

Chinese National Revitalization and Social Darwinism in Lu Xun's Work

By

Yuanhai Zhu

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for
the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Comparative Literature

University of Alberta

©Yuanhai Zhu, 2015

Abstract

This thesis explores decolonizing nationalism in early 20th century China through its literary embodiment. The topic in the thesis is Lu Xun, a canonical modern Chinese realist whose work is usually and widely discussed in scholarly works on Chinese literature and Chinese history in this period. Meanwhile, late 19th century and early 20th century, as the only semi-post-colonial period in China, has been investigated by many scholars via the theoretical lens of post-colonialism. The intellectual experience in China during this period is usually featured by the encounters between Eastern and Western intellectual worlds, the translation and appropriation of Western texts in the domestic Chinese intellectual world. In this view, Lu Xun's work is often explored through his individualism which is in debt to Nietzsche, as well as other western romanticists and existentialists. My research purpose is to reinvestigate several central topics in Lu Xun's thought, like the diagnosis of the Chinese national character, the post-colonial trauma, the appropriation of Nietzsche and the critique of imperialism and colonization. These factors are intertwined with each other in Lu Xun's work and embody the historical situation in which the Chinese decolonizing nationalism is being bred and developed. Furthermore, by showing how Lu Xun's appropriation of Nietzsche falls short of but also challenges its original purport, the thesis demonstrates the critique of imperialism that Chinese decolonizing nationalism initiates, as well as the aftermath which it brings to modern China. In the conclusion, I argue that Chinese nationalism, as a historical continuum which ranges from the late 19th century until now, in fact falls

short of the blueprint of it imagined by Lu Xun, in which an independent modern nation is achieved based upon the realization of the liberty and dignity of each of its subjects. On the contrary, the result is that the material improvement of it covers its inside tyranny.

Table of Contents

Introduction:.....	1
Chapter One	4
The Post-Colonial Trauma and the Diagnosis of the Chinese National Character .	4
Chapter Two	28
Mara Poets, National Revitalization and Evolution.....	28
Chapter Three.....	54
The Healthy and the Unhealthy Nationalism: Against the Hegemony of Imperialism and Colonization.....	54
Chapter Four	70
Conclusion: The Tension between Individualism and Nationalism in Modern China	70

Introduction:

This thesis examines the early 20th century Chinese writer Lu Xun and explores the major dynamics of Chinese literature and intellectual history in the late 19th and early 20th centuries in China. During this period, post-colonial experience, national consciousness, and patterns of East-West cultural exchange, such as Chinese translation and appropriation of western literature and philosophy, are usually intertwined with each other. Also, studies that investigate late 19th and early 20th century Chinese literature from a post-colonial perspective have been produced by many scholars, such as Lydia Liu, Rebecca E.Karl, Jing Tsu, and Shih Shu-mei. In general, Chinese intellectual engagement with national survival stems from the traumatic experience of post-colonial suffering. For Lu Xun, in particular, the international intellectual connection between Nietzsche and him remains an important topic. Lu Xun's early thought is deeply influenced by Western romanticism and existentialism, which emphasizes the dignity of individuality and free will. In my thesis, I will reinvestigate the relation between postcolonial suffering and modern Chinese nationalism by exploring Lu Xun's political thought contained in his essays and stories. I am especially interested in the comparison of Nietzsche and Lu Xun's social thought. In my thesis I try to move beyond the apparent intellectual connection between Nietzsche's individualism and Lu Xun's early thought, which has been addressed in numerous scholarly works on Lu Xun. In Chapter two and three of my thesis, I attempt to compare Lu Xun and Nietzsche's ideas on nationalism, especially the relation between nationalism and individuality, and nationalism and global democracy. The comparison of Lu Xun and Nietzsche's thoughts on nationalism has rarely been explored. As a diagnostician of Chinese society, Lu Xun's social thought as an extension of his literary achievement deserves to be reconsidered. Meanwhile, both Lu Xun and Nietzsche are thinkers who sit on the middle position between literature and political philosophy.

My thesis is organized in four chapters. The first chapter explores Lu Xun's traumatic experience in Japan, his attitude toward domestic Chinese revolution in the late 19th century, his diagnosis of Chinese national character, and his view of cultural evolution as improvement of national character. The second chapter analyzes Lu Xun's appropriation of Nietzsche. Nietzsche's individualism is characterized by Lu Xun as the healthy character indispensable for Chinese national revitalization. However, this appropriation of Nietzsche in fact deviates from Nietzsche's original intention to overcome anxieties of the modern age, especially the nation-state as the new "resentment" of Europeans. The third chapter is dedicated to Lu Xun's egalitarian thought on global justice. Building on these three chapters, the last chapter critiques Lu Xun's complex formulation of nationalism. Lu Xun's enthusiasm of nationalism is blind to the aftermath of nationalism which Nietzsche foresees. As Walter Kaufmann, the most eminent Nietzschean scholar who endeavors to recover the intellectual heritage of Nietzsche, advocates, Nietzsche is a critic of Nazism, rather than the godfather of it. However, Lu Xun's thought on global democracy also suggests the limitation of Nietzsche's thought. Therefore, an interesting point in Lu Xun's thought is that nationalism and internationalism do not contradict each other. On the contrary, for him, international democracy should be the extension of national independence.

A brief consideration of Casanova's *World Republic of Letters* helps contextualize Lu Xun's notions of nation. Casanova identifies two kinds of relations between nation and individual authors. Globalization compels local authors to identify themselves with their invented national tradition. In this case, national identity plays the role as loudspeaker which helps to exaggerate local authors' voices. On the other hand, for authors who live in a culturally or ideologically constrained local world, to join "world literature" is a way to escape from local tyranny. These two relations between nation and its local authors are intertwined with each other in 20th century China. The history of 20th-century China sees China overcome western colonization, achieving national independence. It also sees how China gradually becomes a party-centered government after 1949. Hence the last chapter is mainly about the aftermath of Chinese nationalism that arises in late 19th and early 20th century, an

aftermath that is not clearly foreseen by Lu Xun's generation.

Chapter One

The Post-Colonial Trauma and the Diagnosis of the Chinese National Character

The auto-biographical short story “Mr. Fujino” (*Tengye Xiansheng*, 藤野先生), originally published on December, 10th, 1926 and included in *Zhaohua Xishi* (朝花夕拾), published in September, 1928, is one of Lu Xun’s most remarkable pieces. Lu Xun originally trained as a medical student in Japan and his career as a realistic writer begins after this period of study abroad. This career transition is almost a commonplace that appears in much of the scholarship regarding Lu Xun. After studying in a medical school in Japan, Lu Xun resolutely decides to be a writer rather than a doctor, since in his view, the only way to save his own nation is not through technology, but literature. In other words, in his view, China is not physically but mentally diseased. In this sense “Mr. Fujino” reveals the inner-mental journey that Lu Xun travels during this transforming period and provides us with a cultural motive for his abrupt transition from medical science to literature after his medical school training.

The mental journey in “Mr. Fujino” corresponds to the historical transition in Eastern Asia and also parallels the situation that China faces at that time. Hence Lu Xun’s travelling experience in this story could be read as a miniature of the historical situation in Eastern Asia in the late 19th century and the early 20th century. From a historical perspective, this story is concerned with imperialism, national revitalization, and science. In order to explore these dimensions in this story, it would be helpful to begin with the correlation between Lu Xun’s travelling to Japan and the geopolitical transition in Eastern Asia. Lu Xun’s travelling in this story has a clear geo-political background. He travels from China to Japan, and his purpose is to learn western medical science to advance medicine in China and save the Chinese people physically. This story contains an important historical background, namely, the rise of Japan and the fall of China in the late 19th century and the early 20th century. In the story, Lu Xun especially pinpoints the Russo-Japanese war as the specific background of the

story. The Russo-Japanese war from 1904 to 1905 was Japan's most remarkable victory at that time and this helped Japan to establish its political authority within Eastern Asia. The Chinese acceptance of western ideas, including both scientific knowledge and social-political thought in this period, is largely enabled indirectly through Japan. Before the Russia-Japan war in this story, China had already failed in its war against Japan in 1894. With the rise of Japan, the geo-political order in Eastern Asia was restructured. China hence failed to maintain its traditional leading position within this area and for the Chinese people, Japan became a model of modernization from which they needed to learn. Thus in the late 19th century, Chinese students began to travel abroad to study in the universities in other countries, including both Japan and the western world. Lu Xun's travelling in "Mr. Fujino" in this context shows that his experience in this way is not different from the experience of other people in his era. In other words, this story contains his worldview that Japan is at least technologically superior to China. His geo-political perspective at that time is that he travels from the inferior to the superior world.

Just as the Japanese imperialism and the geo-political transition in Eastern Asia provides the historical background of "Mr. Fujino", the relation between imperialism, scientific knowledge, and national revitalization in this story is atypical embodiment of the logic of colonization. A common Chinese impression of the western world in this period is that its scientific-technological and institutional advantages help the West become superior to the East. In this sense the Chinese people in the post-colonial context believe that national revitalization requires vast technological and the institutional improvement, and for the sake of revitalizing their own nation, the Chinese need to learn modernization from the West. According to "Mr. Fujino", Lu Xun's original worldview before his internal transition during his Japan period is not different from this common worldview anticipating Chinese nation-building. This nationalistic purpose is also the reason why Lu Xun's narrator deeply appreciates his medical professor Mr. Fujino in the Sendai medical school. As Lu Xun's narrator indicates:

Sometimes I always think that his enthusiastic hope for me and his indefatigable

tutelage, narrowly speaking, is for China, for the hope that China will have new medical science; broadly speaking, is for the sake of academy, for the hope that the new medical science could be introduced to China. His person, in my view, is great, although his name is not widely known by many people. (310)

(有时我常常想: 他的对于我的热心的希望, 不倦的教诲, 小而言之, 是为中国, 就是希望中国有新的医学; 大而言之, 是为学术, 就是希望新的医学传到中国去。他的性格, 在我的眼里和心里是伟大的, 虽然他的姓名并不为许多人所知道。)

This professional appreciation suggests that the archetypal impression that ‘science saves the nation’ is deeply engraved in his mind, even after his internal transition during this period.

Lu Xun’s concern with modern science and technology is also illustrated by some of his other writings. For instance, in his essay “On the History of Science”(Ke Xue Shi Jiao Pian, 科学史教篇) written in June, 1907, he especially mentions the example of how science saves France during the period of the French Revolution at the end of his article. In the year 1792, France was invaded by other countries. Meanwhile, as Lu Xun points out, due to the lack of gun powder, iron and bronze ores, the French military was particularly weak at that time, and was unable to defend itself. However, in this case, it is the French scientists who save the nation from its enemies by inventing new ways of producing gun power, bronze and iron. Therefore, the French army strengthens their weapons with the help of the scientists, such Monge and Carnot (285). While this essay basically charts the beneficial development of natural science in a formative moment in western history, this short historical episode concerned with the French Revolution at the end of this essay particularly indicates Lu Xun’s intention. Here Lu Xun’s interest in the French Revolution especially focuses on how science saves the nation. This narrative strategy indirectly uncovers his worldview: During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the main reaction of the Chinese people to colonization is that Western scientific/technological improvements could save their struggling nation. This point also appears in Lu Xun’s essay “On

Chinese Geology” (Zhongguo Dizhi Luelun, 中国地质略论). At the end of this essay, after the generalization of the Chinese geological situation, Lu Xun turns sympathetically to China’s political situation at that time. Generally speaking, after the 1894 Sino-Japanese war, western countries begin to pillage the natural resources in China, particularly ore. With a brief reflection upon this severe situation, Lu Xun argues that Chinese people should be aware of Western exploitation of the Chinese natural resources. Since industrial development and modernization are tied to natural resources, like ores, this political awareness is incumbent upon the Chinese people to save their own land from the hand of the imperialists (45-46).

Lu Xun’s political investment in natural science is also illustrated by some of his translations, for example, the science fiction novels *From the Earth to the Moon* and *A Journey to the Center of the Earth* by Jules Gabriel Verne. *From the Earth to the Moon* is a story about an imagined ‘Baltimore Gun Club’, a post-civil-war club in the US, and how the members in this club devote all their energy to creating a skyward ‘Columbia Space Gun’ to shoot three people to the moon (46-105). Verne’s science fiction was apolitical originally, but when read in the historical context of Lu Xun’s world, these two science fictions become imbued with their translator’s nationalistic atmosphere. The strong will to create the super-gun to reach the moon in *From the Earth to the Moon* parallels Lu Xun’s strong will to foster a cultural context to improve modern technology in China.

Over his literary career, Lu Xun never gives up the idea that national revitalization specifically requires scientific improvement. What Lu Xun wants to argue is that the scientific/technological improvement is not sufficient for this task, and this belief originates in his experience in Japan. The central plot in “Mr. Fujino” is about humiliation and trauma. Lu Xun indicates that his competence and future are seriously suspected by the more capable Japanese students, since his grade is ranked merely in the middle in his class:

The other sentences basically mean that the reason why I could pass the anatomy course in the last year is that Mr. Fujino makes special marks on my in-class notes to let me know the test questions. (308)

（其次的话，大略是说上年解剖学试验的题目，是藤野先生在讲义上做了记号，我预先知道的，所以能有这样的成绩。）

Lu Xun is really hurt by this episode of special assistance that crosses over into academic cheating. His own explanation for this hidden assistance is that China, and therefore the Chinese people, are inherently weak in the Japanese view:

China is a weak country, so that Chinese are certainly mentally disabled. They are unable to get a grade above sixty [i.e., a passing grade]. Otherwise, the grade is certainly not based on their own ability. Hence undoubtedly they suspect my grade. (309)

（中国是弱国，所以中国人当然是低能儿，分数在六十分以上，便不是自己的能力了：也无怪他们疑惑。）

Lu Xun's narration of the Japanese students' stereotypical impression of him uncovers a deep layer of his mind, his weak self-impression. This Japanese stereotype against Chinese students actually reinforces his own negative impression of his motherland, namely that Chinese people are weak. This episode is just the beginning of his traumatic experience in Japan. Shortly after this academic and cultural experience, he suffers a real trauma in a slide-watching class:

In the second year, mycology is added to the curriculum, and the shape of the bacterium is completely demonstrated by the slide. If the content of the course is already finished but there is still a short time before the end of the class, we usually watch several slides in terms of the current events, basically in regard to the battle between Japan and Russia, and how Russia is beaten by Japan. But there are always Chinese in the battle, and usually as the spies who serve the Russian army. The Chinese spies are caught by the Japanese army, and will be sentenced. At that time the people who were watching the film was also a group of Chinese. Meanwhile, I was in that class.

“Cheers!” They were all applauding.

This kind of jubilation appeared during every slide-show. But for me, this applauding was particularly jarring. After that when I was back to China, I saw those people who enjoyed watching the criminals being shot. They were as hilarious as those who are drunk. Alas! Unimaginable! But at that time and at that place, my worldview was totally changed by that. (309)

（第二年添教霉菌学，细菌的形状是全用电影来显示的，一段落已完而还没有到下课的时候，便影几片时事的片子，自然都是日本战胜俄国的情形。但偏有中国人夹在里边：给俄国人做侦探，被日本军捕获，要枪毙了，围着看的也是一群中国人：在讲堂里的还有一个我。“万岁”他们都拍掌欢呼

起来。这种欢呼，是看每一片都有的，但在我，这一声却特别听得刺耳。此后回到中国来，我看见那些闲看枪毙犯人们的人们，他们也何尝不酒醉似的喝彩，一呜呼，无法可想！但在那时那地，我的意见却变化了。）

This descriptive paragraph uncovers the most important and decisive internal transition in Lu Xun's life. At the end of this description, Lu Xun argues that this episode completely changes his worldview, though, in fact, Lu Xun does not directly tell his readers exactly what changes inside him. This circumstantial description, however, indirectly reveals the significant psychological transition his experience forces him to undergo. What actually shocks Lu Xun is that among the Japanese students the educated Chinese students—who are specifically doctors in training—are also happy and amused with what should sadden and disturb them. Those Chinese students watching the movie were indifferent to those Chinese spies who were sentenced by the Japanese army in the slide. This episode happens during the Russia-Japan war and those Chinese in the movie are sentenced as the spies who serve the Russian army, or the beaten side. The weak will be beaten and the strong will survive. In other words, what shocks Lu Xun is that the Chinese are happy to accept the unhappy situation that they are already in.

In a contemporary view, what this episode suggests is the logic of nationalism and imperialism, as well as the political violence that results from this. The Chinese spies who are sentenced in that movie belong to the category of what Giorgio Agamben calls the 'bare life'. The 'bare life' refers to the logic of political violence, nationalism and sovereign power. Namely, there is always a group of people who have to be sentenced illegally in order to maintain the authority of a specific sovereign power. This group of people could be generally defined as the 'political enemy' of the sovereignty. They comprise the inferior class of a society and are brutalized by the sovereign power beyond the normal legal procedure (Agamben 27). Therefore, it is Japanese imperialism that places Russia and China in the inferior position, and the Japanese army brutalizes its defeated enemy with no consideration of international justice. Lu Xun's point also strongly opposes imperialism, colonization, and violence. He raises a more developed critique against imperialism, for instance, in his essay

“Against the Voice of the Mass”(Po Esheng Lun, 破恶声论), or indirectly via his translation of another writer’s work, such as Mushanokoji’s “A Young Man’s Dream”(Yige Qingnian de Meng, 一个青年的梦) However, the difference between “Mr. Fujino” and these pieces is that the critique of imperialism is not what “Mr. Fujino” focuses on, although this autobiographical story is also about imperialism. In this case, what attracts Lu Xun’s attention is the Chinese audience’s reaction to the slides. Lu Xun essentializes their abnormal reaction to the slaughtering of their fellow-men and makes the essentialization of this phenomenon as the national character of Chinese people, or the essence of them. In his view, the character of Chinese people is featured by obedience, especially the obedience to the violence of the stronger. “Mr. Fujino” is not the only story in which Chinese people are characterized by obedience. In Lu Xun’s view, obedience, as a main characteristic of the Chinese people, emerges in many different circumstances. The obedience toward the violence of imperialism is therefore the embodiment of this national characteristic in a special context. But what Lu Xun specifically attempts to indicate is that the obedience toward the violence of imperialism reveals the social-psychological origin of the fall of China in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Therefore, instead of the common presumption that the fall of China is due only to its shortage of modern technology and institutions, Lu Xun turns to a far deeper psychological diagnosis of the fall of China.

As Jing Tsu indicates, the image of Ah-Q represents the national failure of China in a global age (Tsu 120). In fact, instead of Ah-Q, the character of Kong Yiji miniaturizes the national failure of China more vividly. In “Kong Yiji (孔乙己)”, Lu Xun makes Kong Yiji, the protagonist, an embodiment of both the public and private aspects of a traditional Chinese intellectual. He feels the necessity of maintaining his dignity as an educated, upper-class man in the public sphere in front of the average people. On the other hand, however, he has to steal from others occasionally to sustain his life. The paradox of his behavior eventually results in his misery. He is caught once when stealing from a local gentry. He is beaten. The beating lasted nearly a whole night and eventually they broke both his legs. At the end of the story, the last

time when he frequents Lu Zhen's tavern, he sits on the ground and pushes himself off with his hands (144-147). If both Ah-Q and Kong Yiji represent the Chinese national character in Lu Xun's view, the final scenario in "Kong Yiji" particularly resembles the national failure of China both physically and mentally. Namely, Lu Xun suggests that China, as a country, resembles a disabled man whose legs are broken in a failed battle with the stronger, sitting on the ground deprived of all his dignity. Similar to "Mr. Fujino", Lu Xun in "Kong Yiji" attempts to argue that this national failure is not only due to the invasion by the stronger, but more subtly caused by the inner weakness of the character of the nation, which is personified by the pretensions but severe limitations of Kong Yiji.

In Lu Xun's view, obedience as the Chinese national character is not only blamable for its international failure, but also accountable for its domestic failure, the failure of revolution as evolution in Chinese society. In other words, China not only fails to resist western imperialism, but also fails to improve itself and to escalate itself to a higher stage of the history of its own cultural evolution. The domestic failure of revolution and the international failure thereby co-exist in relation to each other. Since China is never able to evolve toward a higher historical stage, it is incapable of counterbalancing the intrusive western forces. Both the international and the domestic failures have the same social-psychological origin, namely, obedience as national character of China. In this sense, Lu Xun attempts to investigate the failure of the domestic revolutions by interrogating the national character of the average people in China, for instance, the average people portrayed in "Medicine"(药).

"Medicine" is a short story first published on *Xin qing nian* (新青年), in May, 1919, included in *Na han* (呐喊), published in August, 1923. The character of the protagonist in "Medicine" largely parallels the character of the Chinese audience in "Mr. Fujino". "Medicine" is created based on a traditional superstitious idea that a steamed-bun saturated by human blood could cure tuberculosis. The protagonist, Hua Xiaoshuan, is an adolescent infected by tuberculosis. His father, Hua Laoshuan, buys a bloody steamed-bun for his son from the public beheading ritual. The executioner saturates the steamed-bun in the blood springing from the beheaded body to make this

special medicine for curing tuberculosis (163-165). The beheaded young man in the story is a revolutionist in the late Qing dynasty. Historically speaking, the Qing dynasty is overthrown by the 1911 revolution. But before this successful revolution, there are already several unsuccessful subversions attempted by the revolutionists who expect to replace the traditional empire with the modern body politic. According to the story, the beheaded young revolutionist, Xia Yu, claims that “the Qing dynasty should not be privatized by the emperor, but should be democratized by everyone.” (167) Unfortunately, the young protagonist, Hua Xiaoshuan, is not cured by this bloody and superstitious remedy. At the end of the story, the protagonist Hua Xiaoshuan and the heroic revolutionist Xia Yu are buried together side by side. Their mothers also hold memorial ceremonies for their sons in front of the graves together (170). In this story, Lu Xun fictionalizes the average people’s indifference toward the hero who dies for attempting to revolutionize the country, or in other words, the hero who dies for them. With this depicted sense of national oblivion, Lu Xun attributes the reason for the failed revolution to the mediocrity of the masses. In his view, the revolution is not only silenced by the executioner, or the bureaucratic system of the empire, but rendered impotent by the indifference and the mediocrity of the masses. This story’s cultural tenor corresponds to the tenor of “Mr. Fujino”: namely, what China needs is a political reformation, but that will only be possible with a reformation of the national character. It is not possible to change the country without changing the character of its subjects at first.

