

Confucianism and Sun Yat-sen's Views on Civilization
Teiichi KAWATA

I. Introduction

The Qing Dynasty, the last of China's feudal monarchies, was shaken to its very foundations due to the impact of the West, which was symbolized by the cannon fire of the Opium War in 1840. This is because the 2,000-plus year old system that made Confucianism the state ideology from the time of Emperor Wu in the Earlier Han was easily defeated by England's military might, which made rapid advances due to the Industrial Revolution in the eighteenth century. Here the history of modern China begins.

In the century that followed, in the time that the old system transformed into socialist China, a multitude of intellectual problems sprung forth. Truly, if this period of 100-plus years were put in the terms of Western European intellectual history, themes of intellectual history spanning several centuries were compressed into this period. Namely, starting the Renaissance in the fifteenth century, the Religious Reformation of the sixteenth century, French Enlightenment philosophy of the seventeenth century, as well as the revolutionary thought of the American and French Revolutions in the eighteenth century, and German Idealism, from Hegel to Marx's Communism, truly various things were adopted, and they sprouted and bloomed.

In a sense, that period could be called a golden age of thought. For these thinkers, it was absolutely necessary to engage in the task of how to think about the China in which they lived, and how to change it. They needed to prepare answers to cultural problems such as China's traditions versus China's modernization, Chinese civilization versus Western civilization; political problems such as imperialism, constitutionalism, or

republicanism and capitalism or socialism. More than anything, they were required to come up with an answer on how to view and deal with Confucianism, which supported the old system.

In this essay, I would like to examine two issues using Sun Yat-sen as a case study. The first is Sun Yat-sen's thoughts toward traditional Chinese culture and Chinese civilization, which can be said to be the foundations of that culture. Next, is what he thought of Confucianism, which can be said to be the symbol of that traditional culture.

However, it would not be an exaggeration to say that until 1990, there were virtually no academic writings on the relationship between Sun Yat-sen and Confucianism. For instance, there is a 468 page book on B5 paper entitled *Sun Zhongshan yanjiu zongmu* (*General Catalog of Research on Sun Zhongshan*, edited by Su Ai-rong and Liu Yong-wei, published by Tuan Jie Publishers, Beijing Press, March 1990). This book, which was published in Chinese, Japanese, English, French, German and Russian between 1900 and 1988 is a comprehensive catalog of research on Sun Yat-sen, essays published in newspapers and magazines, as well as Sun Yat-sen's own writings. According to this catalog, there are five books on Sun Yat-sen's thought (classified into nine categories, including general thought, the "Three People's Principles," philosophical thought, social thought, political thought, and economic thought), and there are a total of 684 essays, but there are a mere three articles that have the words "Sun Yat-sen" and "Confucianism" in the title.¹

Why is that? The primary reason is the complexity of Sun Yat-sen's evaluations of Confucianism. Namely, in Sun Yat-sen's later years, his writings and lectures use Confucian technical terms, concepts, and ideals. Then, after his death, the right wing of

the Kuomintang labeled Sun Yat-sen “a follower of Confucianism,” and was memorialized as the heir of traditional Chinese culture and morality. This negated the image of Sun Yat-sen that the Communists tried to depict, in which he was “pro-Soviet, pro-Communist, and a supporter of farmers and laborers.” In a manner of speaking, Sun Yat-sen had a two-faced image of himself, like the two sides of a coin, created by his successors.

For example, in the well-known *Son Bun-shugi no tetsugaku kiso* (The Basics of Sun Yat-sen’s Philosophy, published May 1925), which Dai Jitao (penname: Tian Qiu) published soon after Sun Yat-sen’s death, he wrote that Sun Yat-sen’s “basic philosophy that completely originated in the orthodox thought of the *Doctrine of the Mean*, and Master Sun is truly a great saint who, in China’s moral culture, inherited the tradition and paved the way for the future.” Chiang Kai-shek also has high regard for Sun Yat-sen’s scholarship, thought, morals, and revolutionary spirit, writing “He has completely inherited a 5,000 year old historical and cultural tradition.”²

Since the foundation of the New China, writing on Sun Yat-sen and Confucianism in Communist-controlled mainland China can be said to be sort of a taboo. Even progressive and cutting-edge mainland Chinese researchers such as Prof. Zhang Kai-yuan, who is also held in high regard in the U.S. and Europe, entitled his essay on the relationship between Sun Zhongshan (Sun Yat-sen) and Confucianism as “From Alienation to Return.” In this essay, Prof. Zhang writes that after the May Fourth Movement, which happened in Sun Yat-sen’s later years, that “he very clearly returned to traditional Chinese culture,” but while this shows that the Chinese bourgeoisie-class revolution was still in its infancy, at the same time Sun Yat-sen’s understanding of

traditional Chinese culture deepened, and although his training as a physician and occupational grounding lent him a scientific mind and an emphasis on the practical, Zhang argues that Sun Yat-sen was weak in advanced philosophical thought and abstract thinking. It is no exaggeration to say that in China a balanced evaluation of the Confucian elements in Sun Yat-sen's later years has yet to be done.³

Even in Japan, Suzue Gen'ichi's famous work *Son Bun-den (A Biography of Sun Yat-sen)* states, "Just that research on Sun Yat-sen's old writings was not deep, also, the boldness that bordered on naiveté given to him by his extremely strong sense of self-respect, as both a spiritualist and idealist, the only thing that is certain about the relationship between Sun Yat-sen's political thought and Confucianism is that is truly un-academic." Furthermore, he writes:

Sun Yat-sen expounded *zhi nan xing yi* (knowing is difficult but action is easy), and based on this, all people can be classified as *xian zhi xian jue* (already knowing and already aware), *hou zhi hou jue* (later knowing and later becoming aware), *bu zhi bu jue* (not knowing and not aware). Those who "previously know and are previously aware" will be made absolute leaders and those who "do not know and are not aware" (the so-called "masses") will be made absolute followers.

Confucius, due to his support of feudalistic relationships of control, established the absolute character of the class of absolute controllers, the class of the absolutely controlled, as well as the emperor, who stands well above both classes. Sun Yat-sen, an adherent of democracy, evidently took his revolutionary philosophy from this philosophy that supports feudalistic relationships of control.⁴

Ever since the aforementioned condemnation was made, with the exception of one or two articles, one can find little or no research that focuses on the relationship between Sun Yat-sen and Confucianism.⁵

II. Sun Yat-sen's Views on Civilization

However, before examining Sun Yat-sen's views on Confucianism, I want to look at what he thought of the problems of Chinese culture and civilization, which can be said to the foundation of his existence as someone born Chinese. In particular, I want to look at his views on Chinese civilization.

