Public Participation in Sun Yat-sen's Revolutionary Writings
Literary Form, Epistemic Authority, and Deliberative Standing

Zhipeng Wu[1]

[1] *Jianghan University, Wuhan, China*

ABSTRACT
Sun Yat-sen's revolutionary writings placed readers, listeners, and association members in different political positions. Reading testimony, propaganda, poetry, commemorative prefaces, The Doctrine of Sun Wen, and the Primer of Democracy together, this article argues that literary and rhetorical form helped determine how the public could participate: as judges of facts, affective successors to a revolutionary cause, implementers of knowledge, or members entitled to alter proposals. Narrative disclosure, elegy, historical memory, analogy, and procedural rehearsal each opened a distinct route into political action. These routes expanded participation unevenly and left unresolved how claims presented as 'true knowledge' should enter procedures that permit objection, amendment, and vote.

Keywords: *Sun Yat-sen, Public participation, Literary form, Revolutionary memory, Deliberative standing.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Sun Yat-sen did not leave behind a systematic poetics comparable to a modern treatise on literature. That absence, however, does not make literary form[1] incidental to his political writing. Late Qing and early Republican public discourse moved across newspapers, speeches, prefaces, memoir, poetry, translation, political treatises, and manuals without the hard institutional boundary that later separated 'literature' from political communication. Sun worked within this mixed field. He wrote a first-person testimony for an international public, used classical verse to mourn a revolutionary martyr, reframed defeated uprisings through commemorative prefaces, invoked a translated antislavery novel in political speech, and turned meeting rules into scenes for rehearsal. The question is therefore less whether Sun possessed a complete literary theory than how forms of writing shaped the political position of their recipients.

Scholarship has clarified several parts of this field. Studies of propaganda and publication trace how Sun's writings circulated and how revolutionary doctrine was popularized [1-2]. Work on political symbols and memory shows how his image and revolutionary history were repeatedly reconstructed for public use [3-4]. More focused studies examine the collaborative English writing of *Kidnapped in London*, the knowledge-action argument of *The Doctrine of Sun Wen*, and the textual history of the *Primer of Democracy* [5-8]. Research on Sun's literary criticism and poetry has also drawn attention to his praise of classical form, his comments on composition, and his use of verse in revolutionary commemoration [21]. These lines of inquiry are usually separated by genre or discipline. Read together, they raise a more relational question: what could the addressee actually do within the situation created by a particular text?

That question requires attention to form as well as doctrine. A rhetorical approach to first-person

1. 'Literary form' is used historically and functionally rather than as a claim that Sun developed a self-contained aesthetic system. It includes poetry and autobiography, but also prefaces, speeches, argumentative prose, translation, and instructional writing when narrative, imagery, address, affect, or staged example materially shapes the recipient's relation to political action.

narration treats narrative as a communicative act that distributes information, credibility, and ethical judgment between narrator and audience [24]. Memory studies likewise remind us that public recollection is selective and socially framed rather than a neutral recovery of the past [25]. Affect theory adds another dimension: emotions do not remain private possessions but circulate through words, images, bodies, and objects, helping to align individuals with collective causes [26]. These perspectives are used here in a limited way. They do not turn Sun into a narratologist or affect theorist. They help describe what his texts themselves do when they arrange testimony, grief, historical memory, persuasion, and deliberation.

The article compares historically distinct recipients under the analytical designation 'the public'[2]: British readers of the 1897 testimony, Chinese-language readers after 1912, audiences of revolutionary propaganda, the 'present generation' and 'later survivors' addressed in prefaces, the implementers of *The Doctrine of Sun Wen*, and members of constituted meetings. Three kinds of standing recur across these texts. Epistemic authority concerns who establishes or explains facts and doctrine. Capacity for action concerns how accepted claims are disseminated and implemented. Deliberative standing concerns the ability to object to, amend, and decide proposals before they become binding. Literary form mediates all three. It determines when recipients enter a political sequence, what has already been settled when they enter, and what still remains open to judgment or revision.

