Front. Hist. China 2014, 9(4): 534–557
DOI 10.3868/s020-003-014-0037-2

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Elisabeth Forster

From Academic Nitpicking to a "New Culture Movement": How Newspapers Turned Academic Debates into the Center of "May Fourth"

Abstract In early 1919, people like Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu were regarded as members of an ivory-tower "academic faction" (*xuepai*), embroiled in a debate with an opposing "faction." After the May Fourth demonstrations, they were praised as the stars of a "New Culture Movement." However, it was not obvious how the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu was associated with the May Fourth demonstrations. This link hinged on the way in which newspapers like *Shenbao* reported about the academic debates and the political events of May Fourth. After compartmentalizing the debating academics into fixed *xuepai*, *Shenbao* ascribed warlord-political allegiances to them. These made the Hu-Chen circle look like government victims and their "factional" rivals like the warlords' allies. When the atmosphere became hostile to the government during May Fourth, Hu Shi's "faction" became associated with the equally victimized May Fourth demonstrators. Their ideas were regarded as (now popular) expressions of anti-government sentiment, and soon this was labeled the core of the "New Culture Movement." The idea and rhetoric of China's "New Culture Movement" in this way emerged out of the fortuitous concatenation of academic debates, newspaper stories, and political events.

Keywords May Fourth Movement, New Culture Movement, *Shenbao*, academic factions (*xuepai*), Chinese newspapers

Introduction

In this article, I explore the role newspapers like *Shenbao* (Shanghai News) played in moving academics such as Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu into the center of the May Fourth Movement, thereby constructing a picture of May Fourth and New Culture that has remained popular until the present day.

The expression "New Culture Movement" (*xin wenhua yundong*) was only

Elisabeth Forster (✉)
Faculty of History, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX1 2RL, United Kingdom
E-mail: elisabeth.forster@history.ox.ac.uk

invented in the months following upon the May Fourth demonstrations of 1919.[1] Before that, ideas like *baihua* ("plain language") that would later be called "New Culture" were already advocated by a circle of scholars around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu. These scholars were mostly based at Beijing University ("Beida"). However, newspapers like *Shenbao* regarded this as the irrelevant nitpicking of an "academic faction" (*xuepai*), which they called the "New Faction" (*xinpai*). This "New Faction" was embroiled in a squabble with an opposing "faction," the "Old Faction" (*jiupai*). By this, *Shenbao* was referring to another group of academics at Beida around Huang Kan and Liu Shipei. On the eve of the May Fourth demonstrations, in April of 1919, *Shenbao* even diagnosed the imminent end of the "New Faction"; it had already been "elbowed out" of Beida by their rival "Old Faction," and ideas like *baihua* would soon become irrelevant to Chinese culture.[2] However, after the May Fourth demonstrations, the "Old Faction," both as a designation and as the individuals subsumed under it, had virtually disappeared from *Shenbao*'s view. The circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, on the other hand, was now identified as the "center" of the newly invented expression "New Culture Movement."[3]

The timing of this image upgrade suggests that May Fourth was instrumental. By "May Fourth," I refer to the demonstrations that started in Beijing on May 4, 1919, and then spread to other cities in China, and by "New Culture," I mean the cluster of *baihua*, science and democracy, Marxism, and so on. The connection between May Fourth and New Culture, however, was not obvious. As Fabio Lanza has argued, scholarship has addressed the question if the two were identical. Some, like Vera Schwarcz and Li Zehou, postulated that "New Culture" and "May Fourth" were two separate events, one about "enlightenment" the other one about "national salvation."[4] Others have claimed that May Fourth and New Culture shared common themes. For example, May Fourth made the New Culture agenda of writing in *baihua* more plausible, because student demonstrators started communicating with the "common people," and *baihua* was a good tool to do so.[5]

However, the situation was even more complicated than that, and both positions leave too many questions open. First of all, contemporaries in 1919 were both

---

[1] Tse-tsung Chow, *The May Fourth Movement: Intellectual Revolution in Modern China*, 195; Zheng Shiqu, "Wusi hou guanyu 'xin wenhua yundong' de taolun," 7; Elisabeth Kaske, *The Politics of Language in Chinese Education, 1895–1919*, 458. This is also indicated by searches in the following databases: "Quanguo baokan suoyin," "Shenbao 1872–1949," and "Zhongguo guojia shuzi tushuguan (Minguo zhuanlan)." According to Ouyang Junxi, one of its earliest mentions was on August 31, 1919, in the journal *Weekly Review* (*Xingqi pinglun*). See Ouyang Junxi, "Guomindang yu xin wenhua yundong," 73.

[2] Xin Wei, "Dongjing tongxin: Riben ren zhi Jiaozhouwan chufen guan," April 25, 1919.

[3] Ye Yun, "Ji Beijing Daxue shiyeshi (xu)," September 15, 1920.

[4] Fabio Lanza, "Of Chronology, Failure, and Fidelity," 54.

[5] Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 178; Jeffrey N. Wasserstrom, *Student Protests in Twentieth-Century China: The View from Shanghai*, 204–5.

convinced and surprised that May Fourth had promoted the cause of ideas like *baihua*. The Jiangsu Educational Association, a semi-official government institution in charge of educational politics, claimed in October of 1919 that the "New Culture Movement continued the May Fourth Movement."[6] For a young teacher in Shanghai who went by the name of Jing Guan, debating "New Faction"-style ideas was equivalent to demonstrating during May Fourth. He reported in 1920 that he approved of the student protests of May Fourth. However, in his capacity as a teacher, he felt unable—maybe too dignified—to go onto the streets and demonstrate. Consequently, he and his colleagues started "researching the question of the new woman." By "new woman," Jing Guan referred to an ideal of emancipated women, who were free from what was regarded as stifling Confucian family morals. This idea was supported by the group labeled the "New Faction" and would later be considered part of the New Culture Movement. Jing Guan felt that in this, he and his colleagues were just like Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, and that this was as valuable an anti-government protest as taking to the streets and demonstrating.[7] These contemporary opinions deny the possibility of treating May Fourth and New Culture as unconnected.

However, at the same time, contemporaries were also surprised about the connection between the two, and this challenges the position that May Fourth and New Culture shared an obvious agenda. The intellectual Li Jinxi, for example, remembered that he "did not expect" that May Fourth would have implications for culture.[8] Immediately after the start of the demonstrations, contemporaries did not even associate the demonstrations with Beida. Instead, they talked about how "students of schools in Beijing" were protesting, not about how "Beida" was protesting.[9] Moreover, it was not apparent at all why May Fourth should favor the "New Faction" over the "Old Faction." Hu Shi was classified as "New Faction" and the translator Lin Shu was, as I show below, associated with the "Old Faction." However, officially they expressed the same opinion on the student protests: They approved of the patriotic spirit of the demonstrations, but despised the idea of students acting publicly outside of the classroom.[10]

Moreover, New Culture-style ideas were held by people other than Beida's academics, and if demonstrators had developed an interest in those ideas, they would not have needed to turn to Hu Shi or Chen Duxiu. For instance, Wei

---

[6] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, "Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao, tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu," 25.
[7] Jing Guan, "Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi," 31–32.
[8] Li Jinxi, *Guoyu yundong shigang*, 137.
[9] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, "Kaihui jilu (May)," 21. Similarly in "Bake zhong zhi Jing xuejie xiaoxi," May 23, 1919.
[10] Hu Shi and Jiang Menglin, "Women duiyu xuesheng de xiwang," 93–97; Zhang Juncai, *Lin Shu pingzhuan*, 241; Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 119. For a discussion of this opinion in a broader historical context, see Fabio Lanza, *Behind the Gate: Inventing Students in Beijing*, 127.

