**Osaka University Forum on China**

Discussion Papers in Contemporary China Studies

No.2020-4

# A Study on Post-war Chinese Liberal Intellectual's Debates over "Economic Democracy" (1945–1949):

## Examining *The Observer*, *Universitas*, and *The New Road*

LIN Lizhao （Translated by Jake ODAGIRI）

Discussion Papers in Contemporary China Studies, Osaka University Forum on China No.2020-4

# A Study on Post-war Chinese Liberal Intellectual's Debates over "Economic Democracy" (1945–1949):

## Examining *The Observer*, *Universitas*, and *The New Road*[*]

December 5, 2020

LIN Lizhao′（Translated by Jake ODAGIRI″）

[*] This article is an English translation of 林礼釗 "戦後中国自由主義知識人の『経済民主』論争（1945–1949）:『観察』『周論』『新路』を素材に" (『阪大法学』第 69 巻第 3・4 号) November 2019.

′ Assistant Professor, Osaka University Graduate School of Law and Politics (linlizhao407@yahoo.co.jp)
″ PhD Candidate, Osaka University Graduate School of Letters

## Introduction

Liberalism in China was introduced from the West into the late Qing dynasty's thought world by Yan Fu(嚴復)[1] and Liang Qichao(梁啓超)'s[2] forerunning attempts. Following the New Cultural and May Forth Movements in the 1910s, liberalism became a widely recognized trend of thought by the 1930s thanks to the efforts of Hu Shih(胡適)[3]. However, along with the changes of liberalism throughout the world from a focus on the rights of freedom in the nineteenth century to a focus on equal rights and social rights in the twentieth century, China's liberalism reflected on the economic and social problems—i.e., monopolies, poverty, and unemployment—based on principles of private enterprise, and it was a new liberalism which was in contrast to the classic style of liberalism. It has been said that "China's liberalism was 'new' from the beginning" [Xu 2000: 33]. Furthermore, from the 1930s, the influence from the United Kingdom's socialism, the Soviet Union's socialism which spread fear throughout the world, and the greatly revised the principles of the classic style of economic liberalism to overcome financial crises known as the New Deal in the United States of America, caused constant changes in China's liberalism. The Chinese intellectuals were particularly influenced by Harold Laski (1893–1950), the representative thinker on social democracy. One feature of Laski's thought was to establish a parliamentary democracy, defer the basic policies of liberalism, and use them to harmonize equality and justice policies of socialism. Laski's writings were widely read not only in Europe but had an influence on Asian intellectuals and had a particularly strong presence among the political thoughts of students and the younger generation [Deane 1955: 3]. Many of Laski's writings were translated into Chinese in the 1930s and 1940s which spread his political thoughts among the intellectuals of the time. Laski also had many students from China at the London School of Economy, where he was a professor. Laski's thoughts on social democracy became the basis of modern and contemporary Chinese liberalism[4]. During the political development of China from the 1940s, the division of policies for liberalism and socialism became exceedingly vague and there was an aim to harmonize the policies [Xu 2000: 29, 32]. China's liberalism was born, developed, and transformed from the end of the Qing dynasty to the 1940s; however, it was post-war China in which this liberalism was actively discussed and there was an anticipation for a realized democratic and constitutional government.

Even with the violent process of establishing the People's Republic of China, post-war China (1945–1949) saw an increase of attention given to the topic of a democratic and constitutional government which it had never historically seen before. The Chinese Nationalist Party (CNP) and the Chinese

---

[1] Yan Fu (嚴復 1854–1921) was a thinker and translator from the late Qing dynasty. He studied in the UK. He translated and introduced modern Western thought to the thinkers in the late Qing dynasty.

[2] Liang Qichao (梁啓超 1873–1929) was a thinker, journalist, and politician from the late Qing dynasty. Disciple to Kang Youwei (康有為) and participated in the Hundred Day's Reform; after failing, he fled to Japan. He proactively introduced Western thought and advocated a constitutional monarchy and citizen reform.

[3] Hu Shih (胡適 1891–1962) studied in the USA and learned about pragmatism under the direction of Dewey. He was a young leader in the May Fourth Movement. During the Sino-Japanese war he was a diplomat in the USA and after the war was the president of Peking University. He fled to the USA in 1949 and relocated to Taiwan in 1958. He is a representative Chinese liberal.

[4] For more information on Laski's theories and their influence on Chinese intellectuals during the 1930s and 1940s see: Sun 2000; Sun 2012; Wu 2012.

Communist Party (CCP) respectively had discussions regarding the justified process, maintenance, and procurement of the "foundation of the nation" and "revolution." However, there was a so-called "third power" of democracy (i.e., the China Democratic League) that put distance between the parties, their policies, and the space for speech and this united the liberal intellectuals[5]. They appealed for peace, freedom, democracy, and a constitutional government in the public space for speech and they actively expanded the discussion regarding how the Chinese government should be organized. Three weekly magazines, *The Observer* (觀察), *Universitas* (周論), and *The New Road* (新路), were in the public sphere as representative mediums for a space of speech.

These mediums in the public sphere allowed the liberal intellectuals appeal the construction of a democracy in post-war China and appealed to the reality of a "democracy" and "economic democracy." In other words, this was the basis of thought for the protection of individual freedom and rights, establishment of a democracy instead of a dictatorship for a democratic government, economic equality, freedom of vocation choice, correction of disparities, and a welfare-oriented society which sought to realize a democracy in the economy by means of a peaceful revolution. Democracy was represented by liberalism and economic democracy was represented by socialism; as a result, both were democratic perspectives. There was a democratic vision embedded in the harmonious achievement of blending both liberalism and socialism.

Even though many previous studies have looked at the democratic government, the same cannot be said about the economic democracy. For example, regarding the material contained in *The Observer*, there are many studies that look at the thought of freedom and democracy by the intellectuals such as Chu Anping (儲安平)[6]; however, there are not sufficient studies looking at the thought regarding the economic democracy [Xie 2005; Yanagi 2006; Chen 2009; Han 2015; Lin 2017]. This paper primarily looks at the material contained in *The Observer*, *Universitas*, and *The New Road* in order to understand how the thought regarding the economic democracy in post-war China, makes this content clear, and re-thinks the thought of

---

[5] In Chinese the word for "liberal (liberalist)" is "自由主義知識分子 (Ziyouzhuyi Zhishi Fenzi)" and "intellectual" is "知識分子 (Zhishi Fenzi)". The meaning of "intellectual" has been debated over by many scholars. For example, Murata Yūjirō 1999: 772–773; Yang Kuisong 2013; Edward Said 1996, etc. Based on these debates, I would like to define "intellectual" as a person who works to hold specialty knowledge in a specific field, and at the same time somebody who has an interest in politics and the benefits of society; a person who has a message and opinion for the masses and will express those thoughts and ideas. The intellectuals written about in this paper are expressed their ideas in the public space with the intention to represent the masses and their main responsibility was to search for how relative autonomy could be attained at the state and governmental levels. The liberalists written about in this paper wanted to see a realization of a freedom and equality on the individual level by distancing themselves from the main power and accepting the opinions of others. This does not mean that this research is only on the "third power" intellectuals. This paper aims to look at all intellectuals that voiced their opinions in the public forums and to analyze their comments as widely as possible.