2. GENRE, ADDRESS, AND PARTICIPATORY POSITION

Sun's writings did not address an undifferentiated mass audience. They created specific positions for readers and listeners. Testimony asks whether a narrated event should be believed and condemned. Propaganda explains an already chosen political direction and seeks assent. A commemorative preface interprets the past and tells later readers what should be inherited from it. Elegy turns individual death into a shared emotional object. A political treatise argues that established knowledge must become action, while a parliamentary manual begins where opinions are still unsettled and must be handled under common rules. The shift from one genre to another therefore alters more than style. It changes what kind of response is politically meaningful.

This distinction is especially important because Sun's public language repeatedly moves between persuasion and participation. A listener who understands an argument and acts on it is not politically inert, but neither is that listener doing the same thing as a member who can rewrite a motion. Likewise, a reader who judges a detention from an eyewitness account exercises a form of judgment, yet the facts reach that reader through a narrative already selected and ordered by its author. Participation is thus best understood not as a single scale from passivity to activity but as a set of differently structured relations. In each case, the decisive question is what remains contestable when the recipient is invited to act.

Genre also governs the temporal relation between text and action. Testimony follows an event and seeks a judgment about what occurred. Commemoration returns to an earlier failure and gives it a new place in collective memory. Propaganda stands between doctrine and future action, translating principles into belief. Parliamentary writing operates before a collective decision has been completed and supplies the procedures through which disagreement can alter its content. These temporal differences explain why the same political movement could value authoritative interpretation in one setting and procedural revision in another without fully resolving the tension between them.

3. LITERARY MEDIATION: TESTIMONY, AFFECT, AND REVOLUTIONARY MEMORY

3.1 Testimony and Readerly Judgment in Kidnapped in London

The 1897 *Kidnapped in London* turns a secret detention into a public case. Its preface presents disclosure as a duty: Sun writes that he would feel he had failed in that duty if he did not place the circumstances of the case on 'public record' [11]. Gan Zuolin's 1912 translation renders the appeal more directly toward contemporaries, saying that the true circumstances should be announced to 'the

2. 'The public' is an analytical designation used to compare historically different recipients. Sun's own writings use more specific terms, including 'the present generation,' 'the people of the nation,' 'later survivors,' 'implementers,' and 'members.' Epistemic authority, capacity for action, and deliberative standing describe textual and political relations rather than legal classifications of rights.

present generation' [10] (54).[3] The difference is small in wording but large in address. The English phrase stresses record, publicity, and the possibility of external scrutiny. The Chinese formulation places the early Republican reader more visibly in the position of the person to whom the event is being told.

The book's first-person form is crucial to that position. Sun is witness, protagonist, and organizer of the evidence. The narrative moves from the enclosed space of the Qing legation - locked doors, surveillance, blocked communication - toward an external network of friends, newspapers, police, and diplomatic officials. Each successful message widens the circle of knowledge. What begins as an isolated bodily experience becomes an event that can be known, discussed, and investigated. The reader follows that same movement. The sequence of concealment, attempted communication, confirmation, and intervention gradually turns sympathy with the captive into judgment of the detention. In rhetorical terms, disclosure and evaluation develop together: the narrator gives the audience the materials for judgment while controlling the order in which those materials appear.

That control matters because testimony is never identical with an unmediated archive. Sun's recollection, contemporary accounts, and later diplomatic evidence do not fully agree on how he entered the legation. Hou Zhongjun's use of archival material has challenged the long-circulating account of accidental entrapment [12]. The discrepancy does not cancel the testimonial function of the book; it reveals its limit. Readers are invited to judge an event, but the field of judgment is narratively prepared. *Kidnapped in London* therefore offers an early form of public participation grounded in readerly adjudication: the public is asked to decide what the detention means, not to determine the political program that follows from it.

The 1912 translation changes the afterlife of that judgment. An account originally written for a British public becomes part of the memory of the revolution after the founding of the Republic. Translation does more than transfer content between languages. It relocates the narrative in time and attaches an earlier ordeal to a new political community. The same episode can now be read not only as a case demanding external scrutiny but as a scene in the prehistory of the republic. This shift from testimony to revolutionary memory anticipates the work performed more explicitly by Sun's poetry and commemorative prefaces.

