

LEIDEN UNIVERSITY

What did they say and why did they say so?

- Slogans in 2012 Anti-Japanese Demonstrations and Discourse
of Contemporary Chinese Nationalists

Leiden University

MA Thesis

Asian Studies: Politics, Economy and Society

Supervisor: Dr. T.M. Salmenkari

Student Number: s1385291

Email: gabriel1991@foxmail.com

Word Count (of main body): 16,530

Zhang Yang

2014-7-14

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. T.M. Salmenkari, who offered me great help and valuable suggestions in the process of writing this thesis. I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. S.R. Landsberger, who provided plenty of helpful materials and inspirations for me at the beginning of preparation. I would definitely appreciate those, especially my mother and friends who constantly supported me in the hard times. Finally, I give great thanks to my friends Julian Grossherr and Michael Bercock for giving a lot of comments and helping me to proofread the thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
1.1. Introduction.....	3
1.2. Background	9
1.2.1 Domestic Politics	9
1.2.2 Sino-Japanese Economic Relations	11
1.2.3 Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands Dispute	13
Slogans in the Demonstrations	17
2.1. Methodology	17
2.2. Collection and Arrangement	22
2.3. Interpretation and Comparison	24
Conclusion	41
References.....	43
Appendix	51

Introduction

1.1. Introduction

Nationalism remains important issue in East Asian countries and seems to become increasingly irresistible force these days as the result of a series of serious challenges regarding to national interest and regional security. Due to their special cultural, historical and geopolitical circumstances, the relations and rivalries among East Asian countries appear more complicated and risky, which make a few dangerous uncertainties to Asian-Pacific peace and order. The bilateral relationships between China and Japan, Japan and South Korea, have become increasingly strained due to a variety of disagreements over key political issues, such as territorial claims. (Kimura, 2014) One of those most intractable should be the Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands dispute as well as the increasing levels of naval and aerial engagements over this issue between China and Japan. Although the claims of these islands do concern practical interests of both countries, great symbolic value has been invested in the incident, whose process and fallout is frequently interpreted as evidence of an ongoing “power shift” in East Asia or explained as a consequence of such a “power shift”. In such narrative, Chinese “aggressiveness” or “pressure”, and Japanese “weakness” or “defeat” are understood respectively as reflections of “China’s rise” and “Japan’s decline”. (Hagstrom, 2012) This means the rivalry over territorial dispute, far beyond its own practical meaning, appears more sensitive and irreconcilable to both of them, which also largely explains Japan’s deep-seated doubt about China’s real intentions. (Shu, 2010) This hot spot, along with ever-present unsettled “history problems” and complex emotions towards China’s newly rise, leads to the exacerbating popular images, increasing distrust, antipathy of each other and the upsurges of nationalist sentiments on both sides. (Cho & Park, 2011)

Apart from stimuli like the current conflicts involving specific and practical benefits, nationalist sentiments, to a large extent, originate from the memories and “inherent” oppositional sentiments in East Asia, which mainly stems from periodically contested quarrels about this region’s painful past and historical animosity. “History problems” refers to a series of controversial issues on modern invasion, occupation and colonization, Japanese wartime atrocities, history textbooks that justify and glorify Japanese colonial rule and Japanese leaders’ homage to Yasukuni Shrine (where convicted Japanese war criminals in World War II are

enshrined), etc., which could be seen in many ways as the most important source that provides nationalist flames with fuel in China and Korea. (Cumings, 2007) This has been, and continues to be, one of the defining features of East Asian international relations, with largely negative regional consequences for alliance ties and regional institution-building. (Cho & Park, 2011) Such features appear much typical especially between China and Japan. Wang Zheng introduced the term *Bainian Guochi* (a century of national humiliation) which refers to the period from the outbreak of the First Opium War in 1839 until the end of World War II in 1945, when China was attacked, bullied, looted and torn asunder by imperialists in a whole century. He also argues, for many Chinese people, they have not really moved forward from their past humiliation and the assumption that “time heals all wounds” taken granted by many of those from the countries of China’s “ex-colonial aggressors”, unfortunately, is wrong. Chinese historical consciousness of the so-called *Bainian Guochi* still plays a powerful role affecting Chinese politics, foreign relations and national psyche. (Wang, 2008) Among all those “invaders” and their “evil deeds”, excluding propaganda out of ideological tensions in the Cold War, such real and horrible incidents as Nanking Massacre and the cession of Taiwan, particularly nailed their perpetrator Japan to “unforgivable” pillory in many people’s mind. The controversial claims of Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands can actually be regarded, for some aspects, as parts of the continued ramifications of former historical legacies as well, since China argues that Diaoyu Islands, as the affiliated islands of Taiwan, has long been the territory and under control of China since Ming Dynasty in 1372 based on the earliest records, and taken by Japan secretly by force in late Qing Dynasty when China was weak. (Xinhua, 2012-09-25) This kind of historical consciousness, in Wang’s opinion, is usually strengthened rather than assuaged by China’s recent economic success and growing muscles, and serves to activate the patriotism and nationalism, which is why it’s necessary to avoid merely viewing China through its present and important to understand one of the main origins of Chinese nationalism, in his words, to view China “through a more comprehensive lens which takes national identity and domestic discourse into account.” (Wang, 2008)

One thing to stress here is that people’s memories and emotions involving nationalism is definitely not limited to modern history – Chinese nationalism is destined to be not a simple concept due to China’s long and unique civilization. Peter Hays Gries (2005; 2004) explored three periods of “past” in Chinese history and argued that “5000 years”, “100 years” and “10 years”, which respectively refers to “the heavy burden of five-thousand-year civilization”, “a century of humiliation” and

“ten years in Mao’s era”, are such three periods of history that had remarkable effect in the formation of today’s Chinese nationalism. His research could well help us to understand what “Chinese” means in this century and how people and their passion work in contemporary Chinese nationalism.

However, history is not the only source of oppositional sentiments and nationalism; Japan is neither the only target nor concern. There are plenty of researches studying the social and economic origins, the evolving process of Chinese nationalism as well as the connections and interactions of different factors in this process. (Zhao, 2013; Li & Lin, 2012; Tang & Darr, 2012) In these papers, the roles of authoritarian regime, market economy, civil society, media, Internet and new technologies, etc. in the changing process of Chinese nationalism are studied and elaborated. It could be observed that some social conditions and voices fuel or take part in the nationalism in ways which sometimes add quite different qualities and claims to it as well. Yang (2013) and Wu (2007) focused on citizen activism online and cyber nationalism respectively, and in both of their researches, it could be easily found that Chinese nationalism, at least partly shown by those online nationalists, has a tendency of mixing or collaborating with other radical thoughts like populism and political conservatism (usually Maoist leftism in Chinese context), etc. This kind of characteristics is backed up by other research focusing on the revival of Chinese leftism online. (Hu, 2007) Hu argues, “because of the growing prevalence and intensity of online debates regarding the nature of Chinese reform, itself initiated as a nationalistic mission, what we are witnessing at present is not only the apparent tide of state-guided Chinese nationalism, but more importantly the revival of Chinese leftism on- and offline as both a less cherished but firm undercurrent and a persistent challenge to that tide.”

