
The statement that the West never forgave China for the failure of Christianity to conquer China (p.52) is not entirely true. It is not Christianity as a religion which is relevant here, but western science and its liberal philosophies which have influenced China as much as any other part of the world, culminating in the ultimate take over of China by Marxism.

If the West has not forgiven any people for the failure of the White Man’s conquest, wrongly identified with Christianity, it is the Arabs. The struggle that started with the Holy War culminated in the late fifteenth century on the west coast of India, and was revived after World War II by the creation of Israel, a thorn in the flesh of the Arab heartland.

As for the word Tianzhu (p.54) it could not have been a case of semantico-phonetic combination. None of the names of places appearing in Hanshu (j.28B) and Hou Han shu (j.118), seems to belong to this category. As a matter of fact it needs much more cultural interaction than existed between the two countries before such names of composite character became current. A look at Indian names of foreign countries (like Yavanas, Barbaras) proves this point. Whatever the name Tianzhu signified originally, it could not mean ‘Heavenly India’; it could be rather a corrupt form of the earlier Shendu itself: Shendu—Xiandu—Hiandu—Tianzhu.1 Shendu
was the correct pronunciation picked up personally by Zhang Qian, after which the contact snapped for some time. The informal intercourse through traders and mendicants continued, and when the name reached again through these intermediaries it underwent transformation. No one would have suspected that the Chinese records had preserved the original sound. In the process, the word had undergone a mutation through the shifting of ‘d’ of the final ‘du’ to the initial part, while the final ‘du’ itself being changed into ‘zhu’ due to contamination with local speech-sound. In another case, i.e. Yindu, the word Sindhu got corrupted into Hindu, an extensive example of which is to be found in the Avestan language (like soma becoming haoma); Hindu in turn changed to Yindu, probably due to Greek influence, because in the old Greek the initial ‘h’ sound remained silent. Being unaware of this Xuan Zang explains that India acquired this name because of its wise men who shed their bright influences like the ‘moon’.

It is not correct to say that Bengal figures as a separate political entity (p. 58) in the accounts of those who visited the country during Zheng He’s voyages to the Indian Ocean in the fifteenth century. Fei Xin, for instance, states ‘Bengal (Bangge-la) is a state of India in the West’. However, other authors are silent about this fact. Fei Xin visited Bengal twice while the other authors visited only once. It is interesting to note that Bengal was included by the Ming authors as part of the Western Regions which included Central and West Asia, while Cochin, Quilon and Kozhikode were regarded as parts of the Western Ocean (Indian Ocean). Despatch of the same envoy like Hou Xian to Central Asia, Bengal, Jaunpur and Delhi corroborates this fact.

Prof. Tan Chung knows it too well that despite the glowing accounts of India given by Fa Xian and Xuan Zang, it is well nigh impossible to find any mention of them or even of the brisk intellectual intercourse between these two countries in Indian literature. Even Bana bhatta, the court poet of Harşavardhana Śilāditya (A.D. 606-647), does not give the slightest inkling about the Chinese presence in India, or of various embassies exchanged between the two countries. Therefore, such negative evidence cannot be adduced to justify the absence of contact between India and China (p. 58).

When I try to integrate my knowledge of our past—through textual study of the Vedic and Brahmanic Literature, the Aranyakas, the principal Upaniṣads, the epics, the classical literature and a little of the six systems of Indian philosophy—with the little knowledge of Chinese literature, I am inclined to believe that acceptance of Buddhism was facilitated in China because it made the king a nexus between the cosmic reality and the laity. Brahmadata, a Kṣatriya king, attains Buddhahood after passing through various stages of rebirths. Compare this with the Brahmanic-Puranic concept of reincarnation (avatāras) in one of which, the Kṣatriya king Hiranyakāśipu faces death for his defiance of the Brahmanic god.

The rise and fall of Buddhism in China is linked with the rise of Islam.
and its advance eastward up to the west and northwest borders of India, the disintegration of various kingdoms in India, and finally the appearance of the titanic personality of Śāṅkara. If Śāṅkara has been described as the ‘Buddhist in disguise’ (Pracchanna Bauddha), Zhu Xi may be described as the Buddhist-in-disguise of China’. Neo-Confucianism absorbed some of the traits of Buddhism as much as the Advaitins. It was during this period, again, that a dose of Brahmanic influence penetrated into China. We have evidence of it in the Brahmanic (this term is more appropriate than Hindu) temples of Quanzhou (Zaytun), and such historical novels as Xiyouji (Journey to the West) by Yang Ne (Late Yuan and Early Ming), which portrays the demigod, the famous celebrate Sun Wukong (Hamunana), as superior to Xuanzang, a clear indication of the eclipse of Buddhism by Brahmanic influence, as indicated by Prof. Tan (pp. 54, 58).

