

## Chinese Anarchism and “Glocalization”\*

Gotelind Müller

In more recent times, scholarship on modern China has tended to favor a “China-centered approach” (Cohen) due to the perceived foregoing dominance of a “Western impact – Chinese response” paradigm. With the rise of global studies the relationship between universality and particularity has been put back on the agenda.

This article, taking a historical approach, focuses on the case of Chinese anarchism. The complex interplay between the global and the local will be discussed in terms of “glocalization” (Robertson). In this perspective, the necessity to view anarchism (and other comparable movements) in modern China not only in a Chinese but also in a greater context will become evident. Still, since Chinese anarchists consciously perceived themselves as part of an international movement, there is no necessary contradiction with a “China-centered approach”. Rather, the suggestion is an enlargement of it.

### Introduction

With the end of the Cold War, historiographical scholarship in general has with increasing vigor taken an approach to history that is commonly known as world history or global history. Other terms in current use include “entangled” or “connected histories” (Conrad; Randeria 2002: 10, 17). Simultaneously, in sociology “globalization” has become a central argument (Osterhammel; Petersen 2003: 18). Although many definitions of “globalization” have been proposed, a major part of these agree in as far as they take globalization as a distinctly modern phenomenon usually contrasting it with the local which – implicitly – tended to be identified with tradition. Thus the global-local nexus became imbued with a time component. On the other hand, the term “globality” (in tandem with “modernity”) implied an atemporal state of mind or being.

Against the dominant trend of placing the global *against* the local, Robertson has proposed the concept of “glocalization”, which blends the two. The term “glocalization” he borrowed from economics where it has been used since the late 1980s in business jargon as an English equivalent to the Japanese “*dochakuka*”, meaning to adapt one’s farming techniques (or products) to local circumstances (*The Oxford Dictionary of New Words* 1991: 134 [“glocal”]). In other contexts, e.g., religion, the Japanese term could also be translated as “indigenization”, but the attitude of thinking and designing globally while acting according to local needs or markets, led the admirers of this perceived successful Japanese business strategy to speak more generally of global localization or, in fact, “glocalization”. Robertson’s use in social theory broadened the concept to account for the simultaneous tendencies of homogenization and fragmentation inherent in globali-

---

\* This article is based on a lecture given at the EACS biannual conference 2004 in Heidelberg. It tries to sum up some reflections on the larger implications of my study on Chinese anarchism in the context of Chinese historiography.

zation. He stressed that globalization means not only to transcend barriers. It also gives the local itself a new meaning since the definition of the local is often constructed on a supra-local basis and – in fact – has similar traits around the globe. In other words, the global and the local are mutually dependent and furthermore are relative categories.<sup>1</sup> This dependence, though, does not simply work one-way in the sense that the emphasis on or even the construction of the local should be seen merely as a reaction to the given global. Rather, local conditions or traditions or identities, though not impervious to supra-local factors, automatically come into play when the global is adopted or “glocalized”. The advantage of the term “glocalization” lies in the fact that it stresses the global dimension of localization, whereas “indigenization”, e.g., tends to stress only the adaptation process *into one locality*.

### Anarchism and Chinese history

Historical scholarship on modern China was famously classified by Paul Cohen in the 1980s as falling into four categories, three of which put the West in a crucial position (positively in the case of the Western impact – Chinese response and the modernization approach, or negatively in the case of the imperialism paradigm) and China in a reactive / imitative position. Cohen himself proposed the fourth one, a China-centered historiography (Cohen 1996). His proposal was taken up and could be linked also to Edward Said’s critique of “orientalism” which, according to Said, invariably assigned the “other” to an inferior position, being “written about” from a Western standpoint (Said 1978).

The advantage of this “China-centered approach” was that by shifting the focus to the Chinese side it underlined the importance of a Chinese subject position, portraying the people involved as actors with their own agendas. The sometimes negative outcome (though not intended) was that it easily led to a kind of new sinocentrism that simply replaced the old eurocentrism.