To some extent, the audience in “Mr. Fujino” is the prototype of Lu Xun’s depiction of the protagonist’s character in “Medicine”. In *Voices from the Iron House*, Leo-Lee quotes a speech given in 1923 by Lu Xun in regard to the Chinese people as the intended audience;

The masses, especially in China, are always spectators at a drama. If the victim on the stage acts heroically, they are watching a tragedy; if he shivers and shakes, they are watching a comedy. Before the mutton shops in Peking a few people often gather to gape, with evident enjoyment, at the skinning of the sheep. And this is all they get out of it if a man lays down his life. Moreover, after walking a few steps away from the scene they forget even this modicum of enjoyment. There is nothing you can do with such people; the only way to

save them is to give them no drama to watch. (72)

His traumatic experience in Japan watching the Chinese students cheer the slide show reminds him of the Chinese people watching the skinning of sheep. As Lu Xun points out, for Chinese people, there is no difference between watching the skinning of sheep and watching the slaughtering of their fellow citizens. “Medicine” also begins with a scenario of the people watching the beheading of the young revolutionist Xia Yu. As Lu Xun describes, “the necks of those audiences who are watching the beheading of Xia Yu are like a group of ducks seized by some invisible hands.” (164) In Lu Xun’s view, Chinese people are naturally inclined to be the passive, obedient audience of everything that attracts their attention. To be the audience suggests that Chinese people are accepting of, and therefore obedient to, everything in their world. Hence they are usually unwilling to participate in any attempt to change their current world. “Medicine” is not the only Lu Xun story in memory of the heroes who die in the revolution. In “The Story of the Hair”(头发的故事), first published on December 10th, 1920, included in *Na han* in August, 1923, Lu Xun poses a question regarding the essence of the 1911 revolution that overthrew the Qing dynasty. The story begins with the “double-tens holiday”, a holiday in memory of the October 10th 1911, the day when the first insurrection of the 1911 revolution begins in the city of Wu Chang. On October 10th, the protagonist in the story happens to find that the “double-tens holiday” is surprisingly not marked on the local calendar. This absence on the calendar draws out the sudden historical recollection of the protagonist as well as his friend of that revolution. While the remembrance of the 1911 revolution is unhappy for the protagonist, who still recalls those young heroes who sacrificed their lives for the revolution, his friend N has a happy memory regarding the 1911 revolution (467-468). Lu Xun thus presents the confusing nature of historical remembrance, as well as the unpredictable ways that political forces are filtered through personal values and experiences. The two friends have completely opposed views and emotions of a significant historical event.

After the revolution, the Chinese people are forced to cut their queues, as the story’s title indicates. To make one’s hair into a queue was mandatory in the Qing

dynasty, the last dynasty of the ancient China. The queue was originally the local custom of the Manchu ethnicity, a racial minority living in the north-eastern China. The queue was mandatory before the revolution to pay respect to the ethnic identity of the royal family of the Qing dynasty, who are descendants of the Manchus. Hence, after overthrowing the former dynasty, the Ming dynasty, the Manchus as a racial minority forced the racial majority, the Han, to adopt their local custom. In other words, the Qing dynasty is established as the racial-minority's inner-colonization of the racial majority in China. In addition to this historical context, Lu Xun mentions the Yangzhou massacre in May 1645 in this story, which is the Manchus' massacre of the Han when the city of Yang Zhou of the Ming dynasty is conquered by the military force of the Qing (468). Here Lu Xun attempts to indicate that the queue, whether grown or cut, represents the forced obedience of the Chinese people, as political forces change. In the story, since the Mr. N had already cut his queue when he was a student in Japan before the 1911 revolution, he had been mocked by his fellows for a long time until the revolution. If the revolution exempts the Chinese people from having the queue as a mandatory custom, then it also authorizes N's practice of cutting the queue and exempts him from the mental pressure that the others put upon him (469-470).

In the story, the queue not only represents the forced obedience of the Chinese people, but also symbolizes the Chinese national character. As Lu Xun indicates due to the western influence upon the Chinese people in the late 19th century, the practice of removing the queue from the head already appeared in China before the official abolition of it after the revolution. However, most people are unwilling to cut their queues until they are forced to abolish it after the bankruptcy of the old dynasty. Therefore, the precursors of the queue-cutting suffer from social persecution, like Mr. N in this story. By comparing the queue-cutting in the late Qing dynasty to the 1654 genocide in Yang Zhou, Lu Xun suggests that the Chinese people who keep their loyalty to the Qing dynasty seem already to forget their ancestors' sufferings hundreds of years ago. In other words, in Lu Xun's view, Chinese people prefer the mass acceptance of forced obedience rather than the more challenging voluntary

reformation of an old custom. As Lu Xun also illustrates in “The Story of Hair” through the character of a western traveler, the Chinese are similarly viewed from abroad as herd-like, as always complying without reflective thought about other possibilities. When someone in the story poses a question to this westerner, who has travel experience in China and south-eastern Asia, he communicates only with gestures that one would use to communicate with a domesticated pet or farm animal because he does not know Chinese. The westerner answers the question by raising his crutch: this primitive gesture indicates that the westerner believes this is a suitable substitute for their complex language and everyone understands this simple gesture (470)! The description here corresponds to the formula in “On the Face of the Chinese People.”(略论中国人的脸) Namely, in Lu Xun’s view, as expressed subtly but also harshly in the story, Chinese people manifest a livestock nature (76). Their political nature is inherently bounded with their obedience, and so lacks the will of resistance. At the end of the story, Lu Xun suggests that the 1911 revolution is far from the end of the history of China. For instance, equal human rights for women are still not prevalent in China (470). However, to continue the reformation of the old custom in China will certainly encounter great counter-revolutionary resistance from the majority of the Chinese people. As the Mr. N indicates in “The Story of Hair”, if the Chinese women still expect their independence, they will incur sufferings and the intolerance of the masses. Hence the best way to achieve a happy life is to forget the ideas of equality and liberty (470). The absence of the double-tens day on the local calendar represents this static, even nihilistic view: to forget is better than remembering, since the remembrance of the sufferings in the revolution is painful for the minority who want to continue the reformation. But Lu Xun’s attitude as author and Chinese citizen is anti-nihilistic. As Lu Xun demonstrates through his writing, “the Chinese people always have the expectation of a good future for their descendents, but for themselves, they are unwilling to do anything to change the world.” (470) The Chinese do not seem to recognize this contradiction that stasis cannot bring a better future. In other words, as Lu Xun contends “if the lord of evolution does not wipe upon the back of China like the groom wiping a horse, China

would never begin its self-evolution toward a higher evolutionary stage.” (470) In Lu Xun’s view, China needs not another unsuccessful revolution, like the 1911 revolution, but a genuine psychological and cultural evolution that can change the Chinese national character.

In “The Story of Hair”, Lu Xun offers as the metaphor of colonization a creator wiping the back of China like a broom wiping a horse (470). In this sense, though Lu Xun’s position is anti-imperialistic, in his view, colonization also plays a positive role in propelling the evolution of China. In other words, Chinese people would never be aware of their inveterate character of obedience until they are forced to be obedient to the western world. Therefore, this metaphor at the end of “The Story of Hair” suggests that “Mr. Fujino” is not only concerned with the relation between imperialism/ colonization and national consciousness, but contains a potential view of evolution. Lu Xun attempts to indicate that China would never complete its transition toward modernity, democracy, and liberty via its inner reformation unless it is compelled by outside force.

In both “Medicine” and “Story of the Hair”, Lu Xun attempts to indicate that for the majority of Chinese people, the revolution does not really refresh their worldview. For the majority of the masses, the series of revolutions attempted by those precursors in the late Qing dynasty represent nothing other than enjoying the watching of the beheading of the heroes, or the changing of the hair-style. In the short story “The Storm”, first published in *Xin Qingnian* on September 1st, 1920, included in *Nahan* in August, 1923, Lu Xun tries to explore the revolution from the perspective of the average Chinese people. As Eva Shan Chou contends, “the story is about what queue cutting looks like at ground level for the millions of people, not just men but also their families, who are willy-nilly affected; about how those who are safe for the moment change sides immediately.” (106) In “The Storm”, the queue of Mr. Seven-Pounds happens to be cut by some revolutionists. This queue-cutting results in his great fear as well as the fear of the other villagers. The problem is that since the villagers are unable to predict if the revolutionists will eventually prevail or not, the life-and-death of Mr. Seven-Pounds is completely dependent upon his hair in the

context of the unpredictable political situation in future. In other words, if the revolutionists eventually fail to overthrow the old regime, the absence of the queue on Mr. Seven-Pounds' head will undoubtedly incur the death-penalty for him. At the end of the story, the rumor of the bankruptcy of the old regime is confirmed. This good news relieves the pressure that Mr. Seven-Pounds and the villagers keep in their mind for so long (437-444). By fictionalizing the revolution as a debate regarding one's lost queue in a small village, Lu Xun suggests that for the most Chinese people, the revolution is nothing other than the changing of the hair style. In other words, Lu Xun is disappointed with the 1911 revolution which marks the demarcation between ancient and modern China. In Lu Xun's view, the revolution is not equivalent to evolution. The majority of Chinese people are still not mentally reformed, though they are forced to accept the new life-style, for instance, like the head without the queue. Lu Xun's attitude toward the Chinese people could also be elaborated in this way: there are two kinds of 'queues' in his view, the queue as the old dressing-custom of the Qing dynasty and the queue which represents the habit of obedience and mediocrity. It is easy to remove the queue from the heads of the Chinese people, but the most difficult reformation is to remove the 'queue' from the mind of the Chinese people.

As Lu Xun suggests throughout his writings, Chinese people are naturally faithful, even subservient, to the traditional, the orthodox, or the unchangeable social habit. Hence any deviation from the orthodox is treated as social degeneration. In a Confucianist view, the society at the beginning of the Chinese history is the most idealized one, the model of perfect society in the Confucian sense. In this view, the progress of history is usually deemed as degeneration, rather than evolution from the original, since the latest society is often believed to be worse than the original model. Or, people's minds are no longer as perfect as the mind of the ancient generation (人心不古). In "The Storm", Lu Xun decries this view of the historical degeneration by naming each member of the family as a number of pounds. The name 'Seven-pounds' indicates that his social status is inferior to the ancestors, the Eight- or Nine-pounds, but also superior to his descendants, the Six-pounds. This strategy of cultural and

nationalistic irony uncovers an important aspect of the Chinese character in Lu Xun's view, namely, Chinese people hate evolution or changing or challenging the orthodox. This is also the social-psychological reason for the failure of revolution as evolution in China. At the end of "The Storm," Lu Xun describes that "a sewed bowl with eighteen copper nails is still being used by someone." (444) Here the sewed bowl with eighteen copper nails is a metaphor for China in the same way as Kong Yiji sitting on the ground with both legs broken. It symbolizes a country suffering from misery and trauma, tumult inside and colonization outside, still trying to keep its traditional dignity as usual, though in an inglorious way.

The queue as the symbol of the Chinese national character not only appears in the "Story of the Hair", but appears in one of the most remarkable pieces by Lu Xun, the "Biography of Ah-Q", first published as series from Dec 4th, 1921 to Feb 12th, 1922, included in *Na han* in August 1923. As Leo Lee points out, "the capital letter Q in English visualizes the typical head of a Chinese with a queue." (76) The Queue represents the national character of the Chinese people as it is embodied in the protagonist Ah-Q: selfishness, mediocrity, hypocrisy, vanity, and arrogance. They are usually obedient to the stronger but have the habit of tyrannizing the weaker. In the "Biography of Ah-Q", Ah-Q as the protagonist is envisioned by Lu Xun as a member of the mediocre Chinese mass. Hence one scenario in this story is that Ah-Q mocks a young man who had cut his queue when he studied abroad and calls him the 'faked westerner' (338). This scenario certainly corresponds to the traumatic memory of the Mr. N in "The Story of the Hair". Mr. N is depicted as a queue-cutting precursor, one of the earliest studying-abroad students, while Ah-Q plays the role of the average person in China. In the "Biography of Ah-Q", Lu Xun represents a more vivid psychological description regarding the Chinese people in the revolution. Ah-Q becomes very excited when the rumor of the revolutionists approaches his ear. He treats the revolution as a chance to take revenge upon the villagers who used to humiliate him in Wei village. However, when he is aware of the fact that he is not the first revolutionist in the Wei village, he still expects to be acknowledged as a revolutionist by the 'revolutionary pioneers'. Unfortunately, the first revolutionist in

the Wei village happens to be the ‘pseudo-westerner’ whom he used to mock. He is excluded from the revolutionary group by the pseudo-westerner and is prohibited to join the revolution (350-358). On the other side, the first two revolutionists in the Wei village, the pseudo-westerner and the scholar Zhao, did nothing other than robbing the Buddhist temple in the name of ‘revolutionizing’ it (354). In this sense, compared with the “Medicine,” “The Story of the Hair,” and “The Storm,” the “Biography of Ah-Q” more clearly indicates Lu Xun’s disappointment with the revolution in China. In his view, the essence of the revolution in China is nothing other than to provide the people with a chance to profit themselves illegally or extract revenge on those who threatened them under a previous regime. At the end of the “Biography of Ah-Q”, the biggest family in the Wei village, the family with the surname of Zhao, is robbed by some gangsters who move stealthily under the revolutionary trend. Ah-Q’s destiny is to become the scapegoat of the gangsters who robbed the Zhao family, since it is impossible to know who actually commit the robbing (358-362). Lu Xun intends to make Ah-Q the metaphor for the Chinese people, with the capital letter Q as the symbol of the Chinese national character. In fact, the other figures in the “Biography of Ah-Q” are not better than Ah-Q. On the contrary, Lu Xun suggests their character resembles Ah-Q’s character. The only difference between them is that the destiny of the protagonist Ah-Q is miserable, in order to echo the miserable destiny of China in the modern age.

Interestingly, though Lu Xun is defined as an iconoclast thinker due to his critique of Chinese national character, Lu’s view in some sense parallels neo-conservatism in the spectrum of the modern western social thoughts, for instance, the political thought of Leo Strauss. Lu Xun attempts to associate the well-being of Chinese society to the human character of the Chinese people. This understanding that the well-being of the whole society is influenced by the character of all the citizens makes Lu Xun’s social thought resemble Leo Strauss’ critical view. In fact, modern western thinkers rarely have the idea that the well-being of a society is dependent upon the well-being of the human character at the individual level, except for Leo Strauss. In his work *On Tyranny*, Leo Strauss approaches the essence of the tyrannical

society from a social-psychological view. *On Tyranny* is Leo Strauss' re-interpretation of *Hiero*, a dialogue authored by the ancient Greek thinker Xenophon. *Hiero* begins with the poet Simonide visiting the tyrant Hiero. The tyrant poses a question to the poet and expects that he could help him to solve a problem that keeps puzzling him. The tyrant claims that he is constantly threatened by all the others in his kingdom since he is the most powerful and the wealthiest one. The poet answers that the best way to secure his ruling position is to enrich everyone with confidence. As Simonide indicates, Hiero should consider "the fatherland to be his estate, the citizens to be his comrades, friends to be his own children, his sons to be the same as his life; if he could prove superior to his friends in beneficence, his enemies will be utterly unable to resist him." (21)

For Strauss, this story discloses the deepest layer of human nature. Strauss attempts to suggest that humans are inherently selfish and self-interested, and the collective selfishness is the social-psychological origin of the tyrannical society. As Strauss indicates, "each man loves what is somehow his own, his private possession; admiration or praise is concerned with the excellent regardless of whether it is one's own or not." (89) Since everyone is selfish, to be the most powerful and the wealthiest certainly incurs the envy of all the others. But the envy could be reconciled by the beneficence that the tyrant could demonstrate for his subjects. In other words, in a Straussian view, a tyrant and a good king are like the two sides of the same coin. Hiero would be the good king if his practice satisfies the selfishness of the others; on the contrary, if he chooses to enrich himself by depriving others, he would be the tyrant in their view. Based on his reading of this story, Leo Strauss attempts to restore the Platonic social hierarchy based on virtue and wisdom, or the Platonic philosopher as the king. Strauss asserts that "in a truly just or non-tyrannical state, complete control will be in the hands of the wise, and the social hierarchy will correspond strictly to the hierarchy of merit and of merit alone." (193) In his view, the best way to secure the well-being of the society is to restore the virtues in people's mind to make them disengaged from their cravings for vanity and wealth.

Lu Xun's diagnosis of Chinese national character indeed parallels Strauss'

critique of human nature. In Lu Xun's fictionalization of the Chinese society, the selfishness comprises a big part in the character of the Chinese people. Furthermore, Lu Xun's understanding of obedience closely resembles Leo Strauss' understanding of it. For both of them, obedience, as the weakness in human nature, is due to humans' engagement with vanity and wealth. Hence people usually belittle or brutalize those whose social status is inferior to theirs, but subjugate themselves to those who are superior to them in this way. In Lu Xun's fictional world, Ah-Q and Kong Yiji characterize obedience as foundational to Chinese national character. Lu Xun exposes the cravings for vanity, wealth or social status underlying Chinese obedience from the perspective of a cultural observer. Though both Leo Strauss and Lu Xun link the well-being of the society to the human character at the individual level, Lu Xun, distinct from Leo Strauss, presumes that what he diagnoses is the universal character of mankind, rather than only the national character of a specific people. Also, the restoration of the classic virtues in the Platonic/Aristotelian sense is never Lu Xun's expectation. However, the similarity between Lu Xun and Leo Strauss on human nature may suggest that, as James Reeves Pusey indicates, though iconoclast, Lu Xun's thought is still influenced by traditional Confucian morality (107). In some sense, Confucian morality parallels western neo-conservatism, though Strauss is not influenced by Confucian thought.

Contrasted to "Mr. Fujino", the short stories "Medicine", "The Story of the Hair", "The Storm" and the "Biography of Ah-Q" represent Lu Xun's diagnosis of Chinese society from a cultural view internal to China. The correlation between the traumatic experience abroad in Japan in "Mr. Fujino" and Lu Xun's reflection upon the domestic Chinese society miniaturizes the correlation between China's encounters with the western world and the domestic modernization in China in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Historically speaking, beginning in the year 1840, China's first national failure in the opium war with the United Kingdom, China officially starts its inner reformation of technological and institutional westernization to empower itself. In Lu Xun's view, neither China's attempt to resist global hegemony nor China's inner reformation or revolution is successful. The abortive revolutions fictionalized in

“Medicine”, “The Story of Hair”, “The Storm” and “The Biography of Ah-Q”, as well as the indifference toward massacre in “Mr. Fujino” represent Lu Xun’s strong dissatisfaction with the failure of China. More importantly, instead of making the western imperialism/colonization totally blamable for China’s miserable situation in the modern age, in Lu Xun’s view, China is responsible for its own failure. Namely, it not only fails to resist global hegemony, but fails to refresh itself to catch up with the evolutionary step of the western world in the modern age.

Moreover, instead of attributing this cultural failure to China’s technological or institutional disadvantages, as Zhang Zhidong (张之洞) or Kang Youwei (康有为) argued in the late Qing dynasty, Lu Xun is interested in the social-psychological origin of China’s failure in its modern period. Such exploration of the social-psychological origin of China’s failure in its modern age places Lu Xun’s fiction close to international literary modernism. In *Voices from the Iron House*, Leo Lee attempts to recover the heritage of Lu Xun as a Chinese precursor of modernism. In Lee’s view, Lu Xun’s fictional world features inner-mental depictions, and this interiority as a fictional skill qualifies his work as modernism (64). The psychological depiction in Lu Xun’s work is due more to his social-psychological diagnosis of Chinese people, rather than merely practicing a western skill of fictionalization.

In fact, to view the defective aspect of Chinese society via western perspective not only appears in Lu Xun’s work. As a cultural phenomenon, it comprises a historical continuum throughout the 20th century. This practice of reviewing China via a self-proposed western view is defined by Rey Chow as ‘auto-ethnography’. To investigate the Chinese character via an auto-ethnographical view in fact re-appears in a post-marketized China after 1990. The word “auto-ethnography” is used by Rey Chow in her book *Primitive Passion: Visuality, Sexuality, Ethnography, and Contemporary Chinese Cinema* to categorize Chinese film in the context of global capitalism (Chow, 499-500). In this case, Zhang Yimou’s film *Ju Dou* (菊豆) which presents the barbarous aspect of Chinese society to its international audience uncovers the auto-ethnographical nature of Zhang’s movie. The barbarous aspect of Chinese custom in this film is specifically designed to satisfy the ethnographical taste of the

western audience. In the film, when Yang Tianqing peeps through the door to see the naked body of his sexually-disabled uncle's new young wife, he sees the wounds on her back caused by his uncle's maltreatment of her. Suddenly, Ju Dou, his uncle's young wife, turning her face toward the door, seems like expecting someone to know her suffering. The naked and wounded body presented via the crevice on the door represents China in a globalized context. As Rey Chow indicates, "the primitive that is woman, who at once unveils the corrupt Chinese tradition and parodies the orientalism of the west, stands as the naïve symbol, the brilliant arcade, through which 'China' travels across cultures to unfamiliar audiences." (515) The voyeuristic desire in the film represents the western world's voyeuristic desire for the secrets of China. This voyeuristic desire not only represents the West's distorted view of China, but also makes Chinese directors ethnographize China and present this auto-ethnographical image via the voyeuristic cinematic view of the western world. This movie presupposes that there is a civilized/un-civilized distinction between the west and the east. Hence to expose the un-civilized aspect of Chinese society to the external world would certainly attract the attention from the western audience. Especially within the context of global marketization, this kind of auto-ethnographical design quickly promulgates this movie to the outside world and helps it to succeed in the international competitions and establish its international reputation. As Rey Chow contends, "if translation is a form of betrayal, then the translators pay their debt by bringing fame to the ethnic culture, a fame that is evident in recent years from the major awards won by Chinese films at international film festivals in Manila, Tokyo, Nantes, Locarno, London, Honolulu, Montreal, Berlin, Venice, and Cannes." (515) Lu Xun's auto-ethnographical diagnosis of China parallels Ray Chow's critique of Zhang Yimou, since both of them examine the interaction between the global context-global hegemony and the Chinese author/ director's self-understanding of their own society. In one word, globalization results in this kind of self-distorted understanding.

