

*Jan VRHOVSKI*

## Mr. Luosu and “China’s Road to Freedom” – A General Introduction to Russell’s Visit to China (1920-1921)

One hundred years after the visit of the preeminent British philosopher Bertrand Russell to China, studies in modern Chinese intellectual history are still directly or indirectly concerned with the consequences this trip had for the Chinese scientific, philosophical and socio-political discourse in the Republican era and thereafter. With his personal and scholarly integrity, his polymathic erudition, progressive social ideas, and unbending fervour in his endeavours for freedom of thought and personal choice, Russell left an enduring imprint on numerous aspects of Chinese modern thought and society.

Russell arrived in China at a pivotal moment in history, when the fogs of war which obscured the illuminating and bright rays of progress in the Western sky had finally begun to clear, and the dormant reformatory and emancipatory potential of Chinese intellectuals, to import and implement the knowledge and experience from the rest of the world, was finally able to reveal

itself. By the year 1919, the progressive intellectuals, social theoreticians and educated youth who gathered around Chinese academic centres and in metropolitan cities were at the same time brimming with patriotic sentiments and national awareness and on the other hand yearning for modern ideas and social reforms coming from the West. When the winds of the May Fourth movement rose from the streets of Beijing and swept through most significant Chinese urban centres, the main intellectual currents in Chinese intellectuals' search for modernity had started to consolidate as many found their adherences or objections to one or the other school of thought from the West. For a brief period of time, the various factions which had formed in the recent years were unified under one single banner of liberty, reform and progress. Through constant engagement with the objectivist worldviews coming from the West, a common belief in the potency and utmost importance of two symbolic figures from contemporary Western thought was gradually established: the first was the paragon of liberty, called "Mr. Democracy" (*De xiansheng* 德先生) and the other personified a profound knowledge about the universe and the ability to wield control over nature, called "Mr. Science" (*Sai xiansheng* 賽先生). The unextinguishable desire for progress and the new, which manifested in the New Culture Movement (*Xin wenhua yundong* 新文化運動), which reached its apex in the early 1920s, had inadvertently pushed the Chinese intellectual world towards the reality of the cultural and intellectual rifts which underpinned the Chinese, as it were, expropriation or adoption of Western ideas. From the chasm which the Chinese intellectuals thus found underneath their feet, a deep sense of cognitive dissonance ensued, which revealed that the majority of them were still deeply immersed in what they referred to as traditional thinking. The dilemmas which arose from the internal ideological schisms were experienced as a deep spiritual crisis. It could be argued that the intensity of the crisis emanated from the fact that the majority of Chinese intellectuals who professed their break with the Confucian past and determination to replace the outdated tradition with modern alternatives, could not avoid using the "traditional" perception and manner of thinking (epistemology and ethics) as the compass and the traditional cosmologies (ontology) as the map used in their mental travels to the West.

Hence, while they dreamt about advancing Chinese culture onto a higher "evolutionary" plane (Darwin's theory of evolution was extremely popular in Chinese modernist discourse from late 19<sup>th</sup> century on), at the same time the very concept of evolution was probably understood in a profoundly holistic, traditional way. The same holism underlay the Chinese scholars' understanding of the nature and value of philosophical and scientific theories, where the

universality of the principles (*li* 理) they postulated and, more importantly, the universality of their beneficial practical effects, was understood as the main criterion of their truth. In that way, as with the sages of old, the true knowledge of the universe would necessarily manifest itself in human ethical disposition. A natural corollary to that was that the scientific method, social theory, philosophy, ethics, economy and so on, were all different manifestations of one single principle. Consequently, although the Chinese intellectuals believed that they took part in a meta-cultural reformation of the identity of the Chinese scholar, what they were still clinging to was an image deeply rooted in the Chinese past. Or, in the words of Charlotte Furth:

When faced with fundamental questions about nature, the average Chinese intellectual of the early twentieth century, whether sympathetic toward science or not, thought that some form of speculative cosmology supplied the kind of answer required. Moreover, he believed that a philosophical question at some point had to involve a question about ethics, and he remained insensitive to the internal guidelines to thought provided by Western logical forms, unless these forms were interpretable in a strictly empirical fashion. This being the case, he tended to make the theories of science into systems of belief, using the concepts suggested by those theories – he came to social Darwinism before he came to the science of biology, and he talked of the mechanistic universe before he examined the laws of mechanics. (Furth 1970, 133)

Although such descriptions cannot be accepted at face value and assumed to have been generally true, the above excerpt still represents a good approximation of a specific re-emerging and thus average segment of Chinese intellectual discourse of the 1910s. Furth’s characterization would also explain the special fascination of Chinese intellectuals for the most profoundly methodological aspects of Western science, such as logic, as well as a widely held notion of logic in the 1920s, which attributed to its most advanced branches the ability to solve all problems of humanity (see Zhang Shenfu 1919a-c).

Thus, in 1919, when a spirit of optimism permeated the Chinese intellectual climate and a promise of impending change endowed young intellectuals with fresh energy to invest in their pursuit of new knowledge, some of the most notable members of the intellectual elite, such as Liang Qichao (梁啟超, 1873-1929), Cai Yuanpei (蔡元培, courtesy name Zhongshen 仲申, 1868-1940), and others, recognized the necessity of the systematic import of Western knowledge to China. Apart from promoting the recruitment of Western-educated scholars to Chinese universities and stimulating

the translation of Western scholarly literature, they also started inviting the most influential Western scholars to China, hoping that a closer view of their teachings might shed some light on which path Chinese society should take on its way towards a modern existence. An important orientational force behind the introductions of the philosophical worldviews of choice were the young Chinese scholars who in the previous two decades had had the chance to study at, first, Japanese and, later, Western universities and whose scholarly formation took place within the intellectual environment of the West. Thus in 1919, owing to the influence of a few professors at Peking University, who had obtained their training at Columbia University in New York, the first person invited to lecture in China was the American pragmatist John Dewey (1859-1952). Shortly afterwards, a few prominent members of the Peking University and Chinese Progressive Party (*Jinbudang* 進步黨) issued an invitation to Bertrand Russell.

The following text aims at giving a general overview of Russell's visit in China: from the general circumstances and influences leading to his invitation in May 1920, to the main aspects of his stay and the content of his lectures in China, from October 1920 to July 1921.

## 1 The Background: From the Idea to Invitation and Organization

Although the reasons why the Lecture Society invited Russell to China might have been more complex than appears at the first sight, Suzanne P. Ogden's relatively early attempt at re-evaluating the impact of Russell's visit on Chinese intellectual developments in the early 1920s states that a direct impetus for inviting him to China might have been given by Dewey himself in his lectures at Peking University in March 1920 (Ogden 1982, 532). In a series of lectures on modern trends in Western philosophy, Dewey mentioned Russell as one of "three great philosophers of our day" (*ibid.*), the other two being James and Bergson. According to Ogden, these lectures influenced the subsequent decision by Liang Qichao – who in this was assisted by Zhang Shenfu – to invite both Bergson and Russell to come to lecture in China (*ibid.*).

Below the surface of the periodical publications from the time, the twists and turns of intellectual trends and the webs of personal influences formed a more complex pattern. Combined with a critically collated retrospective accounts, given by the members of the key circle of Chinese intellectuals, the written documents from the time (from articles to official papers) suggest

that the main reasons behind Russell’s invitation to China must be sought at many different levels and places at the same time. On the one hand, the decision to invite Russell to China was a product of the views of particular senior intellectuals such as Liang Qichao and Cai Yuanpei on the current needs of Chinese intellectual world, while on the other hand the main impetus or affirmation for the invitation emanated from internal developments in the Chinese intellectual world, where, following the May Fourth events in 1919, the tensions between different intellectual currents and ideological factions started to gradually intensify. In other words, the reasons why Russell was invited to China can be found both in the internal Chinese intellectual discourse as well as the external developmental trends in science and philosophy in the West. Observed from another perspective, apart from particular worldview-related divisions, at the time the major divisions between Chinese intellectuals were related to the exact degree and manner to which these internal and external factors should interact in China’s quest for its modern identity.

### 1.1 National Peking University – Cai Yuanpei and Zhang Shenfu

By the year 1919, an important platform which some of the most popular intellectual currents of the time took as their stage was the prestigious National Peking University. Under Cai Yuanpei, who was appointed its president in December 1916, the university became a paragon of a modern institute of higher education, which followed the principles of universal academic inclusiveness, in the framework of which all disciplines and theories of science were to enjoy unconditional “toleration and inclusion” (*jianrong bingbao* 兼容並包) (see Lin 2005; 2012, 131-138). Although Cai’s policy opened the door to a variety of social and philosophical theories and worldviews, which would otherwise not necessarily survive the political trials of the time, such as most notably socialism or Marxism, at the same time departments such as that of philosophy could not avoid succumbing to the influence of most strongly represented philosophical theories or more general theoretical tendencies, such as, for example, American pragmatism. It was exactly the abovementioned openness to the knowledge of the entire world, embodied in Cai Yuanpei’s policy of the increasing recruitment of Western educated scholars, which, by 1919, led to a wave of pragmatism at the department of philosophy. Under the influence of Hu Shi (胡適, courtesy name 適之, 1891-1962) and Jiang Menglin (蔣夢麟, original name Mengxiong 蒙熊, courtesy name Zhaoxian 兆賢, 1886-1964), both of whom earned their doctoral degrees from Columbia University in New York, the transtemporal and trans-discursive balance

endeavoured for by Cai was heavily disrupted in favour of pragmatism. As a result, in early 1919 the renowned American pragmatist John Dewey was invited to China, to assume the post of a visiting professor at the Department of Philosophy at Peking University.

The initial enthusiasm for Dewey's pragmatism, which filled the atmosphere at the university during the initial months following his arrival, was soon replaced by open disappointment and criticism coming from the lines of more progressive students and adherents of contesting schools of Western philosophy at the university, most notably the more leftist members of the New Culture Movement (*Xin wenhua yundong* 新文化運動) at the university gathered around Li Dazhao (李大釗, 1889-1927), Chen Duxiu (陳獨秀, 1879-1942), Zhang Shenfu (張申府, original name Songnian 崧年, 1893-1986) and others. On the other hand, amongst the senior members of Chinese intelligentsia, the excessive "Americanization" or "pragmatization" of the Peking University as the central stage of Chinese intellectual progress was also critically received by the proponents of the balanced expropriation of Western knowledge to serve the cause of Chinese modernity, which also included a few the members of the Progressive Party (*Jinbudang* 進步黨) headed by Liang Qichao and others.