Tingsheng, at the time a master's student at Harvard, held very similar ideas about *baihua* as Hu Shi.[11] *Baihua* and the closely related *guoyu* ("national language") were promoted by other, even state-sponsored, groups, such as the Committee for Research on the National Language.[12] Besides, as Edward Gunn and Shi Shumei have argued, the *baihua* suggested by the circle around Hu Shi was so Westernized and Japanized that it was as incomprehensible to the "common people" as *wenyan* (Classical Chinese).[13]

That the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu should nevertheless come to be regarded as the "center" of the "New Culture Movement that continued the May Fourth Movement" hinged on the reportage of newspapers like *Shenbao*.[14] *Shenbao* had first framed these academics and their opponents as competing "academic factions" and then positioned the "factions" in relation to warlord politics. In 1919, China was technically a republic, but *de facto* ruled by warlords. These were local military rulers who were continuously weaving plots against each other in an attempt to rule the "republic." After compartmentalizing the debating academics at Beida into fixed "academic factions" (the "New" and the "Old Faction"), *Shenbao* ascribed warlord allegiances to them. The result was that the "Old Faction" looked like government allies and the "New Faction" like government opponents, who had been bullied by the warlords for years. When the atmosphere became hostile to the government during the May Fourth demonstrations, the "New Faction" became associated with the equally victimized May Fourth demonstrators, and their ideas came to be regarded as (now popular) expressions of anti-government sentiment. Increasing numbers of people promoted ideas they claimed to be standing in the tradition of the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, and soon this was labeled the "New Culture Movement."

This argument breaks through a discourse that has long shaped academic narratives about the New Culture Movement. As Milena Doleželová-Velingerová and David Der-wei Wang have pointed out, this discourse was shaped by people who were themselves involved in the New Culture Movement.[15] This sort of reportage by participants has claimed that the New Culture Movement was a watershed moment between "old" and "modern" China, and driven by visionary

---

[11] Li Jinxi, *Guoyu xue jiangyi*, shang, 29–30.

[12] Li, *Guoyu yundong shigang*, 133–34.

[13] Edward M. Gunn, *Rewriting Chinese: Style and Innovation in Twentieth-Century Chinese Prose*, 217–96; Shumei Shi, *The Lure of the Modern: Writing Modernism in Semicolonial China, 1917–1937*, 71.

[14] Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, "Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao, tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu," 25.

[15] See Milena Doleželová-Velingerová and David Der-wei Wang, "Introduction," 1–2; Timothy B. Weston, *The Power of Position: Beijing University, Intellectuals, and Chinese Political Culture, 1898–1929*, 9; Leo Ou-fan Lee, "Incomplete Modernity," 52–53; Lanza, *Behind the Gate*, 79; Kaske, *The Politics of Language in Chinese Education*, xii.

intellectuals like Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, who grasped the "teleologically unavoidable" trends of modernity.[16] In the last two decades, this discourse has been challenged. Attention has been drawn to the multiple versions of modernity, the complex agencies involved in their making, and the role played by people other than the New Culture stars.[17] In this article, I drive these developments further: I show how the powerful notion of the "New Culture Movement" emerged out of the fortuitous and unpredictable concatenation of actions and narratives that were originally designed with different ends in mind. I also demonstrate how individual academic fates could depend on political events and newspaper stories.

Sources

As the press gained importance at the time, newspapers provided an important perspective on the events of 1919. The sales numbers of individual publications rose, and a variety of new periodicals was founded.[18] *Shenbao*'s influence, readership, and institutional structure make it a useful case study. Shanghai-based *Shenbao* was one of the biggest newspapers and was influential in shaping notions of May Fourth and New Culture in that region. For example, when someone writing under the pseudonym Cha An published the *Chronicle of the Student Protests* (*Xuejie fengchao ji*) in September 1919 in Shanghai, he almost literally repeated *Shenbao* articles.[19] *Shenbao* was printed in Shanghai, and what I say in this article therefore mainly applies to the Shanghai/ Jiangsu region.[20] However, *Shenbao*'s reportage also reflected narratives in other parts of North China, the domain of the Beiyang Government. *Shenbao* was read supra-regionally. It had a postal service, and appeared on the reading lists of students in Beijing.[21] Moreover, *Shenbao*'s stories chimed with the reportage of newspapers in other parts of the country. To show this, I additionally cite newspapers that came from different

[16] Weston, *The Power of Position*, 9. Weston does not support, but describe, this discourse.
[17] David Der-wei Wang, *Fin-de-Siècle Splendor: Repressed Modernities of Late Qing Fiction, 1849–1911*; David Der-wei Wang, "Return to Go," 257–95; Susan Daruvala, *Zhou Zuoren and an Alternative Chinese Response to Modernity*; Lydia Liu, *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity–China, 1900–1937*; Peng Peng, *Yanjiu xi yu wusi shiqi xin wenhua yundong: yi 1920 nian qianhou wei zhongxin*; Barbara Mittler, *A Newspaper for China?: Power, Identity, and Change in Shanghai's News Media, 1872–1912*, 284–89.
[18] Weston, *The Power of Position*, 163–68; Wang Runian, *Yuwang de xiangxiang: 1920–1930 niandai Shenbao guanggao de wenhua shi yanjiu*, 69; Lee, "Incomplete Modernity," 52.
[19] Cha An, *Xuejie fengchao ji*, shang, 7–9.
[20] Mittler, *A Newspaper for China?*, 3–4; Qiu Shihuang, Wu Xinxun, and Xiang Chunwu, eds., "Shenbao."
[21] "Chuban jie xiaoxi," March 31, 1925; Zong Jingdu, "Contemporary Drama of China," 3.
Washington, D.C. I would like to thank Paul Bevan for his comments at the Joint East Asian Studies Conference, in September 2013 at the University of Nottingham.

political and ideological quarters and regions of Beiyang China. These newspapers are the American Catholic *Social Welfare Tiensin* (*Yishi bao*) from Tianjin, the independent *Impartial* (*Dagong bao*) from Changsha, the *Public Voice* (*Gongyan bao*) of the Anfu Club (the ruling warlord clique) in Beijing, and *Morning Post* (*Chenbao*). *Chenbao* belonged to the Research Clique, a political party headed by Liang Qichao, with long-standing good relations with the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu.[22]

As Tang Xiaobing has pointed out, academic convention requires that remarks be made about the "public-sphere" debate when talking about newspapers.[23] When scholars like Rudolf Wagner, Joan Judge, or Barbara Mittler explored notions of a "public sphere" in China, they often drew upon Habermas' definition.[24] Habermas claimed that, in eighteenth-century Europe, newspapers provided a space (a "public sphere"), in which "citizens" could discuss issues of public interest independently from the state.

Scholars like Eugenia Lean, Jan Kiely, Bryna Goodman, or Tang Xiaobing have moved away from this Habermasian definition in their debates about "public sphere."[25] Inspired by Goodman's emphasis of an "interpenetration" of state and public,[26] this article is not about a separation of "state" and "public," but about assertions that academia and politics were entangled with each other. I furthermore reverse the thrust of inquiry that is usually found in explorations of a Chinese "public sphere," which often ask how a "public" participated in politics. Instead, I explore how "public opinion" about politics and politicians shaped the academic discourse and individual academic careers.

Before "May Fourth": An "Academic Faction" Doomed to Fail

The New Culture Movement has been constructed as a starting point for "modern

[22] On *Yishi bao*, see Timothy B Weston, "The Formation and Positioning of the New Culture Community, 1913–1917," 167. On *Dagong bao*, see Yu Chunmei, *Dadao wei gong: Changsha "Dagong bao" (1915–27) yu Hunan shehui sichao*, 23. On *Gongyan bao*, see Andrew J. Nathan, *Peking Politics, 1918–1923: Factionalism and the Failure of Constitutionalism*, 147. On *Chenbao* and the Research Clique, see Peng Peng, *Yanjiu xi yu wusi shiqi xin wenhua yundong*, 207, 212.

[23] Tang Xiaobing, *Xiandai Zhongguo de gongong yulun: yi "Dagong bao" "xingqi lunwen" he "Shenbao" "ziyoutan,"* 2.

[24] Rudolf Wagner, "The Role of the Foreign Community in the Chinese Public Sphere," 424–43; Joan Judge, "Public Opinion and the New Politics of Contestation in the Late Qing, 1904–1911," 64–91; Mittler, *A Newspaper for China?*, 6.

[25] Eugenia Lean, *Public Passions: The Trial of Shi Jianqiao and the Rise of Popular Sympathy in Republican China*, 10; Kiely cited in Ibid., 7; Tang Xiaobing, *Xiandai Zhongguo de gongong yulun*, 2–4; Bryna Goodman, *Native Place, City, and Nation: Regional Networks and Identities in Shanghai, 1853–1937*, 120.

[26] Goodman, *Native Place, City, and Nation*, 120.

