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Introduction

During the Late Qing (late 19th to early 20th century), many intellectuals started to lean towards a linear temporality as opposed to the traditional temporality. While the traditional temporality suggests a cyclical history characterized by a renewal of the cosmos and life at the end of every cycle, the linear temporality suggests that history linearly developed into higher stages. This linear temporality was closely associated with the notion of progress (jinbu) and evolution (jinhua), which justified solutions to political crises through reform and revolution. While many intellectuals interacted with the ideas of linear temporality, Zhang Taiyan (also known as Binglin), a renowned intellectual and later revolutionary against the Qing Empire, engaged with this linear temporality more critically. His ideas provide further insight into the development of his anti-Manchu and nationalist revolutionary discourse, thus illuminating the conflicting opinions that dominated Chinese social and political life in the Late Qing period.

Building on previous studies on these issues, this essay aims to contribute to existing scholarship by providing a broader account of how the circulation of ideas on a global scale shaped Zhang’s thought on evolutionary history. Furthermore, this essay will explore the interaction between Zhang’s view on evolutionary history and his revolutionary discourse. We will firstly situate Zhang’s initial engagement with evolutionary history by surveying the rise of linear temporality in Late Qing China. During this period, Zhang encountered the idea of evolutionary history through both the Chinese and Japanese translations of Western books. Regarding this
idea as scientific truth, Zhang then exploited it to justify racialist distinctions and later, an anti-Manchu nationalist revolution. Even though he had strong convictions, it is also important to highlight that Zhang’s thought experienced major transformations throughout his life. The first instance in which this occurred was during his imprisonment in Shanghai and later, during his exile in Japan. His time in Japan was particularly notable, as his interactions with the Japanese intellectual milieu led him to engage with evolutionary history more critically and adopt a more mature view on nationalism. Therefore, this essay will describe how Zhang’s interaction with the Japanese intellectual milieu around the turn of the 20th century led to his ultimate political vision for China and other Asian polities in his ideology of non-statist nationalism. Prior to delving into my analysis, it is necessary to clarify the term “nationalism.” Although Zhang explicitly used the Chinese translation of nationalism (minzu zhuyi) to articulate his political agenda, his version of nationalism, which we will see in his revolutionary discourse, was distinct from a typical Western understanding. A further investigation into the origin of Chinese nationalism as a concept is worth another comprehensive study, but for the purpose of this essay, we will use ‘nationalism’ in reference to Zhang’s ideas.
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Zhang Taiyan

Literature Review

Traditional historiography focuses on textual analysis of Zhang’s works and research into his personal life. For example, Wan Fan-sen’s The Thought of Zhang Taiyan gives a comprehensive account of Zhang’s thought based on detailed reading into Zhang’s works.¹ This approach lays the foundation for future studies, but there is still a gap in the historiography when it comes to understanding how the global circulation of ideas shaped Zhang’s thought. Some attempts have been made to study Zhang’s ideas in connection with the reception of Western and Japanese ideas. Kobayashi Takeshi discusses the Japanese intellectual environment’s influence on Zhang’s thought during his exile in Japan.² Another scholar, Peng Chunlin, studies Zhang’s relationship with Japanese intellectuals.³ Peng also researches Zhang’s reception of
Herbert Spencer’s ideas. Despite these efforts, no overarching attempts have been made to connect different sources of influence on Zhang’s thought.

Alongside the examination of Zhang’s writings and ideas, other historians have been involved in the debate over Zhang’s opinion on modernity. Wong Young-tsu argues that Zhang partially accepted the idea of modernity and was trying to construct modern nationalism for contemporary China. In contrast, Viren Murthy, with references to Marxist critique and contemporary Japanese philosophers, presents Zhang as a figure who opposed capitalist modernity. Wang Yuhua, slightly different from Murthy, suggests that Zhang’s thought supported an alternative modernity particular to China. Nevertheless, these discussions of Zhang’s thought alongside the concept of modernity are problematic. Although it was true that some aspects of Zhang’s thought could be situated in the debate of modernity, Zhang’s thought experienced profound changes over time and Zhang himself did not speak in the precise language of ‘modernity’. Therefore, the intellectual framework of modernity is not effective enough to demonstrate the historical and chronological dimension where Zhang’s thought was negotiating with political reality and new intellectual resources. The framework risks oversimplifications of Zhang’s thought and cannot capture its full picture, which is manifest in the case of Zhang’s response towards evolutionary history. Therefore, this essay aims to emphasise more on the process of Zhang’s changing attitude towards evolutionary history and its implication for his revolutionary discourse.