[6] Chu Anping (儲安平 1909–1966?) graduated from Kwang Hua University in Shanghai in 1932 and studied in the UK for about two years in 1936–1938. He founded *The Observer* in September 1946 and established himself as a journalist. In 1949, he actively supported the new government following the establishment of the People's Republic of China. Later he became the chief editor of *Guangming Daily* (光明日報). In June 1957 he declared "power to the party" and became member of the extremist right wing; he was persecuted during the Cultural Revolution and went missing in September 1966. Regarding research on Chu Anping and his thoughts see my paper: Lin 2017.

liberalism in post-war China.

In particular, this paper looks at the content of *The Observer*, *Universitas*, and *The New Road* and introduces the liberal intellectuals that used this media for expression and surveys how they proposed democratic perspectives. Then, the content of how the liberal intellectuals argued for an economic democracy is evaluated and it is made clear that it did not simply mean economic equality. Also, the situation of Japan during the same time is considered and the democracy in post-war China is re-evaluated.

The post-war period in China was a time when a "new China" was being established and the arguments regarding democracy and a constitutional government were actively in development. This period is when the idea of realizing democracy was at its height. Also, economic theories had already been actively tested in this period and were proposed once more following the reformation liberation in the 1970s. Therefore, exploring the democratic thought during this era is not simply reflecting on the past, it gives significance to present-day China's democratic system and the construction of democratic shifts in China's future.

## I. Post-war China's and Speech Space

Liberalism in China experienced its emergence, progress, changes, and historical upsurge from the late Qing dynasty to the 1940s. In post-war China, the government actively took ideas primarily from the USA regarding international liberal movements and connections and moved toward a model with freedom of speech. However, restriction on the freedom of speech strengthened once again in response to the civil unrest [Nakamura 2004: part 1]. Regardless of this situation, varying thoughts appeared in the post-war circles of thinkers in which democracy, freedom, and a constitutional government was actively discussed. With a suffrage boom [Xu 1991] among the intellectuals and a push for freedom of speech as a background, newspapers and magazines were printed in various regions and an interest toward political media became apparent. Using these media outlets, the intellectuals shared their ideas and values regarding democracy, freedom, and liberalism. This section introduces and surveys the three representative magazines *The Observer*, *Universitas*, and *The New Road*, and evaluated their stance and philosophies.

### 1) *The Observer*

The weekly magazine *The Observer*[7] was founded on September 1, 1946 in Shanghai by Chu Anping, and this magazine was preceded by *The Observer* (*Keguan* 客觀, November 1945–April 1946) which was also founded by Chu in Chongqing. *The Observer* aimed to "present opinions regarding matters of the state" and "contribute to the progress and discipline of the youth" on the basis of being an independent and nonparty outlet. It boasted four fundamental positions: "democracy" for the people, their ultimate welfare, protection of the people's freedom, and improvement of happiness; "freedom" to protect the perfection of the people's character through the law; "progress" for scientifically based industry and modernization; "reason" for to peacefully solve any conflict without impulse or power. With the "spirit

[7] For more research on *The Observer*, see my paper: Lin 2017.

democratic principles and tolerance," it was emphasized that other people's freedom of thought should be respected just as one respected their own freedom of thought and they sought to cultivate the seeds for the freedom of thought ["Our Interests and Position", *The Observer*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Sept. 1, 1946]. Until publication was suspended on December 24, 1948, there was a total of five volumes, one hundred fourteen issues. The first issues had four hundred units published and this later increased to one hundred thousand units and there were around one million readers which extended to academia, government officials, and military personnel ["Our Self-Criticism, Activity Responsibilities, and Policies on Editing", *The Observer*, Vol. 6, No. 1, Nov. 1, 1949]. *The Observer* lead the public opinion at the time and it strove to continue as a third party not affiliated with the CNP or CCP with an influential power not seen in any other magazine.

Along with the seventy-eight names for the contract writers[8], *The Observer* consisted of two hundred fifty-one intellectuals that centered around Chu Anping. Among these names were writers active in the post-war Chinese speech and press such as university professors, specialists from various fields, and journalists. There were also many elite individuals that held positions in government facilities who had experiences studying abroad and had direct contact with liberalism in Western countries. Furthermore, names such as Wang Ganyu (王贛愚), Gong Xiangrui (龔祥瑞), Wu Enyu (吳恩裕), and Zou Wenhai (鄒文海) can be confirmed as those who studied under Laski. There are many theories mentioned and direct quotes from Laski in *The Observer* that shows the influence Laski had among many Chinese intellectuals[9].

In *The Observer*, there were columns dedicated to specialist, special serialization, and observation report articles. In the specialist column there were a variety of articles regarding politics, thought, and culture in which critical opinions were published which made *The Observer* a speech space in post-war China that criticized the government, appealed for peace, and acted as a spokesman for freedom, peace, and a constitutional government.

**2) *Universitas***

The weekly magazine *Universitas*[10] was founded on January 6, 1948 in present day Beijing. Until publication was suspended that November, there was a total of two volumes, fourty-three issues published. 1948 was the year that a constitutional democracy was carried out and it was written that "this is the year that we will carry out a constitutional government so this is the year that we will begin to learn about democracy" ["Learning about Politics", *Universitas*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Jan. 16, 1948]. *Universitas* denied the popular idea that the CNP was friendly with the USA or that the CCP was friendly with the Soviet Union and they advocated reason over emotions. Under the idea of science, objectivity, and calmness, they

[8] These were the names of the intellect contributors that were acknowledged by Chu Anping. There were other contributors whose names were not added to the front cover. Hu Shih(胡適)'s name can be seen on the cover but he never submitted to the magazine.

[9] Regarding Laski's theories see "The Mote and the Beam", *The Observer*, Vol. 3, No. 8; "Is Europe Done for?", *The Observer*, Vol. 3, No. 17; "America Strides the World", *The Observer*, Vol. 3, No. 20; "Getting on with Russia", *The Observer*, Vol. 4, No. 3.

[10] For research on *Universitas* there are three articles I have found and I anticipate more research on this topic. See: Li 2009; Ma 2010; Zheng 2015.

anticipated the constitutional democracy and called for a reformation in the CNP in order to realize a peaceful democratic revolution.

Although the names of the editors were not shown on the cover of *Universitas*, the three individuals that were in charge of editing were Lei Haizong (雷海宗)[11], a professor at Tsinghua University, He Lin (賀麟), a professor at Peking University, and Zhu Guangqian（朱光潜), a professor at Peking University. Lei Haizong was requested to be an editor of the magazine by Wu Zhuren (吳鑄人), a member of the CNP branch in Beijing, and worked under the condition of a neutral standpoint of "not belonging to a party" [Ma 2010: 366–367]. The majority of the seventy-nine writers were professors at Peking University or Tsinghua University and they were intellectuals with experience studying abroad. It was not unusual to be affiliated with the CNP like Lei Haizong, but regardless of their political affiliation, they maintained an adherence to liberalism.