Many scholars also pointed out that domestic politics regarding leaders’ personal bias and intentions could lead to state authorities’ playing on such popular feelings for the sake of political needs. (Kimura, 2014; Tang & Darr, 2012; Cho & Park, 2011) In China’s case, Chinese Communist Party was able to defeat Kuomintang (KMT) and take over China in 1949 largely due to its ability to appeal to the sentiment of public nationalism. Although in the previous years of communist rule, “Marxist ideology went side by side with nationalism”, Tang and Darr argue, “Marxism has been replaced by economic pragmatism since late 1970s and nationalism has served almost exclusively as the ideological instrument for political mobilization”, which was especially true after 1989 Tiananmen Incident and following crackdowns when CCP

launched a nationwide campaign to promote “patriotic education”, nationalism and anti-Western sentiment to restore its legitimacy. (Tang & Darr, 2012) After this in the last two decades, the coming nationalist protests have mainly aimed at events most of which concern China’s relations with the US and Japan, however, Chinese government’s role in these protests also became more subtle and vague, who seemingly tended to keep some sort of balance and at times vacillated between support and repress, possibly due to China’s increasing participation in the global affairs and much closer economic ties with those countries. China now is Japan’s biggest trade partner while Japan is one of China’s most important origins of technologies and foreign investment, which means great dependence on each other. (Wang, 2010) Nationalism is a double-edged sword serving not only as the origin of legitimacy, but in some cases the chance and platform for different social and even political forces with “ulterior motives”. When China’s no longer isolated world full of radical ideologies and nationalism’s no longer easily controlled, it needs to take into account much more than risk playing fire, which is likely to damage not only the trade relations but also its own stability. (Kang, 2013)

On Japanese side, a good illustration of political figures’ taking advantage of popular feelings would be the nationalization of Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands in 2012, which was initially instigated by the Governor of Tokyo, Ishihara Shintaro, and eventually resulted in the recent wave of heightened tensions between China and Japan lasting until now. Horiuchi (2014) examined the role of public opinion in Japan in directly influencing the Japanese government’s decision to nationalize the Senkaku Islands in 2012. He argued that the nationalization took place within a nationalistic domestic environment while in the process the “public opinion was channeled most notably through Tokyo Governor Ishihara”, whose plan to purchase the Islands and popular support for his plan “eventually forced the central government’s intervention” and left Prime Minister Noda no choice but to nationalize the Islands. Nevertheless, no matter what kind of predicament Noda was in, Japanese government’s actions would neither be understood nor disregarded by China since Chinese leaders also have their own concerns to calculate. Takeuchi argues that domestic politics on both sides of the dispute result in uncertainty regarding leaders’ intentions, which drives the initiation and escalation of an unnecessary dispute. (Kimura, 2014)

Anyway, Japan’s move provoked swift and violent reactions from both Chinese government and the public – a series of counter measures in waters near the islands and two-month nationwide, large-scale anti-Japanese protests in over 100 cities. (Island, 2012; Wikipedia, 2012 China anti-Japanese demonstrations; International

Business Times, Sep. 17 2012) The fallout from these incidents still contributes to the deadlock and constant frictions between China and Japan until now.

Although the Islands Dispute seemed to be the key issue and direct blasting fuse igniting the enmities and tensions between two countries, the factors involved, ranging from nationalist sentiments on both sides to security and economic concerns about the present and the future, are indeed complicated and tangled. When we return to the case of China and its nationalism, the sources and researches mentioned above, on the other hand, revealed the many facets and the complexity of Chinese nationalism – its possible origins, causes and components. Since Fairclough argues that “discourse is the tool of ideology”, then in what way have these many facets, has this kind of complexity been shown by its discourse? There are plenty of researches studying the discourse of Chinese nationalism on different levels, especially the official discourse of CCP and Chinese government, nationalistic scholars and their works, as well as nationalism in the media and cyberspace. (Zheng, 2012; Li & Lin, 2012; Stockmann, 2010; Breslin & Shen 2010; Chen, 2006) But what is the nationalist discourse like on the mass movement level, or in this specific case of anti-Japanese demonstrations of 2012? Is it possible that the many facets of Chinese nationalism also backed up by something on the ground level, by the discourse down to individuals while still relating to aspects we have discussed above? What, and for what possible reasons, might people holding banners and fervently participating in these protests try to express?

Scholars like Yang (2013) pointed out the possible linkage between online nationalist debates, discourse of activism and protests on the street – the linkage of both the people performing these deeds and the main concerns/ways of expression they have, on- and offline. However, except for news reports and pictures, not many researches directly focused on the people themselves in such anti-Japanese protests as well as the banners and slogans they used, which may quite possibly be a good way to study their discourse and ideas. For one thing, language used by anti-Japanese demonstrators is obviously an inseparable part of the discourse system of contemporary Chinese nationalists, though their concerns may not be limited to Japan. The language they used takes their roots in the history and changing process of Chinese nationalism and society, just as introduced by the literature. For another, 2012 protests broke out in over 100 Chinese cities in two months, which even unusually spread into middle-sized cities and small towns, and were said to be the largest scale since the normalization of Sino-Japanese diplomatic relations in 1972. (BBC, Sep.15 2012) This means the degree of such sentiments being popular and in some ways their

claims being representative, at least within the groups launching these protests; and a good diversity of samples in different areas could be provided and studied. Since textual banners and slogans are almost condensed key words and prior messages of people's concerns, intentions, i.e. to a great extent, why they were there demonstrating and shouting their claims, moreover, they were created with certain motives and designed into certain forms, it is possible that we can unlock more secrets from these textual materials with proper methods and obtain a larger picture these texts as well as the nationalist discourse fit into.

The main ideas of this research hence become clear – Chinese nationalism and specific situations like the islands dispute as the background, slogans from the protests as research objects, and mainly involved critical discourse analysis as the methods – altogether, to link the pieces of specific texts in the slogans back to some parts of the jigsaw puzzle of nationalist discourse. This thesis aims to explore the complexity of Chinese nationalist discourse on the popular movement level with a case study of the slogans in 2012 anti-Japanese demonstrations, to prove the coherence between the discourse discussed here in this paper and some other researches on Chinese nationalism. The main title of this thesis is “What did they say and why did they say so”, however, in the process of answering these two questions, it likely means that the more various content or ideas we observe through the slogans, the more loose and fragmented the discourse system, and hence the group of people using such discourse and holding such opinions, may turn out to be. Beyond these two simple but crucial questions, this research attempts to test and verify one hypothesis that, nationalism is a large flag under which people seemingly originally gather, or be gathered, to demonstrate their solidarity and uniformity while eventually ironically exposed their serious division and divergence.

1.2. Background

To view the anti-Japanese demonstrations in 2012, three points relating to the background are especially important to mention and emphasize again here: China's domestic politics, Sino-Japanese economic relations and the islands dispute.

