhang Deyi (张德彝), *Sui shi faguo ji* [A Journey to France with the Chinese Diplomatic Mission], ed. Zhong Shuhe (Changsha: Hunan renmin chubanshe, 1982), 5.

¹²⁶ See Wang Tao, *Pu fa zhanji* [*The Franco-Prussian War: The German Conquest of France in 1870-1871*] (Hong Kong: Zhonghua yinwu zongju, 1873). For information about Wang, see Paul A. Cohen, *Between Tradition and Modernity: Wang Tao and Reform in Late Ching China* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1987).

¹²⁷ Young John Allen was one of them.

¹²⁸ Jiang Yihua, *Shehuizhuyi xueshuo zai zhongguo de chuqi chuanbo* [The Dissemination of Socialist Theories in the Early Phase of Modern China] (Shanghai: Fudan daxue chubanshe, 1984), 13. As for the term socialism and nihilism, the Qing official Li Shuchang (黎庶昌) was the first Chinese who translated it into Chinese in 1876. See Li Shuchang, *Xiyang zazhi* [A Journey to Europe] (Changsha: Hunan renmin chubanshe, 1981), 58.

报 (*The Time of the Reviews*) published the abbreviated translation of Benjamin Kidd's *Social Evolution* in which Marx and his theory were introduced.¹²⁹

All these were merely translations. The majority of Chinese scholars agree that the first Chinese writer to comment on Marx and socialism was Liang Qichao.¹³⁰ From 1902 Liang wrote a number of articles about Marx, socialism, Saint Simon, and Russian nihilism. These articles were published by the newspaper *Xinmin cong bao* 新民丛报 (The New People's Gazette). At that time, Liang had a positive opinion of Marx. He regarded Marx as the leading thinker of socialism which revealed the social ills of the day—the working masses were exploited by a few people who were rich.¹³¹ Nevertheless, Liang did not believe that China had conditions for a socialist revolution. He maintained that radical socialism was prone to a dictatorship that was commonplace in Chinese politics and history.¹³² His position differed from that of the revolutionaries such as Sun Yat-sen and Zhu Zhixin (朱执信) who were for a revolution.¹³³ Liang, however, sought reform. The debate actually centred on one question: reform or revolution? This was thought to be the early debate over socialism in modern Chinese history.

The debate over socialism, reform, and revolution continued and turned bitter from 1919 to 1920. Many Chinese including most liberals were tremendously disappointed at the result of the Paris Peace Conference at which Western democracies did not protect China's territorial integrity and sovereignty. Chinese intellectuals did not think this was democratic or liberal. Subsequently, a group of people converted to Marxism. Among this camp, Chen Duxiu, Li Dazhao and Li Da (李达) were prominent Marxists who founded the Chinese Communist Party at this time. The press was an efficient medium for them to disseminate Marxism. *New Youth* and *The Communist Party* were these Marxists' most important platforms. They eulogised Marx and Engels, regarding Marxism and a communist revolution as solutions to China's political, social, and economic problems.

¹²⁹ Martin Bernal, *Chinese Socialism to 1907*, 37.

¹³⁰ Gao Wei, ed., "Makesizhuyi heshi chuanru zhongguo kaolue," [When Was Marxism Introduced to China?] *Zhongguo gongchandang xinwenwang* [News of the Communist Party of China], updated 26 March 2012, <http://theory.people.com.cn/GB/49157/17492297.html>.

¹³¹ Dong Fangkui, "Liang Qichao shehuizhuyiguan zai renshi," [A Re-examination of Liang Qichao's Perspective on Socialism] in *Guo Tingyi xiansheng jiuuzhi danchen jinian xiaoxi* [Collected Essays in Commemoration of the 90th Anniversary of the Birth of Guo Tingyi, Volume 2] (Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishisuo, 1995), 233-48.

¹³² Liang, *Yingbinshi heji*, vol. 22, 41-42.

¹³³ Zhu later joined Sun Yat-sen's revolutionary party. Wang Jingwei (汪精卫) and Hu Hanmin (胡汉民) participated in the debate. They joined Sun's party, too.

New Youth was originally a product of the New Culture Movement but Chinese Marxists turned the newspaper toward Marxism, propagating Marxism and instigating a communist revolution in China. In response to this current, Hu Shi, a returned student from America and a disciple of John Dewey, wrote an article entitled “More Study of Problems, Less Talk of ‘Isms’”.¹³⁴ By isms, Hu Shi meant Marxism and anarchism which were popular then. Hu’s remarks aroused immediate refutation voiced by Marxists like Li Dazhao. A year later in 1920, the debate over socialism occurred between Marxists and Liang Qichao’s research group.¹³⁵

The 1920s

Liang Qichao’s research group made full use of the press, spreading new ideas from Japan, Europe, and America. The key journal of the group was *Jiefang yu gaizao*. It contained 361 articles in total and one third of them were about socialism, either translations or introductions to socialism.¹³⁶ As editors or major contributors the research group did not select one particular version of socialism as their favourite one. They introduced assorted socialist movements and ideologies: utopian socialism (Saint Simon, Robert Owen, and Charles Fourier), Marxism (Marx and Engels), anarchism (Peter Kropotkin), Russian socialism (Lenin and Trotsky), social democracy in Germany, Syndicalism in France, Industrial Workers of World in America, and the labour movement in Britain (especially Fabianism of Bertrand Russell and G. D. H. Cole).¹³⁷

None of the members of the research group then held that socialism including reformist Fabianism and social democracy was applicable to China given the different Chinese conditions. But they made positive comments on the reformist socialism in Britain and Germany. When discussing social democracy in Germany, Carsun Chang appreciated the Weimar constitution and the new-born republic.¹³⁸ Zhang Dongsun expressed the view that

¹³⁴ Hu Shi, “Duo yanjiu xie wenti, shao tan xie zhuyi” [More Study of Problems, Less Talk of ‘Isms’] in *Hu Shi wenji* (2) [Collected Works of Hu Shi Volume Two], ed. Ouyang Zhesheng (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1998), 249-278.

¹³⁵ The research group had its origin in “jinbu dang” 进步党 (the Progressive Party) that was established by Liang Qichao and some officials who were involved in the constitutional movement of 1906. They advocated constitutional monarchy. But after the Qing Dynasty was overthrown, Liang split with the officials. He was for a republican government. In 1916 Liang and his followers like Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun founded “xianfa yanjiuhui” 宪法研究会 (Association of Constitutional Law). From then on they were known as “yanjiuxi” 研究系 (the research group).

¹³⁶ Zheng Dahua and Gao Juan, “Gaizao yu wusi shehuizhuyi zhi chuanru,” [Gaizao and the Dissemination of Socialism during the May Fourth Movement] in *Zhongguo jindaishi shang de shehuizhuyi* [Socialism in Modern China], eds. Zheng Dahua and Zou Xiaozhan (Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe, 2010), 94.

¹³⁷ Ibid, 103.

¹³⁸ See Zhang Junmai, “Deguo geming lun,” [On the German Revolution] *Jiefang yu gaizao* [Emancipation and Reconstruction] 2, no. 3 (1920), 9; “Deguo xin gonghe xianfa ping,” [A Commentary on the Weimar Constitution] *Jiefang yu gaizao* 2, no. 9 (1920), 5.

Bertrand Russell's political ideas were the best to change the world.¹³⁹ However, they adopted an empirical and positivist approach regarding the application of socialism to China. They thought that the economic problem of China was not capitalism but poverty. The other problem was a lack of democracy and freedom. This political reality made them oppose Marxism-Leninism. They agreed with Marx on the critique of a capitalist economy, but they also expressed eloquent disapproval of class struggle, dialectical materialism, economic determinism, and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Chinese Marxists, in turn, attacked the research group, defending Marxism and the necessity of a communist revolution in China.

Meanwhile, Hu Shi expressed his views on socialism and his socialist discourse also resembled that of the research group.

To be serious, I advocate a peaceful means to realise the ideal of socialism. Briefly speaking, recent history has seen two different means. One is the means that the Soviet Union is currently using. This means is characterised by the proletarian dictatorship and therefore it does not allow the existence of different classes. The other means, however, is to avoid the "class struggle" and to embrace a 'socialising' tendency that has been underway for three hundred years. It helps gradually expand individual freedom and the happiness that our society will enjoy. I would like to call this means "New Liberalism" or "Liberal Socialism".¹⁴⁰

These concepts of "New Liberalism" and "Liberal Socialism" appeared in Hu Shi's letter dated 4 October 1926. Hu spent three days in Russia and observed the experiment of socialism in Russia. He opposed the form of socialism with dictatorial tendencies, but advocated a liberal or democratic form of socialism. Hu was probably the first modern Chinese liberal who used the English terms "New Liberalism" and "Liberal Socialism" to describe the form of socialism many modern Chinese liberals approved of. This was strikingly similar to Hobhouse's political thought in which liberal socialism was proposed as part of Hobhouse's discourse on new liberalism. However, the immediate intellectual influence on Hu Shi was the American new liberal John Dewey who had been Hu's supervisor.

¹³⁹ Zhang Dongsun, "Disanzhong wenming," [A Third Civilisation] *Jiefang yu gaizao* 1, no. 1 (1 September 1919), 4.

¹⁴⁰ Hu Shi, "Ouyou dao zhong jishu" [Letters during My Journey to Europe] in Ouyang Zhesheng, *Hu Shi wenji* (4) [Collected Works of Hu Shi Volume Four], 47.

The 1930s

In the early 1920s, the research group had reservations about the applicability of a socialist economy to China. However, they changed their views in the 1930s. From the 1930s, they advocated a socialist economy in China while rejecting communist ideologies. This change was caused by the financial crisis in the West, the Soviet Union's implementation of Five-Year-Plans and Japan's aggression of China. Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun argued that the future Chinese economic system should be different from capitalism and that a socialist economy was a remedy for capitalism. They viewed some socialist practices positively from the perspective of social justice.

One influential liberal periodical that reflected their standpoint on socialism was *Zaisheng* (The National Renaissance). It was established in the 1930s by Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun. They developed 'state socialism' for the state-building of China, economic development in particular.¹⁴¹ The most important thing they did was to rationally deliberate on the pros and cons of socialism and capitalism and to dissociate economic means from a particular political ideology. They argued that economic planning was just a means and it could be employed by both socialist countries and capitalist countries; capitalism and socialism were not necessarily antithetical.¹⁴² They seemed to foresee the danger of the practice of Marxism-Leninism as a political ideology in China and the feasibility of a mixed economy in both socialist and capitalist countries. The economic system they advocated was a general type of a mixed economy combining capitalism and socialism.

Concurrent with the development of 'state socialism' was another current among Chinese intellectuals. The liberal thinker Hu Shi and other men of letters in the 1920s founded "Xinyue she" 新月社 (the Crescent Moon Society) which published a monthly *Xinyue* 新月 (Crescent Moon). In the early 1930s, this journal published many articles about Fabianism and works by Harold Laski. Many members of the Society had been Laski's students or had attended Laski's lectures. They firmly believed that human rights must be protected by a constitution. This implied that a liberal form of socialism as they saw should follow the principle of liberty. Given the repression of the KMT government, they published a series of essays that argued for constitutionalism and the protection of human rights. Hu Shi, for instance, contributed several articles on human rights and the rule of law, attacking Sun

¹⁴¹ State socialism here is not subject to literal meanings. For detail, see section 4.3.2 in chapter IV.

¹⁴² See Jizhe, "Women suo yao shuo de hua".

Yat-sun's views on democracy, constitutionalism, and political tutelage. Some notable articles were “Renquan yu yuefa” 人权与约法 (Human Rights and Law), “Renquan yu yuefa de taolun” 人权与约法的讨论 (Commentaries on “Human Rights and Law”), “Women shenme shihou cai keyi you xianfa” 我们什么时候才可以有宪法 (When can China have a democratic constitution?).¹⁴³ In addition, the Crescent Moon Society also worked with some members of the NSP. Luo Longji and Carsun Chang were members of the NSP. Luo also contributed his articles on human rights to *Xinyue* and Chang translated Laski's *A Grammar of Politics* into Chinese for *Xinyue* she.

Overall, modern Chinese liberalism was affected by the presence of socialism. The research group and Hu Shi had an affinity with reformist socialism in the West. From the 1930s to the 1940s most Chinese liberals had positive views of liberal socialism or social democracy whereas they rejected Russia's communist ideology and the party ideology of the Chinese Communists. However, their views on Russia's economic system were not all negative. Many of them including Carsun Chang, Zhang Dongsun, and Hu Shi considered the economic system of the Soviet Union as an alternative to a capitalist economy. In the 1920s, Hu Shi even agreed that China could adopt a policy of public ownership.¹⁴⁴ Russia's new economic system of socialism in the eyes of these liberals aimed at social justice and the well-being of the society as a whole. More importantly, they thought that a socialist economy could help China develop its economy rapidly.

2.4 New Liberalism in Europe, America, and China

I have analysed the morphology of the new liberalism and socialism, and some Chinese liberals' discourses on socialism. The morphological approach shows that the new liberalism and social democracy (reformist socialism) have some overlapping concepts such as democracy, welfare, liberty, and equality. Liberty alone cannot constitute liberalism. Likewise, the single concept of equality cannot be regarded as the socialist ideology. The case of Chinese liberals' involvement in the debates over socialism illustrates that in the first half of the twentieth century permeability was a distinct feature of neighbouring political ideologies—the new liberalism and social democracy. The contextual problem of capitalism helped British liberal thinkers make liberalism develop in the direction of social democracy

¹⁴³ For these articles, see Hu Shi, “Renquan lunji” [A Collection of Essays on Human Rights] in Ouyang Zhesheng, *Hu Shi wenji* (5) [Collected Works of Hu Shi Volume Five], 523-539.

¹⁴⁴ Hu, “Ouyou dao zhong jishu,” 49.

or liberal socialism by absorbing concepts of harmony, welfare, the common good, and social freedom. This tendency of liberal thought was not unique to Britain.

The new liberalism was also manifest in the political thinking of several Continental liberals: Friedrich Naumann, Emile Durkheim, and Leon Duguit. The liberalism of Naumann was permeated by a strong flavour of nationalism and French liberalism then was characterised by solidarism.¹⁴⁵ In spite of the dissimilarities, the British new liberalism and the liberalism of those Continental liberals converged by the early twentieth century on a theory of social justice and social welfare. This trend of liberalism also emerged in America. It was reflected in the progressive movement led by Herbert Croly, Walter Weyl, and Walter Lippmann. Their ideas had an influence on the later New Deal.

Liang Qichao's research group and Hu Shi embraced the strain of liberal thought with some socialistic elements. This accounted for their connections with some new liberals in America and Britain who represented this new tradition of liberty. Herbert Croly's ideas had a direct impact on Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt whose social and economic policies were praised by Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun. These Chinese liberals considered their policies as socialistic and argued that liberalism and socialism were not mutually exclusive. Walter Weyl was an intellectual influence on John Dewey whose works were often cited by Zhang Dongsun and Hu Shi. As regards the British thinkers, both Chang and Zhang were influenced by Hobhouse's *Social Evolution and Political Theory*.¹⁴⁶ Chang considered Thomas H. Green and Bernard Bosanquet as idealists who inherited the idealism of Plato, Aristotle, Kant, and Hegel. Chang himself followed this tradition of idealism. Furthermore, the research group planned to invite John A. Hobson and John Maynard Keynes to come to China in the early 1920s.¹⁴⁷ But these British economists did not come for some reasons.

My research will show that the liberal thought of Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun was similar to the liberal tradition represented by the British thinkers such as Green, Hobhouse, and Hobson. While contemplating the state-building of China, these Chinese thinkers drew on some Western ideas and abandoned others according to Chinese conditions.

I argue that a better understanding of the political thought of Chang can benefit from a

¹⁴⁵ For an analysis of the political thinking of those liberals, see Freedman, *Ideologies and Political Theory*, 210-25; *Liberalism*, 85.

¹⁴⁶ Though Chang mentioned Green and Bosanquet as representatives of the British Hegelianism in his works, he did not quote them.

¹⁴⁷ Zuo Yuhe, *Zhang Dongsun zhuan* [A Biography of Zhang Dongsun] (Beijing: Hongqi chubanshe, 2009), 68.

comparison with Hobhouse precisely because it helps to illuminate the common intellectual streams that Chang drew upon and shared with other prominent thinkers, as well as the way in which Chang's discourse on "democratic socialism" was a distinctive response to Chinese conditions. One main conclusion of this study is the mainstream scholarship that interprets Chang's theory of democratic socialism as simply a form of social democracy is too limited. Chang was a liberal who attempted to adapt Western ideas to Chinese conditions, but he also shared a commitment, also seen among some Western thinkers such as Hobhouse, to absorb harmonious elements from both liberalism and socialism. The end result for Chang was a Chinese form of new liberalism.

2.4.1 The British Case

The problems of the twentieth century and thinkers of the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries (Mill, Kant, and Hegel) helped both Chinese and British intellectuals develop the new liberalism. The liberalism of Mill, Kant's moral philosophy, and the German conception of an organic society were reflected in the political thought of both British new liberals and Chinese liberals. Nevertheless, the genesis and the way of developing the new liberalism in relation to the established traditions of liberty were vastly different. I will deal with this question in detail in subsequent chapters. But I shall here mention briefly the dissimilarities.

For British new liberals, capitalism was the major issue which needed to be addressed to realise social justice. Green, Hobhouse, and Hobson associated capitalism with the British liberal tradition of laissez faire liberalism and atomistic individualism. They found that the conceptions of social freedom, the common good, and an organic society would work as a feasible remedy for the established British tradition of liberty (classical liberalism). Accordingly, they added these new concepts to classical liberalism to make liberalism adapt to the new conditions of Britain from the second half of the nineteenth century.

2.4.2 The Chinese Case

In contrast to British new liberals, Chinese liberals (Liang, Chang, and Zhang) thought that China's social misery lay not in capitalism but poverty, power struggles, and authoritarianism. These issues pertained to the building of a modern state. Hence, state-building was the priority of China. These Chinese liberals held that democratic politics was indispensable to a modern state. This made them demand a change of the political system from a one-party dictatorship to a constitutional democracy. Liberty as a political and legal concept was absent in ancient Chinese thought and traditional Chinese political systems. Thus, they injected this

element into the Chinese tradition of moral freedom which emphasised spiritual freedom, self-autonomy, harmony, and the good of the collective.¹⁴⁸ Liang, Chang, and Zhang did not hold that the Chinese tradition of freedom was the cause of the social misery of China but that it was not adequate to build a modern state. This explained why Chinese thought such as Confucianism was not a target of their critique and why they wanted to introduce to China the British tradition of liberty as civil and political rights. In their opinion, the British tradition was complementary to the Chinese tradition of liberty.

In addition to British liberalism, Carsun Chang incorporated some elements of German idealism (Hegelianism) into Chinese thought. He contended that the political concept of the state was missing in Chinese thought and Chinese people must develop a consciousness of the state. This concept of the state was political, which would help the state-building of China during the war years. The Hegelian conception of the state, Chang found, could serve his purpose. His liberalism, therefore, had close proximity to German liberalism, possessing a strong sense of nationalism. The conditions of China in the early twentieth century were more similar to German conditions than those of other European countries. This was an important reason for Chang's selecting the Weimar Republic as a model for China when designing the future Chinese political system.¹⁴⁹

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I examined the ideological conflicts and interactions between liberalism and socialism in order to understand some distinctive features of the Chinese liberalism represented by Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun. Their liberal thought contained elements of British liberalism, German idealism, and social democracy. The chapter mainly illustrated two points. First, from the late nineteenth century the permeability between liberalism and socialism became a conspicuous phenomenon, which gradually diminished the antagonism between the two isms before. From the perspective of ideological morphology, the new liberalism and social democracy had overlapping political concepts. Democracy, liberty, equality, welfare, and state control were included in both social democracy and the new liberalism. As was the case with British new liberalism, the Chinese liberalism represented by Chang and Zhang contained features of liberalism as well as socialism. Second, in spite of some common intellectual influences such as Mill and German idealism, there were two

¹⁴⁸ For an explanation of Chinese tradition of liberty or freedom, see section 3.4.2 in chapter III.

¹⁴⁹ This is explained in Chapter V.

distinct differences between British new liberalism and Chinese liberalism.¹⁵⁰ One was that the salient social issues of the two societies were different. British new liberals sought to deal with capitalism while the Chinese thinkers aimed at the state-building of China. The other dissimilarity was that the British way of developing a variant of liberalism differed from that of Chinese liberals. The former modified classical liberalism whereas the latter reformulated both the Chinese tradition of liberty and Western political ideas (the British tradition of liberty and German idealism) according to Chinese conditions. Some subsequent chapters will further expound this point.

¹⁵⁰ Chapter III and Chapter IV illustrate this point in detail.

Chapter III: The New Liberalism of L. T. Hobhouse and Carsun Chang

3.1 Two Paths to New Liberalism

This chapter offers a systematic comparison of the liberal thought of Carsun Chang and the British thinker L. T. Hobhouse to better understand the liberalism of Chang. Chang's liberal thinking contained some fundamental tenets of British liberalism which emphasised limited power and individual liberty but it also incorporated some elements of socialism and German idealism. The socialist flavour concerned economic justice (equality, a fair distribution of wealth) and social justice (welfare of the masses, and the good of a society as a whole).¹⁵¹ The flavour of German idealism included a positive conception of freedom, the common good, and an organic state or society. This tradition of liberalism with some features of socialism and German idealism was well developed by L. T. Hobhouse whose political theory about an active state or the growth of the state was discussed by both Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun.¹⁵² Hence, to investigate Chang we need to understand Hobhouse. Hobhouse is important less because he was an influence on Chang than because he engaged with a larger tradition of neo-Hegelian liberalism in the West (Green, Hobson, Dewey) and represented this tradition of liberalism.

Though Chang's liberal thought was comparable to the liberalism of Hobhouse, his major intellectual influences were various schools of Western thinkers such as Plato, Aristotle, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Kant, Hegel, Mill, Walter Eucken, and Henri Bergson.¹⁵³ This could be traced back to Chang's study in Japan (1906-1910) where he read these Western thinkers and published his first essay on Mill's political thought of representative democracy in 1906.

I contend that in spite of the cultural, political, and economic differences between China and Britain in the first half of the twentieth century, Chang and Hobhouse modified different traditions of freedom in their societies and developed similar idea-systems to address their contextual problems. Both found that German idealism and some liberal or democratic form of socialism helped to achieve justice. The British political thought stressed liberty from

¹⁵¹ The socialist elements are explained in the next chapter.

¹⁵² See Zhang Junmai, "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (wu)—Guojia zhi yanhua," [First Draft of the Unfinished

Lectures on the Philosophy of the State—Lecture Five on The Evolution of the State] *Zaisheng* 4, no.9 (15 July 1937): 17.

¹⁵³ Chang became interested in British politics and German philosophy while studying in Japan. He pursued his doctoral study at Berlin University from 1913 to 1915. There he studied politics (especially law and theories of the state) and philosophy. During his study in Germany he met Walter Eucken and Henri Bergson. They became Chang's mentors.

external constraints while Chinese thought emphasised morality and ignored freedom as a political and legal concept. Hobhouse thought that social freedom and the common good must be added to serve as remedies for the one-sided individualism. By modifying the British liberal tradition, Hobhouse aimed to address economic, political, and social injustice caused by capitalism. In contrast to the British tradition of liberty, the traditional Chinese conception of liberty was ethical. Chang did not attribute the practice of absolute monarchy and authoritarianism to Chinese thought like Confucianism. He did hold that the absence of freedom as a political conception was a cause of absolutism and authoritarianism in China. To help China's state-building, Chang tried to infuse into Chinese thought democratic politics (individual liberty and constitutionalism) and German idealism (the concept of the state). As a result, he developed a variant of liberalism that was akin to the new liberalism of Hobhouse. Both Hobhouse and Chang found that this variant of liberalism was a remedy for the social ills of their countries—capitalism (Britain), poverty and authoritarianism (China).

This chapter is divided into 5 sections. Section 2 examines Hobhouse's theory of the state. In section 3 I explore Chang's conception of the state. The two sections show that both Hobhouse and Chang disapproved of a minimal state theory and a mechanical view of the state, arguing for the enlargement of state responsibilities to ensure economic justice and social welfare. In addition, there was an element of German idealism in their conceptions of the state in that they agreed that the state was subject to ethics and it embodied the will of the people. But another salient idealist feature in Chang's theory was Hegelianism that highlighted the consciousness of the nation-state. This was absent from Hobhouse's theory. To justify state intervention, Chang and Hobhouse reformulated the conception of liberty which was not only negative but also social and positive. Section 4 illustrates how they perceived liberty and modified the old conception of liberty that was one-sided. Acknowledging the importance of individual liberty, they also treated liberty as a social concept, which should be compatible with the common good and thus required state intervention. In the last section, I investigate the sources of the development of their liberal thought. Mill and German idealism were common intellectual influences. But another source was related to the different contextual problems Hobhouse and Chang attempted to solve in their societies.

3.2 Hobhouse's View of the State

Hobhouse had an organic conception of the state and advocated the expansion of state functions for the sake of social justice and human welfare. Accordingly, he modified the minimal state theory by infusing into the old liberalism some socialistic elements such as an emphasis on a fair distribution of wealth, the necessity for public property, and the welfare of the masses.

3.2.1 The State as a Compulsory Form of Social Union

Hobhouse conceived the state as a form of social union or association.¹⁵⁴ There were three leading principles of a social union, namely kinship, authority, and citizenship.¹⁵⁵ In spite of its imperfections, the modern state based on the principle of citizenship was a higher form of civilisation.¹⁵⁶

How did the state distinguish itself from other forms of social organisations? Hobhouse said that the state was “a compulsory form of association”.¹⁵⁷ It was distinguished by “its use of coercive power, by its supremacy and by its claim to control all who dwell within its geographical limits.”¹⁵⁸ In some cases, individuals had little freedom of choice. The state “does not leave it open to the inhabitants of its territory to decide whether they will remain members of the association or not.”¹⁵⁹ On the one hand, Hobhouse acknowledged the compulsory attribute of the state. On the other hand, he thought that the state was a necessary social union. He was against a mechanical conception of the state. The state “which is also a nation will have a different life from the State which is fortuitous concourse of atoms, or the mechanical aggregation of a series of conquests.”¹⁶⁰

3.2.2 Re-evaluation of the Minimal State Theory

Reviewing the political and social development of Britain, Hobhouse observed that the tendency to restrict the state was the temper of the period from 1832 to 1886 whereas in his

¹⁵⁴ Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, 57; *Social Evolution and Political Theory*, 126-48.

¹⁵⁵ Hobhouse, *Social Evolution and Political Theory*, 128.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid*, 148.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid*, 187.

¹⁵⁸ Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, 57.

¹⁵⁹ Hobhouse, *Social Evolution and Political Theory*, 187.

¹⁶⁰ Leonard T. Hobhouse, *Democracy and Reaction* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1904), 160.

time the position was reversed.¹⁶¹ “The reluctance to assign new functions to the state is a diminishing quantity.”¹⁶²

As the minimal state theory presumed a simple antithesis between liberty and authority or between individual freedom and state control, many of Hobhouse’s writings were devoted to the reaction against this simple opposition. The antithesis, he argued, appeared to be false.¹⁶³ On the contrary, much of the extension of state authority was friendly to liberty.¹⁶⁴ If the state coercion or compulsion was to prevent coercion exercised by any individual or association, this kind of state control actually maintained liberty.¹⁶⁵ “A great extension of collective activity does not inevitably result in a vital loss of individual freedom.”¹⁶⁶

With respect to property, Hobhouse justified necessary state control. To regard property as absolutely inherent in the individual was one-sided.¹⁶⁷ The state organisation was the basis of property and it “may also be used to increase and improve property, for example, by measures in the interests of social progress.”¹⁶⁸

Hobhouse was dissatisfied with the minimal state theory and therefore he attempted to reconstruct the philosophy of the state within liberalism. Old liberalism was one-sided so he sought harmony between liberty and authority (state control). His political thinking correlated with his social and moral philosophy in which the conception of harmony was essential. “By keeping to the conception of harmony as our clue we constantly define the rights of the individual in terms of the common good, and think of the common good in terms of the welfare of all the individuals who constitute a society.”¹⁶⁹

3.2.3 Limits and Functions of the State

Because the minimal state theory had flaws, Hobhouse sought to reconsider the limits and functions of the state. The function of the state was to “secure the common ends which recommend themselves to the general will and which cannot be secured without compulsion.”¹⁷⁰ Enemies of liberty included the state, but it was “by the state that we have

¹⁶¹ Hobhouse, *Social Evolution and Political Theory*, 167.

¹⁶² Ibid.

¹⁶³ Ibid, 189.

¹⁶⁴ Leonard T. Hobhouse, *The Elements of Social Justice* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1922), 83.

¹⁶⁵ Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, 63.

¹⁶⁶ Hobhouse, *Social Evolution and Political Theory*, 184.

¹⁶⁷ Hobhouse, *The Elements of Social Justice*, 161.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid.

¹⁶⁹ Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, 90.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid, 196.

fought them.”¹⁷¹ This showed that Hobhouse thought it was necessary to have the state for the sake of liberty. But he was not a proponent of the supremacy of the state. He expressed his reaction against the one-sided exaltation of the state.¹⁷² The power of the state must be limited. For Hobhouse law and ethics set limits to the state power.

Subordination of politics to ethics was a must.¹⁷³ Social and political institutions were “organs of social life, good or bad, according to the spirit which they embody”. “The social ideal is to be sought not in the faultless unchanging system of an institutional Utopia, but in the lore of a spiritual life with its unfailing spring of the harmonious growth unconfined.”¹⁷⁴ There was an ethical basis of the state functions.¹⁷⁵

Hobhouse made a distinction between legal and moral rights. For legal rights, we could appeal to the law.¹⁷⁶ In addition, there were moral rights that the law did not recognise and which “the moral consciousness holds ought to be recognised.”¹⁷⁷ He agreed that the state should pursue cooperation. “The best organised society will be that in which the cooperation is most perfect and complete”.¹⁷⁸

Were all actions taken by the state to foster social cooperation good and legitimate? Hobhouse said we could not infer from the principle of cooperation that “the function of the state is to foster cooperation of the society of the same kind or in the same degree.”¹⁷⁹ The general rule he offered was that the sphere “must be determined by considering how far the objects of social cooperation can be furthered by the use of compulsion, or how far, on the other hand, the nature of the methods necessary will itself conflict with the ends desired.”¹⁸⁰ By methods, he meant state control or compulsion. Hobhouse held that the end of social cooperation was mutual development of the individual and the collective. “In thinking, then, of social life as a form of cooperation we must lay stress not only upon the activities which it cultivates in common, but on the idiosyncrasies which it tolerates, the privacy which it allows, the divergent developments of personality which it fosters.”¹⁸¹

¹⁷¹ Hobhouse, *The Elements of Social Justice*, 83.

¹⁷² *Ibid*, 31.

¹⁷³ *Ibid*, 13-14.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid*, 13.

¹⁷⁵ Hobhouse, *Social Evolution and Political Theory*, 191.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid*, 197.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid*.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid*, 185-86.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid*, 186.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid*, 189.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid*, 186.

The sphere of public responsibilities, he contended, had to be further enlarged from the old liberalism advocated by the older school of English Liberals and Radicals because in his time the democratic element in politics urged the development of state activity.¹⁸² The government had responsibilities to address problems of poverty, education, physical, mental, and moral efficiency.¹⁸³ In general terms, the function of the state was to secure conditions which helped the mind and character develop and which helped citizens realise full civic efficiency.¹⁸⁴ To secure economic conditions for personal development was a chief area of the extension of state functions. This led to Hobhouse's concept of economic sovereignty. The state "is vested with a certain over-lordship over property in general and a supervisory power over industry in general..."¹⁸⁵

By advocating the expansion of state functions, Hobhouse aimed to defend certain principles of economic and social reforms, the Labour Movement in particular. Trade unionism, co-operation, state and municipal socialism were such examples of the Movement. He did not believe that the social arrangements in his country were perfect. As the Scottish Liberal politician R. B. Haldane (1856-1928) said, Hobhouse belonged to "a school the leading tenets of which is that the problem of today is distribution and not production, and that better distribution required the active intervention of the state at every turn."¹⁸⁶

To deal with the problem of distribution, Hobhouse differentiated public (common) property from private property. Public property was simply control exercised by some definite authority.¹⁸⁷ It served one function, that is, regulated control.¹⁸⁸ Roads, parks, public places, and drinking-fountains could be subject to common use and general regulations.¹⁸⁹ These things could be state-owned.¹⁹⁰

Although Hobhouse favoured state intervention and related politics to ethics, he distanced himself from some idealists, Hegel and Bosanquet in particular. He disagreed with their claim that "we are morally free when our actions conform to our real will, our real will is the general will, and the general will is most fully embodied in the state."¹⁹¹ Hobhouse agreed that social and political institutions embodied the spirit and the general will. Even as

¹⁸² Ibid, 167.

¹⁸³ Ibid, 184.

¹⁸⁴ Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, 68.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid, 90.

¹⁸⁶ Leonard T. Hobhouse, *The Labour Movement* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1893), ix-xii.

¹⁸⁷ Hobhouse, *The Elements of Social Justice*, 152.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid, 153.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid.

¹⁹¹ Leonard T. Hobhouse, *The Metaphysical Theory of the State* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1918), 43, 117-18.

this showed his idealist inclination, his idealism was different from that of Hegel. The problem of Hegelianism consisted in its negation of individual liberty, equality, and democracy.¹⁹² Hobhouse maintained that “there is no distinction between the real will and the actual will, that the will of the individual is not identical with the general will and that the rational order, which the general will is supposed to maintain, is not confined and may be opposed to the state organisation.”¹⁹³

3.3 Carsun Chang’s Theory of the State

Chang’s conception of the state derived from various schools of Western political thinkers ranging from ancient times to the twentieth century. Living in different times and countries, Chang and Hobhouse might stress different aspects of the state, but overall the role they accorded to the state was a positive and enlarged one. Both men thought that the theory of the minimal state was problematic and thus they argued for state intervention. In their opinions, the state was a compulsory and necessary social association, but it must be subject to law and ethics. However, there was a striking difference between Hobhouse and Chang on the subject matter of Hegel. Chang paid attention to the ethical and positive aspects of Hegel’s theory of the state whereas Hobhouse stressed the flaws of Hegelianism which left no room for individuality and freedom. Chang thought that Hegelianism could help China develop the consciousness of the state that was conducive to the state-building of China.

3.3.1 The State as the Major Theme of Political Philosophy

Chang considered theories of the state as an essential part of political philosophy and practical politics. He endeavoured to get a conception of the state established in China. Chang argued that in Chinese political philosophy there was no concept of the state; the substitute was the notion of “tian xia” 天下.¹⁹⁴ This lack accounted for the differences between Eastern and Western governments and political institutions.¹⁹⁵ The Chinese philosophy of “tian xia”

¹⁹² Ibid, 97. Hobhouse’s analysis of Hegelian freedom is discussed in another section.

¹⁹³ Ibid, 118.

¹⁹⁴ Zhang Junmai, *Xianzheng zhi dao* [The Way of Constitutionalism] (Beijing: Qinghua daxue chubanshe, 2006), 356; “Wei wan zhi guojia zhexue chugao (yi),” [First Draft of the Unfinished Lectures on the Philosophy of the State—Lecture One] *Zaisheng* 4, no.5 (15 May 1937): 5-7. The English translation of “tian xia” is “all under heaven”. For information about the concept of “tian xia”, see Richard Rigby, “Tianxia,” Australian Centre on China in the World, accessed 10 June 2018, <https://www.thechinastory.org/yearbooks/yearbook-2013/forum-politics-and-society/tianxia-%E5%A4%A9%E4%B8%8B/>.

¹⁹⁵ Zhang Junmai, *Liguo zhi dao* [The Way of State-Building], eds. Sun Yafu and Yang Yuzi, vol. 2 of *Zhang Junmai xiansheng jiuzhi danchen jiniance* [Collected Works of Zhang Junmai in Commemoration of the 90th Anniversary of Zhang’s Birth] (Taipei: Wenhai chubanshe, 1976), 15; Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 356-59; Zhang, “Wei wan zhi guojia zhexue chugao (yi),” 6-7.

aimed to establish an order of cosmopolitanism rather than a political order of a nation-state.¹⁹⁶

Chang quoted and accepted the theory of the state offered by the jurist and politician Johann Caspar Bluntschli (1808-1881).¹⁹⁷ The state had three indispensable elements: territory, sovereignty, and the people.¹⁹⁸ It differed from the concept of the nation.¹⁹⁹ He agreed with Bluntschli that a nation was based on a common culture, language, history, rituals or customs and that a nation was connected to a specific race that was not necessarily ruled by the same state.²⁰⁰ A nation, Chang said, was a necessary but an insufficient condition of a modern state. It was not adequate to form a state.²⁰¹ The state differed from a nation in the sense that it was a political and legal concept which must deal with questions of ethics, law, order, and political institutions.²⁰²

Chang favoured a sociological perspective concerning the evolution of the state. He quoted Hobhouse's theory of the growth of the state. There were, he said, three stages of the development of the state. The earliest human association was based on the principle of kinship.²⁰³ A second phase was dictated by the principle of authority.²⁰⁴ It corresponded with the age of monarchy and dictatorship.²⁰⁵ In a higher form of society the principle of citizenship was observed. This form of human association was founded on the rights and duties of citizens and a state of this kind aimed at the common good and individual rights.²⁰⁶ There were two forms of this kind of the state. One was the Greek city state and the other was the modern nation-state.²⁰⁷

Reviewing the history of human society, Chang concluded that the life of humanity was guided by principles of progress and freedom.²⁰⁸ He believed that the modern state was a higher form of political organisation. It first emerged in Europe after the Reformation.²⁰⁹

¹⁹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁹⁷ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 29.

¹⁹⁸ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 57; Zhang Junmai, "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (si)—Guojia zhi xingzhi," [First Draft of the Unfinished Lectures on the Philosophy of the State—Lecture Four On The Nature of the State] *Zaisheng* 4, no.8 (1 July 1937): 5-7.

¹⁹⁹ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 28-29; "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (si)," 6-7.

²⁰⁰ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 29; "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (yi)," 8-9; "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (si)," 6-7.

²⁰¹ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 28.

²⁰² Ibid, 28-29.

²⁰³ Zhang, "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (wu)—Guojia zhi yanhua," 17.

²⁰⁴ Ibid.

²⁰⁵ Ibid, 19.

²⁰⁶ Ibid 20.

²⁰⁷ Ibid.

²⁰⁸ Ibid.

²⁰⁹ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 357.

China, however, had no such political philosophy and institutions.²¹⁰ To contribute to state-building, China should learn and disseminate Western philosophy of the state from Plato onwards.²¹¹

3.3.2 Western Theories of the State

Chang examined two dominant schools of the theories of the state in the then-scholarship. He regarded one school as a scientific school. This school, he said, included thinkers of empiricism, realism, utilitarianism, positivism, and materialism.²¹² The other school was the idealist or philosophical school.²¹³ The scientific school held that the methods of natural sciences should be applied to the study of politics.²¹⁴ Machiavelli, Hobbes, Comte, Marx, James Bryce, George Catlin, and other Anglo-American thinkers who insisted on the investigation of facts to make political study value-free fell into the scientific school.²¹⁵ The idealist school, however, held that politics involved questions of right and good and therefore it must be subject to ethics.²¹⁶ For instance, the Greek philosophers regarded the state as an organisation which pursued the common good; Plato and Aristotle tended to integrate politics with ethics.²¹⁷ This train of thought started from Plato. It was later advanced by Hegel and Fichte in Germany and the British neo-Hegelian idealists such as T. H. Green and Bernard Bosanquet.²¹⁸

Chang summarised the essential points of the two schools' perceptions of the state. The idealists emphasised the question of "ought to be". Humans had reason and aimed to realise the common good. The existence of the community was real and freedom was not separable from the community. The state had an ethical personality.²¹⁹ By contrast, the scientific school stressed the investigation of facts, holding that the essence of freedom consisted in the absence of external restraints. Empiricists claimed that humans were self-centred; materialists such as Hobbes believed that human nature was not good; positivists recognised the existence

²¹⁰ Zhang, "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (yi)," 11.

²¹¹ Ibid.

²¹² Zhang Junmai, "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (er)—Kexuepai zhi guojiaguan yu zhaxuepai zhi guojiaguan," [First Draft of the Unfinished Lectures on the Philosophy of the State—Lecture Two Conceptions of the State from the Perspectives of the Scientific School and the Philosophical School] *Zaisheng* 4, no.6 (1 June 1937): 7; Zhang Junmai, "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (san)," [First Draft of the Unfinished Lectures on the Philosophy of the State—Lecture Three] *Zaisheng* 4, no.7 (15 June 1937): 6-15.

²¹³ Ibid.

²¹⁴ Zhang, "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (yi)," 7.

²¹⁵ Zhang, "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (er)," 7-11; "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (san)," 6-10.

²¹⁶ Zhang, "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (er)," 7; "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (san)," 6-8.

²¹⁷ Zhang, "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (san)," 10.

²¹⁸ Zhang, "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (er)," 7.

²¹⁹ Zhang, "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (san)," 15.

and importance of the individual; Marxists regarded the state as the tool of exploitation and oppression.²²⁰

Chang was not compelled to choose between the two sides. His political thought was characterised by a combination of empiricism and idealism, a feature that also described British new liberals such as Hobhouse and Hobson. Michael Freeden states that the position of British new liberalism was not atomistically individualist, nor hostile to idealism; it combined empiricism both with distaste for the quantification of human behaviour and with a rejection of a value-free approach to the study of man.²²¹ Freeden's comments are also applicable to the Chinese thinker Chang. Chang thought that the scientific school had several strengths as follows: The investigation of facts drove British political thinkers (Locke, Bentham, and Mill) to accord importance to the form of government and the design of institutions in order to prevent tyranny and produce good politics.²²² German idealists, however, stressed the spirit of the nation-state. They thought that the human mind objectified itself in the political and social institutions. Thus, institutional defects that caused the abuse of power were neglected by German idealists.²²³ Chang commented that the model of science might be applied to some political issues but it could not solve all problems. Social reforms and state-building must be guided by ethics.²²⁴ The scientific methodology and idealism could be harmonised to serve our purposes.²²⁵

Although Chang described different theories of the state without expressing his preferences, he passed judgement on some particular thinkers. He was definitely opposed to Marx's view of the state and Hobbes' theory of the origin of the state and his defence of monarchy.²²⁶ In Chang's opinion, Hobbes' theory of the state was mechanical in the sense that it was characterised by physical force and authority, leaving no room for human emotions and ethics.²²⁷ Chang preferred an organic theory of the state.²²⁸ This term "organic" used by Chang derived from German political philosophy. Chang thought that Johann Caspar Bluntschli's theory of the state was an exemplar of the German tradition which regarded the

²²⁰ Ibid.

²²¹ Freeden, *The New Liberalism*, 8.

²²² Zhang, "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (san)," 11-12.

²²³ Ibid.

²²⁴ Zhang, "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (er)," 14.

²²⁵ Zhang, "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (san)," 15.

²²⁶ Zhang, "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (si)," 9-10. A number of Chang's writings dealt with Marxism. In all those works, Chang's criticism of Marxist view of the state was always consistent. For details, see Chapter IV.

²²⁷ Ibid.

²²⁸ Ibid, 10.

state as organic.²²⁹ Bluntschli wrote: “It is the especial merit of the German school of historical jurists to have recognised the organic nature of the Nation and the State. This conception refutes both the mathematical and mechanical view of the State, and the atomistic way of treating it, which forgets the whole in the individuals.”²³⁰ Chang followed this organic conception of the state. But I hold that Chang’s use of “organic” had its origin in Hegel’s philosophy which had been studied by Chang for some time.

It is worth discussing Chang’s analysis of Hegel. Chang conducted detailed research on Hegel, a representative of German idealism. In addition, Hobhouse published a book criticising the Hegelian theory of the state. Without a presentation of Chang’s understanding of the two schools’ philosophy of the state (the scientific school and the idealist school), Chang may be regarded as a disciple of Hegel or an advocate of statism who overlooked political liberalism. His systematic investigation of Hegel was published in 1935, two years earlier than his lectures on Western theories of the state. In fact, he did subscribe to some idealist elements of Hegel’s theory of the state. But he also absorbed elements of the empirical school, especially British political theorists such as Locke and Mill.

There were three points on which Chang aligned himself with Hegel. First, the state had an ethical end.²³¹ According to Chang’s interpretation, Hegel’s philosophy of ethics consisted of discussions of the family, civil society, and the state.²³² Nevertheless, this did not mean Chang accepted Hegel’s absolute idealism that the moral whole was the state. Apart from the moral aspect, Chang acknowledged that the state monopolised the use of force and it was also a danger.²³³ Second, there was a social bond between the individual and the state.²³⁴ Third, the consciousness of the state was central to state sovereignty and state-building.²³⁵ Chang agreed with Hegel that when a country was endangered by domestic separatism and foreign invasions, its people as a whole should make sacrifices to keep the state integral.²³⁶

²²⁹ Ibid.

²³⁰ Johann Caspar Bluntschli, *The Theory of the State*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1895), 18-19. In 1899 Liang Qichao translated Bluntschli’s book and published each chapter in the newspaper *Qing yi bao* 清议报 (The China Discussion). But it is believed that Liang’s translation was not based on the German version or an English version.

²³¹ In this regard Chang’s position was also similar to that of Plato, Aristotle, Kant, and Hobhouse. On the other hand, Chang was aware that Hegel’s philosophy was not the same as that of Kant or Plato. Hegel was devoted to metaphysics and opposed Kant’s theory of pure reason. See Zhang Junmai, *Minzu fuxing zhi xueshu jichu* [The Academic Foundations of National Rejuvenation] (Shanghai: Zaisheng she, 1935), 219, 272.

²³² Zhang, *Minzu fuxing*, 228, 250.

²³³ This is analysed in the section of “Limits and Functions of the State”.

²³⁴ Zhang, *Minzu fuxing*, 224.

²³⁵ Ibid, 217-18.

²³⁶ Ibid.

As for theories of individual liberty, constitutionalism, and representative government, Chang's influences were Anglo-American thinkers, especially the British empirical school (Locke, Mill) rather than Hegel.²³⁷ He compared Hegel's theory of the state with the theories of other political thinkers, concluding that the German perception of the state was significantly different.²³⁸ The differences he found were as follows:

First, Hegel viewed the state as the moral whole.²³⁹ By contrast, Locke presumed an antithesis between the people and government; therefore, how to prevent abuse of power was highlighted.²⁴⁰ The means of exercising power and supervision of the government exercised by the people were stressed by British thinkers but these were not significant concerns of Hegel.²⁴¹

Second, in Hegel's philosophy the law of the state defined individual liberty.²⁴² The spiritual activity aimed to realise freedom and the state was the real vehicle for this aim.²⁴³ Hence, individual liberty could not be enjoyed beyond the state. Law did not conflict with liberty. Compared with Hegel, the British thinkers referred to liberty as a right possessed by the individual.²⁴⁴ Law was regarded by the British thinkers as a means of rule whereas the German thinkers believed it was a product of the human spirit.²⁴⁵

Third, the state itself was not the means but the end.²⁴⁶ Hegel was strongly opposed to the theory that the state was the means for individuals to pursue their private interests.²⁴⁷ By saying this, Chang alluded to the British tradition which treated the individual other than the state as the end.

Fourth, the state was the highest human association (*Gemeinschaft*) and the people should make sacrifices for the interest of *Gemeinschaft*.²⁴⁸ However, the British theorists attached great importance to the individual.²⁴⁹ Constitutionalism was adopted to protect individual rights.²⁵⁰ The German thinker had a differing opinion. The development of

²³⁷ For details about Chang's ideas of constitutionalism, human rights, and representative democracy, see chapter V.

²³⁸ Zhang, *Minzu fuxing*, 224, 229, 249.

