

朱宗震 著

大视野下

清末民初

变革

新华出版社

朱宗震 著

大视野下

清末民初之革

新华出版社

## 图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

大视野下清末民初变革 / 朱宗震著

北京: 新华出版社, 2009.4

ISBN 978-7-5011-8759-1

I. 大… II. 朱… III. 中国—近代史—研究

IV. K250.7

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2009) 第 053221 号

## 大视野下清末民初变革

---

责任编辑: 张 程

装帧设计: 伍民力

出版发行: 新华出版社

地 址: 北京石景山区京原路 8 号

网 址: <http://www.xinhupub.com> <http://press.xinhuanet.com>

邮 编: 100040

经 销: 新华书店

照 排: 新华出版社照排中心

印 刷: 北京竹曦印务有限公司

开 本: 880 毫米 × 230 毫米 1/32

印 张: 6.875

字 数: 160 千字

版 次: 2009 年 4 月第一版

印 次: 2009 年 4 月第一次印刷

书 号: ISBN 978-7-5011-8759-1

定 价: 18.00 元

---

本社购书热线: (010) 63077122 中国新闻书店电话: (010) 63072012

图书如有印装质量问题, 请与印刷厂联系调换。电话: (010) 89580863

## 序 言

我的老师费正清教授曾经这样告诫他的学生：“中国学者对他们本国历史的了解总是比你们所能了解的多得多。”这句话我至今铭记在心。芮玛丽（Mary Wright）是费正清教授最有才华的学生之一，也是我的同事和导师，她总是抱怨说，在使用中文的时候，总是觉得自己像个瘸子。她一直主张自己的学生应该珍惜一切机会学习中文，比她学得更好。在我们这一代，研究生们有了更多更好的机会，但我们大多数的美国人在研究中国历史的时候，总感到心有余而力不足。

因此，对于我是否有资格写这样一篇序言，颇感有点诚惶诚恐。之所以斗胆下笔，也许是因为我曾经对 1911 年发生在中国的那场革命的某个方面作过深入的研究，同时也是因为朱宗震先生在他的著作中提出了相当广泛的问题，其中，比较的方法是十分重要的，而一旦归结到比较的问题，我们任何人不可能是通晓一切的专家，必然会仁者见仁，智者见智。自然，看到外国学者和他们的中国同行之间观点相同总是件令人高兴的事。当然啦，中国的同行们之间观点也并不总是一致的，而他们的争论总是能够给我们这些“老外”带来很大启发，提供很多信息。

我和朱宗震先生的第一次见面是在 1981 年武昌召开的辛

亥革命 70 周年国际学术研讨会上，当我回忆起当时的情景，这些想法就浮现在我的脑海。在那次会议上，朱先生表达了这样一个观点：宋教仁（也是我研究的主人公）是一个议会迷。他的观点受到了其国内同行的批评，认为这是“给宋教仁戴上了帽子”。当时，我的中文还很差劲，对中国历史也知之甚少，所以并不理解这句话的意思。我当时说：朱先生的观点强调了宋教仁对议会制政府信仰的重要性，这是正确的，尽管我并不能赞同他认为这种信念不合实际的想法。至于更大范围的比较和争论，我记得当时还有关于辛亥革命是不是资产阶级革命的讨论。当时法国学者巴斯蒂博士站起来说：“法国学者现在怀疑法国革命是不是资产阶级革命。中国现在不给人戴帽子了，为什么还要给革命戴帽子呢？”又是一个外国学者加入中国同行之间的争论。在您将看到的这本著作中，朱宗震先生再次回到了这个老话题：将辛亥革命定性为一次资产阶级革命是不是有意义，并且指出更重要的是理解在这场变革中发挥作用的各種错综复杂的力量，而不是给它贴上标签。

1981 年之后，我和朱先生在中国的研讨会上还有过数次碰面，最近则是在美国，我们多次见面。这 20 多年来，我们持续地反复争论一个问题，即中国的辛亥革命是否能够产生一个宋教仁所期望的议会制政府。我之所以敢于反对朱先生的悲观看法，部分是基于我对宋教仁的研究，部分是基于我的比较方法，这种方法告诉我：权力分享的政府出现在西方，并没有固定的社会基础，也没有对民主政体原则的强烈信仰，更不用说理解了。在经过长达 20 多年的分歧之后，朱宗震先生向

2001 年年会提交的论文差不多已经说服了我。没有关于中国历史背景的丰富知识（正如朱先生在争论中所运用的），不管是对宋教仁所作的努力，还是与西方历史的比较，都不是那么容易被恰当评估的。看了这篇文章，我又想起了费正清教授的那句话。