1.2.1 Domestic Politics

The 2012 was the year of China's political leadership transition, which means that new top leaders of Chinese Communist Party (CCP), of whom the coming future of China might lie in the hands, would come out and take over the power to rule the country with the world's largest population and second largest economy in the next five years. (The Diplomat, Nov. 16 2012) China is definitely not a democracy with free general elections of their top leaders according to Western standards of any kind and hence the nontransparent process remained highly mysterious and vigilant, attracting tons of interest and speculation from both ordinary Chinese and foreign media. The transfer of power and new leaders might bring new changes to China but in the meantime it first of all implies that the year of 2012's meant to be crucial and highly sensitive, and therefore Wei Wen – “preserving stability” (Feng, 2013) would be the supreme concern and first priority of Chinese government, which usually means fortified security measures across China, stricter restrictions on dissidents and online censorship, and even lower chance to tolerate massive social protests, unless in some cases and for some reasons there may be other special need to divert public attention by means of nationalist sentiments towards foreign countries, just as argued by some scholars. (Tang & Darr, 2012) One possibility of this kind could be the occurrence of unusual domestic political incident that is thought to likely jeopardize the “social stability” or the necessarily “smooth and steady” process of expected power change.

How those leaders had been anointed and come into office remained unknown to most “outsiders” due to lack of open and credible information, but one thing for sure is that, the whole process was far from “smooth and peaceful” as it seemed to be and the final result was merely the outcome of rivalry and compromise, of a series of “hard bargain” games among powerful interest groups and factions within CCP. Different leaders within CCP Politburo Standing Committee, “the party's top decision-making body”, are generally viewed as the mouthpiece or representative of different factions/groups by critics and scholars. (CNN, *After months of mystery, China unveils new top leaders.* Nov. 16 2012) More importantly, this is where

different leaders and factions holding/on behalf of different political opinions, especially those on China's reforms and development, and people/social forces supporting respective political opinions are linked together.

Although the factions could be many based on different criteria or focuses (like the birth-oriented Princeling, etc.), the attitude towards China's reforms and opinion about the future road that China should take is one of the most important standards to distinguish different factions within CCP and Chinese government. For example, leaders inclined to support continuous market-oriented economic reforms (similar to Deng Xiaoping's political thoughts), stronger actions to fight corruption or more open attitude to public concerns can be labeled as reformists; on the contrary, officials denying universal values, opposing "radical" reforms like the declaration of family property of civil servants or in favor of preserving absolute party authority and coercive measures in dealing with mass incidents, etc. are quite possibly regarded as the conservative. By this standard, in Chinese political context, officials and groups could be roughly divided into two main factions – the Conservative (left), who highlight "preserving stability" "strengthening socialist roots" over anything else, willing/tend to maintain the status quo or even return to China's past road in Mao's era (Mao's pictures, thoughts and quotations are frequently used by those pro-Mao cadres); and the Reformist (right), who emphasize continuous and effective reforms of China's economy and politics at present and in the future, to let more people more equally share the benefits of development, basically along Deng Xiaoping's road (who initiated China's Open and Reform Era three decades ago and finally led to rapid change and development). (Center for American Progress, *China's Forthcoming Political Transition – China's left/right ideological divides*. Feb.9 2012) However, the division and fight among factions seem never limited to the party itself. And for those who radically and fervently support and debate these political ideas in the cyberspace, Zhao Jing (2013) put all of them under the tag of nationalists while dividing them into "left cynics" (左愤) and "right cynics" (右愤) (two deriving from the same word Fenqing, literally meaning angry young men, young nationalists or cynics) according to their arguments, since they all show great concern and seemingly uncontrollable strong "sense of responsibility" about China's fate and development despite their irreconcilable divergence of opinions.

Both Willy Lam (2012) and Hu (2007) explored the revival of Maoism or new leftism in China as major factions of the CCP take a conservative turn in ideology and politics. They respectively studied the impact of the restoration of Maoist norms and

thoughts on aspects of Chinese politics and the people's online debates. Lam also assessed the Chongqing campaign spearheaded by the ousted party chief of Chongqing, Bo Xilai, who is well-known for his political practices, generally seen as direct challenges to central government in the charge of President Hu Jintao and Premier Wen Jiabao – two famous grassroots-background reformist leaders, and his dramatic downfall in March of 2012 due to the direct impact of Wang Lijun Incident (Wikipedia – Wang Lijun Incident), both in and outside of China. Bo Xilai, the highly controversial and famous local chief leader with Princeling background, great power, influence and political ambitions, who had initiated a so-called Chongqing Model in the name of Mao Zedong thoughts, under which “revolutionary traditions, socialist culture, social equality and justice” were exceptionally stressed, launched a series of “changhong dahei” (唱红打黑) – campaigns of “singing red (revolutionary) songs and striking the black (gangsters)” in Chongqing City in the years under his rule, was once viewed as the most significant figure in the eyes of Maoist leftists and powerful candidate for potential Politburo Standing Committee Member on the CCP's 18th National Congress at the end of 2012. His rise and fall (BBC, Bo Xilai scandal: Timeline. Nov.11 2013) contributed to one of the most important variables when we are to view Chinese leadership transition itself, domestic political/social environment of that year and hence the 2012 anti-Japanese demonstrations, since Bo's dismissal was out of question a hard blow to leftists and people/forces still in favor of him, some of whom were very likely to express their grievances provided there were any possible chances.

1.2.2 Sino-Japanese Economic Relations

Since the normalization of diplomatic relations in 1972, these two countries have indeed achieved a wide range of communication and cooperation in many fields. One of the most remarkable fruit of the ameliorative relations is the rapidly-developed and increasingly close economic ties between China and Japan, further strengthened and accelerated by China's accession to the WTO in 2001. Due to China's continuous economic reforms, cheap labor, broad market and two countries' complementary industrial structure, such ties have been improving despite their constant political and diplomatic discords. (Wang, 2010)

Since 2007, China has taken the place of the United States as Japan's largest trade partner and their bilateral trade reached 266.79 billion US dollars in 2008. In 2009, China also became Japan's biggest exporting market, even though there was a

24% decline in bilateral trade due to the impact of international financial crisis. Japan's direct investments in China began in 1979, but by the end of 2008, the cumulative number of Japan's investment programs in China had already reached 41,162 with an actual capital amount of 65.38 billion US dollars. Most of those programs and Japanese companies in China, based on statistics, have achieved great success and generous returns, which strongly supported the growth and resurgence of Japanese economy and China's development as well. (Zhang, 2009) Japanese products, especially electronic devices like cameras, cell-phones, etc. and automobiles, are very popular among people with middle/lower incomes due to their fair quality and comparatively cheap price. Japanese automobile brands held over 20% market shares (once 30% in best periods) in China before the Islands Dispute in 2012. (China Finance, 2014-04-04; Huanqiu Finance, 2012-12-06)

Ironically, apart from the intense economic interactions, not all other aspects of Sino-Japanese relations move forward equally due to a series of disagreements over key issues. The fact of high economic dependence on each other incurs discussions every time the diplomatic relations between two countries got into trouble, which is often summarized as “政冷经热” – “cold politics and hot economy”, which refers to that China and Japan have already become economically highly dependent on each other while this has not much affected their cold political relations, and reversely, the several setbacks and even crises in their political relations also seemingly did not much “disturb” economic interactions. (Liu, 2007) Some scholars attribute this situation largely to the so-called complementary or interdependent industrial structure of China and Japan, which refers to the mainly labor, resource intensive industrial structure on China's side and high technology, capital intensive industrial structure on Japan's side. (Gao & Zhao, 2012; Wang, 2010)