Consequently, through the gradual introduction of formal logic on one side and empiricist philosophy and scientific method on the other, the leftist intellectuals at Peking University received a potential philosophical foundation for their opposition against the strong pragmatist current building up at the Department of Philosophy. This rise of the significance of science-based philosophy coincided with the overall popularization of the general notion of science and its practical applications in Chinese public discourse, which was spearheaded by the members of the China Science Society (*Kexueshe* 科學社) and their journal *Kexue* 科學 (*Science*). The significance of the scientization of the philosophical discourse was also the underlying reason for the general disappointment with the solutions offered by the pragmatist worldview of Dewey, which came along with his experimentalist logical method which only slightly resembled the refined machinery and scientific (mathematical) form of symbolic logic. At the same time, the same idea of scientific foundations was also adopted by the original Marxist intellectuals at Peking University, amongst whom both Russell's philosophy as well as his extremely modern version of formal logic (mathematical logic) had first gained popularity. The credit for the initial introduction of Russell's philosophy and mathematical logic amongst the leftist circles of philosophers goes to Zhang Shenfu (張申府, original name Songnian 崧年, 1893-1986), and indirectly and to a

much lesser degree also to his professor of logic at Peking University, Zhang Shizhao (章士釗, courtesy name Xingyan 行巖, 1881-1973). Zhang allegedly already discovered Russell back in 1916, when he was still a student of mathematics at the university (Zhang Shenfu 1993, 85-7). Subsequently, Zhang changed his subject to philosophy and started studying logic and Western philosophy.<sup>1</sup> In 1918, Zhang became a close colleague of Li Dazhao, under whom he worked at the Peking University Library and with whom he co-founded the Communist cell in Beijing. Between 1918 and 1919 Zhang delivered regular lectures on modern logic and probably also on Russell’s philosophy of logic at the university’s Red Building (*Honglou* 紅樓), a gathering place of progressive leftist students (Zhang 1993, 92). Later, in 1918, Zhang also assumed the post of a lecturer in mathematics and logic at Peking University’s preparatory school. His strong advocacy of Russell’s philosophy and the notion of mathematical logic earned Zhang the reputation of the foremost expert and adherent of Russell at the university, as well as in China. Thus, when in late 1919 and first half of 1920 Dewey and his adherents started openly criticizing Russell, Zhang was the person who defended his foreign “idol’s” position against these attacks. Probably the most important domain in which Zhang advanced both Russell’s thought and the notion of mathematical logic as the indispensable components of a modern worldview was within the circle of his friends and close colleagues, who included many important intellectual figures of Republican China, such as Liang Shuming (梁漱溟, 1893-1988), Luo Jialun (羅家倫, 1897-1969), Fu Sinian (傅斯年, 1896-1950), Gu Jiegang (顧頡剛, 1893-1980), Chen Duxiu, Zhang Shizhao and, last but not least, Cai Yuanpei. It is highly probable that Zhang Shenfu’s spreading of Russell’s ideas made a deep impression on Cai, who seems to have been the first person who started actively working on the idea of inviting Russell to come to lecture at the university.

## 1.2 Fu Tong, Liang Qichao and the Lecture Society

Following the end of the “Great War” (World War I), Cai Yuanpei made a few important moves which set in motion the entire undertaking of inviting Russell to China, the first of which was inviting the young Chinese philosopher Fu Tong (傅銅, courtesy name Peiqing 佩青, 1886-1970) to join the university as a member of the Department of Philosophy. Fu was one of the few young Chinese scholars to have obtained their undergraduate training

1 In the framework of his postgraduate studies of mathematics, Zhang focused on the Cantorian set theory. (Zhang Shenfu 1918a/b; Guoli Beijing daxue 1917)

in philosophy from British universities, having studied at those of Oxford and Birmingham. Finally, in 1917, Fu was awarded a master's degree in philosophy from the University of Birmingham for a thesis entitled "A Criticism of Pragmatism", which was allegedly co-supervised by Russell himself<sup>2</sup> (see Shi Yong 2012, 96-7; Fang & Wang 1994, 139-140). Although the exact time and circumstances of the abovementioned invitation are still rather unclear,<sup>3</sup> what can be confirmed is that by early 1920 Fu was at Peking University and fully engaged in organizing Russell's visit in China. Apart from fact that the incentive to invite Russell apparently came from Cai Yuanpei himself, Fu's educational philosophical orientation – in addition to having been a follower of the New Realist school of philosophy and an advocate of scientific objectivism, Fu was also a fervent critic of pragmatism, probably also reveals Cai attempt to restore balance and address the issue theoretical favouritism at Peking University's Department of Philosophy. This tendency and intention is further confirmed by the fact that, following Russell's visit to China, Fu continued teaching Western philosophy at the university.<sup>4</sup>

Thus, it was Fu Tong who on behalf of Peking University, in April 1920, shortly upon his return from one year in Europe, visited Liang Qichao at his residence

- 
- 2 The sources do not agree on this part. While Shi Yong (2012, 96) writes that Fu's thesis was supervised by Russell, the *Biographical Dictionary of Higher Education in Modern China* (2012, 621), on the other hand, states that Fu studied under Russell only upon his graduation from University of Birmingham. Finally, Ding Zijiang (2016, 167) and others (Guo Lanfang and Zhang Xiulong 2006 etc.) claim that in 1913 Fu wrote a letter to Russell, in which he expressed his wish to study philosophy under him.
  - 3 Fang Keli and Wang Qishui (1994, 140), for example, mistakenly claim that Fu graduated in 1913 and returned to China soon afterwards – the date of Fu's thesis (1917), which can be found in the archives of University of Birmingham, confirms otherwise. On the other hand, Shi Yong (2012, 96) mistakenly claims that in 1918 Cai Yuanpei travelled to England where he personally extended the invitation to both Fu and Russell. But from biographies we learn that in 1918 Cai was not in Europe at all (see Gao 1980; Sun 1986; Xiao 1999). What is attested is that Fu was invited to assume the post of lecturer in history of modern Western philosophy at Peking University, which he was to assume in the academic year 1919/20. Nevertheless, it seems that he arrived in Beijing only at the beginning of the year 1920 (see Guoli Beijing daxue, 1919). Fu probably worked at the university until 1924, when he became the dean of the Northwestern University. He returned to Peking University in 1929 (Fang & Wang 1994, 98).
  - 4 Shi Yong 2012, 97. Following the year 1921, the curriculum at the department was also reorganized in favour of science-based philosophical worldviews and modern logic, including the philosophy of Bertrand Russell. At the level of the basic curriculum, this temporary curricular turnover was carried out by Wang Xinggong (王星拱, 1888-1949), another advocate of "scientization" of modern Chinese philosophy and proponent of the use of science-based analytical method at the department. Wang was also one of the key translators of Russell's work in the 1920s China.



in Tianjin to discuss the question of inviting Russell to China (Zhang Yuzheng 2014, 113). At that time, Liang was already not only familiar with the "great three philosophers" of the West, but was probably also greatly interested in the pacifistic social theory and scientific philosophy of Russell (cf. Chang Hao 1971). It is almost certain that Liang became familiar with the current philosophical discourse in the West, which included the work and thought of such prominent figures as Russell and Bergson, during his year in Europe. In contrast with his interest and admiration of Russell, Liang was not so much in favour of pragmatism, which he saw as the root cause of the extensive Americanization of Chinese academia, which greatly undermined the idea of the unbiased and balanced Chinese adoption of Western knowledge as envisaged by Liang.<sup>5</sup> In that way, one of the main positive effects Liang recognized in the idea of Russell's visit in China was to set it as a counterbalance against the excessive Americanization of Chinese philosophy (Levenson 1953, 201). Most importantly, by the request of Liang and his close associate Zhang Junmai (張君勱, 1887-1969), as early as in 1919, when both were still on their travels in Europe, their junior associate Zhang Dongsun (張東蓀), who took over the editorship of their journal *Liberation and Reform* (*Jiefang yu gaizao* 解放與改造) in their absence, started extensively introducing the thought of Russell and Bergson in the publication (Zhang Yuzheng 2014, 113; Zuo Yuhe 1998, 101). Thus in 1919, in Liang Qichao's absence Zhang Dongsun wrote or commissioned a number of articles introducing mainly Russell's (*Luoseer* 羅塞爾) political philosophy, which also included translations from Russell's critically acclaimed work *Proposed Roads to Freedom: Socialism, Anarchism and Syndicalism* from 1918.<sup>6</sup>

As such, when in April 1920 Fu Tong and the president of the China College (*Zhongguo gongxue* 中國公學) Wang Jingfang (王敬芳) visited Liang to seek his support for inviting Russell to China, the latter was just in the middle of realizing a number of ideas which he gathered during his recent visit in Europe. These were mainly related to the ways and sources for the dissemination

5 See "Welcome Speech for Russell at the Chinese Lecture Society (1920)" pp. 65-69.

6 In 1919 and 1920, the texts were translated by the renowned Chinese writer and literary criticist Mao Dun (茅盾, original name Shen Dehong 沈德鴻, courtesy name Yanshui 雁水, 1896-1981). Zhang Dongsun's articles on Russell from 1919 included "Russell's Political Ideals" (*Luoseer de zhengzhi lixiang* 羅塞爾的政治理想), "Why do We Have to Speak about Socialism?" (*Women weishenme yao jiang shehui zhuyi?* 我們為什麼要講社會主義?), and "The Third Kind of Civilization" (*Disan zhong wenming* 第三種文明). In 1920, the journal also published commentaries on individual chapters of Russell's work *Principles of Social Reconstruction*. The years 1919 and 1920 also saw the publication of several articles interpreting Russell's concept of "guild socialism" (translated either as *jierte shehui zhuyi* 基爾特社會主義 or *gonghang shehui zhuyi* 工行社會主義).

of Western science and philosophy in China. For the very same purpose, in March 1920, together with the circle of his associates, he initiated the reorganization of their former society *Xinxuehui* 新學會 (New Academic Society) into the Communal Education Society (*Gongxueshe* 共學社),<sup>7</sup> and their main publication the *Liberation and Reform* into the journal *Reform* (*Gaizao* 改造).<sup>8</sup> Liang also took over the control of the China College. Thus, the main reason why, in their initiative to invite Russell to China, Cai Yuanpei and Fu Tong consulted Liang was to obtain both organizational and financial support from his reformed organization(s). After they received Liang's approval, the task of sending the official invitation to Russell was taken over by Peking University, which was also the official host of Russell's visit in China. Most importantly, the official invitation letter was written and signed by Fu himself (May 1920) – though its content might not necessarily have been decided by Fu himself.<sup>9</sup> Suzanne Ogden, who had a chance to personally examine the letter, described its content as follows: "The invitation seemed to express primary interest in Russell's theory on mathematics and logic and suggested that although the writer did not know precisely what Russell's social and political views were, he would be welcome to lecture on them as well as on his theoretical philosophy" (Ogden 1982, 533). At the same time, the letter also recognized Russell as a social reformer (*ibid.*),<sup>10</sup> which, in eyes of the general

- 
- 7 The main motto of the society was "to foster new talent, propagate a new culture and pioneer new politics", while their main objectives included editing new books, supporting authors, and helping prospective students to enrol into Western universities. (Zuo Yuhe 1998, 101).
- 8 The journal became the source of a major controversy in socialist circles, because under the editorship of Liang Qichao and Zhang Dongsun, the main aim of the journal was the propagation of "moderate socialism" (*wenhe de shehui zhuyi* 溫和的社會主義), an essentially non-Marxist version of scientific socialism. Since this was exactly this kind of socialism which Zhang and Liang had attributed to Russell (Zuo Yuhe 1998, 129), it seems as if the journal was set up to echo Russell's reformist ideas. This unconventional departure from the mainstream idea of a revolutionary form of socialism prompted many critical responses from Chen Duxiu and other Communists (see *ibid.*, 103-125 etc.). Chen, for example, wrote regularly on Russell and the problem of reforms and socialism in his "Random Thoughts" (*Suigan lu* 隨感錄) article series, published in the *New Youth* (1920/1). The "polemics on socialism" which consequently developed between these two factions not only coincided with Russell's visit to China, but eventually also came to absorb Russell's notion of guild socialism. The latter also significantly influenced Zhang Dongsun's vision of socialism.
- 9 Probably because of the uncertainty related to Russell's current affiliation (he was reinstated as a fellow at Trinity College, Cambridge only in 1920), the letter was addressed to J. H. Muirhead, a professor at the University of Birmingham (probably one of Fu's former professors) and a close acquaintance of Russell. Today, the letter is held as part of the main collection of the Russell Archives (Ogden 1982, 532).
- 10 Feng (1994, 99) mentions that, regarding the content of the proposed lectures at Peking University, Fu was inviting Russell to lecture on any topic related to philosophy, science, and politics.