Under these circumstances, it is not to the point to say that China lost her contact with India (p. 58) between the Song and Ming dynasties. It is true that the rise of Islam and the eclipse of Indian merchants by Arab and Persian traders, and the ultimate take-over of the China trade by them, prevented any meaningful contact between India and China for some time, but with the building up of Chinese navy during the Song dynasty Sino-Indian trade and political intercourse revived to a great extent. This coincided with the rise of the Cholas, and we find entire South India being identified as Soli (for Chola in Chinese) for more than four hundred years signifying long and steady intercourse between the two countries. China herself had emerged from half a century of disorder into a unified empire under the Song reign, while the Cholas rose fast to power under their great kings, Rājrāja the great and his son, Rajendra Chola I, the conqueror of Southeast Asia. It was under the first king, called Locha-locha in Chinese, that his Vice-Minister, Soli Shawen (presumably Chola Samanta, the last name being wrongly called Samudra by some) that a mission was sent to China in 1015 A.D. (In the meantime, the king had expired and Rajendra Chola ascended the throne.) At this point the Chinese emperor is described as the ‘sage ruler who offered sacrifice to the Tai Mountain in the east and to the Fen River in the west.’ 6,006 taels (liàng) of pearls, 3,300 catties (jin) of spices and medicinal herbs were presented. The intercourse had not ceased since then, and we hear about prosperous Indian colonies in China inhabited among others by the Tamils during the Yuan dynasty. A bilingual epigraph of 1281 in Chinese and Tamil has been discovered from the coastal town of Quanzhou (Chuanchou/Zaytun) where merchant vessels sailed from South India resulting in large congregation of Tamil people, composing not only of the floating population who visited the place periodically for trade, but also of many permanent residents for whose spiritual benefit the image of the god Nayanar was installed, a fact vouched by the inscription itself. In reality, relics of Indian sculpture in this city date back to 11th century. This was the period when the Chinese sailed to Kalah (Keddah) and to Quilon, and the towns on the western coasts of India,
Malaya Peninsula and coastal China, had become cosmopolises with foreign settlements. Trade brought these peoples together even as the proselytizing forces were being neutralized by commercial-political forces.

Intense maritime activity enlarged China’s geographical concept embodied in such works of historical geography as Pingzhou ketan (Pingzhou chats, 1119 A.D.) by Zhu Yu, Lingwai daida (Information of What is Beyond the Passes, 1178) by Zhou Qufei, Zhufan zhi (Records of Foreign Peoples, 1225) by Zhao Rugua, Daoyi Zhi lue (Records of the Barbarian Islands, 1350) by Wang Dayuan and the Ming travelogues already wellknown. We have also Persian records noticing the arrival of Chinese merchants at the court of Iltumish and displaying all kinds of goods before him. The communications and interflow of goods continued till the first half of fifteenth century and was particularly brisk during the period from 1404 to 1439 when as many as fourteen missions were sent from Bengal and nine from Kozhikode, as against four Chinese missions to Bengal and at least seven to Kozhikode, and as many to Cochin. In addition, there was one return mission to both Delhi (Di-li) and Jaunpur in 1412-13. Another to Jaunpur in 1420-21 was of particular significance, as it was sent as a sequel to the Bengal Sultan Jalaluddin’s complaint to the Court regarding Jaunpur’s frequent incursions into Bengal’s territory. This virtual invitation to a foreign power for intervention into an inter-state dispute in India ended in an anti-climax as the Chinese envoy, Hou Xian, carried nothing more than a mild admonition in Confucian terms, and presents of paper money and silks for Ibrahim Sharqui, the king of Jaunpur. The relations cooled down thereafter, and then stopped altogether, the reasons for which warrant a fuller and separate discussion.
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NOTES


2. For a detailed information on this period, see E.H. Cutts, “Chinese Indian Contacts prior to the latter half of the first century”; Indian Historical Quarterly, xiv, 3(1938), pp. 489-502.

3. Zhuandu, the alternative pronunciation of Shendu as current among the Chinese scholars, may be the rendering of Sanskrit Jambudvipa, another name given to India in the Puranas.

4. The word Tianzhu is still pronounced like Hiandu in some parts of Fujian (Fukien) province; see, T. Watters, op. cit., p. 135.