Their arguments do make sense, however, the diplomatic crisis and anti-Japanese demonstrations caused by the Islands Dispute in 2012 seemingly put more serious threat on this situation and revealed some change. (China Daily, 2012-10-20) It could be observed the prevailing claims to boycott Japanese products and suggestion to suspend travel plans to Japan across China during that period, from both spontaneous individual actions and official sanctions. The frequent violence against Japanese cars and shops in China also led Japanese companies to serious losses and a harsh winter. For example, directly impacted Japanese automobile companies' market share dropped to merely 8%. (Huanqiu Finance, 2012-12-06) Due to the aftermaths of those incidents, the bilateral trade in 2013 remained negative growth that the growth rate of

the total amount of bilateral imports and exports of the first and second quarter of the year was respectively -10.7% and -9.3%. (Zhang, 2014) Many scholars then think that the current Sino-Japanese relations are no longer “cold politics and hot economy” but fell into “cold politics and cool economy”, that is to say, a significant turn of the interdependent and balanced economic and trade relations between China and Japan. China’s state newspaper, People’s Daily also presented an article in favor of such opinion. (People, 2013-11-21)

Zhang (2014) questions such argument and argues that such ‘cooling down’ would not last long as usual and the recovery of Japanese cars in China market, for example, can already be seen. (China Daily, 2014-01-09) Since China is still dependent on Japanese technologies and funds, Japanese brands still have their advantages among Chinese consumers, though “bravado” kind of voices to boycott do exist and take effect temporarily, there is large space to cooperate with Japan; in spite of the political deadlock, the bilateral economic relations are very important and on the way to better development. The title of a critique may also tell the same simple but crucial truth that “China and Japan may not like each other, but they need each other.” (Time, Dec. 01, 2013)

1.2.3 Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands Dispute

Diaoyu Islands, known as Senkaku Islands in Japanese, are a group of eight uninhabited islets and rocks with an area of approximately 7 square kilometers in the East China Sea, of which the largest has an area of 4.32 km² and the smallest is only 0.45 km². In spite of the not large area, the geopolitical context surrounding the islands is highly complicated, since the islands are roughly equidistant to the north of Taiwan, southwestern tip of Okinawa of Japan and the east of Mainland China. More importantly, besides the strategic location, the potential huge amounts of oil, natural gas and other resources in the waters nearby are of great concern to countries with high energy demands like China and Japan, therefore the islands appear extremely important to both of them. (Albrecht & Chemier, 2014)

Both China and Japan claim those islands as their territory on different bases. Japan bases its sovereignty claims on the fact that it incorporated the islands as *terra nullius* – “vacant territory” on January 14th, 1895 and has been continuously occupying the islands since then. That is to say, due to the incorporation as “vacant territory” and long-time “unchallenged” effective control (Japanese government argues that China claimed the islands only in 1971), Japan seems to have a strong

claim to the sovereignty in terms of contemporary rules of international law. (Drifte, 2013)

In sharp contrast to Japan's argument, however, China uses a history-based approach to support its claim and refutes the so-called "vacant territory" explanation held by Japan. According to the official white book of China's State Council (Xinhua, 2012-09-25), Chinese ancestors were the earliest people that discovered, named and utilized the islands based on the historical records, which could date back to 1372 in China's Ming Dynasty, and since then China has exercised effective control over those islands. The historical documents of Ryukyu Kingdom and maps of east China coasts made by French geologists in 1809, by the UK in 1811, by the US scholars in 1859 and British Navy in 1877 all listed Diaoyu Islands under the control of Chinese Qing Empire and therefore refute Japan's claim of incorporating Senkaku Islands as "vacant territory". China accuses that Japan speeded up the overseas aggression and expansion after its Meiji Restoration and plotted to occupy Diaoyu Islands after it had annexed Ryukyu Kingdom and renamed as Okinawa in 1879; and later on, Japan seized the chance of the First Sino-Japanese War in 1894-1895 when China was weak and defeated, and finally succeeded in secretly incorporating the islands by means of the unequal Treaty of Shimonoseki to cede China's Taiwan and its affiliated islands to Japan. That is to say, after the World War II, with the abolishment of all former unequal treaties, Japan must give up all its illegally occupied territories during the war and Diaoyu Islands should have returned to China along with Taiwan. Moreover, China also censures the US for arbitrarily bringing Diaoyu Islands into its jurisdiction after war in 1950s and illegally "returning the jurisdiction" to Japan without China's permission in 1970s – "the underhand secret dealings during Cold War".

Many scholars pointed out that due to the special historical circumstances, the controversy over Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands largely take its roots in the last upheaval of East Asian order when the traditional China-oriented system was broken due to western challenges and the rise of Japan and therefore these islands bear such complex memories relating to power shift, gains and sufferings on both sides. (McCormack, 2013; Hagstrom, 2010) The difficulty, in McCormack's words, is compounded by the process of gradual, but fundamental, shift in the power balance that prevailed throughout the 20th century. Therefore, when the possible new shift in relative weight is happening, "islands that in themselves are trivial come to carry heavy symbolic weight" again. (McCormack, 2013) Scholars also emphasized that, with both China and Japan involved in a number of other territorial disputes in this region, neither wants a negative precedent to be set that would change the tone for

further resolutions of similar disputes; therefore, each actor in the Diaoyu/Senkaku dispute must be very careful of the consequences of their actions that will be echoed throughout the region. (Albrecht & Chemier, 2014)

Against such background, largely due to Japanese domestic politics and the judgments/actions of political figures like Tokyo Governor Ishihara Shintaro and Prime Minister Noda Yoshihiko, Japan decided to purchase and nationalize three of the Islands. On April 16th, 2012, Ishihara publicly announced his decision to let Tokyo Municipality purchase the islands from their private owner. On July 7th, the sensitive anniversary of the Lugouqiao Incident (or the Marco Polo Bridge Incident) which is generally regarded as the marker for the start of the Second Sino-Japanese War (1937.7.7-1945.8.15) and World War II in Asia-Pacific areas as well, Japanese Prime Minister Noda expressed his consideration for the Japanese central government to nationalize the disputed islands. (Zhang, 2012) After this, Chinese angrily protested and Ministry of Foreign Affairs spokesman Liu Weimin retorted “No one will ever be permitted to buy and sell China’s sacred territory.” (Reuters, July 8, 2012) On August 15th, the anniversary of the surrender of the Empire Japan, activists from Hong Kong sailed to and landed on the disputed main island, but later were stopped and detained by Japan Coast Guard, although they were deported two days later. (CNN, August 17 2012) After the detainment of the activists, citizens in mainland China started to call for nationwide protests through the Internet and the first wave of demonstrations began. (BBC, August 16, 2012) On August 19th, a group of Japanese rightists also landed on one of the islands, which incurred even greater wrath from both Chinese government and society and led to the escalation of protests. (Xinhua, 2012-8-19) On September 11, Japanese government formally nationalized three of the Islands held by private owner and China sent two patrol ships to the islands to demonstrate its claims of ownership. (Mainichi Shimbun, 2012-09-11; BBC, September 11, 2012) Later on, fueled by September 18th, the 81st anniversary of the Manchuria Incident – the National Humiliation in Chinese context, the anti-Japanese demonstrations across China reached the peak and took place in over 110 cities. (NHK, 2012-09-18)