In *Universitas* there were columns dedicated to the society and specialty discussions; in later issues there was a column called "Youth Park" which was dedicated to submissions by younger writers. Other than societal issues, there were special issues on the problems in China's economy and liberalism that debated issues regarding China's government, economy, and society. There were also special issues focusing on the younger generation that places emphasis on the enlightenment of university students. *Universitas* focused on young university students and university teaching staff which had an impact in the academic world in Beijing and Tianjin from its first published issues [Ma 2010: 365].

**3) *The New Road***

The weekly magazine *The New Road*[12] was founded on May 15, 1948 in Beijing by the Chinese Society Economy Research Institution. Until its indefinite publication cessation by the CNP on December 18, 1948, *The New Road* had published two volumes, thirty issues. The Chinese Society Economy Research Institute, established in March of 1948, was structured closely to the Fabian Society and was centered around fifty participants that included a few intellectuals [Kubo 2011: 310].

In the "Publication Acknowledgment" of *The New Road*, it was clearly stated that the Chinese Society Economy Research Institution was not a political party and a list of "Thirty-Two Articles" professed that they were not a party network. They declared that it was the duty and right for them to publicly state their opinions regarding different issues. In the "Thirty-Two Articles" they also called for the public to take a stance on the democratization of the government, modernization and industrialization of the economy, protection and establishment of social equality. They declared this as a starting point to debate issues on the Chinese government, diplomacy, economy, and society and that "we want to investigate the many

[11] Lei Haizong (雷海宗 1902–1962) studied history in the USA in 1933. He wrote articles on dictatorship governments and was a core member of the *Zhanguoce* (戦国策) group. Recently their thoughts on freedom have been reevaluated as not being completely abolished. He was criticized for not going to Taiwan in 1949 and being right wing. Regarding research on Lei Haizong see: Jiang 2001.

[12] Regarding research on *The New Road* in China see: Wei 2004; Dai 2005; Yang and Wang 2007. In Japan, Kubo 2011 explores the features of *The New Road* group's features and their context in thought on economy.

difficulties of today under the rise and fall of the powers in the world and so we created this magazine to share the wisdom of many people that look to the future of China" ["Publication Acknowledgement", *The New Road*, Vol. 1, No. 1, May 15, 1948].

There were seventy primary authors for *The New Road* of which many were teaching staff at Tsinghua University and Peking University and they had experience studying abroad in the UK and the USA. There were members, for example, Gong Xiangrui and Wu Enyu, that had influence from Laski's socialist democracy thought, Jiang Shuojie (蔣碩傑) was a student of Friedrich Hayek (1899–1992), and Xu Yunan (徐毓枏) was a student of John Maynard Keynes (1883–1946). From the stance of liberalism, *The New Road* sought for the possibility of a new economic order and their argument was that they had "advanced under the gentle coordination of Keynesianism and social democracy" [Kubo 2011: 314]. The key figures in *The New Road* were Wu Jingchao(吳景超), head of editing, Liu Dazhong (劉大中),head of economy column editing, Qian Duansheng (錢端昇) and Lou Bangyan (樓邦彥), head of political column editing, and Xiao Qian (蕭乾), head of literature column editing.

There were columns for critical circles, debates and speeches, specialist fields, and "our opinion" in which there were active debates on problems in post-war China. The critical circle and debate and speeches columns were styled as dialoged and debates where politics, economy, society, and international issues were discussed. The "our opinion" column contained articles on the shared opinions of *The New Road*. Furthermore, issues concerning the modernization of the economy were clearly introduced to the readers and there was even a column established that covered economic issues. This was a feature not seen in *The Observer* or *Universitas*.

Regarding the similarities and differences in *The Observer*, *Universitas*, and *The New Road*, first of all they all had specialty and correspondence editorials and there were many authors that can be seen in all three magazines which shows the network and interaction of intellectuals[13]. This also points to the fact that in post-war China, intellectuals were able to use the speech space to write in a variety of mediums in which they exercised active speech. From the stand point of their mentality, they were able to criticize the party's desire for peace and democracy by taking the stance of being a third party. The understanding that democracy was a harmony between a political democracy and economic democracy was another shared feature in these three magazines. On the other hand, compared to the astute political criticism found in *The Observer*, a stance of peaceful reformism was emphasized in *Universitas*. A logical analysis of economic policies and society issues by specialists and researchers could be found in *The New Road* which shows it to have a high level of academic specialty.

## II. Democratic Perspectives of Liberal Intellectuals

How did the liberalism intellectuals understand and interpret democracy in the post-war China

[13] There are twenty-five names that overlap as contributors in *The Observer* and *The New Road*, and twenty in *The Observer* and *Universitas*. There are seventeen names that overlap in *The New Road* and *Universitas*. There are seven names that overlap in all three magazines.

speech space?

Understanding of democracy in *The Observer* is expressed in the publication acknowledgements. Democracy must reflect the will of the people, it protects freedom and rights, and "a democratic government aims for the ultimate welfare of the people and improvement of happiness." Also, "the policies of a state must allow the people's discussion. The course of action of the state must be decided by the people. The responsibility for all policies must be accepted by the people." *The Observer* understood this political freedom as a "political democracy" and that "democracy is not limited to political activities but it should extend to economic activities, and not only a political democracy but an economic democracy is needed" ["Our Interests and Position", *The Observer*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Sept. 1, 1946].

It is well-known that liberalism which appears in the establishment of the modern state and society encourages growth in a parliamentary and democratic government and it also contributes to the advancement of a capitalist economy. However, self-correction is unavoidable in the advancement of a capitalist economy where liberalism collides ideologically with freedom and equality. From the mid-nineteenth century, the rescue of the subaltern became an important political issue because of the correction of economic and societal inequality brought on by a private enterprise individualism. Chu Anping criticized the result of a free rivalry in which "the wealthy become more wealthy and the poor became more poor." He pointed out that this was a merit in the UK's "fair play" policies in which "the nineteenth century's main theme was 'political freedom' but in the twentieth century the main theme is 'economic freedom and social equality'" ["Labour Party Takes on the Administration", *Oriental Magazine*, Vol. 41, No. 18, 1945]. A professor at Peking University, Fu Sinian (傅斯年), stated:

> "humanity is demanding freedom and equality. [...] For the past one-hundred years liberalism has brought equality in the laws of the people; but by assisting capitalism, it has encouraged an economic inequality. [...] If there is not economic equality, all other equalities become lies and freedom will no longer be genuine freedom."

This was understood from Roosevelt's "freedom from want" as economic equality and it also emphasized the importance of freedom ["Roosevelt and New Liberalism", *Ta Kung Pao*, Apr.29, 1945].