5. Ibid., p. 138.


48
7. See, Ji Xianlin, "Xiyuji yu Luomoyanna", (A note on Journey to the West and the Ramayana"), Wenxue Yichan (Literary Heritage), 3(1981), p. 29. In this short note the learned author cites passages from the Chinese work showing clear evidence of borrowing from the Indian epic.

8. To To, Songshi, (History of Song Dynasty), j. 489, Bona ben ed. p. 21b.

9. Ibid., p. 22b.


II

THE FOLLOWING paragraphs pertain to the ‘third phase of Sino-Indian contacts’ that corresponds to the colonial era.

When human bonds are loosening all over, it is no surprise that ancient ties between countries or communities will prove to be fragile before the floodtide of modern, materialistic forces. How to revive, restore or repair these ties is bound to be the concern of all conscientious people carrying on the task of international solidarity. Professor Tan Chung that way deserves admiration of all Indians wishing peace and friendship with their great neighbour, China.

History, however, does not repeat itself; nor is it possible to recreate the past in an altogether different present. It is advisable only to try to explore the entire past, disentangle the various threads in it, verify their respective strength in present-day milieu, while preparing for a better tomorrow. The distinguished professor’s silent suffering at the sight of mutual suspicion and hatred between the two nations often leads him to stress the larger interest of uniting forces ignoring the realities.

Lord Buddha has long ceased to be a living force both in India and China. Neither cared, in the colonial days, to compare the concepts of western colonizers with the counsels of Buddha. At times India appraised alien institutions by the yardstick of her own scriptures, while China used the criterion of the canons of Confucius, the all-pervasive native philosopher. The image of each other was shaped not so much by mutual transactions as by their respective response to the West. Prof. Tan has rightly cited, to reveal India’s image, Liang Qichao, a moderate Chinese reformer, who did criticize Indian admiration for British political institutions. However, he has not cared to add that Liang’s was not the sole voice of China, even as there were shades of Indian opinion on Western institutions. China’s New Culture and May Fourth movements at the beginning of the present century partially represent her respect for European rationality. Faced with the formidable war-weapons of the Western powers and their mastery of modern science, Indians and Chinese suffered a sense of insecurity and an inward feeling of inferiority. It is the similarities in their attitudes towards Western traders and territorial invaders rather than the differences that are striking.

Indeed, it was a love-hate attitude of China towards India. As Prof. Tan writes, India’s ‘image of ‘nationless slaves’ was more a self-chastening warning than censuring a neighbouring people’.

It is not easy to accommodate such opinion as ‘the Boxer uprising belonged to the mainstream of Buddhist-inspired struggle ethics’. The Boxer’s pantheon included many gods, historic personages and epic heroes. Among them were Guangong, Jade Emperor, Xiang Yu, Zhuge Liang, Zhao Yun, Sun Wukong all heroes of Chinese legends. All three main currents of

ancient Chinese thinking—Confucianism, Buddhism and Taoism—co-existed within the sect. It is a futile exercise to find out their respective influence over any of China’s secret societies, including the Boxer. The term ‘Yihetu’an’ (Boxer) carries two key words: ‘Yi’ (righteousness) and ‘he’ (harmony), both of which are traditional Confucian virtues.

To point out a few omissions, when the first Indian Nobel laureate Rabindranath Tagore arrived in China in April 1924, he did not receive a unanimous welcome. Tagore’s idealism and universalism, mysticism and message of peace were found to be positive hindrances to the realization of the aims of New China. It was not only the Chinese communists who turned a deaf ear to the divine voice of the Indian poet, even liberals did not listen to him who had brought the ‘futile’ philosophies of the East, not the effective weapons for fighting the West. As cited by an eminent Indian scholar, the well-known Chinese writer Mao Tun said that the people of China ‘were determined not to welcome the Tagore who loudly sings the praise of Eastern civilization, nor do we welcome the Tagore who creates a paradise of poetry and love and leads our youth into it so that they may find comfort and intoxication in meditation’ [R.K. Dasgupta, ‘Tagore in China’, Statesman (New Delhi), 2 April 1978].

Tagore, however, won the respect of resurgent China when he wrote a letter to Nogachi, the Japanese poet, in October 1938 denouncing Japanese aggression on China.

It would be further rewarding if Prof. Tan were to examine Nehru’s brief visit to China in September 1939 and the Chinese attitude to the Indian National Army (INA), whose controversial but charismatic leader Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose had paid a visit to China during the decisive days of the Second World War. Indian readers would like to know the Chinese reaction to Nehru’s meeting with Chiang Kai-shek at Chongqing, and to learn more about the reported advice of Chiang to the Indian leader to accept Dominion Status [A. Gorev and V. Zimyanin, Jawaharlal Nehru (Moscow, 1982), pp. 207-8].