²³⁹ *Ibid.*, 229.

²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

²⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 249.

²⁴² *Ibid.*

²⁴³ *Ibid.*, 229.

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 249.

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 229.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 229-30.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 230, 249.

²⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 249.

²⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

personality relied on the state and individual freedom could only be realised in the state as *Gemeinschaft*.²⁵¹

Furthermore, Hegel committed himself to the metaphysical theory of the state.²⁵² His interest was not an empirical or historical study of the origin and evolution of the state.²⁵³ Chang implied that empirical or sociological approaches were followed by the British thinkers such as Locke, Mill, and Hobhouse.

In addition, Hegel was against Montesquieu's theory of the separation of powers. He held that state power must be centralised and a monarchy was the proper form of government to do this.²⁵⁴ For this reason, Hegel was believed to be a conservative.²⁵⁵ These distinguished Hegel from the French and British thinkers who advocated constitutionalism.

These distinctions that Chang made between Hegel and other thinkers (especially the empirical school) showed that Chang's ideas about limited and accountable power, human rights, and individual liberty were definitely not derived from Hegel. Chang stated that since he was studying philosophy it was his duty to introduce to China various schools of European thought but that he did this with no intention of propagating Hegelian philosophy or being a follower of Hegel.²⁵⁶ Notwithstanding this statement and Chang's appreciation of British politics, it was true that Chang saw a positive side of Hegelianism—the significant role of the state in a national crisis and in state-building. He appreciated that Hegel made nineteenth-century Germany wake up to the fact that Germany was divided and there was no nation-state.²⁵⁷ Hegel's theory then contributed to Germany's founding of a modern state which later became a major player in the international community.²⁵⁸ Chang thought that Germany's situation was similar to that of China after the 1911 Revolution, so it was necessary to introduce Hegel's theory in order to awaken Chinese.²⁵⁹ Chang was aware that Hegel's theory was criticised by many British and French thinkers from the outbreak of WWI who attributed

²⁵¹ Ibid.

²⁵² Ibid, 224, 250-51.

²⁵³ Ibid.

²⁵⁴ Ibid, 255.

²⁵⁵ Ibid.

²⁵⁶ Ibid, 272.

²⁵⁷ Ibid, 227.

²⁵⁸ Ibid, 230.

²⁵⁹ Ibid, 218.

the cause of the war to Hegel's conservatism.²⁶⁰ Still, he held that there was value in Hegel's theory of the state for countries where a modern state was not yet established.²⁶¹

Chang acknowledged the merits of both Hegel and the British thinkers. The British political theory was applicable to a country where a modern state was already established; in this case the focus of politics was to prevent the abuse of power and protect the rights of the people.²⁶² However, when a country was invaded, the people as a whole should make concerted efforts and make sacrifices for the sake of state sovereignty; only this could save the country.²⁶³ Chang believed Hegel's emphasis on the state in this situation had its value.

Even if a country did not solve the problem of sovereignty, was it legitimate for a government to encroach upon rights of the individual so as to save the country? Chang did not discuss this. But the following remarks made by Chang showed that he wanted to synthesise different theories. Chang noted that there were three perspectives on the state: evolutionary, institutional, and idealist.²⁶⁴ Evolutionary theory investigated the origin and growth of the state. Institutional theory examined how to limit the government and advance the rights of the people. Hegel as an idealist espoused the unity of the state and spirit. In Chang's opinion, each had its merit. To research the origin and development of the state, one found that an evolutionary theory was useful. Institutional theory could be used by revolutionists or constitutionalists to maintain the independence of its culture and the survival of a nation. The state was an association which embodied the collective demand and pride of its citizens. This Hegelian view was complementary to the evolutionary perspective and institutional perspective.²⁶⁵

I do not think Chang's use of some aspects of Hegel's theory of the state made him an apologist of Hegelianism. He rejected statism and preferred Mill's liberal theory.²⁶⁶ Because China was fighting for national rights in the 1930s, Chang thought it was justified to emphasise the conception of the state. As a liberal, Hobhouse also defended national rights and certain forms of patriotism or nationalism.

²⁶⁰ Ibid, 230.

²⁶¹ Ibid, 230-31.

²⁶² Ibid, 249-50.

²⁶³ Ibid, 250.

²⁶⁴ Ibid, 256.

²⁶⁵ Ibid.

²⁶⁶ See Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 352.

The form of democratic theory which ignores national differences and national rights is the result of a false abstraction. It rests on a mechanical view of society, and lays stress on only one element in the democratic ideal. It treats the State as though it could be formed by any aggregated of men selected at haphazard and endowed with equal voting power. It forgets that patriotism is not a product of the ballot-box but rather a heritage and a tradition, that loyalty is not merely a matter of reciprocal benefit but as much a matter of collective pride...²⁶⁷

But a nation that is merely standing up for its own rights, and is not seeking either to conquer or to patronise the world at large, has always had the sympathy of liberally minded men. Nationalism of this kind has stood for liberty, not only in the sense that it has resisted tyrannous encroachment, but also in the sense that it has maintained the right of a community to work out its own salvation in its own way. A nation has an individuality, and the doctrine that individuality is an element in well-being is rightly applied to it.²⁶⁸

I hold that patriotism or nationalism (emphasis on the importance of the state) that was reflected in Chang's writings would not encounter objections from liberals like Hobhouse. As was shown, Hobhouse regarded liberty as a social conception, which was related to the concept of the common good. According to his remarks above, the common good of a community such as a nation-state included national rights and collective pride of a nation that did not seek to conquer others. This form of nationalism did not conflict with liberalism. On the contrary, it "stood for liberty" in that it opposed tyranny and protected the right of a community which sought to find its own way of salvation.

3.3.3 Limits and Functions of the State

In Chang's philosophy, the state was necessary and must be endowed with authority to serve the common interests.²⁶⁹ It thus compelled individuals as members of the community to fulfil certain duties in some situations.²⁷⁰ For instance, when a country was invaded by foreign countries, the government needed to levy tax, enforce military conscription, coordinate armies, and control the economy.²⁷¹ In addition, the exercise of power, enforcement of laws, foreign affairs, the issue of property, and conflicts between individuals required that the state must have authority.²⁷²

²⁶⁷ Hobhouse, *Democracy and Reaction*, 159-60.

²⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 163-64.

²⁶⁹ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 95-96; 145-47.

²⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

²⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 96.

²⁷² *Ibid.*, 38, 60-62, 146-47.

The state had force, police, and courts, but these were not good reasons for standing on the side of Marx and anarchists who espoused the “withering-away of the state” or destroying the power of the state.²⁷³ The state was constructed according to the principle of rationality and it pursued the common good.²⁷⁴ Nonetheless, Chang disapproved of the theory which put the state above the society and the individual.²⁷⁵ The state also posed a danger.²⁷⁶

What did Chang propose to solve the seeming conflict? His idea was to set a limit to the power of the state. Law and ethics were the means. First and foremost, the state would be subject to constitutionalism. A constitution must exist and specify the fundamental rights of the people to better protect these liberties against infringement.²⁷⁷ The system of basic liberties Chang discussed was the same as the one present in the constitutions of then-democracies in Europe and America. The state was not justified to infringe upon these fundamental rights.²⁷⁸ It was unreasonable to simply deny the value of individualism.²⁷⁹ Individual freedom was not the antithesis of the interests of the state.²⁸⁰ The progress of a society relied on individuals with free will; one purpose of the law was the expression of the free will of the people.²⁸¹

Furthermore, a constitution should specify how to establish and limit state powers.²⁸² This constitutional idea in fact concerned the institutional design and the form of government. The political system Chang preferred was a constitutional democracy founded on the principles of the separation of powers and checks and balances. Two constitutions he drafted are evidence of this as we shall see in chapter V. Overall, Chang held that the rule of law should be established and the state must be subordinated to law.²⁸³ The essence of the rule of law lay not only in the use of the law to govern the country but also in the protection of the rights of the people.²⁸⁴

²⁷³ Ibid, 57.

²⁷⁴ Ibid, 38-39, 382.

²⁷⁵ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 98-99; Zhang Junmai, *Shehuizhuyi sixiang yundong gaiguan* [An Overview of Socialist Thought and Movements] (Taipei: Daoxiang chubanshe, 1988), 18.

²⁷⁶ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 32-35; 96-97; 146; *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 141.

²⁷⁷ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 147.

²⁷⁸ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 157.

²⁷⁹ Zhang, *Shehuizhuyi sixiang yundong gaiguan*, 17.

²⁸⁰ Zhang, *Mingri zhi zhongguo wenhua*, 124.

²⁸¹ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 358.

²⁸² Ibid, 142.

²⁸³ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 38, 141, 376; *Liguo zhi dao*, 146.

²⁸⁴ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 377.

Apart from law, Chang argued that power was limited by ethics. A state should pursue what was good and the exercise of power pertained to moral responsibilities.²⁸⁵ Chang attached importance to the integrity of politicians. The behaviour of politicians would be subject to moral principles. In his opinion, a politician should develop good political personality, observe the moral code, and pursue goodness.²⁸⁶ Chang did not analyse the meanings of good, but he mentioned several virtues that a good politician should possess. When exercising power, a good politician would act upon faith and conscience; he or she would be motivated by a sense of justice and righteousness; thereby the administration could be of benefit to the country and the people; what the politician said and did should stand the test of law and posterity.²⁸⁷ This stress on the moral responsibilities of politicians was not a new idea in modern China but a tradition of Chinese thought and politics. In this regard, Chang inherited the tradition of Confucianism which advocated the subordination of politics to morality.

So far we can say that Chang's view of the state was liberal. However, he by no means approved of the minimal state theory. Chang claimed that this theory originated from liberalism.²⁸⁸ Fearing the expansion of state powers, liberals advocated a minimal state, putting the state in a position of neutrality and non-intervention.²⁸⁹ Chang said: "This theory of the state now is certainly difficult to be applied to countries which are plagued by economic and social problems".²⁹⁰ Neutrality meant justice rather than being a night-watchman.²⁹¹ He castigated laissez faire liberalism and excessive economic liberty.²⁹² The state had a responsibility to regulate economic activities and deal with the wealth gap between the rich and poor.²⁹³ Private property should be recognised and protected for personal security and development; public ownership should also be established for the sake of general happiness and the development of the national economy.²⁹⁴ What Chang sought was harmonious development between the individual and society. The Constitution of the

²⁸⁵ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 97.

²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 38-39.

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 97.

²⁸⁸ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 350.

²⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 352.

²⁹¹ *Ibid.*

²⁹² Zhang, *Shehuizhuyi sixiang yundong gaiguan*, 19.

²⁹³ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 171-72.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

Republic of China that Chang drafted showed he strongly supported a welfare state and state intervention in economic activities so that the common interests could be secured.²⁹⁵

Reviewing Chang's theory of the state, we find that one philosophical principle ran through the whole idea-system—harmony between authority and liberty or harmony between collective interests and individual interests. "A balance should be made between authority and liberty...Equal stress is laid on the interests of the state and the rights of the people."²⁹⁶ Liberty would not be the antithesis of authority if a balance was made.²⁹⁷ This principle of harmony between authority and liberty was clarified by Chang when he illustrated the relationship of his politics to his philosophy.²⁹⁸ His intention was to examine the falsehood of historical materialism and to promote a functional theory of society.²⁹⁹ Social progress was the outcome of the interaction between free will and social, economic, and political institutions.³⁰⁰

3.4 Liberty Compatible with the Common Good

Hobhouse and Chang shared some views on the notion of liberty. Neither Hobhouse nor Chang made a distinction between negative freedom and positive freedom. Liberty meant autonomy and the absence of restraint as well. The state must safeguard liberty. Yet, they saw that one-sided individualism and laissez faire liberalism were problematic. Social freedom and public interests were as fundamental as individual liberty. They attempted to disseminate a philosophy of harmony between individual liberty and the common good.

Notwithstanding these similarities, there were two differences between their conceptions of freedom. First, Hobhouse did not dwell on human rights and constitutionalism while Chang discussed these topics frequently in his writings. As Britain was already a constitutional democracy and some basic human rights were already protected, Hobhouse sought reforms rather than a transformation of the British political system. By contrast, Chang aimed at a transformation of the Chinese political system from a single-party state to a constitutional democracy. He considered constitutionalism as a vital feature of a modern state,

²⁹⁵ Article 142 to Article 167 of the Constitution are relevant articles. For the text, see Office of the President, ROC, "Constitution of the Republic of China," Laws and Regulation of the Database of the Republic of China, accessed 20 June 2018, <http://law.moj.gov.tw/ENG/LawClass/LawAll.aspx?PCode=A0000001>.

²⁹⁶ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 98-99.

²⁹⁷ Ibid, 97-98.

²⁹⁸ Ibid, 370-84.

²⁹⁹ For Chang's functional theory of society, see chapter IV.

³⁰⁰ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 370-89.

so he emphasised the importance of human rights and constitutionalism in his theory of freedom.

A second difference between Hobhouse and Chang concerned their different ways of modifying theories of freedom and arriving at a theory of harmony between individual liberty and the common good. The British tradition of liberty emphasised individual liberty but ignored or downplayed the social attribute of freedom. Hobhouse found that this tradition of liberty was one-sided and was unable to deal with the labour problem and economic inequality. Therefore, social freedom which aimed at the common good must be added to the established liberal tradition. This helped Hobhouse arrive at a doctrine of harmony between the individual and society.

Compared with the British tradition, Chinese thought such as Confucianism stressed the social aspect of freedom that was not separable from ethics and the good of the collective.³⁰¹ This Chinese tradition of freedom was not political but ethical. Chang did not attribute the problems of Chinese society to Confucianism. Instead of attacking this tradition, Chang attempted to infuse theories of individual liberty and constitutionalism into the Chinese tradition. In his opinion, the Western tradition of liberty as political and civil rights was complementary to Chinese thought. This was how Chang developed a theory of harmony between the individual and the collective. It differed from the way Hobhouse modified the British tradition of liberty.

3.4.1 Hobhouse: Liberty, Restraint, and Harmony

Hobhouse preached a theory of liberty that was compatible with the common good. Believing that the old liberalism must adapt itself to the new age to foster social reforms, Hobhouse injected new ingredients into the theory of liberty developed by classical liberals. Three points were crucial to Hobhouse's understanding of liberty. The first point was that a positive conception of freedom matched the negative.³⁰² Second, liberty involved restraint. Last but not least, liberty was a project of social harmony.

Freedom as Self-Determination without External Constraint

Hobhouse was not fascinated by the idea of differentiating negative freedom from positive freedom. Freedom "is determination by internal factors and the absence of constraint from

³⁰¹ For details, see section 3.4.2.

³⁰² Hobhouse, *The Elements of Social Justice*, 49.

without.”³⁰³ Restraint might be internal or external. Passion, for instance, was an internal factor.³⁰⁴ Because Hobhouse thought freedom was both negative and positive, he rejected Hegel’s doctrine of freedom. Hegel conceived freedom merely as a positive conception—self-determination that was not achieved by the individual on his own account but was subordinated to a system of law and custom of society.³⁰⁵ Hegel’s state system thus was a negation of liberty.³⁰⁶ From the viewpoint of Hegel, it was false to regard freedom as the absence of constraints.³⁰⁷ As a result, the Hegelian conception of the relation of the individual to society was influenced by this doctrine of freedom. Hegel ignored conflicts between individual and universal interests.³⁰⁸ He only acknowledged the harmony and the unity of the universal and the particular.³⁰⁹

Moral, Social, and Political Freedom

Based on the meaning of freedom, Hobhouse discussed moral, social, and political freedom which he said were the property of rational beings.³¹⁰ Moral freedom was not isolation but “the harmony of the whole self in the multitudinous relationship which constitutes the web of its interest.”³¹¹ With respect to social freedom, Hobhouse referred to freedom in social life or freedom within a community.³¹² Once again, this kind of freedom had something to do with harmony. A society or community was free in proportion as its internal life of all members of individuals in close interaction was harmonious.³¹³ Each man’s liberty involved a restraint upon others.³¹⁴ On the practical side social liberty was also a struggle for equality such as equality in the opportunities of education and certain forms of occupation; the social value of the corporation or quasi-corporation, like the trade union, made collective regulations necessary.³¹⁵ “Liberty is not founded on the personal right of the individual as opposed to, or as limiting, the right of the community.”³¹⁶ The common good limited individual liberty.

³⁰³ Ibid.

³⁰⁴ Ibid, 50.

³⁰⁵ Hobhouse, *The Metaphysical Theory of the State*, 32-33.

³⁰⁶ Ibid, 97.

³⁰⁷ Ibid, 32, 37.

³⁰⁸ Ibid, 96-97.

³⁰⁹ Ibid, 96.

³¹⁰ Hobhouse, *The Elements of Social Justice*, 47.

³¹¹ Ibid, 57.

³¹² Ibid, 58.

³¹³ Ibid, 60.

³¹⁴ Hobhouse, *Social Evolution and Political Theory*, 196.

³¹⁵ Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, 15-16.

³¹⁶ Hobhouse, *The Elements of Social Justice*, 61.

Restraints in this sense took the form of “a system of rights which defines the field of liberty, and where no right is invaded there is no restriction.”³¹⁷

Political freedom was regarded by Hobhouse as a guarantee or condition that was essential to the principle of harmony and made law and government represent either the will or the good of the community.³¹⁸ In the narrower sense, political freedom was “the right of contributing by voice and vote to the explicit decisions, laws, and administrative acts, which bind the community.”³¹⁹ It was a common freedom of many members of a community and gave no absolute liberty to any one person. Hence, Hobhouse noted:

Political freedom is just the right of every man bound by decisions to contribute whatever it is in him to contribute to the making and remaking of those decisions. It by no means guarantees that his will is to count among the rest in making the decisions, and that the community as a whole will be bound by the main current of will flowing within it, the resultant of all the wills and brains of everyone concerned in proportion to the energy and intelligence which he brings to bear. That the collective actions should in this manner express the prevalent wills of the community and not be imposed on them is essential to the completion of the principle of Harmony.³²⁰

Personal Development and Social Harmony

Although in Hobhouse’s philosophy restraint and the common good correlated with the conception of freedom, Hobhouse was not indifferent to the development of the individual. He defended the value of liberty and individual rights. Liberty was the basis of rational self-determination; man needed liberty because it was the root of all spiritual development.³²¹ By development, he meant progress which differed from evolution. Evolution referred to any sort of growth.³²² Social progress was “the growth of social life in respect of those qualities to which human beings attach or can rationally attach value”.³²³ It was only one among many possibilities of social evolution.³²⁴ Hobhouse cited a caste system as an example to illustrate the difference between social evolution and social progress. A caste system was a product of

³¹⁷ Ibid, 98.

³¹⁸ Ibid, 95-97.

³¹⁹ Ibid, 96.

³²⁰ Ibid, 96-97.

³²¹ Ibid, 95.

³²² Hobhouse, *Social Evolution and Political Theory*, 8.

³²³ Ibid.

³²⁴ Ibid.

social evolution but judged from the standpoint of human values, it looked more like retrogression.³²⁵

Furthermore, Hobhouse's conception of personal development did not conflict with social development. In his moral philosophy, personal development was only to be sought through one's rational choice and the cultivation of personality guided by rationality led to the development of the common good.³²⁶ If personal development was what Hobhouse defined, harmony between the community and the individual was attainable. The good was the harmony of experience with feeling. The rational good must be consistent and universal; conflicts and contradictions had to be reconciled to achieve harmony.³²⁷ When this principle was applied to social development, "the most perfect social harmony must provide the fullest development for each social personality and that is the good for each."³²⁸

In short, Hobhouse's idea of liberty was connected with rationality, the common good, and harmony. As he expressed, "the principle of liberty is a project of social harmony and the realisation of liberty the measure of its success."³²⁹ Restraints existed in any society but in a free community, restraints were imposed on the members by themselves who were willing to cooperate to materialise their common end that was harmony.³³⁰

3.4.2 Chang: Individual Liberty and Collective Interests

Spiritual Freedom as Self-Autonomy

To reconcile individual liberty with collective interests was also a feature of Carsun Chang's political thought. Chang's conception of freedom was both positive and negative. First, Chang considered spiritual freedom as self-autonomy that was a positive conception. This spiritual freedom was associated with human reason, harmony, and the good of the whole. He believed that the value of freedom and individualism should be acknowledged. Individualism, he said, meant the personality of self-reliance and independence which contributed to the democratic movements in Europe and America.³³¹ The individualism he exalted here referred to the spirit of personal autonomy which was conducive to the cultivation of an equal and

³²⁵ Ibid.

³²⁶ Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, 85.

³²⁷ Leonard T. Hobhouse, *The Rational Good* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1921), 77-82.

³²⁸ Ibid, 142.

³²⁹ Hobhouse, *The Elements of Social Justice*, 90.

³³⁰ Ibid.

³³¹ Zhang Junmai, "Minzhushihuizhuyi zhi zhaxue beijing (yi)," [The Philosophical Background of Democratic Socialism Part One] *Zaisheng* 4, no. 221 (27 June 1948), 5. For Chang's comments on individualism, see Chang, *Shehuizhuyi sixiang yundong gaiguan*, 17.

independent personality. He argued that the future of the Chinese nation depended on a national culture based on this spiritual freedom.³³² This understanding of freedom was cultural, moral, and philosophical.

In the eyes of Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun, spiritual freedom was not foreign to Chinese because Confucianism contained elements of rationalism, independence, and individual autonomy. It was Kantian.³³³ Confucian thinkers such as Mencius did not use the Chinese characters “zi you” 自由 (a Chinese equivalent to the English term “liberty” or “freedom”) to express ideas of self-autonomy and independence. However, there were other words that conveyed such ideas in Chinese classics. Before 1949 Chang himself did not discuss a Chinese equivalent to the Western conception of spiritual freedom or individualism, but his friend Zhang Dongsun did express his opinions. I hold that Chang would agree with Zhang on the Confucian conception of freedom. In 1943 Chang wrote a preface to Zhang’s book *Sixiang yu shehui* 思想与社会 (Thought and Society). In the preface, Chang wrote, “I espouse rationality. This book by Zhang Dongsun illustrates the tradition of Chinese thought: Confucianism and Confucian rationalism. This tradition, I proclaim, is the spiritual heritage of Chinese civilisation.”³³⁴

Zhang discussed the conception of freedom in Chinese thought. “The conception of freedom is not absent from Chinese thought. Nor does Chinese thought ignore it. Because the good of the whole is always the starting point of Chinese thought, individual freedom can only be transliterated into the Chinese characters ‘zi de’ 自得.”³³⁵ According to Zhang, this conception was different from the Western tradition of freedom as a political concept.³³⁶ The Confucian concept of ‘zi de’, Zhang said, was similar to the Western conception like freedom of the mind or the spirit.³³⁷ This Confucian conception of freedom was not separable from the

³³² Zhang Junmai, *Mingri zhi zhongguo wenhua* [Chinese Culture Tomorrow] (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1936), 121-22.

³³³ This was why Chang and Zhang thought Confucianism was comparable to the philosophy of Kant (autonomy and human reason) and both developed Chinese philosophy in the direction of Kantian idealism.

³³⁴ Zhang Dongsun, *Sixiang yu shehui* [Thought and Society] (Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 2010), 7. Chang made a distinction between Confucianism and Confucian rationalism. The former referred to Confucian thought before the Tang Dynasty. The latter meant the Confucian thought since the Tang Dynasty.

³³⁵ Zhang Dongsun, *Lixing yu minzhu* [Rationality and Democracy] (Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 2010), 182.

³³⁶ Ibid, 174-76.

³³⁷ Ibid, 183. The American Sinologist William Theodore de Bary published *The Liberal Tradition in China*. In this book, he investigated Confucian liberalism and individualism represented by Neo-Confucian thinkers, thinkers in the Ming Dynasty in particular. He cited “zi de” as one of the Chinese vocabulary of Neo-Confucian individualism. According to him, “zi de” literally means “getting it by or for oneself” (“learning or experiencing some truth for oneself and deriving inner satisfaction therefrom). But its deeper meaning is “getting or finding the Way in oneself”. For reference, see William Theodore de Bary, *The Liberal Tradition in China* (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1983), 45.

conception of reason or rationality.³³⁸ By saying this, Zhang meant that ‘zi de’ was related to the principles of harmony and the rational good. Human reason would help the individual develop the self that was in harmony with the Chinese philosophy of “dao” 道 (way).³³⁹ Zhang cited the works by Mencius, Kong Ji 孔伋, and Cheng Hao 程颢 to illustrate that ‘zi de’ expressed the idea of spiritual freedom and that the concept of ‘zi de’ was the merit of Confucianism.³⁴⁰ The Chinese texts Zhang referred to were as follows:³⁴¹

君子深造之以道，欲其自得之也，自得之则居之安；居之安则资之深；资之深则取之左右逢其源；故君子欲其自得之也。³⁴²

Mencius said, ‘The superior man makes his advances in what he is learning with deep earnestness and by the proper course, wishing to get hold of it as in himself. Having got hold of it in himself, he abides in it calmly and firmly. Abiding in it calmly and firmly, he reposes a deep reliance on it. Reposing a deep reliance on it, he seizes it on the left and right, meeting everywhere with it as a fountain from which things flow. It is on this account that the superior man wishes to get hold of what he is learning as in himself.’³⁴³

无入而不自得。³⁴⁴

The superior man can find himself in no situation in which he is not himself.³⁴⁵

万物静观皆自得。³⁴⁶

³³⁸ Zhang Dongsun, *Lixing yu minzhu*, 174.

³³⁹ It is hard to find an English equivalent to this Chinese term “dao”, but in Confucianism it is closely associated with truth, virtue, and humanity.

³⁴⁰ Kong Ji (483-402 BCE) whose courtesy name was Zisi 子思 was a philosopher and the grandson of Confucius. His masterpiece was *Zhong yong* (*The Doctrine of the Mean*), a classic of Confucianism. Cheng Hao (1032-1085) was a Neo-Confucian thinker in the Northern Song Dynasty.

³⁴¹ Zhang Dongsun did not offer English translations of these texts. But I provide some of the English translations following the Chinese texts. It should be noted that it is difficult to convey the exact meanings of these Chinese thinkers in English.

³⁴² See Yang Bojun, “Li lou zhang ju xia,” in *Mengzi yizhu* [*Mencius with Annotations by Yang Bojun*], vol. 1. (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1960), 189.

³⁴³ James Legge, *The Chinese Classics: The Works of Mencius* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1895), 322-23. William Theodore de Bary translated the remarks by Mencius. His translation is as follows: “The noble man steepes himself in the Way because he wishes to ‘get it’ by himself. When he gets it himself, he will be at ease with it. When he is at ease with it he can trust it deeply, and when he can trust it deeply, he can find its source wherever he turns. That is why the noble man wishes to get it himself.” See De Bary, *Liberal Tradition in China*, 45-46.

³⁴⁴ See Wang Guoxuan, “Di shi zhang” [Chapter XIV] in *Da xue zhong yong* [The Great Learning and the Doctrine of the Mean with Annotations by Wang Guoxuan] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2007), 76.

³⁴⁵ James Legge, *Li ji* [The Book of Rites] (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1885); “Zhong yong” [The State of Equilibrium and Harmony], Chinese Text Project, <https://ctext.org/liji/zhong-yong>.

³⁴⁶ This is a line from the poem “Qiu ri ou cheng” 秋日偶成 (Chance Creation on an Autumn Day) by the philosopher Cheng Hao. The English translation of the poem is not available. But “zi de” in this line conveys the same meaning as it does in the remarks of Mencius and Kong Ji quoted by Zhang. The poem was written after Cheng was demoted because of his opposition to the socioeconomic reforms advocated by Wang Anshi (王安石), the grand chancellor of the Song Dynasty. In this poem Cheng expressed the Confucian ideal of Way and the idea of being oneself (an independent self) in whatever situation or position.

From Zhang Dongsun's perspective, the Chinese word "zi de" 自得 in these Chinese classic texts expressed a conception of spiritual freedom which sought to keep the self free and independent. I do not think Chang would disagree with Zhang on Zhang's interpretation of the Confucian conception of freedom. In the 1950s Chang also discussed the Chinese conception of freedom.

The views of Lord, Janet, and Hegel seem to be that the Orient thus far has recognised neither the rights of the individual, nor the broader ideal of human freedom, nor, indeed, the entity of the state itself. I believe that this view is based upon a misunderstanding. Although the Orient does not use the term freedom, it certainly is familiar with the concept of freedom. When Williams says of the Chinese in his book *The Middle Kingdom* that "Liberty is unknown among the people; there is not even a word for it in their language," I should like to remind him of what Confucius says: "From the Emperor down the root of everything is in the cultivation of the person." Confucius further says: "An army can be deprived of its commander, but the common people cannot be deprived of its own will." What is this will? If a people is conscious of its own power, what is this consciousness but the sense of liberty? When people are conscious of the need for considering the needs and feelings of others, there exists an awareness of the rights and integrity of man.³⁴⁷

Both Chang and Zhang were aware that the Chinese conception of freedom was moral and cultural. It was considerably different from freedom as political and civil rights in the West. Nevertheless, for them this ethical conception of freedom would be the cultural foundation of Chinese democracy. This was why Chang stressed that the future of China relied on a national culture of spiritual freedom.

When discussing the relationship of spiritual freedom to politics, Chang mentioned two sorts of motive to obey laws or orders. When one acted out of self-imposed responsibilities rather than coercion excised by the government or others, one was motivated by spiritual freedom and he called this the spirit of autonomy.³⁴⁸ Good politics depended on the virtues of politicians and the people as well; the people needed to be motivated by autonomy and be capable of independent judgement.³⁴⁹ The value of liberty was that it enabled people to develop full citizenship and an independent personality.³⁵⁰ To Chang, personality meant

³⁴⁷ Chang, *The Third Force in China* (New York: Bookman Associates, 1952), 322-23.

³⁴⁸ Zhang, *Mingri zhi zhongguo wenhua*, 123.

³⁴⁹ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 368.

³⁵⁰ *Ibid*, 148.

individuality, independence, self-consciousness, and self-responsibility.³⁵¹ Personality should be protected for personal development and the wellbeing of a country.³⁵² He quoted the remarks of Humboldt and Mill on individuality and freedom to support these arguments.³⁵³

It is worthwhile to mention that Chang and Zhang's understanding of individualism was characteristic of many Republican liberals who tended to disassociate individualism from egoism or selfishness. Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun are thought to be cultural conservatives who tried to seek an indigenous cultural basis for democracy and liberty.³⁵⁴ Hu Shi was not a cultural conservative. Instead, he was labelled by his contemporaries as an advocate of "wholesale Westernisation". However, much like Chang and Zhang, Hu also associated a true philosophy of individualism with individuality, freedom of thought (the mind), an independent personality, and self-responsibility. He argued for this true individualism in his articles "Fei geren zhuyi de xinshenghuo" 非个人主义的新生活和 "Geren ziyou yu shehui jinbu" 个人自由与社会进步.³⁵⁵ In the political thought of Chang, Zhang, and Hu, individual liberty and social progress would not be mutually exclusive to each other if people embraced the individualism they discussed.

Freedom as Political and Civil Rights

Chang's conception of freedom was also negative. He was influenced by British liberal thinkers other than Hegel in this regard. Chang said Hegel's theory of the state made him attack "liberty" and "equality" which became popular from the French Revolution onwards.³⁵⁶ Hegel objected to Rousseau's theory of natural rights such as equality and freedom.³⁵⁷ By equality, he only referred to equality before the law which in Chang's opinion was too narrow. It simply meant that since all persons were human beings, the law should treat all persons as equal human beings.³⁵⁸ Law could not impose acts or bills of equality on people because inequality which existed beyond this Hegelian conception of equality before the law was natural and permanent. Liberty was not a natural right to which a human being was entitled. In Hegel's philosophy, it was related to the universal development of the true

³⁵¹ See Zhang, "Minzhushhehuizhuyi zhi zhaxue beijing (yi)," 5-6.

³⁵² Zhang, *Mingri zhi zhongguo wenhua*, 122-24; *Liguo zhi dao*, 97-98, 148.

³⁵³ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 149.

³⁵⁴ For a detailed examination of cultural conservatism in modern China, See Fung, *The Intellectual Foundations*, 61-157.

³⁵⁵ See Hu Shi, "Fei geren zhuyi de xinshenghuo" [A Commentary On the New Life That Is Non-Individualistic] in Ouyang Zhesheng, *Hu Shi wenji* (2) [Collected Works of Hu Shi Volume Two], 564-55; Hu Shi, "Geren ziyou yu shehui jinbu" [Individual Liberty and Social Progress] in Ouyang Zhesheng, *Hu Shi wenji* (11) [Collected Works of Hu Shi Volume Eleven], 584-85.

³⁵⁶ Zhang, *Minzu fuxing*, 253.

³⁵⁷ Ibid.

³⁵⁸ Ibid.

self and man's rationality. The law of the state rather than the liberty of other persons specified the sphere of one's liberty. When explaining Hegel's objective spirit, Chang did not translate the German term "Recht" into concepts of right and liberty.³⁵⁹ The German word was used. He pointed out that some German terms were different from the English translations, so his interpretation of Hegel's philosophy was based on the German version.³⁶⁰

Chang's understanding of freedom as a political concept was influenced by Mill and it was a departure from both ancient Chinese thought and the tradition established by the intellectuals of the New Culture Movement from 1915 to the 1920s which made ideas of democracy, individuality, and freedom popular in modern China. Chang's first publication in 1906 was entitled "Mule Yuehan yiyuan zhengzhi lun" 穆勒约翰议院政治论 (John S. Mill on Parliamentary Politics).³⁶¹ It was a brief translation of the essential substance of Mill's *Considerations on Representative Government*. In this essay, the English words "free" and "liberty" were translated into the Chinese characters "zi you" 自由. There were omissions, free translation, and a number of annotations in Chang's essay, but Chang's translation was generally faithful to the original English text. For Chang the meaning of freedom was complex. But to put it simply there were civil liberties such as the rights to personal liberty and property, liberty of faith (freedom of religion and freedom of thought), and political liberty (the right to political participation).³⁶² Liberty in this political sense pertained to constitutionalism.

Chang's understanding of liberty as civil and political rights was not derived from Chinese thought. In ancient Chinese music, literary works, and historical documents, the word "zi you" usually meant selfishness, unrestrained liberty, disobedience, and contempt for rules and orders.³⁶³ It did not refer to political and civil liberties. However, Chang used this Chinese word in a political sense, associating it with constitutional rights and civil liberties.³⁶⁴ Chang said that liberty was the antithesis of tyranny.³⁶⁵ It was the end of politics;

³⁵⁹ Ibid, 228.

³⁶⁰ Ibid, 231.

³⁶¹ For the Chinese essay, see Chang, "Mule Yuehan yiyuan zhengzhi lun," [John S. Mill on Parliamentary Politics], *Zhengzhi sixiang shi* 1 [History of Political Thought], no. 1 (2010): 137-54. It was first published in 1906 by *Xinmin congbao* 新民丛报 (The New People's Gazette).

³⁶² Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 97.

³⁶³ Philipp C. Huang and Leigh Jenco express this view, too. See Jenco, "Chinese Liberalism"; Philipp C. Huang, *Liang Qichao and Modern Chinese Liberalism* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1972), 69.

³⁶⁴ Chang was not the first Chinese intellectual who infused into the Chinese word *zi you* the modern meanings such as political and civil rights. The first Chinese who did this is probably Huang Zunxian (黄遵宪) who was a poet, educator and diplomat in the late Qing Dynasty. In 1879 Huang mentioned the theory of civil liberties of the United States in his works. Apart from Huang Zunxian, Liang Qichao's use of *zi you* was similar to that of Chang. In 1899 Liang discussed the liberalism of the Scottish liberal politician William E. Gladstone in his late years. Liang was a mentor of Carsun

politics that advanced civil rights and the general will of the people was good politics; politics that failed to achieve these was bad politics.³⁶⁶ By general will, Chang referred to the theory of Jean-Jacques Rousseau.

Moreover, Chang's conception of liberty distinguished itself from that of many leading figures of the New Culture Movement which stressed freedom from traditional Chinese ethics such as Confucianism. To protect individual rights against the encroachment of the state or the government was not much emphasised. This conception of liberty was directly influenced by the Japanese liberalism in the Meiji era. The modern Chinese word for "liberty" (zi you) was spread to China by returned students who had travelled to Japan at the turn of the twentieth century.³⁶⁷ These students learned this word from translations of Japanese intellectuals such as Fukuzawa Yukichi and Nakamura Masanao who made significant contributions to the introduction of Western culture to Meiji Japan.³⁶⁸ Japanese liberalism of the Meiji period referred to liberty and individual independence, but it was an attempt to rid oneself of the shackles of the family, the Shogunate system, rituals, and ethics associated with Confucianism.³⁶⁹ The end of the emancipation was not to protect the basic rights of individuals by limiting the power of the state or the emperor.³⁷⁰ Many Chinese students in Japan returned to China and joined the New Culture Movement.³⁷¹ Two of the leading figures of the Movement were Chen Duxiu and Li Dazhao who had studied in Japan. Their

Chang. They were aware of the differences between the meanings of liberty in Chinese and in English. In addition, two Chinese intellectuals Yan Fu and Ma Junwu (马君武) translated Mill's *On Liberty* into Chinese. But their translations were not published until 1903. Thus, Huang and Liang were the first generation of Chinese intellectuals who used zi you in a manner that departed from the Chinese tradition. For the detail of Huang and Liang who used zi you in a modern sense, see Jin Guantao and Liu Qingfeng, *Guannianshi yanjiu: Zhongguo xiandai zhongyao zhengzhi shuyude xingcheng* (Studies in the History of Ideas: The Formation of Important Modern Chinese Political Terms) (Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 2008), 611, 613.

³⁶⁵ Zhang, *Minzu fuxing*, 141.

³⁶⁶ Zhang Junmai, *Sue pinglun* [A Commentary on the Soviet Union] (Shanghai: Xinyue shudian, 1927), 51-52.

³⁶⁷ Two events made Japan the major destination of Chinese students at the turn of the twentieth century. One was the One Hundred Days Reform (1898). After the failure of the Reform, most Chinese intellectuals who were involved in this event fled to Japan. Liang Qichao, an apologist for constitutional monarchy, was a chief leader of the Reform. Sun Yat-sen, a revolutionary, was also in Japan then. In the meanwhile, it became a trend for Chinese students to study in Japan after the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895). Japan's defeating China was hardly expected in China. Carsun Chang went to Japan in 1906, studying politics, law, and economics at Waseda University. It was during his study in Japan that he met Liang Qichao. The other event was America's return to China of the excess of the Boxer Indemnity. With the return of the indemnity, Chinese government was able to send more and more Chinese to Japan, Europe, and America for study.

³⁶⁸ As translators and educators, they made Western concepts of liberty and individualism popular in Meiji Japan. Nakamura Masanao translated Mill's *On Liberty* into Japanese. Fukuzawa Yukichi is regarded by the mainstream as the leading figure of the "Japanese Enlightenment" (Meiji Enlightenment).

³⁶⁹ Qin Hui (秦晖), "Liangci qimeng de qiehuan yu riben shi ziyoushuizhi de yingxiang," [Switch of Enlightenment Before One Hundred Days of Reform and After the 1911 Revolution and the Impact of Japanese Liberalism on Chinese Intellectuals] *Twenty First Century*, no. 151 (October 2015):32-40, accessed 20 April 2018, <http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/ics/21c/cn/issues/c151.html>.

³⁷⁰ Ibid.

³⁷¹ Ibid, 39-40. By 1901 there were in total 200 Chinese children and students living or studying in America and Europe; by 1905 the number of Chinese students in Japan reached 8600 and more than 2000 returned to China. See Qin Hui, "Liangci qimeng," 35. The New Culture Movement was an intellectual movement which attacked traditional Chinese culture (Confucianism in particular) and disseminated values of democracy, science, liberty, and individualism.

conceptions of liberty and individualism were characterised by denunciation of Confucianism and patriarchy in the domain of family.³⁷² They opposed monarchy but they did not stress the idea of protecting individual rights by setting a limit to the power of the state. These arguments can be supported by the research of Jin Guantao (金观涛) and Liu Qingfeng (刘青峰) who have investigated the meanings of the Chinese word “quan li”权利 (rights) in the articles of the magazine *Xin qingnian* 新青年 (New Youth), the platform for the leaders of the New Culture Movement. By rights those Chinese intellectuals meant individual independence; however, it did not refer to the Western conception of negative freedom but a system of new ethics that was the antithesis of Confucian rites or codes of conduct.³⁷³

Though Chang studied in Japan in the early twentieth century, his knowledge of liberalism and individualism was not acquired from translations of Japanese intellectuals but the original English works of John Locke, John. S. Mill, John William Burgess, and Woodrow Wilson.³⁷⁴ This made his understandings of liberty and individualism different from those of the leaders of the New Culture Movement. Confucianism was not a target of Chang’s critique. He was more concerned about limited and accountable power, constitutionalism, and the protection of basic human rights. These Western ideas about freedom as political and civil rights (a negative conception), Chang found, were complementary to the Chinese (Confucian) conception of freedom that stressed spiritual freedom or self-autonomy in an ethical sense.

Liberty, Human Rights, and Constitutionalism

Chang attempted to crystallise concrete liberties into political institutions. Constitutionalism was the means to achieve this end. Thereby, freedom was translated into human rights which Chang thought constituted the foundation of constitutionalism.³⁷⁵ People had the right to disobey the state if it encroached upon these liberties arbitrarily.³⁷⁶ The provision of basic rights in the Constitution of the Republic of China drafted by Chang reflected Mill’s harm principle. All freedoms of the people that were not detrimental to public welfare would be

³⁷² Ibid, 39.

³⁷³ Jin and Liu, *Guannianshi yanjiu*, 133, 140.

³⁷⁴ Chang described his study in Japan. He became interested in British politics and German philosophy from then on. See Zhang Junmai, “Wo cong shehuikexue tiao dao zhexue zhi jingguo,” [How I Changed My Major from Social Sciences to Philosophy] *Zaisheng* 3, no.8 (15 October 1935): 1-2.

³⁷⁵ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 155-67. Some parts of Chang’s essay “Renquan wei xianzheng jiben,” [Human Rights as the Foundation of Constitutionalism] has been translated into English. See, Stephen C. Angle and Marina Svensson, *The Chinese Human Rights Reader: Documents and Commentary. 1900-2000* (New York: M. E. Sharpe, 2001), 197-201.

³⁷⁶ Ibid, 156-57.

protected and these freedoms would not be restricted by law except that restrictions were necessary to advance public welfare or to prevent infringement upon the liberty of others.³⁷⁷

Chang argued that basic human rights never stayed the same. They expanded as human society advanced.³⁷⁸ The fight for human rights had a long history in Europe and America. Significant written charters of human rights for him were Virginia's Declaration of Rights in 1774, the United States Declaration of Independence in 1776 and France's Declaration of Rights of Man and of the Citizen in 1789.³⁷⁹ In the times of the French Revolution and America's War of Independence, basic human rights generally referred to freedoms of life, property, speech, religion, and association. Then no stress was laid upon the right to work, the right to rest and leisure, and the right to economic justice. But nowadays in the twentieth century, it was generally accepted that these rights were included in the fundamental rights of citizens.³⁸⁰ Only by protecting these human rights could a government be secured and maintained.³⁸¹

On the other hand, Chang held that rights such as freedom of speech and freedom of association should be compatible with public interests, especially the interests of the nation-state.³⁸² When a country was invaded by another country, all parties and factions should stop arguing with each other and stay united to resist foreign aggression.³⁸³ As for the right to association, Chang cited relevant laws in Britain and America to illustrate that this right should be enjoyed as long as one did not break criminal laws or pose any threat to social order or security.³⁸⁴ Nevertheless, people should not abuse this right to cause political terror or instigate revolutions.³⁸⁵ Continuous violence after the French Revolution and the Bolshevik Revolution were cases in which this liberty was abused.³⁸⁶ The interests of workers, trade unions or labour parties must be protected, but these associations should not abuse liberty.³⁸⁷ Besides, freedoms of speech and press were not unlimited in Continental Europe, Britain, and America. There were relevant laws or bills dealing with the demarcation between

³⁷⁷ For these articles, see Chapter V.

³⁷⁸ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 157.

³⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 155.

³⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 157.

³⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 167.

³⁸² Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 98.

³⁸³ *Ibid.*

³⁸⁴ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 163, 393; Zhang Junmai, "Renquan wei xianzheng jiben," [Human Rights as the Foundation of Constitutionalism] *Zaisheng* 4, no.125 (10 August 1946): 8; Zhang Junmai "Renmin jiben quanli sanxiang zhi baozhang," [On the Protection of the Three Fundamental Human Rights of the People] *Zaisheng* 4, no.94 (30 April 1944):38-39.

³⁸⁵ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 150-51.

³⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

the abuse of liberty and legitimate freedoms of speech, press, and assembly and association.³⁸⁸

Chang's reputation as an advocate for the protection of human rights helped him become involved in some international conferences. He had emphasised the importance of the protection of human rights and watched closely the progress of the United Nations on the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* which was proclaimed and adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in December 1948.³⁸⁹ In 1945 Chang was appointed a member of the committee of the UN Charter and attended the United Nations Conference on International Organisation. As one of the representatives of China, Chang signed the UN Charter. In 1946 he attended the first United Nations General Assembly.³⁹⁰ During his stay in America, he was able to use the Library of Congress with the help of the American president Truman. There he investigated the Constitution of the United States and returned to China later at the request of the Chinese government which invited him to attend the Political Consultative Conference and to draw up the Constitution of the Republic of China.

Harmony between Individual Liberty and Collective Interests

In one lecture on the philosophy of the state, Chang discussed two interpretations of liberty. One school was characterised by the theory of the general will.³⁹¹ Rousseau and Hegel were leading thinkers of this theory.³⁹² To be free was to be the true self that could not exist without interactions with the social union. By remaining members of the union, the individual had to give up some liberties. In this sense, individual freedom was limited by the general will.³⁹³ By contrast, the other school tended to define liberty as being free from constraints; these thinkers assumed an antithesis between liberty and control.³⁹⁴

Instead of choosing one side, Chang tried to reconcile the two. Because there were social life and common property, there emerged communities and the state; the highest form of the social union expressed its spirit or will in ethics and laws.³⁹⁵ On the other hand, the progress of a society depended on the creativity of the individual; the state must protect the

³⁸⁸ Zhang, "Renmin jiben quanli sanxiang zhi baozhang," 39.

³⁸⁹ For reference, see Marina Svensson, *Debating Human Rights in China: A Conceptual and Political History* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002), 192-93, 201.

³⁹⁰ Chang himself also described this. See Chang, *The Third Force in China*, 25.

³⁹¹ Zhang, "Wei wan zhi guojia zhexue chugao (san)," 13.

³⁹² Ibid.

³⁹³ Ibid.

³⁹⁴ Ibid.

³⁹⁵ Ibid, 15.

individual's freedom of thought and expression.³⁹⁶ It was possible to synthesise individual liberty and the common good. Individuals could not isolate themselves from the collective but the driving force of the progress of a country was derived from the development of the individual.³⁹⁷ All in all, Chang's idea of liberty was not one-sided individualism. Nor did he put the collective above the individual. He sought to reconcile the individual with the collective.

3.5 Sources of the Development of New Liberalism

Hobhouse and Chang developed similar political thinking in response to the concrete problems of their societies. There were at least two factors that contributed to the making of their political thinking. Common theoretical sources had an impact on both. Two perceptible theoretical sources were liberalism of Mill and German idealism (Kant and Hegel). A second factor pertained to their contextual problems—capitalism and state-building.