当然，眼下的这本著作并不是仅仅讨论辛亥革命是否能够取得成功。朱先生关注具体的中国历史传承关系，这种关系如何支配了辛亥革命及其以后的历史进程。他全方位地思考了精英的政治思潮，尤其是行为习惯；全面考量了传统儒家学者和士大夫心态对于中国经济和政治发展的持续影响；深刻剖析了革命期间权力下移带来的冲击，以及反映地方利益和个人关系并且互相争斗的军阀化的新军事势力的本质。他考察了当时盛行的政治思潮与权势人物及团体现实利益之间的矛盾，发现新的政治思潮与中国当时的实际情况大都风马牛不相及。从上述研究中，他发现导致清王朝崩溃的原因很多，但没有清晰的权力争斗的阶级基础，也没有新的政府组织形式所必需的坚实社会基础。

2001 年的会议反映了过去 20 年来辛亥革命研究，无论是研究范围、论文质量，还是理论思辨，都取得了巨大进步。年会的主题“辛亥革命与 20 世纪的中国”提醒与会者思考这场革命的长时段意义，他们的具体研究为朱先生的观点提供了有价值的佐证。然而，朱先生在评说年会论文之外，还将我们的注意力带回到早期的中国历史，指出了中国强大的士大夫文化和西方进化政治文化之间的差异。当我们思考中国的辛亥革命

会不会真的导致西方政治和社会现代化重演这个问题时，这确实是一个重要的因素。仅仅对这些改革者和革命者们的政治构想和他们采用的现代外国政治理念作比较是不够的。如果新的理念，正如孙中山所抱怨的，甚至是在支持和拥护他们的政治团体中都不能被广泛地理解（更别提那些反对他们的强有力的团体了），如果这些理念不能用于动员广泛的社会基层，革命就不可能真正体现他们的构想和理念。更准确地说，清王朝的灭亡更像是重演了中国历史上其他王朝的崩溃，紧跟着就是拥有私人武装的军阀之间旷日持久的战争。

在这样的境况下，中国面临着互有冲突的历史任务，既要在中央集权下完成国家统一，又要构建现代社会、经济和政治的体系。综合了同行以及他本人对民国时期的研究，朱先生超越了辛亥革命本身，向我们揭示了中国现代化转型中的实际困难。当前国外英语世界的学者对近代中国的研究比较集中的几个问题和朱先生所强调的不谋而合：军事力量整合的困难；国民党动员群众支持的失败，甚至不能代表民族资产阶级的利益；前现代社会的习惯和价值观在社会和政治领域内的持续影响。在很多方面，这一研究支持他的阐述。同样地，大多数西方学者在承认阶级斗争在 20 世纪中国历史进程中重要性的同时，也普遍认为中国士大夫和儒家文化在现代社会中的伸张力同样是重要的。他们会很欢迎朱先生对这一课题的讨论。

这当然不是说本来就意见歧出的西方学者，会一致同意本书中的观点。有些人不否认国民党政权的腐败及其现代化计划中的内部冲突，但是他们仍然认为如果没有日本的入侵，即使

它没有群众动员，改革也可能获得成功。但即便是他们也不会认为它有多大的成功机会。最近，还有一些人认为，到了 20 世纪末，从全世界范围来看，现代性的形式可以是多样的，没有固定的模式，现代化这个概念本身也不再那么有意义。从抽象理论的意义上讲，这也许是对的。然而，这样的说法并不对朱先生的阐述构成问题。在辛亥革命时期，中国的革命者和改革者实现社会和政治民主、依靠现代科技实现国家繁荣和强大的目标，也是整个 20 世纪中国的努力目标。他们非常清楚横在通往目标道路上的艰难险阻，克服它们也是一项重要而且有意义的任务。

构成朱先生宏论的基石虽然为中国近代史的研究者们所熟悉，但他对这些问题的综合仍是独立的。他针对 20 世纪中国现代化和辛亥革命所起的作用，提出了一个重要的观点。文化、政治和经济发展之间的互动关系仍然是一个值得进一步研究的广阔领域，朱先生的范例所提出的这些问题，在未来相当长时间内，将启迪该领域内研究者的灵感。

美国加州大学台维斯分校教授 普莱斯



## Preface

Don.C.Price

I well remember the words of my teacher John Fairbank, who warned his students, " Chinese scholars will always know a great deal more about their history than you will." One of his most brilliant students, Mary Wright, a senior colleague and mentor to me, complained that in using the Chinese language she always felt like a cripple and always insisted that her students take every opportunity to learn the language better than she had. In my own generation, graduate students had better opportunities, but most of us Americans still feel at a severe disadvantage in their study of Chinese history.