Krishna Bose writes in the leading Bengali weekly Desh (11 April 1981) that towards the end of 1943 Netaji went first to Nanking and then to Shanghai where he was given a warm welcome mainly by the Indians settled there. He reportedly made two broadcasts from Chongqing Radio in which he appealed to the Chinese to end disunity among themselves and to forge Sino-Japanese fraternity in the greater interests of Asia.

School of International Studies
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N. Das
TAN CHUNG replies

NARANARAYAN DAS and Harprasad Ray have provided some feedback to my article on 'Indian Images in Chinese Literature', which is welcome. Let me first make some remarks in self-defence. My article has compressed two thousand years of history into twelve pages. It is a broad sweep. Perhaps, both Das and Ray, particularly the latter, have felt it too sweeping to care for exquisiteness. Both of them know very well that I have been engaged in a grim battle against very heavy odds for the establishment of a historical perspective which, I might say, is inborn (or inherited) in me. On every occasion I tend to be assertive rather than cautious. This is not to say that I don't care for historical details.

My main concern in the article is the establishment of the broad perspective at the risk of commissions and omissions. My aim being to make the point I wish to make forcefully, there is always scope for imperfection and imbalance. After reading the two comments by Das and Ray, however, I feel that while I am looking at the wood of history as a whole, they are looking at certain trees. Coming to specifics, since Ray's concerns are more ancient than Das's, I shall deal with Ray first.

I think Ray has totally misunderstood my point about the West not forgiving China for her rejection of Christianity. This is a long story which I cannot explain in a few words. Those who are interested in this issue may read my article on 'God shied from Celestial Kingdom: Christian Missions in Nineteenth-Century China' in my book, *Triton and Dragon: Studies on Imperialism and Nineteenth Century China*, brought out in April, this year. I hold the view that the Christian missions all over the world had launched the largest evangelic movement of history in China in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries with little success. A statistic which drew the attention of Mao Zedong and the Chinese government in 1949 was that
the total investments by U.S. Christian missions in both the centuries amounted to nearly 42 million U.S. dollars. (Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Peking, 1969, Vol. IV, p. 448, citing C.F. Remer, Foreign Investments in China, New York, 1933, which has become a basic source book frequently quoted by scholars.) Such huge investments all for naught had a serious consequence in the post-1949 events between China and the Western world, including the U.S. decision to fight China by proxy which explained the U.S. motivation in the Korean War and Vietnam War. There was the immense regret of Paradise Lost when the U.S. government published its White Paper United States Relations with China, and the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson’s Letter of Transmittal to President Truman in 1949.


Readers may wonder how all this consists with China’s ‘images of India’. There is some connection. Whenever people, particularly Western scholars, talk about China’s external relations, whether with India or with any other country, the ghost of ‘Sinocentrism’ or ‘Middle Kingdom’ invariably rises. Let us have a historical perspective of this theory of Sinocentrism. Tens of thousands of foreigners had visited China before modern Western Christians (including non-missionary people) set foot on Chinese soil in the nineteenth century. There had been practically no complaint about China’s ethnocentrism and the Chinese treatment of foreigners as “barbarians”. There is definitely some link between the birth of the Middle Kingdom myth and the bad experience of Western Christians in China. Has the Chinese cultural tradition suddenly turned hostile against foreigners from the nineteenth century onwards? The answer can be both yes and no. Yes, because almost all the evidence cited in Western literature about Chinese arrogance and xenofobia are of recent origin, dating not before the end of the eighteenth century. No, because all such evidences cited are expressions of Chinese resentment of Western aggressiveness vis-a-vis China, not a fixed Chinese tradition as such. It is a story of give and take. We should, perhaps, forget the past enmity between China and the Christian world when we discuss Sino-Indian contacts exclusively. But many Western scholars have the habit of introducing the myth of Sinocentrism even in our field. To give just one example. In Paul A. Cohen’s study on China
The second point raised by Ray is the term ‘Tianzhu’ which he thinks cannot be a semantic-phonetic combination, and cannot connote ‘Heavenly India’. I must say that this is a case of interpretation awaiting more historical proof. Ray has no more evidence than mine to establish it as a corruption of Sindu or Hindu. From a linguistic point of view his formula of ‘Xiandu—Hiandu—Tianzhu’ (SIC) cannot stand, because ‘Xi’ and ‘Hi’ cannot be corrupted into ‘Ti’ the last being a dental sound, not alveolar. He also mentions the fact that the Hand Annals, Hanshu and Houhanshu, did not have ‘Tianzhu’ as the name of India. This, in fact, is a point of my reasoning. It took time for the ‘Heavenly India’ image to be built up in ancient China. When the time arrived during the Sui and Tang Dynasties (or may be a little earlier), the term ‘Tianzhu’ became accepted.