The contextual problems made them inject into their societies some particular concepts which were not well developed in their political traditions. Hobhouse found that the British tradition was lacking in a theory of social freedom and the common good which treated freedom as a moral concept. This ethical understanding of freedom and its relationship to the state was the very thing that Britain needed to deal with capitalism. The concepts of social freedom and the common good, Hobhouse found, were complementary to the tradition of liberty which stressed individual liberty. Accordingly, Hobhouse further developed Green's idealism whose origin was German idealism such as the philosophy of Kant and Hegel.³⁹⁸

In contrast to the British thinker, Chang found that China was lacking in theories of the state and freedom as a political concept. Chang held that to build a modern state, China must disseminate these ideas. As for an understanding of freedom as a moral concept (a positive conception like spiritual freedom), Chang thought that it was already well developed in Chinese thought like Confucianism. In the 1950s Chang further developed Confucianism, attempting to construct an indigenous cultural foundation of democratic politics for China.³⁹⁹

³⁹⁶ Ibid.

³⁹⁷ Zhang, *Mingri zhi zhongguo wenhua*, 130; *Liguo zhi dao*, 98.

³⁹⁸ For Green's important works on politics and ethics, see Thomas H. Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, ed. A. C. Bradley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899); Thomas H. Green, *Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation* (London: Longmans, 1924).

³⁹⁹ See Chang, *The Development of Neo-Confucian Thought* (New York: Bookman Associates, 1957). In 1958 Chang and another three Chinese scholars on Confucianism co-authored and published a manifesto entitled "*Wei zhongguo wenhua jingao shijie renshi xuanyan*" (Manifesto for the Reappraisal of Chinese Culture: Our Joint Understanding of Sinological Study and Chinese Culture with Respect to the Future Prospects of World Culture). For the Chinese text, see <http://blog.renren.com/share/337500538/15707008691/1>.

Hence, when Chang discussed the theory of freedom, he paid more attention to the other aspect of freedom—freedom as political and civil rights. Accordingly, a large number of Chang’s writings before 1949 focused on the state, constitution law, and human rights. Chang combined the Chinese tradition, German idealism, and the British tradition, developing them into a variant of liberalism which he believed would enable China to build a modern state in the first half of the twentieth century.

3.5.1 Theoretical Sources: Liberalism of Mill and German Idealism

With reference to the common theoretical sources, both absorbed Mill’s liberalism and German idealism. Chang and Hobhouse inherited the liberal tradition established by Mill. When defending individuality and freedom of expression and thought, Chang invoked Mill’s arguments. On the relationship between the individual and society, Chang quoted Mill’s discussion of social tyranny to argue against the tyranny of the majority. His remarks on the balanced relationship between authority and liberty, his preference for representative democracy, and provisions of the basic rights in the Constitution of the Republic of China were reminiscent of Mill’s teachings of liberty and representative government.⁴⁰⁰

Chang’s British counterpart Hobhouse stated categorically that the “teaching of Mill brings us close to the heart of Liberalism.”⁴⁰¹ From Mill Hobhouse and his contemporaries absorbed the idea that liberty was no mere formula of law, or of the restriction of law; liberty did not rest on the self-assertion of the individual; personal opinions and morality were not socially indifferent.⁴⁰² Hobhouse’s conceptions of control, social freedom, and rights of the community were connected to Mill’s theory of social rights which led him to put as much emphasis on personal freedom as on mutual aid (collective action).⁴⁰³ In Hobhouse’s opinion, to acknowledge the two aspects of social life was to conceive an organic conception of the relation between the individual and society.⁴⁰⁴

Compared with earlier liberals, a significant contribution that Mill made was to draw people’s attention to social rights and the social aspect of liberty without overlooking individuality and personal freedom. Liberty was not unlimited. Harmony between individual

⁴⁰⁰ As for Chang’s preference for representative democracy, it is discussed in Chapter V. I also directed readers’ attention to Chang’s first publication which dealt with Mill’s theory of representative government. The remarks about liberty, individualism, and social tyranny quoted by Chang were all from Mill’s *On Liberty*. For Mill’s discussions of the struggle between liberty and authority and of social tyranny, see John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty* (Kitchener: Batoche Books, 2001), 6-9.

⁴⁰¹ Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, 116.

⁴⁰² Ibid, 116, 120.

⁴⁰³ Ibid, 124. For Mill’s conceptions of restraint and public control, see Mill, *On Liberty*, 86-87.

⁴⁰⁴ Ibid, 125.

liberty and public interests was obtainable. This was the political philosophy that Hobhouse and Chang attempted to convince their countrymen of. Liberty must be protected but if the individual's personal conduct affected the interests of others or the public, it was a social act. Then there was a rightful limit to the sovereignty of the individual. The limit might be legal or social. This kind of liberal thinking made Hobhouse and Chang sympathise with certain forms of socialism that were compatible with political liberalism.⁴⁰⁵

As for the influence of German idealism, its major contribution to the development of the political thinking of Chang and Hobhouse consisted in its emphasis on ethics, in its reviving a positive conception of liberty, a concept of the common good, and an organic conception of society and the state.⁴⁰⁶ It should be noticed that some of these idealist elements (the common good and a positive conception of liberty such as spiritual freedom) were not unique to the German tradition. In the political thought of Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun, this German tradition of idealism (Hegel and Kant in particular) was comparable to Confucian idealism that did attach value to spiritual freedom or self-autonomy. This spiritual freedom was associated with human reason, harmony, and the good of the whole. But it was true that one German element of idealism was missing in Chinese thought—a Hegelian conception of the state.

In contrast, Hobhouse only discussed the flaws of Hegelianism. Nevertheless, he did appreciate Green's organic theory of society and his views on the principle of the common good.⁴⁰⁷ As Rodney Barker says, Hobhouse drew specifically on Green for his discussion of rights and positive liberty.⁴⁰⁸ Barker also argues that Hobhouse's own works reflected "the influence of the idealist tradition far more than it indicated dissent from it..."⁴⁰⁹ Green was the pioneer of British idealism which was influenced by Kant and Hegel. Hobhouse downplayed this point and the influence of German idealism on his political thought. However, Chang regarded Hegel, Green, and Bosanquet as idealists who developed and advanced the idealism of Plato and Aristotle.⁴¹⁰ Although Hobhouse was critical of German idealism, especially Hegelianism, his political thought was influenced by Green who absorbed elements of German idealism into his political and moral philosophy.

⁴⁰⁵ Chapter IV examines socialism from the perspectives of Hobhouse and Chang. For Mill's discussion of socialism, see John S. Mill, *The Collected Works of John Stuart Mill, Volume V—Essays on Economics and Society Part II (Chapters on Socialism)* [1850] (Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 2006), 705-55.

⁴⁰⁶ For the organic conceptions of society understood by Chang and Hobhouse, see chapter IV.

⁴⁰⁷ Hobhouse, *Metaphysical Theory of the State*, 96, 118-33.

⁴⁰⁸ Rodney Barker, *Political Ideas in Modern Britain: In and After the Twentieth Century*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 1997), 26.

⁴⁰⁹ Ibid.

⁴¹⁰ Zhang, "Wei wan zhi guojia zhaxue chugao (er)," 7.

3.5.2 Contextual Problems: Capitalism and State-Building

Both Hobhouse and Chang were influenced by Mill and German idealism, but it was the specific contextual problems that made them modify the different traditions of liberty in their cultures and develop a variant of liberalism. They found German idealism and some socialistic elements appealing because they believed that these ideas could deal with capitalism and state-building in their countries.

Social injustice caused by capitalism was the major issue that Hobhouse attempted to rid Britain of. Hobhouse acknowledged the liberal foundation on which the British society developed. Yet, he argued that it was imperfect and reforms must be carried out to cope with the labour problem. To ensure economic and social justice, the distribution of wealth must be fair. The solution he proposed was to distinguish private property from common property, to regulate private wealth, and to make laws protecting the rights of the working class. Therefore, Hobhouse modified classical liberalism by absorbing some conceptions which were not salient in classical liberalism. These conceptions were common property, economic sovereignty, nationalisation, social freedom, the common good, and an organic theory of society. The synthesis of liberalism, some socialistic ideas, and German idealism produced his theory of New Liberalism.

For Chang, China must not follow capitalism despite the fact that it was not as harmful in China as it was in the West. More importantly, China had to find a path to state-building. The solution Chang put forward was a synthesis of democratic politics (constitutionalism, a responsible cabinet, and the protection of basic liberties), a mixed economy (state socialism), and idealism. Democratic politics, Chang maintained, was indispensable to the establishment of a modern state. Issues of poverty and capitalism made Chang develop a theory of a mixed economy combining capitalism and socialism without destroying private property. As the conception of the state was missing in traditional Chinese thought and politics, Chang introduced some elements of Hegelianism to China in the hope of helping China develop a consciousness of the state. As a result, the combination of democratic politics, a mixed economy, German idealism, and the Confucian conception of freedom (as an indigenous cultural foundation) created a system of liberalism that paralleled Hobhouse's New Liberalism.

Capitalism was the major stimulus for Hobhouse's development of the new economic thinking. Although Hobhouse did not arrive at a theory of a mixed economy in the same way

as Chang did, he thought out a similar solution to the problem of economic and social injustice in Britain. The necessity for public ownership, a control of private property, and the protection of private property led to a mixture of capitalism and socialism.

Chang advocated a mixed economy on account of two reasons. First, to develop the national economy some capitalist elements (private property and enterprises) should be allowed. China's economy was vastly different from that of capitalist countries. It was backward. There were no advanced industries or trade unions. The majority of Chinese were not workers but peasants. Poverty was a stark reality. To abolish private property and sectors would discourage individuals to create wealth that was detrimental to the entire national economy. The legitimate rights of the capitalists should be protected.

Second, to adopt a pure capitalist system would create social problems that Western countries faced and therefore an alternative system as a remedy must be established. Chang found that a socialistic economy was such a remedy. He observed that the Soviet Union was experimenting with a new economic system and that considerable achievements were made in the Soviet Union from the 1920s. Chang based this finding on a comparative study of the industrial development of Britain, Germany, France, and the Soviet Union.⁴¹¹ Britain and Germany completed industrialisation under capitalist systems but the Soviet Union developed its industries under the new economic system which had salient socialist characteristics.⁴¹² The statistics showed that it took Germany less time to become industrialised though the Industrial Revolution first began in Britain; it took the Soviet Union even far less time than Germany to materialise industrialisation.⁴¹³ All of them finally became industrialised but the means and policies were different.⁴¹⁴ Chang held that considering the conditions of China in the twentieth century it was necessary to find a means that could help China develop the economy rapidly.⁴¹⁵ A socialistic economy could serve this purpose. China could refer to the economic policies adopted by the Soviet Union and the SPD during the years of the Weimar Republic. In Chang's view, socialism emphasised not only equitable distribution but also, and more important in the Chinese case, creation of wealth. Chang was convinced that socialism promoted industrialism and increased production because it set great store by cooperation and harmony between labour and capital, which was what China needed.

⁴¹¹ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 167-71.

⁴¹² Ibid, 170-71.

⁴¹³ Ibid.

⁴¹⁴ Ibid.

⁴¹⁵ Ibid, 171.

He concluded that capitalism and socialism were not necessarily antithetical.⁴¹⁶ “Concerning China’s national construction in the future, we cannot model after Britain and adopt the laissez faire system whose national economy relies only on private enterprises; neither can we embrace communism, destroy all private sectors, and substitute them with sole state-owned enterprises by waging a class war.”⁴¹⁷ This was how Chang arrived at a theory of a mixed economy for the economic construction of China. The term he used to describe this theory was “state socialism”.⁴¹⁸ His theory would be misunderstood if we refer to conventional political discourse.

Chapter Summary

This chapter compared Hobhouse and Carsun Chang so as to understand the distinctive character of Chang’s liberal thought. I analysed how they perceived the state and liberty and what made them reformulate the liberal principles with a view to the particular conditions of their societies. Chang developed a Chinese form of liberalism that resembled Hobhouse’s liberal thought as regards an active state and equal emphasis on individual liberty and the common good. Both aimed at social justice. On the other hand, this form of Chinese liberalism was distinctive in two respects. First, Chang developed it in response to China’s specific issues such as Japanese aggression, poverty, civil wars between warlords or between the CCP and the KMT, and authoritarianism under the rule of the KMT. These Chinese conditions were different from British conditions in which Hobhouse sought to deal with capitalism and the labour problem. Second, though Mill and German idealism were common intellectual influences, the idealist flavour in Chang’s political thought was not entirely identical with the idealism in Hobhouse’s new liberalism. In spite of some common elements of German idealism (subordination of politics to ethics, an organic conception of the state and society, and a positive conception of freedom), Chang’s liberal thought distinguished itself from Hobhouse’s liberalism by a Hegelian conception of the state (the importance of the consciousness of the state and the significant role of the state in nation-building and national independence).⁴¹⁹ This element of Hegelianism was not characteristic of Hobhouse’s thought. It reflected the different contexts in Britain and in China. Chang attempted to build a modern state in China. He found that the conception of the state which helped state-building was

⁴¹⁶ Ibid.

⁴¹⁷ Ibid, 171-72.

⁴¹⁸ Ibid, 171. State socialism was part of the theory of “modified democratic politics” proposed by Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun in 1932. I explain “modified democratic politics” in Chapter IV. See the section 4.3.2.

⁴¹⁹ As I have said some of the elements of idealism (spiritual freedom, a conception of freedom associated with reason and the common good) were also elements of Confucianism that was understood by Chang and Zhang.

absent from Chinese thought. Therefore, he added the Hegelian conception of the state to Chinese thought. This accounted for a flavour of nationalism in the liberal thought of Carsun Chang.

Chapter IV: Hobhouse and Chang on Socialism

4.1 Socialism and New Liberalism

This chapter is an analysis of socialism from the perspectives of Hobhouse and Chang. It is a further illustration of the preceding chapter which argued that Carsun Chang developed a system of political thinking similar to the new liberalism of Hobhouse with a view to the state-building of China. As has been said, the new liberalism had an overlap with social democracy. The political thought of Hobhouse and Chang was a good case in point. They had a liberal perspective on socialism. Both distanced themselves from Marxian socialism because they rejected a mechanical view of history and society which dismissed ethics and liberal values. However, they advocated some form of socialism—liberal socialism or democratic socialism that combined harmonious elements of liberalism and socialism.

In spite of an overlap between “liberal socialism” and “democratic socialism” regarding their economic thinking, a few differences between them were discernible. These differences reflected the different contextual problems and different political traditions in their countries. Hobhouse’s liberal socialism was a critique of capitalism based on the one-sided individualism in Britain. Chang’s democratic socialism was a critique of Chinese society and European societies as well. Western European countries ignored the interests of the working class while China and the Soviet Union had no political democracy, showing contempt for individual liberty and human rights. Because the economic factor was a major cause of the social ills in Britain, Hobhouse put forward the conception of “economic liberalism” which was the key substance of his liberal socialism.

Chang’s concern was different from that of Hobhouse. In his theory of democratic socialism, political democracy was indispensable and far more important than economic democracy given that economic inequality was not a stark reality in China. Chang held that China’s economic problem was more a matter of production than a matter of distribution because China was so poor. The KMT’s political tutelage and the civil wars between the KMT and the CCP as Chang saw were the obstacles to a modern Chinese democracy. These contextual problems made Chang stress political democracy to which Chinese thought and Chinese political traditions did not attach so much importance. As for the socialistic ideas of a fair distribution of wealth and the good of the whole, ancient Chinese thought did contain

these elements. For instance, Confucianism and Mohism emphasised the common good and the importance of a fair distribution of wealth in a country. Chang knew these thoughts very well. In Chang's opinion, democratic politics rather than a moral theory of distributive justice was the major deficiency of Chinese thought and political traditions. Notwithstanding these differences, Hobhouse and Chang wanted to deal with the tension between individualism and collectivism. Both found that a theory of an organic society was a proper solution to this problem. They finally converged on a theory of harmony between the individual and the collective, seeking to modify the one-sided socialism and individualism. This attempt on the part of Hobhouse and Chang helped them develop distinctive theories of liberal socialism and democratic socialism that were neither Marxian socialism nor social democracy. Rather their proposals of liberal and democratic socialisms might be best described as the new liberalism.

This chapter begins with Hobhouse's views on three forms of socialism: mechanical socialism, official socialism, and liberal socialism. It then examines Chang's discussions of pre-Marx socialism, Marxism, Marxism-Leninism, European social democracy, socialism as an economic system, and his own theory of democratic socialism as a proposal for the state-building of China. The next section analyses how both Hobhouse and Chang used theories of an organic society (German idealism) to deal with the tension between the individual and the collective and therefore developed their theories of "liberal socialism" and "democratic socialism". Both of them recognised the merit of some socialist ideas which they thought were complementary to individual liberty. The comparison shows that democratic politics was indispensable to Chang's theory of democratic socialism and that economic justice constituted the core of Hobhouse's liberal socialism. Although both embraced an organic conception of society, the way they developed German idealism was different. Chang incorporated German idealism to counterbalance the influence of Marxism in China. Hobhouse advanced the idealism of Green because he thought it was a remedy for capitalism. This comparison between Hobhouse and Chang enables us to have a new understanding of Chang's complicated relationship to broader trends in socialist thought and therefore the inadequacy of any simple depiction of Chang as a representative of social democracy.

4.2 Hobhouse's Discourse on Socialism

Hobhouse was conscious of various forms of socialism. He distinguished at least three forms of socialism: Mechanical Socialism, Official Socialism, and Liberal Socialism. He attacked the former two variants which from his viewpoint had nothing to do with democracy and

liberty.⁴²⁰ Because “Liberal Socialism” then was yet to be coined and developed, Hobhouse’s comments were moderate. “If, then, there be such a thing as a Liberal Socialism—and whether there be is still a subject for inquiry—it must clearly fulfil two conditions.”⁴²¹ The two conditions were the principles of democracy and individual liberty.

Hobhouse’s views on socialism were related to the social and economic problems of Britain. From the late 1860s to the late 1890s the British government featured a Gladstonian era of liberalism. William Ewart Gladstone (1809-1898), a member of the Liberal Party, served as prime minister four times during these thirty years. However, his financial and economic policies based on laissez faire liberalism could not respond effectively to the needs of the changing British society in the late 1890s. The increase of the urban proletariat and the extension of the parliamentary franchise to male workers required that a political party represented their interests. It was against this background that the Labour Movement took place. Hobhouse was for the movement and called for economic and social reforms. His book *The Labour Movement* was first published in 1893 with a preface by the Scottish politician Richard Burdon Haldane (1856-1928).⁴²² By labour movements, Hobhouse referred to trade unionism, cooperation, and state and municipal socialism in Britain from the late 1890s.⁴²³ In this book, he justified active state intervention in the distribution of wealth for the sake of the common good or the welfare of the masses. State intervention was seen by Hobhouse as a remedy for Britain’s economic injustice and social misery. These “socialistic” ideas could be traced back to his study at Oxford. Then, he was regarded by the majority at Oxford as a radical and collectivist.⁴²⁴ The member of the Fabian Society George D. H. Cole (1889-1959) later discovered that Hobhouse was “the recognised head of university socialism”.⁴²⁵ Hobhouse would disapprove of Cole’s description of him because he was critical of the Fabian Society. In the early 1910s, he commented on Fabianism (Official Socialism) which in his opinion showed no moral force and no faith in the capacity of the average human beings.⁴²⁶

⁴²⁰ Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, 71.

⁴²¹ Ibid, 74.

⁴²² See Hobhouse, *The Labour Movement*.

⁴²³ Ibid, 5.

⁴²⁴ Stefan Collini, *Liberalism and Sociology: L. T. Hobhouse and Political Argument in England 1880-1914* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 56-74.

⁴²⁵ Ibid, 59.

⁴²⁶ Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, 72-73.

4.2.1 Mechanical Socialism and Official Socialism

Mechanical Socialism referred to Marxism and Marxian socialism though Hobhouse did not use these terms. He argued for the falsehood of Mechanical Socialism regarding its view of history, its economic analysis, and its political analysis. According to Hobhouse, Mechanical Socialism had a mechanical conception of history and society. “It attributes the phenomena of social life and development to the sole operation of the economic factor, whereas the beginning of sound sociology is to conceive society as a whole in which all the parts interact.”⁴²⁷ Hobhouse advocated an organic conception of society which stressed interactions among all parts of the social life. Moreover, he claimed that the economic analysis of Mechanical Socialism was false in that value was reduced to a single factor—labour.⁴²⁸ It denied or distorted functions of the direction of enterprises, the necessary cost of the use of capital, the productivity of nature, and complex social forces which affected movements of demand and supply and the rates of exchange at which goods were traded. In addition to the economic analysis, Hobhouse argued against the political analysis of Mechanical Socialism which “supposes a class war, resting on a clear-cut distinction of classes which does not exist.”⁴²⁹ Contrary to the claim of Marx, Hobhouse maintained that modern society featured a more and more complex interweaving of interactions.⁴³⁰

Hobhouse’s explanation of Official Socialism was more abstract. Official Socialism began with contempt for ideals of liberty, confusing liberty and competition; it further showed “contempt for average humanity in general”.⁴³¹ “Socialism so conceived has in essentials nothing to do with democracy or with liberty. It is a scheme of the organisation of life by the superior person, who will decide for each man how he should work, how he should live, and indeed, with the aid of the Eugenics, whether he should live at all or whether he has any business to be born.”⁴³² Hobhouse did not mention any particular person or the Fabian Society. Neither did he expand these points or explain them in detail. However, it was generally agreed by scholars that the target was British Fabianism including the eugenics advocated by members of the Fabian Society such as H. G. Wells.⁴³³ It was official “not in

⁴²⁷ Ibid, 74.

⁴²⁸ Ibid, 72.

⁴²⁹ Ibid.

⁴³⁰ Ibid.

⁴³¹ Ibid.

⁴³² Ibid, 73.

⁴³³ See Barker, *Political Ideas in Modern Britain*, 28-30; Collini, *Liberalism and Sociology*, 73-74; Peter Clark, *Liberals and Social Democrats* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 65-66.

the sense of being orthodox, but in the sense of being run by officials.”⁴³⁴ Hobhouse was critical of Fabianism mainly because it was based on a mechanical view of human life and society which dismissed morality and values of the older liberalism. He was a moral reformist.⁴³⁵ Both Peter Clarke and Stefan Collini agree that in the opinion of Hobhouse the British Fabians had to learn that they needed to incorporate into their political beliefs elements of value represented by the older liberalism.⁴³⁶

4.2.2 Liberal Socialism

Although Hobhouse opposed Mechanical Socialism and Official Socialism, he thought that liberal socialism would be acceptable. This liberal socialism in essence was his attempt at solving the tension between individualism and collectivism. He contended that liberal socialism must fulfil two conditions.⁴³⁷

In the first place, it must be democratic. It must come from below, not from above. Or rather, it must emerge from the efforts of society as a whole to secure a fuller measure of justice, and a better organisation of mutual aid. It must engage the efforts and respond to the genuine desires not of a handful of superior beings, but of great masses of men. And, secondly, and for that very reason, it must make its account with the human individual. It must give the average man free play in the personal life for which he really cares. It must be founded on liberty, and must make not for the suppression but for the development of personality.⁴³⁸

Hobhouse intended to reconcile liberalism with socialism. He observed the incorporation of some socialistic elements into the old liberalism represented by the Liberal such as William E. Gladstone in his late years, which replaced the antagonism between socialism and liberalism in the earlier period of the nineteenth century.⁴³⁹ He argued that socialistic legislation to protect the interests of workers fulfilled two distinctive ideals of older liberalism—liberty and equality. It did not destroy them.⁴⁴⁰ Both the liberal and the socialist attacked a common problem of social justice that was necessary for progress.⁴⁴¹ But they

⁴³⁴ Barker, *Political Ideas in Modern Britain*, 30.

⁴³⁵ Clark, *Liberals and Social Democrats*, 65.

⁴³⁶ Clark, *Liberals and Social Democrats*, 65; Collini, *Liberalism and Sociology*, 73.

⁴³⁷ Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, 74.

⁴³⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴³⁹ Hobhouse, *Democracy and Reaction*, 214-24.

⁴⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 217.

⁴⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 225-26. The statement that Hobhouse quoted concerns Mill's call for justice, for uniting "the greatest individual liberty of action with a common ownership in the raw material of the globe, and an equal participation of all in the

criticised it from different perspectives.⁴⁴² The liberal reacted against repression by law, government or society and stood for “the unimpeded development of human faculty as the mainspring of progress”.⁴⁴³ In contrast, “The Socialist, or if the vaguer term be preferred, the Collectivist, is for the solidarity of society...His watchwords are cooperation and organisation.”⁴⁴⁴ Continuing on, Hobhouse argued that the two ideals of the socialist and the liberal “are not conflicting, but complementary.”⁴⁴⁵ Based on an examination of the Programme adopted in 1891 by the German Social Democrats and the socialistic practice that was underway in Britain, Hobhouse ventured to conclude that “the differences between a true, consistent, public-spirited Liberalism and a rational Collectivism ought, with a genuine effort at mutual understanding, to disappear.”⁴⁴⁶

Hobhouse’s support for some socialistic practices was an attempt at modifying the established liberal tradition in Britain that emphasised individualism but neglected the interests of the community. This attempt was reflected in Hobhouse’s conception of economic liberalism that was a modification of both classical liberalism (individualism) and traditional socialism (collectivism) on the basis of four main points.

First, for Hobhouse the fundamental problem in economics was not to destroy property, but to restore a social conception of property. “It is to be done by distinguishing the social from the individual factors in wealth, by bringing the elements of social wealth into the public coffers, and by holding it at the disposal of society to administer to the prime needs of its members.”⁴⁴⁷

Second, the individual element in production should be acknowledged. Personal effort should be stimulated as a necessity for a good economy.⁴⁴⁸

Third, he advocated the principle of economic justice “to render what is due not only to each individual but to each function, social or personal, that is engaged in the performance of useful service, and this due is measured by the amount necessary to stimulate and maintain

benefits of combined labour”. See John Stuart Mill, *Autobiography* (London: Longmans, Green, Reader & Dyer, 1874), 231-32.

⁴⁴² Hobhouse, *Democracy and Reaction*, 226.

⁴⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 226-27.

⁴⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 227.

⁴⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 237.

⁴⁴⁷ Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, 81.

⁴⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 82.

the efficient exercise of that useful function.”⁴⁴⁹ Hobhouse held that this was the true meaning of economic equality.

Forth, Hobhouse supported the principle of economic sovereignty whereby the state “is vested with a certain over-lordship over property in general and a supervisory power over industry in general”.⁴⁵⁰ It implied state control of economic activities.⁴⁵¹

Hobhouse admitted that these points embodied many of the ideas that made up the framework of socialistic teaching.⁴⁵² At the same time, he also mentioned one difference between his economic thinking and traditional socialism. His theory of economic liberalism also stressed “elements of individual rights and personal independence, of which Socialism at times appears oblivious”.⁴⁵³ The difference from individualism and socialism he claimed was that economic liberalism “seeks to do justice to the social and individual factors in industry alike, as opposed to an abstract Socialism which emphasises the one side and an abstract Individualism which leans its whole weight on the other.”⁴⁵⁴

4.3 Chang’s Discourse on Socialism

Much like Hobhouse, the Chinese thinker Carsun Chang developed a similar and distinctive theory of socialism—democratic socialism. Chang never defined socialism because he was aware of a variety of socialisms. The socialisms he discussed in his writings included pre-Marx socialism, Marxism, Marxism-Leninism (Russian Communism), European social democracy, and socialism as an alternative to a capitalist economic system.⁴⁵⁵ Chang strongly opposed Marxism and Russian Communism whereas he approved of the socialistic ideal embodied in pre-Marx socialism, social democracy, and a socialist economic system. For instance, he spoke favourably of the British Labour Party. Chang claimed if China was to practise socialism, it must be democratic socialism. This democratic socialism had an overlap with Hobhouse’s liberal socialism in terms of its economic thinking, but it was not entirely the same. Hobhouse’s liberal socialism was a moral theory of distributive justice that tried to address social injustice from an economic perspective. Chang’s democratic socialism placed a priority on political democracy given that injustice in China was more political than economic.

⁴⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁵⁰ Ibid, 90.

⁴⁵¹ Ibid.

⁴⁵² Ibid.

⁴⁵³ Ibid.

⁴⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵⁵ See Zhang, *Shehuizhuyi sixiang yundong gaiguan*, 39-41.

4.3.1 Marxian Socialism and Social Democracy

In the 1910s socialist currents appealed to a number of Chinese students and public intellectuals who converted to Marxism. Chang resisted this trend because he feared that Marxian socialism, especially Russian Communism, would have a negative influence on China. From then on, there were continuous debates between Chang and Chinese disciples of Marxian socialism.

To rebut Marxism and Russian Communism, Chang distinguished “socialism” from “Marxism”.⁴⁵⁶ Chang thought that pre-Marx socialism and social democracy were different from Marxism and Marxism-Leninism. Socialist theory traced back to thinkers such as Henri de Saint-Simon, Charles Fourier, and Robert Owen who castigated private ownership and disseminated the idea of equality.⁴⁵⁷ The direct stimulus for socialist movements was laissez faire economics that prevailed in the epoch of the Industrial Revolution.⁴⁵⁸ Chang held that this current of pre-Marx socialism correlated with religious creeds and ethics.⁴⁵⁹ With reference to the socialism in Germany and Britain, Chang associated it with two positive changes in the conception of socialism that were especially conspicuous during and after WWII. One was that human beings were not a means to an end but an end in themselves. Liberty, equality, justice, and mutual aid thus became widely accepted notions within socialism. The other change was the emergence of the view that political democracy was a distinctive characteristic of this form of socialism.⁴⁶⁰

Supporting these developments in social theory, Chang argued against Marx’s tenets of class struggle, dialectical materialism, his concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the theory of “withering away of the state”. Predictions made by Marx and Lenin were imaginary and their ideal was a Utopia.⁴⁶¹ In Chang’s opinion, Russia’s practice of the proletarian dictatorship that emerged from the teachings of Marx was the opposite of Anglo-American democracy because it infringed upon the political and civil rights of the individual.⁴⁶² The theory of a conflict between workers and capitalists resulted in the antagonism of workers who might oppress anyone in the name of the majority. Borrowing a term from John S. Mill, Chang argued that to decide whether one was entitled to some human

⁴⁵⁶ Ibid, 39.

⁴⁵⁷ Ibid, 44.

⁴⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁵⁹ Ibid, 23.

⁴⁶⁰ Ibid, 33.

⁴⁶¹ Ibid, 37.

⁴⁶² Ibid, 34.

rights based on one's social class amounted to social tyranny.⁴⁶³ Another Marxist theory that Chang criticised was the "withering away of the state". Armies, police, and all government functionaries were what a state needed but they were not the state itself.⁴⁶⁴ There were Hegelian reasons for not abolishing the state. The state had ethical foundations. People, territory, politics, society, language, customs and characters were elements of a state; even after a social revolution these elements could not be abolished.⁴⁶⁵

In addition, Chang analysed Marx's dialectical materialism, concluding that it was false.⁴⁶⁶ His targets were economic determinism and historical materialism as a social theory. From his viewpoint, economy, politics, and law were all indispensable constituents of a society. Marx isolated the economic system from the mental aspect of humanity. Not only did the economic system constrain the human mind but also it determined politics, ethics, law, and ideologies.⁴⁶⁷ Marx thought that in capitalist countries a revolution was a necessary result of the contradiction between the forces of production and relations of production.⁴⁶⁸ To make progress, the economic relations between the working class and the capitalists must be changed. However, Chang argued that there were various causes of a social contradiction and that the economic factor could not explain all conflicts.⁴⁶⁹

Chang claimed that the root cause of Marx's errors was that Marx did not acknowledge that the human spirit played a role in social phenomena and that there was an interaction between the physical world and the human mind.⁴⁷⁰ This perspective on Marx's theory of materialism was related to Chang's beliefs in German idealism, especially organic theories of the state and society.

4.3.2 Democratic Socialism

Democratic socialism was first proposed by Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun in the 1930s. The 1930s was an era of Japan's military aggression in East Asia. China was a major target. The KMT became the ruling party in 1928 and imposed a period of political tutelage on China. Not only did the government need to deal with the Soviet Republic established by the Chinese Communists but also it had to respond to the aggressive behaviour of Japan.

⁴⁶³ Ibid, 18-19.

⁴⁶⁴ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 57-58.

⁴⁶⁵ Ibid, 381-84,

⁴⁶⁶ Ibid, 375.

⁴⁶⁷ Ibid, 374.

⁴⁶⁸ Ibid, 102.

⁴⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁷⁰ Ibid, 377.

Meanwhile, the West was trying to recover from the economic crisis. Another phenomenon that attracted the attention of Chinese intellectuals was the emergence of dictatorships in Europe. From the viewpoint of Chang and Zhang the Soviet Union, Italy, and Germany represented different forms of dictatorships. In the meanwhile, a number of Chinese intellectuals and the KMT held that dictatorships and authoritarian regimes could deal with national affairs more efficiently and effectively during a state of emergency such as the war against Japan.⁴⁷¹ Accordingly, those people suggested that an authoritarian regime should be established in China. Chang and Zhang disapproved of this current and attacked the Kuomintang's theory of political tutelage. They agreed that democracies had low efficiency and low effectiveness when the life of a nation was threatened by war, invasion or disorder.⁴⁷² But this should not be an excuse for the establishment of a dictatorship. To improve efficiency and effectiveness, they referred to the governments of Britain and France in times of war and adapted these democracies to Chinese conditions of the 1930s (Japanese invasion, political tutelage, state-building) in order to establish a Chinese democracy. They supported the creation of a unified and centralised government but one that would be subject to the spirit of democracy. They called the solution they put forward “minzhu shehuizhuyi” 民主社会主义 (democratic socialism) or “xiuzheng de minzhu zhengzhi” 修正的民主政治 (modified democratic politics). This theory was also the political platform of their party—the National Socialist Party which was renamed as the China Democratic Socialist Party in 1946. The general principles of modified democratic politics were as follows:

1. By relying on the state strength the Chinese people develop a national consciousness. Social organisations coordinate with each other. Individuals enjoy freedom of development. As for international relations, we seek to participate in international affairs on an equal footing with other countries in the hope of permanent peace.
2. Our plan regarding political, economic, and educational construction is based on three principles: equality, individual liberty, and improvement of efficiency and effectiveness.
3. Democracy is the fundamental principle of the political system. We endeavour to establish a democratic system that suits Chinese conditions and to make this system as democratic as possible when conditions are met.
4. While dealing with national affairs we attach importance to efficiency and effectiveness. Centralisation is needed to achieve this aim. As regards the development of Chinese society and

⁴⁷¹ Prominent intellectuals who were for the establishment of an authoritarian Chinese regime included Jiang Tingfu (蒋廷黻), Ding Wenjiang (丁文江), and Qian Duansheng (钱端升).

⁴⁷² See Zhang Dongsun, *Zhongguo jindai sixiangjia wenku*, 267.

culture, we advocate decentralisation and openness so that freedom, diversity, and differences are respected.

5. A certain number of key posts in all political institutions are reserved for experts in order to counterbalance manipulations by any political party or faction.⁴⁷³

These five principles thus contained some core concepts of liberalism: liberty, individuality (freedom of personal development), limited and accountable power (democracy, decentralisation), and progress (improvement, efficiency, and effectiveness). But Chang and Zhang also laid equal emphasis on equality, a core concept of socialism.

To put it simply, democratic socialism was a synthesis of democratic politics and “state socialism” that was a type of a mixed economy as an alternative to capitalism. It incorporated some socialist practices into democratic politics and sought harmony between capitalism and socialism. These socialist practices included economic planning, nationalisation of some economic sectors, and the regulation of private property.

According to Chang and Zhang, economic planning played a key role in the economic system of state socialism. However, their proposal for state socialism was also different from the economic system of Russia (despite the fact that Chang and Zhang had a positive opinion of Lenin’s New Economic Policy and Stalin’s Five-Year-Plans). A distinction was made between private property and public property to advance both individual development and the national economy.⁴⁷⁴ Both public and private sectors were to be incorporated into a national plan. Private property was protected but it would be regulated by the state for the sake of economic justice or national defence. State control of private property, however, should follow the principle of justice. The state was supposed to use peaceful means to transfer or redistribute personal wealth. Chang and Zhang called this economic system state socialism. Chang himself also wrote several essays to explain this conception of state socialism.⁴⁷⁵

Thus, the theory of state socialism reflected some socialistic ideas: public property, the redistribution of wealth, and state control of economic activities. At the same time, it did not seek to abolish private ownership. This economic system was a modification of capitalism as well as Russian collectivism.

⁴⁷³ Jizhe, “Women suo yao shuo de hua,” 49-52. Chang and Zhang published this article in the name of Jizhe.

⁴⁷⁴ Zhang Dongsun, *Zhongguo jindai sixiangjia wenku*, 291.

⁴⁷⁵ See Zhang Junmai, “Guojia minzhu yu guojia shehuizhuyi (shang pian),” [National Democracy and State Socialism Part One] *Zaisheng* 1, no.2 (20 June 1932): 1-38; Zhang Junmai, “Guojia minzhu yu guojia shehuizhuyi (xia pian),” [National Democracy and State Socialism Part Two] *Zaisheng* 1, no.3 (20 July 1932): 1-40; Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 81-268.

In regard to the system of government, Chang and Zhang advocated for a modified form of Western democracy, based mainly on a parliamentary system. This showed their belief in liberty and limited and accountable power. They called for a unicameral parliament which would have the authority to make laws and pass a budget resolution. The cabinet would be made up of a committee elected by the parliament; the Head of the cabinet elected by the committee would act as the Head of the State.⁴⁷⁶ The judiciary was to be independent of the parliament and the cabinet; judges would have no party affiliation and they must be paid decently to ensure honesty.⁴⁷⁷ The presidential system of America was not considered because it was more likely to produce a power conflict between the legislature and the executive branch. To create an efficient government, they thought the legislature and the executive branch should be connected. Therefore, they mainly referred to the British political system with some modifications. For example, to avoid frequent changes of government, they suggested that a vote of no confidence and impeachment by the parliament could not be used when the country was in a state of emergency. This did not mean that the power of the executive branch was not limited. They argued that by separating the judiciary from the parliament and the cabinet it would be able to act as a check on executive power.⁴⁷⁸

Chang held that democratic politics was essential to democratic socialism as well as indispensable to a modern state. He maintained that to build a modern state, China must do three things. First, some basic liberties must be guaranteed. Academic freedom, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press were important for seeking truth. Second, the Chinese government should discard the tradition of obscurantism, replacing it with a policy of educating and enlightening the people. Third, a democratic political system would be established that would include a constitution, a legislative body, a voting system, and a judicial body.⁴⁷⁹

Chang's highlighting of political democracy in the first half of the twentieth century distinguished him from the social democratic parties of Europe, where theories on democracy and liberalism had already emerged long before. He thought it was the mission of the Chinese intelligentsia to explain and disseminate ideas of democracy, liberty, constitutionalism, and human rights because these ideas were not as well developed in Chinese thought. His theory of democratic socialism was an attempt to adapt Western ideas (liberalism and some socialist

⁴⁷⁶ Jizhe, "Women suo yao shuo de hua," 50-52.

⁴⁷⁷ Ibid, 51.

⁴⁷⁸ Zhang, *Zhongguo jindai sixiangjia wenku*, 271.

⁴⁷⁹ See Zhang Junmai, "Minzhushuheizhuyi zhi zhixue beijing er," [The Philosophical Background of Democratic Socialism Part Two] *Zaisheng* 4, no. 222 (4 July 1948), 3-5.

ideas of German social democrats and the British Labour Party) to the Chinese conditions of the 1930s.

4.4 Organic Society: Individualism and Collectivism

As was discussed, both Hobhouse and Chang laid equal emphasis on individual liberty and the good of the whole society. Their theories of liberal socialism and democratic socialism were significantly influenced by their social philosophy of an organic society. They used an organic conception of society to modify one-sided individualism and one-sided socialism and therefore to solve the tension between individualism and collectivism. Their theories of an organic society had similarities and differences that reflected the different ways they applied German idealism.

4.4.1 Hobhouse: An Organic Conception of Society

When referring to the relation of the individual to society, Hobhouse commented that an organic conception of the relation was the one “towards which Mill worked through his career”.⁴⁸⁰ In fact, Hobhouse espoused such a conception. According to Hobhouse, the term “organic” was applicable to the social life which was comparable to the life of an individual.⁴⁸¹ He stressed the interdependence between parts and whole and argued that we must not treat a single element as if it was isolated from the social structure as a whole; it had an effect on the whole; nor was it sensible to think that the whole was of value without its parts.⁴⁸²

Thus, Hobhouse noted:

For an organism is a whole consisting of interdependent parts. Each part lives and functions and grows by subserving the life of the whole. It sustains the rest and is sustained by them, and through their mutual support comes a common development. And this is how we would conceive the life of man in society in so far as it is harmonious.⁴⁸³

This then justified Hobhouse’s organic conception of society.

⁴⁸⁰ Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, 54.

⁴⁸¹ Hobhouse, *Social Evolution and Political Theory*, 87.

⁴⁸² Hobhouse, *The Rational Good*, 136.

⁴⁸³ Ibid.

A thing is called organic when it is made up of parts which are quite distinct from one another, but which are destroyed or vitally altered when they are removed from the whole...Now, the organic view of society is equally simple. It means that, while the life of society is nothing but the life of individuals as they act one upon another, the life of the individual in turn would be something utterly different if he could be separated from society. A great deal of him would not exist at all.⁴⁸⁴

Based on his organic conception of the relation between the individual and society, Hobhouse argued that liberty was limited by the equal rights of others or the rights of a community.⁴⁸⁵ The community and any constituent element essential to the life of the community—such as a family, a municipality, a company, and a trade union—could have just claims upon its members.⁴⁸⁶ Hobhouse used “community” in a broad sense to distinguish an individual and a communal principle which was imperfectly represented by organised bodies—states, churches, and associations in all kinds.⁴⁸⁷ He held that collective action was no less fundamental than personal freedom and that in the field of social life all elements were closely interwoven.⁴⁸⁸ Because Hobhouse recognised the community, he did not favour the one-sided individualism which “attributes to the individual as against society anything which really belongs to him only as a member of society”.⁴⁸⁹ Rather, harmony between the individual and society was desirable.⁴⁹⁰

4.4.2 Chang: A Functional Theory of Society

Like Hobhouse, Chang also advocated a functional (organic) theory of society. He posited the existence of the state, civil society, and the individual in any modern country with all three interacting ideally in an organic way to produce harmony and mutual development.⁴⁹¹ Each had an appropriate role and a legitimate sphere of activities. The state was the highest organ of power; it promulgated laws and enacted decrees. Within a society, there were various unions, clubs, associations, and corporations based on various professions and interests; these were organised voluntarily by the members of a society. Finally, the individual was a citizen of the state, who contributed to society through his or her intellectual, moral, and physical

⁴⁸⁴ Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, 54.

⁴⁸⁵ Hobhouse, *The Elements of Social Justice*, 186.

⁴⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 41.

⁴⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 199-200.

⁴⁸⁸ Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, 53.

⁴⁸⁹ Hobhouse, *The Elements of Social Justice*, 31.

⁴⁹⁰ Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, 26-27; *Social Evolution and Political Theory*, 86.

⁴⁹¹ Zhang, *Shehuizhuyi sixiang yundong gaiguan*, 17.

development, and participated in politics as a right and a duty. As a constituent member of the country, Chang argued, the individual should never be neglected.⁴⁹²

This functional theory of society complied with three core concepts of liberalism—liberty, the general interest, and sociability (the notion of interdependence among people). It did not ignore the individual, nor did it elevate the community above the individual. Therefore, it was different from a core concept of socialism—the constitutive nature of the human relationship (group membership), which historically put the community above the individual and regarded the community as focal unit of analysis.

As a result of this organic conception of society, Chang disapproved of any imbalance in the relations between the individual, the state, and society. He found three main recurring forms of such imbalance in history. Each form put one element—society, the state, or the individual—in a position of supremacy and subjected the other two elements to the former.

First, European history showed that the relative position of the state and the civil society varied. The church in the Middle Ages was above the government but gradually its position was diminished. In modern times it was part of the civil society; separation of the state and the church was generally accepted.⁴⁹³ Another variant of this form of imbalance was to endow social organisations with supreme power. Mussolini's practice of cooperativism was a case in point.⁴⁹⁴

Second, there were cases of statism. Chang gave examples of monarchical dictatorship, fascism, authoritarianism, totalitarianism, and proletarian dictatorship within this category. All these put the state above the society and the individual. He particularly castigated proletarian dictatorship as a form of social tyranny, borrowing again from John S. Mill. According to Chang, social tyranny was far more horrifying than political repression because the collective imposed its will on the individual and interfered in a sphere where it should not play a role, which he compared to the forced servitude of souls. In countries such as the Soviet Union, he argued, the state was the end and people became the means.⁴⁹⁵

Although Chang mainly focused on cases where the supremacy of either the state or social organisations caused encroachment on individual rights, he also saw that a political system that allowed excessive individual liberty had consequences, too. An example was

⁴⁹² Ibid, 18.

⁴⁹³ Ibid.

⁴⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁹⁵ Ibid, 18-21.

laissez faire economics, which was connected with classical liberalism. When this economic system was adopted, employers were free to decide the working conditions and their activities were neither controlled nor regulated by the government. Consequently, workers struggled to earn a living.⁴⁹⁶

Chang contended that the state, society, and the individual were equally important; it was difficult to identify which was ranked high and which was ranked low.⁴⁹⁷ Then, what kind of relationship would be the best to secure both order and liberty? Chang's answer was to integrate political democracy with socialism. The term Chang used to describe the synthesis was "democratic socialism." In explaining his position Chang noted:

How to deal with the relation of the three so that each is assigned an appropriate role is indeed a big issue. This must be acknowledged. In modern democracies, the human rights of each individual are safeguarded by the constitution. Thereby, the government shall not intrude upon these rights. Furthermore, the exercise of the sovereignty of the state is subject to the supervision of the people. That is to say, decisions on declarations of war and peace treaties shall be made on the condition that people give their consent. Thus, the power of the state is limited by the will of the people. As for social justice, it concerns the ownership of property. Whether the property is of public ownership or private ownership shall not be determined arbitrarily by one party but by the majority of the parliament. As the property becomes public, representatives of each social organisation can participate in the management of the property. In addition, every year the public sector shall present reports to the parliament and each member of the parliament has a right to make comments. This is socialism based on the principles of democracy and liberty. To put it another way, democratic socialism is the best means to deal with the relationship between the three.⁴⁹⁸

The statements above showed that by socialism Chang meant social justice and some socialistic industries or sectors. At the same time, he never implied that the common end of a state was socialism though social justice was included in his ideal. Social democracy was not adequate to capture his political thinking. To him, socialism was more a means of redressing economic injustice which affected social justice than the end of a political entity. He was not committed to a systematic transformation of the economy from capitalism to socialism. Rather, Chang supported the protection of private property. He argued that a country needed both state ownership and private ownership. The key problem was to decide which industries should be controlled or regulated by the state.

⁴⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁹⁷ Ibid, 21.

⁴⁹⁸ Ibid, 22.

In short, Chang deemed that the individual, the state, and society were interdependent. Individuals could not isolate themselves from society and the welfare of the state depended on the development of the individual.⁴⁹⁹

Chang used this organic theory of society to refute Marx's dialectical materialism and to manage the tension between authority and liberty and between collectivism (socialism) and individualism (liberalism). He wrote:

Speaking of politics, I once mentioned a principle. "To deal with political affairs of a state, efficiency is of significance; flexibility and feasibility are of great value; as for society and culture, freedom and differences shall be respected for the sake of development. That is the demarcation between centralisation and openness." This principle reflects two things: one is authority and the other is freedom. We should not tilt the balance in favour of either side. I suggest a sensible solution for the reasons below. "We seek for efficiency of the state because the executive branch is like the constitution of a human body. If your body can move resiliently your arms will be flexible. The state has nothing to do with civil society...To improve efficiency, it is better to centralise the executive power of the government. This being said, centralisation is confined to the administration. That is the limit. It must not be applied to society and impinge upon the freedom of the people."⁵⁰⁰

Having expounded this principle, Chang proceeded to illustrate what he saw as the falsehood of Marx's materialism. He maintained that as a principle of social philosophy, historical materialism was wrong.⁵⁰¹ In his view, Marx failed to acknowledge the human spirit which embodied itself in political, social, and economic structures. Politics, law, and economy were three aspects of social life; there was an interaction between all institutions and the will of man. The three aspects were constituents of a society as a whole; each had an influence on social development; we could not tell which was the base and which was the superstructure.⁵⁰² Chang said these were the gist of a functional theory of society.⁵⁰³

4.4.3 Similarities and Differences

To what extent was Hobhouse's social theory similar to Chang's? Both men stressed the interdependence between the parts and the whole that could be a society, an association or a state. They put equal emphasis on individual liberty and the common good. This kind of

⁴⁹⁹ Zhang, *Mingri zhi zhongguo wenhua*, 130; *Liguo zhi dao*, 98.