Following the rise of global studies, the end of the Cold War polarization, China’s own desire to become more and more integrated into the world after decades of relative isolation (to a certain degree achieved by entering the WTO), and – last but not least – the increasing number of Chinese participating in Western China studies, the way in which modern Chinese history relates to global history was put back on the agenda in the 1990s. One example of this rethinking is the depiction of the foundation of the CCP. Whereas it had been politically correct both in Maoist China and for some time in Japan and the West (at least in certain academic circles) to stress the Chineseness of the CCP, since around 1990 a new

<sup>1</sup> Robertson (1998). The new work in 6 vols., which Robertson coedited with White (Robertson; White 2003), includes a reprint of an older English version of this article, which Robertson had revised for the German version. Therefore, I will refer to the German one as the most recent version.

interest focused on Russian or other foreign connections, reconsidering Chinese Communism as having been begotten by various parents and socialized into the world with the help of many different hands.<sup>2</sup>

With Chinese anarchism the question is now politically less sensitive, but to a certain extent it involves by definition a particularistic approach – so to speak. Anarchism negates the value of state organization and is per se internationalist. Still, the way in which this “global” ideal should be related to Chinese local circumstances was highly contested among Chinese anarchists. The discussions evolved around different lines, the political one being of immediate concern. Others like cultural assumptions were more general, but all these areas of debate alike retained their crucial importance throughout the whole development of the Chinese anarchist movement.

### Glocalization case 1: The problem of politics

The most pressing issue during the history of Chinese anarchism continued to be politics. The first generation of anarchists either opted to stay away (the so-called Tokyo group, namely the couple Liu Shipei and He Zhen) or to actively support the revolutionary side of Sun Yat-sen (the so-called Paris group, namely Li Shizeng and Wu Zhihui). The former argued basically that the state and politics are superfluous – if not evil – and would be substituted by a self-governing anarcho-communist society in the future anyway. Thus, there was no need for involvement in politics, which in this context furthermore would have implied a betrayal of worthy ends by dirty means.<sup>3</sup> The latter group’s rationale, on the other hand, was an evolutionary concept of revolution which would pass through various stages and finally lead to anarchy. The republic could thus be considered a step in the right direction and as such should be actively supported.<sup>4</sup>

The general question of the compatibility of anarchism and involvement in national politics remained, though, and the most prominent Chinese anarchist, Liu Sifu or rather Shifu,<sup>5</sup> even if ideologically indebted to the Paris group,<sup>6</sup> opted again for political abstention. He did this even to the point of ridiculing Sun Yat-

<sup>2</sup> Authors who come to mind are Arif Dirlik, Hans van de Ven, Tony Saich, Marilyn Levine and, most recently, Ishikawa Yoshihiro.

<sup>3</sup> The main source for the Tokyo group is their published journals *Tianyi* (Natural Justice) and *Hengbao* (Equity) (1907–1908).

<sup>4</sup> The main source for the Paris group is their published journal *Xin shiji* (New Century) (1907–1910).

<sup>5</sup> As an anarchist he distanced himself from the family system and thus advocated dropping family names. It is highly probable that his alias „Shifu” was not unintentionally homophonous (though written with different characters) with the Buddhist term for a religious teacher.

<sup>6</sup> Shifu referred explicitly to the Paris group’s journal, which he had read when still in prison after a failed assassination attempt *before* he turned anarchist, and he sometimes mentioned Li Shizeng and Wu Zhihui also later.

sen's party, which had been fighting back to the wall against Yuan Shikai's rising despotism and was finally crushed and exiled.<sup>7</sup> In Shifu's case moral consistency between means and ends was the decisive factor, i.e. meddling in politics would taint anybody. Therefore, he also strongly criticized former members of the Paris group, who accommodated themselves in one way or other to politics, partly out of conviction, partly out of realpolitik-considerations.<sup>8</sup>