Chinese public at the time, may have denoted a person of inherently humane (*ren* 仁) character, who understands the underlying patterns (*li* 理) of the universe, and directs all his efforts to establishing harmony between nature and humanity by propagating wisdom (*zhi* 智) and commonality (*gong* 公, "impartiality, common justice"). This idea of Russell as a scholar of outstanding moral character and a most insightful scientist was highly reminiscent of the traditional idea of a sagely person (*shengren* 聖人) akin to Confucius. Curiously, when Russell finally arrived in China it was exactly the unyielding ethical persona of Russell, as an immediate result of his scholarly excellence, which eventually attracted most attention in Chinese public. Moreover, this image of Russell as a scientific social reformist (*shehui gaizao* 社會改造) was completely in line with Liang Qichao's ideas related to the current Chinese intellectual needs.

Not long after the official invitation was issued, the university received a telegram from Russell, confirming his arrival in China in October. Consequently, in July 1920, a public announcement was issued by the university, announcing Russell's forthcoming visit.<sup>11</sup> Whilst Fu and others were preparing the stage at the university, Liang and his associates took over the challenge of financing and organizing Russell's visit in China. Firstly, the Communal Education Society together with some private donors were endeavouring to raise the financial means needed to cover the costs for Russell's travel and stay in China, including the 2,000 pounds salary promised to him in the letter of invitation. For the same purpose, in September 1920 Liang and his associates established the Lecture Society (*Jiangxueshe* 講學社), which was about to take over the formal role as the official institution organizing and financing Russell's journey and stay at Peking University.<sup>12</sup> Otherwise, for the purpose of organizing the trip a joint committee was formed of representatives from the Shangzhi Academic Society (*Shangzhi xuehui* 尚志學會), Peking University, Communal Education Society and China College in Shanghai. At its first meeting, which took place on August 30<sup>th</sup> in Beijing, the joint organizational

11 One of the newspaper articles that announced Russell's visit also mentioned Dewey's recent lectures, in which he described Russell as one of three great Western philosophers. (See "*Yingguo zhexuejia Luosu jiang lai Hua* 英國哲學家羅素將來花 [The English Philosopher Russell Will Come to China]")

12 The member of the society, who was also responsible for organizing Russell's stay in China was Liang Qichao's right hand, Zhang Dongsun, who was also in charge of collecting and raising donations needed to subsidise Russell's, Dewey's, Driesch and Tagore's stay in China. Beside the Chinese Ministry of education, which allegedly contributed about 20000 yuan each year, Russell's stay in China was financed by more than 30 donors. (See Xu Yibao 2003, 183; Zuo Yuhe 1998, 103-4)

committee elected Zhao Yuanren (趙元任, Yuen Ren Chao, 1892-1982), Ding Wenjiang (丁文江, courtesy name Zaijun 在君, 1887-1936), Qin Fen (秦汾, 1882-1973) and Ye Jingshen (葉景莘, 1881-1986) as Russell's official interpreters – although ultimately Zhao took over the task of the chief translator, and Tao Lügong (陶履恭, also called Tao Menghe 陶孟和, 1887-1960) and Fu Tong as his attendants (see “*Taolun huanying Luosu shixiang*” 1920). At the same time, the organisations and individuals involved in Russell's visit in China started introducing his work and personality to Chinese public.

### 1.3 A Short Period of Introduction

In the few months before Russell's arrival in China, the stage for his visit was prepared by a small number of authors, who introduced different aspects of Russell's thought to the general Chinese readership. One such author was probably the most ardent follower of Russell's philosophy in China, Zhang Shenfu. Already from 1919 on, Zhang was publishing articles introducing different aspects of Russell's philosophy, his views on society and his methodology (analytical method, mathematical logic etc.). Most importantly, in the few months before Russell's arrival, Zhang published a great number of translations from his texts as well as a few articles introducing Russell's life and work.<sup>13</sup> Amongst others, Zhang's articles and translations were also published in the renowned *New Youth* (*Xin qingnian* 新青年) magazine, which devoted two special issues entirely to Russell (Vol. 8, No. 2 and No. 3) – altogether more than 20 articles and translations were published. Later in the same year, Zhang also published an exhaustive bibliography entitled “A Tentative Bibliography of Russell's Published Works” (*Shi bian Luosu jikan zhuzuo mulu* 試編羅素既刊著作目錄) in the same magazine. Other leading Chinese periodicals, where, in the initial months, special sections were given over to discussions of Russell's thought included the *Eastern Miscellany* (*Dongfang zazhi* 東方雜誌) (around 30 articles and translations), the *Young China* (*Shaonian Zhongguo* 少年中國) (mainly by Zhang Shenfu), the *Xinghua* 興華 journal (mainly commentaries), and Liang Qichao's journal *Reform* (*Gaizao* 改造) and the *Awakening* (*Juewu* 覺悟), a supplement to the *Republic Daily* (*Minguo ribao* 民國日報) newspaper. While *Reform* focused more on Russell's political thought, *New Youth* and *Eastern Miscellany* also contained articles on Russell's theoretical philosophy and his views on science and logic.<sup>14</sup>

13 See Zhang Shenfu pp. 101-164.

14 Authors who published in the *New Youth* include Chen Duxiu (on the problem of socialism), Wang Xinggong and Zhang Shenfu; authors who wrote for the *Eastern Miscellany* include Pan Gongzhan (潘公展), Yang Duanliu (楊端六), Hu Yuzhi (胡愈之) and Zhang Shenfu.

## 2 The Advent of the “New Confucius” – Russell’s Arrival in China

Russell arrived in Shanghai on October 12<sup>th</sup> (1920).<sup>15</sup> He was accompanied by his new, extramarital partner - who was later to become his second wife, the feminist and socialist activist Dora Black (1894-1986). One day later, on October 13<sup>th</sup>, a special welcome banquet was given by a few Shanghai educational institutes,<sup>16</sup> held at the Great Eastern Hotel (Gu Runqing 1920). The banquet was attended by several important dignitaries and members of the Chinese intellectual elite, including those who were in any way involved either in the invitation or organization of Russell’s subsequent stay in China. In his welcome address, the representative of the organizations that hosted the banquet, Shen Xinqing (沈信卿, Enfu 恩孚, 1864-1944),<sup>17</sup> said that:

If Russell is a great English philosopher, he is also a great philosopher of the World. His philosophy has got many points in common with the teachings of China’s forefathers... If Russell has come to China to advocate reformist thought, this is even more deeply in accord with China’s present mentality...

In the second address, Zhu Jinzhi (朱進之, 1888-1923) remarked:

Today China should rejoice. There are three reasons for this: (1) China is the world’s most ancient country; (2) As the first republic in Asia, China is also one of the world’s newest states; (3) Today, Russell, one of the greatest philosophers in the world, has come to visit... China’s greatest disgrace is the underdevelopment of its education; because China has

15 *Xinwen bao* 新聞報, October 13 (1920), 3. In the contemporary scholarship – especially the earliest more extensive studies on Russell and Chinese modernity, there seems to have been some confusion around the exact day of his arrival in Shanghai. Quoting Zhang Shenfu, Vera Schwarcz (1991-2, 126), for example, claimed that Russell had already arrived in Shanghai on October 8<sup>th</sup>. Apart from the local newspapers that reported on the occasion, the most relevant biographical accounts which also explain the problem related the exact date of arrival, were that of Russell’s official translator Zhao Yuanren (1997) and the person who accompanied him on his initial travels in China, Zhang Dongsun. Zhang’s biography (Zuo Yuhe 1998, 104) reveals that in the weeks before Russell’s arrival, Liang Qichao had notified Zhang in a letter that the arrival of the ship Porthos had been rescheduled from October 8<sup>th</sup> to October 12<sup>th</sup>.

16 Jiangsu Educational Association (*Jiangsu sheng jiaoyuhui* 江蘇省教育會), China College, China Vocational Educational Association (*Zhonghua zhiye jiaoyushe* 中華職業教育社), Progressive Association (*Gongjinhui* 共進會), Christian Association for Saving the Nation (*Jidujiao jiguohui* 基督教救國會), etc.

17 Shen was the father of two renowned Chinese scholars: the philosopher, logician and educationist, Shen Youqian (沈有乾) and the mathematical logician and philosopher of logic, Shen Youding (沈有鼎).

always worshipped philosophers in the same way as the Chinese people worship Confucius. But the learning of Confucius is not appropriate to be practiced today. I hope, therefore, that today a new Confucius will arise. Russell, who is present here today, is almost like a new Confucius! I hope that he will work diligently to realize the cause of the new Confucius! (“Huanyan da zhexuejia Luosu ji” 1920)

Although, upon his arrival to China, Shen Xingqing and Zhu Yanzhi welcomed Russell as the “second Confucius” (Xu Yibao 2003, 183), naturally this was not a generally held notion, though occasionally comparisons between the two were indeed made by others who also admired either Russell’s work or persona. Usually, such comparisons came from the ranks of leftist political theoreticians, activists, or philosophers. In some cases, the admiration for Russell was not motivated by his image as a fervent social reformer, but was rather induced by his scientific results, mainly those related to logic and the analytic method. Such admiration was usually reserved for intellectuals engaged in research into modern Western philosophy, science and mathematics, all those who maintained an interest in such matters. Moreover, different factions and adherents of different social theories reacted to what they were told or knew about Russell in different ways. Some proponents of pragmatism (Bergson and Dewey), who were previously not familiar with Russell, recognized in him an ally in their common struggle against Bolshevism and materialism (such as, for example, Zhang Dongsun 張東蓀)<sup>18</sup>. Several introductions, translations and outlines were printed in key journals of the various Chinese ideological factions. Critiques directed against Russell came from proponents of Dewey’s philosophy, who recognized in Russell an opponent to their worldview, one that had recently been strengthened by Dewey’s visit in China.<sup>19</sup> Generally speaking, there was a tendency among Chinese Marxist intellectuals to defend Russell against attacks from their opponents, namely philosophers with more traditional views who were gathering around

18 For example: the public (written) debate between Zhang Shenfu on one side and Zhang Dongsun and Liang Shuming on the other (see Schwarcz 1991/2, 134-139). Zhang Dongsun also wrote a series of articles about logicism, which he considered the fundamental feature of Russell’s philosophy, and the ‘unified’ philosophical worldview of New Realism. He wanted to show that Russell’s “new logicism” is not epistemologically consistent with his logicism, while the latter *per se* represents a scientific method embodied in logic and has a scientific value equal to Einstein’s theory of relativity (see Zhang Dongsun 1922; 1923, 58).

19 The Progressive Party, which was the main agent in Russell’s visit in China, was at that time already ideologically divided. Its members “held heterogeneous political views ranging from guild socialism and democratic socialism to capitalism and constitutionalism” (Ogden 1982, 534). Even Liang Qichao, the member of the party who was most interested in Russell’s teachings, had moved to the liberal camp (see Chang Hao 1971).

