

Anti-Manchu Racism and the Rise of Anthropology in Early 20th Century China

Ishikawa Yoshihiro 石川禎浩

Kyoto University

First of all, I should explain why I have become interested in this subject. Ever since I began to read writings from the late Qing period, I have been shocked to find so many bizarre and outdated theories being advocated in them. These include: the theory of ether (*yitai xueshuo*, 以太學說) advocated enthusiastically by Tan Sitong 譚嗣同 (1865-98), the famous reformist intellectual executed after the failure of the 1898 Reform Movement; and geographical determinism supported mainly by Liang Qichao 梁啟超 (1873-1929), the brilliant reformist journalist who pioneered almost all the modern academic disciplines in China.¹ The theory of race or racism was just one of many theories popular at that time. Its story is the familiar one of the most popular ideas of one era becoming completely forgotten or denied by later generations.

Little attention, however, has been paid to the dissemination of these popular theories despite their immense and prolonged impact on modern Chinese intellectuals. My guess is that it is paradoxically because these nebulous theories were so popular and widespread at that time that we cannot easily trace their history as fully as we might like. Thus, I have decided to attempt to clarify the history of “raciology” or ethnology in modern China which, on the one hand, played such a great role in the anti-Manchu revolutionary movement, and, on the other hand, opened the way for the rise of anthropology in modern China.

Before taking a closer look at the rise of anthropology in China, a few remarks should be made concerning the term “anthropology.” As is often the case with the Western social sciences introduced into China at the beginning of the twentieth century, the definition of “anthropology” at that time was extremely vague. Some works about anthropology were ethnology texts composed mainly of information concerning the human races of the world; some were archeology texts composed of explanations about the origins of mankind; and some were theology texts discussing the problems of Genesis. At the same time, the Chinese equivalents for the term “anthropology” were numerous as well. At least four or five Chinese terms for “anthropology” were used, including *renleixue* 人類學, *minzuxue* 民族學, *minzhongxue* 民種學, *renzhongxue* 人種學, and *zhongzuxue* 種族學. One rather extreme example which I discovered in a Chinese

¹ On Liang Qichao’s introduction of geographical determinism, see Ishikawa Yoshihiro, “Liang Qichao and Geographical Studies in Meiji Japan: On Geographical Determinism,” in Joshua Fogel, ed., *The Role of Japan in Liang Qichao’s Introduction of Modern Western Civilization to China* (Center for Chinese Studies, University of California, Berkeley, forthcoming).

translation entitled *Jinhua lun* 進化論, as in the English “Theory of Evolution,” actually had as its original English title none other than *Anthropology*.² I will use the term “anthropology” and its Chinese equivalent, *renleixue*, to refer to the entire discourse which sought to explain the whole history of humanity from a racial point of view.

As is well known, anti-Manchu racism played an extremely important role in the revolutionary propaganda of the late Qing period. It stimulated racial consciousness among the Chinese people and accelerated the revolutionary movement. One could argue that the 1911 Revolution owed its stunningly quick success to this anti-Manchu racism. In an important sense, then, one might say that anti-Manchuism was the spirit of that age.

It is true as well that China had a long tradition of anti-Manchuism. But, when we read the anti-Manchu propaganda of late Qing revolutionary intellectuals carefully, we can see clearly that they applied anthropology—the newly-introduced, “scientific” knowledge at that time—rather than simply repeating traditional anti-Manchu tropes. In this way, the anti-Manchu propaganda of the 1911 period included not only the narrow concept of race, but also many diverse theories of modern anthropology, such as evolutionary thinking. In this essay, I would like to explain, first, how the elements of modern Western anthropology were introduced into China; second, how they affected the critical activities of both revolutionaries and reformers in China; and then, briefly, how the anti-Manchu racism of the 1911 period affected the subsequent development of Chinese anthropology. The first scholar to offer a full treatment to the discourse of race in modern China was Frank Dikötter. Although his book *The Discourse of Race in Modern China*, published in 1992, is certainly a fine piece of work,³ one topic which remains an unsettled question is the role Japanese writings—the key problem in considering the introduction of Western systems of thought into modern China—played in the field of anthropology. I would like to consider the problem mainly from the perspective of this Japanese influence.

Concerning foreign influences, there was an interesting academic scandal in early 2002 in China. A spirited young professor of anthropology at Peking University, by the name of Wang Mingming 王銘銘, was accused of plagiarizing a book on anthropology written by an American scholar.⁴ After his case came to light, Professor Wang was relieved of some of his academic positions, and this led to a heated controversy surrounding the nature of present-day scholarship in China. When I saw that story on the web, I could not, in a sense, help feeling a strange pity for Professor Wang, because, as we shall see in a moment, at the beginning of twentieth century, China’s leading figures in the field of anthropology were never labeled plagiarists despite the widespread incidence of plagiarism from Japanese books in their writings. What all of this seems to show is that in China the rise and development of anthropology—an academic discipline

² See “Guangxue hui xinshu guanggao 廣學會新書廣告 (List of the new books published by the Guangxue hui),” *Wanguo Gongbao* 萬國公報 186 (1904).

³ Frank Dikötter, *The Discourse of Race in Modern China* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992).

⁴ According to the *Shehui kexue bao* 社會科學報 (dated January 10, 2002), Wang’s *Xiangxiang de yibang* 想象的異邦 (Imagined foreign lands) (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1998) is plagiarized from William A. Haviland, *Cultural Anthropology* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1987).

of Western origin—has been closely connected with the introduction of foreign theories throughout.

1. The Introduction of Western Anthropology into East Asia

Let us start now with the introduction of anthropology into modern China. As was the case with other academic disciplines, one might say that anthropology was, in a sense, not that new a subject in China. Before the modern era, Chinese intellectuals knew that there were a number of different races or tribes outside China. Terms like “Folangji” 佛郎機 and “Hongmaofan” 紅毛番, for example, appeared already in sixteenth and seventeenth century documents as names for Westerners, and later a large number of illustrated ethnographies were made by imperial order to show off how many tributary peoples the Qing empire had. The most famous of them is the *Huang Qing zhigong tu* 皇清職貢圖 (Illustrated ethnography of the peoples in the Qing empire), which was edited on the order of the Qianlong Emperor in 1751. It covered virtually every ethnic group from minority races living on Chinese territory to the white races of the West. This sort of ethnography, however, never developed into the modern discipline of anthropology.

It was in the final decade of the nineteenth century that modern anthropology was introduced into China as part of the “New Knowledge.” And as soon as it was introduced, it provided Chinese intellectuals with a fresh tool that helped them to understand the entire world at a single stroke. The early introduction of anthropology and information on the subject of race were closely linked to the proselytizing efforts of Christian missionaries in China. Insofar as I have been able to discover, the first explicitly anthropological publication to appear in Chinese was “Ren fen wulei shuo” 人分五類說 (On the five classifications of mankind) which was printed in the *Gezhi huibian* 格致匯編 (The Chinese Scientific Magazine) in 1892.⁵ The *Gezhi huibian* was an illustrated periodical edited by John Fryer (1839-1928), a translator and missionary.⁶ “Ren fen wulei shuo” explicated the contemporary Western view of the attributes of humanity’s supposed five basic racial divisions. It read in part: “Westerners divide mankind into five races: the Mongolian race, the Caucasian race, the African race, the Malaysian race, and the American Indian race. Their skin color differentiates them into yellow, white, black, brown, and red peoples.”