This focus on social and equal rights was widely recognized throughout China and most intellectuals accepted the idea of "distributive justice". Justice was regarded similarly as "social justice" or "economic equality" and this concept was adopted alongside freedom which was an important core concept. Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill's utilitarian idea of "the greatest happiness of the greatest number" became the backbone for wide acceptance. This idea of "the greatest happiness of the greatest number" was of utmost value to the Chinese intellectuals and they understood that individualism would not bring this to reality; but it was achievable by the intervention through laws of the state and policies of welfare. The emphasis of social justice and economic equality issues was not only in the results of a rational reflection in Western capitalism, but it was also visible in the perceptive understanding of the reality in China at that time [Xu 2000: 36, 44–45]. Furthermore, even though China's liberalism thought was receptive to the influence of the UK's social democracy thought and the Soviet Union's socialism thought, it greatly transformed these

ideas. In the editorial *Ta Kung Pao*, Xiao Qian explained the integration of liberalism and socialism as:

> "liberalists respect the individual in political and cultural facets which deepens the color in individualism. In light of the terrible result of the disparity between the rich and poor in the economy, the liberalists have come to a rational agreement and the color of socialism is not weak. Liberalism is nothing more than a simple synonym. It can be replaced with progressivism or with social democracy" ["Beliefs of Liberalists", *Ta Kung Pao*, Jan. 8, 1948].

Wu Enyu pointed out that "after WWII, [liberalism and socialism as major thought] have met together in recent trends and will compromise" ["Recent Trends in Contemporary Political Thought", *The Observer*, No. 12, Jan. 26, 1946]. This was an appeal to the intellectuals in the speech space in post-war China that there would be an integration, harmony, and establishment of liberalism and socialism; as a result, this integration became the main way of thinking in China's liberalism. This is seen very clearly in the democratic perspective that democracy must be a "political democracy" and "economic democracy".

This concept of political democracy and economic democracy was described in the following manner:

> "The importance of the current debate on democracy is that the notion of 'political democracy' and 'economic democracy' lacks harmony. The concept of political democracy is rooted in the representative British liberalism. [...] On the other hand, the concept of economic democracy is from socialism, in particular communism. [...] Political democracy emphasizes the individual and economic democracy emphasizes the equality of mankind" [Xiao Gongquan (蕭公権), "Arguing Democracy", *The Observer*, Vol. 1, No. 7, Oct. 28, 1946].
>
> "There is political democracy in the UK and the USA; however, it is unclear if economic democracy actually exists. There is economic democracy in the Soviet Union; however, political democracy does not exist or it is lacking. [...] We do not have a deeply rooted political democracy and economic democracy, both are compatible, and they must be compatible" [Wu Shichang (呉世昌), "Political Democracy and Economic Democracy", *The Observer*, Vol. 1, No. 5, Sept. 28, 1946].

This viewpoint can also be confirmed a report by Luo Longji (羅隆基)[14] for the China Democratic League's political report. Luo reported that "the UK and the USA's political democracy was achievable via the Soviet Union's economic democracy and it will create a democracy model for China. [...] This democratic system is what China is currently looking for" [Luo Longji 1945]. On the other hand, Tsinghua University professor Liu Dazhong was very serious about understanding issues behind the USA's insufficient political democracy and the inadequacy of the Soviet Union's economic democracy. At the same time, Liu understood that political and economic democracy was a "double democracy" and "the goal of these two is

[14] Luo Longji (羅隆基 1986–1965) received a PhD in economics in the USA, also studied in the UK and France. Was a member of Crescent Moon Society (新月派)—a human rights group—with Hu Shih (胡適). Luo Longji formed the China Democratic League in 1941 and became a chair member in 1953. He was criticized for being an extreme rightist.

to unite all people of the world. [...] So they must be compatible and they are necessary requirements for each other" ["Political Democracy and Economic Democracy", *The New Road*, Vol. 1, No. 13, Aug. 7, 1948].

A universal viewpoint was understood in the public domains regarding political and economic democracy being a necessary part of democracy. Even though there were different understandings in the representative USA and Soviet Union, political democracy was understood as liberalism and economic democracy was understood as socialism. A harmonious fulfillment of these two democracies was widely understood and accepted to be a worthy democracy for China.

## III. Debates Regarding Economic Democracy

### 1) Defining Economic Democracy[15]

It is currently understood that the meaning of democracy is to protect the rights of the people, personal rights, and freedoms through the establishment of a politically democratic system instead of a dictatorship. This includes factors such as public voting, political freedom, separation of power, competitive political parties, and control of laws. For example, National Central University professor Wu Shichang, based on the definition of the British and USA systems, stated "the people can freely criticize the government's policies and administration, change the administration in a non-violent manner, the people can freely organize political parties and associations, and they can participate in politics via a competitive election" in the form of a political democracy ["Political Democracy and Economic Democracy", *The Observer*, Vol. 1, No. 5, Sept. 28, 1946]. Yenching University professor Xiao Gongquan understood democracy as the chance and power to "speak and understand, to freely choose a peaceful life, to peacefully chose the government and administration" ["Arguing Democracy", *The Observer*, Vol. 1, No. 7, Oct. 28, 1946]. *New Road* emphasized that "the systemization of politics, democratization of the system, socialization of democracy" as the fundamental ideals behind law-governing, constitutional government, civilian politics, competitive political party system, general voting, and regional government in their "Thirty-Two Articles" ["First Claims of the Chinese Society Economy Research Institute", *The New Road*, Vol. 1, No. 1, May 15, 1948].

There were, however, many opposing interpretations of economic democracy were also presented which furthered the debates regarding the fundamental content. This paper is an examination of how economic democracy was interpreted by the intellectuals. In the weekly magazine *Democracy* (民主), Luo Longji interpreted economic democracy as "a society that comparatively distributes property and wealth equally while protecting the rights of the people to live and work. A democracy financially maintains the rights of freedom and equality for the people" ["Political Democracy and Economic Democracy", *Democracy*, Vol. 1, No. 2, Dec. 16, 1944]. Professor of economics at Tsinghua University Wu Qiyuan (伍啓元) stated "an economic democracy allows the people to enjoy freedom and equality at the economic level" ["Democratic Economy and Economic Democracy", *Ta Kung Pao*, Feb. 10, 1946]. Another professor of economics at Tsinghua University Dai Shiguang (戴世光) agreed by stating that freedom in an economic

[15] This section is based on my paper: Lin 2017.