So it is with considerable uncertainty about my qualifications for the task that I undertake to write this Preface. If I dare to do so, it is because I have been able to pursue one aspect of the 1911 Revolution in depth, and because Mr. Zhu Zongzhen raises very broad questions in which comparative perspectives are important, and when it comes to comparative questions, none of us are experts about everything, and there is plenty of disagreement. It is, of

course, always gratifying to see agreement between the views of foreign scholars and those of their Chinese colleagues. Of course, the Chinese colleagues don't always agree among themselves, and their debates continue to be a major 启发 and source of information for us outsiders.

These thoughts come to mind as I recall my first encounter with Mr. Zhu in 1981 at the international conference on the 70th anniversary of the 辛亥革命 in Wuchang. On that occasion he expressed the view that Song Jiaoren (my special research topic) was a 议会迷. When Mr. Zhu was criticized by his Chinese colleagues for his view, I knew too little Chinese language and Chinese history to understand that it was because they thought he had "给宋氏戴上了帽子." I said that I thought he was right to stress the importance of Song's faith in parliamentary government, although I did not agree that the faith was so unrealistic. As for broad comparative questions, I also remember that there was some discussion of the question whether the 辛亥革命 should be called a 资产阶级革命. Then the French scholar Dr. Marianne Bastid stood up to point out: "法国学者现在怀疑法国革命是否一个资产阶级革命. 中国现在不给人戴帽子了. 为什么还要给革命戴帽子呢?" Here was another foreign scholar intervening in a Chinese debate. In the present volume, Mr. Zhu returns to the issue whether it is useful to characterize the 辛亥革命 as a "资产阶级革命," and points out that it is more important to understand

the many complex forces at work in that revolution than to give it a label.

Since 1981 I have met Mr. Zhu at several conferences in China, and more recently in America. We have carried on a continuous argument about the question whether the 1911 revolution could have produced the kind of constitutional government that Song Jiaoren hoped for. I have dared to disagree with Mr. Zhu's pessimistic view partly on the basis of my research on Song, and partly on the basis of my comparative perspective, which has taught me that power-sharing government arose in the West without any uniform social basis, and without any strong commitment to (not to speak of understanding of) democratic principles. After more than twenty years of disagreement, Mr. Zhu's present review of the 2001 conference papers has almost persuaded me that he is right. Neither the efforts of Song nor the comparative relevance of Western history can be properly assessed without the broad knowledge of the Chinese context that he can wield in such a debate, and Fairbank's words come back to me.

The present volume is, of course, not narrowly focused on the question whether the 1911 revolution could have succeeded. Mr. Zhu is concerned with the concrete Chinese historical context, and the ways in which it determined the course of the revolution in the 1911 era and beyond. He considers the whole range of elite political thought and, more important, habits of behavior. He

considers the continuing influence of traditional Confucian scholar and bureaucratic mentality on the economic and political developments. He considers the impact of the devolution of power in the revolution, and the nature of the new 军阀化的 military power, reflecting regional interests and personal ties and rivalries. He considers the contradiction between political thought and the real interests of the powerful individuals and groups, and finds the new political thought largely irrelevant to China's immediate realities. In all of these developments, he finds ample reason for the fall of the dynasty, but no clear class basis for the power struggles, and no solid social base for a new form of government.

The 2001 conference reflected a great advance in the extent, quality and sophistication of research on the 1911 revolution over the previous twenty years. The topic of the conference, " the 1911 revolution and twentieth century China," prompted participants to consider the long-range significance of the revolution, and their concrete research provided Mr. Zhu valuable support for his views. Beyond his commentary on the conference articles, however, Mr. Zhu draws our attention to centuries of earlier Chinese history, pointing out the difference between China's strong bureaucratic culture and the evolving political culture of the West. This is surely an important factor as we consider the question whether the 1911 revolution in China really resembled the political struggles leading to political and social modernization in the West. It is not enough

to compare the political programs of reformers and revolutionaries with the modern, foreign political ideologies they adopted. If the new ideas were not widely understood, as Sun Zhongshan himself complained, even within the political organizations that advocated them (not to speak of the powerful groups that opposed them) , and if they could not be used to mobilize a broad social base, the revolution did not really represent those programs and ideologies. Rather, the fall of the Qing more closely resembled the fall of earlier dynasties, followed by prolonged struggles between warlords with their private armies.