Lu Xun's depiction of the Chinese national character and the western literary tradition are sharply in contradistinction to each other. The Chinese national character and the western literary tradition appear as negative and positive aspects in his view.

This opposition certainly suggests the connection between his unflattering self-ethnographical diagnosis of China and imperialism/ colonization. It is the broad context of the imperialism-colonization that distorts his worldview. His negative auto-ethnography or auto-stigmatization of the Chinese national character is the evidence that he indeed acknowledges in the global order of inferior/superior cultural capabilities between the east and the west that is created by imperialism and colonization. Namely, in his view, Chinese national character is inferior to the kind of heroic/independent character presented in the western literary tradition. This view of opposing cultural qualities could be strongly justified by his two short essays. The first one, “On the mandatory books for the young Chinese”(Lun qing nian bi du shu, 论青年必读书), first published on November 25th, 1927, included in *Er yi ji* (而已集) in October 1928, suggests the books that Lu Xun would give to the young Chinese students. In this essay, he strongly suggests the “young students to read the western literature rather than the classic Chinese works.” (52) Lu Xun asserts that western literature is full of vitality that is absent from the Chinese literary tradition (52). Here Lu Xun suggests that the vitality in the western literary tradition could provide the young students with the courage they need to break through the mediocrity of the mass. The second piece, “On the Face of the Chinese People”(Luelun Zhongguoren De Lian, 略论中国人的脸), remarkably reveals Lu Xun’s stereotypical racialized impression of the Chinese people. In this essay Lu Xun uses two equations to illustrate the difference between the faces of the Chinese people and Westerners. He points out that “brutality plus humanity equals Westerners, while brutality plus ‘livestock-nature’ equals some sort of people.” (76) Here the phrase ‘some sort of people’ is the synonymous of the Chinese people. The word ‘livestock-nature’ suggests that in Lu Xun’s view, the Chinese people are naturally inclined to be domesticated. In other words, the national character of the Chinese people is marked by their obedience. Lu Xun attempts to indicate that the bad national character of the Chinese people needs radical transition.

Lu Xun’s self-ethnographical interpretation of Chinese national character as well as his understanding of national resuscitation based on the improvement of the

individual character is close in relation to the broad context of imperialism in which the modern China is situated. As both Jing Tsu in *Failure, Nationalism and Literature* and Rebecca E. Karl in *Staging the World--Chinese Nationalism at the Turn of the Twentieth Century* argue, the connection between the idea of national revitalization or the revival of nationalism and the global context of colonization is a kind of collective colonial experience, or collective memory of trauma that the Chinese intellectuals had suffered during this period. It is colonization that forces the concept of the evolutionary theory or social Darwinism into the mind of the Chinese people. In this sense the evolutionary theory becomes a kind of narrative structure of the eastern-western relation, or a kind of discourse in regard to the China/world relation that is prevalent in the Chinese intellectual world in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The discourse of social-Darwinism in this period is usually constructed as a series of the different evolutionary stages. Hence China is usually positioned on the lower evolutionary stage, while the western countries are imagined on the higher.

Also, this imagined map of the evolutionary stages is usually measured by the scientific/technological or institutional advantages which are owned by the westerners. In *The Last Confucian*, Guy S. Alitto draws the parallels among three trends of thought on saving China in early 20th century: socialist revolution, westernization and Neo-Confucianism. The best example to illustrate the influence of this evolutionary paradigm upon the Chinese intellectuals is Liang Shu-Ming's (梁漱溟) Neo-Confucianism, particularly embodied in *On Eastern and Western Cultures and Their Philosophies* (Dongxi Wenhua Jiqi Zhexue; 东西文化及其哲学). Liang attempts to argue that the higher evolutionary stage is temporally occupied by Western civilization because Western civilization is technology-oriented. However, as Liang indicates that the technology-oriented civilization is also the disadvantage of Western civilization in a long run. Liang argues that Eastern and Western civilization in this sense could mutually address each other's disadvantages by taking advantage of each other's superiority (Liang, 488-502). In other words, in Liang's view, China is still culturally or intellectually superior to the west though it suffers invasion temporarily. In a domestic view, Lu Xun's position is far from Liang Shu-Ming's since Lu Xun's

iconoclastic critique is remarkably anti-Confucian. But from an international perspective, their points, though suggesting clearly different attitudes toward Chinese society and cultural tradition, are obviously in reaction to the same global situation that China faces. The only difference between them is that Liang Shu-Ming has faith in Chinese cultural tradition, and in his view, Eastern tradition can counteract the Western in the long term. But for Lu Xun, the only way to strengthen China is to re-build the national character. Therefore, to situate Lu Xun within this structure of evolutionary theory is helpful to clarify the historical context behind his thought. Lu Xun's project of criticizing and re-building Chinese national character intends to promote China from the lower evolutionary stage to the higher, or to enable China to catch up with the Western steps of evolution.

However, in Lu Xun's view, evolution is a complex progress from obedience toward independence, rather than merely a transition from the oppression toward tyranny. In other words, in his view, achieving national independence does not necessarily mean to become a new imperialist, another new tyrant at the top of the chain of looting. In this sense, Lu Xun potentially defines evolution as a progress from biological necessity toward spiritual pursuit. Namely, if biological necessity is the social-psychological origin of the strong tyrannizing the weak, to disengage from biological motivation makes both national independence and pacifism feasible. Lu Xun's attitude toward evolution appears in his comment on Haeckel in "Against the Opinion of the Mass"(破恶声论). As Lu Xun notes, Haeckel draws a distinction between biological evolution and religion as spiritual phenomenon (305). This dualism between materialistic explanation and spiritual phenomenon, or the irreducibility of spirit, becomes the foundation of Lu Xun's understanding of national independence. In "The Story of Hair", Lu Xun argues that "the history of China would never progress toward a higher stage of evolution unless the creator wipes upon the back of China like a broom wiping a horse." (470) Here the creator's wipe potentially refers to colonization. Colonization compels China to learn from the western world. Different from the discourse of empowering China with industrial or military forces, Lu Xun welds his critique of Chinese national character and western

individualism together. In this sense, the second chapter of this thesis will focus on Lu Xun's attempt to re-build Chinese national character as well as his project of national resuscitation.

Chapter Two

Mara Poets, National Revitalization and Evolution

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, social-Darwinism in China is usually imagined as the cultural difference among the different geo-political areas globally. Within such a geo-political framework, the Western world is usually imagined as culturally and technologically superior to the Eastern world. Lu Xun's geo-political imagination is still structured by this framework, but he attempts to add his personal understanding of the cultural difference between the eastern and the western worlds to the general geo-political framework of the social-Darwinian evolution. Lu Xun's cultural imagination is particularly embodied in his essay *On Cultural Prejudice* (Wen Hua Pian Zhi Lun, 文化偏至论), first published in August, 5th, 1908, included in the *Tomb* in 1927. With a brief introduction of the historical progress of the western world, Lu Xun argues that "western civilization, especially in the material sense, achieves its zenith in the 19th century." (289) Hence the unprecedented military force allows the western imperialists to explore the outside world. As Lu Xun remarks, this is the reason why Chinese people in the late 19th and the early 20th century have the strong impression that the Western world becomes superior to the Eastern world because of its industrial and military strength, or even the institutional advantages (286). Based on this general reflection upon the historical situations in both the western and the eastern world in the 19th century, Lu Xun argues that to worship the industrial/military/ institutional superiority of the western world is actually the Chinese people's own prejudice toward Western culture, and this partial judgment in fact impedes the national revitalization of China.

Lu Xun tries to indicate that the Chinese people are never aware of their real disadvantage. The real shortage of the Chinese people is not the industrial or military disadvantage, but the national culture of subservient mental weakness. This fundamental judgment of the mental weakness of the Chinese people is certainly in line with Lu Xun's cultural tenors in "Mr. Fujino" and the "Mara Poets". But in this

essay, Lu Xun introduces his own interpretation of the cultural advantage of Western civilization to his readers. According to Lu Xun, the real cultural advantage of the Western world is not what Chinese people usually pay attention to, but a new school of philosophy thriving in the late 19th century, namely, the *Xinshensi Zong* (新神思宗, or neo-idealism) in his own translation (293). As Lu Xun contends, the category of ‘*xin shen si zong*’ is marked by the importance of the free individual spirit, as writers around the world, including Nietzsche, Max Stirner, Kierkegaard, Schopenhauer, and Ibsen, have also testified. Lu Xun indicates that “this group of thinkers puts emphasis upon the superiority of the mental world, in contrast to the materialism or utilitarianism prevalent in the 19th century.” (293) It is indeed correct that existentialism is the critique of modernity, especially critical to the rationalism, capitalism and political authority. Lu Xun argues that if the individual free spirit is the latest thought in the early 20th century, this is what Chinese people really need to learn from the Western world, rather than only focus on the industrial/ material advantages.

Therefore, by criticizing the Chinese national character, Lu Xun also provides his readers with the alternative choice, the healthy national character, instead of the unhealthy national character. The idealized character and his critique of the national character together comprise Lu Xun’s own evolutionary view. Namely, the re-building of the national character is instrumental to the historical evolution of China. The only way to promote the evolution of China from its current stage toward a stronger and healthier stage is to promote the mental/spiritual change of the Chinese people. In this sense Lu Xun’s own interpretation of modern China is still generally within the narrative paradigm of the evolution or social-Darwinism that is prevalent in his time. Hence Lu Xun adds the re-building of the national character as part of the historical evolution to the fundamental paradigm of social-Darwinism.

Within the category of the *xin shen si zong*, Nietzsche is usually an important clue in terms of the international intellectual connection between Lu Xun and modern western literature and philosophy. Nietzsche has been mentioned in Lu Xun’s three major essays regarding individualism and the national revitalization, “On the Power

of the Mara Poets” (Mo Luo Shi Li Shuo, 摩罗诗力说), “On the Cultural Prejudice” (Wen Hua Pian Zhi Lun, 文化偏至论) and “Against the Voice of the Mass” (*po e sheng lun* 破恶声论), first published in December, 5th, 1908. Though Lu Xun does not have a systematic introduction or interpretation of Nietzsche, these quotations of Nietzsche potentially indicate Lu Xun’s view of Nietzsche: namely, that Nietzsche’s thought represents the idea of vitality, individuality and the evolutionary progress. “The Power of the Mara Poet” begins with a sentence by Nietzsche: “One who has exhausted the traditional will seek for the new spirit in future. Oh, my brother, the new work, the new fountain from the abyss, appears soon.” (247) In the second paragraph, Lu Xun argues that “Nietzsche is not afraid of the savages, since the savages have the vitality inside them”; “Civilization originates in the barbarous. If the civilized is like the flower, the barbarous is like the bud; if the civilized is like the fruit, the barbarous is like the flower.” (248) Nietzsche’s name also appears twice in the “Cultural Prejudice”, in terms of the *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* and the concept of the superman.

More importantly, in “Against the Voice of the Mass”, Lu Xun particularly stresses the relation between Nietzsche and social-Darwinism. Lu Xun asserts that “Nietzsche borrows the idea from the social-Darwinism, attacking Christianity and creating the new-concept of the superman.” (305) Except for the several short quotations of Nietzsche in his essays, Lu Xun provides his own translation of Nietzsche’s original work, namely, the prologue in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. In fact, Lu Xun had translated this piece twice, one into modern mandarin Chinese, the other one into classical Chinese. According to the editor of *Chronological Collection of Lu Xun’s Works* (鲁迅著译编年全集), The one translated into classical Chinese, composed in 1918, is actually a short re-writing of the prologue but remains unpublished (113). The translation into modern Chinese was first published in September 1st, 1920, with a brief annotation by Lu Xun himself. This intellectual connection between Lu Xun and Nietzsche has been discussed in much scholarship on Lu Xun, for instance, in Leo-Lee’s *Voices from the Iron House*. Although the strong nationalistic orientation in his essays, like *On the Cultural Prejudice*, suggests Lu

Xun's appropriation of Nietzsche, Lu Xun's own idea of national character indeed strongly resembles Nietzsche's in some way. Both of them are dedicated to the analysis of human nature, especially hypocrisy and selfishness beneath the surface of civilization. Also, both of them strongly support the dignity of individuality as well as the individual against the mediocre mass. In other words, if Nietzsche's idea of individuality represents the healthy national character that Lu Xun envisions, Lu Xun's critique of the Chinese national character also strongly parallels Nietzsche's diagnosis of human nature.

Besides the short quotation of Nietzsche's thought in several different essays, the translation of the prologue in *Thus spoke Zarathustra* is the most important clue regarding Lu Xun's appropriation of Nietzsche. Lu Xun's own translation of the prologue in Nietzsche's *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* clearly suggests the similarity between Lu Xun's diagnosis of the Chinese national character and Nietzsche's insightful observation of the human nature in two ways: social-Darwinism and the tension between the mass and the 'law-breaker'. The prologue in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* is actually an allegorical definition of the 'overman'. In the prologue, Zarathustra, the protagonist in this book, preaches his new idea about the 'overman' to those people he meets during his journey. The meaning of the overman could be best defined by one sentence in this prologue: "mankind is a rope fastened between animal and overman--a rope over an abyss." (Nietzsche 7) In Nietzsche's view, humans indeed have the 'animal part' inside. Animals' behavior completely follows the social-Darwinian principle. They struggle for survival by brutalizing and eating each other. In the world of the animal, the stronger beats and outlives the weaker. Therefore, this sentence clearly indicates that for Nietzsche, the overman is a way of living beyond the logic of social-Darwinism, or the animal's principle. But the humans, in Nietzsche's view, still have the 'animal part' inside them:

You have made your way from worm to human, and much in you is still worm. Once you were apes, and even now a human is still more ape than any ape."
(Nietzsche 6)

Here the most important point is that the overman preached by Zarathustra is not

another species more evolutionarily advanced than the mankind. Rather, the overman means to overcome the defects of human nature. “Humans are more ape than any ape” suggests that humans are still social-Darwinian. We are still to a large extent bounded by the necessity of sustaining our life, struggling and competing for living space and living resources. In this view, it is the social-Darwinian logic that forces humans to organize themselves collectively, since the collective existence is more powerful and competitive than the individual. To organize people collectively requires ideological manipulation, for instance, like collective faith in the religious sense. Hence Zarathustra in the prologue persuades his audience to renounce those doctrines that are inculcated to them, like the body-soul and the earth-heaven distinction (Nietzsche, 6). For Nietzsche, concepts such as the soul or heaven are actually an ideological strategy to control society. People believe that to pursue this kind of docile spiritual self-improvement will empower them eventually. But for Nietzsche, people actually renounce their freedom in this way; they are exhausting and wasting their energy and lifetime for these useless purposes. Based on this view, Nietzsche preaches the individual freedom and individual creativity that is the intellectual origin of Lu Xun’s ‘Mara poet spirit’:

Look at the good and the just! Whom do they hate most? The one who breaks their tables of values, the breaker, the lawbreaker- but he is the creative one.
 Look at the faithful of all faiths! Whom do they hate most? The one who breaks their tables of values, the breaker, the lawbreaker- but he is the creative one.
 (14)

In other words, anyone who dares to openly challenge the doctrine that empowers these masses collectively will be deemed as the ‘traitor’ or the ‘devil’. Nietzsche’s thought embodied in this prologue certainly parallels Lu Xun’s main points in *On the Cultural Prejudice*: the historical progress of humans and the importance of the independent individual spirit for the historical evolution.

As Lu Xun indicates in *Against the Voice of the Mass*, Nietzsche attacks Christianity with the new concept of the superman, which is based on social-Darwinism (305). Here the connotation of social-Darwinism is not clearly

defined by Lu Xun, for instance, the relation between Nietzsche and social-Darwinism, as well as Lu Xun's own understanding of social-Darwinism and how it relates to Nietzsche's evolutionary view. But the prologue in *Zarathustra* clarifies the Nietzschean definition of social-Darwinism. Lu Xun is correct in this way that Nietzsche had indeed been influenced by social-Darwinism, and Nietzsche's thought in some way, features an evolutionary view.

In general, Nietzsche has his own view of evolution, but his understanding of evolution draws a distinction between the 'vulgar social-Darwinism' and himself. Some of Nietzsche's points, however, suggest that he is a social-Darwinist, for instance, his idea of the 'superman' or the 'overman', which supports self-selection/self-improvement in the human species. But a close reading of Nietzsche by Walter Kaufmann suggests that Nietzsche's idea regarding the overman or the superman is not the theoretical extension of social-Darwinism or the theory of eugenics. In fact, Nietzsche's evolutionary view, the preaching of the overman, differentiates his worldview from the kind of social-Darwinism that promotes the struggle for survival at all expense. As Walter Kaufmann indicates, for Nietzsche, a genuine humanity requires artistic, philosophical or religious pursuit, rather than only the life-sustaining motivation (175). Hence Nietzsche highlights three kinds of people: the artist, the philosopher, and the saint (175). In his view, these are the people engaged in spiritual pursuit. On the other hand, the realistic motivation, or the motivation to merely survive in this world, results in the degeneration of humanity and the subjugation of the individual freedom to the collective mass. This is the reason why it is inaccurate to merely label Nietzsche as a social-Darwinist. Nietzsche preaches the overman or the superman because he aims at moving beyond the social-Darwinian logic of the struggle for survival. In Kaufmann's view, Nietzsche is an anti-social-Darwinian evolutionist. This is also the reason why Nietzsche attacks the Christian morals: behind the moral appearance there is always a realistic motivation. As Nietzsche argues in *The Genealogy of Morals*, the nature of the moral is the method the 'weaker' use to empower themselves collectively. By subjugating themselves to a spiritual leader, like Jesus, and an organization, like the Catholic Church, they empower

themselves by symbolic capitals (33). This group of people then turns out to be spiritually superior to the others. Therefore, ‘good’ and ‘evil’ in the moral sense is actually the ideological weapon that they rely upon to protect themselves and to attack their enemies.

In fact, the argument of “Against the Opinion of the Mass” demonstrates that Lu Xun’s quotation of Nietzsche in this essay indeed positions Nietzsche in an appropriate place. Similar to “On the Cultural Prejudice”, in “Against the Opinion of the Mass”, Lu Xun reiterates his belief that the revival of China requires the kind of individualism featured by liberated thinking, heroism and spiritual pursuit (303). Lu Xun indicates that “nowadays China is divided by two sorts of voices, the opinion advocating a strong imperialistic China and the opinion in support of the total westernization of China.” (303) In Lu Xun’s view, neither Chinese chauvinism nor the westernization of China is satisfying for him. Since both views are hegemonic in nature, “independent thinkers who dare to violate the opinion of the mass will incur ruthless attack from the majority of people.” (303) For Lu Xun, in contrast to the opinions of the mass, the absence of the independent voice is the underlying cause of the fall of China (303). Similar to Nietzsche, Lu Xun indicates that the opinion of the mass is nothing other than the cover of the selfishness, ignorance and arrogance of the average people.

On the other hand, for the average people, their interests never move beyond the utilitarian purpose. The westernization in China makes utilitarianism or the vulgar-materialism into another kind of superstition for the Chinese people (302-303). Although the Chinese people generally like to criticize religions and justify their judgment with modern western science, the Chinese neglect to consider the Christian influence within western science. However, Lu Xun states that the western tradition is inherently intertwined with religions, but this spiritual pursuit in the western tradition never attracts the attention of the Chinese people (304-305). Similar to “On the Cultural Prejudice”, in “Against the Opinion of the Mass”, Lu Xun argues that for the majority of the Chinese people, westernization only means the empowerment of China with the material advantages of the western world. But what the Chinese people

lack, as Lu Xun indicates, is specifically this spiritual pursuit (302-307). Lu Xun therefore puts emphasis upon the significance of religion (305). For Lu Xun, “Nietzsche’s anti-Christian stance does not suggest that he renounces belief, but seeks to change the belief, since in Lu Xun’s view, the superman advocated by Nietzsche is another kind of spiritual pursuit.” (305)

Besides the *Xin Shensizong*, the free individual spirit has another equivalent name in Lu Xun’s work, the Mara poet. Though the thinkers in *Xin Shensizong* and the Mara poets do not overlap each other, both groups of thinkers could be identified comparatively as the ‘law-breakers’ in Nietzsche’s *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. “The Spirit of the Mara Poets”, first published in March, 1908, is composed of a series of the short biographies of Byron, Shelley, Pushkin, M. Lermontov and A. Petofi. Lu Xun’s definition of the Mara Poet is not based on the content of their literary works, but mainly according to their life history, especially their participation in social movements. The word ‘Mara’ is jargon from Buddhism that is basically the equivalent of ‘Satan’ in the Romantic tradition. Lu Xun reminds readers that the ‘Satanic poet’ is originally the title particularly bestowed to Byron. Here the phrase ‘Mara poet’ generally refers to the rebellious thinkers who dare to openly challenge the social mediocrity in their time, leading the social/political reformation by their literary creativity (249). These ‘Satanic poets’ embody the kind of healthy individual character that Lu Xun envisions. In Lu Xun’s view, these poets, courageously challenging societal mediocrity, prove brave enough to break the spiritual shackles put upon them by society, and by their liberated thinking seize the status of “great individuals.” The tension between the Mara poets and society in Lu Xun’s essay also parallels the conflict between the poet and the political authority in Plato’s *Republic*. It seems, however, that Lu Xun is unaware of the strongly Miltonic character also culturally underlining the Mara poets in a European tradition, but prefers to identify them mainly with a concept from Buddhism. This combination of the western authors with a name from Buddhism not only indicates Lu Xun’s academic interests in classic Chinese literature, but in some sense, suggests his will to fuse the Western character with the Chinese tradition.