3.2 Poetry, Commemorative Prefaces, and Affective Succession

Sun's scattered remarks on poetry suggest a literary sensibility that was practical rather than systematic. In comments preserved in the *Complete Works*, he praised the expressive compression of Chinese poetry from the *Book of Songs* through the Tang and Song, arguing that a few rhymed lines could contain what would require much greater length in another language. He also rejected the idea that meter was merely a constraint, observing that formal discipline could display greater craft, while empty ornament did not make a good poem [22] (539). These remarks do not amount to a coherent aesthetic system, but they are useful for reading his own revolutionary verse: inherited form mattered because concentrated language could give political emotion memorable shape.

The seven-character regulated verse usually known as 'Elegy for Liu Daoyi' makes that function visible. Written after the execution of the revolutionary Liu Daoyi and later published in *Minli Bao*, the poem places individual death against images of autumn wind, warhorses, a setting sun, and lamenting wild geese [23]. Its most important turn comes when mourning gives way to the 'unfinished undertaking' left to the living. The elegy does not remain within private grief. Traditional images of heroic lament enlarge the dead revolutionary into a figure of national crisis, while the speaker's promise of future tribute keeps mourning oriented toward unfinished action. The poem's political force lies precisely in this conversion: sorrow is condensed into a durable obligation.

Affect theory helps clarify this movement without reducing it to propaganda. As Sara Ahmed argues, emotions acquire political force through circulation: they gather around signs and bodies and help produce alignments among subjects [26]. In Sun's elegy, grief adheres to Liu Daoyi's body, to the endangered nation, and to the future of the revolutionary cause. The poem asks no assembly to vote and offers no institutional rule. Its form instead

3. Kidnapped in London was first published in 1897. English quotations follow that edition. The Chinese phrase translated here as 'announce ... to the present generation' comes from Gan Zuolin's 1912 translation as reproduced in volume 1 of the Complete Works of Sun Yat-sen. The analysis therefore distinguishes Sun's English wording from the translator's Chinese formulation.

creates an affective relation in which fidelity to the dead becomes a measure of the living. Participation here begins as emotional and ethical succession.

The 1904 preface to Liu Chengyu's *History of the Taiping Heavenly Kingdom* performs a related task through historical criticism rather than lyric mourning. Sun juxtaposes Zhu Yuanzhang and Hong Xiuquan, notes that posterity approved one and condemned the other because one succeeded, and calls this a way of 'judging heroes by their success' [10] (258). The sentence reopens the criterion of historical value. Military outcome no longer fixes political legitimacy. By lamenting the destruction of the Taiping record and asking the 'present generation' to preserve its aspiration, the preface reconstructs a defeated movement as part of a usable revolutionary past. This is close to what collective-memory theory describes as the reconstruction of the past within the frames of a present group [25]. The preface does not simply recover Hong Xiuquan; it relocates him inside a genealogy meaningful to late Qing revolutionaries, a point also emphasized by studies of the changing political evaluation of the Taiping leadership [13].

The 1921 preface to *Biographical Sketches of the Seventy-Two Martyrs of Huanghuagang* intensifies the connection between memory and obligation. The writing first dwells on loss, then turns through highly charged imagery - 'crimson blood' and a 'noble spirit' filling the four quarters - toward the claim that the sacrifice aroused the nation and prepared the way for the Wuchang Revolution [14] (50-51). A failed uprising is thus reread from the vantage point of later success. The final conditional appeal addresses the 'people of the nation' and the 'later survivors': if they carry forward the martyrs' unfinished aspiration, the bloodstained history of the revolution will endure; if they merely lament the dead, they will fail them. The rhetoric makes commemoration future-directed. Memory acquires force only when later readers assume responsibility for continuing what the dead could not complete.

Poem and preface work differently. The elegy condenses public grief through image, rhythm, and the inherited conventions of heroic mourning. The prefaces guide interpretation by reorganizing historical causality and naming an inheritance. Both, however, make a reader more than a spectator. They produce what may be called affective succession: a relation in which the past becomes binding because it has been narrated and felt as unfinished. Yet the content of the inheritance is still largely supplied by the writer. The reader may reassess success and failure and may take up the cause, but the text does not provide a procedure for deciding among competing interpretations of that cause.