⁵⁰⁰ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 369.

⁵⁰¹ Ibid.

⁵⁰² Ibid, 377-79.

⁵⁰³ Ibid, 379.

social theory made them disapprove of classical liberalism as well as Marxian socialism (Marxism and Marxism-Leninism). From their viewpoints, both classical liberalism and Marxian socialism were one-sided which caused an imbalance of the relationship among the individual, society, and the state.

At the same time, there was a difference between the two thinkers as regards the origin of their theories of an organic society. Chang paid attention to the role of the human mind in political, economic, and social institutions. This idealist element (German idealism) in Chang's political thought was developed by Chang to respond to a particular phenomenon in his time where he observed that many Chinese intellectuals advocated Marxism and wanted to follow the Soviet Union. Accordingly, he had to shift the balance towards idealism, which attached importance to the human mind and the ethical basis of political, economic, and social institutions in a particular society. By contrast, the role of the human mind was not much stressed by Hobhouse in his theory. The idealist flavour (moral force) in Hobhouse's thought was not attributed to the influence of Marxism on British intellectuals but the social ills caused by capitalism. Hobhouse noticed a difference between Britain and Germany regarding their socialist movements. He said that in England there was "no sign of the kind of class war to which German Socialists appealed".⁵⁰⁴ Hence, refuting Marx was not a major factor which motivated Hobhouse to develop Green's idealism and a moral theory of distributive justice—liberal socialism.

Chapter Summary

This chapter compared Hobhouse and Chang with a view toward reaching a new understanding of Chang's discourse on socialism. Chang put forward a theory of democratic socialism as a way to make China a modern democracy during the war years. This democratic socialism was distinctive in that it was different from both Marxian socialism and social democracy. Chang's concept of democratic socialism contained most core concepts of liberalism, some elements of socialism, and German idealism, which was also characteristic of Hobhouse's conception of liberal socialism. Hobhouse engaged with a tradition of neo-Hegelian liberalism (New Liberalism) and Chang himself espoused this tradition of liberty. In this way, Chang's democratic socialism was akin to Hobhouse's liberal socialism. Nonetheless, there was also a dissimilarity. Chang stressed democratic politics whereas Hobhouse attached importance to economic justice. They ultimately converged on an organic

⁵⁰⁴ Hobhouse, *Democracy and Reaction*, 237. Hobhouse used the German Social Democrats and German Socialists interchangeably.

theory of society that aimed to achieve harmony between the individual and the collective. Although both embraced an organic conception of society (a tradition of German idealism), the differences between them highlighted the different ways they applied this idealism. Chang's organic theory of society was a response to the growing influence of Marxism on the Chinese intelligentsia. Hobhouse meanwhile was endeavouring to find a remedy for capitalism. For both men, though, this led them to seek an ethical theory that could promote the common good without neglecting the value of individual liberty. The liberal thought of Mill and German idealism also significantly influenced how both Chang and Hobhouse perceived Marxian socialism in their development of the concepts of democratic or liberal socialism. The preceding chapter and this chapter show that a better understanding of Chang's political philosophy can benefit from a comparison with Hobhouse. Both men modified different streams of political thought in their times (liberalism, socialism, and idealism) and developed liberalism in the direction of social democracy in order to solve different problems in their countries.

Chapter V: Carsun Chang and Constitution-Making

5.1 Institutional Design: Constitutional Democracy

This chapter will explore Carsun Chang's liberal thinking and its relationship to two constitutions in Republican China: *Guo xian yi* (The Draft Constitution of the Conference of Significant Affairs of State 1922) and *Zhengzhi xieshang huiyi dui Wu wu xiancao xiuzhengan caoan* 政治协商会议对五五宪草修正案草案 (The Draft Revision of the Fifth of May Draft Constitution of 1936), which became the Constitution of the Republic of China in 1946.⁵⁰⁵ It revises the mainstream view which regards Chang as a social democrat. In addition, it corrects Edmund Fung's view that Carsun Chang overlooked the flaws of the Weimar constitution. I will highlight the differences between *Guo xian yi* and the Weimar constitution in that the differences are essential to Chang's discourse on federalism, a responsible government, and parliamentarianism (the application of a British type of democracy) in the Chinese context.

I argue that Chang embraced constitutional liberalism and he did not neglect the weaknesses of the Weimar constitution. He abandoned some German ideas (referendums, extensive presidential power, and the German federalist system) when conceiving of the future political system for China. To be precise, Carsun Chang adapted the democratic systems of the Weimar Republic, Britain, America, and Canada to Chinese conditions without detracting from fundamental values of liberalism (the separation of powers, a responsible government, federalism, and the protection of basic liberties) in order to establish a Chinese democracy. Chang's political arguments are clearly liberal. The two constitutions he drafted are evidence of this argument. Roger Jeans and Edmund Fung examine in detail the influence of German social democracy on Chang and portray Chang as a thinker of reformist socialism.⁵⁰⁶ This interpretation is too limited because it ignores the other influence of liberalism on Chang, including Anglo-American liberalism and the liberalism of Hugo Preuss who was the principal drafter of the Weimar constitution. Chang himself identified

⁵⁰⁵ *Guo xian yi*, Carsun Chang's interpretations of this constitution and the constitution he drafted in 1946 (the *Draft Revision*) were compiled into one book entitled *Xianzheng zhi dao* 宪政之道 (The Way of Constitutionalism). This book was published in mainland China in 2006. For convenience, I will use the *Draft Revision* to refer to *Zhengzhi xieshang huiyi dui Wu wu xiancao xiuzhengan caoan*.

⁵⁰⁶ See Jeans, *Democracy and Socialism in Republican China*, 29-48; Fung, *In Search of Chinese Democracy: Civil Opposition in Nationalist China, 1929-1949* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 134; Fung, "State Building," 326-27; Fung, *The Intellectual Foundations of Chinese Modernity*, 206-37.

Preuss as a thinker of liberalism rather than socialism. Chang wrote, “He believes in liberty and the rule of law...Preuss is a thinker of liberalism...”⁵⁰⁷

Chang’s constitutional thought had an influence on the current constitution of the Republic of China (Taiwan) because this constitution was based on the constitution Chang drafted in 1946—the *Draft Revision*. In different times the concrete institutions Chang designed might be different in some respects, but the overall framework was always a constitutional democracy—a hybrid of democracies such as Britain, the Weimar Republic, America, and Canada depending on the particular conditions of China. His design of the semi-presidential system, the legal system, and economic and social policies resembled the systems of the Weimar Republic. Chang’s conception of a vote of no confidence and a responsible cabinet sprang from the British system. As for the federalist system, Chang held that a Canadian type was more suitable for China.

The chapter begins with Chang’s constitutional thought in the 1920s. *Guo xian yi* was the first constitution Carsun Chang drafted at the request of Chinese civil society. While drafting this constitution, Chang referred to the Weimar constitution and other Western constitutional law and adapted them to a different Chinese context. Chang’s earlier constitutional thought remained a significant influence on his later thought. In the 1940s he drafted the *Draft Revision*, seeking to change the KMT’s constitution into a liberal one. A revised version of Chang’s constitution was adopted by the government and it became the Constitution of the Republic of China. This constitution was eventually enforced in Taiwan. Based on the elaboration of Chang’s constitutional thinking in the 1920s and in the 1940s, I will then discuss the consistency of Chang’s constitutional thought. The investigation of Chang’s constitutional thought will enable us to have a new understanding of Carsun Chang whose political thought is too complex to be simply described as social democracy by most past studies. I contend that Chang embraced constitutional liberalism.

5.2 The 1920s: Draft Constitution of 1922

In the early 1920s, China was still in the warlord era. There were continuous power struggles among warlords who controlled different regions and desired to expand their sphere of influence. The instability made it hard to establish a constitutional republic though attempts had been made to implement democratic constitutions since the Revolution of 1911. From 1913 to 1922, there were four presidents who were elected by representatives of the

⁵⁰⁷ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 344-49.

provincial assemblies or the national assembly. None of these governments was durable. It was in this background that a federalist movement gathered momentum and reached its heyday in the early 1920s.⁵⁰⁸ Many warlords and liberal intellectuals were actively engaged in this movement, advocating the establishment of a federal republic. This was the context in which Carsun Chang drafted *Guo xian yi*. It reflected the Chinese elite's demand for a durable republic.

Guo xian yi was of significance in the sense that it was the outcome of the first constitutional movement organised voluntarily by the civil society of China.⁵⁰⁹ On 15 March 1922 eight national associations—commerce, education, farmers, workers, banks, lawyers, journalists, and provincial assemblies—convened a meeting in Shanghai.⁵¹⁰ They discussed the idea of a conference, the “Eight Associations Conference of Significant Affairs of State”. The aim was to fight for political participation which was constrained by the senate then. The first conference was held on 7 May. Thirty-five representatives from fourteen provinces attended.

Carsun Chang had just returned to China from Germany in 1922. By then his reputation as an expert in constitutional law had been recognised by the Chinese elite. The attendees of the Conference considered Chang as a competent and suitable person to draft a constitution for China. He was the first intellectual who translated into Chinese the Weimar constitution and the 1918 Constitution of the Soviet Union. The Chinese term for Soviet was first introduced to China by him. Chang acquired relevant knowledge of constitutional law and Western political systems mainly in Japan (1906-1910) and in Germany (1913-1916, 1919-1922) in particular. When he was pursuing his doctoral degree in Germany in the 1910s, he studied law and the philosophy of the state.⁵¹¹ In December 1919 he visited Hugo Preuss, the major drafter of the Weimar constitution, who sent Chang a copy of the constitution. Chang later translated it into Chinese and introduced it to Chinese audiences. Although Chang spoke favourably of the liberal thought of Preuss and the Weimar constitution, he rejected some ideas of Preuss when devising the Chinese political system. A striking difference was that Chang's constitution did not create a very powerful president compared with the Weimar

⁵⁰⁸ For reference about the federalist movement, see Prasenjit Duara, *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995), 177-204.

⁵⁰⁹ Xue, *Minzhu xianzheng*, 135-36; Zheng, *Zhang Junmai zhuan* [A Biography of Zhang Junmai] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1997), 129.

⁵¹⁰ Among the eight associations which proposed drafting a new constitution in 1922, only the association of provincial councils was part of the government. The other seven national associations were all elements of the civil society.

⁵¹¹ Li Guizhong, *Zhang Junmai nianpu changbian* [A Chronological Biography of Zhang Junmai] (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2016), 15.

constitution. This difference reflected Chang's attempt to check presidential power given that most past Chinese governments tended to create a powerful emperor or president.

There were two drafts by Chang with different designs, but the one that Chang preferred was based on the principles of representative democracy and federalism. Britain's parliamentary politics was a model of representative democracy. As for federalism, systems adopted in Germany, Canada, and America could be considered. Chang drafted this constitution independently, but he benefited from discussions with some individuals. For instance, he acknowledged that Zhang Dongsun contributed to the discussion of a unicameral parliament.⁵¹² The other constitution was drafted at the request of the scholar, Zhang Taiyan (章太炎).⁵¹³ Zhang Taiyan held that China should model after Switzerland.⁵¹⁴ I will select the text of *Guo xian yi* Chang preferred for analysis. Moreover, Chang's own interpretation of this constitution is available. The interpretation reflected his own opinions rather than the collective decision of the eight national associations. Though Chang and the eight associations devoted themselves to constitution-making, *Guo xian yi* was not enforced due to the power struggle among warlords who were accused of election rigging at the presidential election of 1923.

5.2.1 A Republic of Federated Provinces

Guo xian yi specified that the political system of China was a republic of federated provinces.⁵¹⁵ Carsun Chang thought that the most distinct characteristic of a federal republic was to draw a demarcation between the power of constituent states and the power of the central government.⁵¹⁶ His discourse on federalism enhanced the view that provincialism and nationalism could coexist which Prasenjit Duara discussed in his book.⁵¹⁷ However, Chang's narrative of federalism differed from the narrative emphasising provincial identity that was stressed by Duara. Chang supported the form of provincialism which would be in harmony with national interests.

Chang compared the federalist systems of America, Canada, and Germany and analysed their suitability to China, concluding that the Canadian system was the most suitable for

⁵¹² Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 8.

⁵¹³ Zhang Junmai, "Wo yu xianfa," [Me and the Constitution] *Zaisheng* 2, no.9 (1 June 1934): 3. Chang explained the reasons for not agreeing with Zhang. See Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 51-52.

⁵¹⁴ Ibid.

⁵¹⁵ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 112.

⁵¹⁶ Ibid, 15.

⁵¹⁷ Duara, *Rescuing History from the Nation*, 178.

China.⁵¹⁸ In Chang's opinion, powers should be fairly divided between the central government and state governments in China. Compared with the Canadian system, American federalism and German federalism tended to create local governments that would challenge the authority of the central government. By contrast, in the Canadian system, the constitution enumerated the powers of both; as for the powers which were not included in the provisions of the power of the central government, they were not definitely granted to state governments. The general rule was to identify the nature of the issue; if it was of national interest, it should be decided by the central government; if it only concerned the interests of individual states, local governments were to make decisions.⁵¹⁹ This differed from America and Germany where all powers except those listed as powers of the central government were granted to the states even if they were not enumerated in the constitution.⁵²⁰ Chang thought that some powers of the remainder were of national importance; under this situation if the state was to act freely it would challenge the authority of the central government which affected the republic as a whole.⁵²¹ Considering this defect, Chang contended that Canadian federalism suited China better than other federalist systems.

Following the federalist principle, the federal government would have the authority to make and enforce laws in the fields of diplomacy, military, custom duty, national tax, immigration, civil law, business and commercial law, criminal law, labour law, and railways.⁵²² Self-governance would be exercised at local levels. Each province would have its own constitution as long as it did not contradict the constitution of the federal republic.⁵²³ The administrative head of a province could be represented by one person or a committee elected by the provincial assembly or directly elected by the people of the province.⁵²⁴

China was reduced to political instability after the collapse of the monarchical government, so in Chang's opinion the rule of law, order, and stability were important. A strong and efficient central government was needed to deal with national affairs. This could explain why Chang preferred Canadian federalism as a model for China. If the provincial governments were too powerful, it was likely that local interests would be pursued at the expense of national interests. For instance, Chang held that the federal government had the responsibility to ensure that the local government was democratic; if it attempted to change

⁵¹⁸ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 17.

⁵¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 15-17.

⁵²⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵²¹ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁵²² *Ibid.*, 113-14.

⁵²³ *Ibid.*, 114-15.

⁵²⁴ *Ibid.*

the political system from a republic to other non-democratic systems, intervention of the federal government was a must.⁵²⁵ Chang's idea of federalism in the 1920s also influenced his thinking in the 1940s.

5.2.2 The Legislature, the Executive, and the Judiciary

Chang endeavoured to balance the power of the legislative and the executive. The domination of either was detrimental to good politics. As he considered that China was experimenting with democracy, *Guo xian yi* allowed flexibility in terms of suffrage and the structure of the legislature.

The legislative power was delegated to a unicameral parliament consisting of members who would be elected by universities, provincial councils or provincial-level administrative regions, special administrative regions, associations of education, farmers, workers, business and commerce, and Chinese citizens residing abroad.⁵²⁶ The parliament would have the right to make laws, impeach the president, vice president, prime minister, and cabinet ministers. This unicameral structure of the parliament was temporary.⁵²⁷ When the literacy rate increased, accurate statistics of the national census of the population, and the electoral roll were available, universal suffrage, and a House of Commons or Representatives directly elected by the people would be added to form a bicameral parliament.⁵²⁸

Chang held that democracy was not unconditional. The prerequisites of democracy Chang mentioned included literacy and virtuous electors. Popular election was what democracy required and he agreed. But education was needed to train qualified voters so that electoral fraud would be minimised.⁵²⁹ With a literacy rate estimated at less than twenty percent nationwide in early twentieth-century China, Chang's considerations were sensible.⁵³⁰ Chang's view was that universal suffrage, a popularly-elected parliament, and government by plebiscite (referendum) would only be considered when these conditions were met.

⁵²⁵ Ibid, 115.

⁵²⁶ Ibid.

⁵²⁷ Ibid, 44, 115.

⁵²⁸ Ibid, 42-44.

⁵²⁹ Ibid, 324-25.

⁵³⁰ Even this literacy rate is based on a broad definition of literacy. The accurate figure is not available. See Suzanne Pepper, "Education for the New Order" in *The People's Republic Part I: The Emergence of Revolutionary China 1949-1965*, vol. 14 of *The Cambridge History of China*, eds. Roderick Macfarquhar and John Fairbank (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 185-86. [http://doi: 10.1017/CHOL9780521243360.005](http://doi:10.1017/CHOL9780521243360.005).

As regards the executive branch, it was comprised of the president and a cabinet (state council). The cabinet was composed of a prime minister and other ministers. Military men were not allowed to run for President.⁵³¹ How the president was elected showed that Chang wanted to make the president reflect the will of the representatives as much as he could in the specific Chinese context. Chang designed a type of two-round system to elect the president. In the first round, six presidential candidates would be elected by the parliament. The second round would elect a winner among the six presidential candidates across the country. There were three steps. First, one needed to be a presidential candidate. To be an eligible candidate one must be nominated by at least fifty MPs or five legal associations (provincial councils, provincial associations of education, business and commerce, farmers, and workers).⁵³² Second, the parliament would vote and decide the eligibility of presidential candidates. A successful candidate needed to get the consent of at least two-thirds of the MPs present.⁵³³ Six candidates would be elected in this round. Third, all provincial councils and all provincial associations of education, business and commerce, farmers, and workers would act as the Electoral College and vote for President among the six candidates. The candidate who won at least two-thirds of the voters present would become President. This round of presidential election would only be valid if the number of voters present exceeded half of the whole Electoral College. By designing such a two-round system, Chang aimed to make the president accountable to the Electoral College.

In addition, Chang made the executive branch accountable to the parliament. The president, prime minister and cabinet ministers should be impeached if the parliament found that they violated the law.⁵³⁴ MPs would have the right to question the cabinet.⁵³⁵ Furthermore, the convention of cabinet responsibility was adopted. If the parliament had no confidence in the whole cabinet or any minister(s), the government or the minister(s) should resign.⁵³⁶ Chang's word choice allowed for two forms of responsibility. It could be a collective responsibility if the parliament was not satisfied with the entire cabinet. Otherwise, there was no collective responsibility. Only those individual ministers who failed to win a confidence vote should resign.

⁵³¹ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 57.

⁵³² Ibid, 117.

⁵³³ The number of MPs present should exceed half of the entire parliament.

⁵³⁴ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 116.

⁵³⁵ Ibid.

⁵³⁶ Ibid, 119.

According to Chang, the president as the head of the state would have the following powers: command of the army, navy, and air force of the country; the powers of amnesty, pardon, and remission of sentence; appoint and dismiss civil and military officers; conclude treaties, declare war, and make peace.⁵³⁷ The prime minister would be nominated by the president but other cabinet ministers would be nominated by the prime minister. The whole cabinet would help the president exercise executive power. At the same time, the cabinet should also check presidential power. The orders issued by the president would not be valid unless they were countersigned by the prime minister or other ministers concerned.⁵³⁸

The judiciary resembled that of the Weimar Republic. Its power resided in the Supreme Court of the federal republic and provincial courts.⁵³⁹ Chang examined three categories of legal systems and concluded that a German legal system would work for China.⁵⁴⁰ One category was the American system. There was no uniform code nationwide and state courts were created by the states which had their own constitutions. The Swiss legal system had national legislation but state laws were determined by individual states. Unlike America and Switzerland, the German legal system was the most hierarchical one. There were uniform codes which applied to the states.⁵⁴¹ Chang maintained that in China it was better to have uniform codes because uniform codes would prevent individual provinces from interpreting provincial constitutions differently.⁵⁴² Ultimately, the court system was closer to the German type. The Supreme Court was the federal court. Besides, there were military courts, administrative law courts, and the Constitutional Law Court.⁵⁴³ In America, the Supreme Court had the authority of constitutional interpretation. Chang's constitution, however, delegated it to the Constitutional Law Court just as the Weimar Republic did. Chang referred to the Weimar constitution while designing the Chinese legal system. However, when he drafted the constitution in 1946 he changed his mind and also referred to the American legal system. In his 1946 constitution, the Supreme Court had the authority to interpret the Constitution.

⁵³⁷ Ibid, 118.

⁵³⁸ Ibid, 119.

⁵³⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁴⁰ Ibid, 64.

⁵⁴¹ For the articles about the judicial system in the Weimar constitution, see Herbert Kraus, *The Crisis of German Democracy: A Study of the Spirit of the Constitution of Weimar* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1932), 180-84, 201-4.

⁵⁴² Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 67.

⁵⁴³ Ibid, 120.

5.2.3 Basic Rights of Citizens

Basic liberties were not significantly different from those in Western democracies. The Constitution only listed one duty of citizens—payment of tax. But Chang’s wording of two articles might be subject to criticism. “Unless restrained by law” was added at the end of articles concerning freedoms of expression, press, and association. Chang did explain this phrase. He noted that the expression to the effect of “unless restrained by law” appeared in the constitutions of almost all monarchies or democracies; it meant that fundamental liberties should not be constrained unless citizens themselves gave consent.⁵⁴⁴ What’s more, Chang assumed that good law was supposed to express the will of the people.⁵⁴⁵ In this sense, he expected no conflict between law and liberty.

Another notable point was that economic and social rights were written into the Constitution. Relevant articles were drafted on the basis of the Weimar constitution.⁵⁴⁶ Industries or economic organisations which affected people’s livelihood should observe the principle of justice so that the individual was provided with decent means of subsistence.⁵⁴⁷ Laws should be made in respects of labour, trade unions, and freedom of business and contract; ownership of land would be regulated for the sake of common interests.⁵⁴⁸ Chang related these rights to people’s livelihood which was an indicator of social justice.⁵⁴⁹ He seemed to conceive these policies as provisions about socialism.

5.2.4 The Weimar Constitution and the Constitution of 1922

Before Chang drafted the constitution in 1922, Chang had published the book *Xin deguo shehui minzhu zhengxiang ji* 新德国社会民主政象记 (The Politics of a New Germany: Social Democracy) in the same year. In this book, Chang introduced to China the revolution which helped Germany establish the Weimar Republic, the Weimar constitution, and the economic system of Germany.⁵⁵⁰ Chang argued that the Weimar constitution combined

⁵⁴⁴ Zhang, *Liguo zhi dao*, 105.

⁵⁴⁵ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 358.

⁵⁴⁶ Ibid, 92. Relevant articles (Article 151 to Article 165) appeared in the Weimar constitution, see Kraus, *The Crisis of German Democracy*, 210-14.

⁵⁴⁷ Chang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 123.

⁵⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁴⁹ Ibid, 91.

⁵⁵⁰ Because the chapter on the economic system in the constitution was derived from the theory of the Social Democratic Party, Chang mainly introduced this party’s policies and relevant articles of the Weimar constitution.

unitary and federalist systems, presidential and parliamentary systems, representative democracy and direct democracy.⁵⁵¹

When drafting *Guo xian yi*, Chang drew on the Weimar constitution regarding the form of government, the legal system and the social and economic rights of the citizens. On the other hand, Chang abandoned some German political institutions. However, most past studies have dismissed these differences. According to Roger Jeans, Chang held that China should follow the Weimar constitution and implement direct democracy.⁵⁵² Edmund Fung claims that the Weimar constitution had flaws regarding the allocation of presidential powers and the unbalanced distribution of power between the central and state governments; these flaws “were not, however, immediately apparent to Zhang Junmai”.⁵⁵³ In fact, Chang’s constitution differed from the Weimar constitution concerning the implementation of direct democracy, the federal system, presidential elections, and presidential powers during national emergencies. Given Chinese conditions, Chang abandoned the idea of government by plebiscite and a German system of federalism. He preferred a fair distribution of power between the central and provincial governments. Furthermore, he favoured representative democracy and a responsible government checked by the legislature. Thus, he also regarded the British system as a model for China.

There were at least four significant differences between *Guo xian yi* and the Weimar constitution. First, Chang did not think the German federalist system suited China because local governments would have too much power and would be able to challenge the authority of the central government. Hence, he found Canadian federalism more suitable for China in that it complied with the principle of a fair division of power.

Second, the constitution Chang drafted did not grant the president extensive power. The president’s term of office was shorter than that of the Reich President.⁵⁵⁴ More importantly, the Weimar constitution entrusted the Reich President with emergency power that was not checked by the legislature whereas Chang’s constitution did not allow the president to act in this manner. During a national emergency, the Reich President could use the armed forces to temporarily suspend, either partially or wholly the fundamental rights of the citizens and

⁵⁵¹ Zhang Junmai, *Xin deguo shehui minzhu zhengxiang ji* [The Politics of a New Germany: Social Democracy] (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1922), 2.

⁵⁵² Jeans, *Democracy and Socialism in Republican China*, 35.

⁵⁵³ Fung, *Intellectual Foundations*, 208.

⁵⁵⁴ For relevant articles of the Weimar constitution and the constitutions drafted by Chang, see Kraus, *The Crisis of German Democracy*, 189; Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 118; Qin Xiaoyi, *Zhonghua minguo zhongyao shiliao chubian—Dui ri kangzhan shiqi diqibian zhanhou zhongguo er* [Important Historical Data on the Republic of China—Volume 7 The Post-War Era Part Two] (Taipei: Guomindang zhongyang weiyuanhui dangshi weiyuanhui, 1981), 524.

orders would be valid if the President got the countersignature of the Chancellor or the competent minister.⁵⁵⁵ By contrast, Chang's constitution did not mention the use of forces to restore public order or the suspension of fundamental rights during a state of emergency. Moreover, the orders and decrees of the president in emergency situations should be subject to the consent of the legislature.⁵⁵⁶ Most of the warlords in the 1910s and the 1920s tended to create a powerful executive branch led by the president. Chang knew the consequences. His aim was to establish a legislature to check the executive power while giving an important role to the president.

Third, none of the articles in *Guo xian yi* discussed the practice of referendums, which was a distinctive feature of the Weimar constitution. Carsun Chang had reservations about the practice of direct democracy or a plebiscitary government given Chinese conditions (a large population with a low literacy rate, a lack of civic virtues, etc.). Many Chinese scholars agree that Chang's preference for representative democracy is attributed to the influence of John S. Mill whom Chang read in his early years of study in Japan. Chang's first publication in 1906 dealt with Mill's theory of representative government. Mill was indeed an intellectual influence on Chang. Another reason was Chang's considerations about the conditions of direct democracy. He held that it was a risky experiment to establish a government by plebiscite in China within several decades because China had a long history of monarchy and a large illiterate population. In his opinion, even representative democracy was not unconditional. Some of the prerequisites of democracy as he saw included a high literacy rate and the virtues of Chinese voters.

A fourth difference pertained to the means of electing the president. The Reich President was elected by the whole German people. This way of choosing a president actually weakened the power of the legislature. In Chang's constitution, the legislature rather than the whole Chinese people played a key role in nominating and electing the president. Chang sought to create a legislature to check executive power. He was not fond of the idea of a popularly-elected president who would be entrusted with extensive power and therefore would compete with the legislature as a result of an unbalanced distribution of power between the president and the parliament.

⁵⁵⁵ Kraus, *The Crisis of German Democracy*, 190-91.

⁵⁵⁶ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 118.

5.3 The 1940s: Constitutional Movements

There was a thread of consistency in terms of Carsun Chang's constitutional thought. His liberal thought in the 1920s found its expression in the 1940s. He eventually became the drafter of the Constitution of the Republic of China, seeking to establish a constitutional democracy in China. The 1940s saw the heyday of Chinese liberalism and democratic movements in the history of modern China. Different parties and public intellectuals were allowed to participate in politics and exert their influence on the government. Constitutional movements took place from 1940 to 1945. These constitutional movements were a prelude to the *Draft Revision of the Fifth of May Constitution of 1936*, which was the fruit of the Political Consultative Conference (PCC) in 1946. Chang participated in all these activities because he was a member of two important committees—the Advisory Council of National Defence (ACND) and People's Political Council which substituted the ACND in 1939.⁵⁵⁷ These committees paved the way for the establishment of the PCC.

When the PCC was held in January 1946, Chang joined the Constitutional Draft Reviewing Committee of the PCC. His expertise in constitutional law made all parties respect him. Even the representative of the Chinese Communists Zhou Enlai thought highly of him and showed his willingness to work on a good constitution. The Constitution of the Republic of China (the revised version of the *Draft Revision* Chang drafted) was drafted according to twelve principles of constitutional revision agreed upon at the PCC. Chang was selected to draft the Constitution of the Republic of China according to these principles. This was an attempt to revise the KMT's the Fifth of May Draft Constitution of 1936. Although these principles of revision were not solely the output of Chang's work, it was widely recognised that Chang contributed much to the discussions of these principles.⁵⁵⁸ This was confirmed by Lei Zhen (雷震), the secretary-general of the PCC, who was responsible for consulting with all parties.⁵⁵⁹ Chang's own narration was also consistent with Lei's description.

Unfortunately, the relationship between the Communists and the KMT deteriorated on account of several military conflicts. It was in April 1946 that Chang completed the *Draft Revision* which was to be reviewed by the government. Chang thought that this *Draft Revision* would probably become waste if the two parties could not solve their differences.

⁵⁵⁷ See Zheng, *Zhang Junmai zhuan*, 346-87.

⁵⁵⁸ Xue, *Minzhu xianzheng*, 173. The principle concerning fundamental national policies was proposed by the Communist representative Zhou Enlai. See, Xue, *Minzhu xianzheng*, 176.

⁵⁵⁹ Lei Zhen, "Zhengxiexiancao zhi youlai," [The Origin of the Draft Revision of the Fifth of May Draft Constitution of 1936] in *Zhixian shuyao—Lei Zhen quanji* [A Succinct Account of Constitution-Making of the Republic of China], (Taipei: Guiguan tushu gufen youxian gongsi, 1989), 9.

Even under this situation, he delivered lectures to universities interpreting the constitution he drafted. These lectures were later compiled into the book *Zhonghua minguo minzhu xianfa shijiang* (Ten Discourses on the Future Constitution of the Republic of China). My analysis of Chang's institutional design in the 1940s is based on the twelve principles of revision, the *Draft Revision* he completed in April 1946, and his own interpretation of these texts.⁵⁶⁰ Though the *Draft Revision* was based on these principles, it was a result of negotiations between the KMT and opposition parties. Hence, the twelve principles better reflect Chang's own views.

5.3.1 Principles of Revision

The twelve principles of revision changed the political system Sun Yat-sen and the KMT designed and made it as liberal as Western democracies. To put it simply, Chang made the executive branch responsible to the legislature by adopting a vote of no confidence which was absent in Sun's political thought and *Wu wu xiancao* 五五宪草 (The Fifth of May Draft Constitution of 1936). To understand the implications of the revision, it is important to review *Wu wu xiancao* that was the first formal draft constitution drawn up by the KMT. *Wu wu xiancao* strictly followed Sun Yat-sen's doctrines of the Three Principles of the People and a five-power government.⁵⁶¹

The five powers represented five branches of the government. They were the Legislative Yuan, the Executive Yuan, the Judicial Yuan, the Control Yuan, and the Examination Yuan. The Control Yuan had the power to impeach government officials. The Examination Yuan was similar to the institution of the civil service examinations in the West. But the idea of the powers of control and examination was derived from traditional Chinese political institutions. Sun thought these two Chinese political institutions were democratic and should be preserved. Hence, he added them to another three powers of the government, making the government a five-power government.

Following Sun's theory, the KMT created a powerful government led by the president, which was not responsible to the Legislative Yuan. The president had the power to appoint the head of a cabinet, the deputy head, and all cabinet ministers who were responsible to the president. The president, the head of the cabinet, and the deputy head of the cabinet were

⁵⁶⁰ Xue Huayuan also holds the view that the *Draft Revision* rather than the one passed by the government is closer to Chang's own thinking. See Xue, *Minzhu xianzheng*, 189.

⁵⁶¹ See Sun Zhongshan, *Sun Zhongshan quanji* [All Works of Sun Yat-sen], vol. 9. (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986), 183-426.

responsible to a so-called “National Assembly” that was supposed to represent the whole Chinese people. Cabinet ministers were neither responsible to the National Assembly nor the Legislative Yuan. By responsible, the KMT did not refer to a vote of no confidence. It was reflected by the power of recall exercised by the National Assembly. In addition, the Legislative Yuan was not independent because it was responsible to the National Assembly. Chang held that these (the powers of the president, the National Assembly, and the Legislative Yuan) were the biggest problems with *Wu xu xiancao*.

First, Chang argued that the structure of the National Assembly Sun designed defeated its purpose because the Assembly consisted of representatives who were indirectly elected by the Chinese people; an institution like this could not represent the will of the people.⁵⁶² Sun intended to make the National Assembly an institution of direct democracy which would entitle the people of China to rights such as election, initiative, recall, and referendum. However, the de facto Assembly consisted of only representatives of the people rather than the entire electorate of China.

Second, Chang held that the National Assembly made the Legislative Yuan weak. The “National Assembly” was borrowed by Sun from the West. He translated it into the Chinese word “guomin dahui” 国民大会. However, the assembly the KMT designed was significantly different from a national assembly in Western democracies. The KMT turned it into a hybrid of the electorate and the legislature under the control of the KMT government. A pure legislature was absent. The Legislative Yuan in *Wu wu xiancao* was different from the legislative branch of Western governments although Sun used the term “legislative” (li fa 立法). The Legislative Yuan designed by Sun could not approve a budget. Neither did it have the power to hold the Executive Yuan responsible. Chang thus complained that the Legislative Yuan was not a parliament but a legal reference council of the central government.⁵⁶³

Third, the executive branch was too powerful because neither the National Assembly nor the Legislative Yuan was able to hold it accountable. The Assembly was only convened every three years with a session of one month. Chang held that during two years and eleven months an assembly of this sort could do nothing and its responsibility was merely confined to recall when the president, vice president, and the (deputy) head of the cabinet were found

⁵⁶² Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 178.

⁵⁶³ Chang, *The Third Force in China*, 203, 207; Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 200.

guilty of a violation of the law.⁵⁶⁴ Therefore, Chang argued this Assembly could not regularly supervise the policies and activities of the government.⁵⁶⁵ Furthermore, the Executive Yuan (the cabinet) was not responsible to the Legislative Yuan. Because the Assembly already failed to supervise the Executive Yuan and the President effectively, this design only helped produce a more powerful President and the Executive Yuan that had close ties with the President.

Considering these flaws of *Wu wu xiancao*, Chang intended to make it more liberal. The principles of revision reflected this endeavour. Chang said that he attempted to reconcile the five-power constitution of Sun Yat-sen with fundamental principles of constitution-making in democracies over the world.⁵⁶⁶ The twelve principles of revision which made the political system more liberal were as follows:

(1) Concerning the National Assembly:

The entire electorate, when they exercise the rights of election, initiative, referendum, and recall, are called the National Assembly. Pending the election of the President by universal suffrage, the President shall be elected by an electoral body, composed of the members of the district, provincial and national representative assemblies. The exercise of the rights of initiative and referendum will be defined by appropriate laws.

(2) Concerning the Legislative Yuan:

The Legislative Yuan will be the supreme law-making body of the State and will be elected by the electorate. Its functions correspond to those of a Parliament in a democratic country.

(3) Concerning the Control Yuan:

The Control Yuan will be the Supreme organ of control of the State and will be elected by the provincial assemblies and the self-governing areas of minority peoples. It will exercise the functions of consent, impeachment, and control.

(4) Concerning the Judicial Yuan:

The Judicial Yuan will be the Supreme Court of the State and will not be responsible for judicial administration.

(5) Concerning the Examination Yuan:

The Examination Yuan will be in the form of a Committee whose members will be appointed on the nomination of the President of the National Government and with the consent of the Control Yuan. Its functions will be

⁵⁶⁴ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 176.

⁵⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶⁶ Ibid, 131.

mainly to examine candidates for civil service and technical experts. Members of the Examination Yuan shall be without party affiliation.

(6) Concerning the Executive Yuan:

The Executive Yuan is the supreme executive organ of the State. The Head of the Executive Yuan is to be appointed on the nomination of the President of the National Government and with the consent of the Legislative Yuan. The Executive Yuan is to be responsible to the Legislative Yuan. If the Legislative Yuan has no confidence in the Executive Yuan as a whole, the latter may resign or ask the President of the National Government to dissolve the Legislative Yuan. But the same President of the Executive Yuan may not ask for the dissolution of the Legislative Yuan for a second time.

(7) Concerning the Presidency of the National Government:

The President of the National Government may promulgate emergency decrees according to law, when the Executive Yuan has so decided. But the action must be reported to the Legislative Yuan within one month. The right of the President of the National Government to call the Presidents of the Executive, Legislative, Judicial, Examination, and Control Yuan into conference need not be written into the Constitution.

(8) The Province is to be regarded as the highest unit of local self-government. The powers of the provinces and the Central Government will be divided according to the principle of “fair distribution of power”. The Provincial Governor is to be elected by the people. The province may have a Provincial Constitution which, however, must not contravene the provisions of the National Constitution.

(9) All freedoms and rights which are generally enjoyed by the peoples of democratic countries should be protected by the constitution. Laws shall not be made to restrict the liberty of the people but to secure liberty.

(10) A separate chapter on elections should be provided in the Constitution. Only those of twenty-three years of age and over have the right to be elected.

(11) Concerning fundamental national policies:

A separate chapter in the Constitution should be devoted to fundamental national policies, including items on National Defence, Foreign Relations, National Economy, Culture and Education.

(12) Concerning amendments to the Constitution:

The right to amend the Constitution shall be vested in a joint conference of the Legislative and Control Yuan. The proposed amendments should be passed by that body in which is vested the right to elect the President of the National Government.⁵⁶⁷

These principles showed that Chang created a more liberal political system by adhering to the following principles of liberalism: a responsible government, the separation of powers,

⁵⁶⁷ Chang, *The Third Force in China*, 153-54; Lei, *Zhixian shuyao*, 71-74.

liberty, and federalism. First and foremost, he made the Executive Yuan responsible to the Legislative Yuan. A vote of no confidence was adopted to achieve this goal. This idea sprang from the practice of British politics. Chang adapted it to the Chinese system. Second, Chang tried to make the Legislative Yuan and the Control Yuan independent of the National Assembly so that both Yuans could function as a parliament. Because the KMT insisted on a structure of a five-power government, Chang kept the Control Yuan. But it was also designed to check the executive power. For instance, it had the power to impeach the Executive Yuan and the president. To Chang, the structure of the parliament, be it unicameral or bicameral, did not influence the function of the legislature. Finally, Chang added a principle of freedom to ensure the protection of basic liberties. This principle was missing in the KMT's constitution. These principles reflected Chang's liberal thinking. He infused liberal elements into the constitution, seeking to create a Chinese liberal democracy compatible with the fundamental principles of Western democracies.

5.3.2 Revision of the Draft Constitution of 1936

Based on these principles of revision, Chang drafted *Zhengzhi xieshang huiyi dui wuwu xiancao xiuzhengan caoan* (The Draft Revision of the Fifth May Draft Constitution of 1936) and completed it in April 1946 without consulting others.⁵⁶⁸ At that time there were conflicts between the Kuomintang and the Chinese Communists. Chang was not optimistic about the political situation of China. Hence, he regarded this constitution as his personal project rather than as a realistic possibility.⁵⁶⁹ Though the *Draft Revision* generally followed the twelve principles, there were four noticeable changes concerning a responsible government, the National Assembly, self-governance of local governments (provincial autonomy), and amendments to the constitution.

First, a vote of no confidence was not adopted. As a counterbalance, the President had no power to dissolve the Legislative Yuan. This was a result of the negotiations between the KMT and opposition parties. On the question of a vote of no confidence, Chang argued for

⁵⁶⁸ Chang, *The Third Force in China*, 192. Though Chang drafted the constitution without consulting others, he then knew the views of all parties concerned. To make the draft be accepted by the government, a series of negotiations were carried out after the twelve principles were passed at the PCC. Because the government was not willing to make concessions on a few questions, some articles in Chang's *Draft Revision* were somewhat different from his own thinking. For the text of the *Draft Revision*, see Qin Xiaoyi, *Zhonghua minguo zhongyao shiliao chubian*, 523-35; Lei Zhen, *Zhonghua minguo zhixian shi—Zhengzhi xieshang huiyi xianfa caoan* [History of Constitution-Making of the Republic of China—The Draft Revision of the Fifth May Draft Constitution of 1936], ed. Xue Huayuan (Taipei: Daoxiang chubanshe, 2010), 387-401.

⁵⁶⁹ Chang, *The Third Force in China*, 192.

the adoption of it, but the KMT was not willing to make a compromise.⁵⁷⁰ Then the Communist representative Zhou Enlai persuaded Chang to give up a vote of no confidence so as to resume talks with the KMT.⁵⁷¹ Finally, the *Draft Revision* took into account the positions of all parties concerned, who did not support a vote of no confidence.

A second difference concerned the National Assembly. The KMT government decided not to abandon the legacy of Sun Yat-sen and therefore it disagreed with Chang. The KMT wanted to make the Assembly an institution which would function as the Electoral College consisting of electors who were indirectly elected by the people. In addition, the Assembly would also exercise other powers such as initiative, recall, and referendum. Chang, however, disapproved of this institution and aimed to change it into an institution representing the will of the people. According to Chang, the National Assembly would represent the whole people of China and therefore it would include the entire electorate. Furthermore, Chang had reservations about the rights of initiative and referendum. He preferred not to give these two rights to the National Assembly at the initial stage of democratisation.

Another change pertained to provincial autonomy. Chang intended to fairly divide the power between the central government and provinces. Hence, provinces could make their own constitutions and elect their own governors. However, the KMT revised Chang's ideas and a compromise was made between the KMT and other parties. The constitution adopted by the government would allow provinces to make provincial laws rather than provincial constitutions. In addition, provincial governors would not be elected but appointed by the central government. These demands of the KMT undermined the principle of federalism Chang proposed.

Fourth, the KMT revised the articles concerning amendments to the constitution. In Chang's *Draft Revision* only the parliament (the Legislative Yuan and the Control Yuan) had the power to initiate an amendment to the constitution. But the KMT changed this. The National Assembly would also exercise this power.

When reviewing the constitution Chang drafted, the KMT did not make a compromise in these four respects. But other articles were approved by the KMT. To make the government accept the *Draft Revision*, Chang had to take into account the demands of all parties, the KMT in particular.

⁵⁷⁰ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 195, 209.

⁵⁷¹ Chang, *The Third Force in China*, 196.

I tried my best to make China live under a truly democratic form of government, that should still be in harmony with the political doctrines of Dr Sun Yat-sen, and also provide an important role for Chiang Kai-shek. I attempted a reconciliation between the plebiscite form and the parliamentary form and drew a line of demarcation between the Legislative Yuan and the Control Yuan. The Kuomintang members' opposition to a political structure like that of France, which would produce too many cabinet changes, had also to be taken into consideration. Lastly, the demands of the Chinese Communist Party and the Democratic League had to be satisfied.⁵⁷²

If this was the aim of Chang and other democratic parties, the *Draft Revision* was a successful constitution. The political system as reflected in *Wu wu xiancao* (the Draft Constitution of 1936) was changed into a constitutional democracy. Chien Tuan-sheng, a jurist and political scientist, was a contemporary of Carsun Chang.⁵⁷³ He agreed with Chang that *Wu wu xiancao* produced a powerful president whose power was not effectively checked. The critics including Chien himself "saw in the draft only a powerful president, compared with whom the other organs of government were all dwarfs."⁵⁷⁴ "To them, the dangers of a constitutionalised personal dictatorship were too apparent to be ignored."⁵⁷⁵ This was an account of a liberal scholar. Liberals within the KMT shared similar views. Lei Zhen, a member of the KMT, wrote that the presidential system in *Wu wu xiancao* was actually a dictatorship; it was never a democracy.⁵⁷⁶

The *Draft Revision* transformed the form of the government created by the KMT. Article One of *Wu wu xiancao* read that "The Republic of China is the San-min chu-yi Republic".⁵⁷⁷ Chien said that this was in imitation of Article One of the Soviet Union's Constitution of 1918.⁵⁷⁸ Advocates of this expression emphasised the unique characteristic of the Chinese Republic which was distinguishable from the Soviet Union and representative democracy of the West.⁵⁷⁹ While revising *Wu wu xiancao*, Chang understood the problem of the phrase

⁵⁷² Ibid, 195.

⁵⁷³ Chien (1900-1990) got his Doctor's degree from Harvard when he was 24. He returned to China and began teaching political science and constitutional law at prestigious universities. In Chinese history, he was one of the trailblazers in modern political science and comparative constitutional law. Chien finally stood on the side of the Chinese Communists and became a member of the Party. The political beliefs of Chien before 1949 and after 1949 underwent a great change.

⁵⁷⁴ Chien Tuan-sheng, *The Government and Politics of China* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961), 306.

⁵⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁷⁶ Lei Zhen, *Zhixian shuyao*, 25. Though Lei was a member of the KMT, he advocated democracy and constitutionalism. Because of his criticism of Chiang Kai-shek and the KMT government he was charged with treason and sentenced to ten years in prison in 1960. During these ten years, Lei wrote memoirs of four million words. The memoirs are valuable materials for studying the politics of Republican China and the constitutional thought of Carsun Chang.

⁵⁷⁷ "San-min chu-yi" refers to Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles of the People.

⁵⁷⁸ Chien, *The Government and Politics of China*, 304.

⁵⁷⁹ Ibid.

“San-min chu-yi”. Hence, he tried to solve it without provoking strong opposition from the KMT.

If the phrase “San Min Chu Yi” were to be used as an adjective before the word “Republic”, the phrase would have legal validity and, further, it would produce the impression that “San Min Chu Yi” were something in which everyone and every party should believe. But Dr. Sun Yat-sen himself was not quite definite about the interpretation of “San Min Chu Yi”, especially concerning the affinities of “San Min Chu Yi” and Communism. As a constitution was to be a legal document, Dr. Sun Yat-sen’s book would be the first source to which the judges of the Supreme Court would refer when they interpreted the Constitution. It was better that such a political platform as “San Min Chu Yi” be left out of the document. It was, however, generally acknowledged that the driving force behind the movement of founding the Chinese Republic was derived from Dr. Sun Yat-sen’s political theory. So the first article was devised to read “The Republic of China, founded on the Three Principles of the People, is a Democratic Republic of the people, for the people and governed by the people.” Mencius had said: “The people are the foundation of the country.” Another version comes from Abraham Lincoln’s phrase, “government of the people, by the people, and for the people.”⁵⁸⁰

Chang held that the power of the state belonged to the people and a government must serve the interests of the people rather than the interests of a ruling party. Therefore, he changed the KMT’s expression that the Republic of China was the “San-min chu-yi Republic”. Chang endeavoured to make the constitution as liberal as he could. Though the conservative faction within the KMT expressed opposition, the twelve principles of revision were accepted by all parties as a basis for drawing up the Constitution of the Republic of China.⁵⁸¹ The KMT government finally revised the constitution drafted by Chang and promulgated the Constitution of the Republic of China on 1 January 1947.⁵⁸² The majority of the articles in the *Draft Revision* were accepted by the KMT. The current constitution of Taiwan is based on the *Draft Revision*. Overall, the political system remains a variant of a constitutional democracy — a semi-presidential system — that generally adhered to the principle of checks and balances, the separation of powers, and the protection of basic human rights.