Lu Xun does not write down his feelings and emotions at first time when he encounters the thoughts of *xin shen si zong* or the *Mara poets*. However, there is circumstantial evidence that could reveal his intellectual journey by linking his traumatic experience in Japan to his purported significance of the *xin shen si zong* or the *Mara poet*. His mental transition is in some sense indirectly mirrored by an essay he translated in 1924, “The Symbol of Kumen”(Kumen de Xiangzheng; 苦闷的象征) by the Japanese literary theorist Kuriyagawa Hakuson. The Chinese word Kumen (苦闷) generally means the experience of frustration. As Jing Tsu indicates, in his essay “Kuriyagawa attempts to explain literary creativity from a psychoanalytic perspective by changing the foundation of Freud’s original idea.” (210) As Freud contends, in *Leonardo Da Vinci: A Psychosexual study of an Infantile Reminiscence* the primitive sexual desire repressed by social norms always reappears in one’s artistic creation as the hidden motivation beneath the civilized surface. On the other hand, artistic creativity could be interpreted as the resistance against the hegemony of socialization. Based on Freudian psychoanalysis, Kuriyagawa broadens the presumption of the Freudian explanation of artistic creativity. Kuriyagawa argues that, generally speaking, frustration/ repression as well as the resistance against frustration/ repression gives birth to artistic creation (297). Art is generally one’s revolting against the frustration/ repression that one has experienced. This frustration that gives birth to artistic creativity does not have to be solely the repression of sexual desire, but could refer to a variety of frustrations one could encounter in a lifetime. According to original Freudian psychoanalysis, sexual desire that is unrealizable in the real world becomes the sublimated artistic expression.

Accordingly, the revised edition by Kuriyagawa suggests that other kinds of unrealizable will or wishes in the real world could also become artistic topics. As Leo Lee observes “Lu Xun seems even more impressed by Kuriyagawa’s rather Freudian view of art, which seeks to locate the genesis of art and literature in psychological trauma; the mental turmoil which results from a suppressed anguish becomes the root of all artistic creativity.” (92) Kuriyagawa’s theory of the relation between creativity and repressed feelings illuminates the connection between the spirit of the *Mara poet*

and Lu Xun's impression of the Chinese national character. In this sense, *xin shen si zong* or the Mara poet spirit represents the silenced voice of social reformation or the aborted revolution in Lu Xun's other works. Jing Tsu argues that, "Kumen in a paradoxical way provides the regeneration for this state of decline; suffering becomes the path to triumph." (216)

Leo Lee contends that the conflict between the mass and the individual serves as a narrative framework in Lu Xun's short stories. In this sense his critique of average people or the mediocre mass usually leads to his sympathy with the loners, or the free-thinking individuals (Lee 72). At the end of *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, Hannah Arendt identifies the difference between solitude and loneliness. Both solitude and loneliness are related to the tension between the individuals with the liberated thinking and the majority of the average people. But the difference between these two existential situations is up to the physical distance between the individuals and the mass. Solitude, which is best exemplified by Rousseau's *Solitary Walker*, suggests that it is possible for the minority of individuals to stay away from the average people if they are at odds with the majority. In contrast to solitude, loneliness refers to the unfortunate situation for the free-thinking individuals. Namely, if the minority have to live within the majority of average people, they will be both socially and mentally isolated (476).

The character of the 'loner' in Lu Xun's fictional world parallels Arendt's definition of loneliness. In contrast to the mediocre mass, brave individuals are depicted as repressed voices. If Lu Xun's realistic fiction represents his attitude toward the real Chinese society in which he lives, the repressed voices of the brave individuals embody his unrealizable will. Hence this fictional structure in Lu Xun's stories, the conflict between the mass and the free-thinking individuals corresponds to Kuriyagawa's self-adapted psychoanalysis. In other words, the thoughts of the *Xin Shensizong*, as well as the Mara Poets, represent the characterization of the repressed, silenced or failed free-thinking individuals in Lu Xun's stories, such the beheaded young revolutionist Xia Yu in "Medicine". In this sense, if the Chinese audience watching the slaughtering of their peers in "Mr. Fujino" is the prototype of the mass in

Lu Xun's fictional world, the Mara poet or the brave individual also represents Lu Xun's self-identification. In "Mr. Fujino", after all, the 'loner' is Lu Xun himself.

This conflict between the great individuals and the mediocre mass as the main fictional drama parallels the issues of the prologue in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. At the end of his translation of the prologue, Lu Xun writes a group of annotations regarding the meanings of the images and the plots. In the last section of the prologue, Nietzsche offers the metaphor of the eagle and the snake as a unity: "The eagle cuts broad circles through the air and the snake curls itself around the eagle's neck." (15) Nietzsche indicates that the combination of the eagle and the snake is Zarathustra's totem, referring to the unification of pride and wisdom. Lu Xun significantly writes a more clarified annotation for this totem of Zarathustra. In Lu Xun's view, "the difference between the superman, the great individual, and the mediocre mass is that the combination of pride and wisdom only belongs to the superman, while for the mass their pride is nothing other than their ignorance, superstition, and arrogance." (460)

This annotation defining the images in Nietzsche's *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* could also serve as an annotation of the characters in Lu Xun's own stories, as well as some stories translated by him, for instance, Epomehk's "The Narrow Cage", "The Soul of the Eagle" and "The Red Flower". In "The Red Flower", for instance, the brave young hero who nurtures the red flower, which represents the utopian hope of a good future, with his own blood parallels the character of Xia Yu in "Medicine" (Epomehk 48). The distinction that Lu Xun draws between the great individuals and the mass not only reveals his pre-conceptions of both the Chinese society and the western intellectual tradition, but also suggests the underlying elitism in his social thought. Lu Xun is not, strictly speaking, a political thinker, though his writings are usually engaged with social issues and political critiques. He certainly does not have a clear sociopolitical blueprint regarding the future of modern China based on the spirit of the Mara poet or the *Xinshensi Zong*. In his early thought, however, Lu Xun attempts to promote a kind of political elitism. In his view, the changing of the character of the majority of Chinese people is incumbent upon the efforts of the

minority of brave individuals. His expectation is that the elite character of the Mara poets could gradually become the common character of the majority of Chinese people. Lu Xun's sense of social reformation relies upon the practice of replacing the mediocre average people with the independent individuals modeled on the Mara poets. As Shih Shu-mei asserts, in *The Lure of Modern, Writing Modernism in Semicolonial China: 1917-1937*, for Lu Xun, elitism and the project of enlightening the majority of Chinese people seem naturally consistent with each other. For Lu Xun, "there is a procedural nature to this relationship: the writer as individual criticizes the stupidity of the masses in order to expose their illness and devise ways for cure, the end of which is to turn the masses into individuals." (83)

For Lu Xun, the amelioration of national character is not only incumbent upon the intellectuals, but largely up to the nurturing of the young generation. Lu Xun emphasizes that the natural vitality in children's minds gradually disappears in one's adulthood. Lu Xun's theory of education parallels Rousseau's point in *Emile* unintentionally. For Rousseau, "coming from the hand of the Author of all things, everything is good; in the hands of man, everything degenerates." (11) Similar to Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Lu Xun believes that the natural character of children is healthy, but this natural healthy character is usually deformed by society or, in Lu Xun's context, the traditional Chinese education. The idea about the nature of children appears in two of Lu Xun's short stories, "My Old Home (Guxiang, 故乡)" and "The Misanthrope (Guduzhe, 孤独者)". "My Old Home", originally written in 1921, is a short autobiographical story, where, the protagonist encounters his friend from his childhood, Run Tu, and this encounter compels him to recollect his childhood memory. He is shocked by the difference between Run Tu as an adult and his memory of Run Tu in his childhood. Lu Xun depicts here how the 'young hero' in the protagonist's mind becomes one of the mediocre people (10-18). In the second story, Lu Xun makes his explanation of the degeneration of the child-like mind through a dialogue between the protagonist, Wei Lianshu, and his interlocutor. In "The Misanthrope", Lu Xun offers a metaphorical explanation of social mediocrity from the view of Buddhism. According to Buddhism, everything is part of the chain of causality. Hence any

phenomenon has its reason and meanwhile results in another phenomenon. In this sense, “the causal relation between children and adults is like the causal chain which links seeds to flowers and fruits.” (368) In this view, if human nature is not inherently deformed in some sense and children are not naturally endowed with the deformed nature, it is not reasonable to believe that the grow-ups would have the evil inside their mind (368). But in Wei Lianshu’s view, the social evil, the mediocrity of the mass, is due to the cultural environment, beginning with family and education, in other words, nurture rather than nature. Namely, the child’s mind is healthy but society contaminates it (368). Or as Rousseau indicates, “the wish to command outlives the necessity from which it sprang; power to control others awakens and gratifies self-love, and habit makes it strong:” (32) “thus need gives place to whim; thus do prejudices and opinions first root themselves within us.” (32)

By re-establishing the causal connection between the mediocrity of average people and nurture, Lu Xun proposes that the unhealthy Chinese national character results from Chinese education and family structure. This is the reason why Lu Xun emphasizes “saving the children” at the end of the “Madman’s Diary (Kuang Ren Ri Ji, 狂人日记)” (28). His essay titled “How to Be Fathers Today (Wo Men Jin Tian Ru He Zuo Fu Qin; 我们今天如何做父亲)”, originally published in 1919, specifically indicates Lu Xun’s critique of the traditional Chinese family indoctrination. Lu Xun outlines that, “from the perspective of the theory of evolution, to be a father means to create the new life, to nurture the new life, and to foster the new life.” (205) The problem of the traditional Chinese family, however, is that parents usually treat their children as their private property, rather than independent individuals. In the traditional Chinese view, children are in debt to their parents their whole life, for their parents give birth to them. Hence children bear great responsibility to be obedient and faithful to their parents, but parents have no responsibility to care for the well-being of their children. (206-207) In other words, as Tina Lu observes, “the irreplaceable parents are important as individuals, but children only as members of a group, each son fully substitutable for another.” (163) In Lu Xun’s view, the traditional Chinese filial piety, or *xiao dao*, is based upon the repression of the individuality of children.

This critique of the traditional Chinese familial ethics parallels Lu Xun's critique in "Madman's Diary".

Instead of the traditional Chinese familial ethics, Lu Xun attempts to promote a new ethics in terms of the parent-children relation. Namely, "children are not the private properties of their parents, but to give birth to children are incumbent upon the parents to foster their physical/mental growth." (204-213) Compared with the model of national character in "Mara Poet", Lu Xun here tries to suggest that if the unhealthy character is due to nurture rather than nature, then to foster the independent individual character should also be the responsibility of the educators. In Lu Xun's view, the type of family miniaturizes the type of the whole society. The status of children in the family life predisposes how they will behave in society in their adulthood. In other words, if the children are not forced to be subordinate to the authority of their parents, their nurtured character of independence will make them good citizens with liberated thoughts in the future. Though Lu Xun does not quote Rousseau's *Emile or On Education* in his critique of the traditional Chinese family and education, he in fact re-creates Rousseau's theory of the nature/nurture in a Chinese context.

More importantly, the reason why Lu Xun draws a distinction between the brave individuals, the Mara poets, and the mediocre mass is not to praise the aloofness of the independent thinkers as the 'new elites', but to stress the social responsibility incumbent upon them. In Lu Xun's view, the feeling of social responsibility is the most important character of the Mara poets. In both "Mr. Fujino" and "Medicine", Lu Xun characterizes the majority of Chinese people as the spectators. They enjoy watching the slaughtering of the others and are indifferent to brutalization. In Lu Xun's fictional world, the spectator represents the selfishness and cowardice of the Chinese national character. Such selfishness at the individual level could deprive the citizens of their social responsibility in a collective sense. As Arendt points out, "the transformation of the family man from a responsible member of society in all the public affairs, to a 'bourgeois' concerned only with his private existence and knowing no civic virtue, is an international modern phenomenon." (153) The family man in the Arendtian sense "only cares for the welfare of his family or how to make the life easy

for his wife and children.” (152) Hence “for the sake of his pension, his life insurance, the security of his wife and children, such a man was ready to sacrifice his beliefs, his honor, and his human dignity.” (152)

Lu Xun criticizes the selfishness of Chinese people in almost the same way as this. For Lu Xun, “few Chinese people are actually propagating a vision for the future without interest for their own rice bowls.” (Tsu 213) Lu Xun’s critique of the Chinese national character potentially echoes Arendt’s critique of the “banality of evil”: namely, expect for “looking out for one’s personal advancement, one has no motives at all.” (Arendt 379) In Arendt’s view, a society with a group of people deprived of their social responsibility is close to the abyss of the tyrannical society (205). In this sense, Lu Xun’s depiction of the sacrifice of the revolutionary pioneers, like Xia Yu in “Medicine”, Mei Jianchi in “Forging Sword”, as well as the numerous heroes who died in the 1911 revolution mentioned in “Hair”, indicates the courage of the great individuals or the Mara poets in his view. Namely, the Mara-poet heroes are the brave individuals with the social responsibility of saving the nation and reforming the corrupted society. This confusion of private and public worlds in Lu Xun’s fiction echoes Frederic Jameson’s insightful comment on him. Namely, in contrast to the Western canon, writers in the non-Western world are more engaged in social reformation, infusing their personal world with the public world. Hence the traditional distinction between private and public worlds in the Western sense is challenged by non-Western texts in this way (Jameson74-75).

Lu Xun’s praising of the *Xin Shensizong* as well as the Mara poets distinctly reveals his pre-conception of the Western world or the Western intellectual tradition. Namely, he expects to find the kind of thinkers or authors whose thoughts typically represent these western free-thinking individuals in his own view. Though it is true that Lu Xun’s diagnosis of the passive, subservient Chinese society touches a deep layer of human nature, his imagination of national character is specifically framed by a Euro-centric axial that clearly categorizes the Chinese national character as the negative side of human nature. His imagination of national character still exists therefore within the framework of the spatialized chronology of historical evolution

that situates the western world on the higher stage superior to the Eastern world. The Mara poet spirit suggests that similar to Nietzsche, Lu Xun understands social-Darwinism as self-selection or the spiritual improvement rather than the struggle for survival. Lu Xun attributes individualism or individual free spirit, however, to the Western character particularly exemplified by the writers and thinkers of the Mara poets or the *Xinshensi Zong*. In this trans-cultural sense, Lu Xun attempts to establish an evolutionary connection between the unhealthy Chinese national character and the healthy character of Western thinkers. The self-improvement of the Chinese national character imagined by Lu Xun is part of the whole project of the Chinese modernization/westernization and nationalization.

In Lu Xun's view, the thinkers in the *Xin Shensizong*, like Nietzsche, Max Stirner, Kierkegaard, Schopenhauer and Ibsen, and the Mara poet writers, such as Byron, Shelley, Pushkin, M. Lermontov and A. Petofi, symbolize the potential for healthy national character. But he prefers to identify these thinkers or authors as the same kind based merely on the general common character among them. In general, these thinkers are in some sense strongly similar to each other in the way that Lu Xun imagined, but a variety of the differences among their personal characters as well as their thoughts seem outside Lu Xun's limited critical view. In other words, Lu Xun does not understand individualism according to the particularity of the specific individuals. On the contrary, in his view, individualism, represented by the Mara poets or the *Xin Shensizong* refers to a homogeneous imagination of the national character. This homogeneous imagination of the healthy national character reveals Lu Xun's own limited imagination of the Chinese national identity. Historically speaking, as Jing Tsu argues in *Sound and Script in Chinese Diaspora*, the imagination of the idealized national character plays the same role as a standardized language in constructing an imagined community. Perhaps not coincidentally, the attempt to make Chinese as standardized as Western languages like English or French, also begins in this period. As a precursor of using modern Chinese in his own writings, Lu Xun's imagination of the modern Western individualism as the idealized national character parallels his practice of re-doing the Chinese language in a modern/Westernized way.

However, an important aspect of Nietzsche's thought that does not attract enough attention from Lu Xun is that instead of promoting nationalization or modernization, Nietzsche is in fact an anti-modern thinker. The critique of modernity as a crucial aspect of Nietzsche's philosophy is especially featured by his severe attack against modern nation-state (132-133). My essay is not particularly dedicated to the western influence upon Lu Xun's work, and therefore it is not necessary to conduct a detailed analysis of all the authors that Lu Xun cites in the "Power of the Mara Poets" and "Cultural Prejudice". However, to analyze how Nietzsche is appropriated in Lu Xun's view is certainly helpful to reveal the Chinese writer's worldview of evolution and national revitalization. A further reading of the other parts of *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* reveals the difference between Lu Xun and Nietzsche in regard to their attitudes toward nationalism. The section "*On the New Idols*" in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* clearly indicates Nietzsche's anti-nationalistic attitude and suggests the limitation of Lu Xun's comprehension of Nietzsche (34-36). Though the common ground between Lu Xun and Nietzsche is their emphasis on individualism, Nietzsche does not understand independent individual spirit as the foundation of national revitalization. On the contrary, for Nietzsche, individual freedom transcends the restriction of social collectivity, including both Christian moral and nation-state as the Europeans' 'new idols'. As Nietzsche indicates:

"Yes, it (nation-state) also detects you, you vanquishers of the old God! You grew weary in battle and now your weariness still serves the new idols!" (35)

Historically speaking, the concept of the nation-state that flourishes in the 19th century becomes the new authoritative way of collective existence, the modern substitute for Christianity in the pre-modern period. Here by comparing the morality of nation-state to Christian morals, Nietzsche suggests that humans are still unaware of their own limitation. Nationalism manipulates the mass ideologically. Its authority is established on the subjugation of individuality:

"Language confusion of good and evil: this sign I give you as the sign of the state. Indeed, this sign signifies the will to death! Indeed, it beckons the preachers of death! Indeed, a dying for many was invented here, one that touts

itself as living; truly, a hearty service to all preachers of death! (Nietzsche 35)

As Nietzsche asserts, the nation-state demands the sacrifice of its subjects, because nationalism preaches this doctrine that the survival of national values is much more important than the survival of individuals. Therefore, the people who die for their nation in the war should be honored. This notion of sacrifice also parallels the religious war in the pre-modern time. The people who die for their faith are equivalent to the people who die for their nation. Here Nietzsche attempts to uncover the merciless social-Darwinian logic behind the ideological manipulation of nationalism. Also, similar to Christianity, nationalism is also a kind of morality that defines what is 'good' and 'evil' for people:

This sign I give you: every people speaks its own tongue of good and evil-which the neighbor does not understand. It invented its own language through customs and rights. But the state lies in all the tongues of good and evil, and whatever it may tell you, it lies- and whatever it has, it has stolen. (Nietzsche 34) State I call it, where all are drinkers of poison, the good and the bad; state, where all lose themselves, the good and the bad; state, where the slow suicide of everyone is called- 'life'." (Nietzsche 35)

Like Christianity, nation-state also draws a distinction between good and evil and inculcates this new morality to its subjects: to be loyal to one's nation is good and to betray one's nation is evil; to fight the enemy of one's nation is good and to be sympathetic with nation's enemy is bad. However, what Nietzsche attempts to indicate is that there is always a realistic political motivation beneath morality or ideology. By criticizing this new ideological manipulation, Nietzsche preaches the end of this social-Darwinian logic and the coming of the Messiah of the 'overman':

"There, where the state end- look there, my brothers! Do you not see it, the rainbow and the bridges of the overman?" (36)

In the section "*On Self-Overcoming*" in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Nietzsche has a detailed explanation in regard to the definition of the 'overman'. The word 'overman' literally means the man who is able to overcome the defects of the average human being, for instance, the cravings for power, or the will to power, and the

social-Darwinian struggle for living space. The will to power, or the will to survival, is the origin of the commanding of the stronger and the obedience of the weaker. As Nietzsche indicates,

Wherever I found the living, there I found the will to power; and even in the will of the serving I found the will to be master. The weaker is persuaded by its own will to serve the stronger, because it wants to be master over what is still weaker: this is the only pleasure it is incapable of renouncing. (89)

This will to serve the stronger is what is called the ‘instinct of the herd’ by Nietzsche. Namely, human beings are inclined to be grouped. Since the motivation to survive directs the action of humans, people have the inclination to empower themselves by subjugating themselves to the ‘stronger’. This inclination is called the will to power. Here the stronger does not have to be a specific figure, but an icon or a title, for instance, as manifested in Church or nation-state. Therefore, on the one hand, people are always obedient to the stronger to make themselves as a herd; but on the other hand, another group of people who are weaker than them are also fall under their repression. Nietzsche attempts to uncover the social-psychological origin of collective social existence. In this view, the nation-state satisfies people by covering their self-interestedness, protecting their private interests, and authorizing their feelings of belonging to the stronger. As Nietzsche asserts, a statesman could “make the spirit of his fellowmen narrow and their taste national by inciting the dormant passion and greed of his people.” (133) In other words, in Nietzsche’s view, the essence of nation-state is collective selfishness.