Chinese government argues that Japan’s unilateral actions over disputed islands in recent years, especially the so-called “nationalization”, seriously challenged Chinese sovereignty and also abandoned the “unofficial consensus or understanding reached by elder Chinese and Japanese leaders to shelve the dispute” in 1972 and 1978 when two countries realized the normalization of diplomatic relations and concluded the Treaty of Sino-Japanese Friendship, which is viewed in Chinese eyes as

“not only terribly damaging Sino-Japanese relations but also reversing the outcome of World War II – the denial of the victories of world anti-fascist war and the resurrection of Japanese militarism”. (Drifte, 2013; Xinhua, 2012-09-25) Although this and the “understanding to shelve dispute” are still subjects of their quarrels and refuted by Japan, the aftermaths of these incidents last and Sino-Japanese relations, even more aggravated by their increasing engagements of air and naval forces in the region, remain frozen.

Slogans in the Demonstrations

2.1. Methodology

Due to the time and scale of the events, slogans and banners of the demonstrations need to be collected through visual materials like pictures and videos during that period. In the sense of this research, slogans, actually as a kind of or at least parts of those visual protest materials after picking up only textual information and excluding others, are used as the empirical data for getting access to some parts of modern Chinese nationalistic discourse in this specific case and probably on the social movement level. Although textual slogans are the direct research objects, to deal with pictures and videos is anyhow the first step to get them, which is why feasible approaches of doing similar researches need to be referred to and introduced.

Axel Philipps gave a research sample of visual protest material to demonstrate how applied visual methods can increase the outcome of protest or social movement research and that his study highlighted how visual analytical procedures could provide extra information for supporting or rejecting interpretations. (Philipps, 2012) In his study, he argued that protest events need to be set in context, which means protests cannot be talked about without the whole picture they fit into – the debates leading to such protests and the social, political and cultural environment, the time point when and where all these events occurred. So in my case study of slogans in 2012 anti-Japanese demonstrations, the context involving such demonstrations has in the first place been introduced in former sections of this paper to provide a larger picture for readers to link to. On the other hand, he highlighted visual protest material recording the demonstrations in contrast to traditional surveys, which means the material itself is an inseparable part of the protests and “independent from the subjective perception of a single researcher because the protesters are the creators of such material”. Philipps also recommended a series of strategies for reducing observer bias, one of which is the accumulation of visual protest material and building an archive of such material to therefore make it open to different interpretations by different researchers, and thus, one is able to analyze such visual protest material as realizations of the protesters’ disposition and orientation. (Phillips, 2012) With such approaches, in the preparation stage of my case, as many photos and videos as possible have been gathered through Internet in order to cover demonstrations and people in different places during that period and the collection of extracted textual slogans has been completely provided as the appendix for possible use of different

researchers.

In the process of collection, some methods of *visual interpretation* mentioned in Philipps' paper have been used. This includes the *first impression analysis* introduced by Müller-Doohm (1997) in order to systematize heterogeneous visual material. He provided a guided interpretation procedure as “a combination of textual and visual analysis” and focused on the inner relationship and formal composition of an image to ensure that written texts are in accordance with other information within the frame. However, since unwritten information beyond the textual slogans is not designed objects to study in this paper, the parts concerning textual information in the first impression analysis are mainly used. By means of such method, the samples of slogans have been dealt with according to: (a) primary messages; (b) represented objects and individuals; (c) employed style elements; (d) and the type of production. The purpose of the first impression analysis is to identify prototypes of different visual materials that share specific characteristics. (Philipps, 2012) With primary messages and represented objects and individuals in head, some elements sharing similar content or close internal connections seem to be easily caught when to first and directly “feel” the slogans. When styles and types are concerned, some interesting and specific patterns seem to be used along with different elements in order to lead people's eyeballs towards different issues. Based on this, to make it easy for further interpretation and comparison, eight sorts of elements have been summarized and marked after each slogan and typical patterns are highlighted in the analytical section.

The research theme of this paper is nationalistic discourse and empirical materials selected are those textual slogans left after the former steps. The discussions of slogans mainly adopted the methods of *critical discourse analysis*. The definition of discourse given by Fairclough and Wodak (1997) is “language use in speech and writings”. What remains to be discussed in this paper are those slogans in China's 2012 anti-Japanese demonstrations as important components of modern Chinese nationalistic discourse, that is to say, the language use in these nationalistic demonstrations. In Fairclough's opinion, discourse, as the constituting parts of society and culture, is an ideological tool and a kind of social practice, which makes a perpetual intervening force in social order and reflects the reality from various angles. It manipulates and influences the social processes by the means of reproducing and recreating the ideologies. With the help of critical discourse analysis, one can reproduce some of the composer's identities and concerns, power relations and connections with historical backgrounds. (Fairclough, 1992)

More specifically, the main approaches of critical discourse analysis include linguistic, intertextual and historical context analyses, all of which have been involved

in this paper. For linguistic analysis, according to systematic functional linguistics, the transitive system is the cornerstone of describing reality in people's language, in which what people think, do, hear and see are described into different processes and indicated by various kinds of participants and environmental components in those processes. The same process in reality, verbally, can indeed be narrated by different types of process within transitive system, or using the same process however with changing positions of participants. Which kind of process to choose and in what way to arrange the position of participants, to a great extent, depends on the ideology. (Halliday, 1994) Fowler mentioned an example that, if there is a documentary on the third world in which the poor people are put as the objects of transitive verbs from the beginning to the end, such impression is inevitably to be made onto the audience – the poor people are passive sacrifices and victims, rather than the participants of struggle and fight. (Fowler, 1991)

Another thing highlighted in systematic functional linguistics is the interpersonal function, which refers to the function of displaying the speaker/composer's identity, status, attitude and intention as well as his/her deduction of what's going on. It is directly related to people's attitude and opinion, which means a shortcut to dig out the ideological effect. (Ji Yuhua, 2001) A simple case is that the use of appellation reflects the speaker/composer's attitude, such as respect, sympathy, contempt, friendliness and neutrality, etc. For example, the reference of Mao Zedong in some slogans used the title of "Chairman Mao" instead of simply the name and *nin*, "you" with respect in Chinese, instead of *ni*, general "you", as the personal pronoun, which apparently shows the speaker's attitude and tendency towards this figure and the political thoughts that he put forward and represents. The interpersonal function of the language actually suggests a kind of power relations between the speaker/composer and other people/parties involved – superior and inferior, dominant and attached, leading and following etc.