I can trace the evolution of ancient Chinese names for India from the Han terms ‘Xiandou,’ ‘Juandu’ and ‘Shendu’ to the Sui-Tang term ‘Tianzhu’. The three Han terms were all Chinese corruptions of ‘Sindu’ or ‘Hindu’. The ancient Chinese liked to use only one syllable to identify the nationalities of foreign monks. They used ‘An’ for Parthians, ‘Zhi’ for Yuezhi (Yueh-chih), ‘Zhu’ for Indians, ‘Yu’ for Khotanese, ‘Kang’ for Soghdians, and ‘Bo’ for Kucheans. Here, we find that as early as the third century, the Chinese had started using ‘Zhu’ to represent the second syllable ‘dou’ and ‘du’ of the three Han terms for India, because in the written form ‘du’ denoted ‘poison’, while ‘zhu’ had a harmless denotation of ‘thickness’. But we have not seen any form of ‘Xianzhu’, or ‘Juanzhu’, or ‘Shenzh~’ for India. Once people started altering the second syllable of the Chinese names for India, it opened the possibility of changing the first syllable as well. In fact, we see two new forms for India in the Tang usage with the already emerged syllable of ‘zhu’. They are ‘Zhuqian’ and ‘Tianzhu’. Take the poetry of the great Tang scholar-officer, Bai Juyi (772-846), for instance. He used the term ‘Zhuqian’ as ‘India’ to identify Buddhism (which he described as the ‘Zhuqian religion’) and the term ‘Tiazhu’ to describe two pieces of stones which he had collected from the famous Tianzhu Hill as a memento at the end of his tenure as the Governor of Hangzhou. Let us analyse how he used the two symbols.

First, he composed several poems about the two pieces of stones which he had picked up from the Tianzhu Hill (the ‘Hill of India’ famed to have been flown from Rajagriha in Bihar to Hangzhou in China). In one poem he wrote:

Retiring after three years as Governor,
My acquisitions are void of treasure.
Two pieces of Tianzhu stones,
And a Huating crane to keep alone.

In another poem he wrote:

Three years as Governor of the place,
Constant worries of duty and grace.
I only turned to the Tianzhu Hill,
Two pieces of stones did I steal.
They worth a thousand pieces of gold,
But my conscience and morality uphold.

(Cited from Quan Tang shi, Beijing, 1980, Vol. XIII, p. 4763.) We know that the stones which he picked up were ordinary stones. But the sacredness which Bai Juyi had attached to the concept of ‘Tianzhu’ (Heavenly India) made him treasure them immensely.

Second, in his poem describing Buddhism as ‘Zhuqian jiao’, he asserted that Buddhism was superior to Taoism. (Quan Tan, shi, Vol. XIII, p. 4983.) Now, the term ‘Zhuqian’ cannot be mistaken as a corruption of any name for India. As we have just said, ‘zhu’ was the replacement of the syllable ‘du’ in the Han terms for India. Although this second syllable was used by the Tang writers as the first syllable, we still can treat it as a part of the transliteration. However, the syllable ‘qian’ is even further removed from the original sound of ‘Hindu’ or ‘Sindu’ or ‘Indu’ than ‘tian’. But ‘qian’ and ‘tian’ are synonyms, both denoting ‘Heaven’. Judging from the context in which it appears, we can say for certain that ‘Zhuqian’ here connotes ‘Heavenly India’ with the poet’s immense reverence.

Let us pass over to the next point raised by Ray. Perhaps, I have made my periodization of Sino-Indian contacts in such a way as to over-emphasize the intimacy between the two countries during the Buddhist period, and the lack of it during the subsequent period which I have described as of ‘little contacts’, but not ‘no contacts’. Ray has taken too literally my remark that ‘this was the period when China had lost contacts with her Buddhist cousins in India’. I am aware of the fact that there were isolated contacts between the Buddhists of the two countries during the Song Dynasty (960-1279), which, I must reiterate, was nothing like the passionate Sino-Indian intercourse of earlier times symbolizing a Buddhist honeymoon. After Song Dynasty, I think even the memory of this honeymoon was lost. Ray has mentioned Wang Dayuan, the famous Chinese voyager during Yuan Dynasty (1279-1368), which furnished a good evidence to support my point. In his famous travelogue, Daoyi zhilue (Brief accounts of foreign islanders) the image of India is totally lost, although it mentions several places of India, from Bengal, Orissa, to Bombay, and a few ports of Kerala. Interestingly, it has also a brief account of a place named ‘Tianzhu’ which was situated to the east of Arabia, and produced gold and horses, but no salt. There is no mention of Buddhism, nor its past contacts with China. Scholars think...
that this country of his description was Sind. (Daoyi zhilue xiaoshi, Beijing, 1981, pp. 356-7.)