The critique of nation-state in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* uncovers a deep distinction between Nietzsche’s and Lu Xun’s intellectual paths. Nietzsche purports a higher stage of human evolution in which the modern nation-state as a form of social existence will disappear. In contrast, for Lu Xun, the revival of a modern China is the guiding purpose of his work. For instance, in “The Spirit of the Mara Poet”, Lu Xun especially emphasizes dialogue of the connection between the character of these spiritual fighters and the possibility of re-building the nation. This interconnection could be illustrated by the example of Byron that Lu Xun quotes in this essay. Byron

died for the Greek national independence movement, and this is the reason why Lu Xun praises him in this essay. As Rebecca E. Karl outlines in her book *Staging the World, Chinese Nationalism at the Turn of the Twentieth Century* there is a correlation between the Chinese people's global imagination and the survival of other nations in this period. Chinese people in the late 19th and early 20th centuries try to imagine the future of their own country based on the destiny of other nations in a global age of imperialism (Karl 195-196). In this context, Lu Xun's strategic example of Byron fighting for the independence of Greece in his essay could also be explained by Rebecca E. Karl's theory.

Also, as Lu Xun indicates, at the end of this essay:

These thinkers aforementioned, though their characters, thoughts and practices in some way differ from each other due to their ethnical/national backgrounds, their characters are identical to each other in one way. Namely, they are all courageous, unyielding and sincere. They are all disobedient to the opinion of the mass and obsolete customs. Their brave voice inspires their fellows to pursue the new life, and then promotes the progress of their own nations. Are there Chinese thinkers comparable with these satanic poets? China traditionally has the most advanced civilization within Asia, and no neighbor country is comparable with China in this way. Hence China is also pride of its cultural priority. Though today it loses its traditional honor, it is still generally comparable with the Western Europe. This is China's fortune...People who appreciate China think that the Chinese civilization has never been influenced by the others. Hence its uniqueness is preserved. Though it falls recently, it is still globally incomparable. But the people who depreciate China argue that Chinese civilization is complacent since it has been isolated from the outside world for a long time. This is the reason why reformation has been voiced in China for twenty years, but the new voice never appears in China. If so, for China, the spiritual fighters are precious. (275)

(上述诸人，其为品性言行思维，虽以种族有殊，外缘多别，因现种种状，而实统于一宗：无不刚健不挠，抱诚守真，不媚取于群，以随顺旧俗；发为雄声，以起其国人之新生，而大其国于天下。求之华土，孰比之哉？夫中国之立于亚洲也，文明先进，四邻莫与之伦，蹇视高步，因益为特别之发达；及今日虽凋零，而犹与西欧对立，此其幸也。得者以文化不受影响于异邦，自具特异之光彩，近虽中衰，亦世稀有。失者则以孤立自是，不遇校讎，终至堕落而之实利，此所为呼维新既二十年，而新声迄不起于中国也。夫如是，则精神界之战士贵矣。)

This discussion at the end of this essay clearly illustrates Lu Xun's purpose of praising these satanic poets in this essay. Lu Xun's interpretation of the spirit of these satanic

poets is not to understand them in their own context, but to use them to emphasize the importance of the spiritual fighters for saving and re-building China. In other words, this essay is not merely for appreciating these rebellious poets, but for the purpose of national revitalization. Similar to the “Mara Poet” essay, in “On Cultural Prejudice”, Lu Xun particularly indicates the importance of *Xinshensi Zong* for the re-building of the Chinese national character, as well as Chinese national revitalization:

Now China has the crisis both domestically and internationally. It needs reformation. It would certainly be unable to survive in a competitive global context if it still keeps its traditional customs and remains on the inferior global position. However, today’s people who want to save China, in most cases, choose the incorrect way. Though Chinese people had already started the reformation to save the nation, and also worry about its destiny, they still cannot deliver China out of its current crisis. Hence the bright people have to understand the global situation at first, and then to apply the quintessence of the western civilization to the Chinese situation. From a global perspective, this kind of practice could let China catch up with the latest trend of the western thought; from the domestic perspective, this could also preserve the essence of the Chinese tradition. To revitalize the Chinese tradition with the help of the latest western thought is also to establish a new kind of Chinese culture, and to change the life of the Chinese people by changing their character. Hence the Chinese people would start to be aware of the current crisis of China and to become the individuals with independence. The country of the mass will transit to be the country of human beings. Although Chinese people have had the idea of reformation for a long time, the young Chinese today still blame China for its outdated culture and want to replace it with the material advantage of the western civilization. They are usually blind to the latest thought in the end of the 19th century that I discuss in this essay. (295)

（中国在今，内密既发，四邻竞集而迫，情状自不能无所变迁。夫安弱守雌，笃于旧习，固无以争存于天下。第所以匡救之者，谬而失正，则虽日易故常，哭泣号叫之不已，于忧患又何补矣？此所谓明哲之士，必洞打世界之大势，权衡较量，去其偏颇，得其神明，施之中国，翕合无间。外之既不后于世界之思潮，内之仍弗失固有之血脉，取今复古，别立新宗，人生意义，致之深邃，则国人之自觉至，个性张，沙聚之邦，由是转为人国。顾今者翻然思变，历岁已多，青年之所思惟，大都归罪于古之文物，而于适所言十九世纪末之思潮，乃漠然不一措意。）

This paragraph clearly indicates how Lu Xun’s idea of the re-building of national character is influenced by the fundamental discourse of evolution in his time. He makes his own change to the paradigm of evolution. Namely, in his view, the advantage of western civilization is the rise of individualism in the late 19th century,

for instance, the individualism in Nietzsche's and Max Stirner's works. This change to the paradigm of evolution establishes a strong connection between the dignity of individual freedom and the destiny of the nation to which the individuals are subject.

Therefore, in Lu Xun's view, the foundation of a strong nation-state is the dignity of individuality as it appears in Nietzsche's, Max Stirner's or Kierkegaard's works. The strong and healthy nation should be the natural extension of the strong and healthy individual character. The paradox of Lu Xun's idea, however, is that the nation-state is usually understood as the repression of individuality, rather than the extension of it, especially from the perspective of Nietzsche and Max Stirner, the two thinkers Lu Xun uses to support his own position. Similar to Nietzsche, according to Max Stirner, "state, conscience, religion, these despots, make me a slave, and their liberty is my slavery; the sacred state hollows everything that is serviceable to it." (98) In general, the difference between Lu Xun's interpretation of Nietzsche and Stirner is that Lu Xun reads their ideas of individuality with a strong nationalistic orientation. Since nationalism, or the concept of the modern nation-state, is strongly rejected by both Nietzsche and Max Stirner, Lu Xun in some sense misuses them in this way. Lu Xun's misuse of Nietzsche does not merely suggest the Chinese writer's textual deviation, however. Instead, the misreading represents a historical phenomenon. Lu Xun's misappropriation of Nietzsche could be elaborated in this way: Lu Xun uses this famous Western anti-modern thinker as part of his own imagination for the modernization/nationalization of China. In other words, if the diagnosis of human nature marks the intersection of their critical horizons, what fall outside the intersection are their different views of global imaginations. Lu Xun's optimistic worldview of the Euro-centric evolution unfortunately restricts his detection of these western thinkers' self-critique. For Nietzsche, though his critique of the modern nation-state is precursory and opens multiple hidden dialogues between those thinkers who critique state-power in the 20th century and himself, his identity as a European thinker prevents him from extending his horizon toward the situation of the non-Western world, and therefore Nietzsche may not offer the political insight that Lu Xun attributes to this philosopher.

Hence Nietzsche's critique of the 'new idols', as well as his concept of self-overcoming, or the emergence of the overman, shows the critical difference between Nietzsche and Lu Xun's understanding of nationalistic evolution. Although the importance of individual creativity in the prologue of *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* strongly parallels the essence of the Mara Poet, Nietzsche's critique of the new idols sharply contrasts Lu Xun's re-interpretation of Nietzsche. Within Nietzsche's framework of evolution, the overman as the evolutionary destination is beyond the current type of social organization in the human world. In other words, the nation-state, the major type of the political organization in the modern age, has to be overcome. For Lu Xun, such movement beyond the nation-state is never politically or psychologically imaginable. On the contrary, Lu Xun's purpose is to re-build China as a modern nation-state, a mentally-strong state able to stand in a competitive global context. Hence Lu Xun's highly construed use of Nietzsche potentially replaces the Nietzschean evolutionary destination with the necessity of revitalizing China.

Compared with Nietzsche, Hegel and Heidegger, whose political theories are strongly in support of the coalition between individuality and nation-state, in fact coincide with Lu Xun's imagination of national revival, though in a historical view, it is very unlikely that Lu Xun would choose Heidegger to frame his theory of the Mara poet. Both Hegel and Heidegger link individuality/ the existential individual to nation-state/ the collective existence. In *Philosophy of Right* and *Phenomenology of Spirit*, Modern nation-state is preached by Hegel as the supreme type of social existence, in contrast to civil society and family, which in his view are insufficient for social life (269). In Hegel's view, the genuine individuality should be, and could only be, realized on a national scale. Meanwhile, the genuine existence of a nation-state should be realized as being fully engaged with each of its subjects, rather than being the dominant force superior to its citizens (307). In this case, Hegel's theory of nation is more suited to theorize the example of Byron fighting for the independence of the modern Greece in the *Power of Mara Poets*. In *Introduction to Metaphysics*, Heidegger preaches the revival of the collective spirit, the 'Being of the beings', which represents the spirit of the continental Europe, in contrast to both the capitalism

in the west and the communism in the east (40). Heidegger similarly indicates that the continental Europe in the early 20th century was squeezed between these two cultural types (40). Hence he changes his early position in support of the ‘existential individual’ in *Being and Time*. In Heidegger’s later period, the original idea of the existential individual is embraced by the collective existence that pre-exists the individual, and one major underpinning of this concept of the collective existence is ‘Volk’, or the nation (38). Heidegger’s motivation therefore in some way parallels Lu Xun’s. Both of their ideas of the national revival result from the geo-political transitions that threaten their homelands. Also, Lu Xun’s global imagination potentially echoes Hegel’s Euro-centric imagination of the progress of the world history in the *Philosophy of History*. In this sense the difference between Nietzsche and Hegel/Heidegger is that Nietzsche calls the legitimacy of nation-state, nationalism or national identity into question, while for Hegel and Heidegger, the national identity makes a cornerstone in their philosophical mansion. As Prasenjit Duara in *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China* indicates that the evolutionary historiography in Hegel’s *Philosophy of history* not only parallels Europeans’ colonial imagination of the non-European areas, but also frames Chinese people’s self-imagination (Duara 19). The Hegelian historiography exemplifies the spacialized evolutionary view which positions the western world as evolutionarily superior to the eastern world. In some sense, the comparison of Hegel, Nietzsche and Heidegger’s historical views suggest that the European evolutionary view is not completely self-consistent. However, though it is partially interrupted by Nietzsche’s critique of modernity, this cleft seems bridged by Lu Xun’s Euro-centric historical imagination.

The trans-national, inter-textual connection between Lu Xun and Nietzsche occurs in a broad historical context in the 20th century in which the formation of China as a modern nation-state is predominant. This difference between Nietzsche and Lu Xun’s attitudes toward the modern nation-state uncovers a historical underpinning behind Lu Xun’s idea of the national revival. Lu Xun did not include Nietzsche’s critique against the modern state power as part of his understanding of

Nietzsche when he drew upon Nietzsche's work to support the national revival and the historical progress of China. This appropriation of Nietzsche does not devalue Lu Xun's work, but serves as an important footnote of the geo-political situation between the non-Western areas and the central Western world. It is also a miniature of the Chinese translation and acceptance of the western intellectual tradition during this period. The anxiety of being threatened by the external world that leads to the emergency of re-building and revitalizing the nation, a situation that in fact narrows the Chinese intellectuals' worldview into the straitjacket of evolution. Chinese intellectuals in the late 19th century and the early 20th century are strongly focused on those determinants that result in the global logic of the strong /weak between the Western and the non-Western worlds. In other words, the imperialistic expansion of the Western world results in the Chinese people's anxiety regarding their national survival and compels them to learn from the side of the stronger, according to their own non-Western view. Lu Xun does not move beyond this comprehensive limitation that pigeonholes the worldview of his intellectual peers, though he attempts to redirect Chinese attention toward Western individualism in the modern age.

Based on *Against the Voice of the Mass*, it is reasonable to believe that Lu Xun would never support national arrogance or chauvinism. But undoubtedly, Lu Xun, similar to the other Chinese thinkers in this period, privileges national revival as the most important task that supports his career as a modernistic/realistic writer. In this sense, the absence of Nietzsche's critique of nation-state in Lu Xun's appropriation of Nietzsche miniaturizes the problematic aspect of the Chinese nationalism in the 20th century. Namely, when national survival becomes the most emergent task, the rise of nationalism in China progresses without self-reflection.

In modern China, Marxism is treated and appropriated in a similar way as Nietzsche was appropriated by Lu Xun. Though some aspects of Marxism are in contradistinction to Nietzsche's thought, both Marx and Nietzsche launch severe critiques of the modern nation-state. In other words, both are anti-modern thinkers. For both of them, the modern nation-state as a developmental stage of human society will eventually be replaced progressively by some new kind of

social organization. In modern China, however, Marxism has been selectively appropriated as a theory of evolution, an evolutionary hierarchy that ranges from primitive society to communism. In other words, similar to Lu Xun's narrow use of Nietzsche, Marxism, as an anti-modern theory, becomes the motivation of Chinese modernization and nationalization. However, in a historical view, as Arif Dirlik observes in *Revolution and History: The Origins of Marxist Historiography in China, 1919-1937*, the significant conflict between Marxism's critique of the nation-state and the socialist-oriented national-building project in China is covered by an ideologically-revised Marxism as the guideline of the Chinese socialism movement. The imagined consistency between the brave western individuals with their liberated thinking and the Chinese national revival as it appears in *The Spirit of the Mara Poet*, as well as in *On Cultural Prejudice*, covers up the inconsistency between national identity and the individuals in the real history.

In fact, the history of Chinese nationalism in the 20th century disproves Lu Xun's assumption that the thriving of individuality is the prerequisite of national revival. In today's view, the project of re-building a strong nation has indeed been realized in the mid-20th century. However, with the establishment of the new socialist regime in the mainland in 1949, individual freedom, especially the spirit of challenging the authority praised by Lu Xun in the *Power of the Mara Poet*, has gradually been suppressed. In the newly-established People's Republic of China, the repression of the independent individual spirit gradually reaches its zenith during the period from the 1950s to the 1970s (Wu 47). This conflict between Chinese nationalism and individualism seriously undermines the Chinese national independent movement in the 20th century. Lu Xun's original purpose is to demonstrate the revival of individuality in the spiritual/intellectual sense steers a path toward the collectively revitalized nation, but the re-building of the nation eventually outweighs the importance of individual freedom in Lu Xun's view. This statement of this conflict and contradiction could also be imagined as Nietzsche's potential response to Lu Xun's construed appropriation of his thought: it is important to be always critical to the idea of national revival.

Chapter Three

The Healthy and the Unhealthy Nationalism: Against the Hegemony of Imperialism and Colonization

As “Mr. Fujino” suggests, for modern China, nationalism/modernization and the resistance to globalization are two sides of the same coin. Generally speaking, the resistance to globalization compels modernization/nationalization. However, though the acceptance of a Euro-centric evolutionary worldview would seem to undermine this resistance, the Chinese resistance to globalization in Lu Xun’s view is much more reactive than the post-colonial theorists in the late 20th century, like Said and Spivak, have estimated for other parts of the world. As Shih Shu-mei indicates, “Lu Xun’s critique of orientalism far surpasses even Edward Said’s in its sharpness.” (84) For Said and Spivak, though post-structuralism as a methodology helps them to discern how the traces of Euro-centrism restructure the non-European mind, their works are more dedicated to the analysis of colonization rather than to constructing a powerful resistance. Post-structuralism, though more skillful in analyzing the colonial traces of a social hegemony, also problematically deconstructs the resistance against hegemony, since resistance in this view is treated as a mental extension of the hegemony, rather than as the counterpart of it. Likewise, nationalism in the non-European world, as the resistance against the global hegemony of the West, also functions as the natural extension of the logic of Western modernity. In this sense Lu Xun does not treat his own acceptance of nationalism as a psychological extension of the influence of western imperialism upon China, but attempts to draw a distinction between the healthy and the unhealthy nationalism. On the one hand, since the national revitalization is what his writing project focuses on, in his view, nationalism is certainly indispensable for China. But on the other side, Lu Xun is also strongly critical to imperialism, which in his view is the “nationalism of brutality (兽性爱国).” (308) In this sense Lu Xun attempts to draw a distinction between the two kinds of nationalism, the healthy and the unhealthy nationalism, where imperialism and

militarism belong to the category of the unhealthy nationalism, or the nationalism of brutality (307-310). For example, in his essay “Against the Opinion of the Mass”, Lu Xun defines what is called the nationalism of brutality:

Therefore, to be fond of invading and brutalizing other countries and expanding one’s own territory is the patriotism of the barbarous. We as mankind would certainly not follow the way of the animals. If we are inherently barbarous, the extinction of the war and the everlasting peace could only be possible after the extinction of human being and the total bankruptcy of the human world. Hence the existence of military power would be as permanent as the existence of mankind. This is also the reason why military power is necessary for every body politic, in order to defend themselves against the invaders. Military power is not for the sake of invading the weak. Otherwise, we, mankind, would be dominated by military force, rather than using it to protect us. (308)

(是故嗜杀戮攻夺，思廓其国威于天下者，兽性之爱国也，人欲超禽虫，则不当慕其思。顾战争绝迹，平和永存，乃又须迟之人类灭尽，大地崩离之后；则甲兵之寿，盖又与人类同终始者已。然此特所以自捍卫，辟虎狼也，不假之为爪牙，以残食世之小弱，令兵为人用，而不强人为兵奴。)

The last part of this essay is dedicated to the critique of imperialism and social Darwinism. In this part Lu Xun identifies two kinds of nationalism, namely, nationalism as the cultural heritage of a national tradition and nationalism as militarism (307-310). As he indicates that “since human beings are originally barbarous, our barbarity is concealed beneath the surface of civilization”; “However, the barbarous part of mankind sometimes re-emerges above the surface of humanity and results in the clash between the different nations”; “Hence military power is necessary for a nation, not for the sake of expanding its own territory and subjugating other nations to its own power, but for the purpose of protecting itself when being invaded by the others.” (308) Based on this analysis of militarism, Lu Xun criticizes the ‘invasive social-Darwinism’ that is prevalent in China in his time. As Lu Xun indicates in the last part of this essay, some Chinese people admire the military strength of the Western invaders. They hope that China would be as militarily powerful as the invaders who used to brutalize China. In this view, the military strength steers the way into the international league of the strongest for China. They hope that China would be able to take revenge upon the invaders one day (309). Lu Xun attacks this kind of ‘vulgar social-Darwinism’ or ‘vulgar patriotism’. He tries to

argue that what China needs is to revitalize itself and defend itself against imperialism, rather than to join the league of the imperialists. Here Lu Xun is promoting a kind of pacifism. Interestingly, he especially identifies the traditional Chinese society as the society of pacifism:

However, the difference between China and those countries of imperialism is that in China, people enjoy agriculture as their life-style. They rarely leave their home towns. If the emperor likes waging war against the neighbors, average people usually complain about this kind of military practice. Chinese people usually like highlighting the great influence of its civilization, rather than brutalizing its neighbors by military force. Hence Chinese people are incomparably the pacifists.... If the customs all over the world are like the custom in China, just as what Tolstoy says, though there are varieties of nations, people would remain in their own territory without invading the others and the everlasting peace would be realizable. (308-309)

(然中国则何如国矣，民乐耕稼，轻去其乡，上而好远功，在野者辄怨怼，凡所自诩，乃在文明之光华美大，而不借暴力以凌四夷，宝爱和平，天下鲜有。倘使举天下之习同中国，犹托尔斯泰之所言，则大地之上，虽种族繁多，邦国殊异，而此疆此界，执守不相侵，历万世无乱离焉可也。)

Here Lu Xun's attitude toward Chinese society is largely different from his attitude against the Chinese national character in other places of his work. Therefore, his attitude toward the national character of China is both negative and positive. In this essay, the national character of China turns out to be inherently peace-loving. This contradiction could be reconciled by his ultimate purpose to defend China against western imperialism. His expectation is that China could be able to counteract the western imperialists, but this country needs remedy for its incapacity of national self-determination. Also, Lu Xun identifies the situation of China with India and Poland, pointing out that both of these countries are the victims of imperialism, just like China:

...our people like mocking at the victims like Poland and India. China and Poland never communicate with each other, but people in Poland are sincere and freedom-loving. People who have sincerity and love freedom always love their motherland as the embodiment of these two characters. Therefore, people who do not want to be slaves are certainly sympathetic with their fate. India has had communication with China for a long time, from ancient time until now. Our cultural tradition, like thought, belief, morality and art, are in debt to what they bestow to us. Hence if these two countries are in danger of being invaded, we should feel melancholy; if they are extinctive, we should cry for their fate.

(309)

（至于波兰印度，乃华土同病之邦矣，波兰虽素不相往来，顾其民多情愫，爰自繇，凡人之有情愫宝自繇者，胥爰其国为二事征象，盖人不乐为皂隶，则孰能不眷慕悲悼之。印度则交通自古，贻我大祥，思想信仰道德艺文，无不蒙，虽兄弟眷属，何以加之。使二国而危者，吾当为之抑郁，二国而陨，吾当为之号咷，无祸则上祷于天，俾与吾华土同其无极。）

This paragraph, together with the former one, embodies Lu Xun's geo-political imagination. In his view, the current situation of China at that time is comparable with the situations of Poland and India since all of these three countries suffer from imperialism. In fact, the practice of identifying the fate of China with the fate of Poland also appears in Liang Qi-chao's works. As Rebecca E. Karl in her book *Staging the World* indicates, the practice of identifying China with Poland suggests the fact that the global logic of imperialism and social-Darwinism had already restructured the world-view of Chinese people. Chinese people treat the failure of Poland as a lesson. Namely, in the Chinese view, it is Polish inability to strengthen their own nation that leads to their destined failure. Hence Chinese people learn from this political situation and endeavor to promote the inner reformation to revitalize China (Karl 29-47). In *Staging the World*, Rebecca E. Karl argues that the revival of nationalism, as well as the reformation or national revitalization projects that appeared during the late 19th and early 20th centuries in China, are actually due to Chinese people's misinterpretation of the global situation of the expansion of the Western world. Her point is that the encounters between China and the outside world do not draw the attention of the Chinese people toward the systematic critique against global capitalism or world-system, but lead them to their inner-reformation, self-revitalization, or modernization. In her view, Chinese intellectuals blame themselves for their own inability to catch up with the evolutionary steps of the western world, rather than to question the global order that places them in an inferior position. Namely, Chinese people at that time believe that they are unable to steer their own way into the western world, or the developed world. Rather, the western world should be responsible for the trauma and failure that they had suffered. In other words, in Karl's view, Chinese intellectuals during this period are blind to the true essence of the global situation: the truth is not that China falls short of western

technology and institutions, but it is the unlimited expansion of global capitalism that results in the fall of the east (Karl 195-196).