This purist all-or-nothing-line remained prevalent in Chinese anarchism during the 1910s and early 1920s and was only strongly contested in the mid-1920s when anarchists perceived their growing disadvantage vis-à-vis the two big political parties now joined in the United Front, the GMD and the CCP. Old Paris group member Wu Zhihui even went so far as to ask anarchists to join the United Front with the GMD, but was scathingly attacked by younger purists as a traitor to the anarchist cause. But soon after, some realized that anarchists were in danger of being left behind by the historical developments in China, including the May 30th movement of 1925 and the Northern Expedition of 1926–1928.<sup>9</sup> Whereas the Communists had capitalized on the anti-imperialist wave in the wake of the May 30 incident and actively promoted revolutionary mass mobilization together with the GMD during the Northern Expedition, anarchists in the mid-1920s were divided over such questions as how far they should organize and how much structure could be permitted without giving up too much freedom. While to many, the Soviet Union appeared as a horrific vision of what could become of socialism if executed in an authoritarian style,<sup>10</sup> others admired its obvious success in the struggle against "reactionary forces" and urged that attacks on Bolshevism be qualified. Even though nobody wanted to imitate the Soviet style, well aware of the merciless suppression of anarchism in the Soviet Union, some argued nevertheless for a closer organizational cohesion among anarchists, sometimes only very short of forming a party. These discussions, by the way, were not unique to the Chinese anarchists but resonated with similar debates in Western anarchism on the so-called "organizational platform" proposed by Nestor Machno, who had first fought with the Bolsheviks in the Ukraine,<sup>11</sup> only to be attacked by them

<sup>7</sup> The main source for Shifu's anarchist thought is his journal *Minsheng* (People's Voice), in the beginning called *Huiminglu* (Records of the Cockcrow) (1913–1921).

<sup>8</sup> He was most outspoken in the case of Zhang Ji, a friend of Li Shizeng and Wu Zhihui and the only personal link between the Tokyo and the Paris group, who had himself elected into the parliament shortly after the founding of the republic.

<sup>9</sup> This was not only expressed by anarchists inside of China but also by active young Chinese anarchists then in Europe like Ba Jin, Wei Huilin and Wu Kegang who joined the debates from France. Their statements are reprinted in Ge (1991: 826–848).

<sup>10</sup> One of the most outspoken anarchist critics of Bolshevism was Qin Baopu who had lived for some time in the Soviet Union. He published various articles and booklets in the Chinese anarchist press. For more information on this important but usually neglected figure, see Müller (2001: esp. 505f., 509–512).

<sup>11</sup> See Avrich (1986: 241–243), and Dahmann (1986: 161–166).

later. Though living in French exile at the time, he admired their victory. Because the platform idea was rather similar to forming a party, most rank-and-file Western anarchists rejected it. The discussions on stronger organization were also joined by neighboring anarchists from Japan and namely Koreans living in China. This clearly shows the ongoing networking and wider context in which the discussions of Chinese anarchists have to be seen.

In China, the final crisis came in 1927 with Jiang Kaishek's bloody purge of the Communists. Now the cooperation with Jiang's GMD meant choosing the right-wing. This was reluctantly done by most of the old Paris group members and their younger followers like Shen Zhongjiu and Bi Xiushao, partly because they hoped to fill the place in the GMD which the CCP had vacated. At least they were happy to be seemingly rid of their most feared ideological rival, though they soon realized that the GMD was no more favorably inclined towards them than to any other dissident voice.<sup>12</sup> Since the leading figures of the radical purist faction in the late 1920s like Lu Jianbo and Mao Yibo perceived themselves as definitely leftist, though highly critical of the CCP,<sup>13</sup> the split in the Chinese anarchist movement could not be avoided. Others like Ba Jin were caught in the middle.<sup>14</sup> Due to the internal split and the external pressure from Jiang's government on anarchists of all kinds they nevertheless all shared the fate of a difficult survival in the 1930s, even though signposted to a certain degree by foreign comrades, e.g., with the Labor University (a project of the anarchist "right")<sup>15</sup> or with bases in Fujian (more "leftist" oriented).<sup>16</sup>