It then went on to give a detailed explanation of the physical features of each race. Early Western anthropology established in the nineteenth century was characterized by its emphasis on the physical classification system, namely physical anthropology. So, it is quite natural that the basic tone of “Ren fen wulei shuo” was dominated by physical anthropology. The fivefold classification of mankind to which the article referred originated with Johann F. Blumenbach (1752-1840), a German anatomist considered to be one of the founders of modern anthropology. The fivefold classification of races was so popular in the West that early East Asian writings on the races of the world, more or

⁵ *Gezhi huibian* 7.3 (1892).

⁶ On for the role of the *Gezhi huibian* in introducing Western natural sciences into China, see Xiong Yuezhi 熊月之, *Xixue dongjian yu wan-Qing shehui* 西学東漸與晚清社会 (The dissemination of Western learning and late Qing society) (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1994), esp. chap. 10.

less, accepted it as an authorized categorization. The first Japanese book on anthropology, *Jinshu hen* 人種篇 (An outline of the human races), published in 1874, for instance, also introduced this fivefold classification, and explained that it had been “devised by a German scholar, by the name of Blumenbach.”⁷ What is more interesting is that *Jinshu hen* moreover referred to “the method of categorizing human races by the shape of the skull”⁸ by which was meant the so-called cranial index, the ratio of the breadth of the skull to its length. This theory had been very popular as one of the most scientific indices of ethnology ever since it was devised by the Swedish anatomist, Anders Retzius (1796-1860) in 1842.

The *Jinshu hen* was published by the Japanese Ministry of Education in a series of reference books for schoolteachers, and was actually an abridged translation from one of the volumes of the Chambers Encyclopedia entitled *Chambers's Information for the People: A Popular Encyclopedia*. It is noteworthy that detailed information about Western ethnology or physical anthropology had already spread to Japan in the earliest years of the Meiji era. The method of categorizing human races by the shape of the skull was introduced in the above-mentioned “Ren fen wulei shuo,” too, although not as clearly as in *Jinshu hen*. We can say with fair certainty that “anthropology” at that time meant mainly physical anthropology, characterized by its emphasis on a “scientific” means of categorizing the races of humanity. And we can say with the same certainty that Western anthropology at that time was strongly colored by a theory of racial evolution. That is, almost all the races were arranged according to their degrees of evolution with the white race at the pinnacle. This was true as well of East Asian anthropology which adopted the value system of Western anthropology. The two writings mentioned above, are cases in point. “Ren fen wulei shuo”, for example, observed:

The Mongolian, that is the yellow races,...do not have a highly-developed ability to tell right from wrong, and they still find it difficult to get rid of convention.... The Caucasian, that is the white races are, physically speaking, tall, strong, and nimble; mentally speaking, they are people of action, good sense, and decisiveness.... The Ethiopian, that is the black races, are not only stupid and ignorant but also lacking in insight.

The *Jinshu hen*, on the other hand, after comparing the characteristics of each race, went on to note: “The European races are much superior to other races in every respect.”⁹ Although this sort of racial stereotype would be denied completely nowadays, it was widely accepted at the time and almost all East Asian intellectuals believed in such a racial hierarchy.

One other thing that is highly important for the emergence of anthropology in modern China is, of course, the influence from Japan. As is well known, we cannot consider the introduction of Western social sciences into modern China apart from Japan's role as a middleman. And, anthropology is no exception. As a matter of fact, the

⁷ Akiyama Kōtarō 秋山恒太郎 (trans.), *Jinshu hen* 人種篇 (Tokyo: Monbushō, 1874), vol. 1, pp. 4-5.

⁸ *Jinshu hen*, vol. 1, p. 16.

⁹ *Jinshu hen*, vol. 2, p. 39.

first Chinese translation of a Western book on anthropology, entitled *Renlei xue* 人類學 (Anthropology), was made from a Japanese translation around the year 1903.¹⁰

The rise of the Japanese anthropology goes back to 1884, when the first academic anthropological society, the *Jinrui gakkai* 人類學會, was established in Tokyo by Tsuboi Shōgorō 坪井正五郎 (1863-1913), Torii Ryūzō 鳥居龍藏 (1870-1953), and others. Torii Ryūzō, especially, exercised a major influence on the rise of anthropology in China. Torii, the most eminent anthropologist in modern Japan, started his career as an East Asian ethnologist working especially on the Siberian and Mongolian races. He carried out fieldwork on several occasions in Manchuria after his first project on the Liaodong peninsula in 1895, and collected all manner of data about the Manchurian peoples, such as physical measurements, folkways, languages, and the like. His early works, such as *Jinshu shi* 人種誌 (Ethnography, 1902), *Jinshugaku* 人種學 (Raceology, 1904), *Minami Manshū chōsa hōkoku* 南滿洲調查報告 (A report on an investigation in south Manchuria, 1910), were products of that fieldwork.

In his investigations of the Manchu people, based on his wealth of data from physical measurements, Torii attempted to clarify the origins of the Manchus and their similarity with other Siberian races, that is the so-called Tungus peoples. And this point had a great impact on the development of anti-Manchu racism in early twentieth century China. Chinese translations from Torii's writings in the first decade of the twentieth century alone were numerous.¹¹ All the Chinese translations were made within a year of their original publication, which shows how closely Chinese intellectuals paid attention to Torii's work. For example, the Chinese translator of "*Jinruigakujō yori mitaru Kō-Shin shokkōzu*" (An anthropological view of the *Huang Qing zhigong tu*) offered a high evaluation of Torii's achievements; he wrote: "Dr. Torii, the Japanese scholar, has toured Mongolia and northern Manchuria for many years, braving so many difficulties and dangers. As a result, some Chinese people suspect him of spying on China." On the racial characteristics of the Manchus, Torii pointed out in 1904: "From the viewpoint of physical features, the Manchus closely resemble the Tungus. We can be fairly certain that the Manchus are one of the subgroups of the Tungus. From the viewpoint of ethnology, they belong, beyond a doubt, among the Tungus race."¹²

In this way, at the very beginning of the twentieth century, the Manchus who

¹⁰ Sir Daniel Wilson, *Anthropology* (New York: Humboldt, 1885); Shibue Tamotsu 澁江保, trans., *Jinrui gaku zen* 人類學 全 (Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1894); Hunan bianyi she 湖南編譯社, trans., *Renlei xue* 人類學 (Tokyo: Hunan bianyi she, 1903).

¹¹ Torii, *Jinshu shi* (Tokyo: Sūzanbō, 1902) [Chinese trans.: Lin Kaiqing 林楷青, trans., *Renzhong zhi* 人種志 (Tokyo: Minxuehui, 1903)]; Torii, "*Jinruigakujō yori mitaru Ajia no jūmin ni tsukite*" 人類學上より見たる亞細亞の住民に就て (An anthropological view of Asian peoples), *Chigaku zasshi* 地学雑誌 16.182-183 (1904) [Chinese trans.: "Cong renleixueshang lun Yaxiya de zhumin" 从人类学上论亚细亚的住民, *Hubei xuebao* 湖北學報 2.14 (1904)]; Torii, "*Jinruigakujō yori mitaru Kō Shin shokkōzu*" 人類學上より見たる『皇清職貢図』 (An anthropological view of the *Huang Qing zhigong tu*), *Taiyō* 太陽 15.14 (1909) [Chinese trans.: "Manzhou renzhong kao" 滿洲人種考 (An inquiry into the Manchu race), *Dixue zazhi* 地学杂志 1.3 (1910)].