China."[27] However, up until early 1919, newspapers like *Shenbao* regarded ideas like *baihua* as part of an ivory-tower academic argument, held by a small group of students and professors at Beida. Among them were Hu and Chen, as well as their students Fu Sinian and Luo Jialun, who expressed their ideas in the journals *New Youth* (*Xin qingnian*) and *New Tide* (*Xinchao*). The circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu was even vehemently attacked by disagreeing academics at Beida. They rallied around Liu Shipei and Huang Kan, opposed ideas like *baihua* in favor of *wenyan*, and publicized their ideas in the journal *National Heritage* (*Guogu*). When *Shenbao* occasionally reported on these debates, it called the opposing professors and students "academic factions," and indicated that they had little relevance to society. The circle around Hu Shi was designated "New Faction" and the one around Liu Shipei "Old Faction."[28] In this assessment, *Shenbao* was seconded by the newspapers *Gongyan bao*, *Yishi bao*, *Beijing New Post* (*Beijing xinbao*), and *Government by the People Daily* (*Minzhi ribao*).[29]

The academics at Beida had an ambiguous relationship to this classification. Liu Shipei wrote an angry letter to *Gongyan bao*, denying both the existence of "factions" and the idea that *National Heritage* was incompatible with *New Tide*.[30] However, the academics themselves had provided the blueprint for the newspaper classification through their polemics. The authors of *New Tide* scolded the *National Heritage* writers for "sticking to the deficient and fragmentary," that is, for being conservatives. The *National Heritage* writers called the *New Tide* contributors murderers of the past.[31] In March 1918, Qian Xuantong ("New Faction") had created for *New Youth* a fictional character named Wang Jingxuan, who attacked the "New Faction" and criticized their ideas.[32] According to Michael Gibbs Hill, the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu could not believe their luck when the famous translator and veteran intellectual Lin Shu started attacking *baihua* advocates in public in February and March of 1919, and thus became "the living incarnation of Wang Jingxuan."[33]

---

[27] Daruvala, *Zhou Zuoren and an Alternative Chinese Response to Modernity*; Rana Mitter, *A Bitter Revolution: China's Struggle with the Modern World*; Peng Peng, *Yanjiu xi yu wusi shiqi xin wenhua yundong*.

[28] Jing Guan, "Beijng Daxue xin jiu zhi anchao," March 6, 1919.

[29] "Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang," March 18, 1919; Yun Chao, "Lun daxue xin jiu zhi zheng," April 7, 1919; Yi Sheng, "Zuijin zhi xueshu xinchao," 107; Wang, "Xin jiu sichao pingyi," 107. The *Gongyan bao* story almost literally repeated the *Shenbao* article.

[30] Liu Shipei, "Liu Shipei zhi Gongyan bao han," March 24, 1919; Guogu yuekan she, "Liu Shipei zhi Gongyan bao han," March 24, 1919.

[31] Fu Sinian, "Mao Zishui 'Guogu he kexue de jingshen' shiyu," 1259; Zhang Xuan, "Bo Xinchao guogu he kexue de jingshen pian," 2A.

[32] Wang Jingxuan, "Wang Jingxuan jun laixin."

[33] Michael Gibbs Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.: Translation and the Making of Modern Chinese Culture*, 220–21.

Lin Shu's attacks took the form of open letters and two short stories published in newspapers, and they drew media attention to the debates at Beida.[34] In this context, stories started emerging, which entangled the intellectual discussions with warlord politics. *Shenbao* did not create these stories, but it repeated them, often with the *caveat* that these were just rumors. In March 1919, *Shenbao* observed that Lin Shu was siding with the group of academics the paper had described as "Old Faction." It also repeated a rumor that the government had ordered the principal of Beida, Cai Yuanpei, to dismiss the "New Faction" members Hu Shi, Chen Duxiu, and Qian Xuantong.[35]

On April 5, 1919, this story became more specific. Lin Shu, *Shenbao* claimed now without any *caveats* about rumors, had persuaded Zhang Yuanqi to threaten Minister of Education Fu Zengxiang with "impeachment" if he did not dismiss Cai Yuanpei immediately.[36] As a censor in the Suzheng ting (肅政廳), a censorial bureau of the Beiyang Government, Zhang Yuanqi could "impeach" ministers who had engaged in illegal actions.[37] Twenty days later, *Shenbao* repeated this story. Now Zhang Yuanqi had already "impeached" the minister, and Cai Yuanpei had already "taken the blame and [offered] his resignation." When *Shenbao* declared the "Old Faction" winners of the debates in April 1919, it was not because the "Old Faction's" arguments were so convincing, but because Lin Shu had "dragged in politics."[38]

When reporting these stories, *Shenbao* journalists or other authors often employed a tentative tone and explained that they were repeating "rumors" (*chuanshuo* or *yaoyan*)[39] that were "circulating widely" (*shengchuan*).[40] Sometimes the academics at Beida sought to downplay such stories. But even when they rejected a rumor, it would sometimes seem to be merely official rhetoric. For example, Hu Shi stated on March 10 in *Beijing University Daily* (*Beijing daxue rikan*) that plans to dismiss him and Chen Duxiu were "all unfounded rumors."[41] Nevertheless, Cai Yuanpei dismissed Chen Duxiu on April 10, 1919.[42] This suggested that the previous refutations were untrue. It is therefore difficult to distinguish fact from fiction.

Scholars have analyzed the provenance of these stories and speculated about

---

[34] Lin Shu, "Da daxue tang xiaozhang Cai Heqing taishi shu," 106–12; Lin Shu, "Yaomeng," 214–16; Lin Shu, "Jing Sheng," 488–90.
[35] Jing, "Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao."
[36] "Jinghua duanjian," April 5, 1919.
[37] Yu Lunian, "Suzheng ting"; Xu Youchun, ed., "Zhang Yuanqi."
[38] Xin, "Riben ren zhi Jiaozhouwan chufenguan."
[39] "Chen Duxiu beibu," June 15, 1919; Li Dazhao, "Xin jiu sichao zhi jizhan," 144.
[40] "Jing xuejie you fasheng da wenti," May 15, 1919.
[41] Wang Guangyuan, *Chen Duxiu nianpu 1879–1942*, 61.
[42] Ibid., 64.

their truthfulness. While some scholars have judged them relatively credible,[43] others have decried them as fabrications.[44] The point, however, is not what really happened in March and April of 1919, but what a newspaper like *Shenbao* claimed to be happening. This, after all, was the information contemporaries were receiving. *Shenbao*, however, with increasing conviction held that Lin Shu and the "Old Faction" were plotting with the government to oust the "New Faction," and people interested in this could read it everywhere in the spring of 1919.[45] Someone reading *Shenbao* before May Fourth must have therefore regarded the situation of what was called the "New Faction" as bleak.

Turning Point: "May Fourth"

Half a year later, at the end of 1919, this situation was reversed. The "Old Faction," as an entity and as the individuals categorized under it, virtually disappeared from the gaze of newspapers, journals and their readers. People previously described as "New Faction" were upgraded into the "center" of a "New Culture Movement,"[46] an expression that started appearing in print in the late summer of 1919.[47] Numerous local intellectuals and students now started discussing the "New Culture Movement," and a veritable star cult around the Movement's avowed "center," Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, was created in the press.[48] In the second half of 1919 and in 1920, many journals in the style of *New Youth* or *New Tide* were founded, which promoted New Culture ideas and wrote in *baihua*.[49] Moreover, in the same year the Ministry of Education made *guoyu* a compulsory subject for the first two years of primary school. This replaced the subject of *guowen* (lit. "national written language," that is, *wenyan*).[50]

According to Rudolf Wagner, the designation "movement" became hugely

[43] Weston, *The Power of Position*, 171–75; Vera Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment: Intellectuals and the Legacy of the May Fourth Movement of 1919*, 53.
[44] Zhang, *Lin Shu pingzhuan*, 223; Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 221.
[45] Chen Duxiu, "Lin Shu de liusheng jiqi," 192; Li, "Xin jiu sichao zhi jizhan"; Cha, *Xuejie fengchao ji*, shang 7–9.
[46] Ye, "Ji Beijing daxue shiyeshi (xu)."
[47] See footnote 1.
[48] Zhu Daihen, "Ni yu tongxiang mou jun taolun xin wenhua yundong shixing fangfa shu," 36–38; Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui, "Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao, tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu"; "Yanshuo jingjin hui yanti zhi jieshi," November 2, 1919; "Hu Shi zuori di Hu," May 21, 1927.
[49] Miao Jinyuan, "Suowei 'xin wenhua yundong' de chachao yu pochan," October 20, 1920, 2; Li, *Guoyu yundong shigang*, 137; see also Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 178; Wen-hsin Yeh, *Provincial Passages: Culture, Space, and the Origins of Chinese Communism*, 161.
[50] David Der-Wei Wang, "Chinese Literature from 1841 to 1937," 466; Ping Chen, *Modern Chinese: History and Sociolinguistics*, 22.