Dewey.<sup>20</sup> Naturally, in these confrontations, the defence of Russell was centred on the fact that the objectivity of his teaching on problems related to ethics and society stemmed from his knowledge of the natural world, which he could only have attained with the use of a more objective methodology: mathematical logic or the method of analysis. On the other hand, most of those members of the public who sought in Russell the paragon of a revolutionary were less academic in the manner in which they perceived him. After having listened to a short speech delivered by Russell on the occasion of the welcome reception in Shanghai,<sup>21</sup> the young leftist thinker and activist Li Zhenying (李震瀛, 1900-1938) noted:

Just because we have lost our hopes about Dr. Dewey, we must not despair about Russell. We must recognize that, nowadays, Russell is one of the most thorough social reformists. Because he repeatedly also received lessons from the government, he cannot but have a thorough (perfect) awareness (*juewu* 覺悟, “enlightenment”) ... I have a deep admiration for Russell’s personal character. In the turbulent times of the Great War, when governments and capitalists of all countries were all behaving like ferocious beasts, he was willing to sacrifice everything to be able to declare himself as a “conscientious objector” (*liangxin de dikangzhe* 良心的抵抗者) and openly oppose the war. Because of that he was sentenced to a half year in prison. This sentence, however, was not only incapable of harming him, but, quite the opposite, made him to gain a more complete realization and become an extreme reformist – an anarchist scholar. (Li 1920, 1)

As already mentioned above, Russell’s chief interpreter for his entire time in China was Zhao Yuanren. Zhao was deemed the most appropriate person for this task, because he was one of only two Chinese scholars who held a PhD related to mathematical logic (the other was Yu Dawei (俞大維, 1897-1993)).<sup>22</sup> The decision was probably also grounded in the understanding of

20 Zhao Yuanren mentioned that the more specialized audience attending Russell’s lectures were: “Those with interest in science, mathematics and philosophy, and also those interested in his revolutionary social ideals.” (Zhao 1977, 62). On the question which “revolutionary social idea” was more interesting to the Chinese audience, Zhao answered, “I suppose it was his advocacy of some sort of socialism” (ibid.)

21 Russell held a short speech in which he addressed the problem of reforms in China. The speech was published in *Chenbao* on November 16<sup>th</sup> (1920).

22 In 1918, Zhao was awarded a PhD degree in philosophy from Harvard University. His doctoral dissertation “Continuity: A Study in Methodology” in part also discussed the notion of infinity from the perspective of mathematical logic as established in Russell’s and Whitehead’s *Principia Mathematica* and other related sources (symbolic logic). Although in the years immediately following his return to China Zhao was still lecturing on philosophy and general logic, later he gradually turned to linguistics (see Zhao Yuanren 1977, 43).

the main organizers in China that Russell was a profoundly scientific figure, whose highly logical and scientific manner of expression required an expert in the field of mathematical logic. Apart from Zhao and Fu Tong, the Lecture Society and Communal Education Society also sent Zhang Dongsun, who was to accompany Russell as the main representative of the society organizing the visit. Zhang Shenfu took part in the welcome reception in Shanghai as the representative of Peking University.

### 3 A Lecture Tour across China – From Shanghai to Beijing

Russell delivered his first lecture only a few days after he arrived in Shanghai. On October 15<sup>th</sup>, he gave a short lecture on the “Principles of Social Reform” at China College in Shanghai. The event, which was moderated by Fu Tong and translated by Zhao Yuanren, was attended by more than 100 people.<sup>23</sup> As already indicated by its title, the lecture was based on Russell’s book *Principles of Social Reconstruction* from 1916. The lecture revolved mainly around Russell’s key-concepts of possessive and creative impulses and the vital importance of distinguishing between them for Chinese social development. Most importantly, in the lecture Russell stated that to reach the final goals of social and spiritual reconstruction, China must not embark upon the path of socialist revolution immediately, but first focus on developing and strengthening its economy (industry and commerce), while the best way to achieve such progress would be through trade associations – i.e. guild socialism (Russell 1920a, 23-5).

One day later, Russell was invited to deliver a lecture at the Jiangsu Educational Association. This time, he was invited to lecture on education-related topics. In a lecture entitled “The Effects of Education”, Russell pointed out that education has got three main goals: to produce professionals, good citizens and good people. He further argued that Chinese education had a chance to fulfil all three goals as long as its education system remained in consonance with the needs of the people and professional requirements, and at the same time independent from politics. Russell also emphasized the importance of a unified system of education with a sound developmental policy. In the future development of their education system the Chinese ought to follow two guidelines: (1) avoid obstinately following the ancient

---

23 See: “*Luosu yanjiang gaizao shehui yuanli* 羅素演講改造原理 (Russell Lectures on Principles of Social Reconstruction),” 17. The translation was originally published in the *Chenbao* 申報, two days after the event.



ways, while (2) seeking support for their future developments in studying their ancient culture. Russell also warned that China ought not to follow in the footsteps of Bolshevik Russia or even the general trends in Western higher education, where, according to Russell, the spiritual aspects were often given precedence over the material, and instead China should pay more closer attention to industrial (vocational) education, for industry and commerce are the main prerequisites for the progress of a nation. Apart from focusing more closely on supporting the needs of the economy, the Chinese education system ought also to attach more importance to universal education, providing elementary education to all citizens, irrespective of gender or class. Finally, the main prerequisite for China to embark upon a path of social reform was to provide good education for all its citizens. And only after its education system had produced good citizens and reformed their thought could the country hope to extend its reforms to politics and remaining aspects of society (“*Luosu yanshuo ‘Jiaoyu zhi gongyong’*” 1920).

Similar ideas were reiterated in Russell’s next two lectures. The first one, entitled “On the Problems of Education” (*jiaoyu wenti* 教育問題) was delivered on October 19<sup>th</sup> at Jiangsu First Normal School (*Diyi shifan* 第一師範) in Hangzhou. (Yuan Gang et al. 2004, 308; “*Luosu zai Hang zhi jiangyan*” 1920) On the next day (October 20<sup>th</sup>), Russell gave his second speech at the Jiangsu Educational Association. This time, his audience was a council comprised of representatives from all regional educational associations in China (“*Luosu yanjiang Zhongguo jiaoyu*” 1920). In his address to the leading educationalists of the country, Russell emphasized the importance of adopting a “new [type] of education”, which would be based on the scientific method, the main benefits of which would include: being more applicable (practical) than the old education, giving people the ability to use the forces of nature, and advancing human abilities (Yuan Gang et al. 2004, 7). He called upon his audience to create China’s new education system and science as a synthesis between Chinese and Western civilization, drawing from both the scientific method, with which they could research the phenomena of the universe, as well as the abstract method, which could be used to elaborate on the totality of scientific findings about the universe (*ibid.*).

Russell finally left Shanghai on October 21<sup>st</sup>, and in company of Dora Black, Dewey and an entourage of his Chinese assistants, set out overland towards the northern capital (Beijing). They made their first stop in Nanjing, where a reception was prepared for Russell at the seat of the Science Society. There, Russell delivered a short lecture outlining the main tenets of Einstein’s General Theory of Relativity. The lecture was entitled “Einstein’s New Theory

of Gravity” (*Aiyinsitan yinli xin shuo* 愛因斯坦引力新說) (Ibid., 9-11), and summarized Russell’s years long engagement with modern physics and the meaning of its theories, such as Einstein’s relativity, quantum mechanics and atomic physics, for modern philosophy. His fascination with Einstein’s theory of relativity resulted in the book *ABC of Relativity*, which was first published in the year 1925.

Their next important stop was Changsha, the capital of Hunan province, and the stronghold of Chinese Communist political activists – with the Communist Party of China (CPC) only officially founded in 1921. Russell’s visit to Changsha had been much anticipated by the proponents of socialism who were based there – including the young Mao Zedong – as they hoped to find in Russell a still living mentor and supporter of their cause in China. At the same time, they also probably anticipated that Russell would endow them with new knowledge about the objectivist foundation of socialism – Marxism defined itself as a scientific worldview. Thus, Russell’s dual image as a reformer and an unyielding fighter for liberty on one side, and a man of science and scholarly disposition on the other, held great promise for China’s leftist elite. Therefore, in the few days he spent in Changsha, Russell decided to give lectures on the topic at the very heart of his philosophical bearing towards the problems of Marxism (theory) and Bolshevism (its practical application in Russia) in the contemporary world. Only one year earlier Russell had had the chance to visit Russia, and upon his return to England wrote an essay which conveyed his highly critical attitude towards the results of the Bolshevik revolution. One year later, faced with an audience of enthusiastic Chinese proponents of Marxism and socialist revolution, Russell felt a deep sense of duty to expound on the drawbacks of Communism and the utter failure of Bolshevik revolution in Russia. Consequently, on October 26<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup>, he delivered a series of four lectures entitled “Bolshevism and World Politics.” In the first, Russell described Bolshevism as simply a Russian attempt to implement Communism and not the latter *per se*. As such it contained a series of shortcomings, which include the underdevelopment and failure of industry and excessive use of repression and authority in its attempt to inculcate Communist ideas into the minds of the majority of the population. Aside from the precarious economic conditions in the country, the two other main points of Russell’s criticism of Bolshevism were related to its inherent lack of liberty and freedom of speech, as well as the fact that the majority of the population were not Communists, and that the Bolshevik solution to that problem included indoctrination of the masses rather than education. The second and third lectures followed Russell’s account of his visit in Russia

in 1919, which described the authoritarianism, dysfunctional economy and intellectual backwardness he witnessed there, as well as his interviews with Trotsky and Lenin, whom he described as having had no idea of liberty. The final lecture presented Russell's analysis of the problems and future of Communism. He stated out that in the following 50 years it could only succeed as a universal Communism. Finally, he pointed out that China must not follow the example of Russia and try to implement scientific Communism. He also warned China against the Bolshevik ambitions to dominate and rule over Asia (ibid., 12-27).<sup>24</sup> Although in his lectures Russell did not explicitly dwell upon his notion of guild socialism, which was an object of much debate and criticism among Chinese Communists long before his arrival in China, the Changsha lectures revealed profound disagreements between some of the most fervent Chinese followers of Communism and Russell.

Whilst in Changsha, the editor of the *Eastern Miscellany* review, the reformist and economist Yang Duanliu (楊端六, 1885-1966), conducted a few interviews with Russell, which mainly examined his views on the problems of Chinese society. The focal point of the conversation, which was later summarized in Yang's "Conversations with Mr. Russell" (*He Luosu xiansheng de tanhua* 和羅素先生的談話), revolved around the problems of implementing Russell's ideal of guild socialism in China, essentially because, on the one hand, the process would have to reduce the centralizing influence of the capitalist class, while on the other it would also require the rapid advancement of commerce and industry, and a radical change of mentality of the people that could only be attained through a mass education scheme (Yang Duanliu 1920, 14-6).

Russell's stay and lectures in Changsha prompted a turn in Chinese Communists' attitude towards him, which soon manifested in a series of critical accounts on Russell's political philosophy and his criticism of Bolshevik Russia, written by leading Chinese leftist intellectuals and published in periodicals like the *New Youth* and so on. Despite his initial failure to win over the majority of the Chinese Communist community, in the months to follow, Russell continued lecturing on the relationship between Bolshevism and Communism and his ideas related to the ideal form of socialism. These lectures, however, were conducted in a more diverse and cosmopolitan setting of Beijing, where Russell spent the rest of his time in China.