There are two reasons for this. First, in China under the old system, before impact of the Opium War, which demonstrated the overwhelming power of Western European civilization, Chinese civilization and culture were not at odds with each other.⁶ The terms "Chinese civilization" and "Chinese culture" were frequently used interchangeably and virtually had the same meaning. However, questions about the nature of Chinese civilization and doubts about its significance began to surface due to knowledge of Western European civilization, which had superior technology in the Opium War. The second reason is that Sun Yat-sen received an English-language education outside of China. Yet, his university education was at a medical college so that he could become a doctor. Sun Yat-sen was truly an "adopted child" of Western European civilization, which emphasized science. In this regard, we must first trace Sun Yat-sen's thoughts regarding civilization and culture.

Sun Yat-sen's fifty-four years were full of tumult, and at present what is considered his writings can be divided roughly into the following four categories. First, things written in his own hand; second, lectures and talks he gave at various places; third, written recordings of things he said; and fourth, things presented in accordance with Sun Yat-sen's wishes, which he looked over and lent his name to.

The *Sun Zhongshan quaji* (*Complete Collection of Sun Yat-sen's Writings*), which was compiled over a five-year period starting in 1981 and published by the Zhonghua Shujie publishing house in Beijing, is eleven volumes all together and reaches 6,695 pages. In these pages, how much does Sun Yat-sen write on “civilization?” According to my count, in this entire collection Sun Yat-sen used the word “civilization” a total of 261 times. Furthermore, the earliest example appears in a letter he wrote to Prof. H.A. Giles (1845-1933), a renowned scholar on China at Cambridge, a month after he was released from confinement at the Qing Consulate in London. When Giles, who resided in China from 1880 for thirteen years as a diplomat, compiled the Chinese Biographical Dictionary, here is what Sun Yat-sen had to say about himself in a letter he wrote in an autobiographical format:

In days of old I played in my native land, and when I immersed myself in the study of the classics, I was mesmerized by the richness of the edified civilization of the earlier sages and wise kings. However, since the Qing barbarians invaded... Chinese civilization has fallen into barbarity. In the past, there has yet to be an example of this kind of extreme suffering by the people.⁷

Namely, Sun Yat-sen believed that the China that reached the pinnacle of prosperity under the “edified civilization” of the “earlier sages and wise kings,” but the invasion by the Manchu “Qing barbarians” and being put under their control put China’s brilliant civilization into decline and made it into barbarity. This is precisely why Sun Yat-sen longed for and advocated revolution in order to recover China’s original civilization.

In December 1903, Sun Yat-sen published an article called “Respectfully, to the people of my hometown” in which he argued along similar lines for the necessity of revolution in the *Xin Zhongguo Bao* (*New China News*), which was printed in Honolulu. He wrote, “The Manchus are nomadic bandits to our northeast, yet they hold imperial

power. We Han are the descendants of a 4,000-year old civilization, yet we do not have the rights of citizens. What is to be said of this?”⁸ Also, in 1904, Sun Yat-sen went to the U.S. mainland, where the Society to Protect the Emperor was still strong, and in St. Louis, at the request of a person by the name of Mr. E. Williams, composed an essay in English entitled “The True Solution of the Chinese Question.” Owing to Williams’ financial support, ten thousand copies were printed in New York, and it was published⁹ as an “eleven page pamphlet with a red cover” that broadly appealed the need for a revolution in China to the people of the U.S. and Europe.

In this revolution pamphlet, Sun Yat-sen said, “We have been oppressed by our villainous government for over 260 years, and these are ten of their most atrocious offences.” He lists the following ten items as examples of the crimes committed by the Qing Empire:

1. The barbarians (the Manchus) enrich themselves but not the people.
2. They obstruct the material and intellectual progress of the people.
3. They control us as though we are slaves, and they have completely deprived us of equal rights and civil liberties.
4. They violate our right to exist and our property rights, all of which are inalienable.
5. They permit government officials to terrorize and exploit the people.
6. They have forbidden us freedom of speech.
7. Without the people’s consent, they have imposed extremely illegal taxes on them.
8. They coerce confessions from prisoners using barbaric punishments in order to convict them.
9. They deprive us of our rights regardless of the law.
10. They have disposed of their right to safeguard our lives and property.¹⁰

Sun Yat-sen passionately argued for liberating “400 million” Han Chinese from this tragic situation and building a new China. He concluded his essay with the following:

When the supreme goal of the Chinese (to overthrow the Qing Dynasty and establish a new nation) is accomplished, not only will a nation of the new epoch be established, it will share its civilization with the people of the world. Regular peace should be restored in accordance with this. An ideal socialist and economic world will appear...the reason we want the Americans to sympathize with this is because when we are compared to the civilized peoples around the globe our situation is most urgent. Perhaps it is because the U.S. is the teacher of civilization to Japan, because they are a Christian nation, and some day, the teacher to our new government. All the more is it not like Lafayette? I humbly beseech you on behalf of the Chinese race.”¹¹

Looking at the original text written in English, which is included in volume five of the *Guofu quanji* (*The Complete Works of the Father of Our Nation*, edited by the Party History Committee of the Kuomintang’s Central Committee, which is now in Taiwan), the phrase *shijie yiban wenmin ren* is translated as “the people of the civilized world in general,” and the phrase *yi mei wei riben wenmingren xiandao* is translated as “you are the pioneers of western civilization in Japan.”¹² In other words, Sun Yat-sen handled “civilized world” and “western civilization” as a single concept, and it is clear that he tried to revolutionize China with this as his goal. Taking this to be the case, what were the contents of a “civilized nation” and “western civilization” as Sun Yat-sen thought of it?

Unfortunately, however, Sun Yat-sen does not argue systematically on this. Yet, when we attempt to reconstruct Sun Yat-sen’s views on civilization that he stated at various places and times, for the most part it is as follows:

1. Separation of church and state is a public ideal of modern civilized nations.¹³
2. Education is important, and the education of women and children is particularly important.¹⁴
3. Industrialism is a necessity for China, and a civilization’s progress is based on this.¹⁵
4. The U.S. is an advanced civilization, and everything American is sufficient for our country to use as a model.¹⁶ The most advanced civilizations in the world are England and the U.S. Their nations are wealthy and their people strong, and the fortunes that people receive are far greater than those of China.¹⁷

5. As a general rule, civilized nations do not employ military force domestically. Because at present China has not yet attained civilized status, it uses military force.¹⁸
6. Schools should be a wellspring for the advancement of civilization. Schools must be built, and for the first time local autonomy will advance.¹⁹

However, Sun Yat-sen fully understood that this type of civilization was not complete.

He also thought about to resolve these problems. In March, 1921, in his “Lecture Given at the Guangdong Special Offices of the Kuomintang,” he said:

In America, there is a philosopher named Henry George, and he says that modern civilizations have been pierced by a sharp drill. Those societies that are above this sharp drill will rise high, but those societies which are beneath it will be crushed. This is why in modern societies the trend is that which makes money continues to make money, but the poor become even poorer. Now, when our people debate social problems, they debate over the “doctrine of the people’s welfare.” Our “doctrine of the people’s welfare” has a method to it. What kind of a method is it? It is “stabilizing land prices.”²⁰

Sun Yat-sen thought that since the gap between the rich and poor widen as a civilization advances, this could be solved through the so-called “doctrine of the people’s welfare” by equalizing land rights.