¹² Torii, "*Jinruigakujō yori mitaru Ajia no jūmin ni tsukite*," *Chigaku zasshi* 16.182 (1904).

had been regarded vaguely as descendants of “Sushen” 肅慎 or the “Jurchens” 如真 for many generations were, for the first time, categorized into the Tungus or Siberian races by the methods of physical anthropology. Later, Chinese revolutionaries came to use the new term “Tungus” 通古斯族 (*Tonggusi zu*) or “Siberian races” 西伯利亞人種 (*Xiboliya renzhong*) to emphasize the heterogeneity of the Manchus. We can now easily see that their grounds for claiming this were modern Western theories of anthropology and racial classifications introduced via Japan.

2. The Reformist Idea of Race

Turning now to the role of the reformers, such as Yan Fu 嚴復 (1854-1921), Kang Youwei 康有為 (1858-1927), Tang Caichang 唐才常 (1867-1900), Liang Qichao, and others, most scholars would accept the fact that, in the late Qing period, they played a highly important role in introducing modern Western systems of thought into China and transformed the Chinese intellectual world. Their contribution is evident in the field of anthropology as well. Tang Caichang, a well-known reformer who died in an abortive uprising in Wuhan in 1900, was the most prominent among them. Tang’s detailed study of race, published between September 1897 and February 1898 in the *Xiangxue xinbao* 湘學新報 (Hunan news), may be considered as the first anthropography written by a Chinese. In the opening paragraph of his article, “Geguo zhonglei kao” 各國種類考 (Inquiry into the world races), Tang introduces Western classifications as follows: “Westerners divide mankind into five races: the Mongolian race, the Caucasian race, the African race, the Malaysian race, and the American Indian race. Their skin color differentiates them into yellow, white, black, brown, and red peoples.”¹³

This paragraph is lifted in full from the article in the *Gezhi huibian*, “Ren fen wulei shuo,” introduced above. In addition to “Ren fen wulei shuo,” Tang’s knowledge about races came from some Japanese writings. Particularly important among them was the *Bankoku shiki* 萬國史記 (World history) by a Japanese publicist by the name of Okamoto Kensuke 岡本監輔 (1839-1904), who wrote this volume originally in literary Chinese in 1879. Although the *Bankoku shiki* is usually classified as a history book, it also contained a lot of information about the geography and races of the world. This fact leads to the inescapable conclusion that so-called world history at that time was inseparable from geography and race. The influence of the *Bankoku shiki* seems to have been greater in China than in Japan, largely because it was written in Chinese. Okamoto’s book was said to have had a circulation of more than three hundred thousand in China.¹⁴ Such a circulation was huge at that time, and, needless to say, all of it came

¹³ Tang Caichang, “Geguo zhonglei kao,” *Xiangxue xinbao* 15 (1897), in Tang, *Juedianmingzhai neiyuan* 覺顛冥齋內言 (Essays on political and historical matters) (Taipei: Wenhai chubanshe, 1968), p. 472.

¹⁴ Hazama Naoki 狭間直樹, “Chūgoku kindai ni okeru teikokushugi to kokumin kokka” 中国近代における帝国主義と国民国家 (Imperialism and the nation-state in modern China), in Hazama Naoki, ed., *Seiyō kindai bunmei to Chūka sekai* 西洋近代文明と中華世界 (Modern Western civilization and the universe of China) (Kyoto: Kyoto University Press, 2001), p. 21.

from pirated editions.¹⁵ In any case, Okamoto's now forgotten bestseller, as had been the case with "Ren fen wulei shuo," followed the racial classification of Blumenbach.¹⁶ And, we should note once again how popular classifications based on physical anthropology were.

It is unnecessary to go into detail about Tang Caichang's article, which did nothing but enumerate so many bits of information about the world's races by quoting all manner of Japanese books. However, it may be worth mentioning in passing the reason he was so interested in anthropology or the races of the world. Another article by Tang Caichang written almost simultaneously with "Geguo zhonglei kao" helps explain why. In his "Tongzhong shuo 通種說 (On racial communication)," Tang wrote:

After discussing this issue frankly with many gentlemen of our country, I have found that only through racial communication can we realize the construction of a peaceful society, the fusion of religions, and true universal equality. Why so? We all know that good fruit trees are always made by grafting or cross-fertilizing. ... The same is true of human beings. ... [As a matter of fact, in Southeast Asia,] there are so many people who were born of white and yellow parents. They are all naturally clever, healthy, and vigorous. Moreover, they are self-confident of being the best race in the world and demonstrate their powerfulness. It proves, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the amalgamation of the white and yellow races would produce offspring of unparalleled intelligence and strength.¹⁷

What this passage makes clear at once is that Tang Caichang considered anthropology a scientific method of strengthening the yellow race, including the Chinese. At that time, differences among races were generally considered congenital, so that the only way to improve the race was through amalgamation of the white and yellow races. As is well known, *baozhong* 保種 (preservation of the race) was one of the slogans of the Reform Movement of 1898, along with *baoguo* 保國 (preservation of the state) and *baojiao* 保教 (preservation of Confucianism). *Baozhong* is usually interpreted as "preservation of the race," but judging from the articles of Tang Caichang, perhaps the term *baozhong* at the time also contained an implication of preservation of the Chinese race by means of racial improvement or racial amalgamation.

In discussing the introduction of anthropology by the reformers, we cannot ignore Liang Qichao. After he "began to discover that there were five continents and various nations"¹⁸ by reading the *Yinghuan zhilüe* 瀛环志略 (A short account of the maritime circuit) in 1890, Liang gradually deepened his understanding of the human races through such magazines as *Gezhi huibian* among others. Suffice it to say here that he, as well as Tang Caichang, repeatedly advocated the fivefold classification of mankind, and much of

¹⁵ Okamoto Kensuke, *Wanguo shiji* 萬國史記 (Shanghai: Shenji shuzhuan, 1897), for example, is one such pirated edition.

¹⁶ Okamoto Kensuke, *Wanguo shiji*, p. 1.

¹⁷ Tang Caichang, *Tang Caichang ji* 唐才常集 (Works of Tang Caichang) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980), pp. 100-01.

¹⁸ Liang Qichao, "Sanshi zishu" 三十自述 (Autobiography at the age of thirty), in Liang, *Yinbingshi wenji* 飲冰室文集 (Selected essays of Liang Qichao; hereafter, *Wenji*) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989), 11: 16.

his account of mankind was suffused by what we would now consider vulgar stereotypes. It is noteworthy, however, that in an 1897 article, Liang tried to explain the differences among races using his own scientific terms such as “*nao zhi jiaodu*” 腦之角度 (cerebral angle) and “*xueguan zhong zhi weishengwu*” 血管中之微生物 (microbe in the blood vessel).¹⁹ The former is similar to the cranial index mentioned earlier, while the latter corresponds to blood type which was scientifically confirmed finally in 1900. These vague, groping terms show that Liang was susceptible to the newly introduced Western natural sciences as well as to the social sciences.

After the *coup d'état* which abruptly ended the Reform Movement in 1898, Liang Qichao took refuge in Japan, and there he resumed his energetic writing activities with his journals *Qingyi bao* 清議報 (“The China Discussion”) and *Xinmin congbao* 新民叢報 (New people’s miscellany). As is well known, the multifaceted influences he experienced in Meiji-era Japan were overwhelming.²⁰ Years later, Liang would write: “My mind was so changed by reading Japanese writings that, in thought and speech, I am like a different person.”²¹ The knowledge of race was, needless to say, one of those things that transformed Liang, and it exerted tremendous influence upon his outlook on the world. Before his exile to Japan, though, race or the idea of races was just one of the new tools useful to him for observing and analyzing the world of his day, but after he absorbed more detailed information in Japan, the idea of races developed into the most fertile perspective for explaining the entire history of mankind at a single stroke. We can easily see how important the idea of race was for him by reading his “Xin shixue” 新史學 (New historiography), especially the chapter on “the relationship between history and race,” which was written especially to adorn the February 1902 founding issue of *Xinmin congbao*. In the opening paragraph of it, he stated:

What is history? History is nothing but the account of the development and strife of human races. There is no history without race.... I don’t know whether we can enjoy the great harmony of mankind across the boundaries of race in the future. Today, however, it is no exaggeration to say that the racial problem is the biggest problem in the world.... The essence of history is to follow the tracks of the rise and fall of every race over thousands of years. The spirit of history is to uncover the reasons for the rise and fall of every race over thousands of years.²²

In short, race was everything in his historiography. As for the classification

¹⁹ Liang, “Lun Zhongguo zhi jiangqiang” 論中國之將強 (About the future power of China), in *Wenji*, 2: 13.