Under such circumstances, China was faced with the conflicting tasks of national reunification under a 中央集权, and the building of a modern social, economic and political system. Drawing on his own and others' studies of the Republican era in China, Mr. Zhu goes beyond the 1911 revolution to show the practical difficulties of this transition to modernity. Current English-language research on modern China deals with many of the issues that Mr. Zhu addresses –the difficulty of military unification, the failure of the Guomindang to mobilize popular support, or even to represent the interests of national bourgeoisie, and the continuing strength of pre-modern habits and values in the social and political realms. In many respects, this research supports his interpretation. Likewise most Western scholars, while accepting the importance of class struggle in twentieth century Chinese

history, have generally assigned equally great importance to the resilience of China's bureaucratic and Confucian culture in modern times, and they will welcome Mr. Zhu's discussion of this subject.

This is not to say that Western scholars, who disagree among themselves, will all agree with the views in the present volume. Some would not deny the elements of corruption in the Guomindang regime, and the internal contradictions within its modernizing project, but would still argue that if Japan had not invaded, it might have succeeded, even without popular mobilization. But even they do not contend that success would have been likely. Most recently others will contend that by the end of the twentieth century, forms of modernity around the world have proved to be so diverse, and so changeable, that the concept of modernization itself is no longer very useful. At an abstract theoretical level this may be true. It does not, however, constitute a very important problem for Mr. Zhu's interpretation. The goals of Chinese revolutionaries and reformers at the time of the 1911 revolution—social and political democracy, and national strength and prosperity based on modern technology—remained the goals throughout the twentieth century. They were sufficiently clear that it remains an important and useful task to understand the obstacles to their attainment.

The building blocks of Mr. Zhu's grand synthesis will be familiar to students of modern Chinese history. But his synthesis of

these issues remains his own. He offers an important perspective on the problems of modernization in twentieth century China, and of the role played by the 1911 revolution. The interplay between culture, politics and economic development remains a rich field for further research, and the paradigm that Mr. Zhu proposes has raised the kinds of questions that should inspire such research for years to come.

## 前 言

我从1973年起，参加中国社会科学院近代史研究所民国史研究室的工作，前5年因还处在“文革”结束前后的政治运动时期，工作做得很少。1978年起，开始专题研究民国初年的历史，1986年后除继续研究民初历史外，又开始研究抗战结束后的民国史。我之所以这样选择，除了民国史研究工作的需要以外，就是希望在大视野下，进行专题研究，通过专题研究，加深对历史真相的了解，而以宽广的视野，来理解历史的演变，也由此理解具体历史事变在历史发展中的地位。

历史很难研究，即使有一点体会，要进行证明，也非常耗费时间。我虽然有许多想法，但很难在文章中一一进行证明。有一些看法，因为发表的原因，也不便写入文章或著作之中。我一直希望在专题研究有相当基础之后，对自己的研究心得作一系统总结。主要是要写出自己对20世纪中国历史发展的理解。当然，一个人的精力有限，我一无学生，二无助手，无法对自己希望深入了解的问题都作相应的研究。所以，一直在考虑用什么方式来实现自己的愿望。我一度希望以10年时间，来完成一本专著。但一则我正在进行的整理黄炎培日记的工作，十分耗费时间，一时也腾不出手来。二则，我已过了耳顺之年，谁知天还能假我几多时间？三则，我已退休，本来比较



好的工作条件已经不复存在。由于收入有限，住房困难，没有书房存放图书资料，20箱图书资料还存放在近代史所的库房里，无法利用。只好另想办法。

我参加了1981年和1991年在武汉举行的纪念辛亥革命国际学术讨论会。但2001年的辛亥革命讨论会，我提交的论文被淘汰，什么理由，我至今不知道。章开沅教授在本次会议上重申：“我在80年代中期曾发表《辛亥革命研究如何深入》一文，提出上下延伸与横向会通问题，希望加强长时段研究并且扩大研究视野。”<sup>①</sup>我为会议提供的论文《辛亥革命的动员模式和国民党失败的历史命运》，就是按照这一思路，以上述的专题研究为基础写作的。可惜，不知道哪一环节存在问题，仍被会议所淘汰。现附于书末，读者自有公断。由于未能参加会议，也就难以与学者们交流，因此也刺激我要去全面了解这次会议的学术成果。

2003年1月，我到美国探亲。这样，一则我就有了闲暇的时间，二则住在美国的一个小镇上，没有什么图书资料可供研究工作之用。正好这次会议的论文集《辛亥革命与20世纪的中国》出版不久，我就决心带在身边，仔细阅读，写一本读书笔记。一方面学习同人们的研究成果，一方面，讨论他们的

---

① 《在纪念辛亥革命90周年国际学术讨论会开幕式上的致词》，中国史学会编：《辛亥革命与20世纪的中国》上册，第23页，中央文献出版社2002年8月第1版。本书系纪念辛亥革命90周年国际学术讨论会的论文集，以下简称《论文集》。