However, why did Sun Yat-sen believe that he could reform China using Western civilization as a model? Where did this confidence, which could be also be called optimism, come from? I think that the reason lies in Sun Yat-sen’s pride and unshakable faith in Chinese civilization. In August, 1905, he made the following remarks before a group of Chinese foreign students in Tokyo:

Chinese civilization has been around for several thousand years now, while Western civilization has only been around a mere several centuries. Chinese people cannot change a past civilization into a modern one. This is why people say that China is the most conservative and that is the reason for its accumulated poverty... We, the modern people of China, are all useless, but if in the future we use Western civilization as a model, we can easily turn weakness into strength, and the old into the new. I think that everyone should go to the West and find something new, then go the East and find something old, and if we Chinese can

bring this about, then there will be nothing hard about the old turning into the new.²¹

In this way, if the Chinese could only skillfully use Western civilization, it would be possible for Chinese civilization, with its several-thousand year-old history, and China itself to be reborn. Not only that, Sun Yat-sen made the paradoxical argument that “civilization not making any progress” conversely makes social reform easy. In April, 1912, three months after the Republic of China, Asia’s first republican government was formed; Sun Yat-sen made the following comments to his supporters in Nanjing:

It has been said that although China succeeded in its ethnic and citizen’s revolutions, it cannot be helped that the social revolution has yet to take place...I am against this. In England and America, civilization has already progressed, and since industry has developed, social reform will be difficult. In China, civilization had not yet advanced, and commerce had not yet developed, so conversely social reform will be easy. In England and America, as well as other countries, capitalists have already appeared, and since there are already many obstacles, it will be difficult to remove them. Capitalists have yet to appear in China, and since obstacles do not yet exist, bringing about social reforms will be easy.²²

This is not all. Certainly, China was behind Europe, the U.S. and Japan in terms of material civilization. However, Sun Yat-sen believed that China was well ahead of these countries in the areas of moral and spiritual civilization, and for that reason it would be possible to surpass Europe, the U.S., and Japan in material terms as well within a short period of time. He elaborated:

Our China is an ancient nation that possesses a 4,000-plus year old civilization, and the people receive a 4,000-plus year old moral education, which in comparison makes them vastly superior to foreigners in terms of moral civilization. Only in the area of material civilization are we not at the level of the foreigners. If we compare our material civilizations, namely agriculture and industry, we are truly not at the foreigners’ level....Foreign nations spent two to three hundred years on material civilization and today they have results for the first time. If we were to utilize this immediately, would you not think this to be useful? If we do it this way, our material civilization can be shoulder-to-shoulder with the foreign nations in three to five years. As far as our moral civilization, the foreign nations will absolutely never match our levels. As a result, compared to

the Eastern and Western nations, we cannot very well be uncivilized. At that time, our Chinese Republic will not only occupy a seat among the powers of the globe, it only stands to reason that we will surpass these powers.²³

As Sun Yat-sen recalled in the above selection, he had a deep-seated pride in Chinese civilization and its “4,000-plus year history” and “its 6,000-year history as a civilization, its 400 million people, its vast territory and resources, and its virtuous people who work diligently, revere charity, love peace, and see obedience as good.”²⁴ He appealed to the Chinese people as though he were embracing them.

At the same time, although he felt affinity and love toward Japan, which was orthographically and ethnically similar,²⁵ and in a mere ten years after the Meiji Restoration succeeded in its modernization and brought about great progress, he said, “Japan is merely the size of our Sichuan Province, yet in a single leap it has become a first-rate power.”²⁶ However, “Japanese civilization” itself was “in actuality Chinese civilization, something that the Chinese transmitted to the Japanese.”²⁷ Namely, “the Chinese race is the world’s oldest and largest race, the most civilized in the world, and the race with the greatest power of assimilation.”²⁸ Without a doubt, it can be said that Sun Yat-sen attempted to prove his ethnic identity via the word “civilization.”

In his writings and lectures, Sun Yat-sen used the word “civilization” on many occasions, but he rarely used the word “culture” until his later years. My reading of all eleven volumes of the *Collected Works of Sun Yat-sen* shows that he used the word “culture” a mere eight times. Moreover, the word “culture” is used with practically the same meaning as “civilization,” for example, when he writes “Today, England and the U.S. are the strongest, and nothing surpasses them. The most civilized are the French, and nothing surpasses them”²⁹ and “In today’s world, no one surpasses England and the U.S.

in monetary wealth. No one surpasses France and its brilliant culture.”³⁰ As far as Sun Yat-sen was concerned, there was no clear distinction between “civilization” and “culture” and “Chinese civilization” and “Chinese culture,” seeing them as the same thing.

If this is the case, then at what point did Sun Yat-sen consciously perceive “civilization” and “culture” as different? It was in his later years, on January 22, 1922, three years before his death, at a lecture he gave in scenic Guilin. He differentiated between “culture” and “civilization” through the following remarks:

The civilizations of the world make progress for the first time when they have knowledge. If there is knowledge, then for the first time progress will be quick. We, as mankind, truly desire civilized progress. That is why we seek knowledge. You probably already know this, but world civilizations have made progress in the past two hundred years, and the quickest ones have made progress in fifty or sixty years. Since then, the more mankind’s knowledge increases the faster civilization progresses. China, for over two thousand years, had no culture. Modern culture does not surpass that of Tang Yu (the era of the ancient sage-kings Yao and Shun) or that of Qin Han. The knowledge of modern people does not surpass that of the knowledge of the ancients. It is for that reason that the Chinese desire to worship their ancestors is more intense than that of people from other countries.³¹

In addition, Sun Yat-sen says that:

Formerly foreigners disparaged China, claiming that “The Chinese are like the natives of Africa and the South Seas, they do not have the slightest bit of culture.” However, in no time were the foreigners were saying “We must learn about Chinese things,” but they also learned that “In Chinese culture, there are many things that they could not surpass,” so they started to have respect for China. The reason is that their “culture has its origins in Rome, but Rome was conquered by European barbarians, and since that point their culture has degenerated.” Marco Polo went to China and became an official, and in his writings he goes so far as to say “Chinese culture is truly wonderful.”³²

In this lecture, Sun Yat-sen emphasizes that even if China loses to the U.S. and Europe in terms of civilization, in terms of culture it outclasses the “Western nations.”