3.3 Literary Exempla and the Rhetoric of Mobilization

Sun's political speeches show another use of literary form: the literary work becomes an example inside an argument. The 1905 inaugural manifesto of *Min Bao* imagined revolutionary doctrine moving from the few to the many until it became 'common knowledge' [10][288-289]. Two decades later, the first lecture on Nationalism compressed the same sequence into a formula: once ideas are understood, belief arises; once belief exists, power follows [9][184]. Communication is not neutral transmission here. Explanation is expected to alter disposition and make action possible.

The lectures achieve this by moving between doctrine and vivid examples. The familiar image of loose sand mixed with water and cement makes organization visible through a material analogy [9][272]. More revealing for the literary question is Sun's use of *Heinu yutian lu* (*A Black Slave's Cry to Heaven*), the Chinese translation of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. He argued that once people knew how enslaved people suffered, they felt injustice on their behalf, and he connected that awakening to the eventual Civil War [9][290]. The history is drastically simplified, but the rhetorical mechanism is clear. Narrative renders distant suffering perceptible, sympathy turns perception into moral judgment, and the speech redirects that judgment toward political action. Literature is valued less as an autonomous aesthetic object than as a form capable of reorganizing feeling and making an abstract injustice experientially available.

This functional view of literary mediation should not be inflated into a complete theory of art. Sun's comments on poetry, his own verse, and his repeated use of stories and images show a real sensitivity to formal effect, but the political texts usually subordinate that effect to a practical sequence of understanding, belief, and action. The important point for the present argument is that literary and rhetorical devices change the way recipients enter politics. Testimony makes them judges, elegy and commemoration make them successors, and narrative exempla help turn sympathy into assent. In all three cases, however, the principal political direction has already been

interpreted before the recipient acts. The problem of how a still-unsettled proposal can be changed by those who receive it belongs to another textual form.

3.4 True Knowledge and the Capacity for Action

The Doctrine of Sun Wen confronts a crisis of action more directly. Written amid the frustrations and divisions of the post-1911 revolutionary movement, the book explains political failure through a mistaken understanding of knowledge and practice. Its preface says that knowledge is transmitted 'from scholars to the masses' and warns that ignorance may produce unwillingness to act while mistaken ideas about difficulty may produce fear even among those who know [14][158-160]. The famous claim that 'knowledge is difficult, action is easy' therefore has a rhetorical purpose as well as a philosophical one. It is designed to restore confidence in large programs of reconstruction by separating the difficulty of discovering reliable knowledge from the wider possibility of acting once that knowledge has been established.

The prose repeatedly crosses from abstract argument into ordinary experience. Eating, construction, shipbuilding, electricity, chemistry, language, and composition all become evidence that people often perform successfully without reproducing the long process by which underlying principles were discovered. The example of writing is especially revealing. Sun distinguishes practical mastery of language from the later effort to abstract rules of grammar and composition, a distinction consistent with his separate comments on literary craft [22]. Everyday practice gives the treatise an accessible rhythm: readers are not merely told that action is easier than knowledge; they are asked to recognize the claim in activities they already know.

The argument culminates in the threefold distinction among those who 'know and awaken first,' those who 'know and awaken later,' and those who 'neither know nor awaken,' corresponding to inventors, propagators, and implementers [14][203]. Sun's example of foreign planners and Chinese workers in Shanghai makes the division unusually concrete. The workers possess abundant practical capacity; what is scarce, he says, is the ability to formulate ideals and plans. This arrangement both dignifies and limits mass action. The majority are indispensable because no program becomes social reality without them, but the direction of action is largely defined elsewhere. Propagators occupy the crucial middle position, translating specialized judgment into language that can recruit wider practice.

The hierarchy is nevertheless less complete than it first appears. In the chapter on acting without prior knowledge, Sun treats experiment, practice, and exploration as sources of new understanding [14][222]. When discussing corrupt officials, he also allows ordinary people to judge political conduct through the consequences they experience directly. These passages matter because they prevent the book from collapsing into a simple model of expert knowledge and passive obedience. Practice can generate knowledge, and lived interest can support political judgment. What remains underdeveloped is the procedure by which such judgments can revise a general political program once disagreement becomes collective and explicit.