popular after the May Fourth demonstrations and many events were declared to be "movements."[51] One motivation for calling New Culture a "movement" may have therefore been to follow a popular trend. Moreover, the label "movement" pointed beyond the narrow classification of Hu Shi's circle as an "academic faction." A "faction of learning" had been something whose relevance was confined to the ivory tower. A "movement," however, was considered to have broad social relevance.[52] Moreover, as soon as people started referring to ideas like *baihua* as a "movement," they also stopped talking about equally strong rivals. In sum, being called the "center of the New Culture Movement" indicated that the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu were considered the winners of the debates.[53]

As pointed out above, the connection between "New Faction" and May Fourth was not obvious. Instead, it hinged on the way *Shenbao* was constructing the debates at Beida. The May Fourth demonstrations were of course primarily directed against Japan. However, May Fourth was also a protest against the government, which was held responsible for signing treaties that had "sold" the formerly German regions in Shandong to Japan, rather than returning them to China. Consequently, some government members were labeled "country-selling traitors," and the atmosphere in China's urban centers became strongly anti-government.

Cai Yuanpei's Resignation in Three "Acts"

In this situation, Cai Yuanpei, the principal of Beida, resigned. In the night of May 9, 1919, he secretly packed up his belongings in his office at Beida and at 5:30 am sneaked out of Beijing.[54] The next day, Beida woke up and was shocked to find their principal gone. Over the next few weeks, representatives of Beida sent countless letters to his abode, first in Tianjin, then in Shanghai, asking him to return to his post. But Cai Yuanpei remained unmoved. His resignation caused a media storm all across the country.[55] In this way, it provided an important catalyst for connecting the academic discourse at Beida with the political

[51] Rudolf G. Wagner, "The Canonization of May Fourth," 71.
[52] Ibid., 78.
[53] Ye, "Ji Beijing daxue shiyeshi (xu)."
[54] Cha, *Xuejie fengchao ji*, shang, 8; Cai Yuanpei, *Cai Yuanpei riji*, 253.
[55] For reports on Cai Yuanpei's resignation, see *Dagong bao*, see "Jing xuejie you fasheng da wenti"; "Beijing jiaoyu jie xiaoxi xu wen," May 20, 1919. *Yishi bao*: "Beijing xuesheng fu Cai Zimin liang dian," December 7, 1919; "Daxue xiaozhang zhi cizhi," May 10, 1919. *Gongyan bao*: "Cai Zimin dumen yangke," June 20, 1919; "Cai Yuanpei zhi xingxing zhizhi," May 28, 1919.

activism of the May Fourth demonstrations, and for turning the "New Faction" into the "center of the New Culture Movement."[56]

One way in which this happened was that newspapers reported about Cai's resignation and the May Fourth demonstrations together. *Yishi bao*, for example, launched a column with the title "Citizens' Diplomatic Fights," where it reported about Cai's resignation next to articles on the "Shandong question."[57] Moreover, newspapers also reinforced the warlord-politics polarization of Beida's academic debates. When a *Shenbao* reporter with the pseudonym Shuang Yu reported on Cai's departure on May 13, 1919, *Shenbao*'s version of the rumors changed in a way that made Cai Yuanpei and the "New Faction" look even more as if they were the victims of the government. At the same time, the "Old Faction" increasingly appeared to be associates of the "country-selling traitors."[58] This story was apparently believed by interested circles, since it was repeated almost literally in Cha An's *Chronicle of the Student Protests*, and similarly described by other newspapers in Beijing, Tianjin, and Changsha.[59]

First of all, *Shenbao* made Cai Yuanpei into a spokesperson for the "New Faction." When the quarrel between the circles around Hu Shi and Liu Shipei was boiling up in spring of 1919, Cai Yuanpei repeated over and over again that he did not favor any one "faction," but endorsed *jianrong bingbao* (兼容並包). This has been translated as "broad-minded tolerance," and praised as his most visionary educational policy.[60] In practice, it meant that Cai had employed scholars who then found themselves opposed as the "New" and the "Old Faction."[61] *Jianrong bingbao* notwithstanding, *Shenbao* regularly displayed Cai Yuanpei as the defender of the "New Faction." *Jianrong bingbao* almost seemed to be a formula designed as a defense of his refusal to dismiss the "New Faction" from Beida.[62] In short, Cai Yuanpei and the "New Faction" must have appeared to be the same to *Shenbao* readers.

Shenbao's reporter Shuang Yu then described Cai Yuanpei's resignation as a gradual fall in three "acts" (*mu*) that "shook" Cai's position.[63] In all these acts, Cai

---

[56] Ye, "Ji Beijing daxue shiyeshi (xu)."
[57] "Daxue xiaozhang zhi cizhi"; "Shandong wenti yi jiejue," May 10, 1919. See also, "Xuejie fengchao you qi," October 5, 1919.
[58] Shuang Yu, "Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai," May 13, 1919.
[59] Cha, *Xuejie fengchao ji*, shang, 7–9; "Jing xuejie you fasheng da wenti"; "Jiaoyu zongzhang zhi zhulu," May 20, 1919; "Daxue xiaozhang zhi cizhi." *Chenbao* from May 13, 1919, cited in Xie Yuanxue, *Zhongguo gongchandang lishi jishi*, 734.
[60] Weston, *The Power of Position*, 123; Chen Pingyuan, *Touches of History: An Entry into "May Fourth" China*, 154.
[61] Li Fan, "Liu Shipei yu Beijing daxue," 111.
[62] Shuang, "Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai."
[63] Ibid.

Yuanpei was bullied by the ruling warlord-clique, Anfu Club, and by its head, the warlord Duan Qirui. The story read: After installing a new government in Beijing in August 1918, Duan Qirui tried to oust Cai Yuanpei, by pinning an anarchist publication on him. Although Cai Yuanpei was rescued by Minister of Education Fu Zengxiang, this event "shook" his position for the first time.[64] The second "act" was the student demonstrations that flared up in May 1918. They opposed the Sino-Japanese Military Mutual Assistance Conventions, which Duan Qirui's government had signed, and which allowed Japanese military to be stationed on Chinese territory.[65] People in the government, *Shenbao* claimed, saw these protests as another welcome excuse to dismiss Cai Yuanpei.[66] In this case, however, Cai was saved by the Zhili Clique, a warlord faction in rivalry with Duan Qirui's Anfu Club. The Zhili Clique apparently saw this as another opportunity to oppose the Anfu Club.[67] In other words, before May Fourth *Shenbao* had claimed that only Lin Shu had polarized the debates politically. Now it argued that the government's hostility towards the "New Faction" was a long-standing and deeply ingrained problem.

The third "act" that "shook" Cai's position was the academic disputes at Beida, which *Shenbao* had identified as the squabble between "Old" and "New Faction" in spring of 1919. So far, *Shenbao*'s story had only depicted Cai Yuanpei as the government's victim. With the third "act," it also associated the "Old Faction" with the "country-selling traitors." In March, *Shenbao* had claimed that Lin Shu had contacted Censor Zhang Yuanqi in defense of the "Old Faction." Now *Shenbao* claimed that Lin Shu had reached out to Xu Shuzheng, a warlord in the Anfu Club who was widely labeled "country-selling traitor."[68]

Shenbao did not flesh out what Xu Shuzheng's intervention at Beida looked like. But in this context scholars like Vera Schwarcz, Chen Sihe, Wang Feng, and Gao Pingshu have cited an apologetic letter by Minister of Education Fu Zengxiang to Cai Yuanpei from March 26, 1919. It said that some "elderly people" in the government were criticizing Cai, and that it would only cause trouble if the dispute between "Old" and "New Faction" would continue to implicate political matters.[69] *Shenbao* went on to report that Cai Yuanpei

---

[64] Ibid. Similar in Cha, *Xuejie fengchao ji*, shang, 8.