Lu Xun's idea of national revitalization certainly matches Karl's judgment in terms of the revival of nationalism during this period, but he indeed raises the critique against imperialism and colonization. Lu Xun not only intends to promote a kind of self-revitalization of China, but also begins with the consideration of the relation between imperialism and war. Hence there are actually two kinds of social-Darwinism in Lu Xun's work. He is indeed influenced by social Darwinism, but he also reverts to a kind of 'vulgar social-Darwinism,' the doctrine that the strong beats and outlives the weak. But since Lu Xun's national revitalization project advocates that a healthy nation should consist of mentally healthy individuals with the freedom of will, and this is the prerequisite for China's resistance against imperialism, the emergence of vulgar social Darwinism represents a contradiction. To praise militarism is a kind of mental degeneration. As Lu Xun outlines,

Nowadays Chinese elites do not consider the connections between Poland/India and China. They think that these two countries are doomed to fail. This is mainly due to the fact that the Chinese had been brutalized by the imperialists and subordinated to their tyranny for a long time. Hence Chinese people lost their traditional nature of pacifism as well as the sympathy. Their mind is full of utility. They made this kind of terrible argument because they misread the current situation. In one word, the reason why people praise militarism is that they have been subjugated to the tyranny of imperialism for so long. Therefore, they gradually lost their original nature and become the slave-minds. (309)
(今志士奈何独不念之，谓自取其殃而加之谤，岂其屡蒙兵火，久匍匐于强暴者之足下，则旧性失，同情漓，灵台之中，满以势利，因迷谬亡识而为此与！故总度今日佳兵之士，自屈于强暴久，因渐成奴子之性。)

Here, Lu Xun associates the nationalism of the barbarous, or the vulgar social-Darwinism with the bad national character of the Chinese people. In general, Lu Xun identifies two kinds of 'national characters', the good and the bad. The bad national character embraces obedience, selfishness and the slave mind, while the good embraces pacifism. He differentiates the eventual qualities of the healthy nationalism from the unhealthy; the healthy strives to be patriotic and to respect the integrity of other nations, while the unhealthy nationalism celebrates militarism and imperialism. He also identifies two kinds of social Darwinism; the healthy social Darwinism refers

to national self-improvement and the progress from the lower to the higher historical stage, while the unhealthy refers to the social Darwinism as the excuse of military expansion. These three groups of concepts together suggest that Lu Xun's thought is heavily influenced by nationalism, national identity, and social-Darwinism as the ideology flourishing in the 19th and early 20th centuries. He certainly has an idealized understanding of healthy nationalism, healthy social-Darwinism, as well as the healthy national character of China. These attitudes also reveal his basic worldview: namely, the revival of the western world suggests that China needs to revitalize itself to counteract the west, but he expects a peaceful world without imperialism and colonization.

James Reeve Pusey in his book *Lu Xun and Evolution* has a more detailed philosophical analysis in regard to Lu Xun's sophisticated attitude toward social-Darwinism. Namely, Lu Xun both accepts and reverts to social Darwinism. Different from what I discuss above, Pusey does not use the healthy and unhealthy social-Darwinism to draw a distinction between Lu Xun's acceptance of the historical view of evolution and his resistance to imperialism. From a philosophical perspective, Pusey attempts to extract a systematic theory of evolution from Lu Xun's text. In his view, the reason why Lu Xun is critical to both Chinese society and imperialism is that, different from pursuing 'biological determinism', Lu Xun embraces a 'behavioral evolution' (99). Lu Xun's point is that we human beings are not pre-determined by the animalistic, the primitive, or the barbarous part that remains in us throughout a long term of evolution. On the contrary, the evolution of human beings is up to how they choose to act. Strictly speaking, this is not a Darwinian view, but Lamarckian (99). Moreover, Pusey argues that Lu Xun's theory of evolution is the evolution from the primitive/barbarous type to the type of humanity (99). Therefore, Pusey argues that Lu Xun's theory of evolution is certainly influenced by Confucianism, though he claims to be iconoclast. In Pusey's view, what Lu Xun attacks intensively is the national character of hypocrisy, selfishness, cowardice and avarice behind the civilized face of the Chinese people. By criticizing the diseased national character, Lu Xun therefore also appeals to a kind of genuine humanity

which parallels the teachings of Confucianism (107). As Pusey asserts, “Lu Xun longed, as much as Confucius, for a world in which people would be humane and only ‘humane people’ were ‘true people’.” (107) Hence Lu Xun’s theory of evolution is critical to the barbarity of both Chinese society and Western imperialism. In his view, human history evolves out of the barbarous stage to the stage of humanity, or as Pusey indicates, Lu Xun “waved the flag of evolution against the flag of evolution.” (81) Pusey’s point is insightful and could be justified by some of Lu Xun’s own argument, but his ‘philosophizing’ of Lu Xun is historically de-contextualized. Lu Xun does not imagine himself as an interlocutor in reaction to the western evolutionists, but as an observer of the historical situation of China from both the domestic and the international perspectives.

In other words, the idea of evolution in Lu Xun’s work is not clearly philosophical, but historical. Pusey’s contribution to an analysis of Lu Xun’s thought is that he discerns Lu Xun’s positive and negative attitudes toward social Darwinism, but the Chinese writer’s ambivalent attitude is more due to the complexity of the historical context in which he is situated, rather than the necessity that he feels to promote his own philosophy of evolution. Lu Xun hoped that Chinese people could spiritually evolve from their current condition to a higher status. He also expected that the imperialist countries could cease the war among themselves. Hence it would be possible to keep China away from the encroachment of the western world. In Lu Xun’s view, both the domestic Chinese society and the Western world are barbarous. Lu Xun’s political thought may have great potential to critique the barbarous social Darwinism that promotes the brutalization and enslavement of the others, but its philosophical potential is ultimately due to his experience of this complex period of Chinese history.

Lu Xun’s critique against imperialism in “Against the Opinion of the Mass” strongly parallels the same kind of pacifistic argument in the Japanese writer Mushanokoji Saneatsu’s drama *A Young Man’s Dream* (*Yige Qingnian de Meng*; 一个青年的梦), which is translated by Lu Xun himself. Mushanokoji Saneatsu is almost completely forgotten by today’s readers, but at that time he indeed greatly influences

Lu Xun's thought. *A Young Man's Dream* is particularly dedicated to the critique of war and nationalism. In this drama, a young student in his dream is led by someone to see the ghosts of the people who die in the wars. These ghosts from different countries convene together to exchange their experiences of the sufferings and traumas resulted from war. The drama begins with different experiences of the sufferings in the war, but eventually steers the talk to the origin of war and the possibility of ceasing violence among nation-states. The central argument in this drama is concerned with the causal relation between nationalism, social Darwinism, and war. In the author's view, nationalism is the intellectual origin of war among different nations. The struggle for supremacy among different nations results in the war among them. Therefore, if the military force of the several strongest countries threatens the other nations, all the nations will eventually be forced into this bad game of the struggle for supremacy and self-preservation. It is the struggle for supremacy that creates the global logic of social-Darwinism (Mushanokoji 291). This logic of social-Darwinism poses the to-be-or-not-to-be question to each of its participants. Namely, if a nation is unable to compete with its international competitors, it will be wiped out of the surface of the earth. Mushanokoji indicates that:

If the utmost reason for waging war still exists, it is totally unreasonable to believe that the war itself would be disappeared. Nationalism necessarily results in the war. War could not disappear in the modern age when each nation-state wants to maximize its own interests. Therefore, if nationalism is the unquestionable truth, then war is certainly unavoidable and should be praised as the loveliest. To occupy other's territory is not shameful, but a way of establishing reputation. To make others to be the conquered people is not shameful, but glorious. (288)

（倘不去掉战争原因的原因，却要消灭战争的枝叶，实在是无理的话。从国家主义生出的战争，是必然的结果。在仅计本国的利益，而且以仅计本国利益为是的现代，战争不能消灭，是当然之至的。如果国家主义无错误，是真理，战争也就不可免。而且是美的了。所以国家主义的人，赞美战争；战胜的事，算是勇，算是美。取了别国的领土，不是耻辱，是名誉；使别国人做了亡国之民，也不是耻辱，是光荣。）

Hence if nationalism is the origin of war, it eventually forces every nation to compete for living spaces or to preserve itself in a social-Darwinian context. Therefore, social Darwinism becomes the only political logic and no people have the

alternative choice:

If I speak to the living people like this, they would say that I am crazy, and would certainly pose this question to me: “don’t you even care about your own nation being conquered? Is it acceptable for you if all your decedents become the conquered people? We would prefer to be dragged into the war or even die for it rather than being the conquered people. In fact, to die is indeed better than being the conquered people. If my country will be a subsidiary part of another country, I will certainly be willing to die for it, to struggle for its freedom. But even so, this does not necessarily suggest that there is no other choice to avoid being enslaved without war.... ‘Without war, people will be the conquered people’ used to be a terrible truth, but in today, this has to be re-evaluated. (Mushanokoji, 273)

(假使我对活人这样说，他们会说我是发疯，并且一定问，你连祖国亡了也不管么。你的子孙做亡国民也不妨么？我们与其做亡国民，不如战争，不如死。其实我们如果要做亡国民，自然不如死。我的祖国如果要变成别国的属国，我自然也愿意拼了命战争的；但虽然这样说，也未必便没有无须战争，也不做属国的方法。不战便亡国，这在从前，也许是可怕的真理；不，在现在还是几分的事实，也未可知的。)

To some extent, Lu Xun’s translation and his preference for this Japanese drama echoes his trauma during his Japan period. As a Japanese author, Mushanokoji Saneatsu is certainly on the side of the left. He also sides with Lu Xun. It is Japanese militarism that results in his original trauma, but he can also find the Japanese author who strongly rejects militarism. Both authors try to move beyond the kinds of vulgar social Darwinism tentatively. In *A Young Man’s Dream*, Mushanokoji Saneatsu deals with the phenomenon of ‘the strong beating the weak’ as a universal phenomenon in the human world. Saneatsu makes a comparison of the students fighting in school and the war among nations. (347-357) He tries to indicate that to struggle for supremacy and to tyrannize the weak represent the endowed nature of mankind. Therefore, pacifism is idealistic but indispensable for humans.

The idea that nationalism is the origin of the imperialistic expansion and the political violence already exists before Lu Xun and Mushanokoji’s works. For instance, Kang You-wei, a leading reformist in the late Qing dynasty, argues in one of his major influential works, *Datong Shu* (大同书, The book of ‘Datong’, or translated as *Utopia or the Book of Egalitarianism*), that the only way to cease the violence between nations is to eliminate the national boundaries and to re-categorize all the

nation-states as a whole. In Kang's view, if there are no national boundaries, there would be no wars against each other (164-183). *Da Tong Shu*, in general, is a utopian project imagined by Kang You-wei, in order to eliminate all kinds of the pains for the human beings. In this book, he attributes all sorts of sufferings and pains to the varieties of social/political differences. To eliminate the national boundaries in order to cease the wars is just a part of this project. Besides the national boundaries, he also argues that the social difference between the male and the female is the origin of the social repression of the women (53-78). Hence life-long marriage should be cancelled for the realization of the equal human rights between the male and the female (76). Kang You-wei's Utopian project is largely over-ambitious and certainly lacks practicability. But this text reveals the historical context of colonization and the east-west relation behind it. For instance, Kang's idea in regard to the unequal binary between the male and the female reveals the influence of western social thought upon the Chinese society. His imagination of a new world without the national boundaries directly responds to the colonization and imperialism that China had suffered in the late 19th century. Compared with Lu Xun and Mushanokoji, Kang You-wei's critique of imperialism is much more radical. In this sense this over-ambitious political reformation project undermines the critical capacity of Kang's critique. However, the reason to read Kang You-wei's critique of imperialism together with Lu Xun and Lu Xun's translation of Mushanokoji's work is to illustrate a genealogy of the critiques of imperialism during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. In other words, Lu Xun's idea not only reveals his own attitude toward imperialism and nationalism, but a historical continuum regarding the thoughts of nationalism and the critique of imperialism.

In this sense Lu Xun and Mushanokoji Saneatsu's critique of imperialism could be illustrated by Isaiah Berlin's theory of national cultural self-determination. In his book *The Three Critiques of Enlightenment*, Isaiah Berlin strongly supports the uniqueness of each national tradition. His argument is based on his re-interpretation of three anti-Enlightenment thinkers, Vico, Herder and Hamann. The German thinker Herder is a nationalist, but in his view, different from modern Nazism. Herder's

nationalism is healthy, positive and constructive. In contrast to French rationalists, Herder steers a new way of re-considering human society. Namely, each human society has its specificity and the local society has to be organized according to its local particularities (Berlin, 256). Moreover, according to Isaiah Berlin, the practice of applying universal rational principles always contains a realistic core, namely, to tyrannize others and to occupy others' territory. As Berlin indicates, "Herder denounced a tendency to destroy regional or national differences in favor of flat and mechanical forms of life," (259) for "nothing is more fatal than the attempted assimilation of one culture with those of the others." (261) Based on this, Berlin raises his own critique against European colonization. His reason for criticizing colonization is the importance of preserving the multiplicity of the different national traditions. Hence Isaiah Berlin praises the national independent movements in the 20th century as the movement against the cosmopolitan tyranny of the single-sided European culture. Lu Xun's and Mushanokoji's points of the relation between national tradition and imperialism certainly parallel Isaiah Berlin's point in regard to this relation. For all of them, imperialism threatens the multiplicity of the different national traditions. Imperialism is to subordinate different national traditions to the tyranny of one culture, and this is especially unjust for those countries being brutalized. According to Mushanokoji:

We should also respect the civilizations of India and China and hope them to thrive. To be fond of the struggle between the neighbors or the bankruptcy of the Chinese civilization is not good. Even for us, now we could convince that the Japanese people are indispensable for the human species. In fact, we should acknowledge the advantage of the others, fostering their advantage, and to learn from them to benefit ourselves. To destruct the civilization of the others and to establish one's own civilization based on tyrannizing the others is a feeble-minded practice and violates the general will of humans. For instance, if the civilizations all over the world all become the German-styled, even the German people would be uncomfortable with this. Could we be happy with the whole world being dominated by the French civilization? We'd rather let the number of different civilizations increase and all kinds of civilizations flourish on the earth. (290)

(我们也不可不可不尊敬支那和印度的文明，要他发达。喜欢邻国的争斗，喜欢支那文明的破坏，是不行的。就是我们日本，现在也一定可以证明是人类里不可缺少的人种。我们其实是应该承认别国人的长处，发挥这长处，

从这里取出可取的东西，因此得到利益的。破坏了别国的文明，就在这上面建设自己的文明，是一件发昏的事，违背人类的意志的。现在试想，如果全世界的文明，都成了德国式的。别国人无须说，就是德国人，也要说不甚舒服的。即使法国的文明支配了全世界，我们能够高兴么？我们还不如种种文明，在地上存在的更多，发达的更盛的好。）

This critique of European cultural hegemony echoes Berlin's analysis of the same issue as aforementioned. As the post-colonial experiences in the Eastern Asia, Mushanokoji and Lu Xun's critiques justify Berlin's judgment.

Besides strong similarities to Isaiah Berlin and Mushanokoji, Lu Xun's critique of imperialism and social-Darwinism also parallels Nietzsche's critique of nationalism. As I indicate at the beginning of this chapter, Lu Xun's attitude toward nationalism is both positive and negative. In his view, national revitalization is indispensable for China, but he is also strongly critical to western nationalism as imperialism or militarism. In other words, he thinks that China needs the positive aspect of nationalism to counteract the negative aspect of nationalism that is promoted by western countries. Lu Xun's critique of western imperialism reveals another potential connection between Nietzsche's point and his own point. Both of them are critical of nationalism, especially the kind of 'vulgar nationalism' as imperialistic expansion and national loyalty. For instance, Nietzsche offers the following example in *Beyond Good and Evil*:

Suppose that a statesman puts his people in the position of needing to do 'great politics' in the future, although they are ill equipped and ill prepared by nature for this task, so that they need to sacrifice their old and reliable virtues for the sake of a new and dubious mediocrity.... Suppose that a statesman like this incites the dormant passions and greed of his people, makes a flaw out of their former shyness and the way they enjoyed staying to the side, makes a fault out of their cosmopolitanism and secret infinity, devalues their most heart-felt tendencies, turns their conscience around, makes their spirit narrow and their taste 'national,'... "That's an abuse of language!" shouted the first speaker in reply: "-strong! Strong! Strong and crazy! Not great!"—The old men had grown visible heated as they yelled their "truth" into each other's faces like this; but me, in my happiness and my beyond, I considered how soon the strong come to be dominated by the stronger; and also that the spiritual leveling of one people is compensated for in the deepening of another. (133)

This paragraph in "Peoples and Fatherlands" in *Beyond Good and Evil* coincides with

The New Idols in Thus Spoke Zarathustra that I have discussed in the second chapter. Here the point that “the strong comes to be dominated by the stronger, and also that the spiritual leveling of one people is compensated for in the deepening of another” already reveals an anti-social Darwinism dimension in Nietzsche’s political thoughts. Nietzsche’s point in opposition to patriotism, nationalism, imperialism, and social Darwinism certainly parallels Lu Xun’s own argument in his essay “Against the Opinion of the Masses”, as well as Mushanokoji’s critique of imperialism in *A Young Man’s Dream*. Similar to his critique of Christian morality, Nietzsche offers us a social-psychological view in regard to the function of nationalism as the ideological manipulation. Nietzsche treats nationalism and patriotism the same as Christian morality. These ideologies are ‘the opium of the masses.’ The vulgar masses are easily enthralled by the doctrines of loving and sacrificing for their fatherland that are inculcated to them by the ruling class.

Therefore, although Nietzsche is not particularly a thinker who dedicates attention to the critique of imperialism, this critique of patriotism potentially suggests Nietzsche’s attitude against imperialism. In this sense Nietzsche’s critique against nationalism could be read together with Foucault, Gramsci, Said, Benedict Anderson and Hannah Arendt. Nietzsche’s critique against nationalism reveals a systematic correlation between nationalism as the ideology and the material foundation of nationalism as the imperialistic encroachment of other countries. Nationalism as a kind of ideology makes the masses feel privileged and potentially satisfies their internal craving for power. Their way of thinking is easily disciplined into a specific kind of “national taste”. Here Nietzsche’s point certainly corresponds to Benedict Anderson’s point in his *Imagined Community: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*, which particularly analyzes the modern nation-state as a systematic cultural-ideological construction and how nationalistic imagination makes a specific group of people believe that their ‘national essence’ is different from the others’. Also, Nietzsche’s critique of nationalism parallels Hannah Arendt’s critique of nationalism and imperialism in her work *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. In the second chapter “Imperialism” in *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, Arendt illustrates how the modern

nation-state protects and fosters its citizens' inherent craving for wealth (157). Arendt indicates that the national identity privileges its subjects and encourages their oversea colonial exploration. The example that Hannah Arendt uses in this chapter is Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*. *Heart of Darkness* is concerned with the colonization in Africa (189-190). Historically speaking, the difference between China and Africa is that the latter has had been completely colonized, whereas the former is semi-colonized and deeply influenced by colonization.

However, the difference between Nietzsche and Lu Xun is that Nietzsche's critique of nationalism and imperialism is a European's self-reflection upon their own history. But Lu Xun's critique against imperialism, which could be read as a hidden response to Nietzsche's point, is the voice of an Eastern-Asian who had experienced the invasion of the western world in early 20th century. Therefore, the difference is that Lu Xun's argument contains the strong will of the national independence. In other words, although both Nietzsche and Lu Xun are anti-imperialistic, the motivations behind their critiques are different. Nietzsche is not an anti-colonial thinker. His political thought is not particularly dedicated to the critique of imperialism and colonization. For Nietzsche, his critique of imperialism is the theoretical extension of his critique of patriotism and European nationalism as the 'new idols' for European people. In other words, Nietzsche's reflection upon nationalism still focuses on the side of 'the strong', rather than on the side of the people who suffered from imperialism. In contrast, Lu Xun supports the national-independent consciousness by criticizing imperialism/ colonization at the same time. Hence compared with Nietzsche, Lu Xun's critique of imperialism is more realistic; it emerges from a kind of political emergency. But what Nietzsche aims at is to move beyond the human condition of the vulgar life-style, the competition for living space, or the struggle for living resources under the title of 'morality' or other kinds of ideologies. A journal entry in Nietzsche's *The Will to Power* indicates the difference between Nietzsche and Lu Xun:

960 (1885-1886) From now on there will be more favorable preconditions for more comprehensive forms of dominion, whose like has never yet existed.