democracy is based on “freedom from want” and freedom from unemployment as interpreted in Roosevelt’s “Four Freedoms” and that equality is to be understood as “an equal opportunity for education and financial expansion” [“Arguing the Fundamental Policies for China’s Economic Revolution”, *Universitas*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Jan. 16, 1948]. Chief of economics at Yeching University Zheng Linzhuang (鄭林莊) understood economic democracy to be “financial justice,” and that the right to work and right to live should at least be included [“Economic Justice and Societal Security”, *The Observer*, Vol. 2, No. 3, Mar. 15, 1947]. Liu Dazhong, who was educated in econometrics, stated that “fair chance, streamlined pay, encouragement of progress, and balance of wealth” should be included and in order to accomplish this, sufficient requirements were also argued. These requirements include a spread of equal education, protection of income under a set standard, enforcement of a progressive taxation system for income, protective system for the freedom of vocation, and protection of the state’s policies and competitive market [“Political Democracy and Economic Democracy”, *The New Road*, Vol. 1, No. 13, Aug.7, 1948]. Regarding the goal of economic democracy, Liu thought that there should be a fair and universal standard of life [“Political Democracy and Economic Democracy”, *The New Road*, Vol. 1, No. 13, Aug. 7, 1948] and Dai stated “the wealth of society should be rationally distributed in order to give a fair result for the people expanding the economy” [“Arguing the Fundamental Policies for China’s Economic Revolution”, *Universitas*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Jan. 16, 1948]. The China Democratic League summarized this by stating “the wealth should be equalized in order to solve the gap between the rich and poor which will equally protect the people’s economy” [“China Democratic League Platform”, 1945]. Even though Chu Anping did not give a systematic opinion on an economic democracy, he proposed the problem with the people’s livelihood was in “welfare politics”. He argued that the biggest issue in China was “welfare politics” which “prioritizes the will of the people and prioritizes the life of the people financially. The government must let the people have housing, clothing, provisions, tools for manufacturing, and jobs” [“Reacting to the Unchangeable with Ten Thousand Changes”, *The Observer*, No. 9, Jan. 5, 1946].

Even with these statements and ideas, it is difficult to rigidly define economic democracy. The intellectuals had an active debate on whether the economic policies should be public or private, planned or market based which will be explored later in this paper. It is worth noting that keywords such as economic equality, economic freedom, distribution of wealth, equal opportunities, social welfare, freedom of vocation, gradual nationalization, favorable economic planning can also be confirmed. Due to these facts, this paper does not agree with the idea that “economic democracy” can simply be stated as “equality”—i.e., social or financial equality—as can be seen in previous research [Yanagi 2003]. Although equality is one of the most important keywords in economic democracy, freedom of vocation and protection of a competitive market are also included as protective rights in economic freedom. Therefore, this paper defines economic democracy as having financial equality and financial freedom in which there is a protection of the rights of financial equality and financial freedom.

Furthermore, even though socialism and economic democracy are important keywords, this

"socialism"[16] is not only limited to the socialism found in the Soviet Union but it is socialism in the broad sense. There were many intellectuals that anticipated the realization of economic expansion seen in policies set forth by the Soviet Union's and these intellectuals were joined by others that modeled their framework on that of a gradually progressive social democracy. In July of 1945, the Labour Party in the UK won the general vote by three hundred thirty-nine seats which gave financial support to begin the complete adoption of socialistic policies based on Keynesianism. The realization of a welfare state established by the Labour Party—i.e., the Attlee administration—gave hope to the Chinese intellectuals. For example, Fu Sinian stated that the victory of the Labour Party would encourage China and praised the Labour Party's socialistic economic policies as "carrying out social welfare policies under the principle of economic freedom" and "it has many more times the socialistic factors than Roosevelt's New Deal." Fu also greatly anticipated a new model of an integrated liberalism and socialism set forth by the UK and the USA which would create a utopian country established on socialism and liberalism ["Evaluating the UK's General Election", *Ta Kung Pao*, July 30, 1945]. Wu Qiyuan compared the economic democracies of the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, the UK, France, and the USA and stated "China should create a model based on the UK and France, adopt the democratic policies in the financial world, and this should be executed as a soft socialism" ["Arguing the Future of China from the Perspective of World Though", *The Observer*, Vol. 2, No. 7, Apr. 12, 1947]. Chu Anping also showed interest in socialism by stating "the people of present day China want a socialist and democratic government" ["China's Political Situation", *The Observer*, Vol.2, No.2, Mar.8, 1947]; however, the "socialist" being used here is in the broad sense in which he saw the path to realizing an economic democracy was by modeling a system on the UK Labour Party's social democracy. Regarding the victory of the Labour Party's victory, Chu Anping declared "executing socialism does not mean that we need to take the same path as Moscow" and this would create a new history in which the Labour Party's government would introduce a system of policies ["Labour Party Takes on the Administration", *Oriental Magazine*, Vol. 41, No. 18, 1945]. This social revolution by the Labour Party's government was later introduced to Chinese readers in articles of *The Observer* (vol. 2, no. 9). Peking University professor He Lin also explained that the execution of an economic democracy would differ from that of the methods seen in the Soviet Union based on the peaceful manner in which the UK was democratically executing socialist policies and this model was the most progressive and efficient manner in which to realize an economic democracy ["Where is the Soviet Union Headed?", *Universitas*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Jan. 16, 1948].

**2)A Public or Private System**

Economic intellectuals came up with an economic democracy in the form of socialism as the antidote to the economic gaps and inequality found in the expansion of a capitalistic economy. The intellectuals in post-war China adhered to the idea of an economic democracy and gradually began to strengthen their desire for this. As previously stated, if they were to understand an economic democracy as

[16] The realization of "freedom" and "equality" here refers to a world history issue that criticizes the harmful effects of capitalism and looks at the protection policies for the subaltern in society that is sought after in socialism. See Mizuha 2007.

a system that protects financial equality and freedom rights, it must also include these rights in the concept. This relationship of freedom and equality shows up in an economic democracy which caused them to actively ask how they could concretely realize this democracy and what kind of economic system would be suitable for China. One of these debates focused on ownership systems and if they should be public or private.

In order to avoid the harmful effects of private enterprise and to realistically distribute wealth in an equal economy, it was agreed upon that the fundamental ideal of socialism was to make production methods public. It was stated that "regarding the public system of production, the majority or liberalists agreed or showed an attitude of approval" [Wei 2004: 102]. In *The New Road*'s "Thirty-Two Articles," it was written that "the state should use appropriate methods, expand the state's resources, realize employment for all people, fairly distribute promotion, and raise the standard of living" in order to overcome limited possession and to have all privately owned land bought by the state to make them state owned; furthermore, fundamentally all monopolized or privately owned mining and manufacturing, as well as all financial institutions were to be operated by the state in which all of the land would progressively become owned and operated by the state ["First Claims of the Chinese Society Economy Research Institute", *The New Road*, Vol. 1, No. 1, May 15, 1948]. Peking University professor Jiang Shuojie, who studied economic theory under Hayek, pointed out that the inequality caused by income and distribution brought upon by a private economy could be resolved by taxing income and inheritance. He also pointed out that it was possible for the regional liberals to adopt socialism which would "take away the need to make all production methods part of the state" making it a freely competitive socialism by keeping a combination of both privately and state-run businesses ["Choosing the Economic System", *The New Road*, Vol. 1, No. 3, May 29, 1948]. The economist Ma Yinchu (馬寅初) held a similar view and stated:

> "we do not need to completely adopt a capitalist freely competitive system like the UK and the USA just as we do not need to completely adopt a system in which everything is public like in the Soviet Union. We have insisted on a system of a hybrid economy in which both state-run and privately owned business can co-exist" ["The Path of China's Economy", *Jingji Pinglun*, Apr. 26, 1947].