In 1922, at the age of 57, Sun Yat-sen differentiated the words civilization and culture, and he discovered the value of China's own "culture." Also, in 1924, the year before his death, he lectured on his famous "Three Principles of the People" and in his lecture on "civil rights" (the sixth lecture on April 26), he made the following comments:

Culturally, China is one of the world's advanced nations, and the materials of other nations have been worth completely emulating. Only recently have the cultures of Europe and the U.S. surpassed China, and because we envy their new civilization all the more we insist on a revolution.³³

Well, where and when did Sun Yat-sen say with certainty that European and American civilization is more advanced than Chinese materialistically, but China is superior to Europe and America in its cultural aspects? The time and place was none other than Kobe seventy years ago (1924), at "A Lecture Given to a Group at the Kobe Chamber of Commerce," (where he lectured on "Greater Asia") a famous lecture given in front of a group of Japanese in Kobe. From the podium, he used the word "civilization" a mere nine times, but he used "culture" sixty-five times, emphasizing its importance. In other words, in Sun Yat-sen's thought, the value of the word "culture" increased relative to "civilization," a keyword whose value had dropped.

At the start of his lecture, he boldly asserted that Asian culture, namely Chinese culture, was the fountainhead of Western culture:

I think that our Asia is the origin of the most ancient cultures. Several thousand years ago, our Asian peoples already had an extremely high level of culture. As for the cultures of the oldest European nations, namely Greece and Rome, everything was passed on to them from Asia. To the present day we Asians have had a philosophical culture, a religious culture, and ethical culture, and an industrial culture. From times of old these cultures have been famous throughout the world. Furthermore, it is something that is born entirely from our own ancient culture, even surpassing the new cultures in the modern world.³⁴

At the same time, in regards to “civilization,” he severed a kind of delusion he held toward Western civilization and clearly indicted the culture born from Western European civilization as oppressing and controlling people through military force. He says:

Just speaking on the cultures of the past several hundred years, European material civilization has made significant advances, and in our Eastern civilization there is no progress to be seen. When we make comparisons based on surface observations, naturally Europe is superior to Asia. However, when we analyze it from its roots, what was European culture of the past several hundred years? It was a culture of science. It was a culture that emphasized utility. When this type of culture is utilized by human society, it appears only as a material civilization, gives birth to only airplanes and bombs, gives birth to only rifles and cannons, and a merely a type of martial culture. Since Europeans of late mainly use this type of culture of military force to oppress us Asians, our Asia cannot advance. In the old language of China, this type of culture that mostly oppresses people through military force was said to “conduct martial rule.” That is why European culture is a martial culture.

However, thus far martial culture has not been held in high regard in the East. There is one more culture besides this one, and it is vastly superior to martial culture. The substance of this type of culture is benevolence and virtue. This type of culture that uses benevolence and virtue inspires, not oppresses, the people. It is a culture that makes people seek out virtue, it does not terrify them. In the old language of China, this kind of culture that makes people seek out virtue is said to “conduct the kingly way.” This is why Asian culture is truly that of “the kingly way.”³⁵

Then, Sun Yat-sen ended his lecture with the following famous passage:

You, the people of Japan, have just started to dabble in the “culture of martial rule” of Europe and the U.S., but you also possess the essence of the Asian “kingly way” culture. From now on, for the future of world culture, in the end will you become the watchdog of Western military ways or will you become a fortress for the Eastern “kingly way?” This is something for you Japanese to think over and choose carefully.³⁶

Unfortunately, however, Japan’s Asano did not heed Sun Yat-sen’s words and invaded China, truly in the tradition of “martial rule.” This is a historical fact.

III. Sun Yat-sen and Confucianism

At the end of the 19th century, China made considerable changes politically and intellectually. Prof. Jiang Yi-hua (of Shanghai's Fudan University), in his *magnum opus* *Zhang Tai-yan sixiang yanjiu* (*Studies on the Thought of Zhang Tai-yan*), classified thinkers who had a significant impact in “turbulent and stormy” “eras of massive changes that happen before our very eyes” into three generations. He lists the names of four thinkers as representative of the first generation: Kang You-wei, Yan Fu, Zhang Bing-lin, and Sun Yat-sen.³⁷

I think that this classification is very appropriate, but out of these four thinkers, Sun Yat-sen is the one that strikes us as being different. This is for no other reason than that the other three are all from gentry families, and received a so-called orthodox Confucian education in order to take the civil service exam. In short, unlike Sun Yat-sen, who not only was born into a farming family in Guangdong and received an American education in Hawaii between the ages of 13 and 17, and after that experienced an English-language education at the Medical College in Hong Kong, the other three received a Confucian education during their formative years. In other words, the other three had solid traditional Confucian thought as their backbone.

Of course, this view is easily refuted by saying that Sun Yat-sen also privately received a Confucian education in his village during his childhood. Looking at various chronologies of his life makes it clear that for two years, starting from age six, he studied children's editions of the *Sanzijing*, *Qianziwen*, and read selections from the *Four Books* and the *Five Classics*³⁸. In the aforementioned letter to Giles, he wrote in his own hand that “In my childhood, I read Confucian texts and at the age of 12 I completed my studies of the classics.”³⁹

Regardless of this, however, reading the numerous essays, dialogs, and lectures in the *Zhongshan quanji* and the *Guofu quanji*, (and comparing his less than skillful handwriting to the superb brushstrokes of Kang You-wei and Zhang Bing-lin), the impression his comrade-in-arms Miyazaki Tōten got from their first meeting was “He is truly an elegant gentleman. Moreover, is not at all the Sun Yat-sen I anticipated meeting. Yet, there is a sense of insufficiency about him. It seems to me that he needs to have more gravity.”⁴⁰ From statements such as this, I am probably not the only person who thinks that Sun Yat-sen is different from the other three Chinese thinkers. (My thoughts on this became stronger when I visited Iolani and Punahou Schools (then Oahu College) and looked at the English-language materials that remain with my own eyes).⁴¹

Can it not be said that the fact that during the crucial period in which Sun Yat-sen was establishing his identity and thought, he was in Hawaii and Hong Kong receiving an English-language education conversely made it possible for him to see, understand, and use Confucianism from a different viewpoint. Then, how did Confucianism exist to Sun Yat-sen? From looking through his writings, I strongly feel that the fact is that unlike people such as Chen Du-xiu and Lu Xun, who represent Prof. Jiang’s “second generation” of Chinese thinkers; Sun Yat-sen did not view Confucius or Mencius negatively. Consequently, in his writings and lectures he makes rather frequently and liberally quotes words and phrases from the *Analects* and *Mencius*. For example, Confucius’s name appears over twenty times in the *Zhongshan quanqi*, and twenty-seven quotations from Mencius can be seen. In addition, Yao, Shun, Yu, Tang Wang, Yi Yin, Wang Ji, Wen Wang, Wu Wang, and Zhou Gong, who are wise sages in Confucianism, all appear favorably.

Sun Yat-sen consistently used vocabulary and phrases from the Confucian classics positively throughout. Furthermore, regardless of whether Sun Yat-sen was conscious of this, I think that to him Confucianism served three broad functions. First, it had a symbolic existence as a direct example of Chinese tradition, politics, history, civilization, and culture. Second, it was used as a method or metaphor to introduce and explain Western precedents, theories, and ways of thinking to the Chinese. Third, in his later years, Sun Yat-sen used Confucian technical terminology to demonstrate his views of the world, political thought, and political principles.