Hu Shi's changing response makes that problem historically visible. In 1919, after Sun and Liao Zhongkai sent him the book, Hu praised its effort to dispel fear of difficult action while reserving judgment on several specific claims [17]. By 1929, under the conditions of Kuomintang political tutelage, his concern had shifted. He warned that if political knowledge were treated as a task already completed by the late premier, the people could be left with obedience and denied the ordinary space of doubt, criticism, and debate [18]. The later criticism should not be projected backward as Sun's original intention. It shows instead what could happen when a functional division between discovering and implementing knowledge hardened into a political hierarchy. That is precisely the point at which the *Primer of Democracy* becomes relevant.

4. PARLIAMENTARY FORM AND COLLECTIVE DECISION

Sun began compiling and translating parliamentary rules in 1916 and published *General Rules for Meetings* in 1917. Correspondence, publishing records, and textual research show that the book was distributed among party colleagues for study and rehearsal [8]. Its principal English source was not simply Robert's *Rules of Order*, as long assumed, but Harriette R. Shattuck's *The Woman's Manual of Parliamentary Law*, a practical manual written for ordinary associations and especially women's organizations [16]. Sun praised its accessibility to beginners [15][554]. The source mattered because it offered not only rules but examples: parliamentary knowledge appeared as a

set of acts that could be learned by people with no prior experience of formal assemblies.

The preface to the later *Primer of Democracy* makes this pedagogical ambition explicit. Citizens, Sun argues, lacked the principles, order, habits, and experience of assembly and therefore had to learn democratic rights through repeated practice [15][553-555]. He calls the book one for 'practice and rehearsal', not casual browsing. The distinction between reading and rehearsal changes the function of prose. Rules are not complete when understood; they must be embodied as procedures of standing, seeking recognition, moving a proposal, responding to others, and voting. In that sense the manual approaches a script. It assigns roles, fixes an order of action, and allows readers to imagine themselves inside a meeting before they enter one.

The so-called illustrative procedures make this especially clear. In one sample meeting, a member rises, addresses the chair, waits to be recognized, proposes a public lecture, and then sits while the chair restates the motion and opens discussion. The characters are deliberately thin. Their importance lies in what they are permitted to do at each step. The member is not a psychologically developed figure but a procedural role that any learner can occupy. Such staging is politically consequential. It trains the reader to transform an individual wish into business that other members can discuss. Unlike a propagandistic example that leads toward a predetermined conclusion, the demonstration preserves more than one possible outcome. The motion may pass or fail; what remains constant is the procedure by which the disagreement is handled.

This difference becomes sharper once a motion has been formally stated. Before the chair restates it, the mover may withdraw it. After restatement, it belongs to the assembly and its alteration becomes a collective matter [15]. The rules on amendment carry that transfer of control further. A mover may accept a proposed change when no one objects, but once disagreement appears, the amendment is decided by the meeting rather than by the original author of the motion. The text thereby distinguishes authorship of a proposal from ownership of its subsequent form. Entry into the assembly exposes the proposal to other members' language and judgment.

A recurring example concerns a proposed library and reading room for members. An amendment changes the intended beneficiaries from members to the public. The difference is substantive: it changes how collective resources will be distributed. Yet the people who benefit from the amendment are not necessarily the people who decide it. The proposal still belongs to the constituted membership. The rules then require separate votes on the amendment and on the motion as amended [15]. This separation creates space for conditional judgment. A member who opposes the library in principle may still prefer a public rather than members-only library if the project is adopted. Parliamentary procedure thus permits a more differentiated political response than simple assent or refusal.

The chair's position is also carefully bounded. The chair may clarify badly worded motions but should preserve the mover's meaning; disputes over order may themselves be appealed to the meeting. When the chair enters substantive debate, the rules require a temporary return to the position of an ordinary member. These details distinguish procedural authority from control of content. The chair keeps the process intelligible, while the assembly decides the fate of the proposal. The text therefore distributes agency through reciprocal limits rather than through a single source of interpretation.