Leader of the China National Democratic Construction Association Shi Fuliang (施復亮)'s opinion was also very representative. He pointed out that the Chinese economy was not able to immediately walk the path of socialism so it would be positive to use the rational private economy which brought forth efficacy and the progress of techniques; this would expand the state-run businesses while protecting the privately run businesses in an economic system he called "new capitalism". This new capitalism was a hybrid of ownership that included the state-run system, private capitalism, small business, and small agriculture. This was an economic system of hybrid and transition models that anticipated the expansion of a socialist economy ["The Abolishment of Exploitation and Increase of Production", *The Observer*, Vol. 4, No. 4, Mar. 20, 1948].

> "In order to achieve a rational economic 'equality,' it is a necessary condition that at least the majority of production methods are public. However, public production methods limit economic freedom. Economic freedom is necessary in political freedom and we cannot abandon this. One of the main

tasks of political scientists and economists is to find a compromise to this contradiction" ["Economic Freedom, Socialism, and Plans for New Investment", *The New Road*, Vol. 1, No. 21, Oct. 2,1948].

Even though it was anticipated as a final goal to make public the socialistic production methods to avoid private enterprise, there were many opinions that a hybrid and national system needed to be realized. This was probably the most efficient method of comprise for the intellectuals.

**3) Planned Economy or Market Economy**

Another issue outside of possession was how to realize a suitable economic system for China. The intellectuals regularly debated about "planned economy" and "market economy"—sometimes as "fair" and "efficient"—in order to solve the issue of how to achieve freedom and equality in an economic democracy. However, both planned economy or market economy needed to be realized with the general idea of socialism as a premise because they understood that a financial system was necessary to conform with socialism which would definitely arrive.

It was Peking University's professor of political science Wu Enyu that put emphasis on financial equality and advocated for the effectiveness of a planned economy. Under the direction of Laski, he wrote a doctoral dissertation on Marx's social and political thought after which he was awarded a PhD. In *The Observer* he emphasized that in order to create a better life—improvement and preservation of existence—public systems were necessary ["Arguing Humanity and Independent Production", *The Observer*, Vol. 3, No. 4, Sept. 20, 1947] and later in *The New Road* he also appealed for the need of a planned economy for life ["Thinking about the Necessity of Planning from the Perspective of Humanity", *The New Road*, Vol. 1, No. 9, July 10, 1948]. Tsinghua University professor Zhao Shouyu (趙守愚) expressed that it was not the time to abolish the system for a planned economy on the grounds that "it is not just the method or system of a planned economy but a tool in which to maintain the life of the economy." He emphasized that if there was no planned economy in socialism, the power of executing policies would weaken. It was necessary to have a planned economy in order to maintain the minimum level of daily life provisions and distribution of production materials ["The Name and Fruits of Economic Freedom", *The New Road*, Vol. 1, No. 21, Oct. 2, 1948]. Furthermore, in *The New Road* a special issue titled "Is it Necessary to Have a Plan for a Socialist Economy?" two specialists exchanged their respective ideas in a dialogue style. Fu Sheng (負生)[17] emphasized that there is a need for a planned economy in socialism because "a public system and planned economy are two essential factors to socialism that cannot be separated;" from the perspective of production and distribution in particular, a higher standard of life for the people becomes a goal of socialism, therefore, it is necessary for a plan to redistribute wealth ["Plans are Necessary for a Socialism Economy", *The New Road*, Vol. 1, No. 16, Aug. 28, 1948].

In response to this idea of emphasizing a planned economy, Tsinghua University professor of economy Wu Jingchao proposed that there is a possibility to establish a system that adopts both socialism and a market economy as a pricing mechanism. He believed that economic freedom in an economic

[17] Fu Sheng is thought to be a pen name used by Wu Enyu (吳恩裕).

democracy was connected to consumers and their freedom to choose a vocation which would be violated through the execution of a planned economy ["Arguing Economic Freedom", *The New Road*, Vol. 1, No. 21, Oct. 2, 1948]. He proposed a combination of public system and pricing mechanism by "focusing on economic equality and economic freedom as the same thing. However, in my theory, even though socialism will bring us economic equality, a planned economy will deprive consumers of their freedom. Only through a combination of socialism and pricing mechanism will we be able to attain equality and freedom" ["Socialism and Planned Economy Can be Separate", *The New Road*, Vol. 2, No. 5, Dec. 11, 1948]. Also, Chun Sheng (春生)[18], drawing upon Hayek's words, emphasized that there was no need for a correlation between a planned economy and socialism because "it is possible to have no plans in socialism and it is also possible to have many plans in socialism." He also pointed out that it is possible to utilize a pricing mechanism in socialism by first understanding the harm of having freedom of consumer choice, freedom of vocation choice, hinderance of rational production material distribution, increase of economic operation cost, and the possibility of economic power focus and monopoly ["Plans are not Necessary for a Socialist Economy", *The New Road*, Vol. 1, No. 16, Aug. 28, 1948]. Furthermore, regarding Fu Sheng's comments, Chun Sheng proposed "plans to publicize all production is a totalitarian socialism economy and an unplanned publicization of production is a liberal socialist economy" and he reemphasized "I agree with a liberal socialist economy. [...] Even though we want socialism, we do not need a planned economy" ["Plans are not Necessary for a Socialist Economy", *The New Road*, Vol. 1, No. 16, Aug. 28, 1948].

Although Wu Enyu and Wu Jingchao had varying arguments regarding the issues in what would be the most efficient system in an economic democracy, it is important to note that their understanding of socialism was quite different. While Wu Enyu advocated for a publicized planned economy based on the system in the Soviet Union, Wu Jingchao sought for a combination of a publicized and pricing mechanism based on policies of a social democracy.

Another point of debate was proposed which was a theory to create a compatible economy consisting of both planned and market economies. Peking University professor and American economy specialist Chen Zhenhan (陳振漢) emphasized that although a planned economy is necessary for socialism, a complete planned economy is not necessary. He proposed to leave parts of the free pricing system while executing a centralized planned economy which would speed up the compatibility between economic growth and equality ["Choosing a Hybrid and Planned System", *The New Road*, Vol. 2, No. 5, Dec. 11, 1948]. Regarding this proposition, Jiang Shuojie pointed out that it was necessary to have a centralized plan for a nationwide adoption and national defense, welfare for public education and sanitation, railways and water supplies in order to prepare for inflation because a pricing mechanism make "it is necessary to execute an economic democracy and protection of economic freedom." This would lead to a focus on free pricing mechanism which was based on the theory of a hybrid economy following mass planning ["Socialism and Pricing Mechanism", *The New Road*, Vol. 2, No. 5, Dec. 11, 1948]. Peking University professor of economics Zhao Naituan (趙迺摶) expanded with his own theory that liberal economy policies should be the

[18] Chun Sheng is thought to be a pen name used by Wu Jingchao (吳景超).

pillar of individualism and free competition based on an economic democracy. He concluded that disadvantages existed in a truly free economy and absolutely regulated economy, therefore a progressive free and regulated economy "is the goal of China's economic policies by utilizing a hybrid of a progressive capitalism and soft socialism" ["Liberalism and Economy", *Universitas*, Vol. 2, No. 4, Aug. 6, 1948]. This theory of a hybrid economy can be confirmed in reports by the China Democratic League.