Interestingly, these same people of the anarchist "left" who denounced any dealing with politics or taking sides in 1927/28 finally reconsidered their purist line following the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War, since they could no longer remain aloof from what was going on on the national level.<sup>17</sup> Still, it would be simplistic to conclude that the purists gave up or even became nationalist in the end. Although they now advocated cooperation with the resistance, this was not to be equated with backing Jiang's government per se. Furthermore, the global orientation of Chinese anarchism even at this time is evident, e.g., in the declared (and practically achieved) solidarity with the Spanish anarchists in their fight

<sup>12</sup> This group's most important forum was the *Geming zhoubao* (Revolution weekly), a substantial part of which has been reprinted in Sakai; Saga (1994), as vols. 1–6.

<sup>13</sup> This group published various relatively short-lived journals, most importantly the *Minfeng* (Avant-garde of the People).

<sup>14</sup> For a more extensive treatment of this complicated story see Müller (2001: part II, esp. ch. 12).

<sup>15</sup> For the Labor University see Chan; Dirlik (1991).

<sup>16</sup> An interesting treatment of the Fujian projects is by Sakai Hirobumi ("Ba Jin yu Fujian Quanzhou") in Yamaguchi; Sakai (1995: 252–315).

<sup>17</sup> Most Western studies of Chinese anarchism stop short of the 1930s. A more detailed overview of the Chinese anarchist movement from its beginning up to World War II can be gleaned from Müller (2001: part II, ch. 2–13).

against Franco during the Spanish Civil War in the mid-1930s,<sup>18</sup> probably the largest and last international effort involving anarchists around the world.

### Glocalization case 2: The question of culture and social practice

Besides politics, “glocalization” of anarchism in China also turned cultural traits into contested issues. The first-generation Tokyo group prominently voiced the opinion that anarchism was not at all alien to China. Rather, in their attempt to erase the official rhetoric of state, traditional China emerged as naturally anarchic. The fact that Laozi was presented as the Chinese forebear of anarchism was not simply another of those familiar cases where new Western imports were made digestible by declaring them rediscoveries of old forgotten Chinese origins. Instead, this vision of Chinese tradition tried to look at Chinese history not from the usual viewpoint of the state but of daily life in society. Little wonder that the Western “pope” of anarchism, i.e. Kropotkin, and Laozi in this interpretation were spontaneously linked, since Kropotkin had insisted that human beings – like any biological species – were perfectly capable of organizing themselves because of an innate tendency to cooperate. All institutions, including the state, were thus totally unnecessary and even detrimental. Laozi, on the other hand, was read literally in his advocacy of returning to nature. (Whether this reading of the *Laozi* is correct, is, by the way, highly disputable). In any case, it may be noted that Kropotkin himself included Laozi in a prehistory of anarchism.<sup>19</sup> Another, more convincing, case that was put forward, was Bao Jingyan of the 4th century, who has also been labeled a Chinese anarchist in Western Sinology.<sup>20</sup>

Even though this tradition-oriented argumentation of the Tokyo group found no direct successors, Shifu, too, in a way harked back to tradition. In his case this was not so much evident from his writings, which aimed at ideological “orthodoxy” as preached by Western anarchists, namely Kropotkin, but rather by his way of living. With Shifu, though, Buddhism and not Daoism was the major component. This facet became most obvious in his “heart society” and its quasi-puritanical rules of behavior. Krebs has aptly called it “secular Buddhism”.<sup>21</sup> Of course, this preoccupation with a “correct” and “consistent” way of living, or “lived” anarchism, had neo-Confucian overtones, too, but one may note that in Western anarchism as well, consistency in living out the anarchist ideal was not rare, either.

<sup>18</sup> The Spanish anarchists, namely Durruti, were publicized by Lu Jianbo and Ba Jin in China, and various Chinese anarchists considered helping their comrades in Europe.