And even this is not the most important thing; the possibility has been established for the production of international racial unions whose task will be to rear a master race, the future “masters of the earth”;- a new, tremendous aristocracy, based on the severest self-legislation, in which the will of philosophical men of power and artist-tyrants will be made to endure for millennia- a higher kind of man who, thanks to their superiority in will, knowledge, riches, and influence, employ democratic Europe as their most pliant and supple instrument for getting hold of the destinies of the earth, so as to work as artists upon “man” himself. Enough: the time is coming when politics will have a different meaning. (504)

Nietzsche’s critique of the modern nation-state as well as its violence leads to his imagination of a master race, a mixture of the people with different racial/national identities. Here Nietzsche’s imagination of the master race is linked to his fundamental philosophical presumption as I have discussed in the second chapter. According to Walter Kaufmann, in Nietzsche’s view, what makes us humans is not the biological/animalistic part with which people are naturally endowed, but the spiritual pursuit that people need to cultivate in their own efforts (175). This is also the reason why Nietzsche defines the new ‘master race’ as a ‘new, tremendous aristocracy based on the severest self-legislation in which the will of philosophical men of power and artist-tyrants will be made to endure for millennia’. Nietzsche’s argument in this place is very closely aligned with Leo Strauss, since both of them argue that society has to be regulated according to the hierarchy of the spiritual pursuit (Strauss 193). In other words, society has to be guided by the ‘philosophical men of power or the artist-tyrants’, the people with the genuine spiritual pursuit, rather than only the social Darwinian motivation for merely survival. Obviously, if Lu Xun and Mushanokoji’s critique of western imperialism leads to their imagination of a kind of embryonic international democracy, the geo-political area of Nietzsche’s imagined ‘democratic Europe’ is certainly narrower than the geo-political area of Lu Xun and Mushanokoji’s imagination. In one word, Nietzsche’s critique of nationalism is still Euro-centric. His thought never moves beyond the geo-political boundary of Europe. The critique of Western colonization as well as the coexistence of the western countries and the non-western countries that appears in Lu Xun and Mushanokoji’s critical horizon is never in Nietzsche’s imagination of the coexistence of the different

racess.

The intertextual connections between Lu Xun and Nietzsche are not limited to Nietzsche's direct influence upon Lu Xun or those ideas in Lu Xun's works that parallel Nietzsche's philosophy. The intertextual connections between them uncover the geo-political relation between East Asia and the Western world behind the texts. In the Chapter Two, I have discussed how Lu Xun's appropriation of Nietzsche reveals Lu Xun's anxiety of national survival. If Lu Xun's appropriation of Nietzsche suggests the western influence upon China and the Chinese national revitalization, Lu Xun's critique of Western imperialism also suggests the limitation of Nietzsche's thought. When Nietzsche was composing the journal entry quoted above, he would never have the imagination that a Chinese realist in the early 20th century would use his idea to support the Chinese national revival in the context of the western imperialistic expansion. Therefore, Nietzsche's imagination of a world without the national/racial conflicts is a democratic Europe, rather than a democratic world. In contrast to Nietzsche, Isaiah Berlin's view is more globally democratic. Isaiah Berlin's theory of the national/cultural multiplicity originates in his reading of the German Enlightenment thinker Herder. Based on this view, he is sympathetic with the third-world national independent movements in the 20th century. Compared with Isaiah Berlin, Nietzsche's critique of European nationalism encloses him within the geo-political boundary of his own world. Lu Xun's critique of the hegemony of the west is precursory in the early 20th century. Compared with the views of post-colonial theorists in the late 20th century, Lu Xun's attitude toward the possibility of resistance is unambiguous. His critique of imperialism not only uncovers the limitation of Nietzsche's imagination of master race, but also suggests an important aspect of the national independent movement in the early 20th century that the post-colonial theorists in the late 20th century fall short of, namely, the resoluteness of the resistance against global hegemony. However, the belief that resistance against global hegemony or the preservation of nation requires the acceptance of western modernity, such as technology and nationalism, lays upon Chinese people a great burden to be as strong as the Western world.

Chapter Four

Conclusion: The Tension between Individualism and Nationalism in Modern China

Benedict Anderson's famous thesis about modular nationalism, tied to a distribution of identity through homogenizing print cultures, can be seen in Lu Xun's appropriation of Nietzsche. Similar to Benedict Anderson, Hannah Arendt in *The Origins of Totalitarianism* also makes a genealogical description of the rise of nationalism in the 19th century. As Arendt indicates, social Darwinism draws the whole world into an international competition. It makes countries in the non-European areas realize that their Western competitors are more powerful, and this compels them to strengthen themselves (178). Drawing on Benedict Anderson's framework, this thesis is mainly concerned with the spread of nationalism from Europe to China, in other words, how the formation of the Chinese national consciousness happens in the context of colonization. In this sense, the case of Lu Xun illustrates the multidimensionality of the Chinese attitude toward western modernity. As Lu Xun's work indicates, Chinese intellectuals in this period both aspire to and resist Western modernity. In some way, due to the aftermath of colonization, Lu Xun's resolute attitude against colonization and militarism exists ahead of the colonialism-criticizers in the late 20th century. On the other hand, however, his uncritical acceptance of Western modernity, especially science and nation, suggests how Chinese intellectuals are deeply influenced by the preconception of Western cultural superiority.

In the second and the third chapter, I use the intellectual connection between Lu Xun and Nietzsche to illustrate Lu Xun's ambivalent attitude toward Western modernity. Regarding Chinese modernization in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, historians and theorists emphasize two central aspects, namely, modernization as an iconoclast movement and modernization as the consequence of colonization. In his work *Repressed Modernities of Late Qing Fiction, 1849-1911*, David Wang Der-wei attempts to suggest that the aspiration to modernity is wrapped in the traditional

fictional discourses in this period. In her work *Translingual Practice*, Lydia Liu argues that the imperialistic logic of colonization creeps into the Chinese mind via East-West intellectual exchange, and the analysis of this unintentional acceptance of colonial logic stresses the importance of the resistance against colonization in an East Asian context. In fact, as Lu Xun's work indicates, the dream of modernity, iconoclasm, and the influence of colonization are intertwined with each other. In Lu Xun's work, the intersection of these dimensions is nationalism.

The last chapter of this thesis will be dedicated to the critique of Lu Xun's national consciousness. Lu Xun is not critical to his own acceptance of nation as one of the Western modernities, though he attempts to differentiate his imagination of the neutral and benevolent nationalism from the militaristic and ferocious nationalism. His idealism of national revitalization is blind to two symptoms of nationalism which gradually emerge to the surface of intellectual life in modern China in the 20th century, namely, the tension between individual creativity and nation-building and the interruption of the cultural tradition by the project of modernization. Lu Xun does not have the chance to live in communist China. Hence it is hard to predicate precisely how he would react to the new situation under the dominance of the communist party in People's Republic of China. It is also difficult to make a clear connection between text and reality, in terms of Lu Xun's view of national survival and the establishment of the new nation-state after 1949. But the two potential symptoms of nation-building, the tension of individuality and collectivity, as well as the interruption of cultural tradition indeed become actualized in the new state of socialism after 1949.

First, in Lu Xun's view, the character of the Mara poet is featured by a group of writers, poets and intellectuals who behave as the pioneers of a new society. In this sense Lu Xun's realism is usually associated with his critique of traditional Chinese society, and his idealism of individual freedom and nation is a utopian blueprint grounded upon the dystopian description of the Chinese society that stagnates in the traditional world. For Lu Xun, the traditional world is repressive of independent thinkers. In the new world where the independent thinkers foster the liberty and independence of a nation, talent at the individual level could be fully developed

without being impeded by the malevolent character of the traditional China. However, as I have discussed in the second chapter, Lu Xun's potential Hegelianism, the idea that individuality could only be realized at the national level, is blind to the fact that the modern nation is as repressive as the traditional society in his own view of individual liberty. As Theodor Adorno indicates, individualism, as a phenomenon in the constellation of modernity, is inherently underpinned and restricted by the shadow of collectivization as the mainstream of modernization (220). In a modern view, liberty at the individual level has to be legitimized by a universalism, for instance, reason in the Cartesian or Kantian sense, or nationalism in the Hegelian sense. Lu Xun's major essays in regard to the relation between individualism and national survival suggests that his idea of individualism falls into this pitfall of individualism-collectivism bind unintentionally. As I have indicated, Lu Xun's nationalistic complex does not suggest that Lu Xun is willing to acknowledge state authority or chauvinism as the backdrop of national survival, but instead reveals how nationalism as a way of imagining modernity creeps into the mind of Chinese intellectuals via imperialism. In this view, nationalism is more similar to a kind of collective subconscious that preexists Lu Xun's personal consciousness of individual freedom and heroism. But in the early 20th century in China, the tension between individualism and national consciousness was submerged beneath the conflict of imperialism and national survival.

Ironically, Lu Xun's works are canonized in the People Republic of China. As mandatory pieces in the high-school standard text books, some of Lu Xun's works are symbolized as the best literary embodiment of the spirit of the Chinese socialism movement. This canonization, backed by state-power, in fact contradicts the spirit of *Mara* poets which he advocated. The truth is that, after 1949, the individual free spirit in the mainland is heavily repressed. The imagined tie between the revival of individuality and the survival of nation in the context of colonization becomes an unbridgeable cleft between these two notions in the new world of totalization. Though his anti-imperialistic attitude leads to an imagination of a genuine political gesture of Chinese nationalism, in either his early or his late period, this genuine gesture of

Chinese nationalism is symbolized stereotypically, rather than represented as a kaleidoscope of different voices of national consciousness. Lu Xun always believes that Chinese national consciousness could be represented by a specific gesture as either the spirit of Mara poet, the *Xin Shensizong*, or the genuine proletarian revolution. Similar to the possibility of making the subaltern speak, posed by Spivak to researchers of post-colonial studies, this question could also be posed to Lu Xun's representation of the Chinese people, namely, can individuals or the proletarians really speak themselves in his work?

The historical period and situation in which Lu Xun's thought is saturated limits his understanding of nationalism. If he had a chance to see how dissidents were ostracized from their own countries, for instance, like Thomas Mann and Milan Kundera excluded from Germany and the Czechoslovakia, he would change his view of Byron fighting for the independence of modern Greece as an example of an independent thinker unified with their nations. In this sense, to compare Lu Xun's individualism with Gao Xingjian's individualism helps to expose Lu Xun's limitation in his political thought. The tension between Chinese national identity and individuals is stressed by Gao Xingjian, whose works have been for a long time prohibited in the mainland. Similar to Milan Kundera banished from Czechoslovakia and Solzhenitsyn deported from Russia, Gao Xingjian wins the Nobel Prize as a dissident ostracized from the mainland. In his works, Gao stresses individualism or the negative freedom disengaged from all kinds of political doctrines as his own doctrine of being a writer. In his view, to be a writer is a way of living within one's inner world, without engaging in any social/political/cultural/literary or artistic factions or movements. Hence instead of Marxism and socialism in the mainland, or even other sorts of doctrines like modernism or realism, Gao prefers to define his writing without any '-ism' (没有主义). Namely, his literary world only belongs to himself and is not affiliated to any intellectual or political factions (97-107). In this sense, compared with Lu Xun, Gao's position seems more closely aligned to Nietzsche and Max Stirner, especially in terms of the dignity of individuality. In a historical view, the comparison of Lu Xun and Gao Xingjian makes Lu Xun's original imagining of

national revitalization questionable. The fact is that there is always the tension between state-power and individual creativity.

The difference between Gao Xingjian's and Lu Xun's imaginations of individuality is that instead of the 'spiritual warriors' in Lu Xun's fictional world, Gao Xingjian constructs individuality in a way corresponding to Merleau Ponty's phenomenology of flesh. In Lu Xun's fictional world, the image of the spiritual warrior is usually linked to the sacrifice of their bodies, like the beheading of Xia Yu in *Medicine* and the beheading of Mei Jianchi in *Forging sword*. In Lu Xun's view, blood represents strong volition. Heroes or the 'Mara poets' in Lu Xun's work are highly spiritualized. They are described by Lu Xun as a way of imagining a strong and liberated spirit, but their carnal aspect never appears in Lu Xun's fictional world. Gao Xingjian challenges the totalization of individuality in another way. Similar to the fictional world in George Orwell's *1984*, in Gao's fictional world, clandestine love or an illicit affair represents personal resistance against tyranny or the persistence of negative freedom at the private level. Namely, within a totalized society, when public protestation against authority becomes nearly totally impracticable, the underground love between two individuals serves as the only possible practice of resistance against total domination. Gao Xingjian puts more emphasis upon such a carnal dimension of individual liberty, rather than the spiritual realization of it in Lu Xun's view. In Gao's view, it is the body, rather than the spirit or volition, that allows more space for individual freedom. In *One's Own Bible* (Yigeren de Shengjing, 一个人的圣经) Gao Xingjian associates his description of body with both rape and clandestine love. Rape represents the repression of or the colonization of individuals by state power, while clandestine love embodies the persistence of individual freedom in the extremely constrained personal space. Similar to Gao Xingjian, Lu Xun has a story about the repressed clandestine love. In Lu Xun's "Regret for the Past" (Shangshi, 伤逝), the marriage between Juan Sheng and Zi Jun eventually ceases under the pressure of traditional morals (381-397). Clearly, in Lu Xun's view, the pursuit of marriage independent of familial relations features the character of Mara poet. As Lu Xun indicates, an effigy of Shelley, a Mara poet, is hung on the wall in the protagonists'

room (382). This pursuit of free marriage is ruined by both public pressure and the inveterate character of Chinese people. In fact, Lu Xun attempts to indicate that the cowardice and selfishness of the male protagonist is responsible for the failure of their marriage. In this sense, Lu Xun presumes that the freedom of personal affair, though prohibited in the traditional society, should be realizable in a liberalized and independent nation. However, as Gao indicates, even in the new People's Republic, a personal affair still has to be approved by political authority. Compared with the Mara poet essay, where Lu Xun suggests that national independence and individual freedom are realizable without contradicting each other, Gao Xingjian's *One's Own Bible* indicates that individual freedom could be repressed in the new nation with international independence.

The pursuit of individual liberty against state authority is not only the major topic in Gao Xingjian's fictions, but widely appears in other pro-liberal writers and intellectuals who are deported from the mainland. In *The Fat Year* (Shengshi, 盛世), Chan Koonchung writes a satire of China in its current age which booms economically after its nation-wide marketization after 1990. The economic growth temporarily conceals the tyrannical nature of Chinese society. The truth is that, with a communist-party centered bureaucratic system, civil society, liberty of speech, and equal human rights that mark the modern age globally are never truly valued in China. Moreover, the fast economic growth in the mainland makes people satisfied with the tyrannical nature of their society. *The Fat Year* fictionalizes a twenty-year social transition in the mainland between 1990 and 2010. Interestingly, as an irony of modern China, the title "fat year", which discloses the dystopian essence of a strong country, parallels Lu Xun's ironical depiction of traditional Chinese society. By quoting Lu Xun's short story "The Lost Good Hell (Shidiao de Haodiyu, 失掉的好地狱)", Chan attempts to indicate that the fat year, the economic growth of China, makes Chinese society as a 'fake paradise' rather than a good hell (Chan 144). If the good hell, the dystopian reality of Chinese society, used to make people think about ways of changing, the fake paradise bewilders people and makes them short-sighted. As both an irony of the pre-20th century old China and a blueprint of an independent

new China, Lu Xun's work combines a dystopian description of Chinese society with a utopian future imagination of China. Hence, compared with the blueprint that Lu Xun draws in his essays on national independence, in Chan's view, a strong nation, especially an economically-flourishing nation does not necessarily allude to the realization of individual liberty. For both Chan Koonchung and Lu Xun, the unhappy truth of China is due to the fact that Chinese people are never able to move beyond selfishness or self-preservation. In other words, as long as they are satisfied with their private living conditions, they will keep public concern outside their horizon of daily life. Similar to *The Fat Year*, *The Crazy* by Ha Jin offers the same diagnosis of Chinese society: "China was a paradise for idiots, who were well treated because they incurred no jealousy, posed no threat to anyone, and made no trouble for the authorities." (92) These two Lu-Xun-esque descriptions of contemporary China by Chan Koonchung and Ha Jin also openly challenge Lu Xun's presumption in early 20th century. Namely, an independent and strong China in the future will be realized as free and independent individuals joining an independent nation. The harsh truth is that China could be economically and militarily strong, as well as even threatening to other major economies globally. However, the tyrannical nature of Chinese society remains as it was one century ago and individual liberty still remains to be honored in future.

In the period between Lu Xun and Gao Xingjian, Chan Koonchung or Ha Jin sees the transformation of Chinese nationalism from imagination to reality. From this retrospective view, the ideal type of nation where individual liberty and nation flourish together is merely Lu Xun's utopia. The boom of western literature and philosophy in the mainland in the 1980s nurtures a whole generation of pro-liberal writers, intellectuals and scholars. They challenge openly or secretly the legitimacy of the communist-dominated Chinese government, appealing to western liberal democracy, freedom of speech, individual liberty and political toleration. Globally speaking, their activity makes them part of the international forum of anti-totalitarian liberalists in the 20th century. Their practices as public intellectuals echo the western liberal voices, like Milan Kundera, Vaclav Havel, Hayek, Karl Popper, and Isaiah

Berlin. This stream of liberal voices is symbolized in *River Elegy* (He Shang, 河殇), a documentary TV series made before the 1989 Tiananmen Massacre. In this documentary film, the Yangtze River represents a self-enclosed, agrarian, superstitious and authoritarian Chinese civilization. In contrast to this bad image of China, the film symbolizes western civilization as open-minded, commercial, scientific, and liberal-democratic. As an innuendo of the fall of Chinese communist party and crescendo of nation-wide liberalization and westernization, this elegy of communist China is soon prohibited by the Chinese central department of ideology and propaganda. To some extent, Jiang Rong's *Wolf Totem* (Lang Tuteng, 狼图腾) recreates this narrative strategy in *The Elegy of River*. In *Wolf Totem*, the oceanic civilization is replaced by indigenous inner-Mongolian culture. In contrast to the lifeless and stagnant inland political culture, the inner-Mongolian indigenous culture is more energetic. But its vitality keeps being suppressed by inland political hegemony, just like the western oceanic civilization keeps being excluded from China as the self-imagined center of the world for Chinese people.

In *Tiananmen Fictions outside the Square*, Belinda Kong argues that Gao Xingjian's extreme individualism falls short of public responsibility. As Kong contends, "Gao's declaration of self-imposed marginality may bear a certain resemblance to Edward Said's thesis on the modern intellectual--a willful exile who prefers to "remain outside the mainstream, unaccommodated, uncoopted, resistant... tending to avoid and even dislike the trappings of accommodation and national well-being." (51) However, "for Said, the modern intellectual's primary task is to 'speak truth to power'." (51) As I have indicated in the first chapter, Lu Xun's short stories on the late-Qing revolution recall the heroic spirit of reformation. In a totalitarian context where personal space is extremely constrained, no alternatives are practicable besides preserving one's inner freedom. In this sense Gao's passive individualism is also universalism. Gao advocates an exiled self not "just for writers and artists but for all men, and in relation to not just specific forms of oppressive government but all human existence, from ancient to modern times" (Kong 53-54). If engaging with nationalism is one major difference between Lu Xun and Gao

Xingjian's individualism, another ramification between their views is that Lu Xun's individuality presupposes social responsibility, whereas Gao's does not. Similar to Kong, Liu Xiaobo in an interview suggests that Chinese intellectuals in the post-1989 period are too timid to speak their minds openly (Varsava 206). In "Medicine (Yao, 药)", Xia Yu dies for democratizing the late imperialistic China. As Lu Xun argues, the Qing regime should be owned by every Chinese, rather than being privatized by the emperor himself (167). In this sense, Lu Xun's political pursuit echoes the political pursuit of the dissidents in People's Republic. However, a strong nation with global influence does not necessarily presuppose its domestic democracy.

Second, in Lu Xun's view, modernization is indispensable for the resuscitation of China in a new age of globalization and colonization. The diagnosis of the Chinese national character is to promote modernization, and to make China modernized both technologically and mentally. In this sense, Lu Xun does not reserve extra space for the preservation of Chinese cultural tradition in his imagined project of nation-building. Lu Xun is not completely iconoclast, although he fervently claims that the Chinese cultural tradition, which is inherently associated with the malevolent national character of China, is responsible for the inferiority of China in a globalized context. In *Literary Remains: Death, Trauma, and Lu Xun's Refusal to Mourn*, Eileen J. Cheng argues that the spirit of Mara poet, in response to a disenchanting world in which Lu Xun lives, is infused with both western and eastern literary traditions (63). In her view, Lu Xun's personal commitment to Chinese literary tradition could be justified by those elements of classic Chinese literature that appears in Lu Xun's work. Lu Xun "had a gamut of antiquarian interests- he collected classical texts and paintings, epitaph rubbings, and old stationery; he read, studied, and compiled classical historical and literary texts." (211) Hence, "traditional genres and forms, along with old fables and folklore, were sources of inspiration for the technical and stylistic innovations, and the content, of many of his stories and essays." (211) For Lu Xun, "reading and composing classical poetry-lifelong endeavors- provided solace and an outlet through which his most private emotions could be expressed." (211) It is

true that Lu Xun used to be influenced by his mentor Zhang Taiyan (章太炎), a sincere patriot whose life is dedicated to the recovery of Chinese philological tradition. Hence Eileen J.Cheng argues that Lu Xun is not really iconoclast, but is dedicated to the recovery of the lost tradition. As she argues, “Lu Xun’s return to origins- classical legends and fables- then, may have been a private obeisance to traditional practices that he himself was helping to bury, a means of making the past flicker alive, even as its grip was loosening.” (190) However, this personal commitment to classic Chinese literary tradition apparently contradicts Lu Xun’s faith in western modernity and national survival. This contradiction is not clarified by Eileen J.Cheng in her book. Does Lu Xun think that the preservation of Chinese cultural/literary tradition could coexist with modernization? In other words, in Lu Xun’s view, is there any other alternative of imagining China besides nationalism-oriented modernization?