Below, I will look at Sun Yat-sen's views on Confucianism by tracing his words in reference to all three categories. In regards to the first example, in July 1916 he lectured in Shanghai and made the following comments on the Four Books and Five Classics:

I was once a student in the village, and I learned the Four Book and Five Classics through oral transmission, but after several years, I forgot most of it. However, if you want to reform politics, you must first know history, and if you want to illuminate history, you must be versed in its texts. Therefore, I read the Four Books, Five Classics, and history texts in English translation, and I was able to become versed in them in no time. (*ju ran tong yi*)⁴²

I think that Sun Yat-sen's honest words clearly demonstrate his character and his learning. Sun Yat-sen received oral instruction in the Four Books and the Five Classics in his home village of Cuiheng from a village teacher named Wang, but he said that within several years he "forgot most of it" and in order to bring about political reform in China, he read and studied the Confucian classics and histories in English translation so that he could understand Chinese history. Sun Yat-sen explicitly mentions in his writings that "the audience burst out in laughter" when he told them this.

Also, four days later, on January 5, 1912, when the Republic of China was founded and Sun Yat-sen assumed the position of provisional president, in the “Letter of Advice to the Officers and Soldiers of the Northern Army,” he cleverly quotes from the *Shu jing* “What the people desire is what heaven will certainly follow” (*min zhi suo yu tian bi cong zhi*) while relaying the historical inevitability of the downfall of the Manchu monarchy due to a revolution occurring in accordance with the people’s wishes and the establishment of a new nation:

In the old language, it is said that “what the people desire is what heaven will surely follow.” This means to know the inclination of the people’s hearts, namely, the proclivities of the national polity. Right now, China is divided in three, but we recovered two parts. Even if it is the wisdom of Sun Wu, or the bravery of Bi Yu, how can we recover these times of decline from the Manchurian court?⁴³

The second example of metaphor, which was used in various ways but was used from early on, can be found in a book Sun Yat-sen gave Minakata Kumagusu, the “father of ethnology in Japan,” with whom he had a close friendship. On March 16, 1897, Sun Yat-sen was introduced to Minakata in the office of a Mr. Douglas, the curator of the Oriental Collection at the British Museum. At the time, Minakata was working on editing the *Catalog of Japanese Writings (Nihon shoseki mokoroku)* at the museum, and he and Sun Yat-sen got along well and frequently had meals and went sightseeing together. When one takes a look at Minakata’s journal, since their first meeting in March until Sun Yat-sen departed for Canada on July 1, they went out a total of twenty-five times⁴⁴ during that three-month period. On June 28, right before they parted, Sun Yat-sen gave him a copy of the *Hongshizihui jiushang diyifa (Red Cross Society First Aid Manual)*, the only thing he translated from English to Chinese that year, as a token of their friendship. In the

translation's preface, Sun Yat-sen opened with a famous line from the *Gao zi* chapter of *Mencius*:

Mencius said, "Everyone has a compassionate heart." This means that if wayfarers encounter trouble their nature dictates that they will most certainly lend each other aid. Compassion is something people have. The art of saving people is to know people themselves. If one is eager to save people without knowing this art, then they will err and compassion will likely turn to barbarity. The fool will likely harm people by trying to help them.⁴⁵

By quoting this passage from Mencius, which expounds upon the good nature of people, and a passage that any Chinese person would probably know, Sun Yat-sen tried to introduce the Chinese to emergency medical knowledge that could be used to save people between life and death. At the same time, to demonstrate a part of the "charitable spirit" of the West, he introduced the Chinese to the Red Cross Society, a charitable organization that helps people.

When Sun Yat-sen gave speeches in front of audiences he often used this method of metaphorically using words and phrases from the Confucian classics. For example, during his spring 1913 lecture in Kobe, he made the following comments, comparing a republican government to "the reign of Yao and Shun" and "what is under heaven is for the people":

In the several thousand years of our country's history, there has been no government that surpasses that of the superlative government of Yao and Shun. I think that the reign of Yao and Shun is also today's republican government, and what is under heaven is for the people. How do I know this? This is because Yao abdicated to Shun because Shun was wise, and Shun abdicated to Yu because Yu was wise. The revolutions of Tang Wang and Wu Wang were also to save the people. But, how sad it is! They were all monarchists, and their descendants could not become wise, so they failed and ruined the nation.⁴⁶

When I read over this assertion by Sun Yat-sen, I recall Yokoi Shōnan, the "Confucian idealist," who lived at the end of Japan's Tokugawa shogunate.⁴⁷ Just as he used

metaphorical means and methods to say, “Over two thousand years ago, Confucius and Mencius truly insisted on rights for the people. Confucius said ‘Practicing the Great Way will make all under heaven for the people,’ but this certainly advocates a Great World of civil rights,”⁴⁸ in his later years, this was often seen when he was lecturing on the “Three Principles of the People.”

It is well-known that amidst the conflicts between the military factions after the founding of the Republic of China, in particular the Yuan Shi Kai imperialist movement in 1916, Sun Yat-sen attempted to construct his political ideals in order to bring about his vision of a nation. This was the three-part series he called the *Jianguo fanglue* (*Plan for Building a Nation*), namely *Xinli jianshe* (*Psychological Construction*, also known as *Sun Wen xueshuo* (*Sun Yat-sen’s academic theory*)), *Wuzhi jianshe* (*Material Construction*, also known as *shiye jihua* (*entrepreneurial planning*)), and *Shehui jianshe* (*Social Construction*, also known as *minquan chubu* (*the first steps of citizen’s rights*)). At this time, he also lectured on the “Three Principles of the People” at the national normal school in Guangzhou between January and August 1924, the year before his death.

I classify the Confucianism and Confucian technical terms that Sun Yat-sen utilized to construct his political ideals and worldview – which could be called a philosophy – into the third category. (Here, I use the word “utilize,” which may not be very appropriate. To elaborate further, instead of the word “utilize” being used with an affirmative meaning, rather, it was used in a practical sense to emphasize its utility. As I mentioned earlier, Sun Yat-sen never viewed Confucianism in a negative light. However, he realized that a Confucian standpoint was merely the clearest and most easily understood way to explain his political ideals and philosophy, and he started to actively

elaborate on Confucianism in his speeches and writings. This is the manner in which I use the word “utilize.”)