[65] Zhongping Chen, "The May Fourth Movement and Provincial Warlords," 140.

[66] Shuang, "Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai."

[67] Weston, *The Power of Position*, 200; Shuang, "Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai"; Chen, "The May Fourth Movement and Provincial Warlords."

[68] Shuang, "Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai." For Xu Shuzheng being labeled "country-selling traitor," see "Wu yue qi ri zhi guomin dahui," May 8, 1919 in *Shenbao*; or similarly in *Dagong bao* "Xu Shuzheng fandui jujue qianzi," November 7, 1919.

[69] Gao Pingshu, *Cai Yuanpei nianpu*, 186. See also Chen Sihe, "Xu Shuzheng yu xin wenhua yundong," 277; Wang Guohua, *Xuelin sui hua: 1919 nian–2009 nian de Zhongguo wenren jianying*, 148; Wang Feng, "Wusi qianhou de Lin Shu," 29; Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 53. It is unclear where this letter was first published. The above works only cite from an "original of the letter by Fu Zengxiang."

rejected any government intervention. This, however, enraged the government. Ideas were forged to "topple" (*dao*) Cai Yuanpei, and the Premier Qian Nengxun even let himself be carried away, in wondering: "If Mr. Cai was dead, would the University [not] be manageable?"[70] At around the same time, *Dagong bao* in Changsha told a story that was "widely circulating," according to which "a certain general" wanted to burn down Beida.[71] *Chenbao* had "certain news" that Cai Yuanpei had received death threats, and that he had "heard" about schemes to "burn down" Beida.[72]

The May Fourth demonstrations then were, in the *Shenbao* narrative, Cai Yuanpei's downfall. However, they also brought him and the "New Faction," which he defended, to the center of the political events of May Fourth. When several Beida students were arrested for demonstrating, *Shenbao* wrote, Cai Yuanpei employed all his authority to free them from prison. But Cai knew that his position was no longer tenable, since pro-Japanese politicians in the government held the "New Faction" and Cai Yuanpei responsible for the demonstrations.[73] The reason was the government's alleged opinion, as *Shenbao* would later explain, that the people who had caused (intellectual) trouble over the past few months also had to be the (political) troublemakers now.[74] With the same argument in mind, *Shenbao* tied the political and academic discourses together even more tightly, when reporting on Chen Duxiu's arrest on June 15. The newspaper interpreted this arrest as the government's "continued" crackdown on the "scholars of the New Faction," because it was using them as a scapegoat for the troubles of May Fourth.[75]

It would be interesting to know if the government really made this connection or if this was just another rumor. However, just as with the earlier rumors about Lin Shu's attempts to mobilize the government, *Shenbao* readers would have seen the story, the question of its truth notwithstanding. In other words, even though there was no immediate connection between May Fourth and Hu Shi's circle, the academic and political discourses were tied together through the *Shenbao* story.

Lin Shu and the "Country-Selling Traitors"

While displaying the "New Faction" as brave government victims, the *Shenbao*

[70] Shuang, "Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai." Similar in Cha, *Xuejie fengchao ji*, shang, 9.
[71] "Jing xuejie you fasheng da wenti."
[72] *Chenbao* on May 13, 1919, cited in Xie Yuanxue, *Zhongguo gongchandang lishi jishi*, 734.
[73] Shuang, "Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai."
[74] "Chen Duxiu beibu."
[75] Ibid.

narrative put people classified as "Old Faction" dangerously close to the "country-selling traitors" of May Fourth when it claimed that Lin Shu had instigated Xu Shuzheng, rather than Censor Zhang Yuanqi, to defend the "Old Faction" at Beida. I can only speculate why the narrative changed after May Fourth. Was this an intended blow against the "Old Faction?" Or was it safe to repeat a generally circulating story about Xu Shuzheng, now that he was discredited by the May Fourth demonstrators anyway? Whatever the reason, this modified *Shenbao* story cannot have been beneficial to people depicted as "Old Faction," even though they themselves were never called "traitors."

The connection between Lin Shu and the warlord government has often been repeated in scholarship, even though, as pointed out above, some have doubted that Lin Shu really mobilized the government against the "New Faction."[76] How obvious was it for newspapers to make this connection between the "Old Faction" and the warlords? Again, it is difficult to distinguish between fact and fiction. Lin Shu and Xu Shuzheng were indeed friends, they shared the ideal of "old-style literature" (*guwen*), and Lin Shu was employed at a school founded by Xu Shuzheng, the Zhengzhi Middle School (*Zhengzhi zhongxue tang*).[77] Xu Shuzheng was, moreover, a member of the ruling warlord clique, the Anfu Club, and friends with the clique's head, Duan Qirui. It was also true that Xu was a pro-Japanese politician: In 1918 he had signed follow-up treaties to the Sino-Japanese Military Conventions, which had caused the student demonstrations of that year.[78]

However, as mentioned before, his friendship with Xu Shuzheng did not keep Lin Shu from commending the students' patriotic spirit during May Fourth.[79] Besides, academia and politics were so entangled in the 1910s that it would not have been unthinkable to construct a connection between the "New Faction" and the government as well. Cai Yuanpei had been the first minister of education of the Republic, and Hu Shi sat in government-sponsored committees that promoted *guoyu*.[80] Moreover, Liang Qichao's Research Clique, which had long supported the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, even used to be allied to the Anfu Club.[81] In short, the warlord-political polarization of "Old" and "New Faction"

---

[76] Zhang, *Lin Shu pingzhuan*, 223; Chen, "Xu Shuzheng yu xin wenhua yundong," 274; Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 221.
[77] Zhang, *Lin Shu pingzhuan*, 223; Hill, *Lin Shu, Inc.*, 21, 171, 220.
[78] Wu Xiang, "Lun Xu Shuzheng yu Wanxi junfa de xingshuai," 18; Arthur Waldron, *From War to Nationalism: China's Turning Point, 1924–1925*, 191; Huang Dexin, "Zhongri junshi xieding."
[79] Zhang, *Lin Shu pingzhuan*, 241; Chow, *The May Fourth Movement*, 119.
[80] Encyclopedia Britannica, "Cai Yuanpei"; Li, *Guoyu yundong shigang*, 144.
[81] Yuan Shuyi, ed., "Yanjiu xi"; Nathan, *Peking Politics, 1918–1923*, 239–44; Peng, "Yanjiu xi yu wusi shiqi xin wenhua yundong," 212.

needed some interpretive help from newspapers like *Shenbao*.

Victims of the Government, Unite!

While "Old" and "New Faction" were, in this way, polarized as pro- and anti-government, another group that was in the limelight of wide-spread urban attention came to regard itself as government victims—the May Fourth demonstrators. In this way, newspapers furthered the impression that the victimized "New Faction" had something in common with these demonstrators. Vera Schwarcz has pointed out that an "exhilaration of blood," that is, an excitement about being violently suppressed by the government, emerged only after the May Thirtieth demonstrations of 1925.[82] But Chen Pingyuan has cited Luo Jialun during the May Fourth demonstrations praising the students' "spirit of sacrifice" in "battling with the powers of darkness with bare hands and empty fists."[83] The students in Beijing who were arrested during the demonstrations were only in prison for a few days. However, for privileged students, even a short time in prison doubtlessly came as a shock, and the government's suppression of the students was a big topic in the press.[84] In other words, being victimized by the government was an important feature in the identity of May Fourth demonstrators.