The revisions from 1917 to 1918 should be described cautiously.[4] Material on special meetings already existed at the end of Section 29 of *General Rules for Meetings*; the 1918 text separated it into a distinct section and clarified the organization of related rules [8]. Formal notice and restrictions on unannounced business protected absent members' access to information and limited the agenda that those present could suddenly expand. Other changes specified more precisely that the assembly's removal power concerned officers. At the same time, the 1918 *Primer of Democracy* removed the prefaces by Deng Jiayan, Yang Shukan, and Zhu Zhixin and retained Sun's own preface as the principal statement of purpose. The result is not a simple movement from hierarchy to democracy. Authorial framing becomes more concentrated even as procedural relations among members, officers, and agenda items are more explicitly defined.

The First National Congress of the Kuomintang in 1924 offers a useful, if limited, point of

4. A stable complete scan of the 1917 Zhonghua Book Company first edition of General Rules for Meetings was not available for this study. Version claims rely on the official collated text based on the Republican-era edition together with Xu Tao's textual research [8]. The argument concerns verified revisions and their implications for members' positions, not the discovery of new variants.

comparison. Fang Ruilin proposed that party members be forbidden to join another party; Li Dazhao and other delegates contested the proposal; the congress debated the issue and ultimately declined to place the prohibition in the party constitution [19-20]. The episode shows a major organizational disagreement passing through proposal, debate, and vote. It does not prove that the congress followed the *Primer* line by line, nor can surviving publication records establish a continuous chain from the 1917 manual to every later meeting. What the case does show is that the procedural vocabulary described by the manual corresponded to a real political problem: how to give disagreement a form in which members could alter or reject a proposal before it acquired collective force.

Placed beside *The Doctrine of Sun Wen*, the manual clarifies two moments in the life of a political claim. The treatise is strongest when a direction has already been defined and the task is to make knowledge actionable at scale. The manual is strongest when the content of a decision is still unsettled and members must handle competing views. Both require education. Neither eliminates authority. Their unresolved relation appears when a claim supported by the prestige of 'true knowledge' enters a meeting. Does expertise merely strengthen the reasons offered for a motion, or does it place the substance of that motion beyond amendment? Sun's writings provide resources for both answers without establishing a general rule for the boundary between them.

5. CONCLUSION

Across Sun Yat-sen's revolutionary writings, public participation changes with genre because genre changes the point at which recipients enter political action. *Kidnapped in London* turns narrative disclosure into readerly judgment while preserving the narrator's control over evidence. Elegy and commemorative prefaces make grief and historical memory into forms of succession, binding later readers to an unfinished cause. Propaganda uses analogy and literary example to move understanding toward belief and action. *The Doctrine of Sun Wen* gives broad practice a decisive role in realizing knowledge, even as the production and authoritative explanation of that knowledge remain unevenly distributed. The *Primer of Democracy* begins from a different problem: opinions are not yet settled, so members need procedures for changing the proposal itself.

The literary dimension of this sequence is not ornamental. Narrative order decides when evidence becomes visible. Poetic compression makes revolutionary loss memorable. Commemorative rhetoric reconstructs failure as inheritance. Stories and analogies give doctrine an affective and experiential form. Procedural examples stage the actions of speakers, chairs, and voters before those actions occur in practice. These formal choices shape political agency because they determine what kind of response a text makes possible. Sun's public writing is therefore best understood neither as pure propaganda nor as a hidden aesthetic system, but as a field in which literary, rhetorical, and institutional forms repeatedly reorganize the relation between author, audience, and action.

The deepest distinction is between acting on a position after it has been established and participating while that position remains open. Sun's writings contain both relations. Their coexistence explains the persistent tension between epistemic authority and deliberative standing. Knowledge, experience, and revolutionary prestige can give a proposal exceptional persuasive force, but parliamentary procedure treats a proposal as something that acquires collective validity only after members have had opportunities to object, amend, and vote. How those principles were reconciled in practice cannot be settled by texts alone. It requires further evidence from party meetings, schools, associations, and other sites where literary persuasion, political education, and procedural decision actually met.

REFERENCES

[1] Bai Wengang and Guo Qi, 'On Sun Yat-sen's Thought on Propaganda,' Sichuan Ligong Xueyuan Xuebao (Shehui Kexue Ban) [Journal of Sichuan University of Science and Engineering, Social Sciences Edition], vol. 23, no. 4, 2008, pp. 1-6 [in Chinese].