Below, I will take up *Psychological Construction*, which was entitled *Plan for Building a Nation*, for discussion and trace the developments of Sun Yat-sen’s well-known “action is easy but knowing is hard” theory and examine the third example of this use of Confucianism. In this essay, he tries to deny what he thought to be the two “theses” of Confucianism. The first thesis he denied was the traditional Chinese intellectual notion of *zhi yi xing nan* (knowing is easy but action is difficult), which has its origins in the *Shu jing*. In regards to this theory, he said, “For thousands of year this idea has possessed the hearts of the Chinese people and is firmly entrenched, so it is not easily broken,”⁴⁹ but he slashed it in half, calling it a “mistake.” Sun Yat-sen used to think that:

Japan’s ancient civilization is something that was imported entirely from China. Fifty years ago, the great heroes of the Meiji Restoration were enraptured with the great Chinese thinker Wang Yang-ming’s theory of *zhi xing he yi* (knowing and doing are one and the same). That is why everyone steadfastly adhered to an independent warrior spirit and was able to accomplish the great feat of saving 45 million people from water and fire.⁵⁰

Moreover, he denied Wang Yang-ming’s highly regarded *zhi xing he yi* theory, namely that “diligently applying oneself to people will make them do good.”⁵¹ Claiming that “truth is not like this” he took up his sword and slashed this theory as well.

In addition, he took up the “Ten Arguments” and smashed the old theory of “knowing is easy but action is hard” and the adage “knowing and doing are one and the same,” as well as building his own thesis, his firm belief that “action is easy but knowing is hard.” This may well be the first possible assertion for Sun Yat-sen, who said that

between founding the Xing Zhong Hui and the Chinese Revolution he “experienced failure ten times.”

In *Psychological Construction*, he did more just propose “action is easy but knowing is hard.” Furthermore, he proposed an independent classification system, in which three types of people exist at civilization’s present state of evolution, and in based on a phrase in the *Mo zhang* chapter of Mencius: “Heaven gives birth to people, and has those who already know enlighten those who do not, and has those who are already aware enlighten those who are not. I am one of those under heaven who is already aware.” He further added:

The evolution of civilization has resulted in the establishment of three types of people. The first are those who “already know and are already aware,” in other words, the innovators. The second are those who “know later and become aware later,” in other words, the propagators. The third are those who “do not know and are not aware,” in other words, the implementers.⁵²

Then, Sun Yat-sen had the following thoughts: those who “already know and are already aware,” such as Sun Yat-sen, would shatter “invented and constructed theories” while the Kuomintang nationalist comrades, who are sparked by Sun Yat-sen and are those who “know later and become aware later” and “resolutely smash the superstition of “knowing is easy but action is hard.” At the same time, if they combine their efforts with “those who do not know and are not aware” and promote “the revolution’s Three Principles of the People and the Five Power Constitution” he thought that “founding the Republic of China, the world’s most advanced civilization, would be as easy as turning one’s hand.”⁵³

Furthermore, Sun Yat-sen used a phrase from the *Yi jing* (*The Book of Changes*) that he often liked to quote: “follow the heavens and respond to the people.” Optimistically and confidently, he declared:

Originally, things followed the laws of heaven, responded to human feelings, and accorded themselves to the needs of the world. If the needs of the masses are met, it is because the decision of someone “who already knows and is aware” bore fruit. This can be said of all past revolutions, restorations, attempts at enriching nations, and attempts at building countries.⁵⁴

It is easy to spot Sun Yat-sen’s optimistic nature, which could be called naiveté and a kind of optimistic self-righteousness in *Psychological Construction* amidst assertions made in this fashion. However, I cannot understand or agree with the criticism⁵⁵ that his view of the populace “for the most part, cannot be denied as being in line with the traditional Confucian view of populace (that they are ignorant).” The reason [for my position] is because it is natural for those who “already know” to teach those who “will know later,” and this is an indispensable way of thinking in all kinds of political movements. If this kind of thinking is going to be criticized as “viewing the populace as ignorant,” then education would have never come into being. Instead, I would like to positively evaluate Sun Yat-sen’s conceptualization of a unique position while deploying Confucian theory, vocabulary, and technical terms. On May 20, 1915, when *Psychological Construction* was published under the title of *Sun Wen xueshuo* (*Theories of Sun Wen*), in response to Shao Yuan-chong’s question, “Ultimately, what kind of learning do you have?” Sun Yat-sen replied, “That which I have learned is none other than revolutionary studies. All learning is to aid my knowledge and abilities for a revolution. Using my research materials, I have constructed ‘revolution studies.’”⁵⁶ Also, it is said that Sun Yat-sen personally proofread three drafts of *Sun Wen xueshou*. Indeed, from this one can strongly feel the passion that he poured into its pages. Furthermore, in the June 9, 1919 issue of the daily *Minguo ribao*, there was an advertisement that read

“*Sun Wen xueshao* is now out. The *Sun Wen xueshao* is an unprecedented theory and is the good medicine that will save the nation.”⁵⁷

It is an undisputed fact that Sun Yat-sen started to actively use Confucianism for the construction of his political ideals from around the time he was writing the *Sun Wen xueshao*. There is not enough space here to examine his doctrines in further detail, but as an example, Confucian vocabulary and technical terms abound in the spiritual education lecture he gave in Guilin to the officers and soldiers from Yunnan, Guangxi, and Guangdong on December 10, 1921, before the Northern Campaign. In this lecture, he asserted that a soldier needs the spirits of “knowledge,” “benevolence” and “courage.” He based this on chapter twenty of the *Doctrine of the Mean*, one of the Four Books, which says “Knowledge, benevolence, and courage are timeless virtues. These are practices as one.”

What is this “knowledge,” “benevolence,” and “courage?” “Knowledge” consists of four parts “differentiating between right and wrong, illuminating advantages and disadvantages, understanding the times, and knowing oneself.” “Benevolence” is “noble minded patriots and benevolent people sacrificing their bodies and producing benevolence.” (“Benevolence to save the nation and the people,” like in the Wei Ling Gong section in the *Analects*). “Courage” is as it is written in the *Gao zi* chapter of *Mencius*: “Sacrifice your life and take righteousness” and is something where in order to “bring about benevolence” and “take righteousness” one “dies in sacrifice to the revolution” and the “value of that death is heavier than Mt. Tai Shan.” In other words, Sun Yat-sen emphasized that “knowledge, benevolence, and courage are the three parts of a soldier’s spirit.”⁵⁸

Then, in one of the lectures Sun Yat-sen gave on the “Three Principles of the People” in the last year of his life, he called for a “revival of native Chinese morals,” seeing the Confucian virtues of loyalty and filial piety, benevolence and love, and fidelity as valuable to modern China. At the same time, he said that “native Chinese knowledge” had to be roused awake and recovered, and exalted the eighth paragraph of the *Great Learning*, which he highly praised as “the essence of Chinese culture.” He said:

What kind of native knowledge does China have? In regards to its ideals toward the nation of human life (?) from ancient times China had a splendid political philosophy. We think that Europe and America have made a great deal of progress recently. However, insofar as their culture, it does not match the completeness of our political philosophy. In China, there is a more systematic political philosophy. Great foreign politicians have yet to discover it, and it is something that has yet to be clearly expounded upon – it is a paragraph in the *Great Learning* which reads, “Natural law, great wisdom, sincerity, a true heart, ethics, an orderly home, orderly government, and peace throughout the realm.” Displaying what is inside a person outward, and starting with what is inside a person we will extend that to “bringing peace to the realm.” No foreign political philosopher has yet to discover this intricately developed argument, and it is something no one has expounded on. This is the treasure that only our knowledge of political philosophy possesses, and it is something that must be preserved.⁵⁹

A little after this quoted passage, Sun Yat-sen stated that Bertrand Russell was “a great philosopher with extremely profound powers of observation,” and Russell came to China, “saw right away how Chinese culture has surpassed that of Europe and America,” and “praised China.” Sun Yat-sen had high praise for Russell, who saw the true value of Chinese culture.