⁵⁸⁰ Chang, *The Third Force in China*, 201.

⁵⁸¹ Ibid.

⁵⁸² For references, see Lu bingkuan et al. (吕炳宽), *Zhonghua minguo xianfa jingyi* [A Study on the Constitution of the Republic of China] (Taipei: Wu nan tushu gongsi, 2016); Xie, *Zhonghua minguo xiu xian shi*. For the English text of the constitution of Taiwan, see Office of the President, ROC, “Constitution of the Republic of China (Taiwan),” Laws and Regulations Database of the Republic of China, accessed 20 March 2018, <http://law.moj.gov.tw/Eng/LawClass/LawAll.aspx?PCode=A0000001>.

5.4 Development of Chang's Constitutional Thinking

Reviewing the development of Carsun Chang's constitutional thought in the 1920s and the 1940s, we can observe that there is consistency regarding the political system Chang envisioned for China. He was a defender of federalism, representative democracy, and the republican form of government.

5.4.1 Consistency

Chang's constitutional thinking in the 1940s bore a close resemblance to his thinking in the 1920s.⁵⁸³ Fundamental principles of the political structure included federalism, constitutionalism, the separation of powers, and checks and balances. The form of the state was a republic. Speaking of the relationship between the central government and local governments, Chang advocated federalism and local self-governance. In the two periods, the federalist system was close to the Canadian type.

Chang's idea of the form of the government was similar in the two periods. It was a semi-presidential system. This political term then was not coined so Chang did not use it to describe the form of government in his constitution. I will not dwell upon every aspect of this political system, but it is worthwhile to mention four essential points that were consistent in his thinking: the structure of the legislature, a responsible cabinet, representative democracy, and the basic rights of citizens.⁵⁸⁴

First, on the structure of a parliament, Chang did not insist on the establishment of a bicameral parliament. It could be a unicameral one or a bicameral one. He left this question to the future generations who might amend the constitution. In the constitution he drafted in the 1920s, he thought a unicameral parliament suited China at the initial stage of an experiment with democracy. In the future, a bicameral structure would be considered. In the 1940s he also discussed this question and had similar views.

Someone may raise a question. Is the parliament as provided for in the Revision of the Draft of 1936 unicameral or bicameral? I will answer that it can be either. In accordance with Mr. Sun Yat-sen's five-

⁵⁸³ For Chang's thinking in the 1940s, I refer to his thought reflected by the twelve principles of revision and the substance of the *Draft Revision* which followed these principles.

⁵⁸⁴ A "responsible cabinet" was the original word Chang used to refer to a responsible government. He thought the form of government he designed for China was closer to a parliamentary system. Taiwanese usually use "neige zhi" 内阁制 (a cabinet system) to refer to "yihui zhi" 议会制 (a parliamentary form of government). I hold that Chang's use of the language has influenced Taiwanese.

power constitution, the institution of the Control Yuan shall be preserved. Members of the Control Yuan are elected by councils of provinces and ethnic autonomous regions...It shall exercise the power of rectification and impeachment. In foreign countries it is the legislature that will hold the executive responsible. Now in the constitution of China we add the Control Yuan that may access the documents of all ministries, urge corrective measures and impeach government officials. If the two Yuans, the Legislative Yuan and the Control Yuan, function as an integral system, we can call it a bicameral form. If we separate them, it is a unicameral system.⁵⁸⁵

Second, Chang was fond of the notion of a responsible government. He was never willing to give up this notion though the mechanism of responsibility he figured out at different times might be somewhat different due to the circumstances. By a responsible government, Chang meant that there must be a mechanism to check the power of the executive branch and to hold it responsible. He advocated the adoption of a vote of no confidence to achieve this aim.

Third, as regards the application of democracy in China at an early stage of democratisation, Chang preferred representative democracy to direct democracy. Neither of the two constitutions he drafted in different periods entrusted the whole people of China or the masses with the rights such as initiative and referendum.

Finally, Chang espoused the protection of basic human rights. He considered this as the fundamental substance of constitutionalism. Theories of Western political philosophy and the constitutions of democracies influenced him in this regard. But there was another factor which contributed to the development of his thought on human rights. That was the repressive government. After the KMT became the ruling party, Chang called for constitutional democracy and fled to Germany twice on account of his criticism of the government. In 1929 he was detained by the government and in the 1940s he was put under house arrest for nearly two years because of his involvement in several constitutional movements. His efforts to establish magazines and a few colleges and research institutes encountered interference from the government. The KMT forced him to shut them down. These experiences made him attach great importance to liberty. He thought that constitutionalism was a necessary means of protecting basic human rights.

⁵⁸⁵ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 200.

5.4.2 Change

In spite of consistency, there was a subtle difference in the articles of the basic rights of citizens. In the 1940s Chang added more social and economic rights into the constitution.⁵⁸⁶ Moreover, he changed the wording of the articles about basic liberties. In the constitution of 1922, articles on some basic liberties read that unless restrained by law people should have freedom of speech and publication, freedom of privacy of correspondence and freedom of assembly and association.⁵⁸⁷ However, the expression “unless restrained by law” was deleted in the *Draft Revision*. Chang added two articles to the *Draft Revision* and his suggestions were accepted. The articles (Article 23 and Article 24) read: “All other freedoms and rights of the people that are not detrimental to social order or public welfare shall be guaranteed under the Constitution. All the freedoms and rights enumerated in the preceding Article shall not be restricted by law except by such as may be necessary to prevent infringement upon the freedoms of other persons, to avert an imminent crisis, to maintain social order or to advance public welfare.”⁵⁸⁸ The change in the wording of the articles concerning basic liberties did not mean that Chang changed his views on the importance of the protection of human rights. Rather, it reflected his development of constitutional thought about human rights in different periods in the broad international community. As was said, Chang was interested in charters on human rights including the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. He watched closely the development of relevant charters in the West and intended to infuse them into the Chinese constitution.

Chapter Summary

This chapter investigated Carsun Chang’s liberal thought in relation to two democratic constitutions in Republican China. Chang believed in constitutional liberalism. *Guo xian yi* was the first and the only Chinese constitution that was drafted at the request of the civil society in the history of modern China. The Constitution of the Republic of China, a revised version of the constitution drafted by Chang in 1946, “was widely believed to be the most democratic among the over a dozen constitutions made in China since the late Qing”.⁵⁸⁹ However, previous scholarship (the works by Jeans and Fung in particular) on Carsun Chang usually interprets Chang as a thinker of reformist socialism. I contend that this interpretation is too limited and it neglects the liberal arguments of Chang in the debates over

⁵⁸⁶ For relevant articles, see Qin, *Zhonghua minguo zhongyao shiliao chubian*, 552-53.

⁵⁸⁷ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 122.

⁵⁸⁸ Qin, *Zhonghua minguo zhongyao shiliao chubian*, 521.

⁵⁸⁹ Shiping Hua, *Chinese Legal Culture and Constitutional Order* (New York: Routledge, 2019), 46.

constitutionalism, presidential democracy, parliamentary democracy and their applications to China. Chang was a committed liberal and constitutionalist.

I have argued that when drafting the constitutions, Chang always embraced the following liberal ideas: the separation of powers, a responsible government, federalism, and the protection of basic liberties. Concerning the concrete political institutions, he referred to the democratic systems of the Weimar Republic, Britain, America, and Canada. Chang tried to adapt these democratic systems to Chinese conditions. Given the political traditions of China (political systems which tended to give an important role to an emperor or a president), he finally designed a semi-presidential system though in theory he preferred a parliamentary system.

Chang's choosing a semi-presidential system was by no means an accident. It was derived from the Weimar constitution. The Weimar Republic exemplified an early form of a semi-presidential system. Chang met Hugo Preuss and had a good opinion of the liberal thinking of Preuss and the Weimar constitution.⁵⁹⁰ Yet, a significant difference between Chang and Preuss was that Chang sought to create a responsible government. By contrast, the Weimar constitution produced a powerful president. Chang's preference for parliamentarianism explains why the semi-presidential system he designed for China was different from that of the Weimar Republic. He cast doubt about the application of presidentialism to China given that most past and existing Chinese governments tended to create a powerful leader.⁵⁹¹ The KMT, the China Democratic League, and the Communist Party often used "neigezhi" 内阁制 (a parliamentary system) to describe the form of government Chang designed in the *Draft Revision*.

I conclude that while devising a political system for China, Carsun Chang always took Chinese conditions into consideration without overlooking some fundamental values of political liberalism. To avoid creating powerful local governments and a powerful executive branch led by the president in China, Chang abandoned American presidentialism, some institutions of the Weimar Republic such as a German federalist system, direct democracy, and extensive presidential power. It is not correct to think that Chang dismissed the flaws of the Weimar constitution and that he subscribed to the implementation of direct democracy in

⁵⁹⁰ See Zhang Junmai, "Deguo jiqi bang xianfa duiyu shijie fazhishi shang zhi xin gongxian," [Germany's Contribution to the Constitutional History of the World] in Zhang Junmai, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 302-13; Zhang Junmai, "Deguo xinxian qicaozhe bolusi zhi guojia guannian jiqi zai deguo zhengzhi xueshuoshi shang zhi diwei," [Hugo Preuss' Conception of the State and Its Position in German Political Philosophy] in Zhang Junmai, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 345-53.

⁵⁹¹ Zhang, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 187-89.

China unconditionally. Most past studies have neglected these significant differences between Chang's constitutional thought and the German constitution. Taiwan remains a semi-presidential system but the amendments make the system develop towards presidentialism.⁵⁹² As a result, there emerge calls for parliamentarianism and an amendment to the current constitution of Taiwan. The reasons for parliamentarianism in Taiwan are reminiscent of Carsun Chang's arguments for a responsible government.

⁵⁹² For the discussion of the relationship between the current constitution of Taiwan and Chang's constitutional thought, see Conclusion.

Chapter VI Zhang Dongsun on Democracy in the 1940s

Zhang Dongsun and Carsun Chang were known as “intellectual twins” in that they had similar views on Chinese culture, Western culture, liberalism, European social democracy, Russian Communism, and the future political system of China. In spite of these similarities between Chang and Zhang, a gulf developed between the two long-time friends. This chapter and the next chapter deal with Zhang Dongsun’s political thought and reveal an ideological cause of the split between them in the 1940s. Zhang’s liberal thought in the 1940s had Marxist leanings in the sense that he associated the ideal of Marx and the CCP with his conceptual system of democracy. He trusted the CCP not because he approved of the party ideology of the CCP but that he had a good opinion of the CCP who called for constitutionalism, democracy, a coalition government, and the protection of human rights.⁵⁹³ This made him disassociate the CCP from Russian Communism. Chang, however, believed that the CCP and the Soviet Union had close ties. A breakdown of political negotiations between the CCP and the KMT also caused the split between the two. I focus on the divergence between Zhang and Chang regarding their political views.

In this chapter, I re-evaluate key aspects of Zhang Dongsun’s political thought about democracy in the 1940s. His theory of democracy was actually a synthesis of core concepts of liberalism and socialism but it shared more overlapping political concepts with the family of liberalism. Thus, to understand Zhang’s liberal thought, we need to examine his theory about democracy. Zhang regarded democracy as a conceptual system of several interrelated ideas: liberty, rationality, individuality, progress, equality, tolerance, justice, and human rights. In his opinion, the future political system of China should be “xin xing minzhu” 新型民主 (Democracy of a New Type), an alternative to the British system and the Soviet type of democracy. A parliamentary system, a multi-party system, a mixed economy, and the protection of basic freedoms were key characteristics of this new type of democracy. Zhang cited Russian Communism and European capitalism as two cases of an imbalance between individual liberty and equality of opportunities. He argued that while carrying out social reforms or building a modern democracy, a country should put equal emphasis on liberty, equality, and progress; for agrarian countries like China that was in a transition to democracy, economic growth set the limit to the degrees of liberty and equality relative to each other.

⁵⁹³ This is explained in detail in the next chapter.

The chapter consists of six sections. It begins with a short biography of Zhang Dongsun. Then I briefly present his ideas about democracy before the 1940s. This helps to understand how Zhang changed some of his views and how some ideological differences developed between Zhang and Chang in the 1940s. Section 3 analyses Zhang's conception of democracy in the 1940s. Because Zhang considered liberty and equality as the basis of the conceptual system of democracy, section 4 is devoted to his understanding of the relationship between liberty and equality in a transition to democracy. In section 5 I examine Zhang's views of the applicability of "Democracy of a New Type" to China. The last section attends to Zhang's affinity with the new liberal tradition in Britain and America. This chapter about Zhang Dongsun's theory of democracy discloses his connections with some new liberals in the West and the ideological divergence between Zhang and Chang in the 1940s. I hold that this divergence had an influence on the two thinkers who ultimately made different political choices—to support the CCP or not.

6.1 Zhang Dongsun as a Philosopher and Political Figure

Zhang Dongsun (1886–1973) was a philosopher and public intellectual in Republican China. He made a great contribution to Chinese and comparative philosophy, being the first modern Chinese thinker who created his own theory of knowledge—a pluralistic epistemology which was a revision of Kantian philosophy and Confucianism. As a political figure, Zhang devoted himself to the cause of Chinese democracy. He was one of the leading figures of the China Democratic Socialist Party and the China Democratic League. When the KMT ruled China he castigated the political tutelage enforced by the government and participated in constitutional movements of the time. In the late 1940s, Zhang had no trust in Chang Kai-shek. He ultimately believed in the CCP. In early 1949 Zhang was one of the key figures who were involved in the negotiations between the CCP and Fu Zuoyi (傅作义), a general of the KMT. Then General Fu still controlled and defended important regions in the north of China including Beijing. As one of the representatives of Fu, Zhang negotiated with the CCP. Finally, the CCP controlled Beijing and other parts of the north without military attacks.⁵⁹⁴

After the CCP founded the PRC, Zhang became a member of the Central Government Committee, the highest policy-making body of the new-born regime. It was not until later that

⁵⁹⁴ Dai Qing, *Zai rulaifo zhang zhong: Zhang Dongsun he ta de shidai* [In the Palm of Buddha: Zhang Dongsun and His Era] (Hong Kong: Xianggang zhongwen daxue chubanshe, 2000), 10-12. Neither the CCP nor the KMT has officially described this event in the history of modern China. But some figures of the third force such as Carusn Chang and Liang Shuming acknowledged Zhang's contribution to the peaceful negotiations. See Dai, *Zai rulaifo zhangzhong*, 12.

Zhang realised Mao's conception of new democracy was considerably different from his theory of democracy. From the 1950s Zhang was persecuted and lost his professorship. He was accused of being a spy for America because he disapproved of Marxism-Leninism and Mao's diplomatic policies towards the Soviet Union and America. According to the description of Dai Qing (戴晴), the charge was merely Mao's retaliation against Zhang.⁵⁹⁵ Zhang cast the lone "nay" vote in Mao's election as head of the new government.⁵⁹⁶ During the Cultural Revolution, Zhang was imprisoned at the age of 82. He tried to commit suicide four times but failed. In 1973 he died. The last sentence he said just before his death was: "I am right." By saying this, Zhang alluded to Mao's controversial diplomatic policies. Then the PRC and the US had just resumed diplomatic ties. Three generations of his family were persecuted because of Mao's charge against Zhang.

Zhang Dongsun and Carsun Chang had been friends for more than 40 years before they split after the mid-1940s. They met each other in Japan in the early twentieth century. During their study in Japan, Liang Qichao was their mentor. From then on the three intellectuals were close friends and collaboratively organised several academic and political activities. In the early 1920s, they were involved in the debate over metaphysics and science. Chang was labelled "a metaphysician" by a school of scholars who believed in the power of science. Liang and Zhang defended Chang. After Liang's death in 1929 Chang and Zhang remained intimate friends. In the early 1930s, they founded the National Socialist Party and co-authored the manifesto of this party. In the 1940s they took great pains to prevent a civil war between the CCP and the KMT. Unfortunately, the breakdown of political negotiations forced them to split. Zhang finally stayed in mainland China whereas Chang left mainland China for self-imposed exile. They never met each other from then on. When Zhang was 80 years old, Chang who lived in America sent his good wishes and congratulations. Zhang did not know this since China and America then were still hostile to each other and the communication never arrived.

6.2 Perception of Democracy before the 1940s

Throughout his life, Zhang Dongsun was an advocate of democracy. But his views of democracy did not remain unchanged in different periods of time. From the 1910s until the early 1920s, Zhang tended to discuss democracy as a form of government which followed principles of the separation of powers, the rule of law, self-governance, and the protection of

⁵⁹⁵ Ibid, 3-6.

⁵⁹⁶ Ibid, 4.

the private sphere.⁵⁹⁷ In the early 1930s, Zhang co-authored with Chang and published “Women suo yao shuo de hua 我们所要说的话” (Our Parole) as the manifesto of the NSP.⁵⁹⁸ In this long article, they proposed a theory of modified democratic politics to defend democracy during a particular period when there was a growing trend of dictatorships at home and abroad. “Our Parole” reflected their shared views on democracy and its application in China.

Until the 1920s, many of Zhang’s political writings centred on democratic systems or institutions (presidential systems, parliamentary systems, federalism, and constitutionalism) and their applicability to China. He seemed to regard democracy as a better form of government, advocating a parliamentary system and self-governance. These ideas were actually his responses to the political reality of Warlordism in the aftermath of the 1911 Revolution. After the revolution, the political systems of Republican China were not durable. When different warlords became presidents, they tended to change the previous system. There were two attempts to restore a monarchy, which were short-lived. These governments led by warlords also experimented with presidential systems, parliamentary systems, and a hybrid of these systems. They referred to the French system, the British system, and the American system. But most of the warlords tended to create a powerful president. Along with Liang Qichao and Carsun Chang, Zhang Dongsun called for the establishment of a parliamentary system and a federalist system in China.⁵⁹⁹ They held that a presidential system in China would only make China worse in that China already had a powerful president and government. What China needed was a parliament of a British type so as to hold the executive branch accountable. As for the federalist system, Zhang’s idea was similar to the view of Carsun Chang. Zhang compared German, American, and Canadian federalist systems and concluded that a Canadian system suited China better.⁶⁰⁰ In addition, Zhang had a preference for representative democracy that had a flavour of elitism. At that time his conception of democracy was influenced by Plato and Mill.⁶⁰¹

⁵⁹⁷ By private sphere Zhang meant development of a free society and free development of personality. See Zhang Dongsun, *Zhang Dongsun xueshu wenhua suibi* [Selected Readings of Zhang Dongsun], ed. Ke Rou (Beijing: Zhongguo qingnian chubanshe, 2000), 58-60; Zhang Dongsun, “Zhongguo zhi jianglai yu jinshi wenminguo liguo zhi yuanze,” [China’s Future and the Principles of State-Building of Civilised Countries in Modern Times] *Zheng yi* [The Rightness] 1, no. 4 (February 1915): 1-16.

⁵⁹⁸ See Jizhe, “Women suo yao shuo de hua”.

⁵⁹⁹ Zhang Dongsun, “Neige lun,” [On Parliamentarianism] *Zheng yi* 1, no. 2 (15 January 1914): 1-10; Zhang Dongsun, “Yu zhi lianbang zuzhi lun,” [My Views on Federalism] *Zheng yi* 1, no. 5 (15 September 1914): 1-8.

⁶⁰⁰ Zuo, *Zhang Dongsun zhuan*, 39-40.

⁶⁰¹ For Zhang Dongsun’s essays which quoted Mill and Plato, see Zhang, *Zhongguo jindai sixiangjia wenku*, 90-125; Zhang, *Zhang Dongsun xueshu wenhua suibi*, 76-84.

In the 1930s Zhang Dongsun's theory about democracy was similar to that of the 1920s. It was a further development of his earlier ideas in response to the particular Chinese conditions of the 1930s. His ideas then were not significantly different from those of Carsun Chang. The two thinkers shared some views on democracy and its application in China. Thus, they collaborated with each other and proposed a theory of "modified democratic politics" (democratic socialism).⁶⁰²

On the whole, until the early 1930s Zhang's political thought about democracy was not significantly different from Chang's conception of democracy. They disapproved of Marxism because in their opinions the tenets of Marx were neither compatible with democracy nor with individual freedom. Like Chang, Zhang was a new liberal then. However, in the 1940s Zhang's understanding of democracy became different. A conspicuous change pertained to his association of Marx and the CCP with his political ideal of democracy.⁶⁰³

6.3 Democracy as a Cultural Conception and a Political System

In the 1940s Zhang Dongsun proposed a unique theory of democracy. Democracy was not only a political system but also a form of society that was related to a specific culture. To illustrate this point, he mentioned several Western thinkers who had similar conceptions of democracy. He agreed with the American sociologist Malcolm M. Willey (1897-1974) that thinkers such as Dewey, Russell, Hobson, and Hobhouse used democracy in a wider scope and most of them considered democracy as a form of society.⁶⁰⁴ This understanding of democracy made Zhang give up the conventional approach to democracy, i.e., to provide a particular definition of democracy. When explaining the method, he wrote that there was an interaction between concepts and a particular culture and the interaction made both evolve.⁶⁰⁵ Accordingly, he developed a conceptual system of democracy which had a prescriptive function for the development of a society.

⁶⁰² For details about "modified democratic socialism", see section 4.3.2 in chapter IV.

⁶⁰³ This point is further explained in chapter VII.

⁶⁰⁴ Zhang, *Lixing yu minzhu*, 215. For Willey's remarks Zhang quoted, see Malcolm M. Willey, "Some Recent Critics and Exponents of the Theory of Democracy," in *A History of Political Theories: Recent Times*, eds. Charles Edward Merriam and Harry Elmer Barnes (New York: The Macmillan, 1923), 62. Willey became an instructor in sociology at University of Minnesota in 1927. Being a champion of academic freedom, he contributed to the University of Minnesota the first faculty tenure code in 1938. The code stated that faculty had the freedom to write and speak about any issue outside of the University. Willey's decision to include a statement on academic freedom was directly linked to the dismissal of William Schaper from the faculty in 1917 after Schaper publicly criticised America's involvement in WWI. Like Willey, Zhang Dongsun attached importance to academic freedom and regarded this freedom as part of freedom of thought which was supreme.

⁶⁰⁵ Zhang Dongsun, *Minzhuzhuyi yu shehuizhuyi* [Democracy and Socialism] (Shanghai: Guancha she, 1948), 6.

6.3.1 The Conceptual System of Democracy

Zhang regarded democracy as a system of several interrelated concepts that formed the basis of a particular culture. These concepts were individuality, liberty, rationality, progress, equality, justice, tolerance, and human rights.⁶⁰⁶ Under a morphological analysis proposed by Michael Freedman, liberalism is composed of seven core concepts: individuality, liberty, rationality, progress, sociability, the general interest, and limited and accountable power. Socialism hosts five core concepts: equality, the constitutive nature of the human relationship, human welfare as a desirable objective, human nature as active, and history as the arena of beneficial change. Zhang's theory of democracy combined some core concepts of liberalism and socialism. Most concepts in his theory of democracy were the core concepts of liberalism and equality was the only core concept of socialism.

In Zhang's conceptual system of democracy, both equality and liberty were related to the notion of justice in ancient Greece though connotations of "justice" in the Greek context were more associated with "equality" than with "liberty".⁶⁰⁷ Equality referred to equality before the law and equal opportunities.⁶⁰⁸ As regards the idea of tolerance, it contributed to the development of the conception of individuality or personality.⁶⁰⁹ Zhang held that recognition of the personality of an individual was indispensable to the progress of human civilisation.⁶¹⁰ But this was true only when the principle of rationality was observed in a culture.⁶¹¹ Rationality or reason meant intelligence, logic, and order that was connected with the notions of law and fairness.⁶¹²

Zhang held that among all the concepts liberty and equality formed the base of the conceptual system of democracy.⁶¹³ Other concepts such as justice, human rights, and rationality emerged as resultants of interactions between liberty and equality when a society strived for liberty and equality.⁶¹⁴ Then, these later concepts and the two fundamental concepts (liberty and equality) added up to the conceptual system of democracy. Based on the history of human societies, Zhang found that there were three media to link the ideal of

⁶⁰⁶ Ibid, 1, 9-10. Zhang used the same English terms to describe these concepts. Though Zhang wrote in Chinese, he provided English equivalents to these Chinese words. I expound Zhang's understanding of liberty, individualism, liberalism, socialism and communism in chapter VII.

⁶⁰⁷ Zhang, *Minzhu zhuyi yu shehuizhuyi*, 12-13.

⁶⁰⁸ Ibid, 12.

⁶⁰⁹ Ibid, 10.

⁶¹⁰ Zhang, *Lixing yu minzhu*, 118.

⁶¹¹ Ibid.

⁶¹² Ibid, 120-21

⁶¹³ Zhang, *Minzhuzhuyi yu shehui zhuyi*, 26.

⁶¹⁴ Ibid.

democracy with the practice of democracy so that human beings obtained more freedom and equality and developed other conceptions such as justice, human rights, and rationality. The three media were nationalism with the independent nation-state as a unit, individualism and its by-product capitalism, and a planned economy.⁶¹⁵

The three media made democracy no longer a utopia though they had demerits. For instance, the form of nationalism characterised by expansionism and militarism caused wars and ignored the national rights of weak countries. Capitalism based on the culture of individualism neglected the wretched conditions of the working class. On the other hand, both capitalism and nationalism had merits. Nationalism contributed to the emergence of modern nation-states which pursued national rights, development, and independence.⁶¹⁶ Concerning individualism, it played a significant role in the Industrial Revolution and in the cultivation of the spirit of freedom. In spite of its problems, capitalism made contributions to the development of the national economy and personal wealth of individuals, which was an important condition of democratic politics.⁶¹⁷ A planned economy served as a remedy for the problems of capitalism in that it made the ideal embodied in socialism (equality and justice) no longer a utopia.⁶¹⁸ All in all, Zhang held that the conceptual system of democracy and the actual system of democracy must be linked. The interactions between concepts and real societies helped modify the concepts and integrate them into a system of democracy.

6.3.2 Interaction between Concepts and Society

Zhang paid attention to the interaction between the conceptual system of democracy and the social structure. History and environment were factors which influenced the meanings of the concepts. First, the internal meanings (intension) of the concepts and the range of applicability of these concepts (extension) were not absolutely rigid.⁶¹⁹ Some concepts emerged earlier than others in the history of democracy.⁶²⁰ For instance, the notion of liberty was an earlier concept compared with equality.⁶²¹ Tolerance and individuality, however, were more recent than equality and liberty. In addition, the meanings of concepts such as liberty were subject to modifications depending on the development of human society. The actual system of rights and liberties expanded in a progressive and accumulative manner across

⁶¹⁵ Ibid, 33.

⁶¹⁶ Ibid, 33, 38-39.

⁶¹⁷ Ibid, 35-36.

⁶¹⁸ Ibid, 48-49. By a planned economy, Zhang meant a mixed economy. For details, see section 6.5.2.

⁶¹⁹ Ibid, 6.

⁶²⁰ Ibid, 10-17.

⁶²¹ Zhang, *Lixing yu minzhu*, 174.

time.⁶²² In reality, the notion of liberty underwent a change from a negative concept to a positive one.⁶²³ Movements of liberalism in Europe at the beginning were reactions against a repressive government whose power was not limited. As a result, the minimal state theory was preached in the eighteenth century. Then the idea that more freedom meant a better government was popular. But in the twentieth century the old liberalism was outdated and state intervention was justified.⁶²⁴

Second, democracy in practice was an ongoing process and experiment and therefore it had different forms. The spirit of democracy was universal but concrete democratic systems were various depending on the conditions of a specific country and the characteristics of its people.⁶²⁵ This allowed for a variation of the quality of democracy over time and space.⁶²⁶ There was always a gap between the ideal of democracy and the democratic systems in the real world. In ancient Greece, not all people enjoyed liberty. The notion of liberty then differed from that of modern times.⁶²⁷ Furthermore, some countries were more democratic than others and no existing democracy was perfect. Zhang was especially interested in the practical implementation of democracy in agrarian countries with a long history of absolutism. China was such a country.

In Zhang's view, democracy as a political system must be based on the general will or consent of the people.⁶²⁸ Consent was not an outcome of coercion or deception but an outcome of the autonomy and free will of the governed.⁶²⁹ The theory of consent and the general will that Zhang discussed derived from the political theory of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Nonetheless, he did not think that the general will could be fully embodied by actual political institutions. The will of a few was always excluded and therefore in actuality the general will was translated into the will of the majority.⁶³⁰ Nor did he agree that the social contract was the genesis of the state or government.⁶³¹ Like Carsun Chang, he believed that sociologists better explained the origin of the state.

Because Zhang related consent to autonomy and free will, he thought that a government based on the consent of the governed recognised self-government and equal personality of the

⁶²² Zhang, *Minzhuzhuyi yu shehui zhuyi*, 12, 17-18.

⁶²³ *Ibid.*, 16-18.

⁶²⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶²⁵ Zhang, *Lixing yu minzhu*, 214, 224.

⁶²⁶ *Ibid.*, 216.

⁶²⁷ Zhang, *Minzhuzhuyi*, 20.

⁶²⁸ Zhang, *Sixiang yu shehui*, 105.

⁶²⁹ *Ibid.*, 246-47.

⁶³⁰ Zhang, *Lixing yu minzhu*, 213.

⁶³¹ Zhang, *Sixiang yu shehui*, 105.

individual. The notions of equal personality and self-government were actually consistent with liberty and equality which were believed by Zhang to be two of the fundamental principles of democracy. Could any actual democratic system reach the highest level of liberty and the highest level of equality simultaneously? How did a country in a transition to democracy assign the weight of liberty and equality relative to each other? Zhang Dongsun's answers to these questions on the practical implementation of democracy were interesting and significant considering that in the 1940s most countries around the world were not democracies and that countries such as China were debating over capitalism, socialism, liberalism, and suitable paths towards democracy.

6.4 Liberty, Equality, and Transitions to Democracy

“Progress” seemed to be the yardstick Zhang used to decide the degrees of liberty and equality relative to each other within the system of democracy. He did not discuss whether we needed to refer to each of the core concepts of democracy to build a modern democracy or carry out social reforms. But he singled out individual liberty, equality of opportunities, and progress as three fundamental principles of democracy and social reforms.⁶³² Any institution that advanced liberty and equality at no cost of the progress of a society was good. Zhang did not specify the indicators of the progress of countries that were already industrialised and politically free. Nonetheless, he identified economic growth or increases in production as one indicator for the progress of poor and agrarian countries such as China which were in a transition from absolutism or authoritarianism to democracy.⁶³³ This indicator was used to strike a balance between economic liberty and economic equality. Zhang did not identify specific indicators for measuring economic development. In my opinion, Zhang thought that this involved the practical implementation of democracy in individual countries. The limits to liberty or equality were not known unless people drew lessons from the experiment with democracy for some time. This was a trial-and-error experiment.

6.4.1 Imbalance between Liberty and Equality

Zhang Dongsun held that theoretically it was possible to reach simultaneously the highest level of freedom and the highest level of equality, but it was extremely difficult for any actual country to achieve this.⁶³⁴ He regarded Western capitalism and Russian dictatorship as two examples of an imbalance between liberty and equality. Capitalist countries ignored

⁶³² Ibid, 246.

⁶³³ Zhang, *Zhang Dongsun xueshu wenhua suibi*, 252,332; Zhang, *Minzhuzhuyi yu shehuizhuyi*, 65.

⁶³⁴ Zhang, *Minzhuzhuyi yu shehuizhuyi*, 65.

economic inequality while socialist countries like the Soviet Union despised political liberalism (political and civil rights of the individual).⁶³⁵

In Zhang's opinion, the old liberalism based on beliefs in atomic individualism and laissez faire economics failed to meet the needs of the twentieth century and economic exploitation caused by capitalism was an obstacle to democracy because it was against justice and equality.⁶³⁶ He thus regarded economic justice as a condition of the well-being and freedom of a society as a whole. A revolution of the economic system must take place after the political revolution of the eighteenth century and the Reformation of the sixteenth century if human beings were committed to the ideal of democracy.⁶³⁷

At the same time, Zhang Dongsun argued that the utopian form of socialism should also be discarded.⁶³⁸ He held that a good social reform or revolution was the one that had economic growth or progress of a society as its purpose.⁶³⁹ Zhang did not think economic growth and progress were identical because progress also referred to the overall development of other aspects of a society such as politics, morality, and culture. Socialist countries which enforced the proletarian dictatorship pursued economic equality at the expense of individual liberty, which had a negative impact on the progress of the society.⁶⁴⁰ Looking back upon the history of socialism in Europe, Zhang said socialism was nothing but a tragedy.⁶⁴¹ Experiments with socialism failed because equality was pursued at the expense of progress.⁶⁴²

6.4.2 Economic Growth: The Limit to Liberty and Equality

Zhang Dongsun argued that poor countries with a long history of absolutism must refer to economic growth to decide the limits to economic liberty and economic equality when they carried out social reforms.⁶⁴³ It was justified to limit equality if too much equality prevented production. It was likewise legitimate to limit liberty if excessive liberty created an obstacle to the progress of a society.⁶⁴⁴ But he did not support the elimination of private property. The

⁶³⁵ Zhang, *Lixing yu minzhu*, 213-14.

⁶³⁶ Zhang, *Zhang Dongsun xueshu wenhua suibi*, 247; Zhang, *Lixing yu minzhu*, 213-14.

⁶³⁷ Zhang, *Zhang Dongsun xueshu wenhua suibi*, 331.

⁶³⁸ Ibid, 256.

⁶³⁹ Ibid, 250.

⁶⁴⁰ Ibid, 257.

⁶⁴¹ Ibid, 250.

⁶⁴² Ibid, 251.

⁶⁴³ Zhang, *Minzhuzhuyi yu shehuizhuyi*, 65.

⁶⁴⁴ Ibid.

right to property should be protected although it might be properly regulated by the state for the common good.

From Zhang's viewpoint, the cause of injustice in poor and dictatorial countries was not entirely the same as capitalist countries.⁶⁴⁵ Injustice in dictatorships was more political than economic.⁶⁴⁶ Accordingly, these countries faced two challenges at the same time. One was to get rid of absolutism and the other was to increase economic production.⁶⁴⁷ This was because the real problems of poor and dictatorial countries were poverty and the absence of social, political, and civil rights. Zhang argued that to rid China of absolutism China must develop a culture of liberalism and individualism.⁶⁴⁸ To develop the national economy, some elements of capitalism would be preserved on the condition that the principle of justice was not violated.⁶⁴⁹ Socialism was doomed to failure if these countries pursued an equal distribution of wealth and ignored the reality of poverty and absolutism.⁶⁵⁰ By contrast, the reality of the West was different. Injustice was attributable to the capitalist economic system. Hence, capitalist countries that were already wealthy and politically free must attend to the distribution of wealth to make progress.⁶⁵¹

6.5 Applicability of Democracy to China

Believing that democracy suited China and that the future of China depended on democratic politics, Zhang Dongsun put forward in the late 1940s a theory of "Democracy of a New Type" as an alternative to the British system and the Soviet system. This new type of democracy was based on some universal principles of democracy (liberty, equality, and progress) but it allowed modifications of Anglo-American political systems and Russia's economic system. According to Zhang, democracy of a new type was characterised by a parliamentary republic, a multi-party system, and a mixed economy of private enterprises, state-owned enterprises, and cooperatives. However, he did not specify concrete democratic institutions.

⁶⁴⁵ Zhang, *Zhang Dongsun xueshu wenhua suibi*, 259.

⁶⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁴⁷ Ibid, 257.

⁶⁴⁸ Ibid, 259.

⁶⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁶⁵¹ Ibid.

6.5.1 Political Democracy: Democracy of a New Type

When the final showdown between the KMT and the CCP loomed large, Zhang Dongsun wrote that a way out of the crisis was democracy. The future democratic system of China fell into a third broad category between the Soviet system and the Anglo-American system—“Democracy of a New Type”.⁶⁵² This term was borrowed from the Marxian economist Eugen Varga who used it to describe a few European countries (Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Albania) which were carrying out political, economic, and social reforms in the aftermath of WWII.⁶⁵³ In Zhang’s opinion, the democratic system of Czechoslovakia was the ideal type.⁶⁵⁴

Zhang’s interpretation of this third type of democracy was not entirely the same as “democracy of a new type” coined by Varga.⁶⁵⁵ Varga focused on economic democracy (economic systems and land reforms) and its implications for the political and social structure of these European countries whereas Zhang was more concerned with the political system. Varga did not cite Finland as an example of democracy of a new type. Zhang included Finland in his category of the third type of democracy. Why Zhang included Finland was a mystery. He only said that democracy of a new type was a general category. No distinctions between Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Finland were discussed by him.

Zhang identified three features of Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Finland as models of new democracies that distinguished themselves from Soviet democracy.⁶⁵⁶ First, in terms of politics, it was not a single-party system. Different parties were allowed to compete in elections. Second, they had mixed economies. Private capital, public capital, and cooperatives existed in parallel. Third, the land there was re-distributed in a moderate manner. Apart from the three features, Zhang argued that China as a new democracy must model herself after the West regarding the protection of freedom, academic freedom in particular.⁶⁵⁷

With reference in particular to the first feature, several questions could be raised. Were elections held in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Finland since WWII fair and free? Were

⁶⁵² Zhang, *Zhongguo jindai sixiangjia wenku*, 540.

⁶⁵³ Zhang made these remarks before Czechoslovakia became a communist state after the coup d’état in February 1948.

⁶⁵⁴ Zhang, *Zhongguo jindai sixiangjia wenku*, 540.

⁶⁵⁵ Eugen Varga, “Democracy of a New Type,” *Seventeen Moments in Soviet History*, accessed 25 October 2018, <http://soviethistory.msu.edu/1947-2/cominform-and-the-soviet-bloc/cominform-and-the-soviet-bloc-texts/democracy-of-a-new-type/>.

⁶⁵⁶ Zhang, *Zhongguo jindai sixiangjia wenku*, 541.

⁶⁵⁷ Ibid.

elections in the three countries different or similar? Was it good for a communist party to dominate the election and therefore create a Communist-led coalition government? Zhang did not discuss these questions. He was concerned about the early stage of democratisation of countries like China. The first thing that a single-party state must do was to grant opposition parties legal status and allow them to compete in elections. Zhang thought Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Finland (especially Czechoslovakia) set good examples for China, whose political conditions to some extent were similar.

Democracy of a new type in essence was a further development of the “middle-of-the-road politics” Zhang discussed in 1946.⁶⁵⁸ Zhang made two points concerning this middle way. First, as regards foreign policy, China must have an independent stance. To be close to the Soviet Union would make Britain and America unsatisfied. In the same vein, to follow the West would cause hostility from Russia.⁶⁵⁹ Hence, China was to find its own way of development that was different from capitalism and communism. Second, as regards domestic politics, China needed a third political force outside the KMT and the CCP to establish a democratic system.⁶⁶⁰

To be exact, the political system of the middle road was based on the principles of liberalism and democracy.⁶⁶¹ In this sense, the Chinese political system was to be similar to that of Britain and America.⁶⁶² Meanwhile, China was going to adopt economic planning so its economic system would resemble the system of the Soviet Union.⁶⁶³ Zhang said: “We want democracy and abandon capitalism. We adopt socialism but discard the proletarian dictatorship. We advocate liberty and cooperation rather than laissez faire economics and class struggle.”⁶⁶⁴ To put it simply, this middle way in a broad sense was democracy, but it was not a pure Western type, let alone the Soviet type.⁶⁶⁵

It should be noted that after the mid-1940s Mao Zedong and the CCP also argued for the establishment of new democracy and a coalition government. However, Mao’s new democracy (xin minzhuzhuyi 新民主主义) was different from the new type of democracy Zhang advocated. When Zhang realised this it was too late. Zhang Heci (张鹤慈), a grandson

⁶⁵⁸ Zhang had published his theory of the middle way before actual examples of democracy of a new type in Europe were discernible.

⁶⁵⁹ Zhang, *Zhang Dongsun xueshu wenhua suibi*, 171-73.

⁶⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 173.

⁶⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 176.

of Zhang Dongsun, recalled that his grandfather expressed a negative opinion of Mao.⁶⁶⁶ “My grandfather told me that Mao Zedong was not a reliable person...To understand the real Mao one should never rely merely on Mao’s writings. He never kept his word. If you only read his articles you would be deceived.”⁶⁶⁷ It was not until his late years that Zhang Dongsun told his grandson these thoughts on Mao. Another factor that explains why Zhang in the 1940s believed that the CCP had a commitment to democracy was that some articles such as “On a Coalition Government of China” in *Selected Readings of Mao Zedong* published before 1949 differed from those published after the founding of the PRC. Zhang Heci who got the earliest and limited edition from his grandfather compared the two editions and discovered this difference.⁶⁶⁸ According to the description of Zhang Heci, the tone and many words in the article “On a Coalition Government of China” were significantly different from a later edition, especially the paragraphs discussing America.⁶⁶⁹

6.5.2 Economic Democracy: A Mixed Economy

Another thing that may confuse us is Zhang’s remarks on the applicability of Russia’s economic system to China. On the one hand, Zhang said China’s future economic system was socialism, similar to that of the Soviet Union. On the other hand, he distinguished the Soviet system from the economic system of new democracies. In fact, Zhang Dongsun had a unique understanding of Russia’s planned economy (socialism). He thought that it was a mixed economy rather than pure socialism.

Lenin’s vision of Russia’s economic system during the transition from capitalism to socialism accounted for Zhang’s misinterpreting Stalin’s planned economy as a mixed economy. It was not because Zhang misunderstood Lenin’s ideas but because Zhang misunderstood the actual economic system adopted by Stalin. He thought that Stalin’s Five-

⁶⁶⁶ Dai, *Zai rulaifo zhang zhong*, 468.

⁶⁶⁷ Ibid, 43.

⁶⁶⁸ Ibid. Zhang Heci read the limited edition in the early 1960s. But during the Cultural Revolution this limited edition of *Selected Readings of Mao Zedong* was confiscated by Red Guards. This edition is not accessible to the public. It is hard for me to get it and compare it with later editions. But the banned book *Lishi de xiansheng* 历史的先声 shows that Mao made promises that the CCP would pursue democracy and freedom and that the CCP would not establish a Soviet type of political system. This banned book is a collection of speeches and articles by the CCP including its leaders such as Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai. The editor collected these from the CCP’s newspapers *Xinhua Daily* 新华日报 and *Jiefang Daily* 解放日报 in the 1940s. For this Chinese book, see Xiaoshu, ed., *Lishi de xiansheng* [Herald in Our History—Solemn Promises Made by the Chinese Communists in the 1940s] (Shantou: Shantou daxue chubanshe, 1999). The article “On a Coalition Government of China” was first published in the mid-1940s. It is highly likely that Mao in this article also tried to create a democratic profile by commending freedom, human rights, and American democracy. Marina Svensson has discussed the CCP’s call for the protection of human rights in the 1940s, see Svensson, *Debating Human Rights in China*, 197-99.

⁶⁶⁹ Dai, *Zai rulaifo zhang zhong*, 43.

Year Plans followed Lenin's doctrines of state capitalism which combined elements of both capitalism and socialism. Zhang wrote:

The idea of a planned economy is not derived from the doctrines of Marx. Instead, it is attributed to the German economist Georg Friedrich List who belongs to the school of national economics. To be honest, the reason that a planned economy works for the Soviet Union is that state capitalism has been adopted. I use "state capitalism" and this term is the original word that Lenin used. He said that under a Soviet government state capitalism constituted three-quarters of socialism. (According to the book *Economic Planning in Soviet Russia* by Boris Brutzkus, this sentence Lenin expressed appeared on page 484 in the 23rd volume of *All Works of Lenin*. But I only find it on page 100 in Brutzkus's book).⁶⁷⁰

In the late 1940s, Zhang held that a planned economy was a suitable economic system for Russia to achieve the transition to socialism. "The Soviet Union does not acknowledge that communism has been realised. When Russia will make it is uncertain. At present, Russia is in a transition. During the transitional period, what Russia can do is to strive for the goal that Lenin set. This goal is to establish an economic system in which state capitalism constitutes three-quarters and socialism makes up one-quarter of the economy. This system can also be seen as a hybrid of socialism and state capitalism."⁶⁷¹ These remarks actually pertained to Lenin's economic thinking. Zhang did not misinterpret Lenin's theory about a mixed economy during the transition. He referred to Lenin's economic thinking. Lenin said:

But what does the word "transition" mean? Does it not mean, as applied to an economy, that the present system contains elements, particles, fragments of both capitalism and socialism? Everyone will admit that it does. But not all who admit this take the trouble to consider what elements actually constitute the various socio-economic structures that exist in Russia at the present time. And this is the crux of the question. Let us enumerate these elements: (1) patriarchal, i.e., to a considerable extent natural, peasant farming; (2) small commodity production (this includes the majority of those peasants who sell their grain); (3) private capitalism; (4) state capitalism; (5) socialism.

Russia is so vast and so varied that all these different types of socio-economic structures are intermingled. This is what constitutes the specific feature of the situation.⁶⁷²

⁶⁷⁰ Zhang, *Minzhuzhuyi yu shehuizhuyi*, 49-50. Hayek wrote a forward for Brutzkus's book and he made positive comments on this book. See Boris Brutzkus, *Economic Planning in Soviet Russia* (London: George Routledge & Sons, 1935), vii-xii.

⁶⁷¹ Zhang, *Minzhuzhuyi yu shehuizhuyi*, 60.

⁶⁷² V. I. Lenin, *Lenin Collected Works*, trans., David Walters and R. Cymbala, vol. 32. (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965), "The Tax in Kind", <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1921/apr/21.htm>.

Zhang misinterpreted Stalin's planned economy as a hybrid of socialism and state capitalism that Lenin designed for Russia during the transition from capitalism to socialism. In spite of the misinterpretation, the economic system that Zhang himself advocated for China's economic development was a type of a mixed economy. He discussed Russia's economic system in order to provide an alternative to pure capitalism and to argue that China should modify Russia's economic system to build the national economy.

In the West, a planned economy then was usually associated with a particular version of socialism or communism that would not allow any capitalist element. Zhang had different views. He argued that a planned economy was by nature neutral and capitalist countries could also adopt it; economic planning was not a matter of presence or absence but a matter of degree.⁶⁷³ Zhang regarded economic planning as a means of building the national economy. Capitalist countries used this means at a late stage of their economic development and fascist countries also used this means. However, not all instances of economic planning would bring about good changes. In capitalist countries, economic planning was still subject to the principle of laissez faire liberalism. To make progress, economic planning must comply with the principles of socialism—equality and justice.

In addition to a different interpretation of a planned economy, there is a second point that helps us understand the consistency of Zhang's idea—the applicability of a mixed economy to China. When Zhang published the theory of "the middle way", the economic systems in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Finland were at an early stage of development. It was just one year since the end of WWII. To Zhang a mixed economy as an alternative to pure capitalism was then represented by the Soviet Union. But in the late 1940s, Zhang made a distinction between the Soviet type of democracy and the new democracies. A significant difference between the two types of mixed economies was that the latter respected the right to private property. The other difference was the internal structure of a mixed economy—the relative weight of private enterprises, public enterprises, and cooperatives. Zhang did not provide the statistics of these new democracies. He only said that these countries were different from the Soviet Union and that China's future democratic system was supposed to be the general category of democracy of a new type.

⁶⁷³ Zhang, *Zhang Dongsun xueshu wenhua suibi*, 251.