> "China's financial policies regarding the expansion of industry absolutely must harmonize a planned and free economy. [...] By expanding both economies and, at the same time, encouraging private enterprises, the chance for free competition for all private must be protected" [Luo Longji 1945].

If the protection of economic equality and economic freedom rights are to be understood as "economic democracy," the tension of economic equality and freedom in the aforementioned arguments and how they reached a level of compatibility are issues that also must be considered. As it has been pointed out "economic liberalism in post-war China was achieved and formed by economic arguments on theories of social democracy to market fundamentalism and many other theories" [Kubo 2001: 310]. This means that social democracy advocated by Chu Anping and Wu Jingchao, Soviet Union styled socialism advocated by Wu Enyu, market fundamentalism advocated by Jiang Shuojie, and Keynesianism advocated by Xu Yunan all coexisted in the economic democracy.

To simply summarize the contents of the debates regarding an economic democracy: first, it must be based on the idea of economic equality, protection of all rights including economic freedom, redistribution of wealth, equality of chance, and life quality improvement; second, aim for socialism in the broad sense; third, recognition of a progressive state ownership and hybrid ownership system; and fourth, which has the most important feature, the pursuit of a socialistic economy that includes a planned economy based on the ideas of Keynesianism, market fundamentalism, and a soft social democracy[19].

## Conclusion

In regards to the political democracy and economic democracy in Chinese democracy that was argued in this paper, the question remains if, just as in Chinese liberalism, Chinese democracy is the same as other democracies. To answer this, a comparison is made with the situation in Japan. In 1946, the GHQ requested to have the Japanese Ministry of Education and Science and Culture structured and Miyazawa Toshiyoshi, a professor of law at Tokyo Imperial University, was chosen to be the main member of the editorial board. Following the enforcement of the new constitution, philosopher of law Otaka Tomo'o (formerly a professor at Tokyo Imperial University) and economist Ōkōchi Kazuo wrote and published a social studies textbook titled *Democracy* in 1948–1949 and it was used until 1953[20]. The following is a

[19] Regarding a further analysis of the fourth point, see Kubo 2011.

[20] I found a book on the National Diet Library (国立国会図書館) digital collection called *Democracy Vol. 1* (民主主義　上); I have also found a newspaper article related to this book called "Reprinting the High School Textbook *Democracy*" (『民主主義』高校教科書を復刻) in *Asahi Shinbun* (朝日新聞), Aug. 21, 1995.

summary of how this textbook discussed democracy.

The three fundamental facets of democracy are: one, respect for all people; two, the spirit of democracy is not only in political or social life but is also necessary in economic life; three, democracy in politics, democracy in society, and democracy in economy. The goal for democracy in politics is to "improve welfare in the public domain and to allow all people the equal opportunity to pursue happiness." The realization of this begins with the people's individual right to participate in choosing the political leaders. The understanding of democracy in society is "regardless of race, gender, faith, or age, all people have equal opportunities offered to them." Regarding democracy—as an economic democracy—in the economy is that "all people have equal financial opportunities which will close the financial gap between the capitalists and workers." This thought is further emphasized as "the mission of democracy in the economy is to protect the distribution of a fair economy by respecting each other's rights which will raise the standard of life for all people and will build a better society." It is also pointed out that "among the three facets of democracy, there is one which has not been adequately achieved and that is an economic democracy. [...] The fundamental solution for this problem in the economic democracy is anticipated to be in a combination with political democracy" [Ministry of Education, Science and Culture 1948: 2, 152, 203–207].

Compared to the debates regarding democracy in China at the same time, it can be understood that the so-called "democracy in politics" is "political democracy" in "political freedom," "democracy in society" is "political democracy" in "political equality," and "democracy in the economy" is "economic democracy". These ideals of freedom, equality, and societal rights are clearly written in the Constitution of Japan, drafted in November of 1947 and executed in May of 1948. Many of these fundamental rights are also reflected in the Constitution of the Republic of China which was drafted and executed around the same time of January 1947 and December 1947.

By focusing on a harmony between liberalism and socialism it can be said that the hybrid of planned and market economy in the Chinese democracy was modeled on the social democracy that from the UK. From this, the democracy that China sought for was not too far off from having a universality and the incomplete modernization of China was not too far from being a universal modernization.

This paper focused on analyzing how the debates in *The Observer*, *Universitas*, and *The New Road*, public domains of speech, were formed and how the liberal intellectuals in post-war China understood the formation of democracy by respecting the freedom and equality of the individual, independence, generosity, and rationality. The features of democracy that the liberal intellectuals presented are that democracy is a political democracy which protects political freedom and rights and that it involves economic democracy which protects economic equality and economic freedom rights. Both of these ideas were hybrid and they sought for a harmony between liberalism and socialism. Regarding economic democracy, the compatibility between financial equality and freedom were argued in which a socialism in the broad sense was sought. Under the connection of many theories regarding economy, there was a gradual transition from social democracy to market fundamentalism and they engaged in a socialistic economy that included a planned economy.

## References


*Democracy* (民主).
*Jingji Pinglun* (経済評論).
*Oriental Magazine* (東方雑誌).
*Ta Kung Pao* (大公報).
*The New Road* (新路).
*The Observer* (観察).
*The Observer* (*Keguan* 客観).
*Universitas* (周論).

Chen Yongzhong 陳永忠 (2009), *Research on the Thought and Life of Chuanping* (儲安平生平與思想研究：国共不容的知識分子), Showwe Information Co., Ltd.

"China Democratic League Platform" (中国民主同盟綱領) (1945), *Historical Documents of China Democratic League 1941–1949* (中国民主同盟歴史文献 1941-1949), Wenshi Ziliao Press, 1983.

Dai Guangyuan 代光源 (2005), *Research on The New Road*（『新路週刊』研究）, Magisterial Dissertation of Shanghai Normal University.

Deane, Herbert A. (1955), *The Political Ideas of Harold J. Laski*, Columbia University Press.

Edward Said (1996), *Representation of the Intellectual*, Vintage Books.

Han Shu 韓戍 (2015), *A Biography of Chuanping* (儲安平伝), Oxford University Press (China).

Jiang Pei 江沛 (2001), Research on the Thought of *Zhangguoce Group* (戦国策派思潮研究), Tianjin People's Publishing House.

Kubo Tōru(2011), "Economic Liberalism in Post-war China" (戦後中国の経済自由主義), in Murata Yūjirō, eds., *China in Liberalism* (リベラリズムの中国), Yushisha.

Li Tongxing 李統興 (2009), *Research on Liberal Magazines in Post-war (1945–1949)* (岐路短歌:戦後中国自由主義時政週刊研究(1945-1949)), Doctoral Dissertation of Huazhong University of Science and Technology.

Lin Lizhao 林礼釗 (2017), "Chuanping's Democratic Though: Relations Between *The Observer* and the Early Era of the People's Republic of China" (儲安平の民主思想：『観察』時期と共和国初期の関係について), *Review of Historical Studies* (史学研究), No. 295.