IV. Conclusion

This concludes what I wanted to discuss. In this essay, with China as a part of East Asia that made considerable transformations between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as the setting and with Sun Yat-sen, whose actions during this time left its mark

on history as the protagonist; I related the state of Confucianism, which could be said to be the symbol of traditional Chinese civilization, culture, and furthermore, Chinese thought. Since I will try to adopt the words of Sun Yat-sen, “Writings do not exhaust words, and words do not exhaust meaning,” I will conclude this essay with a summary of what I wanted to say.

First, he received an education based on Western European civilization, and matured under its auspices. However, at first he did not perceive any distinct difference between “civilization,” a system of technologies, and “culture,” a system of values. He used these words practically interchangeably, and for the most part, used the word “civilization.” And, in the word “civilization” he found one ideal of Western modernity that was more politically and socially advanced than China, and he thought to use it as a model to reform China.

Second, although Sun Yat-sen felt an affinity with Japan, which had the successful Meiji Restoration and made strides toward modernity, he saw Japanese civilization as merely a branch of Chinese civilization, and he had absolute confidence in China’s long 4,000-year old civilization. He had ethnic pride and identity. At the same time, he did not feel inferior to Western European civilization, and although Chinese civilization was behind Western Europe as a material civilization, he believed that Chinese civilization was superior morally and spiritually.

Third, in his last years Sun Yat-sen differentiated between the words “culture” and “civilization” and started to use the word “culture.” In particular, at the famous lecture he gave on the “Great Asia Doctrine” in Kobe four months before his death, he made frequent use of the word “culture.” Then, he presented the concepts of the “kingly

way” and the “martial way” and disavowed Western European civilization, saying that the culture born of Western European material civilization oppresses people through military force, and is a controlling “martial way.” He thought that the Eastern “kingly way” was what the world needed” and he presented it as “unique values particular to China.”

Fourth, speaking of the relationship between Sun Yat-sen and Confucianism, unlike fellow contemporary thinkers such as Zhang Bing-lin and Kang You-wei, he did not receive a so-called orthodox Confucian education in order to take the civil service examination; his intellectual nurturing was in the western style. However, it can be said that this conversely made it possible for him to view Confucianism with fresh eyes. In any case, Sun Yat-sen through and through thought of Confucianism as something positive, and made references to it in his writings and lectures. Also, in his later years, from the time that he started differentiating between “civilization” and “culture,” he used Confucianism even more actively and revered it.

Fifth, in the cases that he quoted and “used” vocabulary, terms, ideals, and ideas from the Confucian classics in his writings, the manner in which they were used fit into three patterns. The first pattern is to symbolically display Chinese tradition, history, civilization, and culture; the second, as a metaphorical method to introduce Western European things and theories to the Chinese people; the third is as something to discuss his political ideas and worldview – in other words, his philosophy – in his later years. In particular, his use of Confucianism to construct his political ideals in his writings in his later years, such as the “Three Principles of the People” gave the people of his day a sensational impression, and he was told by people afterward that “he was unable to

escape from the control of traditional political thought,” and it is possible that his ideas may have seemed outdated. However, for Sun Yat-sen, he had no other means than to use Confucianism. I venture to say that Confucianism is rich in content and significance, so he has no obligation to feel at fault.

Sixth, taking this to be the case, I do not think that Sun Yat-sen’s personal understanding, usage, praise and enhancement of Confucianism is something to be criticized as being “reactionary” or “full of contradictions.” Rather, it is no exaggeration to say that looking back seventy years after his death, his deployment of every type of Confucian vocabulary, technical terms, concepts, and ideals has been a sort of inspiration to later generations, such as ours.

¹ Ma Ke-feng, “Lun Sun Zhongshan yu ruxue” in *Bao ji shi yuan xuebao* (Zhe she), 1986, no. 3, Ma Ke-feng, “Sun Zhongshan yu ruxue” in *Xuexiu yanjiu*, 1986, no. 5, Li Kan “Sun Zhongshan yu chuantong ruxue” in *Lishi yanjiu*, 1986, no. 5.

² Li Kan, “Sun Zhongshan yu chuantong ruxue” in *Sun Zhongshan he ta de shidai – Sun Zhongshan yanjiu guoji xuexiu taolunhui wenji*, vol. 2 (Zhonghua shuju, 1989) p. 1714-1715. Also, “Sun Wen zhuyi zhexue zhi zhaxuede jichu” in *Minguo congshu*, vol. 3, no. 6, Shanghai shudian, 1991, p. 51. For further information on Dai Jitao, refer to Yasui Sankichi “Son Bun no enzetsu ‘Dai ajia shugi’ to Tai Tenkyū” (Son Bun kenkyūkai, ed. *Son Bun to ajia*, Kyūko shoin, 1993).

³ Zhang Kai-yuan “Cong liyi dao huigui – Sun Zhongshan yu chuantong wenhuade guanxi” in *Sun Zhongshan yu ta jiu nian – Sun Zhongshan yanjiu guoji xuexiu taolunhui wenji*, vol. 2 (Zhonghua shuju, 1989), p. 1710-1711.

⁴ Suzue Gen’ichi, *Son Bun-den* (Iwanami Shoten, 1950), p. 380-381. Furthermore, what he in the *Son Bun-den* (Kaizōsha, 1931, p. 320-321) that was published before the war under the penname Wang Shu-zhi (J. Ō Sushi) is practically the same.

⁵ Shimada Kenji, “Son Bun no jukyō sen’yō no dōkiron wo megutte” in *Shimane Sachio kyōju taikyū kinen mindaishi ronsō*, vol. 2 (Kyūko Shoin, 1990), and “Inja no sonchō – Chūgoku no rekishi tetsugaku” (Chikuma Shobō, 1997). In these essays, Shimada writes “Research has either avoided or barely touched the fact that Sun Yat-sen ‘thought greatly about promoting the superior cultural traditions of the Han people’ or even if it does touch upon this matter, it is an extremely negative light, a common tendency of Japanese and Chinese academic circles in recent times (postwar)” (ibid, p. 123). The view of Sun Yat-sen in Takeuchi Hiroyuki’s “Son Bun to jukyō” (in *Chūgoku kenkyū shūkan*, no. 17 (Ōsaka Daigaku Bungakubu Chūgoku Tetsugaku Kenkyūshitsu, ed.)) is different from mine, but it does approach this issue head on and leaves a favorable impression.