<sup>19</sup> He did this in his late entry on „anarchism” in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1910: vol. 1, pp. 914–919).

<sup>20</sup> Notable cases are Étienne Balasz, Alfred Forke, Wolfgang Bauer, Hsiao Kung-chuan and Joseph Needham.

<sup>21</sup> See his excellent biography of Shifu (Krebs 1998).

(The most well-known case of hard-line puritan ethics were the Spanish anarchists as described by Hobsbawm (1959),<sup>22</sup> others explicitly rejected puritan ethics but fiercely stuck to libertarianism.<sup>23</sup>) Still, Shifu’s peculiar case was a clear example of “glocalization” and was seen as such by his followers<sup>24</sup> as well as, e.g., by his one-time Japanese collaborator Yamaga Taiji.<sup>25</sup>

Other Chinese anarchists like the first-generation Paris group and the May Fourth anarchists, too, often advocated living out the anarchist ideal through daily behavior, thus presenting themselves as credible advocates and as educators of others. Immediately after the founding of the Republic, e.g., members of the old Paris group initiated various societies to be spread in China (parallel to that of Shifu mentioned above), which spelled out how the “new” person should voluntarily live.<sup>26</sup> Compliance to the rules was a matter of the individual conscience, of course. Others opted for communal experiments, partly inspired by Western models,<sup>27</sup> partly also by Japanese ones like the Atarashiki mura (New Village),<sup>28</sup> driven by the desire to create an ideal – if small – world of their own. Furthermore, before and during the New Culture movement various programs for students and workers were designed, the most famous being the student-oriented work-study movement in France initiated by the old Paris group,<sup>29</sup> but parallel

<sup>22</sup> One may note that this “romanticizing” or “irrational” presentation has been challenged by more recent studies on Spanish rural anarchism.

<sup>23</sup> One example is the German anarchist Rudolf Rocker who, fleeing the Nazis, preferred to be denied entry into the US during World War II than submit to marrying his life-long partner, as US immigration regulations would have required him to do.

<sup>24</sup> Cf., for example, the Shifu special of the May Fourth anarchist journal *Jinhua* (Evolution) (3 [1919]) which propagated and defined „Shifuism”.

<sup>25</sup> Yamaga noted the peculiar stern and puritanical style of Shifu, which was unknown to him from Japanese anarchism. Yamaga’s Japanese „mentor” Ōsugi Sakae was even known as a bon vivant (though sometimes criticized for this by his comrades as excessive). Yamaga’s unpublished autobiography is the basis for Mukai (1974). For Ōsugi see Stanley (1982).

<sup>26</sup> The details of the regulations are reprinted, e.g., in *Li Shizeng xiansheng wenji* (1980: vol. 1, 175–182).

<sup>27</sup> Ex-Paris group member Zhang Ji, for one, had lived some time in a commune in Europe. Communes were en vogue, e.g., in French anarchism since the late 19th century. See Maitron (1951: 359ff.).

<sup>28</sup> Atarashiki mura – a still extant commune, though founded in 1918! – was the brain child of the Japanese noted author Mushakōji Saneatsu. He was more of a humanitarian artist than of an anarchist and had some quasi-religious leanings. For a more detailed discussion of his ideas, this commune project and how it related to China, as well as for the whole question of social experiments – an aspect that has been treated only in passing by conventional presentations of Chinese anarchism. See Müller (2001: esp. part II, ch. 7).