‘Evolutionary History’ in Late Imperial China

In Ancient China, human activities and history were thought to be connected to the cyclical activities of the cosmos, but this cyclical notion of history was challenged by linear temporality in the late 19th century. At this time, the Qing
Empire was suffering from continuous crises, which included internal rebellions like the Taiping Rebellion as well as Western intrusions, which had been occurring since the First Opium War (1839-1842). Intellectuals who were overwhelmed by the technological superiority of the West struggled for years to save the Empire without much success. By the dawn of the 20th century, a cyclical renewal that brought about redemption in the contemporary predicament seemed unlikely to take place, leading to doubts about this traditional temporality. With the intellectuals’ reading of Western books in which the notion of progress was dominant, they started to lean towards the idea that history develops linearly into higher stages. Attempts started to be made to periodise Chinese history linearly, with intellectuals like Xue Fucheng, Wang Tao, and Zheng Guanying leading the effort. For instance, in his *Shenshi weiyan* (Warnings to a Prosperous Age), Zheng Guanying depicted Chinese history in four stages: the ‘high-ancient’ age when the sage-rulers established culture and government, the feudal period of Three Dynasties, the Qin system of imperial rule, and the fourth period when China was forced to establish ‘trade relations’ with the West. While this is only one example of the attempt by Chinese scholars to outline Chinese history in a linear way, it reveals the shift away from traditional temporality that many intellectuals adopted.

These attempts to understand history linearly fit well with Yan Fu’s influential translation of Thomas Huxley’s *Evolution and Ethics (Tianyan lun)*, which promoted evolutionary history. Huxley was actually against the notion of social evolution associated with Herbert Spencer. Criticising the worship of unlimited progress, Huxley argued that the logic of evolution was necessarily at odds with human ethical values, so to preserve these values and curb vices, social progress had to take place alongside natural evolution. Yan Fu, on the other hand, sided with Spencer against Huxley, but he chose to translate Huxley’s work because it nicely illustrated the Spencerian evolutionary theory. What Spencer originally
meant was debatable, but for Yan, the doctrines of Social Darwinism meant ‘the struggle for existence’ and ‘the survival of the fittest’ in the evolutionary process. He translated this as ‘things struggle’ and ‘superior victorious, inferior defeated.’ Yan argued that humans should act according to this universal principle of evolution, meaning that their struggle for existence would lead to progress. However, Yan did not mean a struggle between individuals; he was referring to a struggle between races. Because he conceived the various peoples under the Qing Empire as one Chinese race, he was against an anti-Manchu revolution that would undermine the unity of the Chinese race. In his eyes, this united Chinese race ought to strengthen itself to survive the international competition.

The prominent reformist Kang Youwei had developed a historical theory of three stages that eventually led to the utopia of Great Unity, but Yan’s translation provided ‘scientific’ evidence for Kang. Kang regarded the theory of three stages as a universal law of history with the Great Unity destined to come. However, during the process of these stages, he acknowledged that a struggle might be necessary to overcome obstacles to progress. For contemporary China, this struggle was analogous to reforms that would establish a constitutional monarchy that promoted Kang’s version of Confucianism. Kang’s student Liang Qichao, influenced by both Kang Youwei and Yan Fu’s Social Darwinism, shared the notion of progress intertwined with evolution, and he too invoked this notion to justify the political agenda of social revolutions that promoted civic virtues.

It was in this context that Zhang started to engage with evolutionary history. In 1896, Zhang left Gujing Jingshe (Gujing Academy) and became involved in politics. Believing in the Confucian doctrine of taking political responsibilities
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as a literatus (shì), China’s recent defeat in the Sino-Japanese War triggered him to leave the purely academic life behind. He initially joined the Kang-Liang reform movement, but the academic difference between Zhang’s Old Text Confucianism and Kang’s New Text Confucianism eventually prompted Zhang to leave the reformists.