6.6 Zhang Dongsun and the New Liberalism in the West

Zhang tried to integrate liberalism and some form of socialism into one idea-system—democracy. Most of the constituent concepts of democracy were the very core concepts of liberalism and socialism but his theory was more liberal than socialistic. The form of socialism he espoused was the one that was subject to the fundamental principles of democracy and liberalism. He argued that genuine democracy must contain this form of socialism and socialism as a remedy for injustice was the same thing as democracy.⁶⁷⁴ Advocates of democracy considered absolutism or authoritarianism as the most severe problem in their societies whereas thinkers with socialist leanings observed that economic exploitation was the greatest evil in their world.⁶⁷⁵ Democracy and socialism must converge and become a composite.⁶⁷⁶ Zhang maintained that this composite was not entirely the same thing as social democracy which was historically associated with the ideologies and policies of socialist parties.⁶⁷⁷ To avoid ambiguity and misunderstanding, he preferred not to use the term “social democracy” to describe the composite.⁶⁷⁸

Zhang Dongsun made very positive comments on the incipient trend of political thought in the first half of the twentieth century—to absorb socialism without compromising liberalism. In an article published in 1947 Zhang made the following comments:

John Dewey has recently published the book *Problems of Man* which consists of essays about his political and social thought. This book shows that the recent trend of his thinking is to fully absorb socialism or communism without sacrificing liberalism. Personally, I appreciate such an attitude. Liberalism and socialism can be integrated into one system and there should not be a conflict between the two regarding the substance...In my opinion, if socialism is to be transplanted into China, this form of socialism must be integrated with liberalism.⁶⁷⁹

In Zhang’s opinion, the Labour government of Britain and the American government under the leadership of Roosevelt were good examples of the implementation of democracy that integrated good aspects of liberalism and socialism. This kind of practical politics was not separable from the ideas of political thinkers or economists at that time. Chinese

⁶⁷⁴ Zhang, *Sixiang yu shehui*, 267-68; Zhang, *Minzhuzhuyi yu shehuizhuyi*, 26.

⁶⁷⁵ Zhang, *Lixing yu minzhu*, 192.

⁶⁷⁶ Zhang, *Sixiang yu shehui*, 268.

⁶⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁷⁹ Zhang, *Zhongguo jindai sixiangjia wenku*, 520.

intellectuals such as Liang Qichao, Carsun Chang, and Zhang Dongsun embraced the new liberal tradition. In the early 1920s, they organised an academic association that would employ prominent Western thinkers to disseminate new ideas in China. The British economists J. A. Hobson and John Maynard Keynes were on the list.⁶⁸⁰ Before this association had difficulty with funding, it had managed to pay three Western philosophers, John Dewey, Bertrand Russell, and Hans Driesch who worked for the association. These scholars stayed in China for at least one year. They delivered lectures to Chinese audiences and published some works on China. Dewey published *China, Japan and the USA* in 1921 and Russell had *The Problem of China* published in 1922.⁶⁸¹ These books concerned their observations of China, especially Chinese culture, politics, and society in the early 1920s.

A very important reason for employing these Western scholars was that Liang, Chang, and Zhang thought their ideas helped to solve the problems of Republican China. Democracy and political liberalism would rid China of authoritarianism and Warlordism. A liberal or democratic form of socialism would help deal with economic inequality and a communist revolution. Both Russell and Dewey supported the federalist movement in China, advocating provincial autonomy.⁶⁸² In addition, they held that transformation from within was the sole way out and China must work out her own salvation which would not discard the merits of Chinese culture.⁶⁸³ Concerning Bolshevism, Dewey and Russell were well aware of its attraction to some Chinese intellectuals. Dewey supported China's transformation that would be based on Chinese culture and spirit.⁶⁸⁴ Russell disapproved of the application of Bolshevism to China and advocated education and social reforms as the proper means of transforming China.⁶⁸⁵ Liang, Chang, and Zhang had similar views on the federalist movement, Chinese culture, and Bolshevism.

⁶⁸⁰ Zuo, *Zhang Dongsun zhuan*, 68.

⁶⁸¹ See John Dewey, *China, Japan and the USA: Present-Day Conditions in the Far East and Their Bearing on the Washington Conference* (New York: Republic Publishing, 1921); Bertrand Russell, *The Problem of China* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1922).

⁶⁸² Russell, *The Problem of China*, 244; Dewey, *China, Japan and the USA* (New York: Republic Publishing Company, 1921), chap. VI, Project Gutenberg, <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/28393/28393-h/28393-h.htm#essay4>.

⁶⁸³ Russell, *The Problem of China*, 194. Dewey, *China, Japan and the USA*, chap. VII. According to the research of Jessica Ching-Sze Wang, Dewey's trip to China also changed Dewey's social and political philosophy, especially his thought on democracy. After the trip Dewey thought that democracy was more than a political system or a form of government. He realised that democracy was a way of community life. It was ethical and cultural. See Jessica Ching-Sze Wang, *John Dewey in China: To Teach and to Learn* (New York: State University of New York Press, 2007), 109-12. This understanding of democracy was akin to that of Zhang Dongsun who regarded democracy as a form of society and a cultural conception that encompassed all aspects of a society.

⁶⁸⁴ Wang, *John Dewey in China*, 111.

⁶⁸⁵ Russell, *The Problem of China*, 194; Tan Zhongchi, ed., *Changsha tongshi: Xiandai juan* [A General History of Changsha, Modern Times] (Changsha: Hunan jiaoyu chubanshe, 2013), 169-71.

The ideas of these Western and Chinese scholars then were well received by many Chinese students and some local governments and they had a positive influence on the federalist movement of China in the 1920s. From October to November in 1920 the government and scholars of Hunan province invited some of these Western and Chinese scholars to deliver lectures.⁶⁸⁶ Dewey and Russell accompanied by Zhang Dongsun arrived in Changsha, the capital city of Hunan. All discussed the social transformation of China and argued for a moderate means of transformation.⁶⁸⁷ In addition, Dewey and Zhang Dongsun mentioned federalism and China's movement of self-governance. Both were for self-governance and the application of federalism in China. They suggested that Hunan and other local governments in China should first create conditions for federalism and self-governance. Dewey said in the aftermath of wars the priority for China was to develop education, industries, commerce, and businesses so that people could live in peace and order.⁶⁸⁸ Zhang agreed with Dewey. Moreover, Zhang proposed three principles for China's social transformation: liberty, equality, and progress.⁶⁸⁹ China should lay equal stress on each of them.⁶⁹⁰ These lectures and speeches helped Hunan promote federalism. Mao Zedong attended these lectures and was responsible for recording some speeches.⁶⁹¹ At that time he was for self-government and federalism but he disapproved of the moderate means of transformation proposed by Zhang Dongsun, Dewey, and Russell. In 1922 Hunan became the first local government that made its own draft constitution. This movement also produced the first elected provincial Governor and female councilors in Chinese history before 1949.

In spite of their similarities, there were two differences between Zhang and Western thinkers such as Dewey, Hobhouse, Hobson, and Russell. After the mid-1940s Zhang devoted much space to the argument that democracy and socialism were the same thing and the two must converge. A second difference was that Zhang associated the socialist ideal of Marx to democracy. These differences reflected a distinctive Chinese context—the influence of the CCP on Chinese politics and the intelligentsia was growing. This did not take place in Britain or America. Nevertheless, Dewey and Russell discussed Chinese democracy and socialism during their visits to China in the late 1910s or the early 1920s. Both opposed revolutionary socialism and advocated moderate means of social transformation so as to make China a democracy. Zhang shared these views with Dewey and Russell. Zhang's argument that

⁶⁸⁶ Tan, *Changsha tongshi*, 165.

⁶⁸⁷ Ibid, 165-78, 200-203.

⁶⁸⁸ Ibid, 177-78.

⁶⁸⁹ Ibid, 200

⁶⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁶⁹¹ Ibid, 166.

democracy and socialism must converge was not only a critique of the old liberalism and Russian Communism but also an endeavour to persuade the CCP to pursue a form of socialism that was compatible with democracy and liberalism. His book *Democracy and Socialism* was published in July 1948. In January 1949 he sent this book to Mao Zedong.⁶⁹² Mao in return gave him *Selected Readings of Mao Zedong*. Although Zhang did not treat Mao's writings as serious and scholarly works he then pinned hopes on the CCP. It was not until later that Zhang found out the truth.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I investigated Zhang Dongsun's theory of democracy in the 1940s in order to understand the features of his liberal thought and the developing gulf between Zhang Dongsun and Carsun Chang. Zhang integrated several core concepts of liberalism (liberty, individuality, rationality, and progress) and a core concept of socialism (equality) into the conceptual system of democracy. The concepts such as tolerance and human rights in Zhang's conceptual system of democracy could be derived from other core concepts of liberalism like sociability and limited and accountable power. Zhang's theoretical construction showed his attempt at reconciling liberalism with socialism. His conception of "Democracy of a New Type" was an application of his theory of democracy to Chinese conditions. It sought to establish a Chinese democracy with some socialist elements in terms of the economic system. This kind of liberal thought that contained basic principles of political liberalism and some socialist ingredients was also discernible in Britain and America. Liang Qichao's research group including Zhang was fond of this liberal tradition. These Chinese thinkers tried to invite some British and American new liberals to come to China for lectures in the 1920s. Till the 1940s Zhang still paid attention to the political thought of John Dewey. Notwithstanding a similarity between Zhang and those new liberals, Zhang finally related the socialist ideal of Marx to his theory of democracy. He probably thought that if the CCP followed the ideal of Marx rather than Russian Communists, the CCP could be trusted.

⁶⁹² Dai, *Zai rulaifo zhang zhong*, 43.

Chapter VII: Left Liberalism of Zhang Dongsun

This chapter is a further elaboration of Chapter VI, which contends that until the early 1930s Zhang's political thought was similar to that of Carsun Chang and the new liberalism in the West in many respects, but in the 1940s his political thinking turned left, bearing some Marxist leanings. I will investigate Zhang Dongsun's perspective on liberalism, socialism, and the divergences between Zhang and Chang in the 1940s. To examine Zhang's split with Chang enables us to understand an ideological cause of a divided Chinese liberalism that undermined China's prospects for democracy. At that time, there were at least two streams of Chinese liberalism: new liberalism and left liberalism. Zhang became a left liberal while Chang remained a new liberal. The CCP might have reconsidered its decision if the third force represented by the Democratic League had reached a consensus to form a coalition government with the KMT. Unfortunately, many members of the Democratic League were sympathetic towards the CCP. This split within the third force was not much caused by a belief in the political ideology of the CCP but divided opinions on the nature of the CCP and its correlation with Marxian socialism in general. Zhang was a representative of those who supported the CCP. Along with Zhang, many of the third force in the 1940s changed their negative views of the CCP and preferred the CCP to the KMT.

The chapter is divided into four sections. In the first section, I discuss the context of left liberalism in the 1940s. Section 2 deals with Zhang Dongsun's understanding of liberty, liberalism, individualism, and his contemplation of their relationships to Chinese democracy and state-building. Section 3 illustrates how Zhang perceived socialism and its variants. It shows that Zhang opposed Marxism-Leninism but had a good opinion of social democracy. His views of Marx, however, underwent a great change in the 1940s. Until the 1930s he disapproved of the teachings of Marx while in the 1940s he regarded Marx as a genuine democrat. The last section analyses an ideological divergence between Zhang Dongsun and Carsun Chang. The divergence had an influence on their different political choices.

7.1 Left Liberalism in the Chinese Context of the 1940s

Events that happened in 1946 had great implications for Chinese politics because agreements reached at the Political Consultative Conference provided for a constitutional democracy with a coalition government of all parties. Delegates of the KMT, the CCP, the DL, and some

independents attended the Conference and discussed five key issues: government organisation, national reconstruction, military problems, the National Assembly, and constitution-making.

The Conference passed five resolutions on these issues.⁶⁹³ All parties had few disputes over resolutions on national reconstruction, military problems, and constitution-making. Some questions on government organisation and the National Assembly remained to be negotiated by the CCP and the KMT. But ultimately an agreement on the National Assembly was also reached. The major controversy concerned government organisation—the number of seats at the State Council allocated to the CCP. Pending the convocation of the National Assembly, the State Council was the supreme organ of the Government in charge of national affairs. The State Council would consist of 40 councillors. Half of the State Councillors would be the KMT members. General resolutions before the State Council would be passed by a majority of the Councillors present. If a resolution involved changes in an administrative policy, it must be passed by a two-thirds vote of the State Councillors present. To veto a change that would be initiated by the KMT, the CCP demanded that 14 Councillors be chosen from the CCP and the Democratic League. The KMT finally agreed to give 13 seats. However, the CCP was determined not to make a compromise. This dispute indeed became one of the pretexts for the CCP to boycott the new constitution and the National Assembly despite the fact that the substance of the constitution Chang drafted was not considerably different from the one the CCP had discussed in detail with Carsun Chang.⁶⁹⁴

Meanwhile, there were continuous military attacks between the CCP and the KMT. The KMT decided to convene the National Assembly as soon as possible but the CCP refused to send delegates to the Assembly. Apart from the quota of seats at the State Council, the CCP stated other reasons for boycotting the Assembly, claiming that the KMT violated the agreements of the PCC. The KMT attacked the CCP and announced the convocation of the National Assembly without negotiating with the CCP and the DL. The Communists argued that the Constitution made the KMT dictatorship legal. But the CCP's description was one-

⁶⁹³ For the texts of these resolutions, see Lei Zhen, *Zhonghua minguo zhixian shi*, 56-79; The United States Department of State, ed., *The China White Paper, August 1949* (California: Stanford University Press, 1967), 610-16.

⁶⁹⁴ Even if the KMT met the demand of the CCP, it was not certain that the CCP would recognise the Constitution and attend the National Assembly. In 1967 Zhou Enlai made some remarks which revealed the true intention of Mao Zedong. "After I attended the PCC of 1946 I went back to Yanan and reported the Conference to Chairman Mao. Liu Shaoqi was present, too. Chairman Mao explicitly said that our purpose for peaceful negotiations with the KMT was to buy some time so that we were able to maintain our strength and train our armies. We needed to do three things simultaneously to prepare for a war with the KMT: army training, production, and land reform...In addition, Chairman Mao instructed that we could sign the agreements of the PCC and pay lip service to the Resolutions." See Zhou Enlai, "Zhou Enlai tan pipan Liu Shaoqi" [Zhou Enlai on the Question of Liu Shaoqi], *Wenxuecheng boke* [Blog on Literature], updated 28 April 2009, <http://blog.wenxuecity.com/blog/frontend.php?act=articlePrint&blogId=42701&date=200904&postId=44609>.

sided. Both the CCP and the KMT violated agreements of the PCC. The CCP also attacked the KMT and occupied the Northeast of China with the help of the Soviet Union. To accuse the KMT of promulgating a constitution that legalised the dictatorship of the KMT was groundless. Clauses of the new constitution were based on the resolution on constitution-making at the PCC and Zhou Enlai as the representative of the CCP discussed the details and agreed upon the bulk of the substance. However, it was true that the KMT announced the convocation of the National Assembly unilaterally. The DL criticised this, too.

Not only did these events in 1946 cause the breakdown of political negotiations between the CCP and the KMT but also they caused a split within Chinese liberals, especially the DL. In the year 1948, Zhang Dongsun said he agreed that until the convention of the Political Consultative Conference of 1946 Chinese intellectuals were committed to political liberalism but events that happened after the Conference made the Chinese intelligentsia split.⁶⁹⁵ This also described the split between Zhang Dongsun and Carsun Chang. They had to decide whether to attend the Assembly or not. Both were leaders of the same party and the DL but they made different choices. The KMT government reserved quotas of the delegates for the CCP and other parties. Chang thought it was necessary to include the CCP in a coalition government. However, the CCP refused to join the new government. Chang decided to let his party attend the Assembly on the condition that the government would pass and enforce the constitution he drafted. Zhang had a different opinion. He held that even if the KMT approved of the constitution and a coalition government was formed without the participation of the CCP, the KMT would still be the largest party dominating the reformed government.

The KMT's understanding of democracy is totally incorrect. They think that a democratic constitution and elections will bring about democracy. We hold that a constitution is a mere scrap of paper. If elections are manipulated by one party, there will be no democracy but anti-democracy. Therefore, a democratic constitution and elections are not the kernel of democracy. We subscribe to the co-existence of all parties and this is the essence of genuine democracy.⁶⁹⁶

Zhang and Chang split not because they had different political ideals but because Zhang changed his opinions of the CCP and Marx. Until the mid-1930s Zhang was still a new liberal. "I am a disciple of democratic politics. I am also a follower of liberalism. My hope of

⁶⁹⁵ Zhang, *Zhongguo jindai sixiangjia wenku*, 592.

⁶⁹⁶ *Ibid*, 502.

establishing democratic politics is not different from the hope of entitling each individual the right to liberty.”⁶⁹⁷ Changes in Zhang’s opinions of the CCP and Marx were evident in the 1940s. I describe Zhang’s differences in these respects as “left” relative to the views of Carsun Chang. Their divergences were concerned with the nature of the CCP and its relationship to Marx and Russian Communism. Zhang assumed that the CCP was committed to democracy. By contrast, Carsun Chang did not think the CCP’s political ideal was different from the Communists of the Soviet Union. Never did Chang pay a compliment to Marx.

7.2 Modifications of Classical Liberalism

Zhang held that classical liberalism was not sufficient to solve the problems of the twentieth century and therefore it must be complemented by a democratic form of socialism. In his opinion, it was very difficult to establish constitutionalism and democracy without a culture of individualism.⁶⁹⁸ To get democracy established, China should not discard individualism.⁶⁹⁹ If socialism was imposed on a country which had no individualism, socialism would definitely lead nowhere.⁷⁰⁰ As was analysed in the preceding chapter, Zhang thought that socialism and democracy must converge and socialism must be compatible with liberty and democracy. Zhang thought that any socialist society which did not develop cultural individualism would have no democracy or constitutionalism. A socialist society was pointless with no democracy and constitutionalism.

Though Zhang attached importance to liberalism and individualism, he did not have a one-sided view of liberalism or individualism. When liberalism or individualism combined with capitalism or laissez faire economics, it resulted in economic inequality and relevant social problems.⁷⁰¹ Zhang thus modified classical liberalism and developed it in the direction of liberal socialism or social democracy in the hope of solving China’s problems including authoritarianism, poverty, and the power struggle between the KMT and the CCP.

7.2.1 Liberty, Personality, and Restraint

Zhang did not emphasise the differences between “freedom” and “liberty” when he referred to civil or social rights. Freedom to him was more associated with the philosophical conception of the will of the individual whereas liberty was more connected to liberation—

⁶⁹⁷ Zhang, *Zhang Dongsun xueshu wenhua suibi*, 15.

⁶⁹⁸ Ibid, 286.

⁶⁹⁹ Ibid, 219, 259.

⁷⁰⁰ Ibid, 287.

⁷⁰¹ Ibid, 284-85.

civil or social rights.⁷⁰² However, he quoted Mill and explained that his discussion likewise was more concerned about the civil or social rights whose opposite was coercion or repression.⁷⁰³ This use of freedom departed from the tradition of Chinese thought such as Confucianism. Zhang said that Chinese thought was always characterised by holism.⁷⁰⁴ Accordingly, freedom of the individual was related to the concept of harmony with the whole.⁷⁰⁵ Confucianism did not regard freedom as being free from external constraints.⁷⁰⁶ Overall, Zhang's conception of liberty was not significantly different from that of Carsun Chang and Hobhouse. Liberty was both negative and positive. On the one hand, he related liberty to concepts of the self and personality. On the other hand, he conceived liberty as a social conception that involved control or restraint. Among all liberties, Zhang argued that spiritual freedom or the liberty of thought and discussion was supreme and absolute. This liberty was indispensable to individualism and liberalism.

Liberty to Zhang meant individual growth and consciousness of the self. It did not merely mean being free from external restraints.⁷⁰⁷ It was also a positive concept which made a person recognise equal freedom of others.⁷⁰⁸ He agreed with the American philosopher John Dewey and the Italian liberal and historian of philosophy Guido De Ruggiero concerning their views on freedom. He quoted their remarks on freedom. Dewey said, "Freedom for an individual means growth, ready change when modification is required."⁷⁰⁹ De Ruggiero wrote, "Liberty is consciousness of oneself, of one's own infinite spiritual value; and the same recognition in the case of other people follows naturally from this immediate revelation. Only one who is conscious of himself as free is capable of recognising the freedom of others."⁷¹⁰

Zhang argued that real liberty involved control and restraint. The social dimension of liberty made it necessary to recognise the same and equal liberties of other members in a society. From the viewpoint of Zhang, this kind of restraint was legitimate and necessary. First, freedom could not conflict with the rule of law.⁷¹¹ The spirit of the rule of law not only

⁷⁰² Zhang, *Lixing yu minzhu*, 173.

⁷⁰³ Ibid, 177.

⁷⁰⁴ Ibid, 182.

⁷⁰⁵ Ibid, 181.

⁷⁰⁶ Ibid, 183.

⁷⁰⁷ Ibid, 185.

⁷⁰⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁰⁹ Ibid. For Dewey's remarks, see John Dewey, *Reconstruction in Philosophy* (New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1920), 207.

⁷¹⁰ Zhang, *Lixing yu minzhu*, 103; Guido De Ruggiero, *The History of European Liberalism*, trans. R. G. Collingwood (London: Oxford University Press, 1927), 13.

⁷¹¹ Zhang, *Zhongguo jindaisixiangjia wenku*, 31.

required that the power of the state be limited but also that restraint be necessary for the protection of liberty.⁷¹² Second, true freedom was not separable from the concept of equality.⁷¹³ It meant that freedom an individual enjoyed should not conflict with that of others and one could not impinge on the same freedom of others. Equal personality would be recognised.⁷¹⁴ Third, Zhang subscribed to Hobhouse's view that liberty as a social conception was a right to be shared by all members of society.⁷¹⁵ He went further to justify Hobhouse's advocacy of state intervention and a collective responsibility in a society that was negatively influenced by atomic individualism and laissez faire economics. Zhang said: "For such a society the essential question is not to discuss whether freedom is good or whether intervention is bad. The real problem is how to strike a balance and draw a line between individual freedom and state intervention."⁷¹⁶ Zhang argued for the separation of government and society. The government should not intervene in the social sphere and private sphere of the individual because the cultivation of personality depended on a free society.⁷¹⁷ Education, ethics, religious beliefs, and some local affairs were some areas state interference was not legitimate.⁷¹⁸

Among the basic rights, Zhang attached supreme importance to spiritual freedom the immediate embodiment of which was liberty of thought and discussion.⁷¹⁹ This freedom was part of cultural liberalism—a critical or suspicious spirit and an attitude of tolerance.⁷²⁰ The antithesis of freedom of thought was dictatorship in forms of Russian Communism, fascism or other isms.⁷²¹ He held that all liberties relied on the protection of one liberty—spiritual freedom or liberty of thought and discussion.⁷²² As the kernel of freedom, this liberty meant that the individual had an independent personality and was capable of self-autonomy and independent judgement without the control and interference of others.⁷²³ To defend the significance of freedom of thought, Zhang quoted Mill's liberal principles and the relationship of this liberty to the pursuit of truth.⁷²⁴

⁷¹² Ibid.

⁷¹³ Zhang, *Lixing yu minzhu*, 186; Zhang Dongsun *xueshu wenhua suibi*, 328.

⁷¹⁴ Zhang, *Lixing yu minzhu*, 186.

⁷¹⁵ Ibid, 203; Hobhouse, *Social Evolution and Political Theory*, 189-90.

⁷¹⁶ Zhang, *Lixing yu minzhu*, 203.

⁷¹⁷ Zhang, *Zhang Dongsun xueshu wenhua suibi*, 55, 63.

⁷¹⁸ Ibid, 56.

⁷¹⁹ Ibid, 199.

⁷²⁰ Ibid, 325.

⁷²¹ Zhang, *Lixing yu minzhu*, 199.

⁷²² Ibid.

⁷²³ Zhang, *Minzhuzhuyi yu shehuizhuyi*, 13.

⁷²⁴ Zhang summed up essential points of the section "Liberty of Thought and Discussion". For the text, see John S. Mill, *On Liberty* (Kitchener: Batoche Books, 2001), 19-52.

7.2.2 Liberalism, Individualism, and China's Path to Democracy

Zhang Dongsun did not define liberalism, but he related liberalism to several concepts: liberty, democracy, individuality, self-governance, tolerance, and constitutionalism. A historical manifestation of liberalism that promoted and advanced these values was the European liberal tradition in the eighteenth century. Zhang argued that liberalism was the precondition of all isms because the existence of all isms depended on the protection of freedom of thought.⁷²⁵ Moreover, concepts such as liberty, democracy, and self-governance would never be outdated.⁷²⁶ Nevertheless, Zhang's perception of liberalism was not all positive. A particular phenomenon in the history of Western liberalism was a capitalist society based on doctrines of laissez faire liberalism. Zhang was critical of this phenomenon. He described this kind of liberalism which evolved from the liberalism in the eighteenth century as the "old liberalism"⁷²⁷

Zhang believed that a liberal or democratic form of socialism was complementary to the old liberalism.

I do not mean that liberalism is not good but that given the situation of today it is not adequate to promote only liberalism. Nowadays in the West some people advocate liberal socialism and others promote social democracy. We can see that to preach a single ism such as liberalism is not sufficient to cope with the problems we face today. This is a growing tendency all over the world.⁷²⁸

Apart from liberalism, Zhang also related the emergence and development of democracy to individualism.⁷²⁹ He regarded individualism as a philosophy of the moral self, personality, individual consciousness, and personal responsibility.⁷³⁰ It was not selfishness or indulgence as was misinterpreted in traditional Chinese culture.⁷³¹ In a society which was based on a culture of individualism, the individual was the agent and the state was an instrument for the

⁷²⁵ Zhang, *Zhang Dongsun xueshu wenhua suibi*, 329.

⁷²⁶ Zhang, *Lixing yu minzhu*, 208.

⁷²⁷ Zhang, *Zhang Dongsun xueshu wenhua suibi*, 247.

⁷²⁸ Ibid, 249.

⁷²⁹ Ibid, 219.

⁷³⁰ Ibid, 233, 283.

⁷³¹ Ibid.

happiness of the individual.⁷³² Nevertheless, Zhang also associated individualism with capitalism, a crisis of the West.⁷³³

In spite of the phenomenon of capitalism, Zhang maintained that China still needed a culture of individualism and liberalism. “Individualism helps develop a consciousness of self-respect and personal responsibility. Individuals who have these attributes have no fear of authority and are able to observe the principle of spiritual freedom and independence. This is a widely accepted conception of liberalism.”⁷³⁴

Zhang held that the real challenge for China was not whether individualism was applicable or not but how to deal with the relationship between individualism and collectivism and between human rights and the right to private property in the future. He wrote: “Will China first develop a culture of individualism and then lead a collectivist life? Or will individualism and collectivism develop in parallel? Shall we in some areas advocate individualism and in other areas promote collectivism? This is the real and tricky problem that we should contemplate.”⁷³⁵ It would be perfect that individualism developed in parallel with collectivism, but in practice there was a conflict between the two due to the particular traditions of China.⁷³⁶ Zhang noted that the question of property was a good case in point:

In theory, if we recognise the value of personality that is associated with individualism, we must recognise the right to private property. And human rights are not separable from the right to private property. However, Chinese society and politics were negatively influenced by a monarchical tradition. In this kind of political and social system, Chinese people had no human rights or the right to private property. Neither was protected. According to the principle of individualism, if China is to respect human rights, China must respect the right to private property. Without the right to private property, it is impossible to have an independent and integral personality. Here lies the difficulty China must overcome. China has not undergone an industrial revolution.⁷³⁷

Zhang maintained that China must develop individualism that was conducive to the protection of all individual rights, the right to private property included.⁷³⁸ In his opinion, the industrial revolution, individualism, and constitutionalism were closely related and they

⁷³² Ibid.

⁷³³ Zhang, *Zhang Dongsun xueshu wenhua suibi*, 284-85.

⁷³⁴ Ibid, 259.

⁷³⁵ Ibid, 287-88.

⁷³⁶ Ibid.

⁷³⁷ Ibid, 288.

⁷³⁸ Ibid, 289.

helped the establishment of democracy. If China was to pursue socialism, this form of socialism must be compatible with democracy and liberty. This was a great difference between his view of socialism and that of the CCP. However, in the 1940s Zhang neglected this difference.

As was shown, Zhang was opposed to the abolition of private property. How did he reconcile this with the tenets of Marx and the practices of the CCP? Zhang did not discuss Marx's views on the matter of private property but his standpoint on the protection of the right to private property in all his works at different times was always consistent. With reference in particular to the CCP, Zhang was critical of its ideology which advocated the abolition of private property. However, Zhang did not discuss much about the CCP's perspective on private property because from the 1930s to 1949 the CCP did not dwell on the idea of the abolition of private property. Instead of promoting the "abolition of private property", the CCP used "land reforms" (the redistribution of land) more frequently to attract people in rural areas. Zhang disapproved of the radical land reforms that confiscated the properties of landlords and rich peasants. Relevant policies were formulated in the late 1920s and land reforms were carried out in limited areas controlled by the CCP from the 1930s.⁷³⁹ Moreover, the CCP's policies on land reforms were flexible. Collective farms and radical land reforms were not always practised by the CCP from 1930 until 1949. When it needed support or supply of produces from rural regions to fight against the KMT, the CCP did not confiscate all properties of landlords or rich peasants. Thus, after the 1930s Zhang only passed judgements on the CCP's implementation of land reforms other than its views on private property. He opposed radical land reforms carried out by the CCP.

7.3 A Liberal Perspective on Socialism

The socialisms Zhang Dongsun discussed included the tenets of Marx and Engels, revolutionary Marxism such as Marxism-Leninism (Russian Communism), and socialism or communism as a social ideal, socialism as an alternative to capitalism, and the practice of social democracy in Europe. He rejected revolutionary Marxism as a political system but accepted the form of socialism or communism which pursued justice, equality, liberty, and democracy. This attitude towards socialism influenced his perspective on the applicability of socialism to China. Zhang held that as a social ideal that pursued justice, equality, liberty, and

⁷³⁹ By contrast, the KMT did not carry out such land reforms. According to the laws promulgated by the KMT government the right to private property was protected.

democracy, socialism was progressive and it was applicable to all countries including China. However, not all instances of socialism were applicable to a specific country.

From the 1910s to the 1920s he advocated an empirical and analytical approach to all instances of socialism including moderate socialism in Britain. In his opinion, to implement socialism in China which had little capital and few workers would be unrealistic and destructive.⁷⁴⁰ What China needed was a thorough academic investigation of socialism.⁷⁴¹

Socialism is yet to be validated. The experiment with socialism has not been completed. All existing forms of socialism have flaws though Britain's guild socialism is relatively better than others. Socialism in all forms is being revised. This being said, I believe the world will ultimately develop towards a good form of socialism...China does not need propaganda of socialism because propaganda exposes China to Russian Communism.⁷⁴²

In the 1930s Zhang disapproved of the application of Marxism to China and supported a democratic form of socialism. He thought that socialism as an economic system and social democracy were applicable if they were appropriately modified to suit Chinese conditions. Zhang's defence of the application of a democratic form of socialism to China remained unchanged in the 1940s. Accordingly, he argued for the convergence of socialism and democracy and developed a theory of democracy which integrated core concepts of socialism and liberalism.

7.3.1 Socialism and Communism as a Social Ideal

Zhang did not oppose socialism or communism as a social ideal of justice, equality, mutual aid, and human welfare. When he referred to this ideal, he did not distinguish communism from socialism.

The socialism we advocate is not guild socialism that has a national guild. Nor is it Bolshevism that is characterised by the proletarian dictatorship. In addition, it is not anarchism which has all organisations eliminated. Neither is it state socialism that confiscates all properties and nationalises all industries...The form of socialism we accept refers to a tendency that is against the status quo. If the status quo features

⁷⁴⁰ Zhang, *Zhang Dongsun xueshu wenhua suibi*, 105-11.

⁷⁴¹ *Ibid*, 113-14.

⁷⁴² *Ibid*, 118.

parasitic lifestyle, capitalism, free competition, and hedonism, socialism I advocate is nothing but the tendency towards a communal life, work, mutual aid, wellbeing, and happiness of the society as a whole.⁷⁴³

According to Zhang, socialism had its moral and theoretical principles and it was a great mistake to interpret socialism as the antithesis of capitalism that was not a theory but a phenomenon of a society based on laissez faire economics.⁷⁴⁴ The tradition of communism in the West could be traced back to proto-communism. Plato's republic was a form of proto-communism.⁷⁴⁵ By "tradition of communism" Zhang meant an ideal of social reforms towards equality and solidarity.⁷⁴⁶ To clarify this tradition of communism, he classified communism into two categories. One was negative and the other was positive. Negative communism aimed to remove obstacles to a fair distribution of wealth caused by political and economic privileges.⁷⁴⁷ Positive communism concerned the establishment of concrete institutions to ensure equality.⁷⁴⁸ There were various institutions to achieve this. However, negative communism was a consensus among all countries which aimed to pursue justice and equality. Zhang said he espoused only this negative category of communism.⁷⁴⁹ From the perspective of negative communism, both socialism and Christianity followed the Western tradition of equality, justice, and liberty.⁷⁵⁰ In the 1940s Zhang related Marx to this social ideal of communism. He argued that according to the theory of Marx the spirit of communism was not different from that of democracy.⁷⁵¹

7.3.2 Marxism and Marxism-Leninism

When Zhang referred to Marxism, he meant two versions: the doctrines of Marx and Engels and Marxism-Leninism. Zhang rejected Marxism-Leninism because he held that Russian Communists aimed to incite revolutions and to destroy freedom. "When Communists came to China they tried to deceive Chinese peasants into a peasant revolution. China should never develop industries at the cost of agriculture and force the peasants to become workers."⁷⁵² In regard to the tenets of Marx, Zhang had different understandings at different times. From the

⁷⁴³ Zhang, *Zhongguo jindai sixiangjia wenku*, 140.

⁷⁴⁴ Zhang, *Sixiang yu shehui*, 217.

⁷⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 219.

⁷⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 219-20.

⁷⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 220.

⁷⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷⁵¹ Zhang, *Minzhuzhuyi yu shehuizhuyi*, 70-71.

⁷⁵² Zhang Dongsun, "Shengchan jihua yu shengchan dongyuan," [Economic Planning and Economic Mobilisation] *Zaisheng* 1, no. 2 (20 June 1932): 7.

1920s to the mid-1930s he had negative opinions of Marx but in the 1940s he tried to re-interpret Marx as a democrat. Though Zhang changed his views on Marx, he did not change his objections to class struggle, Marxian dialectics, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and economic determinism. His change of attitudes towards Marx centred around one question: Did Marx himself oppose democracy and advocate the proletarian dictatorship and economic determinism (historical materialism)? Before the 1940s Zhang did not make a distinction between Marx and Marxists who interpreted Marx while in the 1940s he separated the two and re-interpreted Marx's understanding of the proletarian dictatorship and historical materialism.

In the early 1930s, Zhang Dongsun was explicit about the flaws of Marx and his theories. He initiated a debate over Marxism, disapproving of the way that Chinese intellectuals treated Marx and his doctrines. Zhang wrote: "Marxists in China, Japan, and Russia consider Marx as God as if his teachings were absolute truth. By contrast, attitudes towards Marxism are very different in Europe and America. It is not a good phenomenon that Chinese should trust in Japanese translations of Marx's works"⁷⁵³ To challenge Chinese Marxists, Zhang edited and published *Weiwubianzhengfa lunzhan* 唯物辩证法论战 (Critical Essays on Red Philosophy). He used the pejorative word "red philosophy" to show his disapproval. The contributors were Chinese scholars who were critical of Marxism. Zhang contributed an essay on Marx's dialectical materialism.⁷⁵⁴ Carsun Chang wrote a preface to the book. In addition, the book included three articles by Bertrand Russell, John Dewey, and Morris Raphael Cohen who explained why they were not Communists.⁷⁵⁵ Zhang said that contributors of the book agreed with the three Western scholars on the reasons for opposing Communism: the dictatorship of the proletariat, class struggle, personality cult of leaders, and advocacy of violence or revolutions.⁷⁵⁶ These doctrines were against the principles of freedom and democracy.⁷⁵⁷

In the 1940s Zhang changed his perception of Marx. He objected to some views of Marx but made positive comments on other tenets. Marx's theory was divided into five parts: surplus value, class struggle, dialectics, the proletarian dictatorship, and historical

⁷⁵³ Zhang Dongsun, ed., *Weiwubianzhengfa lunzhan* [Critical Essays on Red Philosophy] (Shanghai: Minyou shuju, 1934), 214.

⁷⁵⁴ See Zhang, ed., *Weiwubianzhengfa lunzhan*, 135-214.

⁷⁵⁵ These articles were translated into Chinese and published by the Chinese press in 1934. For the English book, see Bertrand Russell et al., *Why I Am Not a Communist?* (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1934).

⁷⁵⁶ Zhang Dongsun, "Bianzhe anyu," [Notes by the Editor] Appendix to *Weiwubianzhengfa lunzhan*, 16-17.

⁷⁵⁷ Ibid.

materialism.⁷⁵⁸ He commented that the theory of surplus value was a significant contribution to scholarship in that it revealed and explained the phenomenon of exploitation from the unique angle of economics.⁷⁵⁹ However, dialectical materialism was not scientific at all.⁷⁶⁰ Marx's dialectics originated from Hegel's philosophy. Their theories were not based on inductive reasoning but on deductive reasoning.⁷⁶¹ But not all premises were true. Some terms were not clear. These made their conclusions about history implausible or even wrong. Hegel thought that contradiction was the principle of the changing world. Marx developed it and changed it into the theory of class struggle that was seen as the driving force of social changes or revolutions.⁷⁶² Zhang argued that neither Hegel nor Marx clarified three terms while discussing the triad of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis.⁷⁶³ The three terms were negation, contrariety (contrast), and contradiction. Hegel and Marx equated the three terms with one word "opposite".⁷⁶⁴ Zhang argued that not all actual things had their opposites and contradiction was not a universal principle in the universe.⁷⁶⁵ For instance, "cold" and "hot" were not opposites but contrasts.⁷⁶⁶ Likewise, negation did not necessarily mean that the relationship between two things was polarity.⁷⁶⁷

Speaking of the conception of the proletarian dictatorship, Zhang contended that Marx was a democrat and that the dictatorship of the proletariat Marx mentioned was not the one that Marxists after Marx and Engels described.⁷⁶⁸

Marx himself did not think the proletarian dictatorship was an inevitable and necessary stage of social revolutions. He did not regard dictatorship as a form of government. A dictatorship is a method for realising Communism in a transitional period. Even during the transition, the government is limited. It is accountable to the proletariat. This is not inconsistent with the spirit of democracy in theory. Yet, there is always a gap between theory and practice. The practice of the proletarian dictatorship does not turn out to be something as Marx thought.⁷⁶⁹

⁷⁵⁸ Zhang, *Sixiang yu shehui*, 223-24.

⁷⁵⁹ Ibid, 224.

⁷⁶⁰ Ibid, 229.

⁷⁶¹ Zhang, ed., *Weiwubianzhengfa lunzhan*, 160, 175.

⁷⁶² Ibid, 172, 223.

⁷⁶³ Ibid, 171.

⁷⁶⁴ Ibid, 167-69.

⁷⁶⁵ Ibid, 168-69.

⁷⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁶⁷ Ibid, 171-72.

⁷⁶⁸ Zhang, *Minzhuzhuyi yu shehuizhuyi*, 40; Zhang, *Sixiang yu shehui*, 258.

⁷⁶⁹ Zhang, *Sixiang yu shehui*, 259.

Zhang maintained that Marx intended to improve existing democracies and he made a great contribution in this regard.⁷⁷⁰ The liberation of the proletariat was indispensable to the spirit of democracy.⁷⁷¹ Zhang hardly commended Marx from the 1910s to the 1930s. When refuting the dictatorship of the proletariat, Zhang attacked both Marx and Marxists. “Marx’s theory is not truth in terms of scholarship and argumentation. It is propagated and used by its followers to instigate social movements...To understand Marx one must refer to psychoanalysis. He was motivated by a sentiment of hatred towards capitalists.”⁷⁷²

Not only did Zhang change his views on Marx’s understanding of the proletarian dictatorship but also he changed his perception of the correlation between teachings of Marx and economic determinism (historical materialism). In the debate over Marx and Marxism in the 1930s Zhang associated Marx with economic determinism and rejected historical materialism. He thought that the economic structure interacted with politics, law, and ethics and therefore there was a functional (organic) relation instead of a casual relation.⁷⁷³ Marx turned this interaction into economic determinism.⁷⁷⁴ In contrast, Zhang no longer held this negative opinion of Marx in the 1940s. He attributed economic determinism to interpreters of Marx rather than Marx himself. Marx was not a disciple of materialism and he advocated interactionism between the subjective and the objective.⁷⁷⁵ He meant only when objective conditions became mature the creativity of the individual could bring about a social transformation.⁷⁷⁶ Why Zhang changed his opinions of Marx is mysterious. I do not think the CCP was a significant influence on this because Zhang’s understanding of Marx was based on original works or English translations of Marx.

7.4 Zhang Dongsun and His Split with Carsun Chang

Both Zhang Dongsun and Carsun Chang were fond of the British political system and German philosophy. They tried to adapt a parliamentary government to Chinese conditions and to integrate German idealism with Confucianism. In the debates over liberalism and socialism they attempted to reconcile liberalism with socialism. This attempt helped them develop liberalism in the direction of liberal socialism or social democracy.

⁷⁷⁰ Ibid, 266.

⁷⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷⁷² Zhang, ed., *Weiwubianzhengfa lunzhan*, 157; Zhang Dongsun, *Daode zhexue* [Moral Philosophy] (Shanghai: Zhonghua shuju, 1930), 646.

⁷⁷³ Zhang, *Daode zhexue*, 622-23.

⁷⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁷⁵ Zhang, *Sixiang yu shehui*, 231-32.

⁷⁷⁶ Ibid, 230.

They split in the 1940s chiefly because Zhang changed his judgement about the CCP, the KMT, and Marx. As was shown in the previous section Zhang began to view Marx and some of his doctrines positively in the 1940s. Similar things did not happen to Chang. After the mid-1940s Zhang did not trust the KMT anymore and hoped that the CCP would make China a constitutional democracy. Chang, however, was more suspicious of the relationship between the CCP and the Soviet Union.

Zhang's split with Chang was a reflection of a divided Chinese liberalism that took shape after the mid-1940s. Many members of the DL turned left supporting the CCP whereas liberals like Chang and Hu Shi remained new liberals. This division had consequences for China's development of constitutionalism because after the split Chinese democratic parties were no longer able to influence the trajectory of Chinese politics in the Republican period. The party founded by Chang and Zhang split into two factions. One was led by Chang with the party name "Democratic Socialist Party". Zhang, however, belonged to the other faction which called themselves "zhongguo minzhushenhuidang gexinpai" 中国民主社会党革新派 (Reformist China Democratic Socialist Party).⁷⁷⁷ More importantly, the DL which was the mainstay of the Chinese liberal force separated into two groups. One group was sympathetic towards the CCP and the other group decided to form a coalition government with the KMT. Among the six parties and interest groups of the DL, the China Youth Party and Chang's DSP withdrew from the DL and attended the National Assembly. Other parties and groups boycotted the Assembly because they thought without the participation of the CCP, it was meaningless to join the coalition government. These events created an advantageous situation for the CCP to change the direction in which Chinese politics developed.

Zhang Dongsun's opinions on the CCP and the KMT underwent changes and these changes also happened to other members of the third force who favoured the CCP. Until the early 1930s, Zhang was critical of both the KMT and the CCP. He opposed a single-party state and political tutelage under the rule of the KMT. Nevertheless, he believed that the KMT still had a chance to reform itself so as to maintain its legitimacy. "We oppose the KMT but we don't think there is no remedy for the problems of the KMT government...I'm not for the idea that the KMT should give up all its power. No matter what form a coalition government takes, it must include the KMT and other political forces outside the KMT."⁷⁷⁸ Speaking of the CCP, Zhang related it to revolutionary Marxism and expressed his objections

⁷⁷⁷ For reference, see *Zhongguo dier lishi danganguan* [The Second Historical Archives of China], ed., *Zhongguo minzhushenhuidang* [The China Democratic Socialist Party] (Beijing: Dangan chubanshe, 1988), 414-39.

⁷⁷⁸ Zhang Dongsun, "Dang de wenti," [The Question of Political Party] *Zaisheng* 1, no. 3 (20 July 1932): 12.

to a communist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. “Friends of the red philosophy are trying to make a massacre...My standpoint is always anti-communism.”⁷⁷⁹ “To be frank, the CCP’s development today is attributable to red armies which are originally incarnations of corrupt warlords and bandits. The CCP thus has nothing to do with peasants and workers.”⁷⁸⁰

Zhang’s comments on the CCP were not entirely negative after the mid-1930s. He passed a positive judgement after the CCP published a statement of cooperation with the KMT in order to resist the Japanese invasion of China. He admired that the Communist Party made a change in its ideology.⁷⁸¹ “A party that used to advocate the abolition of private property is now calling for the protection of private property and freedom of business. A party that used to support the dictatorship of the proletariat is now calling for democracy and freedom...It is such a blessing that the Communist Party proposes cooperation and gives up dictatorship.”⁷⁸² After the mid-1940s Zhang believed that the CCP would make China a de facto democracy.

As for the Communists, we don’t think such a party that emphasised too much the power of the proletariat suited a democratic country. Nevertheless, the Communist Party has one merit compared with the KMT—it is committed to its propositions. It has announced that it will implement New Democracy and therefore it is no longer an obstacle to democracy. We don’t need to be suspicious of New Democracy proposed by the Communists. They will keep their word. By contrast, the KMT has never kept its promise and has lost our trust.⁷⁸³

It is apparent that after the mid-1940s Zhang was in favour of the CCP. Compared with Zhang, Chang had steady views of the CCP and the KMT despite the fact that Chang was always ready to cooperate with the CCP and the KMT on the condition that they were committed to democracy. Until the early 1930s, Zhang’s judgement on the CCP and the KMT was not different from that of Chang. After the mid-1930s Zhang began to have some positive opinions of the CCP and his distrust of the KMT further developed. Ultimately, he showed favour to the CCP.

⁷⁷⁹ Ibid, 10.

⁷⁸⁰ Zhang Dongsun, “Jieji wenti,” [The Question of Class] *Zaisheng* 1, no. 4 (20 August 1932): 10.

⁷⁸¹ Zhang, *Zhang Dongsun xueshu wenhua suibi*, 397.

⁷⁸² Ibid.

⁷⁸³ Zhang Dongsun, “Zhuishu women nuli jianli lianhezhengfu de yongyi,” [Our Motive for Establishing a Coalition Government] *Guancha* [The Observer] 2, no.6 (15 April 1947):7.

What caused Zhang's changes in the judgement of the CCP? I assume Zhang's personal connections with the CCP after the mid-1930s was a key factor. This was a significant difference between Chang and Zhang. The contact with the CCP exposed Zhang to the propaganda of the CCP who tried its best to create a democratic profile to win the support of Chinese intellectuals. When the CCP made an announcement in 1935 calling for an end to the civil war and for the nation to unite in resistance against Japan, Zhang Dongsun was the first public intellectual in the areas controlled by the KMT to respond positively to the CCP's statement.⁷⁸⁴ Zhang's response was published in 1936 as a commentary—"The Declaration of the CCP on 1st August 1935 and a Nationwide Cooperation".⁷⁸⁵ This commentary was commended by the CCP. Liu Shaoqi (刘少奇) who worked closely with Mao wrote a letter to Zhang and published the letter. Liu reported to the Central Committee of the CCP that Zhang could be an ally of the CCP.⁷⁸⁶ From then on the CCP kept in touch with Zhang. In 1938 Zhang met Zhou Enlai and other Communist leaders to discuss the war of resistance against Japan. In the early 1940s, Zhang was detained by the Japanese army because of his contact with the CCP. When Zhang worked for the DL as a mediator between the CCP and the KMT, he and many of the other members of the League often met the delegates of the CCP discussing how to deal with the KMT.⁷⁸⁷ Carsun Chang thought there was a lack of independence on the part of the DL in the 1940s.