Historically speaking, in the 20th century, the case of Western modernity joining nationalism is not limited to China. As a dissident ostracized from modern Turkey, Orhan Pamuk’s fiction is dedicated to the recovery of the traditional Islamic cultural heritage and the subversion of western-styled modernization and political centralization in modern Turkey. In Pamuk’s view, the fascistic cultural policy in modern Turkey which compels the Turkish people to accept western modernity and ‘Turkishness’ as the homogeneous cultural-political identity keeps the abundant resources of the traditional Islamic culture outside its project of modernization and nationalization (Goknar 307). For subverting this local cultural hegemony, Pamuk attempts an imagination of a cultural Turkey beyond the limitation of modernization and provincialism. He especially prefers traditional Islamic painting as an example of local tradition encountering Western modernity. Pamuk attempts to make the conflict of the two painting languages as the embodiment of the cultural conflict in Turkey after its modernization in the early 20th century. The project of redoing traditional Ottoman Turkish miniature in a Renaissance way refers to the national project of modernization after Kemalist revolution in 1920s, a reformation endeavors to save Turkey in a globalized age by empowering it with Western modernity. In *My Name is Red*, compared with Renaissance painting, traditional Islamic painting lacks the

vividness that the perspectival painting skill could actualize. In contrast, the aperspectival skill of the traditional Islamic painting allows more space for imagination. Pamuk's interpretation of Turkish miniature represents a third way beyond Islamic religious authority and Western modernity. Pamuk's favorite example of Turkish miniature is the miniature of the love story of Husrev and Shirin. Before encountering each other in person, the male and female protagonists have seen the portraits of each other and fall in love with each other's effigies. In the story, the final encounter between them completes their quest for each other. They realize that their imaginations of each other coincide with their impressions of each other in the real world. Here Pamuk attempts to indicate that different from Renaissance painting, the Turkish tradition blurs the distinction between imagination and reality, reserving space for imagination more than Western tradition. In *My Name is Red*, the main plot between the male protagonist Black and the female protagonist Shekure is designed based on this love story (Pamuk 54). Different from cultural fundamentalist, for Pamuk, this ambiguity between imagination and reality created by Turkish miniature is the most important legacy of the pre-modern Turkish tradition.

However, the Turkish Kemalist revolution criticized by Orhan Pamuk is an evolutionary improvement in Lu Xun's view. In *From Beard to Tooth* (从胡须到牙齿), an essay published on Feb 10, 1926, Lu Xun indirectly affirms the Turkish Kemalist revolution as a cultural revolution that liberates women in the Islamic world by removing their veils in the public sphere (405). As Lu Xun indicates, in contrast to the Turkish revolution, the reformation of the cultural tradition in China never proves to be resolutely iconoclast. In other words, in China, any changes to the traditional customs would incur severe attack from the orthodox faction. The praise that Lu Xun gives to the Kemalist revolution in Turkey is not merely a trans-cultural imagination, but reveals Lu Xun's straight-minded view of nationalism and modernization. In Pamuk's view, the nationalism-oriented modernization in modern Turkey is essentially tyrannical. This cleft between Lu Xun's imagination of the Turkish nationalization and the real situation in modern Turkey parallels his appropriation of Nietzsche without considering Nietzsche's anti-nationalistic stance. When Lu Xun

uses Nietzsche in *Spirit of the Mara Poets* to support his nationalistic individualism, he does not consider the transition of Nietzsche's attitudes toward Wagner as Nietzsche's attitude toward nationalism. The reason why Nietzsche eventually renounces his early obsession with Wagner is that he finds that Wagner's aesthetic taste is nationalism-oriented.

Gao Xingjian's work is not only a way of thinking of the possibility of individual freedom under the dominance of tyrannical socialism, but a way of re-thinking Chinese national consciousness as a hinge between nationalism in the mainland and the diaspora in the western world. On the one hand, he rejects the ideological straitjacket that socialism in the mainland puts upon him. On the other hand, he endeavors to recover the heritage of Chinese literary tradition. In his view, in contrast to the rationalistic doctrine in the western linguistic principles, the rhetoric of Chinese is inherently flexible and allows more space for individual literary creativity. In this sense, Gao Xingjian argues that the Westernization/modernization of the Chinese in the early 20th century in fact interrupts the Chinese literary tradition. This combination of individual freedom against totalitarian socialism and Chinese cultural/literary tradition compels him to rethink the relation between Chinese national identity, state authority, and the individuality of Chinese writers in modern Chinese history. As Gao Xingjian suggests, the establishment of the new nation-state in the mainland after 1949 is not only repressive of individual freedom, but also undermines the Chinese cultural/literary tradition. As an exiled dissident in Paris, he creates another possibility of re-thinking the Chinese literary tradition in a diasporic context. For him, to be a Chinese writer does not necessarily mean to be identified with the mainstream of nationalism in the mainland. Nationalism or state-power in the political sense does not completely overlap the national cultural/literary tradition of China. As Gao Xingjian indicates in *Meiyou Zhuyi* (没有主义, Without-ism), this flexibility of Chinese creates the possibility of the cohabitation of Chinese and western languages (147). In his view, different from Western languages which are built upon the rationalized syntactical criteria, the flexibility of the rhetoric of Chinese makes the rendering of the Western literary tradition in the Chinese context

possible (150). In this sense, to imagine a Chinese literary world beyond the national political authority in the mainland allows him to be a France-based writer with a dual-identity of Sino-Francophone author at the same time. The imagination of a Chinese literary world detached from the Chinese national ideology uncovers Gao Xingjian's predicament as an exiled author. As he indicates, for the dissidents in the regime of socialism in the mainland, an imagined Western world serves as an alternative view in contrast to the extremely centralized culture in China.

In this sense, Gao Xingjian's point of view could be read as an answer in response to the question that kept haunting Lu Xun's generation. Different from the spirit of the Mara poets, for Gao Xingjian, national memory or national cultural/literary tradition could be personalized and carried by oneself in any place outside the geo-political boundary of a nation. This combination of individual freedom and national tradition broadens the category of national tradition and values the Chinese diasporic culture as equally important as the authorized mainstream in the mainland (129-174). Nationalism in the cultural sense suggests the possibility of preserving national cultural, national literature, or national memory without institutionalizing it as violence. Personal memory deconstructs nationalism as political authority. In this sense, Gao Xingjian's imagination of Chinese literature beyond national ideology in the mainland parallels Orhan Pamuk's imagination of Turkish cultural tradition beyond modern Turkish nationalism. But the comparative reading of Lu Xun's idea of national survival and Gao Xingjian's self-identification as a diasporic writer calls Lu Xun's project of national revitalization into question. Namely, is it possible that instead of the collective national consciousness, personal experience in fact broadens the spectrum of national consciousness without centralizing individual feelings into the straitjacket of national ideology? As dissidents ostracized from China or Turkey, both Gao Xingjian and Orhan Pamuk recreate their imaginations of national tradition in their fictional worlds. In other words, One could still carry one's national identification or national memory with oneself even one betrays one's own country politically. For Gao Xingjian and Orhan Pamuk, they are Chinese and Turkish authors who are not loyal to the institutional authority that

authorizes the legitimate national consciousness as the only orthodox way of national self-identification.

In *Archive Fever: a Freudian Impression*, Derrida argues that he always feels trembling in front of a political stance, for instance, like Zionism: namely, a promised land is destined to be associated with a specific group of people for carrying their national memory as a religious-political injunction (77). Derrida attempts to suggest that the monotheistic logic which bonds one language, one religion, one territory, as well as one group of people with their national memory and national identification is usually the origin of exclusion and persecution. Paul Ricoeur claims that when a variety of different voices, experiences, memories are represented by one symbolized voice or gesture, this symbolized gesture becomes an ideology repressive of the alternative voices from the dissidents against it (299). Hence the resistance against ideology requires individual actions. In Ricoeur's view, actions at the individual level not only make ideological centralization impossible, but also promote mutual understanding and tolerance of different voices. In *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China*, Prasenjit Duara explores modern Chinese nationalism from a micro view, a quasi-Foucauldian view, focusing on how the monotheistic discourse of the imagined community creeps into the Chinese mind in its modern history. The title "rescuing history from the nation" suggests that similar to other nation-states, Chinese history is also structured by its national imagination and this compels the researchers to investigate the process of the formation of this imagination (32-49). The standardization of Chinese as part of the imagined Chinese community has been explored by Jing Tsu in *Sound and script in Chinese Diaspora*. In her book, with the critique of the standardization/Westernization of modern Chinese, Jing Tsu indirectly affirms Gao Xingjian's literary gesture as a diasporic writer. In Jing Tsu's view, the multiplicity of Chinese as a language could not be represented as a system of unified sound and script. In other words, the difference between the authorized writing and speaking style in the mainland and the transformation of Chinese in oversea areas could not be deemed as deviations (227). Jing Tsu's critical view in *Sound and Script in Chinese Diaspora* crosses Prasenjit

Duara's practice of rescuing Chinese history from the nation. In her view, Chinese as a language has to be rescued from both western universalism, the kind of universalism criticized by Casanova in *World Republic of Letters*, and localism, which makes the resistance against the western hegemony narrow-minded.

In conclusion, the relation between Lu Xun's view of China in a post-colonial context, his view of national survival, as well as his reaction to imperialism, reveal the relation between the rise of Chinese nationalism and globalization in the 20th century: namely, globalization or western imperialism compels national solidarity and makes national solidarity indispensable for a nation sitting on the inferior position in a globalized world. However, the causal connection between globalization and national solidarity, though seeming naturally convincing for the sake of rescuing the nation from imperialism, in fact narrows the preservation of the nation into the straightjacket of the politics of nationalization, which is usually accompanied by violence and centralization. Different from Lu Xun's appropriation of Nietzsche, in Nietzsche's original view, nationalism is collective egotism or collective selfishness. It does not allow freedom and tolerance. In this sense, the relation between globalization and rise of nationalism in modern China parallels the relation between Holocaust and post-Holocaust Zionism. Israel nationalists try to justify their practice of preserving the Jewish people by the massacre of Jews in the Holocaust. This forced connection between the political correctness of Israel's nationalism and the Holocaust not only makes the critique of the Israel-Palestine conflict more difficult, but also violates the will of the true survivors of the Holocaust. Different from the official voice authorized by the Israel authority, the true survivors of the Holocaust are unwilling to expose their trauma to the world, especially as an excuse of legitimizing nationalism (Pappe, 173). As Paul Ricoeur indicates, in *Memory, History, Forgetting* archived history is established upon the silence of the witness of the real history (336). Since the experiences of the witness could not be represented by a unified voice, the memory carried by the witness plays the role of deconstructing the archived history. In this sense, if the imagined causal connection between the Holocaust and the nationalism of modern Israel is an excuse for national selfishness, nationalism, which is claimed

to be indispensable for modern China, could also be selfish in nature, and does not allow the different voices in China to speak themselves on their own. Therefore, instead of the presupposition that globalization necessarily compels national solidarity, the tenor in Benjamin's *Task of the Translator* is more conducive to the preservation of the national tradition in a globalized context. If imperialistic globalization interrupts the mutual understanding of different worlds, nationalism only reinforces the interruption. As Benjamin indicates, instead of the syntax or sentence, the rhetoric or word makes the mutual rendering between two languages possible without tyrannizing one by the other one (79). In this view, instead of nationalism in the political sense, culture or literary creativity makes the fusion of East and West possible without national boundaries, just like the literary worlds carried by Gao Xingjian and Orhan Pamuk personally. Their national memory without nationalization makes the fusion of East and West possible in their own view.

 Works Cited

- Arendt, Hannah. *The origins of totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, 1976. Print.
- Arendt, Hannah. "Organized guilt and universal responsibility." *The portable Hannah Arendt*. Ed. Peter Baehr. New York: Penguin, 2003. 146-156. Print.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Community: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso, 2006. Print.
- Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo sacer: sovereign power and bare life*. Trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen. California: Stanford University Press, 1998. Print.
- A. Varsava, Jerry. Book Review: "No Enemies, No Hatred, by Liu Xiao Bo." *The China Quarterly* (213). Mar. 2013: 205-206. Print.
- Berlin, Isaiah. *Three critics of the Enlightenment*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2013. Print.
- Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations*. Trans. Harry Zohn. Ed. Hannah Arendt. New York: Schocken Books, 1968. Print.
- Chou, Eva shan. *Memory, violence, queues: Lu Xun interprets China*. Ann Arbor: Association for Asian studies, 2012. Print.
- Chow, Rey. Film as ethnography; or, translation between cultures in the postcolonial world (extract from Rey Chow, *Primitive Passion: Visuality, Sexuality, Ethnography, and Chinese Cinema*. Columbia University Press, 1995, 176-202, 238-243). *Literary Theories: A Reader and Guide*. Ed. Julian Wolfreys. New York: New York UP, 1999. 499-516. Print.
- Chan, Koonchung. *The Fat Year*. New York: Doubleday. 2011. Print.
- Duara, Prasenjit. *Rescuing history from the nation: Questioning narratives of modern China (Chinese translation)*. Trans. Xianming Wang, Jimei Gao, Haiyan Li & Dian Li. Nanjing: Jiangsu People's Publisher, 2009. Print.
- Dirlik, Arif. *Revolution and history: The origins of Marxist historiography in China, 1919-1937 (Chinese translation)*. Trans. Hekai Wong. Nanjing: Jiangsu People's Publisher, 2010. Print.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Archive fever: a Freudian impression*. Trans. Eric Prenowitz. Chicago: University of Chicago Print, 1996. Print.

-
- Epomehk, B.R. "The red flower." (Chinese translation) Trans. Lu Xun. Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Vol.5, 40-59.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Leonardo Da Vinci: A Psychosexual Study of An Infantile Reminiscence*. Trans. A. A. Brill. London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1948. Print.
- Gao, Xingjian. *Mei you zhu yi* (Chinese edition). Taipei: Lianjing Publisher, 2001. Print.
- Gao, Xingjian. *One's Own Bible* (Chinese edition). Taipei: Lianjing Publisher, 1999. Print.
- Goknar, Erdag. "Secular Blasphemies: Orhan Pamuk and the Turkish Novel," *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 45.1 (2012): 301-326. Print.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Introduction to Metaphysics*. Trans. Gregory Fried & Richard Polt. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000. Print.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Logic as the question concerning the essence of language* Trans. Wanda Torres & Gregory Yvonne. Albany: SUNY, 2009. Print.
- Hegel, G.W.F. *Philosophy of right*. Trans. S.W. Dyde. Kitchener: Batoche, 2001. Print.
- Hegel, G.W.F. *Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*. Trans. A.V. Miller, New York: Oxford University Press, 1977. Print.
- Ha, Jin. *The Crazyed*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2002. Print.
- Jameson, Frederic. "Third-World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism." *Social Text*. 15.Nov.1986: 65-88. Print.
- J.Cheng, Eileen. *Literary remains: death, trauma, and Lu Xun's refusal to mourn*. Honolulu: Hawai University Press, 2013. Print.
- Jiang, Rong. *The Wolf Totem* (Chinese edition). Changjiang literature and art publisher, 2004. Print.
- Ju Dou*. Screenplay by Heng Liu. Dir. Zhang Yimou and Yang Fengliang. Prod. Hu Jian, Yasuyoshi Tokuma and Zhang Wenze. Perf. Gong Li, Li Baotian, Li Wei. Miramax, 1991. Film.
- Karl, Rebecca. E. *Staging the World: Chinese nationalism at the turn of the twenties century*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002. Print.

-
- Kaufmann, Walter. *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2013. Print.
- Kuriyagawa, Hakuson. "The symbol of Kumen."(Chinese translation).Trans. Lu Xun. Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Vol.5.295-35.
- Kong, Belinda. *Tiananmen fictions outside the square: the Chinese literary diaspora and the politics of global culture*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2012. Print.
- Kang, You-wei. *Da Tong Shu* (Utopia, Chinese edition). Shanghai: Shanghai classics publisher, 2009. Print.
- Lee, Leo Ou-fan. *Voices from the iron house: a study of Lu Xun*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1987. Print.
- Liu, Lydia. *Translingual Practice: literature, national culture, and translated modernity—China, 1900-1937*. California: Stanford University Press, 1995, Print.
- Liang, Shu-ming. *The Completed collection of Liang Shu-ming* (Vol.1) Jinan: Shandong People's Publisher, 2005. Print.
- Lu, Tina. *Accidental Incest, filial cannibalism, and other peculiar encounters in late imperial Chinese literature*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008. Print.
- Lu, Xun. "Mr. Fujino (Teng Ye Xian Sheng; 藤野先生)."Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An.Vol.7, 306-310.
- Lu, Xun. "Madman's Diary (Kuang Ren Ri Ji: 狂人日记)."Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Vol.3, 19-28.
- Lu, Xun. "On the History of Science (Ke Xue Shi Jiao Pian; 科学史教篇)."Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An.Vol.1, 277-285.
- Lu, Xun. "On the Chinese Geology (Zhong Guo Di Zhi Lue Lun; 中国地质略论)."Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Vol.1, 33-46
- Lu, Xun. "Medicine (Yao; 药)." Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An.Vol.3,163-170.
- Lu, Xun. "Kong Yiji (孔乙己)."Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Vol.3, 144-147.
- Lu, Xun. "The mandatory books for Chinese young people (Qing Nian Bi Du Shu; 青年必读书)."Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Vol.6, 52.

- Lu, Xun. "On the face of Chinese people (Lun Zhong Guo Ren De Lian; 论中国人的脸)." Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Vol.8, 75-77.
- Lu, Xun. "The story of hair (Tou Fa De Gu Shi; 头发的故事)." Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Vol.3, 467-471.
- Lu, Xun. "The storm (Feng Bo; 风波)." Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Vol.3, 437-444.
- Lu, Xun. "The biography of Ah-Q (A Q Zheng Zhuan; 阿 Q 正传)." Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Vol.4, 330-362.
- Lu, Xun. "Against the voice of the mass (Po E Sheng Lun; 破恶声论)." Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Vol.1, 301-310.
- Lu, Xun. "How to Be Fathers Today (Wo Men Jin Tian Zen Yang Zuo Fu Qin; 我们今天怎样做父亲)." Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Vol.3, 204-213.
- Lu, Xun. "My old home (Gu Xiang; 故乡)." Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Vol.4, 10-18.
- Lu, Xun. "On the power of the Mara poet (Mo Luo Shi Li Shuo; 摩罗诗力说)." Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Vol. 247-276.
- Lu, Xun. "On the cultural prejudice (Wen Hua Pian Zhi Lun; 文化偏至论)." Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Vol.1, 286-300.
- Lu, Xun. "The misanthrope (Gu Du Zhe; 孤独者)." Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Vol.6, 363-380.
- Lu, Xun. "*The annotated translation of the prologue in Thus Spoke Zarathustra.*" Vol.3, 445-460.
- Lu, Xun. "Regret for the Past (Shang Shi; 伤逝)." Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Vol.6, 381-397.
- Lu, Xun. "From Beard to Tooth (Cong Hu Xu Shuo Dao Ya Chi; 从胡须说到牙齿)." Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Vol.6, 404-410.
- Lu, Xun. *The chronological collection of Lu Xun's writings and translations (Chinese edition)*. Eds. Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Beijing: People's Publisher, 2009. Print.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus spoke Zarathustra: a book for all and none*. Eds. Adrian del Caro, Trans. Adrian del Caro & Robbert B. Pippin. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Print.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The will to power*. Eds. Walter Kaufmann & R.J. Hollingdale,

-
- Trans. Walter Kaufmann. New York: Vintage Books, 1968. Print.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Beyond good and Evil: Prelude to a philosophy of the future*.
Eds. Judith Norman, Trans, Rolf-Peter Horstmann. New York: Cambridge
University Press, 2008. Print.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *On the Genealogy of Morals*. Trans. Douglas Smith. Oxford:
Oxford UP, 2008. Print.
- Pusey, James Reeve. *Lu Xun & evolution*. Albany: SUNY, 1998. Print.
- Pamuk, Orhan. *My Name is Red*. Trans. Erdag Goknar. London: Faber and Faber,
2001. Print.
- Pappe, Ilan. *The idea of Israel: a history of power and knowledge*. New York: Verso,
2014. Print.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Memory, history, forgetting*. Trans. Kathleen Blamey & David Pellauer.
Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2004. Print.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Emile, Or On Education (Extracts)*. Trans. Eleanor
Worthington. Boston: D. C. Heath & Company, 1889. Print.
- River Elegy*. By Su Xiaokang and Wang Luxiang. Dir. Xia Jun. CCTV. Beijing. 16
June. 1988. Television.
- Shih, Shu-mei. *The lure of the modern: Writing modernism in semicolonial China,
1917-1937*. California: U of California Press, 2001. Print.
- S. Alitto, Guy. *The last Confucian*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.
Print.
- Strauss, Leo. *On Tyranny*. Eds. Michael S. Roth & Victor Gourevitch. Chicago:
University of Chicago Press, 2013. Print.
- Stirner, Max. *The Ego and His Own: The Case of The Individual Against Authority*.
Trans. Steven. T. Byington. New York: Verso, 2014. Print.
- Saneatsu, Mushanokoji. "A young man's dream." Trans. Lu Xun. Wang Shi-jia & Zhi
An. Vol.3, 258-406.
- Tsu, Jing. *Failure, nationalism, and literature: the making of modern Chinese identity,
1895-1937*. California: Stanford University Press, 2005. Print.
- Tsu, Jing. *Sound and script in Chinese diaspora*. Cambridge: Harvard University

-
- Press, 2010. Print.
- Verne, Jules Gabriel. "From the Earth to the Moon." Trans. Lu Xun. Wang Shi-jia & Zhi An. Vol.1, 46-105.
- Wu, Yiching. *The Cultural Revolution at the margins: Chinese socialism in crisis*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014. Print.
- Wang der-wei, David. *Fin-de-siecle splendor: repressed modernities of late Qing fiction, 1849-1911*. Taipei: City cultural enterprise Ltd, 2003. Print.
- W. Adorno, Theodor. *Negative dialectics*. Trans. E. B. Ashton. New York: continuum, 1973. Print.