During this period, in 1898, he translated the writings of Herbert Spencer with Zeng Guangquan. These translations, however, reinterpreted and modified Spencercian theory. Zhang himself did not know English but Zeng did, so Zeng translated the English text verbally and Zhang wrote it down while polishing the translation. This polish resulted in important changes to the original texts. Differentiating between the knowable domain of science and the unknowable domain of religion, Spencer originally had suggested that the scientific reason for progress should not be ‘noumenally considered’ because this noumenon lay in the unknowable. Zhang’s translations suggested the complete opposite, stressing that humans could understand progress noumenally, exaggerating the role of humans’ abilities in the road towards progress.16 Additionally, Spencer’s originally optimistic vision of evolution was received by Zhang with a sense of crisis that reflected the tumultuous political scene in China. Spencer described a situation where ‘newly-raised tracts’ led to the encounter between species, which included a process of natural selection that was impartial and value neutral. In contrast, Zhang’s translations emphasized the cruelty of natural selection and competition between species, and he attributed this to the limited land resources.17 This understanding of evolutionary history echoed Yan’s vision of evolution in Tianyan lun.

Indeed, Zhang had a connection with Yan Fu during this period, and the two intellectuals greatly respected each other; this is evidenced through their correspondence around 1900. By then, Zhang had regarded evolutionary history as scientific truth and exploited evolutionary theory to analyze
human history. In *Zuzhi (On Lineage)* in *Qiushu*, he argued that “the superior will necessarily win” while “the inferior will necessarily fail.” Following Yan Fu’s thought, Zhang argued that humans could become better at this competition through nurture. The importance that Zhang placed on nurture is best exemplified through the following quote: “If a person is not educated, even though with great talent naturally, how could this person have great achievements?” Mirroring Yan Fu’s argument, Zhang also explained that humans competed with each other during the evolutionary process by using equipment and tools (*qi*), and he clarified that this competition was between *qun* (groups). Thus, during this time, Zhang’s evolutionary history also reflected the competitions between different races that led to evolution to a higher stage of development.

This vision was strengthened by the Western ideas that Zhang encountered in Japanese books. After the Qing defeat in the Sino-Japanese War in 1895, intellectuals like Kang and Liang started to advocate for learning from the Japanese experience of reforms and encouraged Chinese to read Japanese books. Sharing the same writing tradition of Han Characters, Japanese was relatively easy for the Chinese to learn. Zhang also took part in this trend of reading Japanese books, which then helped shape his ideas on evolutionary theory. His engagement with Japanese thought and Western thought through Japanese translations was manifested in references to Japanese books in the revised edition of *Qiushu* published in 1904, which included Shirakawa Jiro’s *A History of Chinese Civilisation* and Anesaki Masaharu’s *An Introduction to Religious Studies*.