The same is my impression about the Ming accounts of India on which Ray is doing his research. In all the Ming accounts, India does not exist as a geographical or historical entity, but Bengal and several Kerala ports find mention in them. The glaring mistake of Fei Xin describing Bengal as a part of western India (as Ray mentions) is another evidence of the short memory of the contemporary peoples in both India and China about the past contacts.

I don't agree with Ray that Xuanzang's visit to India did not leave behind any impact. First of all, a fallout of his visit was that it inaugurated a period of closest diplomatic contacts between King Harsha of India and the Chinese emperor Taizong. On the cultural side, there was the famous correspondence between Xuanzang and his old Nalanda colleague, Jnanaprabha. A Tang writer, Duan Chengshi, met a Japanese monk in the ninth century and was told by the latter that he saw in Central India the thrown-away straw sandals of Xuanzang and the chopsticks Xuanzang had used in India being kept on the altar of an Indian monastery with coloured cloth. (See my article “Ageless Neighbourliness between India and China”, in China Report, Vol. XV, No. 2, p. 29.) The Indian monks must have talked to the Japanese visitor with nostalgia about Xuanzang's visit. But in later accounts of Yuan and Ming such memories were erased.

Let me now come to Das's comments. He finds my description of the Boxer uprising as a part of 'Buddhist inspired struggle ethics unacceptable. Again, it will be difficult for me to explain in brief this important contention of mine. I have partially spelled it out in my article ‘Buddhist Incense to Chinese Mass Rebellion: A New Look at the Boxer Uprising of 1900' in Bodhi Rasmi (Souvenir of the First International Conference on Buddhism and National Cultures, New Delhi, October 10-15, 1984) which is also included in my book Triton and Dragon. I may just say here that the dynamics of China's historical evolution comes, I think, from the interactions between the Confucian 'harmony ethics' and the Buddhist 'struggle ethics'. As a political, ideological force, Confucianism represented the projection of a sage-ruler in harmony with the Mandate of Heaven, the permanency of traditions and values, the non-violability of the hierarchical order, and the maintenance of the status quo. With the introduction of Buddhism to China, the talented and ambitious Chinese found it to their advantage to propagate the Indian ideas of good fighting the evil, the transmigration of life and fortune, equality, compassion and justice. It was this new Indian ideology which had helped to create the following famous rulers of China who would not have occupied the throne if they had adhered to the ideology of Confucian harmony ethics. They were: the Liang Emperor Wu (503-549), the Sui Emperor Wen (589-604), the Sui Emperor Yang (605-617), the Tang Emperor Taizong (627-649), the Tang Empress Wu (684-704), the Tang Emperor Gaozu (705-711), the Tang Emperor Xuanzong (712-755), the Song Emperor Taizu (960-976), the Song Emperor Taizong (976-997), the Ming Emperor Taizu (1368-1398), and the Ming Emperor
Chengzu (1403-1424). Whereas Mencius propagated the idea of ‘wang tianxia’ (to rule China in the kingly way), these rulers introduced the element of ‘da tianxia’ (to fight for the throne of China) which was clearly a departure from the Confucian norms. The first seven of these rulers (with the exception of Tang Emperor Gaozu) were enthusiastic patrons of Buddhism in China. The Ming Emperor Taizu was an extraordinary example of a petty Buddhist monk climbing to the top of political power. Encouraged by their examples, China became a happy hunting ground of power struggles and peasant rebellions of which the Boxer Movement was an eminent one.

Buddhism not only provided the ideology for China’s struggle ethics, but it rendered physical support to Chinese rebellions. We know that after Bodhidharma introduced martial arts to the monks of the Shaolin Monastery, the Buddhist monasteries all over China became citadels of Kungfu. When Li Shimin (later the Tang Emperor Taizong) helped his father to overthrow the Sui government, he received reinforcements from the Shaolin Monastery. Buddhist monks with fighting skills participated virtually in every subsequent rebellion, including the Boxers’. Even in the Communist army there is the eminent example of General Xu Shiyou who had been a monk in the Shaolin Monastery before he joined the fighting forces of the peasants.