---

24 The Chinese translation of the lectures was recorded by Li Jimin (李濟民) and Yang Wenmian (楊文冕) and published in the *Republic Daily* (November 3, 7, 8, and 9). A significantly edited and adapted English translation of Russell's lectures was published in Shanghai based *The China Press* on December 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> 1920.

## 4 Arrival in Beijing – Welcome Reception by the Lecture Society

Russell arrived in Beijing on October 31<sup>st</sup>. Following a reception by the representatives of the Peking University, Russell and Dora Black were accommodated at the same residential unit on the university as his translator, Zhao Yuanren.

The main welcome reception in Beijing took place at the Academy of Arts, on November 9<sup>th</sup>. The event was organized by one of the official hosts of Russell's visit in China, the recently established Lecture Society. At the event, which was attended by around 100 people, the main welcome speech was delivered by Liang Qichao. In his speech, Liang described Russell's visit to China as a part of the Lecture Society's endeavours to foster the "absolutely unrestricted and maximal import" of Western scholarship. Having compared China to a bare tree which had awakened from a long winter's sleep, Liang, however, prescribed a balanced and thoughtful approach to cultivating and nourishing its opening buds and flowers. He described Russell as a scholar able to make ideals truer to life, praising his outstanding moral character:

Because he is against wars, he was subjected to severe harassment of his country's government. Later, because of his spreading of the ideal of great harmony (*datong* 大同) and his resistance against nationalism, he was ultimately sentenced to six months in prison. The book *Roads to Freedom*, which we have all read, was completed in his first few days in prison. After he was released from custody, he continued spreading his ideology with even greater passion. This is the genuine bearing of an independent and fearless scholar, a towering figure of humanity's struggle for freedom. (*Jiangxueshe huanying Luosu zhi yanji* 1920, 24)

As the most precious object Russell could bestow upon the Chinese people in their search for new culture and scholarship Liang named his research method, which he compared to the fingers of a well-known Chinese literary character, the immortal Lü Chunyang (呂純陽, Lü Dongbin 呂洞賓), who possessed the ability to turn stones into grains of gold. In a jocular manner, Liang remarked that:

At this very moment we also want Mr. Russell's fingers. And what exactly are his fingers? What we want him to bestow upon us is the method he himself uses in his scholarly research. If we will use his method in our research, we will naturally be able to obtain same kind of knowledge as him. By so doing, however, we shall not turn into a second Lü Chunyang. But will we be also able to turn stones into gold? I sincerely believe that Mr. Russell can understand and forgive the Chinese people's fervour for attaining erudition. (*Ibid.*)

To facilitate the access to “Russell’s fingers”, later in 1921, Liang Qichao’s Lecture Society founded the *Russell Monthly* journal and the *Russell Book Series*, which was published with the Commercial Press in Shanghai.

## 5 The Russell Monthly Journal and the Russell Series

The *Russell Monthly* (*Luosu yuekan* 羅素月刊) journal was founded in early 1921 by the Lecture Society in cooperation with some more visible members of Peking University and the circle of philosophers in Beijing.<sup>25</sup> The journal specialized on publishing Chinese articles on Russell’s thought, translations from Russell’s work and transcripts of Russell’s lectures and speeches in China. The editor-in-chief of the journal was Qu Shiyong (瞿世英, 1901-1976), a lecturer of modern Western philosophy at Peking University, who earned his PhD in philosophy from Harvard University. Another more visible contributor to the journal was the philosopher and Russell’s chief interpreter Zhao Yuanren. Although in 1921, when the journal was launched, a total of six issues were planned, in the end only four were actually published. The first, introductory issue contained a biography of Russell, a concise bibliography of his works, an article by Zhao Yuanren titled “The Spirit of Russell’s Philosophy”, transcripts of Russell’s lectures on the “The Analysis of Mind”, and an account of the welcome reception given by the Lecture Society in November 1920. The same structure content was retained throughout the remaining three issues of the journal, while more emphasis was given to the content of Russell’s lectures and speeches in Beijing.<sup>26</sup>

In addition to the journal, in 1921 the Communal Study Society set up a “Russell Book Series” (*Luosu congshu* 羅素叢書), which was intended for the Chinese translations of Russell’s major works. While the series was sponsored by the society, it was actually printed by the Commercial Press, which later included the early translations into its own book series. By the year 1922, the series already included the complete Chinese translations of the following books: *Justice in War-Time* (translated in 1921 by Zhang Taipu 鄭太撲), *Political Ideals* (1921, Cheng Zhenji 程振基), *Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy* (1922, Fu Zhongsun and Zhang Bangming), *Scientific Method in Philosophy* (1922, Wang Xingong) and *German Social Democracy* (1922, Chen Yuyi 陳輿漪).

25 Aside from Qu Shiyong and Zhao Yuanren, there were also Sun Fuyuan, Jiang Boli (蔣百里, 1882-1938) and Wang Geng (王賡, 1895-1942).

26 Regarding the journal see also Song Jinkai 2020.

## 6 In Search of “Russell’s Fingers” – Lectures at Peking University

Russell delivered his first lecture at Peking University two days prior to the welcome reception described above. Although, back in November, the *Peking University Daily* reported that during his visit at the Department of Philosophy Russell would be lecturing primarily about social reform and analysis of the mind (Xu Yibao 2003, 183), in the time since Russell seems to have changed his mind completely. Instead, he decided to focus his lectures at the university exclusively on topics in theoretical philosophy. Thus, on November 7<sup>th</sup>, he started teaching a course entitled “Problems of Philosophy” (*zhexue wenti* 哲學問題). As the title suggests the course was aimed at epitomizing the main conclusions of Russell’s book of the same name from 1912. The course was given in the form of a series of 12 consecutive lectures. While the first was given in the building of the so-called “Third Court” (*di san yuan* 第三院) of Peking University, the rest of the lectures were delivered in the auditorium of Peking Normal University. The lectures were regularly recorded by Sun Fuyuan (孫伏園, pseudonyms Fulu 伏廬, Bosheng 伯生, Songnian 松年, 1894-1966) and Zhang Yanqian (章延謙), a student of philosophy, and published in the *Peking University Daily*.<sup>27</sup>

As regards the content of the lectures, the course represented a condensed introduction to the epistemological tenets of logical positivism, with a special emphasis on logic and physical sciences. The first five lectures, which bore the titles “Appearance and Reality”, “What is Matter?”, “Subjective Idealism”, “Logical Idealism” and “Mystical Idealism”, were summaries of the first four chapters of Russell’s book *The Problems of Philosophy*. Whereas in the remaining seven lectures, entitled “The Notion of Cause” and “Knowledge and Error”, Russell summarized the parts of the book which touched upon the problems of logic and induction – a part of the lectures even mentioned his quintessential work *Principia Mathematica*. The last two lectures were modelled on the 13<sup>th</sup> chapter of *The Problems of Philosophy*. The last in the series of lectures was given in January 1921.

The second series of lectures delivered in the framework of Russell’s visit at Peking University was entitled “The Analysis of Mind” (*xin de fenxi* 心的分析). The lectures were given at the “First Court” of Peking University. In the

27 The complete record of lectures was published *Collected Lectures of Bertrand Russell and Dora Black* (*Luosu ji Bolake jiangyan ji* 羅素及勃拉克講演集), which was first printed in 1922 by the Weiyi ribao 惟一日報 publishing society. The anthology was edited by Liang Qichao. Some of the lectures were also recorded by and published in the central newspapers.

course of 15 lectures, conducted from November 7<sup>th</sup> 1920 until early February 1921, Russell delivered a comprehensive introduction to his forthcoming treatise re-evaluating human consciousness from the perspective of recent advances in psychology – the book *The Analysis of Mind*. The most important aspect of these extensive excursions into the realms of modern psychology was undoubtedly that in them Russell introduced psychological theories such as behaviourism, comparative psychology and Freud’s psychoanalysis (*jiexin shu* 解心術). Following Zhang Shenfu’s translation of Russell’s essay “The Modern Science of Psychology” (*Jindai xinlixue* 近代心理學) in the *New Youth* magazine in 1920, this was the second attested and significant introduction of Freud to the Chinese intellectual world. As in the case of the lectures based on *The Problems of Philosophy*, the lectures were regularly recorded and published in various newspapers and reviews.

In late December 1920, Russell also started giving a third series of lectures, entitled “The Analysis of Matter” (*wu de fenxi* 物的分析). This was a more elaborate and longer version of his Nanjing lecture on Einstein’s relativity and its implications for philosophical understanding of reality (the philosophy of science), extended to cover other theories of modern physics. A final version of Russell’s comprehensive interpretation of Einstein’s theories of relativity (general and special), also covering the uncertainty principle of Heisenberg and other novel approaches in particle physics (quantum mechanics), was published under the same title in 1925. The booklet *The Analysis of Matter* served as an ontological compendium to his previous book *The Analysis of Mind*. Russell’s course at Peking University encompassed six lectures, which were delivered between December 1920 and March 1921. All the lectures were translated and recorded by Zhao Yuanren and Ren Hongjun (任鴻雋, 1886-1961). A preliminary lecture was delivered on December 14 in the context of the weekly meeting of the recently established Russell Study Society (*Luosu xueshuo yanjiuhui* 羅素學說研究會, “Society for Study of Russell’s Theories”) (*Luosu jiang jiangyan wu de fenxi* 1920).

## 7 The Russell Study Society

In late November, a group of students and professors from Peking University and other educational institutions in Beijing established a study society for the organized research of Russell’s thought, the Russell Study Society. The preparatory session of the society took place on November 20<sup>th</sup>, 1920. On that occasion, more than 100 people registered as members of the society. Already at this first session, the society was divided into two sections:

an English and Chinese, both of which convened on a weekly basis to discuss Russell's thought in English and Chinese, respectively (*Luosu xueshuo yanjiuhui kaihui* 1920a). The inaugural session of the society took place on November 28<sup>th</sup> (at 7 pm), in the auditorium of the Western Returned Scholars Association (*Ou-Mei tongxuehui* 歐美同學會). Apart from Russell, Dora Black, Zhao Yuanren and Fu Tong, around 30 members of the society attended the event.

Akin to the first and second welcome receptions, the reception of Russell at the inaugural session of the Russell Study Society also contained a slightly mystical undertone, in which Russell's arrival to China was set into a historical context, in which Russell was compared to Confucius. Thus, in the opening lines of the welcome speech, an unknown member of the society made the following remark:

Sir is referring to himself as a follower of the philosophy of neutral monism, who takes the middle road between idealism and materialism, expounding on the principles of philosophy by using the scientific method. This corresponds very much to the Chinese philosopher Confucius, who famously said that: 'my *dao* 道 is woven together by one single principle' (*wu dao yi yi guan zhi* 吾道一以貫之). His way of distinguishing the true and false of matters started in the investigations of the underlying principles of things. Which is why he also said: 'Knowledge is attained by investigation of things (*gewu* 格物); after one has investigated their underlying principles one will attain knowledge.' This clearly shows that the integrating principle Confucius spoke about was the analysis of things. Now, since, to one's great surprise, Sir's theories are identical to the philosophy of Confucius, our county should treat Sir with the same sense of reverence as is paid to Confucius... (Zhichang 1921, 114)

Following the initial welcome addresses and a discussion regarding the work and internal organization of the society, Russell was invited to give some advice on how the study society ought to be conducted.