⁶ For my thoughts on civilization and culture, refer to my “Tōyō to seiyō no hazama de – seiō kindai bunmei: Natsume Sōseki soshite Shō Taen” in *Machida Saburō kyōju taikan kinen chūgoku shisōshi ronsō*, vol. 2 (Chūgoku Shoten, 1999) p. 241-242.

⁷ “Fu di li si han” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 1 (Zhonghua shuju, 1981), p. 47.

⁸ “Jinggao tongxiang shu” in *Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 1, p. 232.

⁹ Refer to the commentary in Yamada Keizō, trans., “Chūgoku mondai no shin no kaiketsu” in *Son Bun senshū*, vol. 3 (Shakai Shisōsha, 1989), p. 229.

¹⁰ “Zhina wenti zhen jieju” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 1, p. 245-246.

- ¹¹ “Zhina wenti zhen jieju” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 1, p. 247-248.
- ¹² Zhongguo guomindang dangshi weiyuanhui, ed, *Guofu quanji*, vol. 5 (Zhongyang wenwu gongyingshe, 1973), p. 121.
- ¹³ “Fu gao yi sheng wei ya jie han” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 2, p. 66.
- ¹⁴ “Ming jiaoyu buhe bian nuzi tiansang xuexiao ling” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 2, p. 117.
- ¹⁵ “Zhongguo tielu jihua yu minshengzhuyi” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 2, p. 492.
- ¹⁶ “Zai yan qing meilingshi huishang de jianghe” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 4, p. 400.
- ¹⁷ “Dui zhu guangzhou xiangjunde yanshuo” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 9, p. 504.
- ¹⁸ “Zai yan qing dianjun disi shijunzuohuishang de jianghe” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 4, p. 300.
- ¹⁹ “Difang zizhi shixingfa” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 5, p. 224.
- ²⁰ “Zai zhongguo guomindang benbu teshe zhuyue bianshichu de yanshuo” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 5, p. 478.
- ²¹ “Zai dongjing zhongguo liuxuesheng huanying dahui de yanshuo” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 1, p. 278.
- ²² “Zai nanjing tongmenghui huiyuan jianbiehui de yanshou” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 2, p. 319.
- ²³ “Zai anhui doudufu huanyinghui de yanshuo” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 2, p. 533.
- ²⁴ “Guifu yuefa xuanyan” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 3, p. 305.
- ²⁵ “Zai yan qing meilingshi huishang de jianghe” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 4, p. 400.
- ²⁶ “Zai dongjing zhongguo liuxuesheng huanying dahui de yanshuo” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 1, p. 279. The statements in “Zai guangdongsheng diwuci jiaoyu dahui bimushi de yanshuo” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 5, p. 565 are practically similar.
- ²⁷ “Yu Lundun beinanji eyizhe dengde tanhua” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 1, p. 87.
- ²⁸ “Sanmin zhuyi” (1919) in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 5, p. 186.
- ²⁹ “Zai nanjing tongmenghui huiyuan jianbiehui de yanshou” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 2, p. 319.
- ³⁰ “Fuer: zhongguo de xia yibu” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 2, p. 327.
- ³¹ “Zai guilin xuejie huanyinghui de yanshou” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 6, p. 68.
- ³² “Zai guilin xuejie huanyinghui de yanshou” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 6, p. 69.
- ³³ “Sanmin zhuyi (Minquan zhuyi diliujiang)” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 9, p. 343-345.
- ³⁴ “Dui shenhu shangye huiyisuo deng tuanti de jiangyan” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 11, p. 401.
- ³⁵ “Dui shenhu shangye huiyisuo deng tuanti de jiangyan” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 11, p. 405.
- ³⁶ “Dui shenhu shangye huiyisuo deng tuanti de jiangyan” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 11, p. 409.
- ³⁷ Jiang Yi-hua, *Zhang Tai-yan sixiang yanjiu* (Shanghai Renmin Chubanshe, 1989), p. 682.
- ³⁸ Chen Xi-qi, ed., *Sun Zhongshan nianpu changbian* (Zhonghua shuju, 1991), vol. 1, p. 18.
- ³⁹ “Fu di li si han” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 1 (Zhonghua shuju, 1981), p. 47.
- ⁴⁰ Miyazaki Tōten, *Sanjūsannen no yume* (commentary by Shimada Kenji and Kondō Hideki, Iwanami Shoten (Iwanami Bunko), 1993), p.179.
- ⁴¹ Kawata Teiichi, “Son Bun no mananda hawai” in *Chūgoku wo mitsumete* (Kenbun Shuppan, 1998), p. 205-209.
- ⁴² “Zai hu shangxiantang chawahuishang de yanshuo” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 3, p. 321.
- ⁴³ “Quangao beijun jiangshi xuanyanshu” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 3, p. 321.
- ⁴⁴ *Minakata Kumagusu zenshū* bekkān 2 (Heibonsha, 1982) p. 77-93.
- ⁴⁵ “Hongshizihui jiushang diyifa yixu” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 1, p. 107-108.
- ⁴⁶ “Zai shenhu guomindang jiaotongbu huanyinghui de yanshou” in *Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 3, p. 43.
- ⁴⁷ Refer to Shimada Kenji, previously cited texts, p. 137.
- ⁴⁸ “Sanmin zhuyi (Minquan zhuyi diyijiāng)” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 9, p. 262.
- ⁴⁹ “Xinli jianshe (Sun Wen xueshou)” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 6, p. 158.
- ⁵⁰ “Zai dongjing zhongguo liuxuesheng huanying dahui de yanshuo” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 1, p. 278.
- ⁵¹ “Xinli jianshe (Sun Wen xueshou)” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 6, p. 197.
- ⁵² “Xinli jianshe (Sun Wen xueshou)” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 6, p. 203.
- ⁵³ “Xinli jianshe (Sun Wen xueshou)” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 6, p. 202.
- ⁵⁴ “Xinli jianshe (Sun Wen xueshou)” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 6, p. 228.
- ⁵⁵ Refer to p. 11 of the previous essay by Takeuchi Hiroyuki.
- ⁵⁶ “Yu Shao Yuan-chong de tanhua” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 5, p. 55.
- ⁵⁷ Chen Xi-qi, ed., *Sun Zhongshan nianpu changbian* (Zhonghua shuju, 1991), vol. 2, p. 1175-1176.

⁵⁸ “Zai guilin xuejie huanyinghui de yanshou” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 6, p. 16.

⁵⁹ “Sanmin zhuyi (Minquan zhuyi diliujiang)” in *Sun Zhongshan quanji*, vol. 9, p. 247.