At the same time the League sent three representatives to contact Chou En-lai, which showed that, along with other indications, it was prepared to work in close cooperation with the Communists. That move, however, precipitated a crisis and made the entire Third Group wonder if the Democratic League had become a political tool of the Communist Party. If it was an independent group, why should the three members go to Chou En-lai and ask for his instructions—since that was apparently their purpose? The indications of an uncritically pro-Communist attitude on the part of the League were later substantiated,

⁷⁸⁴ Dai, *Zai rulaifo zhang zhong*, 243; Zuo, *Zhang Dongsun zhuan*, 216-18.

⁷⁸⁵ See Zhang Dongsun, "Ping 'gongchandang xuanyan' bing lun quanguo dahezuo," [The Declaration of the CCP on 1 August 1935 and a Nationwide Cooperation] *Ziyou pinglun* 自由评论 [Free Comment], no.10 (7 February 1936): 4-9. This declaration originally had nothing to do with the Communists in China. It was made by the Chinese Communists who worked for the Third International in Moscow according to the instructions of the Third International. The Declaration was published in the name of the Central Committee of the CCP and the Central Government of the Chinese Soviet Republic founded by the CCP. Later domestic Communists revised the Declaration and published it in China.

⁷⁸⁶ Zuo, *Zhang Dongsun zhuan*, 220.

⁷⁸⁷ For the close relationship between the DL and the CCP, see Dai, *Zai rulaifo zhang zhong*, 312-13; 46; Gerald Groot, *Managing Transitions: The Chinese Communist Party, United Front Work, Corporatism, and Hegemony* (New York: Routledge, 2004); Fung, *In Search of Chinese Democracy*, 247-54; Lyman P. Van Slyke, *Enemies and Friends: The United Front in Chinese Communist History* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1967), 190-200.

and destroyed the League's usefulness as an independent party. Under the circumstances I had to consider whether my own party, the Democratic-Socialist Party, should stay within the League.⁷⁸⁸

Ultimately, Chang and his followers made a hard decision to break with the League. Zhang and some other members of the DSP who boycotted the National Assembly organised a faction and therefore split with the DSP. To sum up, Zhang split with Chang not because he believed in the party ideology of the Communists but mainly because he judged that Chinese Communists were committed democrats and that the KMT was not at all reliable. He related the purpose of the CCP to the ideal of socialism which pursued democracy, justice, freedom, and equality. Carsun Chang, however, had faith in constitutionalism and hoped that the KMT would abide by the new constitution. Zhang's standpoint represented many of the DL who supported the CCP while Chang's views were similar to the liberals who had faith in the rule of law and the constitution Chang drafted. For example, Hu Shi held similar views. He had a very positive opinion on the new constitution and was suspicious of the actions of the CCP.⁷⁸⁹ This divided Chinese liberalism was detrimental to China's prospects for constitutionalism and the development of Chinese democratic parties. Since the founding of the PRC, the so-called Chinese democratic parties have been significantly different from those in Republican China.

Chapter Summary

This chapter examined the historical context of Chinese left liberalism in the 1940s, Zhang Dongsun's discourse on liberalism and socialism and his divergences from Carsun Chang in order to understand the liberalism of Zhang Dongsun. Zhang's liberal thought was a modified version of Western liberalism in the eighteenth century. He associated the ideal form of liberalism with a few concepts such as liberty, equality, justice, democracy, individuality, constitutionalism, self-governance, and the wellbeing of a society. Classical liberalism thus in his opinion had flaws.

These liberal ideas made Zhang develop a liberal perspective on socialism. He made distinctions among different forms of socialism: tenets of Marx and Engels, Marxism-Leninism, social democracy or liberal socialism, socialism as an alternative to capitalism, and socialism as a social ideal. Throughout his lifetime, he was an opponent of Marxism-

⁷⁸⁸ Chang, *The Third Force in China*, 184.

⁷⁸⁹ Ibid, 222.

Leninism. But he had positive opinions on social democracy, a socialist economy, and the socialist ideal which pursued equality, justice, mutual aid, solidarity, and the welfare of the masses. His views on Marx, however, changed significantly in the 1940s. Until the 1930s Zhang held that Marx's political theory and philosophy conflicted with democracy and liberty whereas in the 1940s he disassociated Marx from the proletarian dictatorship and economic determinism, praising Marx as a genuine democrat. This was one ideological difference between Zhang and Chang. Chang's negative comments on the doctrines of Marx remained unchanged.

Apart from divided opinions on Marx, there were other differing views between Zhang and Chang regarding the CCP. After the mid-1930s Zhang began to perceive the CCP positively and he eventually favoured the CCP. Compared with Zhang, Chang cast doubt upon the CCP's dedication to democracy and freedom. The gulf between the two thinkers reflected a division within the third force that ultimately split into two groups. One larger group including Zhang had trust in the CCP and they refused to form a coalition government with the KMT. The other group (the China Youth Party and the DSP led by Chang) hoped that the KMT would implement the liberal constitution Chang drafted and they decided to join the coalition government.

The preceding chapter and this chapter have examined the political thought of Zhang Dongsun, which absorbed most concepts of liberalism and some socialist concepts. Like Carsun Chang and new liberals in the West, Zhang Dongsun also tried to reconcile liberalism with a democratic form of socialism. Yet, in the 1940s Zhang did not align himself with Chang as regards the nature of the CCP and the doctrines of Marx. This divergence between Zhang and Chang was an ideological cause of the split within the Democratic Socialist Party and the China Democratic League. It also embodied a divided Chinese liberalism in the 1940s.

Conclusion

In 1946 Zhang Dongsun stated his opinions on liberalism and the mentality of the intelligentsia in Republican China. He said: “In today’s China only a small number of intellectuals fail to observe the principle of spiritual independence...I would like to emphatically tell our compatriots that it has only been 50 years since China decided to accept Western culture but within such a short time the Chinese intelligentsia has cultivated a liberal mind.”⁷⁹⁰ Zhang himself used the English term “liberal mind” to describe the character of Chinese intellectuals in Republican China. By liberal mind, Zhang meant spiritual independence, the sceptical and critical spirit possessed by the individual.⁷⁹¹

The liberal tradition Zhang discussed here mainly referred to the conception of liberty as political and civil rights. To engage with political liberalism was a feature of Chinese liberalism only after the Qing Dynasty was forced to open its doors to the Western world. Furthermore, Zhang agreed it was in the 1940s that political liberalism had some influence on real politics in modern China.⁷⁹² This explained why Zhang stressed China’s contact with the West and made comments on the mentality of the Chinese intellectuals in the 1940s.

Carsun Chang, Zhang’s intellectual twin, had similar views on the differences between the political traditions of China and the West. He wrote as follows:

But in comparing the Chinese system of government with that of the Western world, it must be pointed out that while the West bases its principles of government upon a code of law, China bases its principles of government upon a code of ethics. This is a fundamental difference, and one of great importance. The Chinese political thinker approaches political questions purely from a moral or ethical point of view, and not, as is common in the West, from the Machiavellian point of view which regards the state and the individual as two separate entities under the control of different principles.⁷⁹³

Both Chang and Zhang acknowledged the merit of the Confucian conception of freedom which meant spiritual independence, self-autonomy, and personal development of reason

⁷⁹⁰ Zhang Dongsun, “Zhishifenzi yu wenhua de ziyou,” [The Intelligentsia and Cultural Freedom] *Guancha* 5, no. 11 (1 September 1946), 4.

⁷⁹¹ Ibid. The sceptical spirit and the critical spirit were Zhang’s original words. He provided both Chinese and English terms.

⁷⁹² Zhang, *Zhongguo jindai sixiangjia wenku*, 592.

⁷⁹³ Chang, *The Third Force in China*, 325.

which would ensure harmony between the self and the good of the whole. Nonetheless, they found that to build a modern state in China this Confucian understanding of freedom must be supplemented with the German conception of the state and the British tradition of liberty that was characterised by an emphasis on constitutionalism, democracy, and human rights. Hence, they both endeavoured to introduce these Western ideas to Chinese audiences.

Despite their clear commitment to liberal ideas, both Chang and Zhang have been conventionally and cursorily classified as social democrats and accused of misunderstanding liberal ideas. I have shown in this study that this view is not correct and that both developed genuine liberal ideas in accordance with Chinese conditions. My study supported and extended the arguments of Edmund Fung, Benjamin Tsai, and Weng Hekai who challenged the mainstream view.

By adopting Michael Freeden's ideological morphology, this dissertation recovered the distinctive Chinese pattern of liberal thought represented by Chang and Zhang. The liberal tradition developed by Chang and Zhang synthesised a Confucian conception of freedom, the British tradition of liberty, German idealism (a Hegelian conception of the state and an organic conception of society), and some elements of socialism (equality, state intervention, and human welfare). It should be made clear that to Chang and Zhang freedom as an ethical and positive conception which was guided by human reason and the principle of the common good was not unique to German idealism. Instead, it was also a tradition of Chinese thought represented by Confucianism. Both Chang and Zhang sought to develop Chinese philosophy along the lines of Kant.⁷⁹⁴ Thus, the moral elements in the positive conception of freedom Chang and Zhang advocated also had its origin in Chinese thought.

Chang and Zhang adapted both Chinese thought and Western political ideas to Chinese conditions and aimed at China's state-building. From the perspective of Chang and Zhang, state-building mainly centred on the establishment of a modern state. According to their understanding, a modern Chinese state would have democratic politics and a sound national economy; the future Chinese political system and the economic system would be based on the principle of justice, which attached importance to liberty as well as equality. To be precise, they favoured the German conception of the state, a parliamentary government, a mixed economy, a federalist system, a multi-party system (a two-party system in particular), and a national culture based on spiritual freedom. They developed ideas about this modern Chinese

⁷⁹⁴ For the works which reflected this feature of the philosophical thought of Chang and Zhang, see Carsun Chang, *The Development of Neo-Confucian Thought*; Zhang Dongsun, *Renshilun* [Epistemology] (Shanghai: Shijie shuju, 1934).

state to address particular Chinese issues from the collapse of the Qing Dynasty in 1911: national independence, authoritarianism, poverty, and continuous civil wars between warlords and between the CCP and the KMT. Because they found that socialism was a remedy for laissez faire liberalism, they also infused some socialist elements into their liberal thought so as to achieve social justice. In their opinions, both the liberal tradition and the socialist tradition aimed at justice and the two isms could be reconciled with each other.

I used Freeden's ideological morphology to investigate the Chinese liberalism developed by Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun. The conventional methodology which is either stipulative or canonical, is not able to explain the variation within the liberal family across time and different cultures. Neither could it account for the relationship between neighbouring ideologies that might intersect and have an overlap. For instance, the new liberalism and social democracy are such instances of neighbouring ideologies. Ideological morphology, however, can successfully explain the variation within a particular ideology and the intersection of different ideological families. It gets rid of some misconceptions about political ideologies. One misconception is to assume that the boundaries between two ideologies are clear-cut and they are mutually exclusive to each other. The Chinese case and the British case in my study have shown that liberalism and certain forms of socialism like liberal socialism (Hobhouse) or democratic socialism (Chang and Zhang) are compatible. Another misconception is to equate the presence of one political concept with a particular ideology: liberty with liberalism, equality with socialism, tradition with conservatism.

The morphology of New Liberalism and social democracy shows that the two ideologies have different cores but they also intersect. Several adjacent and peripheral concepts are neither exclusively affiliated with liberalism nor with socialism. Liberty can be an adjacent concept of social democracy while equality is an adjacent concept of New Liberalism. In addition, democracy, human welfare or the general interest are the overlapping concepts. Nonetheless, the pattern of configurations of a set of concepts, the specific meanings of the concepts, and the relative weight of each value within the new liberalism and social democracy are by no means identical.

As particular variants of liberalism and socialism, the new liberalism and social democracy do not conflict with each other. This study of the political thought of Chang and Zhang illustrated that these Chinese liberals incorporated some elements of social democracy into liberalism and advanced the new liberalism in Republican China. Despite an overlap

between liberalism and social democracy, the key to understanding the liberal thinking of Chang and Zhang is the liberal core which consists of seven political concepts: liberty, individuality, rationality, limited and accountable power, sociability, progress, and the general interest.

The morphological approach also enables us to understand the general liberal arguments in spite of regional and cultural differences. The Chinese case and the British case are good cases in point. Notwithstanding the vast differences between China and Britain, the Chinese thinkers Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun developed a form of Chinese liberalism that was similar to New Liberalism represented by the British thinker L. T. Hobhouse.⁷⁹⁵ Hobhouse modified classical liberalism by adding some elements of socialism (state intervention, equality, public property, and welfare) and German idealism (Green's idealism influenced by Kant and Hegel). Both Chinese thinkers and the British thinker were influenced by Mill and German idealism.

However, there were also several differences between the Chinese case and the British case. First, Chinese thinkers aimed at the state-building of China but Hobhouse sought to redress social injustice caused by capitalism. Second, the way these thinkers developed the new liberalism was different. Chang and Zhang added to the Chinese tradition of spiritual freedom (an ethical concept) the British conception of liberty as political and civil rights whereas Hobhouse infused into the British tradition of liberty moral elements such as harmony, social freedom, an organic society, and the common good. Chang and Zhang held that these moral elements were well developed in Chinese thought, Confucianism in particular. What China needed was a political and legal concept of freedom. Third, the liberal thought of Chang and Zhang was characterised by a German (Hegelian) conception of the state which put emphasis on the consciousness of the state and the important role of the state in a national crisis and in the development of sound political and economic systems. This accounted for the flavour of nationalism in the new liberalism developed by Chang and Zhang. By contrast, Hobhouse had a negative opinion of Hegelianism.

I have systematically compared the liberal thought of Hobhouse and Chang, but some chapters have shown that the trend of the new liberalism was not unique to Britain from the late nineteenth century to 1949. This tendency of liberal thought that was flavoured with socialism and moral concerns (justice and welfare), was also perceptible in America and in

⁷⁹⁵ As was said, Zhang Dongsun became a left liberal in the 1940s. He was a new liberal until the mid-1930s.

some Continental European countries such as Germany and France. It would be illuminating to conduct a systematic comparative study on the varieties of the new liberalism that emerged in China and these Western countries in the first half of the twentieth century.

Overall, my study has helped to understand the influence of Chang's liberalism on the constitution of Taiwan and an ideological cause of a divided Chinese liberalism in the 1940s. Moreover, the study has also developed a new understanding of Chinese liberalism and Chinese socialism because the liberal tradition established by Chang and Zhang played an important role in the intellectual debates over liberalism, socialism, and their relationships to specific Chinese problems. Contemporary Chinese thinkers whose political thought is similar to this liberal tradition are calling for the development of a modern theory of liberalism with a view to the problems of contemporary China. Hence, this study throws light on contemporary Chinese liberalism and current ideological debates in China.

Carsun Chang and the Current Democratic System of Taiwan

The investigation of the political thought of Carsun Chang has enabled us to understand the relevance of Chang's liberal thought to the political system of Taiwan and its implications for the relationship between Taiwan and mainland China. The current constitution of Taiwan (The Constitution of the Republic of China) has its origin in a revised version of the constitution that was drafted by Chang in 1946. Taiwan's constitution has been amended seven times in 1991, 1992, 1994, 1997, 1999, 2000, and 2005. The results of the amendments are twelve additional articles.⁷⁹⁶ Some of these amendments acknowledge a few liberal principles Chang proposed while other amendments make the semi-presidential system develop towards presidentialism. In recent years heated debates over an amendment to the current constitution have occurred in Taiwan. Some politicians and political parties are demanding a parliamentary system.

Several amendments are consistent with Chang's own ideas rather than those of the lawmakers of the KMT government, but other changes conflict with Chang's liberal thought. As was pointed out in chapter V, Chang was not fond of the idea of a so-called national assembly designed by Sun Yat-sen and the KMT. He also insisted on a responsible cabinet and the adoption of a vote of no confidence. The amendments to the Constitution of Taiwan have abolished the national assembly and stipulate that a vote of no confidence can be

⁷⁹⁶ See Office of the President, ROC, "Additional Articles of the Constitution of the Republic of China," Laws and Regulations of the Database of the Republic of China, accessed 22 March 2018, <http://law.moj.gov.tw/Eng/LawClass/LawAll.aspx?PCode=A0000002>.

proposed by the Legislative Yuan. In these respects, therefore, the amendments ratify the liberal principles Chang proposed.

Other changes that make the president and the government more powerful than before would definitely be opposed by Chang. After amending the Constitution, the form of government in Taiwan remains a type of a semi-presidential system, but some additional articles make it close to a presidential system rather than a parliamentary system. The president becomes more powerful in respect of the appointment of the personnel because he or she can choose the head of the Executive Yuan without the consent of the Legislative Yuan. Moreover, the change in the structure of the Control Yuan strengthens the presidential power and creates a presidential advisory council consisting of 29 members.⁷⁹⁷ Members of the Control Yuan had previously been elected by local councils. By contrast, since the amendment came into effect the Control Yuan has become an advisory body for the president. All members of this Yuan are nominated, and with the consent of the Legislative Yuan, appointed by the president of the Republic. According to Chang, the Control Yuan should be separate from the executive branch and be part of the legislature which would check the executive branch by exercising the power of consent, impeachment, and control. Hence, the amendment affecting the Control Yuan and its relationship with the executive branch is in conflict with Chang's liberal thought.

Furthermore, some amendments make it more difficult to initiate an impeachment of the president. In Carsun Chang's draft constitution, the impeachment could be proposed by at least 10 members of the Control Yuan, part of the legislature. When half of the entire Control Yuan agreed, the impeachment would be decided by the National Assembly.⁷⁹⁸ The current constitution makes the Control Yuan part of the executive branch and therefore grants the Legislative Yuan the power to impeach the president. However, it is more difficult to initiate an impeachment. The impeachment should be proposed by at least one-third of all legislators (57 legislators). In addition, a two-thirds majority vote must be passed by the Legislative Yuan.⁷⁹⁹ Finally, a referendum would be held. Therefore, the current system makes it more difficult to hold the president accountable. Once the Legislative Yuan has no confidence in the executive branch, it is usually the Head of the Executive Yuan who may resign and become the scapegoat.

⁷⁹⁷ Xie, *Zhonghua minguo xiuxian shi*, 611-17.

⁷⁹⁸ Lei, *Zhonghua minguo zhixian shi*, 302.

⁷⁹⁹ Xie, *Zhonghua minguo xiuxian shi*, 611-17.

The amendments which expand presidential power and make it more difficult to initiate impeachment of the president have sparked controversies over the current constitution and Taiwan's democratic system. In 2015 Li Denghui (李登辉), a former president of Taiwan, called for an amendment to the Constitution and complained that the constitution of Taiwan made the President too powerful because he or she was not responsible to the Legislative Yuan. In the same year "she min dang" 社民党 (the Social Democratic Party of Taiwan) was founded. This party advocated a parliamentary system and published its support for amending the current constitution. Some KMT MPs also expressed similar ideas. In Taiwan, people are still debating an amendment to the current constitution. The two major parties in Taiwan, the KMT and the Democratic Progressive Party, are also considering this issue so as to win elections.

In addition, the current constitution of Taiwan allows for the possibility of the peaceful unification of Taiwan and mainland China. The amendment reads: "To meet the requisites of the nation prior to national unification, the following articles of the ROC Constitution are added or amended to the ROC Constitution".⁸⁰⁰ This implies that Additional Articles will be reconsidered or cease to be in force once mainland China recognises and implements the Constitution Chang drafted. In that case, Taiwan and mainland China will need to negotiate with each other and discuss the constitution Chang drafted in 1946. Parliamentarianism, presidentialism, semi-presidentialism, and federalism will again be debated. Both sides will need to refer to Chang's interpretation of the constitution he drafted.

A Divided Chinese Liberalism in the 1940s

This study of Chang and Zhang has disclosed an ideological cause of a division within Chinese liberalism in the 1940s. Chang and Zhang represented two conspicuous strands of Chinese liberalism after the mid-1940s. One strand was the new liberalism. Hu Shi and Carsun Chang were two exemplars. The other strand was left liberalism in the sense that it also believed in Marx's social ideal and in the CCP's commitment to democracy. It was not the case that left liberals believed in the ideology of the CCP. On the contrary, they were critical of the party ideology of the CCP. It was the actions (especially demands for democracy, constitutionalism, human rights, and national unity) of the CCP from the mid-1930s that made left liberals change their negative views of the CCP.

⁸⁰⁰ Ibid, 575-617.

The developing gulf between Chang and Zhang regarding the nature of the CCP dated back to the mid-1930s. Until the mid-1930s, the political views of Zhang and Chang were not significantly different. Both could be seen as new liberals. However, after the mid-1930s, Zhang began to change his views on the CCP. In the 1940s his views of Marx also changed. He associated Marx and the CCP with his theory of “democracy of a new type”. The change in Zhang’s political thought in this regard was significant. It was an ideological cause of Zhang’s split with Chang whose negative opinions of the CCP and Marx were steady.

This split was not just a personal split between Zhang and Chang but the embodiment of a division within the third force as a whole. Along with Zhang Dongsun, many Chinese liberals finally stood on the side of the CCP. By contrast, the rest of the third force including Carsun Chang did not support the CCP. When Mao Zedong saw that the CCP would win in the civil war in 1948, he identified Chang as a first-class war criminal. This was a great change on the part of the CCP. Just two years before (1946), Zhou Enlai as the representative of the CCP had wished Chang longevity and praised Chang as a fighter for democracy. The events in the late 1940s forced Chang to leave mainland China and live in exile. Zhang and others who stayed in mainland China took office in the new regime of the PRC, but most of them were persecuted later.

Liberalism of the Third Force and Contemporary Chinese Liberalism

This study has developed a new understanding of Chinese liberalism and Chinese socialism in both Republican China and contemporary China. Carsun Chang, Zhang Dongsun, and Hu Shi represented a liberal tradition that had a flavour of social democracy. This liberal tradition still exists in contemporary China. It is included by many Chinese scholars in the broad category of liberalism that competes with other strands of Chinese political and social thought since the late 1980s—the New Left (including radicalism, post-modernism) and conservatism (including New Confucianism).⁸⁰¹

Among contemporary Chinese intellectuals, Qin Hui, Xu Jilin, and Zhang Rulun clearly relate a contemporary strand of Chinese liberalism to the liberalism of the third force in Republican China although they tend not to use the single “liberalism” to refer to what they

⁸⁰¹ Xu Jilin, “Zonglun” [Preface] in *Qimeng de ziwo wajie* [The Self-Disintegration of Chinese Enlightenment in the 1990s], eds. Xu Jilin and Luo Gang (Changchun: Jilin chubanshituan youxian zeren gongsi, 2007), 37-38; Xu Youyu, “Ziyoushuyi yu dangdai zhongguo,” [Liberalism and Contemporary China] in Li Shitao, *Zhishifenzi lichang*, 414-15; Ren Jiantao, “Jiedu xin zuopai,” [Interpreting the New Left] in Li Shitao, *Zhishifenzi lichang*, 191; Xu Youyu, “Jinru ershiyi shiji de ziyoushuyi he xinzuopai,” [Liberalism and the New Left in the Twenty-First Century] *Dangdai zhongguo yanjiu* [Modern China Studies], no. 2 (2007), accessed 12 December 2018, <https://www.modernchinastudies.org/cn/issues/past-issues/96-mcs-2007-issue-2/1006-21.html>.

support.⁸⁰² I use “contemporary Chinese new liberalism” to refer to their liberal thought. Xu and Zhang advocate “disantiao daolu” 第三条道路 (The Third Way) that accords equal importance to both social justice and individual freedom or both economic democracy and political democracy.⁸⁰³ In their discourse, this third way combines both harmonious elements of socialism and liberalism and in China it can either be called New Liberalism or social democracy the boundaries between which in Xu’s opinion are not clear-cut.⁸⁰⁴ They also hold that this third way in both modern and contemporary China is generally similar to the third-way politics in Europe. Though Qin does not use “the third way” to discuss a theory of liberalism which aims to solve Chinese problems, his discourse resembles that of Carsun Chang, Zhang Dongsun, Xu Jilin, and Zhang Rulun in the sense that Qin also believes in justice, equality, welfare, and liberty.⁸⁰⁵ From Qin’s perspective, China needs both liberalism and social democracy to address particular Chinese problems: a lack of individual freedom, civil rights, and welfare, and economic injustice caused by public ownership and the centralisation of political power.⁸⁰⁶

Compared with Xu and Zhang, Qin pays more attention to the particularity of Chinese conditions.⁸⁰⁷ He argues that China does need a modern theory of liberalism to deal with contemporary Chinese problems.⁸⁰⁸ Qin Hui uses “modern” to distinguish what he proposes from ancient Chinese thought and from the new ideas of the West. From his viewpoint, there are four intellectual sources of contemporary Chinese liberalism: the liberalism of Hayek, the neo-liberalism (new institutional economics) represented by Ronald Coase, New-Confucian liberalism, and the liberalism with a flavour of social democracy in Republican China (Hu Shi, Carsun Chang, and Luo Longji).⁸⁰⁹ In his opinion, the former three strands of liberal thought cannot solve Chinese problems; the last stream of liberalism including the liberal

⁸⁰² Qin Hui, “Dangdai zhongguo de wenti yu zhuyi,” [Problems and Isms in Contemporary China] *Xinlang lishi* [Sina History], updated 17 April 2013, <http://history.sina.com.cn/his/hs/2013-04-17/204926955.shtml>; Xu Jilin et al., “Xunqiu disantiao daolu,” [Seeking the Third Way], in Li Shitao, *Zhishifenzi lichang*, 309-33; Zhang Rulun, “Disantiao daolu,” [The Third Way] in Li Shitao, *Zhishifenzi lichang*, 334-43.

⁸⁰³ Xu, “Xunqiu disantiao daolu,” 333; Zhang, “Disantiao daolu,” 334-38.

⁸⁰⁴ Xu Jilin, *Ershi shiji zhongguo sixiangshi lun* (shangjuan) [Chinese Intellectual History in the Twentieth Century Volume 1] (Shanghai: Dongfang chubun zhongxin, 2000), 8-9.

⁸⁰⁵ Zhou Xiaozheng (周孝正) is also a representative of this liberal tradition. But Zhou’s political ideas are only accessible in forms of lectures and interviews. For this reason, I focus only on the political thought of Qin Hui, Xu Jilin, and Zhang Rulun.

⁸⁰⁶ Qin, “Dangdai zhongguo de wenti yu zhuyi”.

⁸⁰⁷ The contemporary scholar Gao Like also notices this point. See Gao Like, “Ruhe renshi zhuanxing zhongguo—Guanyu ziyoushu yu xinzupai de zhenglun,” [How to Understand China in a Transition—The Debate between Liberals and New Leftists] in Xu Jilin and Luo Gang, *Qimeng de ziwo wajie*, 227.

⁸⁰⁸ Qin Hui, “Zhongguo xiandai ziyoushu de lilun shangque,” [A Discussion on a Modern Theory of Chinese Liberalism] *Ai sixiang* [Ideas], updated 28 July 2011, <http://www.aisixiang.com/data/42554.html>.

⁸⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

thought of Hu Shi and Carsun Chang is “authentic” in Chinese history and the liberal proposal offered by these Republican thinkers was reasonable given the conditions of Republican China.⁸¹⁰ He also agrees that contemporary Chinese intellectuals may further develop some of their ideas to reformulate a modern theory of Chinese liberalism. Qin argues for the establishment of a constitutional democracy and a free market (including the right to private property) in China. The so-called socialist market economy as he sees differs from Western economies. Chinese economic reform is launched and controlled by the party-state. In this sense, the state has much power. However, in the area of social welfare the state is almost absent and shares little responsibility. By saying these Qin means that the Chinese state draws no appropriate lines of demarcation between private and public spheres. In areas where the state should play a positive role, the Chinese state does not assume any responsibility while in areas it should not intervene the state is ubiquitous and omnipotent. These arguments which reflect Qin Hui’s considerations of the particularity of Chinese conditions are not very evident in the political thought of Xu and Zhang and this distinguishes Qin from Xu and Zhang.

In spite of some differences between the liberal thought of Qin Hui and that of Xu Jilin and Zhang Rulun, the general arguments of the three thinkers remind us of the liberalism of Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun. Both these contemporary and Republican intellectuals absorb some socialist elements (justice, equality, welfare) into political liberalism and do not avoid using the term “social democracy” to show their approval of some elements in this form of socialism.

In addition to the liberalism of Qin Hui, Xu Jilin, and Zhang Rulun, other notable strands of liberalism in contemporary China are economic liberalism (developmentalism or new institutional economics) and political liberalism. Advocates of economic liberalism usually confine reforms to the economy and they set aside injustice, democracy, and liberty.⁸¹¹ “Political liberalism” is merely used to distinguish this strand of liberal thought from economic liberalism and the liberalism of Qin Hui, Xu Jilin, and Zhang Rulun. Its position is in the middle between economic liberalism and the contemporary form of Chinese new liberalism. Prominent representatives of political liberalism are Xu Youyu (徐友渔), Liu

⁸¹⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹¹ Xu, “Zonglun,” 38.

Junning (刘军宁), Ren Jiantao (任剑涛), and Zhu Xuqin (朱学勤).⁸¹² Both political liberalism and contemporary Chinese new liberalism emphasise justice and liberty, but compared with followers of political liberalism, Xu Jilin, Zhang Rulun, and Qin Hui highlight China's problem of injustice in the phase of economic reform.

Indeed, contemporary Chinese liberalism cannot be simply reduced to a broad category of liberalism, but from the late 1980s to the 1990s these different schools of Chinese liberalism mentioned above seemed to form a liberal circle and actively participated in the intellectual debates over liberalism, socialism, modernisation, and their relevance to China's reform and development in order to respond to the attacks on liberalism by the New Left.⁸¹³ Wang Hui (汪晖), Gan Yang (甘阳), Cui Zhiyuan (崔之元), Han Yuhai (韩毓海), and Wang Bingbing (王彬彬) are some of the leading figures of the New Left.⁸¹⁴ According to Qin Hui's description, the views of him and those of his colleagues put themselves in an awkward position in these debates of the 1990s.⁸¹⁵ He and his followers advocated both liberalism and social democracy. The Chinese new leftists attacked their liberalism in the name of equality, democracy, and justice.⁸¹⁶

"The New Left" in contemporary China is not an organised intellectual circle. Neither do new leftists have developed their ideas into a systematic theory. Nevertheless, almost all new leftists castigate capitalism, modernity (modernisation), liberalism, a free market, representative democracy, and a Western-Centric world order.⁸¹⁷ Their critiques are not derived from Chinese thought but Western theories, especially neo-Marxism (including the Frankfurt School and analytical Marxism), postmodernism, postcolonialism, and Occidentalism. The new leftists tend to invoke Immanuel Wallerstein, Fredric Jameson, Fernand Braudel, Michel Foucault, Edward W. Said, John Roemer, and Jon Elster.⁸¹⁸ Many

⁸¹² For their articles, see Li, *Zhishifenzi lichang*; Zhu Xueqin, "Ziyoushuizhi xueli de yanshuo," [A Discourse on the Doctrines of Liberalism] Guanchazhe [Observer], updated 10 October 2011, http://www.guancha.cn/ZhuXueQin/2011_10_10_50718.shtml; Li, *Zhishifenzi lichang*.

⁸¹³ For references, see Li, *Zhishifenzi lichang*; Xu and Luo, *Qimeng de ziwo wajie*; Xu Youyu, "Jinru ershiyi shiji de ziyoushuizhi yu xinzuopai".

⁸¹⁴ For a collection of the articles by these new lefties, see Li, *Zhishifenzi lichang*.

⁸¹⁵ Qin, "Zhongguo xiandai ziyoushuizhi de lilun shangque".

⁸¹⁶ According to Qin, new leftists in China refer to the intellectuals whose views are in the middle between Western Marxism (Antonio Gramsci, Georg Lukacs, and Karl Korsch) and Stalinism (including Maoism). See Qin, "Dangdai zhongguo de wenti yu zhuyi".

⁸¹⁷ Ren Jiantao and Xiao Gongqin have also mentioned these features of the New Left. See Ren, "Jiedu xinzuopai"; Xiao Gongqin, "Xinzuopai yu dangdai zhongguo zhishifenzi de sixiang fenhua," [The New Left and the Disintegration of the Intelligentsia in Contemporary China], *Dangdai zhongguo yanjiu* [Modern China Studies], no. 1 (2002), accessed 12 December 2018, <https://www.modernchinastudies.org/cn/issues/past-issues/76-mcs-2002-issue-1/1219-2012-01-06-08-38-50.html>.

⁸¹⁸ Ren, "Jiedu xinzuopai," 196-97; Xu, "Ziyoushuizhi yu dangdai zhongguo," 427; Xu, "Xunqiu disantiao daolu," 325; Gao, "Ruhe renshi zhuanxing zhongguo," 219; Xiao, "Xinzuopai yu dangdai zhongguo zhishifenzi de sixiang fenhua".

of them call for direct democracy or mass democracy and implicitly or explicitly defend the abstract ideal of “socialism” though they may interpret a socialist China in different ways. Wang Hui, Gan Yang, Cui Zhiyuan, and Han Yuhai are such examples.⁸¹⁹

From the late 1980s to the 1990s the New Left and the liberal circle hotly debated the relationship between democracy and liberty, justice and equality, modernity and modernisation, and the nature of Chinese society and economy since Reform and Opening-Up.⁸²⁰ The new leftists associated liberalism with modernity or modernisation and attributed China’s problem of injustice (corruption, economic inequality which affected the political rights of the masses) to modernisation, liberalism, capitalism, private ownership, and a free market. They held that China was developing towards a market economy and the Chinese economy was part of global capitalism. On the questions of democracy, liberty, and equality, the new leftists regarded individual liberty and equality (including equality of opportunity) as two antithetical concepts. In their opinion, only direct or popular democracy can ensure equality and justice. Constitutionalism and representative democracy protect only the rights of the few who are rich and powerful. As a response, the liberal circle published works to defend their standpoint. Liberals do not think all contemporary Chinese problems are caused by the practice of modernisation and liberalism in China. Chinese economy by nature is not a market economy. Economic and social injustice in China is closely related to the authoritarian political system. Liberals like Xu Jilin, Xu Youyu, Zhu Xueqin, and Gu Su (顾肃) worry that the New Left’s call for popular and direct democracy would bring about populism and mass movements such as the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution of 1917, and China’s Cultural Revolution.⁸²¹

Both the New Left and the liberal circle have identified some real problems which China since Reform and Opening-Up has been struggling to deal with. Modernisation, the nature of the current Chinese economic system, democracy and liberty, justice and equality these intellectuals have debated reflect the Chinese problems. However, the two sides have divergent opinions on the causes of these problems and therefore have proposed different

⁸¹⁹ See Wang Hui, “Dangdai zhongguo de sixiang zhuangkuang he xiandaixing wenti,” [On Contemporary Chinese Thought and Modernity] in Li Shitao, *Zhishifenzi lichang*, 99-120; Gan Yang, “Ziyouzhuyi: Guizu de haishi pingmin de?” [Liberalism: Aristocratic Democracy or Popular Democracy?] in Li Shitao, *Zhishifenzi lichang*, 1-2; Cui Zhiyuan, “Hunhe xianfa yu dui zhongguo zhengzhi de sanceng fenxi,” [A Mixed Constitution: An Analysis of the Future Chinese Political System on Three Levels] in Li Shitao, *Zhishifenzi lichang*, 537-38; Han Yuhai, “Zai ziyouzhuyi zitai de beihou,” [What Is Behind Liberalism?] *Ai sixiang* [Ideas], updated 8 January 2007, <http://www.aisixiang.com/data/12648.html>.

⁸²⁰ For references, see Xu, “Jinru ershiyi shiji de xinzuopai yu”; Xu and Luo, *Qimeng de ziwo wajie*; Xiao, “Xinzuopai yu dangdai zhongguo zhishifenzi de sixiang fenhua”.

⁸²¹ Xu, “Xunqiu disantiao daolu,” 324; Xu, “Jinru ershiyi shiji de ziyouzhuyi yu xinzuopai”; Gao, “Ruhe renshi zhuanxing zhongguo,” 221-24.

solutions. The New Left attributes China's social ills to liberalism, but the liberal circle argues that China still needs liberalism to solve some of these problems.

Among the three different schools of contemporary Chinese liberalism, the liberal thought of Qin Hui, Xu Jilin, and Zhang Rulun is most similar to the liberalism of the third force in Republican China. Economic liberalism in Republican China had no market and few Republican liberals embraced this form of liberalism. Representatives of political liberalism in contemporary China usually proclaim to be liberals and they tend to use "liberalism" to refer to their political ideal. This differs from the action of Republican liberals. However, the political thought of Qin Hui, Xu Jilin, and Zhang Rulun is more comparable to the liberalism of the third force in Republican China. Like Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun, Qin, Xu, and Zhang do not use the single "liberalism" to describe what they support. They try to reconcile liberalism with social democracy and political liberalism is essential to their liberal thought. In this sense, their political thought can be best described as the new liberalism. Yet, within contemporary Chinese new liberalism, Qin Hui's liberal thought is more "indigenous" in that Qin bases his arguments more on Chinese conditions rather than merely on abstract theories of liberalism and socialism.

By exploring the political thinking of Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun, this study revealed a truer picture of Chinese politics and Chinese political ideologies in the Republican era: contrary to the official narratives of the CCP and the KMT, liberalism was a significant political ideology whose influence on the Chinese intelligentsia was far more seminal than that of the "Three Principles of the People" and Chinese communism (Marxism, Marxism-Leninism, and the party ideology of the CCP). This argument is consistent with the description of Chu Anping who lived in Republican China. Chu was a prominent intellectual without party affiliation and the founder of the influential liberal journal *Guancha* 观察 (The Observer). In the 1940s Chu wrote: "In today's China, alongside the China Democratic League and the China Democratic Socialist Party, liberals scatter among every university and cultural circle. The number of these liberal intellectuals is extremely large..."⁸²² But for a combination of political, organisational, and ideological factors, these Chinese liberals might otherwise have helped mainland China establish a coalition government in which the third force would have been opposition parties. The intellectual debates between the New Left and

⁸²² Chu Anping, "Zhongguo de zhengju," [The Current Political Situation of China] *Guancha* 2, no. 2 (8 March 1947): 7. Though the China Democratic Socialist Party then was still a member of the China Democratic League, Chu treated them as different organisations. The former was more politically organised while the latter was a league of six different parties and groups.

the liberal circle in contemporary China are reminiscent of the liberal tradition in Republican China. The political thought of Qin Hui, Xu Jilin, and Zhang Rulun is clearly akin to Zhang Dongsun's "middle-way politics", Carsun Chang's distinctive discourse on "democratic socialism", and Hu Shi's discourse on liberal socialism. The liberalism of the third force in Republican China and the liberalism of the three contemporary liberals belong to the liberal tradition known as the new liberalism in the West.

Appendix I: Chronological Biography of Carsun Chang (1887-1969)

- 1887 Chang was born in Jiangsu province, China.
- 1906 Chang enrolled in Waseda University's undergraduate programme in economics and political science. He met Liang Qichao (1873-1929) and joined some political and academic organisations founded by Liang Qichao. During his study in Japan, he translated into Chinese some parts of John Stuart Mill's *Considerations on Representative Government*.
- 1911 Chang graduated from Waseda and returned to China.
- 1918 Chang travelled to Europe with Liang Qichao.
- 1919 Chang met with German philosopher Rudolf Eucken, German social democrat Philip Scheidewann, and the major architect of Germany's post-war constitution, Hugo Preuss.
- 1920 Chang translated the Weimar constitution into Chinese.
- 1922 Chang returned to China. Subsequently, he drafted a provisional constitution for "Shanghai guoshi huiyi" 上海国事会议 (the Shanghai National Affairs Conference) organised by eight national organisations with representatives from 14 provinces.
- 1923 Chang delivered the speech "Outlooks on Life" in February at Tsinghua University which sparked a heated debate over science and metaphysics. Ding Wenjiang and Hu Shi were representatives of scientific outlooks on life while Carsun Chang argued that science could not solve the problems of the mind. In the same year, he founded the National College of Self-Governance (国立自治学院).
- 1925 The National College of Self-Governance was renamed "The National University of Political Science" (国立政治大学) in Shanghai. The Northern Expedition launched by the KMT and the CCP forced the University to be closed in 1927.
- 1928 Chang established *Xinlu Journal* 新路 (New Way) in Shanghai, which dealt with political affairs and castigated the single-party dictatorship of the KMT government.

- 1929 In early 1929 *Xinlu* was banned by the government. In June Chang was kidnapped by people who were supposed to be associated with the KMT. He began his second exile in Germany in autumn, lecturing on Chinese philosophy at the University of Jena, Germany.
- 1930 Chang published his Chinese translation of Harold Laski's *The Grammar of Politics*.
- 1931 Chang arrived in China in September. He accepted an academic post at Yenching University, lecturing on Hegel. In the same year, Chang and other intellectuals took part in a constitutional movement, calling for the establishment of a constitutional government.
- 1932 Chang established the journal *Zaisheng* in Beijing. Meanwhile, his political party the National Socialist Party was in the making.
- 1933 Chang resigned from the academic post at Yenching University.
- 1935 Chang founded Xuehai shuyuan 学海书院 (Xuehai Academy) but it was closed in 1936. The KMT censored and burned books that were believed to be subversive. Many of Chang's books and the journal *Zaisheng* were burned.
- 1937 Chang as the leader of the National Socialist Party accepted an invitation from President of the Republic of China Chiang Kai-shek to attend the Lushan Conference that aimed at establishing a council to advise the government during the war against Japan. In August National Defence Advisory Council (ANDC) was formed and Chang was appointed a member of the Council.
- 1939 Minzu wenhua shuyuan 民族文化书院 (The Academy of National Culture) was founded by Chang but it was closed in 1941. In October 1939 leaders of various parties and some non-partisans who were members of the ANDC organised a democratic league. This league was renamed the "China Democratic League" in 1944.
- 1944 Chang was one of the founders of the DL.
- 1940 Chang actively participated in the first constitutional movement in the 1940s.

- 1941 Chang was put under house arrest in Chongqing by the KMT because of his participation in the constitutional movement and his involvement in organising the DL. It was not until 1943 that he was released.
- 1944 Chang took part in a second constitutional movement in the 1940s, being one of the leaders of the third force who attempted to reconcile the Communists with the KMT.
- 1946 The Political Consultative Conference was convened in January. All political parties and non-partisans had representatives. Being a member of the Constitutional Draft Reviewing Committee of the Conference, Chang took into account suggestions from all parties concerned and drafted a new constitution of the Republic of China. There was no disagreement on the issue of constitution-making. But other issues prevented the Communists and the League from attending the Constituent Assembly. The KMT government promised to pass and implement the constitution drafted by Chang. There were correspondences between Chang and Chiang Kai-shek to make sure that Chiang would keep his word. Under this condition, Chang agreed to let his party attend the Constituent Assembly but he was absent from the Assembly. He refused to take any position in the reorganised government.
- 1948 The KMT was defeated by the Communists and fled to Taiwan. Chang was criticised by the Communists who regarded him as a “war criminal”.
- 1949 In November Chang took a trip to India. He began lecturing on Chinese philosophy of Confucianism at Indian universities.
- 1952 Chang returned to Hong Kong in March, developing the third force. He and his colleagues founded a secret organisation named the Fighting League for Chinese Freedom and Democracy (FL). He went to America to seek help and aid from Americans in May. On 10 October Chang formally announced the founding of the League in America. After 1952 Chang lived in California. The FL dissolved in 1954.
- 1955 To solve financial problems, Chang was employed by Stanford University to conduct research on mainland China. The job was completed at the end of 1955.
- 1956 Chang found a job, contributing articles almost daily to *The World Journal*.

- 1957 Chang did some research in the Library of Congress. The output was the publication of his English book *The Development of Neo-Confucian Thought*.
- 1958-1967 Chang travelled around the world, delivering lectures at many universities in America, Germany, Great Britain, India, Vietnam, Japan, South Korea, Hong Kong, and Singapore.
- 1965 Chang founded the Free China Association and the journal *Liberal Bell* 自由钟 in California. The journal reflected upon the political history of dictatorship in China.
- 1969 On 23 February 1969 Chang passed away in California.

Note:

The chronological biography of Carsun Chang is edited by the author according to the narratives of Carsun Chang, Roger B. Jeans, Zheng Dahua (郑大华), and Li Guizhong (李贵忠). These sources are listed in the Bibliography.

Appendix II: Major Books by Carsun Chang

Guo xian yi 国宪议 1922 (A Commentary on the Draft Constitution of 1922)

Xin deguo shehui minzhu zhengxiang ji 新德国社会民主政象记 1922

(The Politics of a New Germany: Social Democracy)

Sue pinglun 苏俄评论 1927 (A Commentary on the Soviet Union)

Zhengzhi dianfan 政治法典 1930 (A Grammar of Politics)

Shitailin zhixia zhi sue 史太林治下之苏俄 1934 (The Soviet Union under the Rule of Stalin)

Minzu fuxing zhi xueshu jichu 民族复兴之学术基础 1935

(The Academic Foundations of National Rejuvenation)

Mingri zhi zhongguo wenhua 明日之中国文化 1936 (Chinese Culture Tomorrow)

Liguo zhidao 立国之道 1938 (The Way of State-Building)

Ni Helu zhuan 尼赫鲁传 1940 (A Biography of Javaharlal Nehru)

Yindu fuguo yundong 印度复国运动 1941 (India's Movement of Reconstruction)

Faguo benkui riji 法国奔溃日记 1943 (A Diary of the Collapse of France)

Zhonghua minguo minzhu xianfa shijiang 中华民国民主宪法十讲 1947

(Ten Discourses on the Future Constitution of the Republic of China)

The Third Force in China 1952

Bijiao zhongri yangmingxue 比较中日阳明学 1953

(Studies on the Philosophy of Wang Yangming in China and Japan)

The Development of Neo Confucian Thought 1957

Bianzheng weiwuzhuyi bolun 辩证唯物主义驳论 1958 (A Critique of Dialectic Materialism)

Zhang Junmai xin dalu yanlun ji 张君勱新大陆言论集 1959

(A Collection of Zhang Junmai's Writings on Mainland China)

Zhong xi yin zhexue wenji 中西印哲学文集 1981

(A Collection of Essays on Chinese, Western, and Hindu Philosophies)

Zhongguo zhuanzhi junzhu zhengzhi zhi pinglun 中国专制君主政制之评论 1986

(On China's Political Institution of Absolute Monarchy)

Shehui zhuyi sixiang yundong gaiguan 社会主义思想运动概观 1988

(An Overview of Socialist Thought and Movements)

Xianzheng zhi dao 宪政之道 2006 (The Way of Constitutionalism)

Appendix III: Chronological Biography of Zhang Dongsun (1886-1973)

- 1886 Zhang Dongsun (张东荪) was born in Zhejiang province. His original name was Zhang Wantian (张万田) and courtesy name was Shengxin 圣心.
- 1893 His mother died and his brother supervised his early study of Confucian classics—四书五经 (Four Books and Five Classics).
- 1901 Zhang became interested in Buddhism.
- 1904 Zhang began his study in Japan and enrolled in the programme of philosophy at Tokyo Imperial University.
- 1906 Zhang worked with Lan Gongyu (蓝公武) and Feng Shide (冯世德). They founded an association of philosophy called Ai zhi hui 爱智会.
- 1907 He met Carsun Chang who introduced him to Liang Qichao. All three were in Japan and supported the constitutional movement in the late Qing Dynasty.
- 1911 Zhang went back to China. He passed dianshi 殿试 (the palace examination), the final stage in the sequence of civil service recruitment examinations in the Qing Dynasty, and became a Hanlin 翰林, a member of the Imperial Academy.
- 1912 After the 1911 Revolution Zhang took up a position in the provisional government of the Republic of China led by Sun Yat-sen. He worked as the secretary of the ministry of internal affairs).
- 1913 Zhang became a regular contributor of Liang Qichao's journal *Yong yan* 庸言 (The Justice), commenting on politics and current affairs. In the same year, he got married.
- 1914 Zhang worked with Fan Zhongxiu (樊钟秀) and founded in Shanghai the magazine *Zheng yi* 正谊 (The Rightness), advocating parliamentarianism. In addition, he cooperated with Ding Foyan (丁佛言) and established in Beijing *Zhonghua zazhi* 中华杂志 (Chinese Magazine).
- 1915 Zhang worked with Li Jiannong (李剑农), Yang Duanliu (杨端六) and others. They founded in Shanghai the journal *Xin zhonghua* 新中华 (New China). Zhang published a series of articles on federalism and its application in China in this journal.