In this period of the early 1900s, Zhang exploited evolutionary history to justify the distinction between the Manchus and the Han, and elevating the superiority of the Han. Zhang relied on a variety of sources to supplement his argument, and among these was Terrien de Lacouperie’s theory of the Western origin of the Chinese. Lacouperie’s
theory provided Zhang with a theoretical arsenal to group the “Han Chinese” with the “White people,” and Zhang argued that this association made the Han superior to the Manchu. Lacouperie’s *Western Origin of the Early Chinese Civilisation* was included in Shirakawa Jiro’s *A History of Chinese Civilisation*, and illustrated that the Han Chinese shared the same origin with the Ancient Babylonians— the same origin of Western Civilisation. Based on this theory, Zhang wrote a history of the Han race from an evolutionary perspective to demonstrate that both the European Whites and the Han were superior to other ethnicities (especially the Manchus). For this, he wrote several articles in Qiushu, and exploited this historical investigation to advocate for historical nationalism. His promotion of historical nationalism consisted of tying the identity of Han to lineages, which were traceable through well-recorded surnames. For Zhang, the clear distinction of lineages meant that other ethnicities could not be converted to the Han even if they had been culturally assimilated.
Han nationalism led Zhang to advocate for a Han-nationalist revolution (geming), and it was in this revolutionary discourse where Zhang deviated from the linear temporality of evolutionary history. On the one hand, Zhang allied with the revolutionary Zou Rong and wrote the preface for Zou’s *Gemingjun* (The Revolutionary Army), arguing that “if we go against the trend of evolutionary competition for survival… [our race] will be extinct.” In this sense, he supported the notion of evolutionary progress, but we might well speculate that this was due to pragmatic consideration to support a revolutionary ally. This suggestion of political pragmatism is supported by the fact that Zhang put great emphasis on restoration (guangfu) in other writings. He himself proclaimed that, “if I follow nowadays popular rhetoric, I talk about revolution; if I follow my own heart, I will rather talk about restoration.” He also defined the difference between revolution and restoration: “When a government is replaced by people of the same lineage, this is called revolution. When one expels an alien lineage, this is called restoration.” Zhang advocated for restoration more forcefully because he argued that the crises of contemporary China were not caused by the problems in the institutional arrangement of the political system, but instead they were caused by the rule of an alien race, the Manchus. In his mind, the Manchus’ alien nature corrupted the ethical values of the nation and led to crisis. Therefore, this analysis reveals that while Zhang was willing to adhere to the mainstream argument for revolution, he mainly advocated for restoration to expel the Manchus without suggesting an evolution or progress of the society and politics that a revolution was believed to bring. This tension within Zhang’s early thought reveals that Zhang, not prepared to support all the implications of evolutionary history, probably supported it due to political pragmatism. During this period, he still needed more time to digest various intellectual resources which would allow him to form a coherent philosophy.
Zhang Taiyan’s Response to Evolutionary History

Zhang Taiyan against Evolutionary History

Zhang’s formal turn against the notion of evolutionary history took place around 1903-6, when he was imprisoned in Shanghai. Exiled in Japan after his release, the Japanese ideas he encountered provided intellectual resources for Zhang’s eventual critique of evolutionary history. Thus, we will firstly survey the Japanese intellectual and political context with which Zhang engaged during his exile.

Japan’s enthusiasm for Western civilisation in the early years of Meiji Restoration rapidly faded in the 1890s due to disorientation of cultural identity, leading to movements to promote national values. For instance, a cultural conservative group, Seikyōsha (Society of Politics and Religion), including intellectuals like Miyake Setsurei and Kuga Katsunan, was formed around the magazine Nihonjin (The Japanese). The magazine advocated for Japanese Kokusui (National Essence). This was a stance Zhang shared with his own promotion of Chinese national essence (guocui). He had direct interactions with the Society, as he was interviewed by Nihonjin and the script was published in Nihonjin.

In addition to the Seikyōsha and their promotion of national essence, there was another intellectual trend that subscribed to Weltenschmerz in contemporary German philosophy. These ideas dominated during late Meiji Japan, with the ideas of Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, and Karl Robert Eduard von Hartmann becoming well-known in intellectual circles. However, we should not see the statist ideology and the prevalence of German Weltenschmerz as mutually exclusive ideas. For instance, Miyake Setsurei, a key member of Seikyōsha, engaged deeply with the philosophy of Kant and Schopenhauer in his writings. Additionally, a professor of Tokyo Imperial University, Inoue Tetsujirō, who was the first to introduce Schopenhauer into Japan, openly supported the Imperial Rescript of Education which emphasized Japanese traditional values to endorse statism and nationalism. Inoue himself
studied overseas in Germany and had connections with the local intellectual circle. In fact, he had visited Hartmann, and his tutor was Paul Deussen, a friend of Nietzsche.\textsuperscript{35} After Inoue returned to Japan, he played a major role in promoting German philosophy.\textsuperscript{36} There was evidence that Zhang knew Inoue personally and that Zhang greatly respected Inoue’s academic achievements.\textsuperscript{37} Inoue’s student, Anesaki Masaharu also studied German philosophy and later studied overseas with Paul Deussen as his tutor. While Anesaki specialised in religious studies and Buddhism, he tried to integrate Buddhist religion with German Weltschmerz, relying greatly on the works of Schopenhauer. This attempt was not exceptional in contemporary Japan, as other intellectuals like Anesaki’s tutor Inoue contributed to this integration as well.\textsuperscript{38}