The society adopted an astoundingly rigorous and complex method of discussion which was set to be followed at the weekly meetings:

(A) First, someone would express their own opinions about a book by Russell they had already read in the form of an essay, whose content would be read at the meeting. After that, everyone would engage in an open discussion. (B) Every time, another member of the society would write an essay about point out a specific question, about which they would then also compose an essay. This essay would, in turn, be handed



out to another member of the society, who would then summarise its conclusions. This summary would then be revised and epitomized for the second time. The final summary would then be subjected to common discussion. (C) Subsequently, a question would be formed, which would be studied by all members. Each member would express their own views in form of an essay, which would be handed out to another member for review. In turn, this would then serve as a topic of the next symposium. (*Luosu xueshuo yanjiuhui kaihui* 1920b)

Furthermore, another goal set by the society was to print and disseminate Russell’s writings and records of his lectures, which were also to be used as the principal resource for the society’s regular discussions. The first two manuscripts to be reproduced by the society were English manuscripts for the lectures on “Analysis of Mind” and “Bolshevism and World Policy” (*ibid.*). At the inaugural session the society also determined the main topic, which were to be discussed at the future meetings of the Chinese section of the society. The first two such topics were the definition of truth, and marriage and the population question – the latter referring to the sixth chapter of Russell’s book *Principles of Social Reconstruction*.

The regular discussions and analyses of Russell’s work by the Chinese section of the society were primarily meant to supplement Russell’s lectures at the university as well as his thought related to other questions. On the other hand, the meetings of the English section, which were led by Russell, represented a relatively advanced discussion forum on questions which were related directly to his lectures on the “Analysis of Mind”, and later also the ontological aspects of his philosophical worldview. At the initial meeting, Russell outlined the working method of the English section in the following manner:

Above anything else, the essence of a study society resides in the possibility to conduct straightforward conversations, the ability to take part in intense debates where everyone can argue from one’s own standpoint. The spirit of a study society can be recognized only after the possibility to do so. Yesterday four main problems featured within the scope of “The Analysis of Mind” were published in the *Peking University Daily*. This was not unnecessary at all. If anyone among you is able to write a solution to anyone of these problems in the English language, it can be handed over to me before the next session of the English section of the study society, so that it can be given further discussion in the framework of the debate on particular problems. (Zhichang 1921, 114-5)

According to a student of philosophy, who wrote under the pseudonym Zhichang 質廠, the meetings of the English section were not as well attended as originally planned. If the first meeting was attended by 18 people, only four of them engaged in an open discussion with Russell and wrote papers discussing the solutions to the three problems published in the *Peking University Daily*. The two subsequent meetings were attended by even fewer people. Beside the three problems from the "Analysis of Mind" Russell further discussed the work *The Analysis of Sensations* by the Austrian physicist and philosopher of science Ernst Mach. At the third session, which was attended by only three people, Russell asked why so few people were attending. In response, the only student of philosophy who was still attending the meetings pointed out that the majority of the researchers and students at Peking University were not interested in problems from psychology, and that the number of participants was bound to increase when Russell started lecturing on matter-related problems. Upon which Russell responded with the following remark: "My ability to study problems hinges entirely on my having the capacity of mind. If indeed, one possesses a sound knowledge of psychology, one can easily solve all sorts of scientific problems" (ibid., 115).

This reveals that the main interest of the majority of the philosophical audience at Russell's lectures rested predominantly with topics related to modern science and science-based philosophical epistemology. At the same time, a high degree of interest seems also to have been directed towards Russell's scientific method or, more precisely, his mathematical logic.

## 8 Lectures on Mathematical Logic

Thus, in March 1921, the Society for Mathematics and Physics of Peking University and the Society for Chemistry, Mathematics and Physics of Peking Teachers College jointly invited Russell to give a series of lectures on mathematical logic (*suānxué de lūnlǐxué* 算學的論理學). Initially four lectures on the basic principles were planned, however, because in mid-March Russell fell ill with pneumonia only two lectures were carried out. The first was given on March 8<sup>th</sup>, to an audience of about 150 professors and students (Xu Yibao 2003, 183).

Among those who attended Russell's lecture were Wu Fanhuan and Wang Shiyi. Both of them kept detailed notes of the lecture. Wang's notes were immediately published in the *Magazine of Peking University for Mathematics and Natural Science*. Wu's notes, nevertheless, were published in 1921 by the New Knowledge Press of the National University of Peking

as a pamphlet entitled: *Shuli luoji*, an expression that soon became the standard Chinese translation for ‘mathematical logic.’ (Ibid.)

In addition to Wu Fanhuan (吳範寰, 1897-1978) and Wang Shiyi (王世毅, ?), the third version of notes from the lectures was recorded by a person writing under the name Muyan (慕岩). These bore the Chinese title *Shuxue luoji* 數學邏輯 and were published as a part of Liang Qichao’s collection from 1922. Although the three records differ significantly from each other, what they collectively confirm is that Russell intended to deliver an overview of the elementary concepts from the mathematical and logical apparatus of the first volume of the *Principia Mathematica*. In the two lectures, which he actually managed to carry out, Russell was only able to give a brief introduction to the concepts of propositional functions, deductive principle, relations among propositions, logic of classes etc. Generally speaking, in the lectures the discipline of mathematical logic was represented as a discipline complementing “general” mathematics. Russell delineated the main difference between general mathematics and mathematical logic as one in orientation: while that of general mathematics is “forward” (inductively), mathematical logic works in a “backward” direction (deductively). These two orientations do not describe the stages of development, but rather how the two are related to the fundamentals of mathematics. In this regard, mathematical logic is a direct offshoot of studies in the fundamentals of mathematics. Naturally, this view was a clear expression of Russell’s philosophical position towards the relationship between logic and mathematics, namely his philosophy of logicism (Yuan Gang et al. 2004, 292-299).

Indirectly and in the long term, Russell’s lectures on mathematical logic opened up a new chapter in Chinese academic studies in modern logic, by introducing this new branch of formal logic to both Chinese mathematicians and philosophers. Following Russell’s lectures in March 1921, the first step towards appropriation of his contributions to fundamentals of mathematics and mathematical logic took shape in an effort to translate his work *Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy*. This was done by two young mathematicians from Peking Normal University who were present in the audience of the lectures from March 1921. Even before they accomplished their ambitious mission, Fu Zhongsun (傅種孫, 1898-1962) and Zhang Bangming (張邦銘) wrote a letter to Russell (March 23<sup>rd</sup> 1921), explaining their intent to translate his *Introduction* into Chinese (Xu Yibao 2003, 185-9). The importance of the letter also resided in the fact that, at the same time, they also raised a number of relevant questions about some parts of the work they intended to translate, revealing a surprising degree of understanding

of its content (see Xu 2003 and 2005). Before the first edition of Fu's and Zhang's translation was ultimately published (August 1922),<sup>28</sup> Fu wrote a concise summary of the first six chapters of the *Introduction*, which was published in the *Shuli zazhi* 數理雜誌 (*Mathematical and Physical Magazine*) in 1921.<sup>29</sup>

## 9 Other Lectures in Beijing – From Bolshevism to the Science of Social Structure

Before his departure from Beijing, Russell also delivered a few other lectures, which, by and large, were all related to social and political issues. The first such lecture, "Bolshevist Thought", was given at the Women's College in Beijing on November 19<sup>th</sup>, 1920. Another such lecture was given at the Chinese Association for Social and Political Sciences (*Zhongguo shehui zhengzhi xuehui* 中國社會政治學會). The title was "Industry in Undeveloped Countries" (*weikaifa guo zhi gongye* 未開發國之工業), which called upon the members of the public to recognize the importance of developing a strong industry in China; a form of industry which would at the same time be as independent from the capitalist class as possible.<sup>30</sup>

Two months later, on January 6<sup>th</sup> (1921), Russell gave a lecture at the recently established Philosophical Association. The lecture was entitled "Religious Belief" (*zongjiao zhi xinyang* 宗教之信仰). The Philosophical Association (*Zhexueshe* 哲學社, full name *Zhexue yanjiu she* 哲學研究社 "Association for Studies in Philosophy") was established in January 1921 by Fu Tong and affiliated with the Department of Philosophy at Peking University. Owing to its main founder Fu Tong, the society had a profoundly modern outlook and consequently became one of the platforms for dissemination of Russell's ideas. Moreover, the content of the lectures organized in the framework of the society and the content of the journal *Philosophia* (*Zhexue* 哲學), the official publication issued by the society, reveal that the central focus of the society was the study and introduction of contemporary Western trends in philosophy (as well as logic, critical

28 Their translation was entitled *Luosu suanli zhexue* 羅素算理哲學 (*Russell's Mathematical Philosophy*) and was published by the Commercial Press in Shanghai.

29 In the article, Fu further discussed the nature of the relationship between mathematics and philosophy (see Fu 1921).

30 The text of the lecture was included in Zhang Jinglu's (張靜廬, 1898-1969) *A Compendium of Records of Lectures by Dewey and Russell* (*Duwei, Luosu yanjianglu hekan* 杜威、羅素演講錄合刊) from 1921.

study on religion, etc.). From its establishment in January 1921 on, the society organized two regularly held series of lectures: one was called "Comprehensive View of the Universe" (*Yuzhou zhi mianmianguan* 宇宙之面面觀) – held two times a week, and the second "Accounts on the History of World Philosophy." Because, as previously mentioned, Fu Tong was a great admirer of Russell's philosophy, the first four numbers of the journal *Philosophia* also contained Fu's articles about the philosopher. The third issue of the journal, which was published two months after Russell left China, also contained an account of a written discussion between Fu Tong and Zhang Dongsun as well as Russell's final speech, which he delivered on the eve of his departure from Beijing.<sup>31</sup>

The last of the short independent lectures in Beijing was given at the Yude Middle School (*Yude zhongxue* 育德中學) on March 14<sup>th</sup>, shortly before Russell fell critically ill. The lecture, "The Problems of Education", was a recapitulation of Russell's earlier lectures on education in China.

Russell's last significant group of lectures in China was on "The Science of Social Structure" (*Shehui jiegou xue* 社會結構學), comprised of four major lectures given between February and March 1921 in the main hall of the Ministry of Education. The content of the lectures was, in large part, extracted from his *Principles of Social Reconstruction* (1916), a work which won Russell critical acclaim as a reformist thinker. However, surprisingly, Russell's Chinese lectures contained a number of personal statements, which had previously been absent from any other of his texts or lectures on reform and socialism. Most notably, he said the following:

I am a Communist. I believe that Communism, combined with developed industry, is capable of bringing to mankind more happiness and well-being, and a higher development of the arts and sciences, than have hitherto existed in the world. I therefore desire to see the whole world become communistic in its economic structure.

I hold also, what was taught by Karl Marx, that there are scientific laws regulating the development of societies, and that any attempt to ignore these laws is bound to end in failure. Marx taught what his nominal disciples have forgotten, that Communism was to be the consummation of industrialism... (Harrison 1989, 6)<sup>32</sup>

31 On the founding of the Philosophical Association see: *Zhexue yanjiu she zhi neirong yu jianzhang* 1921; *Yizhen* 1921; and *Zhexue yanjiu she tonggao* 1921.

32 This text was taken from Russell's original notes written for the lecture in Beijing. The document is kept as a part of the Dora Black papers in the Russell Archives.