The Buddhist inspired struggle ethics brought a change in the value system in Chinese tradition. Das thinks that the name Yihetuan sounds very Confucian. In my opinion, it does not. The struggle ethics propagated ‘dabao buping’ (fighting injustice) and ‘qiyi’ (rise for righteous fighting). In its perspective, rebels were termed ‘Yijun’ (righteous army). It was in this spirit that the Boxers first organised themselves into ‘Yihequan’ (Boxing for righteous harmony). Apparently, their intention was to combine the Confucian harmony ethics with the struggle ethics, but in practice they were anti-establishment in nature, hence not belonging to the harmony ethics mainstream. We know that the various religious sects which propagated this Righteous Boxing were the descendants of the famous revolutionary movement under the umbrella of the White Lotus Religion (Bailianjiao). This White Lotus used to be a well organized secret society with a Buddhist-Taoist synthesis.

In my Missionary article alluded to earlier, I have also cited the Boxer propaganda materials which accused the foreign Christians for (1) deceiving the Chinese emperor, (2) extinguishing God Buddha (shen Fo), (3) dismantling temples, (4) doing away with incense burning, (5) giving up good books, (6) violating rational teachings, and (7) attempting annexation of China. (See Yihetuan, Shanghai, 1957, Vol. II, p. 188.) We see that items (2), (3), (4) virtually reflected a Buddhist protest against the Western Christians. Of course, like all other Chinese mass movements, the Boxer Uprising had a variegated ideology drawn from both Buddhist and non-Buddhist sources. That is why I have described it as belonging to the mainstream of struggle ethics.
Why haven’t I mentioned Tagore’s visit to China which has been so much discussed about? Partly because the topic is rather controversial, and partly because it does not fit into my broad framework. Since Das has mentioned it now, let me briefly recount the event. I know about Professor R.K. Dasgupta’s study on Tagore’s visits to China and Japan. He not only wrote but also talked about it in a lecture in Delhi University in the middle of 1960s. But Professor Dasgupta had no chance to read a book brought out by the Institute of South Asian Studies of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences in 1983 which is a fairly comprehensive collection of the opinions of important Chinese on Tagore, including his 1924 visit to China. Recently Sisir Kumar Das and Tan Wen utilized the Chinese materials and published a book in Bengali entitled Bitarkita Atithi (The controversial guest) which serves as a reply to the opinions held by Nityapriya Ghosh and others thinking that modern China rejected Tagore. We know that an American scholar, Stephen Hay, was mainly responsible to spread this opinion. The quotation from Mao Dun in Das’s comment originated from Stephen Hay who has twisted his evidence. Mao Dun’s article entitled ‘Duiyu Taige’erde xiwang’ (Our hope from Tagore) published in a Shanghai newspaper on 14 April, 1924, expressed a mixed feeling about Tagore’s visit. Let me quote some of his words in my own translation. Mao Dun wrote:

We also respect Tagore. We respect him as a poet with a pure personality. We respect him as a person who feels pity on the weak, a poet who sympathizes with the oppressed. We respect him even more as a poet who resorts to practices to help the peasants. We respect him especially as a poet who elates patriotism, and inspires the Indian youth to rebel against British imperialism.

Based on this, Mao Dun declared that ‘We also welcome Tagore in a relative sense.’ However, he was worried that because ‘the minds of Chinese youth are too empty, their conduct too impractical, and their will power too fragile’, the speeches which Tagore was making in China about the greatness of the oriental culture might further lead the Chinese youth to escapism. Mao Dun said: ‘Talking (loudly about the oriental culture is tantamount to ‘asking the enemy to retreat by reciting classics before them’! He thought the need of the hour was to make machine-guns to fight back the trigger-happy enemies. Thus, said Mao Dun:

We will never welcome the Tagore who loudly sings for the oriental culture, nor do we welcome the Tagore who creates the paradise of the spirit of poetry, and who leads our youth into it to intoxicate themselves, to dream and to find comfort. We do welcome the Tagore who engages in peasant movement (although we are opposed to the methods of his peasant movement), and who sings loudly: ‘follow the brightness!’
Mao Dun hoped that: (1) Tagore would give strength to the Chinese youth, and draw them back to the social reality to engage in practical strife; (2) Tagore would severely criticize the slavishness towards foreign powers on the part of some Chinese. (See Zhang Guangling (ed), Lun Taige'er, Institute of South Asian Studies, 1983, pp. 73-5.)