![Tokyo Imperial University, 1925\textsuperscript{61}](image)

Deeply engaged with Anesaki’s thought, Zhang was influenced by this integration of Buddhism and German Weltschmerz. Zhang started to read Buddhism on a much more intensive level during his imprisonment in Shanghai,
which Murthy argued was crucial in the transformation of Zhang’s thought. He continued to read Japanese works on Buddhist philosophy in Japan after his release in 1906. According to Zhang’s own description, he read Buddhist classics like *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*, *Yoga sutra*, *Mahāyāna ghana vyūha sūtra* alongside Kant and Schopenhauer. *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* and *Yoga sutra* were both classics about Yogācāra Buddhism that later formed the core of Zhang’s philosophy. Along with these Buddhist classics, Zhang read widely in Japanese studies of German philosophy, evidenced by his request for a reading list from his revolutionary ally Song Jiaoren immediately after he had arrived in Japan.

Based on these multiple sources of thought mentioned above, Zhang formed his own criticism against the evolutionary history which he had once believed. In *Jufen jinhua lun* (On Separating the Universality and Particularity of Evolution), Zhang cited Schopenhauer’s theory of will to reject the Hegelian view of progressive history: “When Hegel advocated for a theory of progress, Schopenhauer disagreed by arguing that the world was formed by the blind movement of the will to which knowledge became a slave.” Zhang then linked the Schopenhauerian concept of will with the Buddhist concept ālaya. He also cited Anesaki’s definition to denote these two concepts as the rudiment in Anesaki’s *History of Indian Religions of the Last Generation*. Thus, through Anesaki’s interpretations, both the Schopenhauerian explanation and the Buddhist explanation of forming of the world was adapted into a philosophy of history that opposed evolutionary temporality. Firstly, Zhang argued that evolutionary history moved in two directions: moral and immoral. Adopting Buddhist doctrines, he argued that the karmic seeds resting in the ālaya consciousness contained both virtue and immorality. Due to the karma of past actions, these seeds initiated the evolution into manas consciousness as well as the feeling of time and history. Another key assertion by Zhang was that morality also
emerged due to the mixture of virtue and immorality in the seeds. Furthermore, Zhang emphasized that the manas self-consciousness would lead to the rise of the self’s will to win, which accounted for the dark side of evolution. In this sense, the history that humanity produced developed in the direction of virtue and also the direction of immorality. Zhang writes: “The seeds cannot only contain virtue without immorality, so the phenomena in the world cannot only contain virtue without immorality. While species developed to be more virtuous, their ability to do evil things was enhanced as well.” With the development of human intellect and technology, fighting due to the will to win could cause much more damage than ever before.44

Furthermore, Zhang argued that “the evolution [of consciousness] was only delusionary in our minds, rather than happening in reality,” as it was produced by the original seeds in our ālaya consciousness.45 The argument of illusion led to two layers of implications. Firstly, articulated in his Wuwu lun (On the Five Negations), Zhang suggested that a utopian solution to the illusory evolution of consciousness was a nirvana of everything, negating government, human settlements, people, species, and the whole world.46 As a result, the Schopenhauerian will and consciousness would be negated which would fundamentally prevent the rise of pains and evils in the evolutionary process.47 However, this utopian vision required the negations of everything to happen simultaneously, since as long as there were still sentient beings in the world, the process of the rise of consciousness would repeat itself. In practice, this meant that this utopian vision did not constitute a pragmatic solution for China’s political predicament. Secondly, this critique contributed to Zhang’s advocacy for particularity against universal laws, more thoroughly discussed in his Qiwu lunshi (An Interpretation of ‘On the Equalization of Things’). Since the law of evolution was generated by human consciousness rather than a concrete universal law,
it was unnecessary to require everyone and every nation to behave accordingly. For Zhang, universal laws were a form of oppression against individuals who should be allowed to pursue their own particular principles.