<sup>29</sup> Since there were quite some later Communist leaders who have gone through this program there has always been some interest in this topic. Material collections and monographs published in the PRC and in Taiwan display intriguing differing viewpoints on the whole undertaking.

undertakings also mushroomed in China. On the other hand, the education of laborers was put on the agenda as well, be it in China, be it the Chinese workers in France during World War I.<sup>30</sup> Whereas social experiments and communal living were also en vogue in the West and the education of laborers, too, was a common undertaking in world anarchism, in the Chinese case the perceived need to bridge the gap between the newly risen labor class and the self-styled intellectuals was especially pressing. Since the late 19th century, Chinese reformers had decried the low standard of civil education, calling for a “new citizen” (cf. Liang Qichao, most notably). But how this new citizen was to be designed was open to contention. Anarchism advocated an education which integrated physical and intellectual skills in order to overcome fixed labor division, which easily led to authoritarian structures. In China, this naturally evoked Mengzi’s word of “those who work with their brain govern; those who work with their hands are governed”,<sup>31</sup> but this kind of argumentational link to Chinese tradition became prominent only after the experimental craze during the May Fourth period had subsided. Even though local experiments to live out the libertarian ideal continued into the 1930s, this form of “glocalization” proved difficult to realize in an increasingly hostile climate.

On the theoretical level, though, “sinicization” of Western anarchism remained a hotly debated topic. A role in this scene was also played by the opponents of anarchism, which demonstrates that in a kind of “reception history”, as with Western anarchism in China, it is not enough to think in terms of Western “originals” and Chinese “imitations” and then – due to the China-centered approach – simply shift the focus to the recipients, in this case the Chinese anarchists, rather the whole context has to be considered. In the debates on “sinicized” anarchism in the early 1920s, the rival Marxist Communists, particularly Chen Duxiu, used “sinicization” as an accusation which obviously led to many anarchists distancing themselves from this approach.<sup>32</sup> Whereas some anarchists championed the “indigenization” of anarchism by trying to build up (or invent) a Chinese anarchist tradition, most younger anarchists were skeptical. At the same time, the Communists accused the anarchists of not joining in the national revolution and of lacking commitment to the “Chinese” cause. Especially the younger anarchists, who had grown up mainly under the Republic and had joined the anarchist movement during the iconoclastic days of the May Fourth movement, opted for purism (see above) and only later reconsidered their stance.

With them especially, internationalism and a global way of thinking, though not to the exclusion of Chineseness, was of utmost importance. Thus, they remained in

<sup>30</sup> A detailed study on Chinese laborers in France is Chen (1986). For a survey of the old Paris group’s initiatives in France see *Lü Ou jiaoyu yundong* (1916).

<sup>31</sup> *Mengzi* 3A.4.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. the debate between Zheng Xianzong (alias Taipu) who advocated an „anarchism with Chinese characteristics”, and Chen Duxiu late in 1920, as well as various follow-ups involving more people. See Müller (2001: esp. 449–452).

the internationalist current which also had formed one part of the New Culture drive during the 1920s when rightists and leftists tried to pose as foremost concerned with the nation. An important medium was Esperanto, which was an integral part of the Chinese anarchist movement throughout its history.<sup>33</sup> It was not only hailed on ideological grounds but also used for the correspondence with foreign anarchists, not only in the West but also in Asia, e.g., Korea and Japan.<sup>34</sup> Chinese anarchists also traveled abroad frequently and thus established direct personal links to world anarchism. The degree to which Chinese anarchists abroad joined in the respective local movements varied of course, but they brought concreteness to international connections. At the same time, foreigners, namely Japanese and Korean anarchists, participated actively in the Chinese anarchist movement.<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, since anarchism had no geographical center (i.e. no “Moscow”) – albeit more or less agreed-on “authoritative” texts –, it was easy for Chinese anarchists to imagine themselves full-blown members of world anarchism and not second-class ones. The frequent use of the international language Esperanto underlined this fact since it suggested no language hegemony. (This may be one of the main triggers of the euphoria surrounding Esperanto in East Asian anarchism, where it was used to a much greater degree than in Western anarchism.<sup>36</sup>)

## Conclusion

What then should we make of Chinese anarchism and “glocalization”? As has hopefully become obvious, there was no single way of adapting anarchism to China, but rather multiple ones. This process of “adaptation” could be framed conventionally in a Western impact/Chinese response paradigm. Thus, we would define Western anarchism as the original and the Chinese response or responses as imitations (or distortions, depending on the viewpoint). If we move on to a China-

<sup>33</sup> The important issue of Esperanto has been treated insufficiently – if at all – by earlier research on Chinese anarchism, but it accompanied the anarchist movement from its very start. For a general, but not always accurate, overview of Esperanto in China – rather low-key on the anarchist connection, though – see Hou (1985). The role of Esperanto is integrated in my narrative of the Chinese anarchist movement in Müller (2001). See also Müller; Benton 2006a and Müller; Benton 2006b.