What impression, I would like to speculate, may all this have made on someone like Jing Guan, the young teacher who claimed that his way of showing opposition to the government during May Fourth was to discuss the "question of the new woman?"[85] Since *Shenbao* and other newspapers were aimed towards, and read by, Jing Guan's social group, there is a good chance that he was a newspaper reader, maybe even a *Shenbao* reader.[86] Jing Guan would have read in the newspapers that an important part of the identity of May Fourth demonstrators was to be suppressed by the government. He would have read how Cai Yuanpei's resignation was the result of the continuous bullying by the government, because Cai had bravely defended the "New Faction." Jing Guan may have concluded that discussing "New Faction" ideas was tantamount to demonstrating against the government on the streets. It may have been for this reason that he and his colleagues "researched the question of the new woman," while his students were marching in protest. And it may have been for this reason

[82] Schwarcz, *The Chinese Enlightenment*, 153.
[83] Chen, *Touches of History*, 53.
[84] "Chajin 'fanghai zhi'an' de jihui chuban zhi jingguo," July 27, 1919; "Ge xiao xiaozhang zhi jianjue," October 5, 1919.
[85] Jing, "Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi," 32.
[86] Zong, "Contemporary Drama of China," 3; Cai, *Cai Yuanpei riji*, 254.

that it was important for him to trace the inspiration of these ideas back to Chen Duxiu and Hu Shi, when a reference to other groups would have been possible as well.[87]

Conclusion

After the May Fourth demonstrations, the group of academics whom the media had classified as "New Faction" experienced a meteoric rise in popularity among students and educators in China's urban centers. The reason was not that May Fourth and the "New Faction" had goals in common, or that May Fourth evidenced the necessity of ideas peculiar to the "New Faction." Instead, a cluster of stories surrounding Beida and the Beiyang Government went viral in the press after the resignation of Cai Yuanpei. This made the circle around Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu look as if they were the same sort of anti-government activists as the May Fourth demonstrators.

These stories had been circulating in the months preceding May Fourth, and they had claimed that Lin Shu was mobilizing his government connections to oust people like Hu and Chen from Beijing University. Before May Fourth, *Shenbao* had judged that this meant the imminent crumbling of the "New Faction" under government pressure and the victory of the "Old Faction." After May Fourth, however, the atmosphere among intellectuals in the country turned against the government. It is understandable that under these circumstances people did not want to identify with an "Old Faction," which was now even said to have connections with one of the government's "country-selling traitors." The "New Faction," however, looked as if it had something in common with the May Fourth demonstrators: According to the *Shenbao* narrative, it had been harassed by the government for a long time, and Cai Yuanpei had bravely stood up to it, although in the end the constant bullying had forced him to resign. Discussing new-style ideas and ascribing them to the constructed entity of a Beida "New Faction" therefore felt like an anti-government act.

Consequently, teacher Jing Guan in Shanghai could say that, although he did not demonstrate during May Fourth, he did discuss the "question of the new woman," just like, in his view, Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu had done. This showed equally well his patriotic spirit and participation in the May Fourth and New Culture Movements.[88] What this demonstrates is that May Fourth and New Culture were connected, not through a necessary link, but because newspapers like *Shenbao* had made disputing academics at Beida into fixed "academic

[87] Jing, "Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi," 31–32.
[88] Ibid., 31.

factions," and then ascribed political allegiances to both sides. Perceptions of allegiances had implications after May Fourth that were not anticipated earlier: Before May Fourth, they seemed to suggest the end of the "New Faction," afterwards they caused its dissolution as a "faction of learning" and the rebirth of its members as stars of a "movement."

I would like to conclude this article by drawing attention to the special role of *Shenbao*'s prediction of April of 1919, in which the newspaper claimed that the "New Faction" had lost the debate and would never again play a role in shaping Chinese culture. This prediction, which turned out to be inaccurate soon afterwards, does not only say something about the year 1919. It also speaks to the twenty-first century, in which, according to David L. Shambaugh, attempts to anticipate China's future are as popular as ever.[89] Newspapers unquestionably participate in these undertakings. On the one hand, *Shenbao*'s miscalculation points to the difficulties in making such predictions. When divining culture's future in April 1919, *Shenbao* was drawing on stories about political allegiances that they themselves were reporting. Nevertheless, it was apparently impossible for them to anticipate the life these stories would develop after May Fourth, a political event that was maybe not completely unforeseeable after the anti-Japanese demonstrations of 1918 and the long-standing nation-wide concern about the Treaty of Versailles.[90] Without wanting to commit the logical fallacy of claiming that the unpredictability of events in 1919 foretells the unpredictability of events in the future, *Shenbao*'s miscalculation of April 1919 may indicate the difficulties in assessing how a number of known factors, when thrown together, will play out.

More importantly, however, the anecdote indicates how such predictions and stories can impact reality, even though newspapers may not always be aware of creating such impacts. *Shenbao*'s stories about "academic factions" and their political polarization, which led to the miscalculation in the first place, positioned the relatively uninvolved Hu Shi at the center of May Fourth. Over the next few decades, Hu Shi and Chen Duxiu, a certain set of ideas (*baihua*, and so forth), and the demonstrations of 1919 would still be tied together and regarded as part of "modern China's" founding narratives of "New Culture" and "May Fourth." A newspaper like *Shenbao*, it would seem, had an enormous power in 1919 to shape narratives and realities, and it appears that it was not always cognizant of all the implications its constructions would have.

Acknowledgements This article is based on a chapter of my doctoral dissertation at the

[89] David L. Shambaugh, *China's Communist Party: Atrophy and Adaptation*, 170.
[90] See, for example, "Shandong wenti Zhong Ri huanwen zhi pilu," February 22, 1919.

University of Oxford, funded by the British Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC). I would like to thank my supervisor, Peter Ditmanson, for his invaluable help with my work. I am also grateful to Howard Goodman, Leigh Jenco, Liu Qian, Laura Newby, Barend ter Haar, and David Der-wei Wang for their inspirational comments on this paper.

References

Databases Used

China Reference Works Online (CNKI). Database, accessed January 28, 2014, http://gongjushu.oversea.cnki.net/oversea/default.aspx.

Duxiu. Database, accessed January 28, 2014, http://qw.duxiu.com/note.jsp.

Quanguo baokan suoyin (National index of Chinese newspapers and periodicals). Database, accessed August 1, 2013, http://www.cnbksy.com/.

Shenbao 1872–1949 (Shanghai news 1872–1949). Database, accessed October 19, 2012, http://shunpao.egreenapple.com/.

Zhongguo guojia shuzi tushuguan (Minguo zhuanlan) (National digital library of China [Republican section]). Database, accessed October 1919, 2012, http://res4.nlc.gov.cn/home/index.trs?channelid=6.

"Bake zhong zhi Jing xuejie xiaoxi" (News of the striking students in Beijing). *Shenbao* (Shanghai news). May 23, 1919.

"Beijing jiaoyu jie xiaoxi xu wen" (News about academia in Beijing, part 2). *Dagong bao* (Impartial). May 20, 1919.

"Beijing xuesheng fu Cai Zimin liang dian" (Two telegrams from the students in Beijing in reply to Cai Zimin). *Yishi bao* (Social welfare Tiensin). December 7, 1919.

"Cai Yuanpei." *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc, 2014, accessed March 21, 2014, http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/607574/Cai-Yuanpei.

Cai Yuanpei. *Cai Yuanpei riji* (Cai Yuanpei's diary), vol. 1, edited by Wang Shiru. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2010.

"Cai Yuanpei zhi xingxing zhizhi" (The whereabouts of Cai Yuanpei). *Gongyan bao* (Public voice). May 28, 1919.

"Cai Zimin dumen yangke" (Cai Yuanpei stays at home to cure his illness). *Gongyan bao* (Public voice). June 20, 1919.

Cha An. *Xuejie fengchao ji* (Chronicle of the student protests). Shanghai: Zhonghua shuju, 1919.

"Chajin 'fanghai zhi'an' de jihui, chuban zhi jingguo" (The process of prohibiting meetings and publications that 'harm the public order'). *Meizhou pinglun* (Weekly review). July 27, 1919.

Chen Duxiu. "Lin Shu de liusheng jiqi" (Lin Shu's speech machine). In *Duxiu wencun* (Selected works of Duxiu), edited by Wang Guangquan, 192. Guiyang: Guizhou jiaoyu chubanshe, 2005.

"Chen Duxiu beibu" (Chen Duxiu arrested). *Shenbao* (Shanghai news). June 15, 1919.