In many cases, syntactic structures like the active and passive voices deliver quite different textual meanings as well. Ji Yuhua mentioned their research on the different front page titles of newspaper reports about Clinton's White House press conference on March 19th, 1999, where the case of China suspected of espionage and stealing U.S. weapon technologies remained one of the focuses. (Ji Yuhua, 2001) As for this question, President Clinton answered: "It is my understanding that the investigation has not yet determined for sure that espionage occurred." The reports derived from this sentence later, however, told the story with different attitudes. To take two examples in his research, *People's Daily (overseas)* used the title "So-called 'Stealing Nuclear Technologies' Unproven" while *Singtao Daily* reported as

“Espionage has no complete answer yet”. Ji Yuhua argued that the word “so-called” expressed a negative attitude while “unproven” – the passive voice, attempted to show the objectiveness; the title of *Singtao Daily* adopted the active voice, in which “espionage” was put at the beginning as emphasis while “has no answer yet” seemed to express the connotation that “there would be complete answer and truth”. The active voice seemingly left a more direct impression to make people feel the possible “crafty and conspiracy behind the scenes” when the author assumed that most of their readers had already been quite familiar with the case (or former reports). The active and passive sentences here led to different connotations and hence readers’ understandings.

For intertextual analysis, it highlights the author’s rhetorical intentions of producing such texts and the readers’ understanding about such rhetorical intentions when they read such texts. (Dai Weihua, 2000) In Fairclough’s opinion, linguistic analysis focuses on how the author selectively utilizes the language system while intertextual analysis focuses on how the author selectively utilizes discourse order and textual styles. Different styles and forms of text contain different potential meanings, represent the interest and ideology of different people or groups. Intertextual analysis is conducive to reveal the way of combination and the degree of being harmonious of different textual materials and styles, in order to further explore their semantic and syntactical functions. (Fairclough, 1992, 1995) One good example fit for intertextual analysis among the slogans is an “although/even though” pattern (哪怕……也要……, literally means even though ..., [I/we] will/should/have to...), in which different and even irrelevant textual materials are mixed and put in contrast within one similar structure. Generally speaking, both in English and in Chinese, the action and condition are in accordance with each other in such adverbial clause of concession. However, in most of those samples adopting such pattern, for some reasons and purposes, facts put after “even though” (哪怕……) have little to do with the claims followed (也要……). They appear to be arranged deliberately in this way to produce some kind of hidden texts and dramatic effect. Based on the above theories, there must be some potential meaning in this specific pattern and arrangement which represents the interest and ideology of some people or groups. The intertextual analysis will help to discuss this issue and some other similar slogans in details to reveal their secrets in the following sections of this paper.

For historical context analysis, Foucault emphasized the historicity of discourse, whose idea influenced scholars like Utz Maas who thinks that discourse is a language

form closely connected with social practice and only to link the discourse with the history of social practice makes discourse analysis meaningful and possible. Siegfried Jäger also thinks that discourse is institutionalized and formulated language form relating to action and power relation; any discourse has its historical origins by which today is influenced and tomorrow determined. (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, P266-267) In his research, Wodak along with other historians tried to analyze the anti-Semitic tendencies in Austrian society after the World War II by means of historical context analysis and he pointed out that many authors and speakers were quite willing to use anecdotes of the past to allude to the present since this was the best strategy to get away with accusations – because they didn't directly yell out “Down with the Jews” after all in the eyes of the law. (Wodak, 1989) For cases like this, historical context analysis is useful and powerful for linking specific phrases with the historical background and unraveling the mysteries hidden among the words and between the lines. Language used as slogans in the anti-Japanese protests also takes their roots in Chinese history, culture and society. Some “shrewd” composers tried to pack their ideas, which may cross the line of government tolerance or indeed not convenient to be made public or put in a “too straightforward” way for whatever reasons, into slogans with comparatively less “showy” expressions that can be easily unscrambled and eventually play their “intended” role – to transmit the ideas they want to say. The specific word may appear simple and “harmless” but the unspoken message and symbolic value behind it can turn out to be complicated and unexpected. “The historical context of word itself could be the context of an ideology.” (Ji Yuhua, 2001) Then to explore the origins and changing processes in people's impression of such expressions would definitely help to reveal users' understandings and intentions. Another point to stress is that historical context analysis is one of the tools and inseparable parts of critical discourse analysis, which means it cannot be done alone without supporting each other.

In former sections, some main points of the historical background of 2012 protests and Chinese nationalist context have been introduced to provide a basic ground for readers to build their understanding when reading the analytic content of slogans later, but it is impossible to give mature consideration to and cover all relevant aspects of the question in this short paper. Corresponding examples and details will be given when specific samples are met and dealt with. In this paper, slogans in Chinese would be translated and explained in the way as close to its original Chinese way of expression as possible in order to more completely and accurately preserve and reveal their wording, function, style and connotation, etc. like above. This paper aims to offer readers inspiration and discussion about modern

Chinese nationalist discourse on the mass movement level with the methods of critical discourse analysis like above, to the slogans selected from the case of 2012 anti-Japanese demonstrations.

2.2. Collection and Arrangement

Through plenty of visual materials during August and September in 2012, more than three hundred samples of slogans and banners have been collected and about 200 left excluding highly repetitive and defective samples. (*See Appendix*) Slogans in the demonstrations, no matter in Chinese or in English, with strong pertinence and purposes just as the demonstration itself, are composed in order to advertise certain ideas, build certain atmosphere and eventually attempt to affect or change certain situations. The characteristics of language use in slogans and the composers' concerns with occasion, audience and effect, etc. require relatively concise words, clearer claims, objects that people are more familiar with and more impressive styles and forms. Thus, slogans tend to use symbolized people, events and objects to represent larger things like nation or ideology, and combine different elements and signs for more dramatic effect, which make slogans appear more fragmented both in structure and meaning.

To make it more convenient for interpretation and intertextual analysis beyond each sample, eight sorts of elements, those of every sort more similar or relevant to each other, have been summarized from the content of those slogans and marked with their numbers after each one involving them. Those eight sorts of elements are:

1. Directly aiming at Diaoyu Islands dispute or problem of territory and sovereignty. Emphasis put on defending national sovereignty and maintaining the territorial integrity, which involves the key issue of this round's Sino-Japanese crisis – Diaoyu/Senkaku Dispute, and other relevant issues such as East China Sea and South China Sea, etc. as well.

2. Relating to history memories (ex. national humiliation, historical guilt of Japanese imperialism), emphasizing patriotism and wish for a more powerful nation. Symbolized cognition of Japan and understanding/expectation about “Chinese” in contrast, i.e. a symbolized Japan (ex. 日本鬼子 *ribenguizi* - “Japanese Devils”, 小日本 *xiaoriben* – “little Japan”, Yasukuni Shrine, US-Japanese Alliance, cartoon, etc.)

and an imagined China (ex. Great Walls, one billion youths, 泱泱大国

yangyangdaguo – which means “a great and proud country” , etc.)

3. Any kinds of retaliatory actions and counter measures including both specific behavior (like calling for boycotting Japanese products, attacking Japan and its leaders, declaring wars, etc.) and imagined retaliative means (like curse that disasters happen in Japan).

4. Concerning personal life and benefits, widely-concerned social problems and livelihood issues. It could be lots of specific problems which have nothing to do with islands dispute or Japan (ex. commodity prices, food safety, pollution and pension issue, etc.) or elements of Japan relating to people’s private interest and preferences (ex. cartoons, adult videos, cheap and good-quality Canon cameras, etc.)