²⁰ For further details, see Hazama Naoki, ed., *Kyōdō kenkyū: Ryō Keichō, Seiyō kindai shisō juyō to Meiji Nihon* 共同研究 梁啓超—西洋近代思想受容と明治日本 (Joint research: Liang Qichao, modern Western thought and Meiji Japan) (Tokyo: Misuzu shobō, 1999); Chinese edition: *Liang Qichao, Mingzhi Riben, Xifang* 梁啓超-明治日本-西方 (Liang Qichao, Meiji era Japan, and the West) (Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe, 2001).

²¹ Liang, “Xiaweiyouji” 夏威夷游记 (Travel notes on Hawaii), in Liang, *Yinbingshi zhuanji* 飲冰室傳集 (Selected works of Liang Qichao; hereafter, *Zhuanji*) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989), 22: 186.

²² Liang, “Xin shixue,” in *Wenji*, 9: 11-13.

system of the races of mankind, while he had adhered to the fivefold classification ever since the era of the 1898 Reform Movement, he also introduced various schemes which ranged from four to sixty-three races. The fourfold classification had been advocated by Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), and the sixty-three-fold classification by Henry T. Buckle (1821-62). In addition, he made a chart of races of the world which took into account the elements of language and explained the development of each race in detail. It is noteworthy here that these classifications and charts were Liang Qichao's obsession, because they lent an aura of "scientific" authenticity to his racial message. Liang hungrily absorbed this sort of "scientific" authenticity from Japanese writings. His "Xin shixue" is, as is the case in many of his other works, based on several writings of Japanese publicists, especially *Shigaku tsūron* 史學通論 (Overview of historical studies) and *Seiyō jōko shi* 西洋上古史 (Ancient Western history) written by Ukita Kazutami 浮田和民 (1859-1946), a professor of history at *Tokyo senmon gakkō* 東京專門學校 (Tokyo Higher School, the forerunner of Waseda University) and editor-in-chief of the journal *Taiyō* 太陽 (The sun).²³ For example, the various classifications of races and the chart of the world's races that Liang introduced in his essay were carbon copies of those in Ukita's writings.²⁴

However, comparing more carefully Liang's article with Ukita's writings, we can also see that Liang did not completely accept Ukita's view of the relationship between history and race. The differences here between Liang and Ukita are important to analyze, because it is certain that Liang based himself on Ukita's work. By comparing them, we can understand more clearly what Liang accepted and what he did not accept from Ukita. The most significant difference between them concerns the interpretation of the term "historical races" (歷史的人種). Ukita interpreted "historical races" as historically formed races—that is, the races formed by non-physical factors, such as language and culture; whereas Liang used the term to describe history-making races, races which played important roles in the drama of mankind's history. These different interpretations further produced the exact opposite understandings of the relationship between history and race. That is, Ukita denied a racial interpretation of history, because "the historical races were the effect of history, not its cause"²⁵; by the same token, Liang wrote: "History is nothing but an account of the development of and strife among the human races."²⁶ In this way, for Liang races had developed side by side until they eventually engaged in struggle—that is, racial war.

Reformers like Liang and Tang Caichang, though, could not propound a racial interpretation of history when they discussed domestic Chinese matters. Needless to say, it would easily give rise to anti-Manchu racism which they as royalists could not accept. Liang had shown an interest in anti-Manchuism even before the Hundred Days Reform, when he served as Academic Director at the *Hunan shiwu xuetang* 湖南時務學堂 (Hunan academy of current events). He is said to have distributed some anti-Manchu pamphlets, such as *Yangzhou shiri ji* 揚州十日記 (Record of ten days in Yangzhou), to

²³ Ukita Kazutami, *Shigaku tsūron* (Tokyo: Tōkyō senmon gakkō, 1898); Ukita, *Seiyō jōko shi* (Tokyo: Tōkyō senmon gakkō, 1898).

²⁴ See Ukita, *Shigaku tsūron*, p. 78; Ukita, *Seiyō jōko shi*, pp. 18-19.

²⁵ Ukita, *Shigaku tsūron*, p. 86.

²⁶ Liang, "Xin shixue," in *Wenji*, 9: 12.

his students in 1897 and emphasized the racial differences between Han and Manchu.²⁷ Furthermore, in a 1902 letter to his mentor Kang Youwei, Liang still retained his anti-Manchuism:

Now is the time that the nationalistic idea has become highly developed. If we lack this idea, we can never found our nation.... In order to rouse the nationalistic idea, naturally we cannot keep from attacking the Manchus. Anti-Manchuism is the best-timed idea in China, just as was anti-Tokugawa (*tōbaku* 倒幕) sentiment in Japan.²⁸

In spite of these early inclinations toward anti-Manchuism, however, it was impossible for Liang Qichao and other reformers to advocate anti-Manchuism in public after the revolutionaries, mortal enemies of the reformers, began to clamor for anti-Manchu racism among their most popular slogans.

3. Revolutionary Anti-Manchuism and the Rise of Anthropology in China

Now that we have touched on both the introduction of anthropology into China and the reformists' idea of race, we can proceed to consider the relationship between revolutionary anti-Manchuism and the rise of anthropology in China. As is well known, anti-Qing revolutionary propaganda was initially made through reprinting and distributing a number of older pamphlets, such as *Yangzhou shiri ji* and *Jiading tucheng jilüe* 嘉定屠城紀略 (Record of the massacre of Jiading), which described atrocities committed by the Manchu invading army at the beginning of the Qing era. Although these works were officially prohibited throughout the Qing, they were reprinted continually and secretly for more than two hundred years to provide Han Chinese with a sense of racial hostility toward the Manchus. The late Qing revolutionaries were, in this sense, descendants of the anti-Manchu loyalists of the early Qing period. The late Qing revolutionaries, however, were more than that. It was not long before they discovered that the newly arrived anthropology could furnish their anti-Manchuism with a new "scientific" authority. We thus find a complicated situation in the late Qing—that is, both reformers and revolutionaries trying to apply anthropology and ethnology to advocate pro-Manchuism and anti-Manchuism, respectively.

For the most of the revolutionaries, of course, the Han and the Manchus were two completely different "races." For example, in his *Geming jun* 革命軍 (The revolutionary army), the most widely circulated political pamphlet before the 1911 Revolution, the young revolutionary Zou Rong 鄒容 (1885-1905) claimed: "For revolution, race must be clearly distinguished" (*geming bi pouqing renzhong* 革命必剖清人種).²⁹ Zou divided the yellow race into two main branches: the "races of China," including the Han, the

²⁷ Liang Qichao, *Qingdai xueshu gailun* 清代學術概論 (Intellectual trends in the Qing period), in *Zhuanji*, 34: 62.

²⁸ Ding Wenjiang 丁文江 and Zhao Fengtian 趙豐田, eds., *Liang Qichao nianpu changbian* 梁啟超年譜長編 (Chronological biography of Liang Qichao) (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1983), p. 286.