Chen Ping. *Modern Chinese: History and Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University

Press, 1999.
Chen Pingyuan. *Touches of History: An Entry into "May Fourth" China*. Translated by Michel Hockx. Leiden, 2011.
Chen Sihe. "Xu Shuzheng yu xin wenhua yundong" (Xu Shuzheng and the New Culture Movement). *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue yanjiu congkan* (Collection of research on modern Chinese literature), no. 3 (1996): 272–87.
Chen Zhongping. "The May Fourth Movement and Provincial Warlords: A Reexamination." *Modern China* 37, no. 2 (2011): 135–69.
Chow Tse-tsung. *The May Fourth Movement: Intellectual Revolution in Modern China*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1964.
"Chuban jie xiaoxi" (News from the publishing world). *Shenbao* (Shanghai news). March 31, 1925.
Daruvala, Susan. *Zhou Zuoren and an Alternative Chinese Response to Modernity*. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Asia Center, 2000.
"Daxue xiaozhang zhi cizhi" (The resignation of the principal of the University). *Yishi bao* (Social welfare Tiensin). May 10, 1919.
Doleželová-Velingerová, Milena, and David Der-wei Wang. "Introduction." In *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital: China's May Fourth Project*, edited by Milena Doleželová-Velingerová and Oldřich Král, 1–27. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001.
Fu Sinian. "Mao Zishui 'Guogu he kexue de jingshen' shiyu" (Editor's note on Mao Zishui's [paper] "The National Heritage and the scientific spirit"). In *Fu Sinian quanji* (Collected works of Fu Sinian), 4: 1258–59. Taibei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1980.
Gao Pingshu. *Cai Yuanpei nianpu changbian* (A chronology of Cai Yuanpei's life, extended version), vol. 2 (1917–26). Beijing: Renmin jiaoyu chubanshe, 1996.
"Ge xiao xiaozhang zhi jianjue" (The determination of the principals of all schools). *Dagong bao* (Impartial). October 5, 1919.
Goodman, Bryna. *Native Place, City, and Nation: Regional Networks and Identities in Shanghai, 1853–1937*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
Gunn Edward M. *Rewriting Chinese: Style and Innovation in Twentieth-Century Chinese Prose*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.
Guogu yuekan she. "Guogu yuekan she zhi Gongyan bao han" (A letter from the National Heritage Society to *Public voice*)." *Beijing daxue rikan* (Beijing University daily). March 24, 1919.
Hill Michael Gibbs. *Lin Shu, Inc.: Translation and the Making of Modern Chinese Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
Hu Shi, and Jiang Menglin. "Women duiyu xuesheng de xiwang" (Our hopes for the students). In *Minguo shiqi mingren tan wusi: lishi jiyi yu lishi jieshi* (Famous Republican people talk about May Fourth: Historical memories and historical explanations), edited by Yang Hu, 93–97. Fuzhou: Fujian jiaoyu chubanshe, 2011.
"Hu Shi zuori di Hu" (Hu Shi arrived in Shanghai yesterday). *Shenbao* (Shanghai news). May 21, 1927.
Huang Dexin. "Zhongri junshi xieding" (Sino-Japanese military conventions). In *Zhong wai guanxi shi cidian* (A historical dictionary of Sino-foreign relations), edited by Zhu Jieqin

and Huang Banghe. Wuhan: Hubei renmin chubanshe, 1992.

Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui. "Kaihui jilu" (Meeting minutes). *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* (The Jiangsu Educational Association monthly report), May 1919, 20–25.

———. "Kaihui jilu" (Meeting minutes). *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* (The Jiangsu Educational Association monthly report), October 1919, 41–47.

———. "Zhi zhongdeng yishang ge xuexiao, tongzhi dingqi juxing yanshuo jingjin hui shu" (Letter to all schools of a higher level than middle [schools], informing them that a date has been chosen to conduct the lecture competition). *Jiangsu sheng jiaoyu hui yuebao* (The Jiangsu Educational Association monthly report), October 1919, 18–21.

"Jiaoyu zongzhang zhi zhulu" (The minister of education's bid for power). *Dagong bao* (Impartial). May 20, 1919.

Jing Guan. "Beijng daxue xin jiu zhi anchao" (The latent trends of old and new at Beijing University). *Shenbao* (Shanghai news). March 6, 1919.

Jing Guan. "Gao xin wenhua yundong de tongzhi" (A warning to the comrades of the New Culture Movement). *Xin funü* (New woman) 1, no. 2 (1920): 31–33.

"Jing xuejie you fasheng da wenti: Beijing daxue xiaozhang chuzou" (Another big problem arises in Beijing's academia: The prinicpal of Beijing University leaves). *Dagong bao* (Impartial). May 15, 1919.

"Jinghua duanjian" (Short letters from the capital). *Shenbao* (Shanghai news). April 5, 1919.

Judge, Joan. "Public Opinion and the New Politics of Contestation in the Late Qing, 1904–11." *Modern China* 20, no. 1 (1994): 64–91.

Kaske, Elisabeth. *The Politics of Language in Chinese Education, 1895–1919*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Lanza, Fabio. *Behind the Gate: Inventing Students in Beijing*. New York; Chichester: Columbia University Press, 2010.

———. "Of Chronology, Failure, and Fidelity: When Did the May Fourth Movement End?" *Twentieth-Century China* 38, no. 1 (2013): 53–70.

Lean, Eugenia. *Public Passions: The Trial of Shi Jianqiao and the Rise of Popular Sympathy in Republican China*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2007.

Lee, Leo Ou-fan. "Incomplete Modernity: Rethinking the May Fourth Intellectual Project." In *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital: China's May Fourth Project*, edited by Milena Doleželová-Velingerová and Oldřich Král, 31–65. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001.

Li Dazhao. "Xin jiu sichao zhi jizhan" (The fierce battle between new and old intellectual trends). In *Qingchun* (Youth), edited by Zhang Yuexuan, 141–44. Beijing: Gaodeng jiaoyu chubanshe, 2010.

Li Fan. "Liu Shipei yu Beijing daxue" (Liu Shipei and Beijing University). *Beijing daxue xuebao* (*zhexue shehui kexue ban*) (Journal of Peking University [humanities and social sciences edition]) 38, no. 6 (2001): 108–18.

Li Jinxi, *Guoyu xue jiangyi* (Lecture notes on the study of the national language). Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1919.

———. *Guoyu yundong shigang* (A survey of the national-language movement). Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2011.

Lin Shu. "Da daxue tang xiaozhang Cai Heqing taishi shu" (Reply to the principal of the

University, Hanlin Scholar Cai Heqing). In *Lin Shu wenxuan* (Selected works of Lin Shu), edited by Xu Guiting, 106–12. Tianjin: Baihua wenyi chubanshe, 2006.

———. "Jing Sheng" (Master Jing). In *Zhongguo xiandai sixiang shi ziliao jianbian* (Concise edition of historical materials on contemporary Chinese thought), vol. 1, edited by Cai Shangsi, 488–90. Hangzhou: Zhejiang renmin chubanshe, 1982.

———. "Yaomeng" (Nightmare). In *Canchun* (Last days of spring), edited by Zhang Ren, 214–16. Changchun: Jilin sheying chubanshe, 1996.

Liu, Lydia. *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity-China, 1900–1937*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Liu Shipei. "Liu Shipei zhi Gongyan bao han" (Letter by Liu Shipei to *Gongyan bao*). *Beijing daxue rikan* (Beijing University daily). March 24, 1919.

Miao Jinyuan. "Suowei 'xin wenhua yundong' de chachao yu pochan" (Confiscation and bankruptcy of the so-called "New Culture Movement"). *Minguo ribao: Piping* (Republic daily: Criticism). October 20, 1920.

Mitter, Rana. *A Bitter Revolution: China's Struggle with the Modern World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Mittler, Barbara. *A Newspaper for China?: Power, Identity, and Change in Shanghai's News Media, 1872–1912*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2004.

Nathan, Andrew J. *Peking Politics, 1918–1923: Factionalism and the Failure of Constitutionalism*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1976.

Peng Peng. *Yanjiu xi yu wusi shiqi xin wenhua yundong: yi 1920 nian qianhou wei zhongxin* (The Research Clique and the New Culture Movement in the May Fourth period: With a focus on 1920). Guangzhou: Zhongshan daxue chubanshe, 2003.

"Qing kan Beijing xuejie sixiang chao bianqian zhi jinzhuang" (Let's gave a look at the recent changes in intellectual trends in Beijing's academia). *Gongyan bao* (*Public voice*). March 18, 1919.

Qiu Shihuang, Wu Xinxun, and Xiang Chunwu, eds. "Shenbao" (Shanghai news). *Xinwen chuanbo baike quanshu* (Encyclopaedia on news and broadcasting). Chengdu: Sichuan renmin chubanshe, 1998.

Schwarcz, Vera. *The Chinese Enlightenment: Intellectuals and the Legacy of the May Fourth Movement of 1919*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Shambaugh, David L. *China's Communist Party: Atrophy and Adaptation*. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2008.