Undoubtedly, after a series of relatively neutral as well as politically ambiguous lectures, these statements must have caused a stir among those members of Chinese intellectual elite who followed Russell's lectures from the time of his arrival in China. Thus, in one of his final lectures before he fell ill, Russell finally revealed the side of himself which everyone had hoped for from the very beginning. Nonetheless, the venue for such public declarations could not have been less fortunately chosen. Some records from the time reveal that these lectures made a rather unfavourable impression on some of the most politically influential members of the public., who, according to a rumour, even pushed to expel Russell from China (see Lizi 1921). When, due to his sudden illness, Russell was not able to complete the fifth and final lecture from the series, the tension between the government in Beijing and Russell seemed to have been overshadowed by the seriousness of his medical condition and then eventually faded away.

## 10 Illness and Departure

As mentioned above, Russell's lecturing activities in China were suddenly interrupted, when in mid-March he contracted a pneumonia-like disease<sup>33</sup> and fell critically ill. In his initial weeks at the hospital a rumour even spread in a few Japanese periodicals whose reporters were stationed in Beijing that Russell had passed away at the hospital. "This news was forwarded by mail from Japan to America to England. It appeared in the English newspapers on the same day as the news of my divorce. Fortunately, the Court did not believe it, or the divorce might have been postponed" (Russell 2009, 347). Although Russell eventually recuperated, he was too weak to carry on with his lectures. Almost three months later (July 6), on the eve of his departure from China, he addressed the Chinese audience for one last time in the well-known lecture "China's Road to Freedom" (*Zhongguo dao ziyou zhi lu* 中國到自由之路). At the same event, Dora Black also gave a speech entitled "Men and Women of Young China".<sup>34</sup> On the following day, Russell left Beijing for Tianjin, from where he took a ship to his next destination, Japan.

---

33 In his autobiography Russell recounts: "during convalescence, I had a whole series of minor diseases. The main trouble had been double pneumonia, but in addition to that I had heart disease, kidney disease, dysentery, and phlebitis" (Russell 2009, 346).

34 The English manuscript of the lecture was first printed in Fu Tong's journal *Philosophia*, in September 1921.

## 11 Epilogue – Glimpses of a Long-Lasting Aftermath

As the above survey reveals, Russell’s visit and lectures in China, which took place between late 1920 and July 1921, most probably influenced Chinese intellectual developments in the 1920s in an extremely multifaceted and complex way. While in matters related to science and theoretical philosophy, his influence manifested itself in a rather straightforward manner, the impact of his lectures on social questions and political philosophy was rather indirect and, in many cases, still remains a matter of discussion. It appears that the main direct impression Russell’s lectures and presence in China left on his audience was in line with the original expectations: wholesome and general. Hence, the image of Russell which remained in China after his departure, roaming the Chinese intellectual world as a more or less faint memory, was a collection of impressions and quintessential notions which constituted Russell as a complete, integral persona. This idea of personal integrity, which strung together the scientific method, mathematical logic, excursions into the world of modern psychology and physics of his scholarly self on one side, and profoundly humanistic bent towards values of equality, freedom and love on the other, made Russell’s persona very much like that of the sages of ancient China. Therefore, even if his friendly advice to his fellow socialists or Communists in China did not produce any of the desired effects and redirect the future of Chinese Marxism onto a more moderate path, in the more scholarly echelons of Chinese intelligentsia, both the scientific and humanistic aspect of his thought left a lasting impression. Even though it took at least five years for the results to appear, Russell’s influence on Chinese philosophical discourse finally took shape in the establishment of analytical philosophy (New Realism) and mathematical logic at Chinese universities (Peking University and Qinghua University). More directly, the influence of Russell’s scientific and philosophical worldview on Chinese intellectual discourse prompted, or at least critically contributed to, the development of the debate on “Science and the View on Human Life” (*Kexue yu renshengguan* 科學與人生觀, also referred to by the proponents of science as the debate on “Science and Metaphysics” (*Kexue yu xuanxue* 科學與玄學)) of 1923, which represented the confrontation between two sides of the objectivist schism, which underpinned the long evolving dissonance between the Chinese cultural perception and modern scientific worldviews. By binding together the undisputable and somehow mystical efficacy and insight of modern science with modern libertarian values such as freedom of speech, gender equality, universal suffrage, freedom of marriage, etc., philosophical worldviews such as Marxism or Russell’s New Realism or scientific socialism increased

the moral imperative of the objectivist turn in Chinese culture, forcing the proponents of traditional thought and more subject-oriented philosophical views to rise in defence of their place in the Chinese intellectual world.

If in 1920s China there really was a general image of Russell, then it boiled down his multifaceted persona to two mutually related aspects: his scientific method and the embodiment of scientific truth in his sage-like moral character. To put it at its simplest, it was this combination which to the members of his Chinese audience was reminiscent either of a “new Confucius”, as in the case of some senior members of Chinese intelligentsia, or a world-leading scientist and revolutionary, in the eyes of the younger Chinese intellectuals. In the very same manner, in the months following Russell’s departure from the country one of his academic sympathizers in China and the editor of the *Russell Monthly*, Qu Shiyong, summarized the English philosopher’s contribution to the Chinese as follows:

52

... during his visit Russell did bestow upon us two exceptionally precious things. If these two things really were received by everyone of us and if everyone is also able to put them to use, then, irrespective of the matter we use them in or the problem we want to resolve with them, we will always be successful. These two treasures are: (1) His personality. When one is conversing with Russell, one gets the feeling that he is a person who really embodies a scholarly attitude. If one catches only a glimpse of him, one can already imagine what a solemn spirit must have surrounded him when he was put into prison. This kind of spirit to sacrifice himself for his ideology is what has influenced us to a great degree. ... (2) His method... Regardless of whether one is conducting research into a scientific question or handling different affairs, the analytical method is indispensable. It does not matter what profession one is working in, if one does not possess the spirit of sacrificing oneself for one’s convictions, one will never completely succeed. (Qu Shiyong 1921, 2-3)

Indeed, as Qu indicated in 1921, in the following two decades, the notion of analytical method obtained an important place in modern Chinese philosophy. Moreover, it became a synonym for modernity of philosophical systems, a foundation upon which a group of philosophers at Qinghua and Peking Universities endeavoured to establish their systems of philosophy. On the other hand, the gradual rise in significance of analytical philosophy, which can be traced back to Russell’s direct and indirect influence on China, opened up a current of scientific objectivism in Chinese philosophy, one which vitally coincided with that embodied in the Marxist movement. From this point of



view, what had probably been Russell's main contribution to China, a scientific worldview warped together by modern formal logic and analytical method, underpinned the Chinese intellectual discourse for the decades to come. Over time, though, in the same discourse Russell's philosophical scientism became divorced from his social and political theories and integrated into a discursive framework similar to that of the logical positivism of Vienna School. Furthermore, by the early 1930s, the analytical method and mathematical logic became considered by some Chinese philosophers as something which can be used in argument against dialectical materialism and Marxist philosophy in general.

However, in the 1920s, the Chinese intellectual world had also produced a rather unique theoretical phenomenon, which can be also traced back to Russell and his visit in China: a theoretical fusion between Russell's analytical philosophy, Confucian morality and dialectical materialism. The person responsible for this transcultural syncretism, which was also hoped for by Russell in one of his speeches in China, was Zhang Shenfu, the Russell enthusiast, who can also be credited for the earliest introduction of Russell's thought to China. In the years following Russell's visit in China, Zhang continued teaching mathematical logic and Russell's philosophy at Chinese universities, which he also used as a platform for propagating his syncretistic philosophical worldview. Zhang's popularisation of mathematical logic, Russell's analytical philosophy and dialectical materialism reached its peak in early 1930s. As the editor of a special column of the newspaper *L'Impartial* (*Dagong bao* 大公報), Zhang wrote numerous articles about Russell and regularly produced translations from his most recent works.

In a less conspicuous way, Russell's contact with China in early 1920s also influenced many other aspects the intellectual and socio-political discourse. Regardless of whether we observe the purely academic, general intellectual or ethical influences of Russell's stay and lectures in China, or whether we consider his influences in the years immediately following his visit or the long-term presence of his ideas in Chinese intellectual discourse, it is beyond doubt that Russell had immensely influenced the courses of intellectual development in Republican China. Beside Bergson, Dewey, Marx and others, he was one of the towering personalities from the West which were more or less directly involved in China's search for modernity, either as idols which ought to be followed or the representatives of the cultural/ideological other, which the proponents of traditional solutions to Chinese problems of modernity needed to overturn in order to assert their identity. Either way, in the decades following his tour of China, Russell became unavoidable ingredient

of the most of Chinese discourse on philosophy of science, society, politics, logic and so on. Therefore, our understanding of the circumstances and content of Russell's visit in China represent a vital and indispensable part of our understanding of the intellectual foundations of Modern China.

## Bibliography

- "Bertrand Russell's Lectures at Changsha" (1920). *The China Press*, December 2, 10; December 3, 12.
- Chang, Hao. *Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and Intellectual Transition in China, 1890-1907*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Ding, Zijiang 丁子江 (2016). *Luosu yu Zhong-Xi sixiang duihua* 羅素與中西思想對話 (*Russell and the Intellectual Dialogue between China and the West*). Taipei: Xiuwei zixun.
- Fang, Keli 方克立 & Wang, Qishui 王其水 (1994). *Ershi shiji Zhongguo zhexue* 二十世紀中國哲學 (Chinese Philosophy in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century). Volume 2. Beijing: Huaxia chubanshe.
- Feng, Chongyi 馮崇義 (1994). *Luosu yu Zhongguo* 羅素與中國 (Russell and China). Beijing: Shenghuo, Dushu, Xinzhi sanlian shudian.
- Fu, Zhongsun 傅种孙 (1921). "Luosu suanli zhexue rumen shu tiyao 羅素算理哲學入門書提要 (A Summary of Russell's Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy)." *Shuli zazhi*, 3-4, 9-21.
- Furth, Charlotte (1970). *Ting Wen-Chiang: Science and China's New Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gao, Pingshu 高平叔 (1980). *Cai Yuanpei nianpu* 蔡元培年譜 (*A Chronicle of Cai Yuanpei's Life*). Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- Gu, Runqing 顧潤卿 (1920). "Mr. Bertrand Russell in Shanghai." *English Weekly/Yingwen zazhi* 英文雜誌, 6(11), 868-869.
- Guo, Lanfang 郭蘭芳 and Zhang Xiulong 章修龍. 2006. "Fu Tong: Zui zao xuexi Xifang zhexue de Zhongguoren 傅銅: 最早學習西方哲學的中國人" [Fu Tong: The Earliest Chinese Student of Western philosophy]. *Zongheng* 5, 572-576.
- Guoli Beijing daxue 國立北京大學 (1917). "Like gemen yanjiusuo baogao" 理科各門研究所報告 (A Report on Research Institutes of All Sub-Divisions of the Science Division). *Beijing daxue rikan*, November 29, 2.
- Guoli Beijing daxue 國立北京大學 (1919). "Jiaowuchu bugao 教務處佈告 (Announcements of the Teaching Administration Office)." *Beijing daxue rikan*, September 30, 1.
- Harrison, Royden (1989). "'Science of Social Structure': Bertrand Russell as Communist and Marxist." *Russell*, Summer 1989, 6-11.