²⁹ Zou Rong, *Geming jun*, in John Lust, trans., *The Revolutionary Army: A Chinese Nationalist Tract of 1903* (The Hague and Paris: Mouton & Co., 1968), p.106.

Tibetan, and the Cochinese races; and the “races of Siberia,” composed of the Mongolian, the Tungus, and the Turkish peoples. Obviously, the Han belonged to the former; and the Manchus, one of the sub-branches of the Siberian race, belonged to the latter. The racial classification he used was the commonly held view at that time and suited anti-Manchu propaganda well. Zou undoubtedly found this classification in Japan, because it is obvious that his classification followed exactly that of Kuwabara Jitsuzō 桑原隲藏 (1870-1931), one of the founders of modern Japanese Oriental studies. Kuwabara’s racial classification can be found in his high school textbook *Chūtō Tōyō shi* 中等東洋史 (East Asian history for middle school) published in 1898.³⁰ From Zou’s point of view, because the Han and the Manchus were two completely different races, it did not matter if the Han expelled the Manchus from China or killed them to take revenge.

In the face of this revolutionary propaganda, the reformers found themselves in a great difficulty. Before Zou Rong’s *Geming jun* was published, Liang Qichao had always divided the yellow race into three groupings: the first consisted of East Asians, such as Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, and Siamese; the second consisted of North Asians, such as Mongolians, Tartars, and Siberians; and the third consisted of Europeans and “Near Easterners,” such as Turks and Hungarians. At that time, Liang included the Manchus among the Chinese.³¹ But, after the revolutionaries repeatedly emphasized the racial differences between Han and Manchus with reference to physical anthropology, the reformers could not repeat their former classification any longer, because it became impossible for anyone to deny the racial differences between Han and Manchu as long as one followed the then commonly held view of physical anthropology. Because of this dilemma, Liang, when he later classified the “Chinese” into six different groups—the Miao, Han, Tibetan, Mongolian, Huns, and Tungus—had to admit reluctantly, “the Qing dynasty originated from the Tungus.... Compared with the white, brown, red, and black races, we are definitely a yellow race; compared with Miao, Tibetan, Mongolian, Huns, and Manchus, we are generally speaking Han.”³²

Liang and other reformers, however, did not surrender to the logic of revolutionary propaganda. What they produced as the alternative to the method of physical anthropology was, so to speak, the method of cultural anthropology. To put it the other way round, they tried to use the cultural classification of race, which took cultural, linguistic, and customary elements into consideration, to reinforce their pro-Manchuism. Kang Youwei, the leader of the reformers, for instance, noted in 1902:

The relationship between so-called Han and Manchu is no more than that between natives (*tuji* 土籍) and immigrants (*keji* 客籍). In norms and culture, both conform to Confucianism; in lifestyles and social systems, both conform to the traditions of the Han, Tang, Song, and Ming dynasties. The Manchus are very different from the Mongols of the Yuan dynasty who did not conform to Chinese culture. In short, the Manchus have been assimilated into China for so many generations that there is no

³⁰ Kuwabara Jitsuzō, *Chūtō Tōyō shi*, in *Kuwabara Jitsuzō zenshū* 桑原隲藏全集 (Complete works of Kuwabara Jitsuzō) (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1968), vol. 4, pp. 22-24.

³¹ Liang, “Xin shixue,” in *Wenji*, 9: 13; Liang, “Zhongguo jiruo suyuan lun” 中國積弱溯源論 (On the source of China’s weakness),” in *Wenji*, 5: 36.

³² Liang, “Zhongguo shi xulun” 中國史叙論 (About Chinese history),” in *Wenji*, 6: 7.

difference whatsoever between Han and Manchus.³³

To add just one more example, Liang Qichao, as well as his mentor Kang Youwei, refuted certain points used to classify the Han and the Manchus by Wang Jingwei 汪精衛 (1883-1944), an eloquent revolutionary leader. Liang pointed out:

It has been said that the Manchus and we are completely different races, but that is not strictly true.... Actually, the Manchus have been definitely assimilated into us in four out of the six elements which the debater [namely, Wang Jingwei] applied to classify races. In the remaining two elements, we cannot easily draw a conclusion that they and we are different.... We therefore conclude that, judging from the sociological definition of race, that the Manchus have already assimilated into the Han and have sufficient qualifications to be members of our mixed nation (*huntong minzu* 混同民族).³⁴

The word “sociological” is important in this context, because it shows traces of painstaking efforts made by reformers, who had to do something to oppose the revolutionary anti-Manchuism which was supported by the methods of physical anthropology. In spite of these efforts, their reformist explanation of the relationship between Han and Manchu was virtually helpless in the face of the emotional slogans of the revolutionaries. In actual fact, the reformist ideas, such as *Man-Han bufen lun* 滿漢不分論 (the inseparability of Han and Manchus) and *Manzu tonghua lun* 滿族同化論 (the assimilation of the Manchus), were refuted one after another by the revolutionaries in articles published in *Minbao* 民報, the organ of the Revolutionary Alliance 中國同盟會.

Let me offer just two examples here. Liu Shipai 劉師培 (1884-1920), an extraordinary classical scholar and a revolutionary activist, tried in a 1907 article to argue that *Jianzhou wei* (建州衛), the homeland of the Manchus, was in no way part of the territory of the Ming dynasty.³⁵ He went on to claim, by referring to nearly one hundred sources, that the homeland of the Manchus had never belonged to China, a view often later accepted by many Japanese militarists when they tried to separate Manchuria from the Republic of China in 1920s and 1930s. On the other hand, Tao Chengzhang 陶成章 (1878-1912), another famous revolutionary activist who died just after the founding of the Republic, agreed with Liu and declared that Manchuria was the enemy of China as early as the end of the Ming period.³⁶ One could find many similar examples from *Minbao* which tried to demonstrate the fundamental difference of the Manchus by using

³³ Kang Youwei, “Nanhai xiansheng bian geming shu” 南海先生辨革命書 (Mr. Kang Youwei’s letter about revolution), *Xinmin congbao* 新民叢報 16 (1902).

³⁴ Liang, “Shenlun zhongzu geming yu zhengzhi geming zhi tezhi” 申論種族革命與政治革命之特質 (About the nature of racial revolution and political revolution), in *Wenji*, 19 29-31.

³⁵ Weiwei 衛裔 (Liu Shipai), “Bian Manren fei Zhongguo zhi chenmin” 辨滿人非中國之臣民 (Manchus have never been Chinese subjects), *Minbao* 14, 15, 18 (1907).

³⁶ Sigu 思古 (Tao Chengzhang), “Lun Manzhou dang Mingmo shidai yu Zhongguo wei diguo” 論滿洲當明末時代於中國為敵國 (Manchuria was the enemy of China at the end of the Ming period), *Minbao* 20 (1908).

countless historical materials.³⁷

Compared with their enthusiastic inquiries into the origin of the Manchus, though, the revolutionaries seemed to be indifferent to the question of the origin of the Han race. In fact, they had only a vague, at most psychological or emotional, concept of the Han race at its beginning. As is well known, the Han race was, and sometimes still is, generally considered the descendants of the Yellow Emperor or *Huangdi* 黄帝, the first Chinese emperor in the mythological age. But, no one knew where the Yellow Emperor had come from. Thus, over the first decade of the twentieth century, the origins of the Han race provoked a great deal of controversy in the political world as well as in the academic world. And the problems surrounding the origins of the Han race and its relationship to minority nationalities in China were so closely connected with the blueprints for future state-building that both the revolutionaries and the reformers devoted themselves to the study of Chinese prehistory. This was not only an academic subject, but also a political one. As we shall see, almost all the early Chinese paleoanthropologists were late Qing revolutionaries or reformers, and this has much to do with the political character of the issue. In a word, although the inquiry into the origins of the Han Chinese was an academic study in name, it was actually a form of political action.