"Shandong wenti yi jiejue" (The Shandong question has already been solved). *Yishi bao* (*Social welfare Tiensin*). May 10, 1919.

"Shandong wenti Zhong Ri huanwen zhi pilu" (Disclosure of Sino-Japanese diplomatic correspondence on the Shandong question). *Shenbao* (Shanghai news). February 22, 1919.

Shi Shumei. *The Lure of the Modern: Writing Modernism in Semicolonial China, 1917–1937*. Berkeley, London: University of California Press, 2001.

Shuang Yu. "Daxue xiaozhang wenti zhi guoqu, xianzai, weilai" (Past, present, and future of the problems with the University's president). *Shenbao* (Shanghai news). May 13, 1919.

Tang Xiaobing. *Xiandai Zhongguo de gongong yulun: yi "Dagong bao" "Xingqi lunwen" he "Shenbao" "Ziyou tan"* (Modern Chinese public opinion: the example of *Weekly Review* of the *Impartial* and *Free Talks* of *Shanghai news*). Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe,

2012.

Wagner, Rudolf. "The Role of the Foreign Community in the Chinese Public Sphere." *The China Quarterly* 142 (1995): 424–43.

Wagner, Rudolf G. "The Canonization of May Fourth." In *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital: China's May Fourth Project*, edited by Milena Doleželová-Velingerová and Oldřich Král, 66–120. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001.

Waldron, Arthur. *From War to Nationalism: China's Turning Point, 1924–1925*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Wang. "Xin jiu sichao pingyi" (A fair discussion of new and old intellectual trends). In *Wu si yundong zai Shanghai shiliao xuanji* (The May Fourth Movement in Shanghai: A selection of historical materials), edited by Shanghai shehui xueyuan lishi yanjiusuo, 107–8. Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1980.

Wang, David Der-wei. "Chinese Literature from 1841 to 1937." In *The Cambridge History of Chinese Literature*, edited by Kang-i Sun Chang, Cambridge Histories Online, vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

———. *Fin-de-Siècle Splendor: Repressed Modernities of Late Qing Fiction, 1849–1911*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997.

———. "Return to Go: Fictional Innovation in the Late Qing and the Late Twentieth Century." In *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital: China's May Fourth Project*, edited by Milena Doleželová-Velingerová and Oldřich Král, 257–95. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001.

Wang Feng. "Wusi qianhou de Lin Shu" (Lin Shu around the time of May Fourth). In *Honglou zhongsheng ji qi huixiang: chongxin shendu "wu si" xin wenhua* (The tolling of the red mansion and its echo: A new reading of the "May Fourth" New Culture), edited by Chen Pingyuan, 22–33. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2009.

Wang Guangyuan. *Chen Duxiu nianpu 1879–1942* (A chronology of the life of Chen Duxiu, 1879–1942). Chongqing: Chongqing chubanshe, 1987.

Wang Guohua. *Xuelin sui hua: 1919 nian–2009 nian de Zhongguo wenren jianying* (Anecdotes from academia: Sketches of Chinese literary people from 1919 to 2009). Showwe Information Co., Ltd., 2010.

Wang Jingxuan. "Wang Jingxuan jun laixin" (A Letter from Mr Wang Jingxuan). In *Qian Xuantong, Liu Bannong* (Qian Xuantong, Liu Bannong), edited by Zhao Lidong, 107–13. Beijing: Renmin ribao chubanshe, 1999.

Wang Runian. *Yuwang de xiangxiang: 1920–1930 niandai Shenbao guanggao de wenhua shi yanjiu* (The imagination of desire: A cultural history of advertisement in *Shenbao* in the 1920s and 1930s). Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 2007.

Wasserstrom, Jeffrey N. *Student Protests in Twentieth-Century China: The View from Shanghai*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.

Weston, Timothy B. "The Formation and Positioning of the New Culture Community, 1913–1917." *Modern China* 24, no. 3 (1998): 255–84.

———. *The Power of Position: Beijing University, Intellectuals, and Chinese Political Culture, 1898–1929*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2004.

Wu Xiang. "Lun Xu Shuzheng yu Wanxi junfa de xingshuai" (The rise and fall of Xu Shuzheng and the Anhui warlord clique). Master's thesis, Huazhong shifan daxue, 2009.

"Wu yue qi ri zhi guomin dahui" (The national assembly of May 7). *Shenbao* (Shanghai news). May 8, 1919.

Xie Yuanxue. *Zhongguo gongchandang lishi jishi* (Records of the history of the Chinese Communist Party), vol. 1A (1921–24). Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 2003.

Xin Wei. "Dongjing tongxin: Riben ren zhi Jiaozhouwan chufenguan" (Letters from Tokyo: different opinions among Japanese about the Jiaozhou Bay). *Shenbao* (Shanghai news). April 25, 1919.

"Xuejie fengchao you qi" (Renewed eruption of the student protests). *Gongyan bao* (Public voice). October 5, 1919.

"Xu Shuzheng fandui jujue qianzi" (Xu Shuzheng against the refusal to sign the treaty). *Dagong bao* (Impartial). November 7, 1919.

Xu Youchun, ed. "Zhang Yuanqi" (Zhang Yuanqi). *Minguo renwu da cidian* (Great dictionary of Republican people). Shijiazhuang: Hebei renmin chubanshe, 1991.

"Yanshuo jingjin hui yanti zhi jieshi" (Explanation of the topic of the lecture competition). *Shenbao* (Shanghai news), November 2, 1919.

Ye Yun. "Beijing tongxin: ji Beijing daxue shiyeshi (xu)" (Letters from Beijing: remembering the term-opening ceremony of Beijing University, part 2). *Shenbao* (Shanghai news). September 15, 1920.

Yeh Wen-hsin. *Provincial Passages: Culture, Space, and the Origins of Chinese Communism*. Berkeley; London: University of California Press, 1996.

Yi Sheng. "Zui jin zhi xueshu xinchao" (Recent new trends in scholarship). In *Wusi yundong zai Shanghai shiliao xuanji* (The May Fourth Movement in Shanghai: A selection of historical materials), edited by Shanghai shehui xueyuan lishi yanjiusuo, 106–7. Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1980.

Yu Chunmei. *Dadao wei gong: Changsha "Dagong bao" (1915–1927) yu Hunan shehui sichao* (The great way pursues a public spirit: The *Impartial* in Changsha (1915–1927) and intellectual trends in Hunanese society). Changsha: Hunan renmin chubanshe, 2011.

Yu Lunian. "Suzheng ting" (Censorship bureau). *Zhongguo guanzhi da cidian* (Great dictionary of the Chinese bureaucratic system*)*. Harbin: Heilongjiang renmin chubanshe, 1992.

Yuan Shuyi, ed. "Yanjiu xi" (Research clique). *Zhongguo lishi da shidian* (Great encyclopaedia of Chinese history). Shijiazhuang: Hebei Jiaoyu chubanshe, 1988.

Yun Chao. "Lun daxue xin jiu zhi zheng" (Discussing the quarrel between new and old at the University)." *Yishi bao* (Social welfare Tiensin). April 7, 1919.

Zhang Juncai. *Lin Shu pingzhuan* (A critical biography of Lin Shu). Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2007.

Zhang Xuan. "Bo Xinchao guogu he kexue de jingshen pian" (Against the article "The National Heritage and the scientific spirit" in the *New Tide*). *Guogu* (National heritage) no. 3 (1919): 1B–4A.

Zheng Shiqu. "Wusi hou guanyu 'xin wenhua yundong' de taolun" (Discussions about the "New Culture Movement" after May Fourth). Conference paper presented at the "Wusi de lishi yu lishi de wusi" xueshu taolun hui ("The History of May Fourth and the May Fourth of History," An academic symposium), Beijing, June 5, 2009, accessed April 24, 2013, http://www.wanfangdata.com.

Zhu Daihen. "Ni yu tongxiang mou jun taolun xin wenhua yundong shixing fangfa shu" (Pretending to discuss ways to implement the New Culture Movement with someone from my native village). *Jiangsu shengli di er nüzi shifan xuexiao xiaoyou hui huikan* (Alumnae of the Second Jiangsu Provincial Woman's Teacher's College) no. 9 (1919): 36–38.

Zong Jingdu. "Contemporary Drama of China." Essay, July 29, 1924. Container 220. Lewis Nathaniel Chase Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.