- "Huanyan da zhexuejia Luosu ji 歡宴大哲學家羅素紀 (Notes from the Welcome Banquet for the Great Philosopher Russell)" (1920). *Shibao*, October 4, 5.
- "Jiangxueshe huanying Luosu zhi yanci 將學社歡迎羅素之演詞 (Welcome Speech for Russell at the Chinese Lecture Society)." *Jiaoyu gongbao* 教育公報, 7(12), 23-4.
- Levenson, Joseph (1953). *Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and the Mind of Modern China*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.
- Li, Zhenying 李震瀛 (1920). "Women duiyu Luosu de xiwang 我對於羅素的希望 (My Expectations from Russell)." *Juewu* 覺悟 (*Minguo ribao* 民國日報), October 15, 1.
- Liang, Qichao 梁啟超 ed. (1922). *Luosu ji Bolake jiangyan ji* 羅素及勃拉克講演集 (*Collected Lectures of Bertrand Russell and Dora Black*). 2 Volumes. Beijing: Weiyi ribao she.
- Lin, Xiaoqing Diana (2005). *Peking University: Chinese Scholarship and intellectuals, 1898-1937*. New York: State University of New York.
- Lin, Xiaoqing Diana (2012). "Developing the Academic Discipline of Chinese Philosophy: The Departments of Philosophy at Peking, Tsinghua, and Yenching Universities (1910s –1930s)." In: John Makeham ed. *Learning to Emulate the Wise: The Genesis of Chinese Philosophy as an Academic Discipline in Twentieth-Century China*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 131-162.
- Lizi 力子 (1921). "Zhu Luosu buyao si 祝羅素不要死 (Wishing Russell to Survive)." *Minguo ribao* 民國日報, March 29, 2.
- "Luosu jiang jiangyan wu de fenxi 羅素將講演物的分析 (Russell Will Lecture on the Analysis of Matter)" (1920). *Minguo ribao*, December 19, 2.
- "Luosu xueshuo yanjiuhui kaihui 羅素學說研究會開會" (1920a). *Minguo ribao*, December 1, 3.
- "Luosu xueshuo yanjiuhui kaihui 羅素學說研究會開會 (A Meeting of the Russell Research Society)" (1920). *Minguo ribao*, December 4, 2.
- "Luosu yanjiang gaizao shehui yuanli 羅素演講改造原理 (Russell Lectures on Principles of Social Reconstruction)" (1920). *Shangxian tang jishi* 尚賢堂紀事 [*Documents of The International Institute of China*], 11(11), 17-9.
- "Luosu yanjiang Zhongguo jiaoyu 羅素演講中國教育 (Russell Lectures on Chinese Education)" (1920). *Xinghua*, 17(42), 18-19.
- "Luosu yanshuo 'Jiaoyu zhi gongyong' 羅素演說 '教育之功用' (Russell Lectures on the 'Effects of Education')" (1920). *Minguo ribao*, October 17, 3.
- "Luosu zai Hang zhi jiangyan 羅素在杭之講演 (Russell's Lecture in Hangzhou)" (1920). *Shibao*, October 22, 3.

- Ogden, Suzanne P. (1982). "The Sage and the Inkpot: Bertrand Russell and China's Social Reconstruction in the 1920s." *Modern Asian Studies*, 16(4), 529-600.
- Qu, Shiyong 瞿世英 (1921). "Luosu dui women de gongxian 羅素對我們的貢獻 (Russell's Contribution to Us)." *Luosu yuekan*, 1(4), 1-3.
- Russell, Bertrand (1912). *The Problems of Philosophy*. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Russell, Bertrand (1919a). "Luoseer Dao ziyou de jitiao ni jing 羅塞爾到自由的幾條擬徑 (Russell's Proposed Roads to Freedom)." Translated by Mao Dun 矛盾 [Yanshui 雁水]. *Jiefang yu gaizao*, 1(7), 21-37.
- Russell, Bertrand [Luosu 羅素] (1920a). "Luosu lai Hua de yanjiang: Gaizao shehui de jiben yuanli 羅素來華的演講: 改造社會的基本原理 (Russell's Lectures in China: Fundamental Principles of Social Reform)." *Xinghua*, 17(41), 23-5.
- Russell, Bertrand [Luosu 羅素] (1920b). "Buersaiweike di sixiang 佈爾塞維克底思想 (Bolshevist Thought)." *Dongfang zazhi*, 17(24), 109-113.
- Russell, Bertrand (1921a). *The Analysis of Mind*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Russell, Bertrand [Luosu 羅素] (1921b). *Shuli luoji 數理邏輯 (Mathematical Logic)*. Recorded by Wu Fanhuan 吳範寰. Beijing: Beijing Daxue Xinzhi shushe.
- Russell, Bertrand [Luosu 羅素] (1922). *Luosu suanli zhexue 羅素算理哲學 (Russell's Mathematical Philosophy)*. Translated by Fu Zhongsun 傅種孫 and Zhang Bangming 張邦銘. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan.
- Russell, Bertrand (1927). *The Analysis of Matter*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Traubner & Co. Ltd.
- Russell, Bertrand (2009). *Autobiography*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Schwarcz, Vera (1991/2). "Between Russell and Confucius: China's Russell Expert, Zhang Shenfu (Chang Sung-nian)." *Russell: The Journal of the Bertrand Russell Archives*, 11, 117-46.
- Schwarcz, Vera (1992). *Time for Telling Truth is Running out: Conversations with Zhang Shenfu*. New Heaven & London: Yale University Press.
- Shi, Yong 時勇 (2012). *Dutu yiwang 讀圖憶往 (Reading the Pictures of Memories of the Past)*. Zhengzhou: Henan daxue chubanshe.
- Song, Jinkai 宋晉凱 (2020). "Minguo shiqi renwu yanjiu lei qikan de haoshi – Luosu yuekan kanchuang, neirong jiqi yingxiang 民國時期人物研究類期刊的嚆矢 (The Precursor of the Periodicals Studying Personages in Republican China: Foundation, Content and Influence of Russell Monthly Magazine)." *Ziran bianzhengfa yanjiu*, 36(2), 92-97.

- Sun, Changwei 孫常煒 ed. (1986). *Cai Yuanpei xiansheng nianpu zhuanji* 蔡元培先生年譜傳記 (A Chronicled Biography of Cai Yuanpei). 3 volumes. Taibei: Guoshiguan.
- "Taolun huanying Luosu shixiang 討論歡迎羅素事項 (Discussing Matters Related to Welcoming Russell)" (1920). *Shibao*, August 31, 3.
- Xiao, Chaoran 蕭超然 et al. (1999). *Cai Yuanpei* 蔡元培 (*Cai Yuanpei*). Beijing: Kunlun chubanshe.
- Xu, Yibao (2003). "Bertrand Russell and the introduction of mathematical logic in China." *History and Philosophy of Logic*, 24, 181-196.
- Xu, Yibao (2005). "Concepts of Infinity in Chinese Mathematics." PhD dissertation, The City University of New York, 2005.
- Yang, Duanliu 楊端六 (1920). "He Luosu xiansheng de tanhua 和羅素先生的談話 (Conversations with Mr. Russell)." *Dongfang zazhi*, 17(22), 9-17.
- Yizhen 一真 (1921). "Beijing zhexue yanjiu she zhi neirong 北京哲學研究社之內容 (The Content of the Peking Society for Studies in Philosophy)." *Dongfang zazhi*, 18(3), 129-130.
- "Yingguo zhexuejia Luosu jiang lai Hua 英國哲學家羅素將來花" (The English Philosopher Russell Will Come to China)" (1920). *Minguo ribao*, July 12, 1.
- Yuan, Gang 袁剛 et al. (2004). *Zhongguo dao ziyou zhi lu: Luosu zai Hua jiangyan ji* 中國到自由之路：羅素在華講演集 (*China's Road to Freedom: A Collection of Russell's Lectures in China*). Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe.
- Zhang, Dongsun 張東蓀 (1922). "Xin shizailun de lunlizhuyi" 新實在論的論理主義 (Logicism of New Realism). *Dongfang zazhi*, 19 (17), 15-34.
- Zhang, Dongsun 張東蓀 (1923). "Xiangduilun de zhexue yu xin lunli zhuyi" 相對論的哲學與新論理主義 (The Philosophy of Theory of Relativity and New Logicism). *Dongfang zazhi*, 20 (9), 58-81.
- Zhang, Jinglu 張靜廬 ed. (1921). *Duwei, Luosu yanjianglu hekan* 杜威、羅素演講錄合刊 (*A Compendium of Records of Lectures by Dewey and Russell*). Shanghai: Taidong shuju.
- Zhang, Shenfu 張申府 [Songnian 崧年] (1918a). "Like shuxue yanjiusuo baogao" 理科數學研究所報告 (The Report of Science Division's Research Institute of Mathematics). *Beijing daxue rikan*, February 8, 2-3.
- Zhang, Shenfu 張申府 [Songnian 崧年] (1918b). "Like shuxue yanjiusuo baogao" 理科數學研究所報告 (The Report of Science Division's Research Institute of Mathematics). *Beijing daxue rikan*, February 18, 2.
- Zhang, Shenfu 張申府 [Songnian 崧年] (1919a). "Zhexue shuxue guanxi shi lunyin" 哲學數學關係史論引 (A Historical Outline of the Relationship between Philosophy and Mathematics). *Xinchao*, 1(2), 160-9.

- Zhang, Shenfu 張申府 [Songnian 崧年] (1919b). "Shu zhi zheli" 數之哲理 (Philosophical Principles of Numbers). *Xinchao*, 1(4), 90-2.
- Zhang Shenfu 張申府 (1919c). "Ziyou yu zhixu" 自由與秩序 (Liberty and Order"). *Meizhou pinglun*, 30 & 32, 1-2.
- Zhang, Shenfu 張申府 [Songnian 崧年] (1920). "Jindai xinlixue" 近代心理學 (Modern Science of Psychology). *Xin qingnian*, 7(3), 95-99.
- Zhang, Shenfu 張申府 (1993). *Suoyi* 所憶 (*Reminiscences*). Beijing: Zhongguo wenshi chubanshe.
- Zhang, Yuzheng 章玉政 (2014). *Guangrong yu mengxiang: Zhongguo gongxue wangshi* 光榮與夢想：中國公學往事 (*Glory and Dreams: The Story of China College*). Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chubanshe.
- Zhao, Yuanren 趙元任 (1997). *Cong jiaxiang dao Meiguo – Zhao Yuanren zao-nian huiyi* 从家乡到美国 – 從家鄉到美國——趙元任早年回憶 (*From hometown to America – Zhao Yuanren memoires of early years*). Beijing: Xuelin chubanshe, 1997.
- "Zhexue yanjiu she zhi neirong yu jianzhang 哲學研究社之內容與簡章 (Content and Short Constitution of the Society for Studies in Philosophy)" (1921). *Da gongbao*, January 1, 6.
- "Zhexue yanjiu she tonggao 哲學研究社通告 (A Public Announcement of the Society for Studies in Philosophy)" (1921). *Beijing daxue rikan*, January 6, 1.
- Zhichang 質廠 (1921). "Luosu (Russell) xueshuo yanjiuhui yingwenbu jishi 羅素 (Russell) 學說研究會英文部紀實 (Records from the Sessions of the English Section of Russell Study Society)." *Gaizao*, 3(6), 113-5.
- Zhou, Chuan 周川 ed. (2018). *Zhongguo jinxiandai gaodeng jiaoyu renwu cidian* 中國近現代高等教育人物辭典 (*Biographical Dictionary of Higher Education in Modern China*). Fuzhou: Fujian jiaoyu chubanshe.
- Zuo, Yuhe 左玉河 (1998). *Zhang Dongsun zhuan* 張東蓀傳 (*Biography of Zhang Dongsun*). Jinan: Shandong renmin chubanshe.