Almost all the early studies of the origins of the Han race were, as I have suggested, made by late Qing political activists. Included among them are Liu Shipei and Tao Chengzhang, as well as Zhang Binglin 章炳麟 (1869-1936), Song Jiaoren 宋教仁 (1881-1913), and Jiang Zhiyou 蔣智由 (d. 1929, also known as Jiang Guanyun 蔣觀云), among others. Some of them, such as Zhang Binglin and Liu Shipei, were extreme anti-Manchuists at that time; others, such as Jiang Zhiyou who collaborated with Liang Qichao, were typical reformers who opposed anti-Manchuism. It is clear that the problem of the origins of the Chinese or Han race was an important issue in the political views of both groups.

One important point to note here is that their inquiries into the genesis of the Han race were dominated by the influence of the so-called theory of the Western origin of Chinese civilization, advocated by the controversial historian Albert Etienne Jean Baptiste Terrien de Lacouperie (1845-1894). Terrien de Lacouperie was a Frenchman brought up in Hong Kong where he appears to have been educated in the Chinese classics. In the 1870s he went to Britain where he established a position on the fringes of academic life, editing his journal *The Babylonian and Oriental Records* and propagating his theories.³⁸ In this critical era in modern East Asia, we often find obscure Western scholars whose views have been taken up respectfully as if they were the greatest authorities in their fields. This was the case with Terrien de Lacouperie in the field of prehistory.

Terrien de Lacouperie's theory, which appeared in publications throughout the 1880s mainly in his own journal and later compiled in his major work of 1894, *Western*

³⁷ For further details on the revolutionaries' anti-Manchuism, based on articles in *Minbao* after 1905, see Michael Gasster, *Chinese Intellectuals and the Revolution of 1911: The Birth of Modern Chinese Radicalism* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1969), chap. 3.

³⁸ H. M. Mackenzie, "Memorial notice of Prof. Terrien de Lacouperie," *The Babylonian and Oriental Records* 7.11 (1894).

Origin of the Early Chinese Civilization,³⁹ is a work of great interest, especially for laymen. He proposed that the “Bak Sings,” ancient Babylonian tribes, were the origins of the later Chinese, who often called themselves *baixing* 百姓. The “Bak Sings” were, according to him, headed by the Yellow Emperor, whose name (*Huangdi*) was similar to Kudur Kakhunti, the generic title of the kings of Babylonia. The Yellow Emperor led his people to the southwest of present-day Gansu, where he eventually founded a Chinese kingdom by conquering the Miao 苗 people, the real native Chinese. In his articles, Terrien de Lacouperie mentioned numerous coincidences between ancient Babylonia and China to support his theory, such as the notion of a cycle of twelve years, allusions in the names of the planets, knowledge of twenty-eight stellar points, and the like. In spite of many far-fetched interpretations, his ideas created a great sensation among Orientalists who had vaguely believed in a common origin between Westerners and Chinese.

The first introduction of the theory of Western origins of the Han race was made by Jiang Zhiyou in his long article, “Zhongguo renzhong kao” 中國人種考 (Inquiry into the Chinese race), in 1903,⁴⁰ and many similar introductions followed in rapid succession by Liu Shiwei, Tao Chengzhang, Zhang Binglin, and others. Jiang Zhiyou’s article not only introduced Terrien de Lacouperie’s theory for the first time, but was also in itself the first, full-fledged ethnological research study written by a Chinese concerned with the so-called Chinese race.

At first glance, it seems strange that Terrien de Lacouperie’s theory on the Western origins of Chinese civilization would be accepted not only by reformers like Jiang, but also by revolutionary nationalists like Liu, Tao, and Zhang, because the theory stressed the derivative nature of Chinese or Han culture. The best explanation for their acceptance of this theory, however, can be found right in their articles. After introducing key sections of the *Western Origin of the Early Chinese Civilisation*, Jiang’s article went on to say:

As early as four thousand years ago when all mankind was too primitive to have any transportation such as boats or carts, the ancestors of our race trekked a long way across high mountains, steep precipices, and deserts, and finally founded the great Eastern country. How great and brave were our ancestors! They accomplished the greatest undertaking that other races had not ever done. What they did is the best encouragement for us.

The same explanation is even truer of the revolutionary nationalist Liu Shiwei. He went so far as to note:

When the Han race entered China for the first time, the Chinese mainland was inhabited by the Miao. After conflict between the races, the superior defeated the inferior. Thus, all the rivers and mountains of our great continent finally fell into the hands of the Han race. That being the case, we should never forget that China wholly owes what she is to

³⁹ Terrien de Lacouperie, *Western Origin of the Early Chinese Civilisation* (London: Asher, 1894).

⁴⁰ Jiang Guanyun, “Zhongguo renzhong kao,” *Xinmin congbao* 37 (1903).

the Han race. China belongs to the Han race.⁴¹

It should be clear from these examples that the theory of the Western origins of Chinese civilization had appeal paradoxically because it satisfied the pride of its advocates as Han. This helps explain why Terrien de Lacouperie's theory was introduced in the first issue of the journal *Guocui xuebao* 國粹學報 (National essence journal), published in 1905 and dedicated to the preservation of the national essence of Chinese civilization.⁴² It may be, however, too much to say that all Chinese nationalists accepted this sort of paradoxical logic. For example, Zhang Binglin, whom most historians consider the most typical nationalist and anti-Manchu racist, later did modify and abandon this theory. In a 1904 book, he acknowledged the truth of Terrien de Lacouperie's theory; later, in 1908, he disagreed with the notion that the Yellow Emperor was an immigrant; and at last in 1910, just a year before the Revolution of 1911, he abandoned the theory altogether.⁴³ He wrote at that time:

A French scholar once advocated that the Chinese originally came from Babylonia and China was originally inhabited by the Miao people who were later expelled from her heartland by the Han people. Although I believed in it before, I have found, after thorough inquiry, that this theory isn't correct at all.⁴⁴

One explanation for Zhang's change of view may be that, as an ultra-nationalist, he could not accept a theory which stressed the derivative nature of Chinese culture, and as a realist politician, he noticed the latent threat posed by such a theory—namely, that it was likely to divide the Chinese people into several hostile camps and therefore be harmful to the future Republic.

In any event, we can be fairly certain that Terrien de Lacouperie's bold hypothesis exercised a huge influence over Chinese intellectuals who, be they revolutionaries or reformers, had a much firmer grounding in the Chinese classics than Terrien de Lacouperie did. This brings us to the question of how they got to know of Terrien de Lacouperie's theory in the first place. Strange to say, the English original of the *Western Origin of the Early Chinese Civilisation* never appeared in Chinese translation, nor was a complete Japanese translation ever published. How then did they encounter this book? Japan's role as middleman is, in fact, the key to explain why Terrien de Lacouperie's theory suddenly became so widespread in early twentieth century China. Let me now look briefly at the introduction of Terrien de Lacouperie's theory into Japan.

⁴¹ Liu Shibei, "Lun Zhongguo duiwai sixiang zhi bianqian" 論中國對外思想之變遷 (On the changes in Chinese ideas concerning foreign countries), *Jingzhong ribao* 警鍾日報, June 20-21, 1904.