5. Involving the image, role and action of the government and authorities, both existing images that people hold (ex. weak, corrupted, Chengguan – “city inspectors”, etc.) and roles that people expect (ex. tougher to foreign provocation, etc.). Involving domestic politics, ideological claims and their corresponding representative figures/symbols (ex. the use of Mao Zedong’s name and thoughts according to the composer’s understanding, the ideas about political figure like Bo Xilai and his political practices, and the advocacy and claims of universal values like democracy, liberty, human rights, rule of law, etc.).

6. Opposing violence, emphasizing “rational patriotism”. Criticizing violence of any kind during the demonstrations and some people’s behavior contradicting to the empty talks that they shouted as “loving the country”; calling for peaceful and rational expression of personal concerns and opinions, which is consistent with the idea of mainstream media.

7. Reflecting such identities as region, stratum and profession. In some slogans appear the descriptions and emphasis on the shared identities like grassroots, home cities, people of the same occupation, etc.

8. Other

By the means of first impression analysis, all samples in the appendix have been labeled with the serial number of elements involving. According to the number of the sort of elements each slogan carries, they could be divided into two types – unitary type, mainly carrying one sort of elements, and compound type, carrying two and more sorts of elements.

2.3. Interpretation and Comparison

Some of both types have been chosen to discuss in this paper. Based on the approaches of critical discourse analysis, steps taken to process these slogans are designed mainly in order to answer the following questions: in what styles and forms has the slogan been composed; what objects and opinions have possibly been emphasized in each slogan, and what might be the primary concerns and claims; the phrasing can possibly tell what kind of identity, status, attitude and intention of the composer, that is to say, the interpersonal function and power relations of/in the discourse; who might be the audience that the composer expects or target that he or she tries to project ideas onto; how have those different kinds of elements been linked together within the compound type of slogans, and what could be the hidden words and historical context behind it, etc.

Slogans carrying the first sort of elements generally express the claims of Diaoyu Islands and/or the wish and resolve to defend national sovereignty, dignity and territorial integrity. However, different moods and ways of expression, adding different elements lead to nuances and even opposite effect in the connotations.

In “Diaoyu Islands are China’s inherent territory” (钓鱼岛是中国的固有领土) and “Diaoyu Islands are our country’s divine territory” (钓鱼岛是我国的神圣领土), “Diaoyu Islands” as both subjects, first and foremost, are stressed. Both slogans adopt simple declarative sentences and both in the meaning declare the fact that Diaoyu Islands belong to China. Different attributes, however, contribute to the nuances between two sentences. The former one is literally in accord with Chinese government’s official statement (Xinhua, 2012-09-25), in which the possessive “China’s” makes it available to say by both Chinese and anyone else, sound like judgment with “relatively neutral stance” or “bystander’s eyes” and seemingly without personal emotions; the latter one picks the expression “our country’s” in the contrast, apparently stressing the point of view of the composer as a Chinese and revealing strong emotional preferences as the sense of belonging, responsibility and pride. The following “divine territory” further more displays such kind of “honorable sense of mission” when “divine” implies absolutely inviolable and superior stance. The expression “divine/sacred territory” was also once used in official situations such as the spokesman of Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs who stressed “No one will ever be permitted to buy and sell China's sacred territory”. (Reuters, July 8 2012) By

comparison, “inherent territory” as the predicative seems to seek legitimacy from a historical perspective and more sounds like rational explanation based on historical facts that could be introduced to anyone. Although both slogans actually expressed support for Chinese official stance – historically based claim (Drifte, 2013), and reassert whom Diaoyu Islands belong to, the former one would be more likely used as diplomatic parlance in the official statement and negotiation on an equal basis, while the latter one shows much stronger personal feelings whose targets are probably Japan or anyone that holds an opposite point of view. In slogans like “Diaoyu Islands are Chinese territory, Japan get out!” (钓鱼岛是中国领土, 日本滚出去!), this target appears more specific and clear.

Compared to declarative sentences, slogans, due to the situations where they are used, are more likely to be designed in imperative mood and couplet style to make it sound much stronger. Such sentences like “Defend Diaoyu Islands! Expel Japanese!” (保卫钓鱼岛, 赶走日本人!), “Send troops to the islands!” (驻军钓鱼岛!) actually stress the initiative that China/our side should have in contrast to the “opposing” ones which still focus on Japan, demand/expect Japanese to stop or change its actions. Moreover, since most of the actions expressed in such ones probably cannot be performed by individuals or ordinary people, these slogans likely take Chinese government and national authorities as their designed audience if the composers don’t simply attempt to warn or threaten Japan by their voices. People using these slogans try to discuss or provide suggestions of specific actions/postures for the government, to push and urge it to do so to show toughness. In this sense, their demonstrations here aim at influencing how their own government behaves, or we might say, express more concern about the image of the government left on them, although Japan in this case could be a good target to test whether the government is able to meet people’s expectations, like “enough toughness to foreign provocation”.

The impressions or expectations of the government/national authorities implied in the slogans are not limited to their performance in diplomacy or international relations. “How do we take back out territory Diaoyu Islands? Well, send the Chengguan (city inspectors) and China’s corrupted officials there.” (要怎么收回国家领土——钓鱼岛? 哎, 不如叫城管和中国的贪官去吧). “Our armed police and Chengguan troops, don’t lord it over (the people) at home, go to Japan!” (我们的武警战士城管队伍莫要在家逞威风, 去日本吧!) Slogans like these two are quite

interesting since the composers somehow ridicule some national authorities like “Chengguan”, Chinese armed police and corrupted officials, who are known/thought by the composers as usually tend to act mighty towards ordinary people and throw their weight around at home. The connotation is “now that you are so powerful and bossy, why not go to show your strength towards Japanese and take back our territory”. Among all those departments, Chengguan – Chinese city/urban management officers mainly in charge of street vendors, unlawful business and the appearance of urban areas, have been of ill reputation on media and to ordinary citizens for their terrible or even violent ways of law enforcements in several malignant cases. “Chengguan” even became a new loanword in English, synonym for violence, bully and terrorize. (Ramzy & Lin, 2009) The composers link these images with the islands dispute, or more specifically, China’s reaction towards Japan over the dispute, which imply, on the one hand, the composers’ discontent and sarcasm with those authorities, domestic affairs and the administrations’ attitude/style in dealing with citizens; on the other hand, somewhat disappointment in government’s reaction over the dispute – expectations of stronger and more effective counter measures to defend the territory.

Quite a few slogans call upon people to boycott Japanese goods as a counter measure against Japan’s actions over the islands dispute, which is an often used tool of Chinese nationalists to demonstrate their anger and initiative, aiming at ordinary people or consumers. Composers of this sort design their slogans and claims based on the understanding about economic ties between China and Japan, more specifically Japan’s economic dependence on China/Chinese market, which from their perspective, is usually one-sided and oversimplified but “indispensable to Japan”. “Chinese don’t buy Japanese products, Japan will collapse (by itself) without being attacked” (中国人不购日本货，日本不攻自破) and “Boycott Japanese goods, stop supplying rare-earth metals!” (抵制日货，停供稀土) are both based on this kind of judgment and confidence.