<sup>34</sup> Shifu was one of the most dedicated users of Esperanto in his correspondence. In the 1920s most younger anarchists were active esperantists, including, e.g., Ba Jin, who also translated materials on Japanese anarchism from Esperanto versions provided by the Japanese comrades.

<sup>35</sup> The issue of cooperation between Chinese and other Asian anarchists has only been taken up so far by some Japanese and Korean scholars.

<sup>36</sup> For a general overview of the Esperanto movement see Forster (1982). The problem of Esperanto and political ideologies is treated by Lins (1990), including a highly interesting part on East Asia.

centered view, we may ask why certain Chinese felt attracted to Western anarchism in the first place, then, how they adapted it and to what ends. These are all certainly useful questions. Still, even looking at it from the Chinese viewpoint, we have to account for the fact that many of the Chinese involved saw themselves as playing an active part in an international movement. And they were in fact part of it, even if recognized only on the periphery by many Western anarchists. The simplistic notion of model vs. copy implies that the model was fixed and finished; but Chinese and world anarchism went along together for some time, even if the Chinese anarchist movement joined in later than many others. Shocks like World War I or the problem of how to deal with the rising tide of Marxist-Leninist Communism on the one hand and fascism on the other were *real-time* issues for them all. Thus, Chinese discussions not only reflected international developments but also shaped them. Questions such as involvement in the Chinese national revolution, e.g., were consciously linked with supra-national considerations, and analogies were drawn with perceived similar situations in other countries.<sup>37</sup> This was perfectly logical from an anarchist point of view, since national borders were ultimately insignificant. In a way, anarchism led the people back to a vision of mankind as a basically indivisible whole that was only spatially scattered around the globe. Divisions meant power relations and as such should be abolished. Rendering this ideal in the most fundamental way makes evident that anarchism is certainly not the only aspirant to it. Other ideologies, thought traditions or religions basically aim at a similar outcome of mankind's history. In this sense, the problem of "glocalization" is certainly not unique to anarchism, but the case of Chinese anarchism may illustrate that

- reception history can still be done without falling into the classical Western impact/Chinese (or wherever) response paradigm,
- a China-centered perspective needs to be broadened not only by cultural, historical and geographical contextualization, but also by taking seriously the global aspirations and the global frame of mind of the Chinese actors themselves.
- Last but not least, the concept of "glocalization" may help view specific cases of adaptation or indigenization in comparison also with similar processes in other places.

Thus, Chinese history could also become more global in its representations.

<sup>37</sup> One example would be the French anarchist Jean Grave and his deliberations on the Chinese national revolution. See the Chinese version of a letter from Grave 1927 together with Bi Xiushao's reply in Ge (1991: vol. 2, 729-734).