⁴² Huang Jie 黃節, "Huangshi" 黃史 (History of the yellow race), *Guocui xuebao* 1 (1905).

⁴³ Zhang Binglin, "Xu zhongxing" 序種姓 (Introducing races and clans), in Zhang, *Qishu* 楮書 (The book of raillery) (1904; Shanghai rpt.: Gudian wenxue chubanshe, 1958), pp. 41-56; Zhang, "Pai Man pingyi" 排滿平議 (About driving out the Manchus), *Minbao* 21 (1908); Zhang, "Lun jiaoyu de genben yao cong ziguozixin fachulai" 論教育的根本要從自國自心發出來 (The basis of education should come from our own country and our own hearts), *Jiaoyu jinyu zazhi* 教育今語雜誌 3 (1910).

⁴⁴ Zhang, "Lun jiaoyu de genben yao cong ziguozixin fachulai," *Jiaoyu jinyu zazhi* 3 (1910).

As far as I have been able to determine, the introduction of Terrien de Lacoupérie's theory into Japan goes back to 1896, seven years earlier than that in China, when Miyake Yonekichi 三宅米吉 (1860-1929) published an article titled "Rakūperi-shi ga Shina kodai no kaika no kigen ni tsukite no setsu" ラクウペリ氏が支那古代の開化の起源に就ての説 (Professor Lacoupérie's theory about the origins of ancient Chinese civilization).⁴⁵ Miyake Yonekichi was then a professor of history at Tokyo Higher Normal School and had just returned from London, where he had an opportunity to read Terrien de Lacoupérie's essays. In his article, Miyake introduced the outline of the *Western Origin of the Early Chinese Civilization*, and concluded: "We cannot completely agree with his interpretation. However, I cannot help being surprised to find numerous coincidences between ancient Babylonia and China. It is likely that there were certain relationships between ancient Babylonia and China."

It is also interesting to note that, in the same year of 1896, another Japanese historian offered a commentary on Terrien de Lacoupérie's book. He is none other than Kuwabara Jitsuzō, mentioned earlier as a founder of modern Japanese Oriental studies. In his maiden academic essay, "Shina no taiko ni kansuru Tōyō gakusha no shosetsu ni tsuki" 支那の太古に関する東洋學者の所説に就き (On some Orientalists' views about ancient China), Kuwabara, after quoting some key sentences of Terrien de Lacoupérie's book, leveled a biting critique of it. He produced numerous pieces of evidence to counter Terrien de Lacoupérie, and noted: "I can not agree with his interpretation at all. Some Orientalists in the West seem to advocate the Western origins of all world civilizations out of a certain racial emotion or religious faith of theirs. This kind of theory will never be accepted in the academic world."⁴⁶ It will be clear from these two examples that Terrien de Lacoupérie's book was criticized as soon as it was introduced into Japan. That is, the Western origins of early Chinese civilization was treated as a suspicious theory by some Japanese professional scholars from the very beginning.

As we often see, however, academic evaluation is one thing, and public evaluation can be quite another. Despite these refutations, interest in the fascinating and easily grasped theory of the "Western origins of early Chinese civilization" did not die. The bestseller *Shina bunmei shi* 支那文明史 (History of Chinese Civilization) was a typical example.⁴⁷ Written by two non-academic historians in 1900, four years after Kuwabara's criticism, *Shina bunmei shi* devoted an entire chapter to a favorable and detailed introduction of Terrien de Lacoupérie's book and emphasized that it was an epoch-making work. One can safely assume that Terrien de Lacoupérie's name and his theory became widely known in Japan through the introduction in *Shina bunmei shi* rather than in the academic writings of Miyake or Kuwabara.

We should note that *Shina bunmei shi* was not a translation of Terrien de Lacoupérie's book in the exact sense of the word. That is, the two Japanese writers of the

⁴⁵ Miyake, "Rakūperi-shi ga Shina kodai no kaika no kigen ni tsukite no setsu," *Shigaku zasshi* 史学雑誌 79 (1896).

⁴⁶ Kuwabara, "Shina no taiko ni kansuru Tōyō gakusha no shosetsu ni tsuki," *Kokumin no tomo* 国民の友 287-88 (1896), in *Kuwabara Jitsuzō zenshū*, 1: 132

⁴⁷ Shirakawa Jirō 白河次郎 and Kokubu Tanenori 国府種徳, *Shina bunmei shi* (Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1900).

book did translate some of the main points of Terrien de Lacouperie; but, they added, without making mention of it, some examples of their own on the similarity between ancient Babylonia and China. Initially, I believed that the chapter of the book in question would be a translation of the *Western Origin of the Early Chinese Civilization* or other pamphlets of Terrien de Lacouperie.⁴⁸ But, after gathering almost all of the works of Terrien de Lacouperie, I ultimately came to the conclusion that some parts of the chapter were, surprisingly, invented by these Japanese writers using Terrien de Lacouperie's name. In spite of this, why they introduced him the way they did remains something of a mystery—Terrien de Lacouperie's book was a mishmash of various articles by him published in his journal, and was thus highly awkward in its construction. In this sense, we might say that *Shina bunmei shi* made Terrien de Lacouperie's theory more palatable by adding some clear examples and simplifying the original theory. Indeed, *Shina bunmei shi* owed its rise on the bestsellers' list to its style.

The impact of *Shina bunmei shi* was so immense that there appeared a sort of Terrien de Lacouperie boom—or, to put it more precisely, many began quoting from Terrien de Lacouperie via *Shina bunmei shi* in the first decade of the twentieth century. Almost all of the Chinese articles which referred to the Western origins of early Chinese civilization were this kind of second-hand quotation. To take just one simple example, Jiang Zhiyou's article "Inquiry into the Chinese race," the first introduction of Terrien de Lacouperie's theory into China, was little more than a translation, or rather adaptation, from *Shina bunmei shi*. The same is true of numerous articles by Liu Shipai, Tao Chengzhang, Zhang Binglin, and others.⁴⁹ One should note in passing that a Chinese translation of *Shina bunmei shi* was published in 1903, three years after the Japanese edition and the same year as Jiang Zhiyou's essay.⁵⁰ I cannot say for certain whether these Chinese intellectuals, including Jiang Zhiyou, referred to this Chinese translation, because information on it is limited. We do not know, for example, who translated it, or what the Jinghuashe 竞化社 which published it was. One thing, however, is certain: the Chinese translation of *Shina bunmei shi* must have convinced more Chinese intellectuals that their ancient civilization had originated in Mesopotamia, the heartland of all civilizations. Space prevents a full discussion of the subsequent development of the theory of Western origins of early Chinese civilization in China. Suffice it to say here that although the theory is largely denied today, some Chinese ancient historians, such as Lu Maode 陸懋德 (b. 1888), Dong Zuobin 董作賓 (1895-1963), Guo Moruo 郭沫若 (1892-1978), and Gu Jiegang 顧頡剛 (1893-1980), were influenced to a greater or lesser degree by this theory before the 1940s.

⁴⁸ See, for example, Terrien de Lacouperie, *Early History of the Chinese Civilisation* (London: E. Vatou, 1880); Terrien de Lacouperie, *The Old Babylonian Characters And Their Chinese Derivates* (London: The Babylonian and Oriental Record, 1888).

⁴⁹ Liu Shipai, *Zhongguo minzu zhi* 中國民族志 (Chinese Ethnography, 1905), in *Liu Shenshu yishu* 劉申叔遺書 (Posthumous works of Liu Shipai) (Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1997), p.603; Tao Chengzhang, *Zhongguo minzu quanli xiaozhang shi* 中國民族權力消長史 (The history of the rise and fall of the might of the Chinese people, 1904), in *Tao Chengzhang ji* 陶成章集 (Works of Tao Chengzhang) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986), pp. 231-47; Zhang Binglin, *Qiu shu*, pp. 41-56.