Luo Longji 羅隆基(1945), "Report on the Provisional Meeting of Representatives by China Democratic League"(中国民主同盟臨時全国代表大会政治報告), *Historical Documents of China Democratic League 1941–1949* (中国民主同盟歴史文献 1941-1949), Wenshi Ziliao Press, 1983.

Ma Ruijie 馬瑞潔 (2010), "Between Ideals and Reality: 1948s Review Magazine *Universitas*" (理想現実両橛之間:1948 年『周論』述評), Hu Chunhui and Lü Shaoli, eds., *The Fundamental Society of China in the Process of Modernization* （現代化進展中的中国基層社会）, Chu Hai College of Higher Education Centre for Asian Studies.

Ministry of Education and Science and Culture, eds. (1948), *Democracy Vol. 1*(民主主義　上), Kyōiku Tosho.

Murata Yūjirō (1999), "Intellectuals" (知識人), in Amako Satoshi, et al. eds., *Encyclopedia of Modern Chinese Affairs* (岩波現代中国事典), Iwanami Shoten.

Nakamura Motoya (2004), *Constitutionalism and Freedom of Speech in China during the Civil War period，1945-49* (戦後中国の憲政実施と言論の自由 1945–49), University of Tokyo Press.

"Reprinting the High School Textbook *Democracy*"（「民主主義」高校教科書を復刻）, Asahi Shinbun, Aug. 21, 1995.

Sun Hongyun 孫宏雲 (2000), "Laski and China: Fundamental Research on Laski and His Chinese Students" (拉斯基与中国：関於拉斯基和他的中国学生的初歩研究), *Journal of Sun Yat-Sen University*, No. 5.

Sun Hongyun 孫宏雲 (2012), "Democratic Socialism and Democratic Economy: Laski's Influence in China" (民主社会主義与民国政治：拉斯基在中国的影響), *Journal of the History of Political Thought*, No. 1.

Wei Chunhui 衛春回 (2004), “Economic System Thought up by Liberal Intellectuals in the 1940s: Looking at *The New Road*” (40 年代自由主義学人理想中的経済制度：以『新路』週刊為例), *Twenty-First Century*, No. 4.

Wu Yunxi 呉韵曦 (2012), “Laski and the World of Thought in the People’s China” (拉斯基与民国思想界), *Issues of Contemporary World Socialism*, No. 3.

Xie Yong 謝泳 (2005), *Chuanping and The Observer* (儲安平与『観察』), China Social Sciences Press.

Xu Jilin 許紀霖 (1991), “Political Participation of China’s Liberals 1945–1949” (中国自由主義知識分子的参政 1945-1949), *Twenty-First Century*, No. 6.

Xu Jilin 許紀霖 (2000), “Social Democracy Thought in Contemporary China” (現代中国的社会民主主義思潮), Xu Jilin ed., *History of 20th Century Chinese Thought (cont.)* (二〇世紀中国思想史論　下), Orient Publishing Center.

Yanagi Ryōsuke (2006), “On the Ideals of Democracy in 1945–1949 China: Focusing on ‘Economic Democracy’ and ‘Democratic Mentality’” (国共内戦時期（1945-1949）における「民主」概念について：「経済民主」及び「民主精神」を中心に), *Modern China* (現代中国), No. 80.

Yanagi Ryōsuke(2003), “On *Democracy* during the Establishment of the People’s Republic of China: Focusing on ‘Liberal Intellectuals’” (中華人民共和国建国前後における『民主』について：「民主派知識人」を中心に), *Junior Research Journal* (北大法学研究科ジュニア・リサーチ・ジャーナル), No. 10.

Yang Kuisong (2013), *Intellectuals and Politics around 1949* (忍不住的「関懐」：一九四九年前後的書生与政治　増訂版), Guangxi Normal University Press.

Yang Hongyu 楊宏雨 and Wang Shujing 王術静 (2007), “The Final Flag of China’s Liberalism: The Last Issues of *The New Road*” (中国自由主義的最後一面旗幟：『新路』週刊始末), *Academics*, No. 3.

Zheng Mengmeng 鄭萌萌 (2015), “Magazines and Newspapers on Liberalism in 1945–1949s China” (1945-1949 年的中国自由主義報刊), *Theory Monthly*, No. 10.

大阪大学中国文化フォーラム・ディスカッションペーパー No.2020-4
大阪大學中國文化論壇 討論文件 No.2020-4

# 戦後中国自由主義知識人の「経済民主」論争（1945-1949）：『観察』『周論』『新路』を素材に

林　礼釗

## 要旨

日中戦争終結から中華人民共和国成立までの激しい国共内戦が展開された戦後中国（1945-1949）において、民主・憲政の課題がかつてないほどクローズアップされることとなった。中国国民党と中国共産党はそれぞれの「建国」と「革命」の正統性を維持・調達するために、民主・憲政に関する議論を各自展開していった。しかし、現実の政治や公共言論空間において大きな存在感を示したのが国共両党から距離を置くいわゆる「第三勢力」の民主諸党派や公共論壇に結集する「自由主義知識人」（以下、「　」省略）であった。彼らは、公共の言論空間において平和・自由・民主・憲政を訴え、中国の政治体制のあり方をめぐって論争を活発に展開していった。その言論空間として機能していた代表的な公共論壇には週刊誌『観察』（1946.9-1948.12）、『周論』（1948.1-11）と『新路』（1948.5-12）がある。

これらの公共論壇を通じ、自由主義知識人らは戦後中国に相応しい民主のあり方について、「政治民主」と「経済民主」の実現を訴えていた。それはすなわち、個人の自由・権利の保障や、独裁にかわる民主的な制度の樹立という政治面での民主主義と、経済的平等、職業選択の自由、格差の是正、「福利社会」の実現といった経済面での民主主義を平和的な変革によって実現しようとする考え方であり、「政治民主」は自由主義によって代表され、「経済民主」は社会主義（広義の社会主義）によって代表されるという民主観であった。その民主には自由主義と社会主義の調和的達成という理想的な民主像が埋め込まれていた。

しかし、従来の研究では、「政治民主」についての考察は多く行われたものの、「経済民主」に関する検討は十分とは言えない。したがって、本稿は、『観察』『周論』『新路』を主な素材として、戦後中国自由主義知識人が引き起こした「経済民主」論争を整理し、その中身を明らかにし、戦後中国の自由主義と民主思想を再考する。具体的には、まず、『観察』『周論』『新路』を中心に、戦後中国の言論空間とそこに結集した自由主義知識人らを簡単に紹介した上で、彼らが共有している民主観を概観する。次に、自由主義知識人らが起こした「経済民主」論争を素材に、その中身を具体的に検討し、それは単なる「経済的平等」を意味しないことを明らかにする。最後に、同時代の日本をも視野に入れ、戦後中国の自由と民主を共時的に再検討する。

担当委員（高橋慶吉*）

* 大阪大学大学院法学研究科・准教授