## Bibliography

- Avrich, Paul (1986): *The Russian Anarchists*. Princeton: Princeton University Press (1st ed. 1967).
- Chan, Ming K.; Dirlik, Arif (1991): *Schools into Fields and Factories: Anarchists, the Guomindang, and the Labor University in Shanghai, 1927-1932*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Chen Sanjing 陳三井 (1986): *Huagong yu ouzhan 華工與歐戰* [Chinese labourers and the European War]. Taipei 台北: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo.
- Cohen, Paul A. (1996): *Discovering History in China: American Writing on the Recent Chinese Past*. New York: Columbia University Press (1st ed. 1984).
- Conrad, Sebastian; Randeria, Shalini (2002): *Jenseits des Eurozentrismus: Postkoloniale Perspektiven in den Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften*. Frankfurt, New York: Campus.
- Dahlmann, Dittmar (1986): *Land und Freiheit: Machnovščina und Zapatismo als Beispiele agrarrevolutionärer Bewegungen*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1910). 11th edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Forster, Peter (1982): *The Esperanto Movement*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Ge Maochun 葛懋春 et al. (eds.) (1991): *Wuzhengfuzhuyi sixiang ziliaoxuan 无政府主义思想资料选* [Collected Materials on Anarchist thought]. 2nd ed. Peking: Beijing daxue 北京大学.
- Hobsbawm, Eric (1959): *Primitive Rebels*. Manchester: Manchester UP.
- Hou Zhiping 侯志平 (1985): *Shijieyu yundong zai Zhongguo 世界语运动在中国* [The Esperanto movement in China]. Beijing: Shijieyu 世界语.
- Krebs, Edward S. (1998): *Shifu, Soul of Chinese Anarchism*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Li Shizeng xiansheng wenji 李石曾先生文集* (1980). 2 vols. Taipei: Jingxiaochu zhongyang wenwu gongying.
- Lins, Ulrich (1990): *La Danĝera Lingvo. Studo pri la persekutoj kontraŭ Esperanto* [The dangerous language. Study of the persecutions of Esperanto]. Moskau: Progreso.
- Lü Ou jiaoyu yundong 旅歐教育運動* [The educational movement (of Chinese) while in France] (1916). Tours: Lü Ou zazhi.
- Jean Maitron (1951): *Histoire du mouvement anarchiste en France (1880-1914)*. Paris: Société universitaire d'éditions et de librairie.
- Mukai Takashi 向井孝 (1974): *Yamaga Taiji: hito to sono shōgai 山鹿泰治・人とその生涯* [Yamaga Taiji: The Man and his Life]. Tokyo: Aoga.
- Müller, Gotelind (2001): *China, Kropotkin und der Anarchismus: Eine Kulturbewegung im China des frühen 20. Jahrhunderts unter dem Einfluß des Westens und japanischer Vorbilder*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

- ; Benton, Gregor (2006a): „Esperanto and Chinese anarchism, 1907–1920”. In: *Language Problems and Language Planning* 30.1 (forthcoming).
- ; Benton, Gregor (2006b): “Anarchism and Esperanto in China, 1920–1930s”. In: *Language Problems and Language Planning* 30.2 (forthcoming).
- Osterhammel, Jürgen; Petersson, Niels P. (2003): *Geschichte der Globalisierung: Dimensionen, Prozesse, Epochen*. München: Beck.
- Robertson, Roland (1998): „Glokalisierung – Homogenität und Heterogenität in Raum und Zeit“. In: Beck, Ulrich (ed.): *Perspektiven der Weltgesellschaft*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, pp. 192–200.
- ; White, K. E. (eds.) (2003): *Globalization: Critical Concepts in Sociology*. London: Routledge.
- Said, Edward (1978): *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon.
- Sakai Hirobumi 坂井洋史 (1995): “Ba Jin yu Fujian Quanzhou” 巴金与福建泉州 in Yamaguchi; Sakai (eds.) (1994) pp. 252–315.
- Sakai Hirobumi 坂井洋史; Saga Takashi 嵯峨隆 (eds.) (1994): *Genten chūgoku anakizumu shiryō shūsei* 原典中国アナキズム史料集成 [Collection of historical primary sources of Chinese Anarchism]. 12 vols. with supplement. Tokyo: Ryokuin.
- Stanley, Thomas A. (1982): *Ōsugi Sakae. Anarchist in Taishō Japan: The Creativity of the Ego*. Cambridge (Mass.), London: Harvard University Press.
- The Oxford Dictionary of New Words* (1991). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yamaguchi Mamoru 山口守; Sakai Hirobumi 坂井洋史 (1995): *Ba Jin de shijie* 巴金的世界. Peking: Dongfang.