⁵⁰ *Zhina wenming shi* 支那文明史 (Shanghai: Jinghuashe, 1903).

Let us move to a discussion of the different meanings that the theory of the Western origins of early Chinese civilization had in Japan and China by analyzing the case of Song Jiaoren, and then advance a perspective for explaining the characteristics of Japanese influence on modern China. Song Jiaoren (1881-1913), one of the eminent revolutionary leaders, was also one of the advocates of the theory of the Western origins of early Chinese civilization. From 1904 to 1907, Song kept a diary largely covering his experiences in Japan.⁵¹ His diary is extremely useful for us to understand the relationship between his reading and writing in Tokyo, and demonstrates vividly how eager Chinese students were in absorbing modern Western systems of thought via Japanese translations. How then did he come to encounter Terrien de Lacouperie's theory in his reading?

According to his diary, in September 1906, after he had been in Japan for ten months, Song saw, for the first time, Terrien de Lacouperie's theory cited in a newspaper. Song records excitedly on September 3, 1906: "I found an interesting article in a newspaper. According to it, the French Orientalist Lacouperie recently proved conclusively that the origin of the Chinese race was the Sumerians and Akkadians of Mesopotamia who later came to the East. His theory is not a conjecture but a conclusion drawn from scientific research in several fields."⁵² The article he referred to here was Sasaki Yasugorō's 佐々木安五郎 "Takakusu hakase no 'Monju shosetsu shukuyō roku ni miyuru nijūhachi-shuku jūnikyū shichiyō no meimoku ni tsukite' o yomu" 高楠博士の「文珠所説宿曜録に見ゆる二十八宿十二宮七曜の名目に就て」を読む (Review on Dr. Takakusu's "On the names of the twenty-eight stellar points, the twelve signs of the zodiac and the seven days in the Buddhist scriptures"), which was published in the Japanese newspaper *Yomiuri shinbun* 讀賣新聞 on that very day.⁵³

This article was Sasaki's interpretation of Terrien de Lacouperie's theory as well as his impressions of another interpretation of Terrien de Lacouperie's theory written just before by Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 (1866-1948), a leading figure in Japanese Buddhist studies.⁵⁴ Sasaki's article which acknowledged the Western origins of the Chinese stimulated Song Jiaoren so much that Song kept on reading Sasaki's subsequent articles later published serially in *Yomiuri shinbun*'s Sunday edition, and wrote down summaries in his diary.⁵⁵ Thus, guided by Sasaki's explanation, Song became yet another follower of Terrien de Lacouperie's theory.

Song Jiaoren's acceptance of Terrien de Lacouperie's theory can probably be explained along the same lines as that of Jiang Zhiyou, Liu Shiwei, and other Chinese intellectuals. That is, the theory of the Western origins of the early Han race could satisfy their self-respect as Han, the great conquerors. But a second question now rears its head: Who in the world was Sasaki Yasugorō? And, why did he advocate Terrien de

⁵¹ *Song Jiaoren riji* 宋教仁日記 (Diary of Song Jiaoren) (Changsha: Hunan renmin chubanshe, 1980); Matsumoto Hideki 松本英紀, trans. and annot., *Sō Kyōjin no nikki* 宋教仁の日記 (Diary of Song Jiaoren) (Kyoto: Dōhōsha shuppan, 1989).

⁵² Song, *Song Jiaoren riji*, p. 228.

⁵³ Sasaki Yasugorō 佐々木安五郎, "Takakusu hakase no 'Monju shosetsu shukuyō roku ni miyuru nijūhachi-shuku jūnikyū shichiyō no meimoku ni tsukite' o yomu," *Yomiuri shinbun*, September 3, 1906.

⁵⁴ Takakusu's article was published in *Yomiuri shinbun* on August 12 and 19, 1906.

⁵⁵ Song, *Song Jiaoren riji*, pp. 235, 245-46, 254-56, 265-67, 277-80, 282-83.

Lacoupérie's theory? At first glance, Sasaki's article is just one of many rehashes of Terrien de Lacoupérie which appeared like so many mushrooms in Japan following the publication of *Shina bunmei shi*. But, when we look into his background, we find another hidden interpretation of Terrien de Lacoupérie's theory.

Sasaki Yasugorō (1872-1934) was a Japanese authority on Mongolia at that time, a so-called *Mōkotsū* 蒙古通, and a hard-liner or expansionist, often dubbed the "King of Mongolia 蒙古王" by his buddies, those generally called *tairiku rōnin* 大陸浪人 (continental adventurers). In the first decade of the twentieth century, he also developed some new theories of his own, such as the theory of the same origins of the Mongolian and Japanese peoples (*Nichi-Mō dōsoron* 日蒙同祖論) and the theory of the Hebrew origins of the Japanese race (*Nihon jinshu Heburai kigenron* 日本人種ヘブライ起源説). Obviously, the aim of these highly suspect theories was to justify Japanese continental expansion. We can now see his advocacy of Terrien de Lacoupérie's theory was, by no means, motivated by a desire to develop historical research, but to support his expansionism: The Chinese were just an immigrant people from the West. So, why can't we expand our territory onto the Asian Continent? For Sasaki, this was the implied meaning of the theory of the Western origins of early Chinese civilization.

As far as I conclude at this point, there is no evidence in Song's diary that he was aware of the implied meaning in Sasaki's work. For Song who intended to recover the glory of the Han Chinese by overthrowing the Manchus, the meaning of Terrien de Lacoupérie's theory was no more than that it might be used to remind all Han Chinese of the great feat of their ancestors. In other words, the theory of the Western origins of early Chinese civilization which was regarded as an established theory at that time was, in fact, expected to play different roles by different supporters. In this sense, Terrien de Lacoupérie's theory, as well as modern anthropology itself, was destined to take on political characteristics from its inception.

We need to take the introduction of modern anthropology into consideration when we analyze the anti-Manchu racism of the 1911 Revolution period. Similarly, we need to take the revolutionary movement and the political situation in the late Qing period into consideration when we analyze the rise of anthropology in modern China. Chinese revolutionaries were, on the one hand, propagandists of anti-Manchuism, and on the other hand, they were introducers of modern Western anthropology into China. As anti-Manchu propagandists, they were good at stirring up anti-Manchu emotions among the people to foment revolution; as early introducers of anthropology, they continually absorbed foreign theories and developed historical work on the origins of the Chinese race in their disputes with the reformers. At the same time, however, we need to point out that anthropology in modern China which was initially expected to play a political role, in its subsequent development could not break away from a sense of the superiority of the Han Chinese over other minority nationalities including the Manchus. An American anthropologist by the name of Stephen O. Murray describes this inclination as follows:

In some basic ways, Han anthropologists have failed to address the charge that their "applied" anthropology is engaged primarily in the process of aiding the assimilation of "primitives" into Han civilization, which is as transparent a goal as the Western

civilization colonial anthropologists wanted to bring to benighted “savages.”⁵⁶

Not being an expert on anthropology in present-day China, I cannot say for certain whether this comment is fully correct or not. However, if it is correct, we cannot help noting that anti-Manchu racism, the spirit of the late Qing revolutionary movement, which stimulated the rise of anthropology, has exercised a serious and deep influence on the subsequent development of Chinese anthropology.

⁵⁶ Cited in Gregory E. Guldin, *The Saga of Anthropology in China: from Malinowski to Moscow to Mao* (New York: M. E. Sharpe, 1994), p. 247.