How distorting it is to quote Mao Dun's article only in part! Indian scholars should now realize how not to study China only through Western sources. Did Chinese communists turn a deaf ear to the divine voice of Tagore, as Das asserts? Did the Chinese liberals resent Tagore for his bringing the 'futile' philosophies of the East to China? Well, I think the questions have been wrongly posed. First of all, Mao Dun was no liberal at that time. What he spoke represented the voice of the communist left. The liberals, like Liang Qichao and Cai Yuanpei gave Tagore a rousing welcome. Even the left of centre writer, Zheng Zhentuo, who was co-editor of Xiaoshuo Yuebaohu (Monthly Journal of Fiction) with Mao Dun, wrote a warm article in the journal to welcome Tagore. Zheng wrote:

Rabindranath Tagore is about to come. When this copy of the journal reaches the hands of our readers or their desks, he would have probably reached China. . . . We welcome the person who offers to us love and light and happiness; we welcome our dear brother, our fellow traveller in knowledge and spirit.

He ends his article with these words:

His greatness is omnipresent. His sentiments can be understood by us only when we are facing the twinkling stars, the roaring streams, or when we lie on the green carpet of the meadows, or sailing our boats in the clean streams surrounded by his all round, or sitting in the trains with depression, or in the frightened midnights listening to the turbulence outside the windows.

We should give him such a welcome which is not just outwardly warm!

(See ibid, pp. 35-40.)

Chen Duxiu, the founder of the Chinese communist party, had translated Tagore’s ‘Gitanjali’ and published it in Qingnian Zazhi (Youth Magazine, which was the forerunner of the Communist organ for the youth, the New Youth) in Vol. I, No. 2, October 15, 1919. Here is an example of the founder of the Chinese communist movement not only listening to the divine voice of Tagore, but also wishing his young and progressive countrymen to listen to the same voice.

Das suggests that I should do two more studies to complete my historical survey of Chinese images of India: (1) the Chinese reactions to Nehru’s 1939 visit to China, and (2) contemporary Chinese views about the Indian National Army led by Netaji Bose. These are worthwhile topics to study.
I have not read Zimyanin's book on Jawaharlal Nehru, and am not keen either to seek information about Sino-Indian contacts from a third quarter—be it the U.S.A. or the U.S.S.R. If the Russian author has intended to create an impression that the Chinese leader of the Kuomintang government wanted to see India permanently remain a dominion of British colonialism, I will have no hesitation to say that it is a malicious distortion. We need not go much further than the Nehru Museum and Library to verify the facts. Let me quote excerpts from the *Jawaharlal Nehru Correspondence* which is a collection of valuable manuscripts. Soong Mailing, i.e. Madam Chiang Kai-shek, had exchanged many warm letters with Jawaharlal Nehru. In her letter dated February 22, 1942, Kunming, she wrote:

The Generalismo [Chiang Kai-shek] requests me to tell you that today he wired Washington and London regarding his trip to India, to the effect that after careful study, he has come to the conclusion that the Indian situation is extremely critical, and that in his opinion Britain should not wait until India is attacked, but should transfer real political power to the Indian people. The above of course is purely for your information. He is a bit worried, however, lest Congress should make a mis-step, and so he wants me to ask, you to see to it that Congress considers most carefully the statements in his farewell message. He hopes too that you will remember all the points he brought out in our conversations, and will make it possible for him to help India. You know, don’t you, that we shall leave nothing undone in assisting you to gain freedom and independence.

I need not re-iterate what you must already know, that our hearts are drawn to you, and that the bonds of affection between you and us have been strengthened by our visit, and in more ways than one...When you are discouraged and weary,—and I think you must be sometimes although you have that rare quality of childlike spontaneity and joy, and to an unusual degree,—remember that you are not alone in your struggle, for at all times we are with you in spirit.

(See *Jawaharlal Nehru Correspondence* in Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, New Delhi, File No. C-46, J.N. Papers Part I, Vol. XIII, pp. 38-9.)

I think these were not only heart-felt words from Soong Mailing to Nehru, but also the voice of the Chinese people calling the Indian people—their fellow-colonial twins. It is very unfortunate that such sentiments between the two countries have often been vitiated by extraneous forces which have come in the way in the development of Sino-Indian fraternity. I am moved by Das's thoughtful words about me. I have been, and remain an optimist. Moreover, as students of history, we look at things in terms of centuries and millennia. The peoples of India and China may have many weaknesses, but their immense patience cannot be matched by any other people. We are all “silent sufferers' with a bright future to look forward to.