[2] He Jianguo, A Study of the Dissemination of Sun Yat-sen's Writings, China Social Sciences Press, Beijing, 2014, pp. 1-9, 144-210 [in Chinese].

[3] Chen Yunqian, Cult and Memory: The Construction and Dissemination of the Sun Yat-sen Symbol, Nanjing University Press, Nanjing, 2009, pp. 46-84, 147-222 [in Chinese].

[4] Li Gongzhong, Sun Yat-sen Mausoleum: The Birth of a Modern Political Symbol, revised ed., SDX Joint Publishing Company, Beijing, 2019, pp. 29-75, 127-189 [in Chinese].

[5] S. Li, 'Sun Yat-sen's English Writing and Revolutionary Image after His Kidnapping and Imprisonment in London,' Journal of Modern Chinese History, vol. 15, no. 2, 2021, pp. 139-155.

[6] Cai Zhidong, 'Ambiguity and Originality: A New Inquiry into Sun Yat-sen's Epistemological Thought and the Real Implications of The Doctrine of Sun Wen,' Hangzhou Shifan Daxue Xuebao (Shehui Kexue Ban) [Journal of Hangzhou Normal University, Social Sciences Edition], no. 4, 2015, pp. 19-25 [in Chinese].

[7] Li Qicheng, 'The Study of Parliamentary Procedure and the Evolution of Democratic Rights in Modern China: From the Detailed Rules of Procedure of the Advisory Council to the Primer of Democracy,' Faxuejia [The Jurist], no. 3, 2013, pp. 140-157 [in Chinese].

[8] Xu Tao, 'A Textual Study of the Composition of Sun Yat-sen's Primer of Democracy: Centered on the Three Prefaces to General Rules for Meetings,' Jindaishi Yanjiu [Modern Chinese History Studies], no. 2, 2026, pp. 25-47 [in Chinese].

[9] Sun Zhongshan, Sun Zhongshan Quanji [Complete Works of Sun Yat-sen], vol. 9, Zhonghua Book Company, Beijing, 1986, pp. 184, 272, 290 [in Chinese].

[10] Sun Zhongshan, Sun Zhongshan Quanji [Complete Works of Sun Yat-sen], vol. 1, Zhonghua Book Company, Beijing, 1981, pp. 54, 258, 288-289 [in Chinese].

[11] Sun Yat-sen, Kidnapped in London: Being the Story of My Capture by, Detention at, and Release from the Chinese Legation, London, J. W. Arrowsmith, Bristol; Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Company Limited, London, 1897, Preface.

[12] Hou Zhongjun, 'The Rule of Non-Extradition for Political Offenders and a Third Interpretation of Sun Yat-sen's London Abduction,' Guangdong Shehui Kexue [Guangdong Social Sciences], no. 3, 2022, pp. 96-108 [in Chinese].

[13] Liu Pujiang, 'Deconstructing the Historical Context of Views of the Taiping Heavenly Kingdom: The Complex Entanglements among the Kuomintang, Hong Xiuquan and Yang Xiuqing, and Zeng Guofan and Hu Linyi,' Jindaishi Yanjiu [Modern Chinese History Studies], no. 2, 2014, pp. 84-99 [in Chinese].

[14] Sun Zhongshan, Sun Zhongshan Quanji [Complete Works of Sun Yat-sen], vol. 6, Zhonghua Book Company, Beijing, 1985, pp. 50-51, 158-160, 203-204, 222 [in Chinese].

[15] Sun Zhongshan, Guofu Quanji [Complete Works of the Father of the Nation], vol. 1, edited by Qin Xiaoyi, Modern China Publishing House, Taipei, 1989, pp. 553-593 [in Chinese].

[16] H. R. Shattuck, The Woman's Manual of Parliamentary Law: With Practical Illustrations Especially Adapted to Women's Organizations, 4th ed., Lee and Shepard, Boston, 1894.

[17] Hu Shi, 'The Contents of and Comments on The Doctrine of Sun Wen,' Meizhou Pinglun [The Weekly Review], no. 31, July 20, 1919, p. 3 [in Chinese].

[18] Hu Shi, 'Knowledge Is Difficult, but Action Is Not Easy Either: A Review of Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Doctrine that Action Is Easy and Knowledge Difficult,' Xinyue [Crescent Moon], vol. 2, no. 4, 1929, pp. 1-15 [in Chinese].