Zhang’s critique of evolutionary history as a universal law targeted both contemporary constitutionalists and anarchists who invoked evolution to justify their political agendas which paved the way for progress to a higher stage. Zhang also enriched the meaning of his anti-Manchu nationalism in these philosophical discussions. He argued for a decentralized and non-statist nationalism that was compatible with a cosmopolitan worldview which was also against imperialism. In Qiwu lunshi, Zhang argued that imperialists divided peoples into “civilized” and the “barbarians” and regarded the peoples of Late Qing China and most other Asian peoples as barbarian in order to oppress them for their own imperial interests. In light of this, it is not surprising to see Zhang’s involvement in an anti-imperialist movement in the late 1900s. He was one of the central figures in the Yazhou Heqin Hui (Asian Solidarity Society) in Tokyo which included Chinese, Indian, and Vietnamese nationalists who spoke out against Euro-Japanese imperialism. These individuals were also well-connected with prominent Japanese socialists like Sakai Toshihiko. The goal of the society was to establish an alliance between Asian peoples to provide mutual assistance in the struggle against imperialism. As Rebecca Karl has argued, the society was formed around the idea of Asia which was generated from the shared experience of Euro-Japanese imperialist dominance in Asia. Thus, this sort of nationalist alliance dialectically embodied a cosmopolitan vision of world order. In addition, for Zhang, the Qing Empire was part of the problem of imperialism because the Qing Empire suppressed the inherent heterogeneous cultural identities within its territories. Therefore, Zhang transcended his simplistic form of anti-Manchu nationalism to a cosmopolitan and
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decentralized vision of nationalism by his critique of universal laws including the theory of evolutionary progress.

Conclusion

The intellectual milieu of Late Qing China received the concept of evolutionary history through Japanese and Chinese translations of Western ideas, and Zhang engaged with these ideas more critically through a variety of influential sources. Throughout the course of this essay, the importance of the global circulation of ideas in shaping Zhang Taiyan’s response to evolutionary history becomes clear, as well as the way in which he justified his revolutionary discourses. Zhang’s reception of evolutionary history was not a diametric shift from ardent support to complete resistance. Instead, his ideas underwent a series of negotiations with various intellectual traditions to form a mature response to evolutionary history. The resulting theory was then used to justify the political agenda of a nationalist revolution.

Zhang initially followed the dominant narrative of evolutionary history received from both the West and Japan to justify straightforward anti-Manchu nationalism and revolution. He invoked evolutionary history to distinguish the Han from the Manchus and emphasized the Han’s superiority over the Manchus. Yet, possible tension within this evolutionary vision surfaced in his revolutionary discourse when he emphasized restoration over revolution. These crude and immature ideas underwent profound transformations during Zhang’s imprisonment and exile in Japan. During this period, Buddhist philosophy, German Weltschmerz, and other relevant Japanese ideas all met in Zhang’s mind, contributing to his later thought. In this later period, he engaged more critically with evolutionary history, demonstrating that evolution led to more evils as well as happiness. He also stressed that evolution was ultimately illusory in the human mind. This critical attitude
towards evolutionary history enriched the content of his discourse of revolution and nationalism, propelling the idea that nationalism should be non-statist and decentralized and also aim to resist imperialism. This revolutionary discourse transcended the original narrow anti-Manchu nationalism into a truly cosmopolitan political solution for China and beyond. After exploring the evolution of Zhang’s thought, it is clear that all of these complications and the chronological dimension of Zhang’s thought could not be fully captured by the framework of modernity.

While Zhang’s work pertains to Late Qing China, his ideas also shed light on our understanding of modern Chinese and global intellectual history. During the late 19th century, the global circulation of ideas with the expansion of imperialism was important in shaping the intellectual history of non-Western cultures. As Sebastian Conrad has argued, we should focus on the important causal links of history on a global level. When these ideas were received by non-Western cultures, they did not simply move from one place to another but were reinterpreted with various other traditions, namely, a process of knowledge production. Furthermore, we can see that Zhang’s response to evolutionary history was always used to support his political agenda which was connected to the concept of ‘China’ as manifest in the discussion about Manchu-Han relations. Therefore, Zhang’s thought confirms Timothy Cheek’s argument of the key problematik of contemporary Chinese intellectuals: “How to change China to resist Western imperialism” and “What is the ‘China’ that is to be saved”?\(^5\)
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