- 1917 Zhang took charge of *Shishi xinbao* 时事新报 (The China Times) which had been managed by Carsun Chang. *Shishi xinbao* mainly reflected the research group's views on political, economic, and social problems. Three figures of the research group were Liang Qichao, Carsun Chang, and Zhang Dongsun. In the same year, Zhang proposed his theory of "xianren zhengzhi" 贤人政治 (the politics of the virtuous) and published it in *Dongfang zazhi* 东方杂志 (The Eastern Miscellany).
- 1918 Zhang translated Henri Bergson's *Evolution Créatrice* into Chinese and published it in *Shishi xinbao*.
- 1919 Zhang and his colleagues founded in Shanghai *Jiefang yu gaizao* 解放与改造 (Emancipation and Reconstruction) which was renamed as *Gaizao* in 1920.
- 1920 In May Zhang attended a meeting in Shanghai organised by the Marxist Chen Duxiu (陈独秀) who intended to found the Chinese Communist Party. Zhang later withdrew from the group led by Chen because he did not think China had the conditions to implement Communism and Marxism.
- 1920 In September Zhang Dongsun, Carsun Chang, and Liang Qichao organised the academic association Jiangxue she 讲学社 which would invite prominent Western scholars to deliver lectures to Chinese audiences. Jiangxue she ceased to exist in 1925 due to financial circumstances but it managed to employ John Dewey, Bertrand Russell, Hans Driesch, and Rabindranath Tagore. This association had planned to invite Henri Bergson, Rudolf Eucken, John Maynard Keynes, and John A. Hobson.
- 1920 In November Zhang joined the debate over socialism and argued with Chinese Marxists: Li Da, Chen Duxiu, Shaolizi (邵力子), and Chen Wangdao (陈望道), and. He opposed the propaganda of socialism in China.
- 1921 In Spring Zhang took charge of Zhongguo gongxue 中国公学 (China College), the first modern university in China established in 1906. He tried to carry out some reforms. In 1927 the KMT became the ruling party and controlled China College.
- 1921 In September Zhang founded the supplement of *Shishi xinbao*, *Shehuizhuyi yanjiu* 社会主义研究 (Studies on Socialism).
- 1923 Zhang participated in the debate over science and metaphysics (kexuan lunzhan 科玄论战) and defended Carsun Chang's arguments.

- 1925-1927 Zhang became the chancellor of China College again. He did two things to make the college better. One was to employ good teachers and professors regardless of age and political beliefs. The other thing he did was to get more good books for the library of the college.
- 1927 Zhang and Qu Junong (瞿菊农) established in Beijing the first Chinese journal on philosophy—*Zhexue pinglun* 哲学评论 (Philosophy Review).
- 1929-1936 Zhang modified Kant's philosophy, epistemology in particular, and developed his own philosophy—a pluralistic epistemology which was published in his writings such as *Xin zhexue luncong* 新哲学论丛 (Essays on New Philosophy), *Renshilun* 认识论 (On Epistemology), and “Duoyuan renshilun chongshu” 多元认识论重述 (Restating a Pluralistic Epistemology).
- 1931-1934 Zhang initiated a debate over dialectical materialism and published works which showed his disapproval of Marxism and Russian Communism.
- 1932 In April Zhang and Carsun Chang founded the National Socialist Party in Beijing. In May they established the journal *Zaisheng* which disseminated the political ideas of their party.
- 1936-1945 Zhang cooperated with the Communist Party of China to resist Japanese invasion of China.
- 1941 In March Zhang Dongsun, Carsun Chang, Zhang Lan (张澜), Luo Longji (罗隆基) and others secretly organised a democratic league that was the predecessor of the China Democratic League. In late 1941 Zhang Dongsun was arrested by the Japanese army and was sentenced to one year and a half because of his close ties with the CCP.
- 1946 In January Zhang attend the Political Consultative Conference as a representative of the National Socialist Party and the DL. In May Zhang delivered a speech on the middle-way politics that tried to reconcile socialism with liberalism, and called for the establishment of a coalition government so as to establish a Chinese democracy. In August the NSP was renamed the “China Democratic Socialist Party” following a merger with the Democratic Constitutionalist Party. Zhang Dongsun was elected a member of the standing committee of the DSP's central committee. In October the DSP underwent a split with Carsun Chang and Zhang Dongsun in two different factions.
- 1948 Zhang published his theory of “democracy of a new type” and advocated its application in China.

- 1949 In January on behalf of the KMT's General Fu Zuoyi (傅作义), Zhang conducted negotiations with the CCP, which would make Beijing under the control of the CCP without military attacks. In September Zhang attended the New Political Consultative Conference organised by the CCP and was elected a member of the central government of the PRC.
- 1952 Zhang became a target of the Thought Reform Campaign. He was charged with treason, being a spy for America.
- 1968 He and his eldest son were arrested and jailed at the secretive Qincheng prison 秦城. Later another two sons and a daughter-in-law committed suicide. The eldest son went mad while serving the sentence.
- 1973 Zhang passed away.

Note:

The chronological biography of Zhang Dongsun is edited by the author according to the book by Zuo Yuhe. The source is listed in the Bibliography.

Appendix IV: Major Books by Zhang Dongsun

Kexue yu zhexue 科学与哲学 1924 (Science and Philosophy)

Xin zhexue luncong 新哲学论丛 1929 (Essays on New Philosophy)

Daode zhexue 道德哲学 1930 (Moral Philosophy)

Jiazhi zhexue 价值哲学 1934 (Philosophical Theories of Value)

Renshilun 认识论 1934 (On Epistemology)

Weiwubianzhengfa lunzhan 唯物辩证法论战 1934 (Critical Essays on Red Philosophy)

Zhishi yu wenhua 知识与文化 1940 (Knowledge and Culture)

Sixiang yu shehui 思想与社会 1943 (Thought and Society)

Lixing yu minzhu 理性与民主 1944 (Rationality and Democracy)

Minzhuzhuyi yu shehuizhuyi 民主主义与社会主义 1948 (Democracy and Socialism)

Bibliography

Angle, Stephen C. and Marina Svensson. *The Chinese Human Rights Reader: Documents and Commentary, 1900-2000*. New York: M. E. Sharpe, 2001.

Baradat, Leon P. *Political Ideologies: Their Origins and Impact*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1979.

Barker, Rodney. *Political Ideas in Modern Britain: In and After the Twentieth Century*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Bell, Duncan. "What Is Liberalism?." *Political Theory* 42, no.6 (2014): 682-715.

Bernal, Martin. *Chinese Socialism to 1907*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1976.

Bernstein, Eduard. *The Preconditions of Social Democracy*. Edited by Henry Tudor. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Bluntschli, Johann Caspar. *The Theory of the State*. 3rd ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1895.

Brutzkus, Boris. *Economic Planning in Soviet Russia*. London: George Routledge & Sons, 1935.

Chang, Carsun 张君勱. *The Third Force in China*. New York: Bookman Associates, 1952.

Chang, Hao 张灏. *Liang Qichao yu zhongguo sixiang de guodu 1890-1970 梁启超与中国思想的过渡* [Liang Qichao and Intellectual Transition in Modern China, 1890-1907]. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Cheng, Yinghong. "Liberalism in Contemporary China: Ten Years after Its 'Resurface'." *Journal of Contemporary China* 17, no. 55 (2008): 383-400.

Chien, Tuan-sheng 钱端升. *The Government and Politics of China*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Chu, Anping 储安平. "Zhongguo de zhengju" 中国的政局 [The Current Political Situation of China]. *Guancha* 观察 [The Observer] 5, no. 11 (1 September 1946): 3-8.

Clark, Peter. *Liberals and Social Democrats*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Collini, Stefan. *Liberalism and Sociology: L. T. Hobhouse and Political Argument in England 1880-1914*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Cui, Zhiyuan 崔之元. “Hunhe xianfa yu dui zhongguo zhengzhi de sanceng fenxi” 混合宪法与中国政治的三层分析 [A Mixed Constitution: An Analysis of the Future Chinese Political System on Three Levels]. In Li Shitao, *Zhishifenzi lichang*, 529-38.

Dai, Qing 戴晴. *Zai rulaifo zhang zhong: Zhang Dongsun he ta de shidai* 在如来佛掌中: 张东荪和他的时代 [In the Palm of Buddha: Zhang Dongsun and His Era]. Hong Kong: Xianggang zhongwen daxue chubanshe, 2000.

De Bary, William Theodore. *The Liberal Tradition in China*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1983.

Dewey, John. *Reconstruction in Philosophy*. New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1920.

Dewey, John. *China, Japan and the USA: Present-Day Conditions in the Far East and Their Bearing on the Washington Conference*. New York: Republic Publishing, 1921.
<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/28393/28393-h/28393-h.htm#essay4>.

Dong, Fangkui 董方奎. “Liang Qichao shehuizhuyiguan zai renshi” 梁启超社会主义观再认识 [A Re-examination of Liang Qichao’s Perspective on Socialism]. In *Guo Tingyi xiansheng jiuzhi danchen jiniance xiaoc* 郭廷以先生九秩诞辰纪念册下册 [Collected Essays in Commemoration of the 90th Anniversary of the Birth of Guo Tingyi, Volume Two], 233-48. Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishisuo, 1995.

Duara, Prasenjit. *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Freeden, Michael. *The New Liberalism: An Ideology of Social Reform*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Freeden, Michael. *Liberalism Divided: A Study in British Political Thought, 1914-1939*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Freeden, Michael. *Ideologies and Political Theory: A Conceptual Approach*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Freeden, Michael. "The Morphological Analysis of Ideology." In Freeden, Lyman Tower Sargent, and Marc Stears, *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*, 115-37.

Freeden, Michael, Lyman Tower Sargent, and Marc Stears, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Freeden, Michael. *Liberalism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Fung, Edmund. "The Alternative of Loyal Opposition: The Chinese Youth Party and Chinese Democracy, 1917-1949." In Roger B. Jeans, *Roads Not Taken*, 241-65.

Fung, Edmund. *In Search of Chinese Democracy: Civil Opposition in Nationalist China, 1929-1949*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Fung, Edmund. "State Building, Capitalist Development, and Social Democracy in China's Modern Transformation, 1921-1949." *Modern China* 31, no. 3 (2005):318-52.

Fung, Edmund. "The Idea of Freedom in Modern China Revisited: Dual Conceptions and Dual Responsibilities." *Modern China* 32, no. 4 (2006): 453-82.

Fung, Edmund. "Were Chinese Liberals Liberal? Reflections on the Understanding of Liberalism in Modern China." *Pacific Affairs* 81, no.4 (2008): 557-76.

Fung, Edmund. *The Intellectual Foundations of Chinese Modernity: Cultural and Political Thought in the Republican Era*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Gan, Yang 甘阳. "Ziyouzhuyi: Guizu de haishi pingmin de?" 自由主义: 贵族的还是平民的? [Liberalism: Aristocratic Democracy or Popular Democracy?]. In Li Shitao, *Zhishifenzi lichang*, 1-12.

Gao, Chaoqun 高超群. "Dangdai zhongguo zhengzhi sixiang bantu" 当代中国政治思想的版图 [The Landscape of Contemporary Chinese Political Thought]. *Zhongguo gaige luntan* 中国改革论坛 [China Reform Forum, China Institute for Reform and Development].

Updated 4 February 2012.
http://www.chinareform.org.cn/gov/governance/practice/201202/t20120205_133500.htm.

Gao, Like 高力克. “Ruhe renshi zhuanxing zhongguo—Guanyu ziyoushuyi yu xinzuopai de zhenglun” 如何认识转型中国—关于自由主义与新左派的争论 [How to Understand China in a Transition—The Debate between Liberals and New Leftists]. In Xu Jilin and Luo Gang, *Qimeng de ziwo wajie*, 194-250.

Gao, Wei 高巍, ed. “Makeshizhuyi heshi chuanru zhongguo kaolue” 马克思主义何时传入中国考略 [When Was Marxism Introduced to China?]. Zhongguo gongchandang xinwenwang 中国共产党新闻网 [News of the Communist Party of China]. Updated 26 March 2012. <http://theory.people.com.cn/GB/49157/17492297.html>.

Geng, Yunzhi, Zheng Dahua, and Yu Zuhua 耿云志, 郑大华, 俞祖华. “Lishi weishenme meiyou xuanze ziyoushuyi—Guanyu ‘zhongguo jindai ziyoushuyi’ de duihua” 历史为什么没有选择自由主义—关于“中国近代自由主义”的对话 [Why Was Liberalism not the Choice?—A Dialogue on Modern Chinese Liberalism]. In Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo, *Jindai zhongguo shi shang de ziyoushuyi*, 1-10.

Green, Thomas Hill. *Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation and Other Writings*. Edited by Paul Harris and John Morrow. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Grieder, Jerome B. *Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Groot, Gerald. *Managing Transitions: The Chinese Communist Party, United Front Work, Corporatism, and Hegemony*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Han, Yuhai 韩毓海. “Zai ziyoushuyi zitai de beihou” 在自由主义姿态的背后 [What Is Behind Liberalism?]. Ai sixiang 爱思想 [Ideas]. Updated 8 January 2007. <http://www.aisixiang.com/data/12648.html>.

He, Xiaoming 何晓明. “Jindai zhongguo ziyoushuyi” 近代中国自由主义 [Modern Chinese Liberalism]. In Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo, *Jindai zhongguo shi shang de ziyoushuyi*, 14-26.

Hobhouse, Leonard T. *The Labour Movement*. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1893.

Hobhouse, Leonard T. *Democracy and Reaction*. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1904.

Hobhouse, Leonard T. *The Metaphysical Theory of the State*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1918.

Hobhouse, Leonard T. *The Rational Good*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1921.

Hobhouse, Leonard T. *Social Evolution and Political Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1922.

Hobhouse, Leonard T. *The Elements of Social Justice*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1922.

Hobhouse, Leonard T. *Liberalism*. Kitchener: Batoche Books, 1998.

Hobson, John A. *The Crisis of Liberalism: New Issues of Democracy*. Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1974.

Hu, Shi 胡适. *Hu Shi wenji* 胡适文集 [Collected Works of Hu Shi]. Edited by Ouyang Zhesheng 欧阳哲生. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1998.

Hu, Shi 胡适. “Duo yanjiu xie wenti, shao tan xie zhuyi” 多研究些问题, 少谈些主义 [More Study of Problems, Less Talk of ‘Isms’]. In Ouyang Zhesheng, *Hu Shi wenji* (2), 249-278.

Hu, Shi 胡适. “Fei geren zhuyi de xinshenghuo” 非个人主义的新生活 [A Commentary on the New Life That Is Non-Individualistic]. In Ouyang Zhesheng, *Hu Shi wenji* (2), 564-72.

Hu, Shi 胡适. “Ouyou dao zhong jishu” 欧游道中寄书 [Letters during My Journey to Europe]. In Ouyang Zhesheng, *Hu Shi wenji* (4), 41-50.

Hu, Shi 胡适. “Renquan lunji” 人权论集 [A Collection of Essays on Human Rights]. In Ouyang Zhesheng, *Hu Shi wenji* (5), 523-539.

Hu, Shi 胡适. “Geren ziyou yu shehui jinbu” 个人自由与社会进步 [Individual Liberty and Social Progress]. In Ouyang Zhesheng, *Hu Shi wenji* (11), 584-85.

Hu, Weixi, Gao Ruiquan, and Zhang Limin 胡伟希, 高瑞泉, 张利民. *Shizi jietou yu ta: Zhongguo jindai ziyoushuizhi sichao yanjiu* 十字街头与塔: 中国近代自由主义思潮研究 [A Crossroads and the Pagoda: A Study of Modern Chinese Liberalism]. Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1991.

Hua, Shiping. *Chinese Legal Culture and Constitutional Order*. New York: Routledge, 2019.

Huang, Ko-wu 黄克武. “Jindai zhongguo de ziyoushuyi: Yuanqi yu yanbian” 近代中国的自由主义: 缘起与衍变 [Modern Chinese Liberalism: Origin and Evolution]. In Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo, *Jindai zhongguo shi shang de ziyoushuyi*, 27-43.

Huang, Philipp C. *Liang Chi-chao and Modern Chinese Liberalism*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1972.

Jackson, Ben. “Social Democracy.” In Freedman, Lyman Tower Sargent, and Marc Stears, *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*, 348-63.

Jeans, Roger B., ed. *Roads Not Taken: The Struggle of Opposition Parties in Twentieth-Century China*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1992.

Jeans, Roger B. *Democracy and Socialism in Republican China: The Politics of Zhang Junmai, 1906-1941*. Boulder: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997.

Jenco, Leigh K. “Chinese Liberalism.” LSE Research Online (2012). Accessed 25 December 2015. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/45300/>.

Jenco, Leigh K. “Chinese Political Ideologies.” In Freedman, Lyman Tower Sargent, and Marc Stears, *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*, 644-60.

Jiang, Yihua 姜义华. *Shehuizhuyi xueshuo zai zhongguo de chuqi chuanbo* 社会主义学说在中国的初期传播 [The Dissemination of Socialist Theories in the Early Phase of Modern China]. Shanghai: Fudan daxue chubanshe, 1984.

Jin, Guantao and Liu Qingfeng 金观涛, 刘青峰. *Guannianshi yanjiu: Zhongguo xiandai zhongyao zhengzhi shuyi de xingcheng* 观念史研究: 中国现代重要政治术语的形成 [Studies in the History of Ideas: The Formation of Important Modern Chinese Political Terms]. Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 2008.

Jizhe 记者 [Editor]. “Women suo yao shuo de hua” 我们所要说的话 [Our Parole]. *Zaisheng* 再生 [The National Renaissance] 1, no.1 (20 May 1932): 1-60.

Kraus, Herbert. *The Crisis of German Democracy: A Study of the Spirit of the Constitution of Weimar*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1932.

Lee, Soonyi. “Culture and Politics in Interwar China: The Two Zhangs and Chinese Socialism.” PhD diss., New York University, 2014.

Legge, James. *Li ji* 礼记 [The Book of Rites]. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1885.
<https://ctext.org/liji/zhong-yong>.

Legge, James. *The Chinese Classics: The Works of Mencius*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1895.

Lei, Zhen 雷震. “Zhengxiexiancao zhi youlai” 政协宪草之由来 [The Origin of the Draft Revision of the Fifth of May Draft Constitution of 1936]. In *Zhixian shuyao* 制宪述要 [A Succinct Account of Constitution-Making of the Republic of China], 9-11. Taipei: Guiguan tushu gufen youxian gongsi, 1989.

Lei, Zhen 雷震. *Zhonghua minguo zhixian shi—Zhengzhi xieshang huiyi xianfa caoan* 中华民国制宪史—政治协商会议宪法草案 [The History of Constitution-Making of the Republic of China—The Draft Revision of the Fifth May Draft Constitution of 1936]. Edited by Xue Huayuan 薛化元. Taipei: Daoxiang chubanshe, 2010.

Lenin, V. I. *Lenin Collected Works*. Translated by David Walters and R. Cymbala. Vol. 32. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965.
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1921/apr/21.htm>.

Li, Guizhong 李贵忠. *Zhang Junmai nianpu changbian* 张君勱年谱长编 [A Chronological Biography of Zhang Junmai]. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2016.

Li, He. *Political Thought and China's Transformation: Ideas Shaping Reform in Post-Mao China*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Li, Shitao 李世涛, ed. *Zhishifenzi lichang: Ziyoushuizhi zhi zheng yu zhongguo sixiangjie de fenhua* 知识分子立场: 自由主义之争与中国思想界的分化 [The Positions of Intellectuals: Debates over Liberalism and Divisions within Chinese Intellectual Circles]. Changchun: Shidai wenyi chubanshe, 2000.

Li, Shuchang 黎庶昌. *Xiyang zazhi* 西洋杂志 [A Journey to Europe]. Changsha: Hunan renmin chubanshe, 1981.

Liang, Qichao 梁启超. *Yingbinshi heji* 饮冰室合集 [Complete Works of Liang Qichao]. Vol. 37. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989.

Liang, Qichao 梁启超. *Yingbinshi heji* 饮冰室合集 [Complete Works of Liang Qichao]. Vol. 39. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989.

Lin, Fen, Yanfei Sun, and Hongxing Yang, “How Are Chinese Students Ideologically Divided? A Survey of Chinese Students’ Political Self-Identification.” *Pacific Affairs* 88, no.1 (2015): 51-74.

Liu, Jianjun 刘建军. *Dangdai zhongguo zhengzhi sichao* 当代中国政治思潮 [Contemporary Chinese Political Thought]. Shanghai: Fudan daxue chubanshe, 2010.

Liu, Juning 刘军宁. *Gonghe minzhu xianzheng—Ziyouzhuyi sixiang yanjiu* 共和·民主·宪政 [Republic, Democracy, and Constitutionalism—A Study of Liberalism]. Shanghai: Sanlian shudian, 1998.

Ma, Kefeng 马克锋. “Chuantong moxue yu xiandai shehuizhuyi” 传统墨学与现代社会主义 [Ancient Mohism and Modern Socialism]. In Zheng and Zou Xiaozhan, *Zhongguo jindaishi shang de shehuizhuyi*, 29-39.

Ma, Licheng 马立诚. *Dangdai zhongguo bazhong shehui sichao* 当代中国八种社会思潮 [Eight Strands of Social Thought in Contemporary China]. Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe, 2011.

Mill, John Stuart. *Autobiography*. London: Longmans, Green, Reader & Dyer, 1874.

Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty*. Kitchener: Batoche Books, 2001.

Office of the President, ROC. “Constitution of the Republic of China (Taiwan).” Laws and Regulations Database of the Republic of China. Accessed 20 March 2018. <https://law.moj.gov.tw/ENG/LawClass/LawAll.aspx?pcode=A0000001>.

Office of the President, ROC “Additional Articles of the Constitution of the Republic of China.” Laws and Regulations of the Database of the Republic of China. Accessed 21 March 2018. <http://law.moj.gov.tw/Eng/LawClass/LawAll.aspx?PCode=A0000002>.

Ouyang, Zhesheng 欧阳哲生. *Ziyouzhuyi zhi lei—Hu Shi sixiang de xiandai chanshi* 自由主义之累—胡适思想的现代阐述 [The Burden of Liberalism—A Modern Interpretation of Hu Shi’s Thought]. Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1993.

Pepper, Suzanne. "Education for the New Order." In *The People's Republic Part I: The Emergence of Revolutionary China 1949-1965*, 184-217. Vol. 14 of *The Cambridge History of China*. Edited by Roderick Macfarquhar and John Fairbank. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987. doi: 10.1017/CHOL9780521243360.005.

Qin, Hui 秦晖. "Zhongguo xiandai ziyoushuyi de lilun shangque" 中国现代自由主义的理论商榷 [A Discussion on a Modern Theory of Chinese Liberalism]. Ai Sixiang 爱思想 [Ideas]. Updated 28 July 2011. <http://www.aisixiang.com/data/42554.html>.

Qin, Hui 秦晖. "Dangdai zhongguo de wenti yu zhuyi" 当代中国的问题与主义 [Problems and Isms in Contemporary China]. Xinlang lishi 新浪历史 [Sina History]. Updated 17 April 2013. <http://history.sina.com.cn/his/hs/2013-04-17/204926955.shtml>.

Qin, Hui 秦晖. *Gongtong de dixian* 共同的底线 [Our Common Ground and Bottom Line in the Debate over "Isms" in Relation to Chinese Problems]. Nanjing: Jiangsu wenyi chubanshe, 2013.

Qin, Hui 秦晖. "Liangci qimeng de qiehuan yu riben shi ziyoushuyi de yingxiang" 两次启蒙的切换与日本式自由主义的影响 [Switch of Enlightenment before One Hundred Days of Reform and after the 1911 Revolution and the Impact of Japanese Liberalism on Chinese Intellectuals]. *Ershiyi shiji* 二十一世纪 [Twenty First Century], no. 151 (October 2015):32-40. Accessed 20 April 2018. <http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/ics/21c/cn/issues/c151.html>.

Qin, Xiaoyi 秦孝仪. *Zhonghua minguo zhongyao shiliao chubian—Dui ri kangzhan shiqi diqibian zhanhou zhongguo er* 中华民国重要史料初编—对日抗战时期第七编战后中国 (二) [Important Historical Data on the Republic of China—Volume 7 The Post-War Era Part Two]. Taipei: Zhongguo guomindang zhongyang weiyuanhui dangshi weiyuanhui 中国国民党中央委员会党史委员会 [Party History Committee of the KMT Central Committee], 1981.

Ren, Jiantao 任剑涛. "Jiedu xin zuopai" 解读新左派 [Interpreting the New Left]. In Li Shitao, *Zhishifenzi lichang*, 191-214.

Ren, Jiantao 任剑涛. *Zhongguo xiandai sixiang mailuo zhong de ziyoushuyi* 中国现代思想脉络中的自由主义 [Liberalism in the Threads of Modern Chinese Thought]. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2004.

Ruggiero, Guido De. *The History of European Liberalism*. Translated by R. G. Collingwood. London: Oxford University Press, 1927.

Russell, Bertrand. *The Problem of China*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1922.

Schwarz, Benjamin I. *In Search of Wealth and Power: Yen Fu and the West*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Shi, Bifan 石毕凡. *Jindai zhongguo ziyoushuyi xianzheng sichao yanjiu* 近代中国自由主义宪政思潮研究 [Constitutional Liberalism in Modern China]. Jinan: Shandong renmin chubanshe, 2004.

Sun, Shanhao 孙善豪. “Zhang Junmai de xianzheng shehuizhuyi” 张君勱的宪政社会主义 [Zhang Junmai: Constitutional Socialism]. Tengxun wenhua 腾讯文化 [Tencent Culture]. Updated 18 July 2013. <http://cul.qq.com/a/20130718/015913.htm>.

Sun, Zhongshan 孙中山. *Sun Zhongshan quanji* 孙中山全集 [All Works of Sun Yat-sen]. Vol. 9. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986.

Svensson, Marina. *Debating Human Rights in China: A Conceptual and Political History*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002.

Tan, Zhongchi 谭仲池, ed. *Changsha tongshi—Xiandai juan* 长沙通史—现代卷 [A General History of Changsha, Modern Times]. Changsha: Hunan jiaoyu chubanshe, 2013.

The United States Department of State, ed. *The China White Paper, August 1949*. California: Stanford University Press, 1967.

Tsai, Benjamin C. “Enemies of the Revolution: Ideology and Practice in the Making of Chinese Liberalism, 1890-1927.” PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2000.

Van Slyke, Lyman P. *Enemies and Friends: The United Front in Chinese Communist History*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1967.

Varga, Eugen. “Democracy of a New Type.” Seventeen Moments in Soviet History. Accessed 25 October 2018. <http://soviethistory.msu.edu/1947-2/cominform-and-the-soviet-bloc/cominform-and-the-soviet-bloc-texts/democracy-of-a-new-type/>.

Wang, Guoxuan 王国轩. “Di shisi zhang” 第十四章 [Chapter XIV]. In *Da xue zhong yong* 大学·中庸 [The Great Learning and the Doctrine of the Mean with Annotations by Wang Guoxuan]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2007.

Wang, Hui 汪晖. “Dangdai zhongguo de sixiang zhuangkuang he xiandaixing wenti” 当代中国的思想状况和现代性问题 [On Contemporary Chinese Thought and Modernity]. In Li Shitao, *Zhishifenzi lichang*, 83-123.

Wang, Jessica Ching-Sze. *John Dewey in China: To Teach and to Learn*. New York: State University of New York Press, 2007.

Wang, Tao 王韬. *Pu fa zhanji* 普法战纪 [*The Franco-Prussian War: The German Conquest of France in 1870-1871*]. Hong Kong: Zhonghua yinwu zongju, 1873.

Weng, Hekai 翁贺凯. “Xiandai zhongguo de ziyou minzu zhuyi—Zhang Junmai minzu jianguo sixiang pingzhuan” 现代中国的自由民族主义—张君勱民族建国思想评传 [Liberal Nationalism in Modern China: A Commentary on Zhang Junmai’s Political Thought of Nation-Building]. PhD diss., Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, 2006.

Weng, Hekai 翁贺凯. “Xiuzheng de minzhu zhengzhi bianxi—Chongshen Zhang Junmai 1930 niandai de minzhu guannian he zhidu sheji” 修正的民主政治辨析—重审张君勱 1930 年代的民主观念和制度设计 [An Analysis of the Theory of ‘Modified Democratic Politics—A Re-examination of Zhang Junmai’s Political Thought about Democracy and Institutional Design in the 1930s]. In *Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo, Jindai zhongguo shi shang de ziyouzhuyi*, 430-55.

Willey, Malcolm M. “Some Recent Critics and Exponents of the Theory of Democracy.” In *A History of Political Theories: Recent Times*. Edited by Charles Edward Merriam and Harry Elmer Barnes. New York: The Macmillan, 1923.

Xiao, Gongqin 萧功秦. “Xinzuopai yu dangdai zhongguo zhishifenzi de sixiang fenhua” 新左派与当代中国知识分子的分化 [The New Left and the Disintegration of the Intelligentsia in Contemporary China]. *Dangdai zhongguo yanjiu* 当代中国研究 [Modern China Studies], no. 1 (2002). Accessed 12 December 2018. <https://www.modernchinastudies.org/cn/issues/past-issues/76-mcs-2002-issue-1/1219-2012-01-06-08-38-50.html>.

Xiao, Gongquan 萧公权. *Jindai zhongguo sixiang renwu lun—Shehuizhuyi* 近代中国思想人物论—社会主义 [Modern Chinese Thinkers—Socialism]. Taipei: Shibao wenhua gongsi, 1980.

Xiao, Shu 笑蜀, ed. *Lishi de xiansheng* 历史的先声 [Herald in Our History: Solemn Promises Made by the Chinese Communists in the 1940s]. Shantou: Shantou daxue chubanshe, 1999.

Xie, Zhengdao 谢政道. *Zhonghua minguo xiu xian shi* 中华民国修宪史 [The History of Revision to the Constitution of the Republic of China]. Taipei: Yangzhi wenhua shiye gufen youxian gongsi, 2007.

Xu, Jilin 许纪霖. *Ershi shiji zhongguo sixiangshi lun (shangjuan)* 二十世纪中国思想史论 (上卷) [Chinese Intellectual History in the Twentieth Century Volume 1]. Shanghai: Dongfang chubanshe, 2000.

Xu, Jilin 许纪霖. “Shehuiminzhuzhuyi de lishi yichan—Xiandai zhongguo ziyoushuyi de huigu” 社会民主主义的历史遗产—现代中国自由主义的回顾 [The Historical Legacy of Social Democracy: A Review of the Liberal Tradition in Modern China]. In Li Shitao, *Zhishi fenzi lichang*, 474-86.

Xu, Jilin et al. 许纪霖. “Xunqiu disantiao daolu” 寻求第三条道路 [Seeking the Third Way]. In Li Shitao, *Zhishifenzi lichang*, 301-33.

Xu, Jilin and Luo Gang 许纪霖, 罗岗, eds. *Qimeng de ziwo wajie* 启蒙的自我瓦解 [The Self-Disintegration of Chinese Enlightenment in the 1990s]. Changchun: Jilin chubanshe, 2007.

Xu, Jilin 许纪霖. “Zonglun” 总论 [Preface]. In Xu and Luo Gang, *Qimeng de ziwo wajie*, 1-42.

Xu, Youyu 徐友渔. “Ziyoushuyi yu dangdai zhongguo” 自由主义与当代中国 [Liberalism and Contemporary China]. In Li Shitao, *Zhishifenzi lichang*, 413-30.

Xu, Youyu 徐友渔. “Jinru ershiyi shiji de ziyoushuyi he xinzuopai” 进入二十一世纪的自由主义和新左派 [Liberalism and the New Left in the Twenty-First Century]. *Dangdai zhongguo yanjiu* 当代中国研究 [Modern China Studies], no. 2 (2007). Accessed 12 December 2018. <https://www.modernchinastudies.org/cn/issues/past-issues/96-mcs-2007-issue-2/1006-21.html>.

Xue, Huayuan 薛化元. *Minzhu xianzheng yu minzuzhuyi de bianzheng fazhan—Zhang Junmai sixiang yanjiu* 民主宪政与民族主义的辩证发展—张君勱思想研究 [Dialectic Development of Democracy, Constitutionalism, and Nationalism—A Study of Zhang Junmai's Thought]. Taipei: Daoxiang chubanshe, 1993.

Yang, Bojun 杨伯峻. “Li lou zhang ju xia” 离娄章句下. In *Mengzi yizhu* 孟子译注 [Mencius with Annotations by Yang Bojun]. Vol. 1. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1960.

Yin, Haiguang 殷海光. “Ziyoushuyi de quxiang” 自由主义的趋向 [The Tendency of Liberalism]. In *Jindai zhongguo sixiang renwu lun—Ziyoushuyi* 近代中国思想人物论—自由主义 [Modern Chinese Thinkers—Liberalism], edited by Zhou Yangshan and Yang Suxian 周阳山, 杨肃猷, 19-97. Taipei: Shibao wenhua gongsi, 1980.

Yu, Zuhua and Zhao Huifeng 俞祖华, 赵慧峰. “Shehuizhuyi: Xiandai zhongguo san da sichao de gongtong quxiang” 社会主义: 现代中国三大思潮的共同取向 [Socialism: A Common Orientation of Three Main Intellectual Currents in Modern China]. In Zheng and Zou Xiaozhan, *Zhongguo jindaishi shang de shehuizhuyi*, 40-56.

Zhang, Deyi 张德彝. *Sui shi faguo ji* 随使法国记 [A Journey to France with the Chinese Diplomatic Mission]. Edited by Zhong Shuhe 钟叔河. Changsha: Hunan renmin chubanshe, 1982.

Zhang, Dongsun 张东荪. “Neige lun” 内阁论 [On Parliamentarianism]. *Zheng yi* 正谊 [The Rightness] 1, no. 2 (15 January 1914): 1-10.

Zhang, Dongsun 张东荪. “Yu zhi lianbang zuzhi lun” 予之联邦组织论 [My Views on Federalism]. *Zheng yi* 1, no. 5 (15 September 1914): 1-8.

Zhang, Dongsun 张东荪. “Zhongguo zhi jianglai yu jinshi wenminguo liguo zhi yuanze” 中国之将来与近世文明国立国之原则 [China’s Future and the Principles of State-Building of Civilised Countries in Modern Times]. *Zheng yi* 1, no. 7 (February 1915): 1-16.

Zhang, Dongsun 张东荪. “Disanzhong wenming” 第三种文明 [A Third Civilisation]. *Jiefang yu gaizao* 解放与改造 [Emancipation and Reconstruction] 1, no. 1 (1 September 1919): 1-5.

Zhang, Dongsun 张东荪. *Daode zhexue* 道德哲学 [Moral Philosophy] Shanghai: Zhonghua shuju, 1930.

Zhang, Dongsun 张东荪. “Shengchan jihua yu shengchan dongyuan” 生产计划与生产动员 [Economic Planning and Economic Mobilisation]. *Zaisheng* 1, no. 2 (20 June 1932): 1-15.

Zhang, Dongsun 张东荪. “Dang de wenti” 党的问题 [The Question of Political Party]. *Zaisheng* 1, no. 3 (20 July 1932): 1-24.

Zhang, Dongsun 张东荪. “Jieji wenti” 阶级问题 [The Question of Class]. *Zaisheng* 1, no. 4 (20 August 1932): 1-21.

Zhang, Dongsun 张东荪, ed. *Weiwubianzhengfa lunzhan* 唯物辩证法论战 [Critical Essays on Red Philosophy]. Shanghai: Minyou shuju, 1934.

Zhang, Dongsun 张东荪. “Ping ‘gongchandang xuanyan’ bing lun quanguo dahezuo” 评“共产党宣言”并论全国的合作 [The Declaration of the CCP on 1st August 1935 and a Nationwide Cooperation]. *Ziyoupinglun* 自由评论 [Free Comment], no.10 (7 February 1936): 4-9.

Zhang, Dongsun 张东荪. “Zhishifenzi yu wenhua de ziyou” 知识分子与文化的自由 [The Intelligentsia and Cultural Freedom]. *Guancha* 5, no. 11 (1 September 1946): 3-5.

Zhang, Dongsun 张东荪. “Zhuishu women nuli jianli lianhezhengfu de yongyi” 追述我们努力建立联合政府的用意 [Our Motive for Establishing a Coalition Government]. *Guancha* 2, no.6 (15 April 1947):5-7.

Zhang, Dongsun 张东荪. *Minzhuzhuyi yu shehuizhuyi* 民主主义与社会主义 [Democracy and Socialism]. Shanghai: Guancha she, 1948.

Zhang, Dongsun 张东荪. *Zhang Dongsun xueshu wenhua suibi* 张东荪学术文化随笔 [Selected Readings of Zhang Dongsun]. Edited by Ke Rou 克柔. Beijing: Zhongguo qingnian chubanshe, 2000.

Zhang, Dongsun 张东荪. *Lixing yu minzhu* 理性与民主 [Rationality and Democracy]. Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 2010.

Zhang, Dongsun 张东荪. *Sixiang yu shehui* 思想与社会 [Thought and Society]. Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 2010.

Zhang, Dongsun 张东荪. *Zhongguo jindai sixiangjia wenku: Zhang Dongsun juan* 中国近代思想家文库—张东荪卷 [Library of Modern Chinese Thinkers: Zhang Dongsun]. Edited by Zuo Yuhe 左玉河. Beijing: Zhongguo renmin daxue chubanshe, 2015.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. “Deguo geming lun” 德国革命论 [The German Revolution] *Jiefang yu gaizao* 解放与改造 [Emancipation and Reconstruction] 2, no. 3 (1920): 6-22.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. “Deguo xin gonghe xianfa ping” 德国新共和宪法评 [A Commentary on the Weimar Constitution]. *Jiefang yu gaizao* 2, no. 9 (1920): 5-24.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. *Xin deguo shehui minzhu zhengxiang ji* 新德国社会民主政象记 [The Politics of a New Germany: Social Democracy] Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1922.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. *Sue pinglun* 苏俄评论 [A Commentary on the Soviet Union]. Shanghai: Xinyue shudian, 1927.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. “Guojia minzhu yu guojia shehuizhuyi (shang pian)” 国家民主与国家社会主义 (上篇) [National Democracy and State Socialism Part One]. *Zaisheng* 1, no.2 (20 June 1932): 1-38.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. “Guojia minzhu yu guojia shehuizhuyi (xia pian),” 国家民主与国家社会主义 (下篇) [National Democracy and State Socialism Part Two]. *Zaisheng* 1, no.3 (20 July 1932): 1-40.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. “Wo yu xianfa” 我与宪法 [Me and the Constitution]. *Zaisheng* 2, no.9 (1 June 1934): 1-8.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. *Minzu fuxing zhi xueshu jichu* 民族复兴之学术基础 [The Academic Foundations of National Rejuvenation]. Shanghai: Zaisheng she, 1935.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. “Wo cong shehuikexue tiao dao zhexue zhi jingguo” 我从社会科学跳到哲学之经过 [How I Changed My Major from Social Sciences to Philosophy]. *Zaisheng* 3, no.8 (15 October 1935): 1-14.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. *Mingri zhi zhongguo wenhua* 明日之中国文化 [Chinese Culture Tomorrow]. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1936.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. “Wei wan zhi guojia zhexue chugao (yi)” 未完之国家哲学初稿 (一) [First Draft of the Unfinished Lectures on the Philosophy of the State—Lecture One]. *Zaisheng* 4, no.5 (15 May 1937): 1-11.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. “Wei wan zhi guojia zhexue chugao (er)—Kexuepai zhi guojiaguan yu zhexuepai zhi guojiaguan” 未完之国家哲学初稿 (二)—科学派之国家观与哲学派之国家观 [First Draft of the Unfinished Lectures on the Philosophy of the State—Lecture Two Conceptions of the State from the Perspectives of the Scientific School and the Philosophical School]. *Zaisheng* 4, no.6 (1 June 1937): 6-14.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. “Wei wan zhi guojia zhexue chugao (san)” 未完之国家哲学初稿 (三) [First Draft of the Unfinished Lectures on the Philosophy of the State—Lecture Three]. *Zaisheng* 4, no.7 (15 June 1937): 6-15.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. “Wei wan zhi guojia zhexue chugao (si)—Guojia zhi xingzhi” 未完之国家哲学初稿 (四)—国家之性质 [First Draft of the Unfinished Lectures on the Philosophy of the State—Lecture Four On The Nature of the State]. *Zaisheng* 4, no.8 (1 July 1937): 5-13.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. “Wei wan zhi guojia zhexue chugao (wu)—Guojia zhi yanhua” 未完之国家哲学初稿 (五)—国家之演化 [First Draft of the Unfinished Lectures on the Philosophy of the State—Lecture Five On The Evolution of the State]. *Zaisheng* 4, no.9 (15 July 1937): 16-21.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. “Renmin jiben quanli sanxiang zhi baozhang” 人民基本权利三项之保障 [On the Protection of the Three Fundamental Human Rights of the People]. *Zaisheng* 4, no.94 (30 April 1944):36-40.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. “Renquan wei xianzheng jiben” 人权为宪政基本 [Human Rights as the Foundation of Constitutionalism]. *Zaisheng* 4, no.125 (10 August 1946):3-8.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. “Minzhushuheizhuyi zhi zhixue beijing (yi)” 民主社会主义之哲学背景 (一) [The Philosophical Background of Democratic Socialism Part One]. *Zaisheng* 4, no. 221 (27 June 1948): 3-6.

Zhang Junmai 张君勱. “Minzhushuheizhuyi zhi zhixue beijing (er)” 民主社会主义之哲学背景 (二) [The Philosophical Background of Democratic Socialism Part Two]. *Zaisheng* 4, no. 222 (4 July 1948): 3-5.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. *Liguo zhi dao* 立国之道 [The Way of State-Building]. Vol. 2 of *Zhang Junmai xiansheng jiuzhi danchen jiniance* 张君勱先生九秩诞辰纪念册 [Collected Works of Zhang Junmai in Commemoration of the 90th Anniversary of Zhang’s Birth]. Edited by Sun Yafu and Yang Yuzi 孙亚夫, 杨毓滋. Taipei: Wenhai chubanshe, 1976.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. *Shehuizhuyi sixiang yundong gaiguan* 社会主义思想运动概观 [An Overview of Socialist Thought and Movements]. Taipei: Daoxiang chubanshe, 1988.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. *Xianzheng zhi dao* 宪政之道 [The Way of Constitutionalism]. Beijing: Qinghua daxue chubanshe, 2006.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. “Deguo jiqi bang xianfa duiyu shijie fazhishi shang zhi xin gongxian” 德国及其邦宪法对于世界法制史上之新贡献 [Germany’s Contribution to the Constitutional History of the World]. In Zhang Junmai, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 302-13.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. “Deguo xinxian qicaoze bolusi zhi guojia guannian jiqi zai deguo zhengzhi xueshuoshi shang zhi diwei” 德国新宪起草者柏吕斯之国家观念及其在德国政治学说史上之地位 [Hugo Preuss’ Conception of the State and Its Position in German Political Philosophy]. In Zhang Junmai, *Xianzheng zhi dao*, 341-53.

Zhang, Junmai 张君勱. “Mule Yuehan yiyuan zhengzhi lun” 穆勒约翰议院政治论 [John S. Mill on Parliamentary Politics]. *Zhengzhi sixiang shi* 政治思想史 [History of Political Thought] 1, no. 1 (2010):137-54.

Zhang, Qing 章清. *Hu Shi paixue renqun yu xiandai zhongguo ziyoushuyi* 胡适派学人群与现代中国自由主义 [The Hu Shi Group of Scholars and Modern Chinese Liberalism]. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2004.

Zhang, Rulun 张汝伦. “Disantiao daolu” 第三条道路 [The Third Way]. In Li Shitao, *Zhishifenzi lichang*, 334-43.

Zheng, Dahua 郑大华. *Zhang Junmai zhuan* 张君勱传 [A Biography of Zhang Junmai]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1997.

Zheng, Dahua 郑大华. *Minguo sixiangshi lun* 民国思想史论 [An Intellectual History of Republican China]. Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe, 2006.

Zheng, Dahua 郑大华. “Lun Zhang Junmai zhengzhi sixiang de yanbian jiqi dangdai yiyi” 论张君勱政治思想的演变及其当代意义 [Development of Zhang Junmai’s Political Thought and Its Contemporary Significance]. *Guanchazhe* 观察者 [Observer]. Updated 22 August 2013. https://www.guancha.cn/ZhengDaHua/2013_08_22_158305.shtml.

Zheng, Dahua and Gao Juan 郑大华, 高娟. “Gaizao yu wusi shehuizhuyi zhi chuanru” 《改造》与五四社会主义之传播 [Gaizao and the Dissemination of Socialism during the May Fourth Movement]. In Zheng and Zou Xiaozhan, *Zhongguo jindaishi shang de shehuizhuyi*, 92-136.

Zheng, Dahua and Zou Xiaozhan 郑大华, 邹小站, eds. *Zhongguo jindaishi shang de shehuizhuyi* 中国近代史上的社会主义 [Socialism in Modern China]. Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe, 2011.

Zhongguo dier lishi danganguan 中国第二历史档案馆 [The Second Historical Archives of China], ed. *Zhongguo minzhusheshuidang* 中国民主社会党 [The China Democratic Socialist Party]. Beijing: Dangan chubanshe, 1988.

Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo 中国社会科学院近代史研究所 [Institute of Modern History, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences], ed. *Jindai zhongguo shi shang de ziyoushuyi—Ziyoushuyi yu jindai zhongguo (1840-1949) xueshu yantaohui lunwenji* 近代中国史上的自由主义—自由主义与近代中国 (1840-1949) 学术研讨会论文集 [Proceedings of Liberalism in Modern Chinese History—Liberalism and Modern China, 1840-1949]. Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe, 2008.

Zhou, Enlai 周恩来. “Zhou Enlai tan pipan Liu Shaoqi” 周恩来谈批判刘少奇 [Zhou Enlai on the Question of Liu Shaoqi]. Wenxuecheng boke 文学城博客 [Blog on Literature]. Updated 28 April 2009. <http://blog.wenxuecity.com/blog/frontend.php?act=articlePrint&blogId=42701&date=200904&postId=44609>.

Zhu, Xueqin 朱学勤. “Ziyoushuyi xueli de yanshuo” 自由主义学理的言说 [A Discourse on the Doctrines of Liberalism] Guanchazhe 观察者 [Observer]. Updated 10 October 2011. http://www.guancha.cn/ZhuXueQin/2011_10_10_50718.shtml.

Zuo, Yuhe 左玉河. *Zhang Dongsun zhuan* 张东荪传 [A Biography of Zhang Dongsun]. Beijing: Hongqi chubanshe, 2009.