[19] Minutes of the First National Congress of the Kuomintang [online], Sun Yat-sen Academic Database, 1924, accessed August 28, 2026, https://sunology.yatsen.gov.tw/detail/9bed8d5eeba86ebefd0c5dd4d33bc958/ [in Chinese].

[20] Wang Qisheng, 'From Accommodating the Communists to Accommodating the Nationalists: A Reconsideration of Kuomintang-Communist Party Relations, 1924-1927,' Jindaishi Yanjiu [Modern Chinese History Studies], no. 4, 2001, pp. 37-85 [in Chinese].

[21] Xu Wenze, 'On the Modern Characteristics of Sun Yat-sen's Criticism of Literary Theory and Creation,' Guangdong Kaifang Daxue Xuebao [Journal of the Open University of

Guangdong], vol. 30, no. 4, 2021, pp. 56-61 [in Chinese].

[22] Sun Zhongshan, Sun Zhongshan Quanji [Complete Works of Sun Yat-sen], vol. 4, Zhonghua Book Company, Beijing, 1985, p. 539 [in Chinese].

[23] Sun Wen, 'Elegy for Liu Daoyi,' Minli Bao, January 1, 1912, p. 1 [in Chinese].

[24] James Phelan, Living to Tell about It: A Rhetoric and Ethics of Character Narration, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 2005.

[25] Maurice Halbwachs, On Collective Memory, edited and translated by Lewis A. Coser, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1992.

[26] Sara Ahmed, The Cultural Politics of Emotion, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2004.

APPENDIX

Chronology of Sun Yat-Sen's Major Literary Practices, 1897-1924

Date	Text or Practice	Genre or Form	Principal Content and Significance for Literary Practice
1897	Publication of Kidnapped in London	English testimony and autobiography	Writing as an eyewitness, Sun narrates the London detention as public testimony addressed to British society. The narrative joins factual appeal to the construction of a revolutionary self-image.
1904	Preface to Liu Chengyu's History of the Taiping Heavenly Kingdom	Preface and historical criticism	The phrase 'judging heroes by their success' reopens the standard of historical evaluation and relocates the Taiping movement within a revolutionary genealogy.
November 1905	Inaugural Manifesto of Min Bao	Political writing for the press	The manifesto seeks to turn radical doctrine into 'common knowledge,' connecting journal writing with explanation, circulation, and revolutionary mobilization.
1907	Elegy for the Martyr Liu Daoyi	Seven-character regulated verse and revolutionary poetry	Traditional elegiac form links personal mourning, national crisis, and an unfinished revolutionary cause, turning grief into an ethical demand on survivors.
May 1912	Gan Zuolin's translation of Kidnapped in London	Translation and autobiography	The 1897 testimony enters the Chinese-language public sphere of the early Republic. Translation shifts the episode from external appeal toward revolutionary memory and contemporary judgment.
1917-1918	General Rules for Meetings revised as the Primer of Democracy	Compilation, translation, and political writing	Rules, staged examples, and 'practice and rehearsal' transform procedural prose into training for speaking, amendment, and collective decision.
1918	Informal conversations on poetics	Literary conversation and poetics	Sun praises the density and formal craft of classical poetry, emphasizing concision, resonance, and the artistic possibilities of meter while rejecting empty ornament.
1919	Publication of The Doctrine of Sun Wen	Political treatise and argumentative prose	Questions, analogies, and everyday examples make the knowledge-action argument accessible; discussion of composition also links political reasoning to the practice and theory of writing.
December 1921	Preface to Biographical Sketches of the Seventy-Two Martyrs of Huanghuagang	Preface and revolutionary commemoration	Elevated imagery and conditional address turn martyrdom into collective memory and make remembrance inseparable from the responsibility of later survivors.

Date	Text or Practice	Genre or Form	Principal Content and Significance for Literary Practice
1924	Lectures on the Three Principles of the People	Political speech and oral communication	Stories, material analogies, historical anecdotes, and literary works move listeners between explanation, sympathy, belief, and action, displaying the oral and rhetorical dimension of Sun's late political writing.