China is world’s largest rare-earth producer with a proportion of over 90% of global total output. Rare-earth metals are indispensable resources to Japanese economy, especially its electronic and high technology industries, and hence Japan was once the largest consumer of China’s rare-earth export. In September 2010, due to the Sino-Japanese conflict caused by the ships’ collision incident in surrounding waters of Diaoyu Islands, Chinese government restricted the export of rare earth to

Japan as one of official economic sanctions, which forced Japan to make some concession but actually led to serious economic losses of both sides and greater dispute. (BBC, March 27 2014) Apparently, the composer of the second slogan attempts to urge the government to take similar sanctions again. The term “Japanese goods” implies the differentiation made by both composers that in the market according to their imagination, there are simply two types of goods – Japanese ones and non-Japanese ones. In this sense, the connotation of this term is actually closer to Japanese brands, or even just famous Japanese brands known by the composer, rather than Japanese goods. As for not well-known Japanese products, Japan-made parts in other non-Japanese products, or brands with a name or feature similar to Japanese pronunciation and style mistaken as Japanese but actually not from Japan, etc., these situations are probably not of the composers’ interest and concern. The claim to boycott Japanese goods or impose economic sanctions like “stop supplying rare-earth metals” are both driven by a judgment or motive that this action could lead to losses of Japanese companies and hence do harm to Japanese economy, which will further cause pressure on the Japanese government to influence its decisions. This does make sense and is easy to understand since China’s boom and Japan’s increasing trade dependence on China are known by one and all. However, there are two facts generally ignored in their claim. Firstly, economic ties are not unilateral but mutual, i.e. China does not enjoy a one-sided overwhelming advantage. Indeed, Japan’s dependence on China appears greater than the other way around, (Wang, 2010) which gives many people, including the composers, great or even starry-eyed confidence. But the neglect/ignorance of the complexity of real situation quite likely leads to the exaggeration of such dependence and China’s economic power, underestimation of possible risks, over simple judgments and blind actions which may result in great losses for China itself, as shown in the case of rare-earth export limit in 2010. (BBC, Oct. 26 2013) Secondly, in an age of globalization, there are almost no simple “Japanese goods”, i.e. to beat Japan without hurting China since they so deeply interrelate. (Gao & Zhao, 2012) It is quite possible that the composers try to find more effective and influential ways to demonstrate their claims and anger against Japan beyond simple protests when well-known “Japanese products/brands” in daily life appear easy objects to use – to make/show people a near and tangible target rather than something thousand miles away. After all, what Japanese do over disputed islands and how Chinese government reacts are hardly determined by ordinary people, but whether to consume certain brands and products seemingly always lie in the hands of consumers – “we are powerful enough here to say ‘no’.”

“Diaoyu Islands belong to China since 1372!” – one shares some similarities with the expression “inherent territory”, however, what attention needs to be paid to is that this slogan is written in English – in the protests occurring inside China and dominated by Chinese. Language has its own social and cultural background. Although English is the most important international language today, neither China nor Japan use English as important language at home, while more familiar and typical English-speaking countries for ordinary Chinese might be United States, Britain and some other western countries. This slogan apparently tries to project its information to someone beyond China and Japan, especially when taking into account the various and subtle positions of those parties. It could be United States, Australia, some International media and someone that does not know the truth or history facts which the composer thinks of, or someone in favor of Japan’s side for whatever reasons. Among all possible targets, the United States, believed by many in actually interfering in this Sino-Japanese dispute, ranks high due to its vague while tricky position and alliance with Japan. The US officials stressed that “the United States holds no position and would not take sides over the Islands Dispute” and “hope that concerned states resolve this issue through peaceful means”, yet at the same time “the islands administered by Japan are covered by US-Japan Security Treaty”. (Fenghuang, 2012-07-10, 2012-08-16) Through TV programs, newspapers and Internet, the US government’s attitude was widely reported and hence well-known by Chinese people. A slogan in English to stress China’s sovereignty and long history of control could possibly aim at such ambiguous positions of some countries. “Since 1372” in the slogan underlines the long history and hence the legitimacy of China owning Diaoyu Islands, whose connotation is “first come first served” – Diaoyu Islands belong to China since long before and hence still belong to China now as a matter of course. If we say that the composer takes advantage of some hidden qualities of language in this slogan to imply his/her judgment that “some people beyond China and Japan don’t think Diaoyu Islands belong to China and even interfere in this dispute, so I should wake them up and reassert the truth”, then in the following slogan similar judgment aims at more specific target, however tells something else.

“Enforce justice for/on behalf of Heaven, evil United States and Japan, if (you) dare to harm the security and interest of our nation, US president and his people as well as Japanese prime minister and his people shall all suffer disasters.” (替天行道，邪恶的美国与日本，如敢损害我国安全与利益，美国总统与人民及日本首相同人

民全家遭殃) This is indeed an interesting example of Chinese-way of thinking. “Evil United States and Japan” as the clear attacking targets reveals the composer’s own opinion – United States and Japan are birds of the same feather, they act evilly in collusion and come to harm our national interests – we or China on Good side; “United States and Japan” rather than “Japan (the one that directly robbed our islands) and United States” also implies some subtle power relations in the composer’s opinion that it is United States that is Japan’s big boss and backstage backer, and the “real main threat” to our country. However, apart from reflecting the popular judgment that the US sides with Japan, the cultural meaning of this slogan is far richer. “替天行道” – titianxingdao, in the very beginning, refers to “to perform righteous deeds, enforce justice for/on behalf of Heaven”, usually used together with punishing villains described by “天理不容” – tianliburong (not tolerated or forgiven by Heaven/Heavenly Principles) in order to stress the necessity and validity to wipe out such evil, the legitimacy to comply with “天道”(the Way of Heaven), “天理” (Heavenly Doctrines). This typical Chinese-way saying is based on traditional “侠义观” – Chinese Errantry Culture, which basically means strong sense of justice and ready to help the weak, and “天命观” - the Mandate of Heaven, which refers to an ancient Chinese belief and philosophical idea that Heaven (天 Tian) bestowed/granted a dynasty or emperors the right or legitimacy to rule based on their ability to govern well and fairly. If the emperor, as the Son of Heaven, fails the mandate (e.g. despotic or misconduct), Heaven will let disasters happen as warning or eventually withdraw the mandate leading to the overthrow of that ruler or end of an dynasty – under this belief, Heaven approve of revolution and overthrow of unjust rulers. (Zhao, 2012; Jiang, 2011) This saying provides an overwhelming imposing manner in the slogan while also reveals the so-called “天下认同” – Tianxia Rentong, (self-identity with the people/children living on the Land under Heaven) an exclusive notion of Chinese civilization later spreading across East Asia (Gao, 2004; Wikipedia - Tianxia); and “中央帝国” – Central Empire Complex (China at the middle of the land under heaven) of many Chinese people under the influence of traditional world

views and cultural values. In this context, the unspoken message is that China's security and interests comply with "the Way/Mandate of Heaven", to defend China's sovereignty is to practice "Heavenly Doctrines" while on the contrary, United States and Japan who challenge such security and interests are those villains who defy "the Way of Heaven" and justice. The curse in the latter part comes naturally and coherently with such way of thinking – "US president and his people" and "Japanese prime minister and his people" is such a pattern as "top leader and his people" in which a dependence/subordinate/possession relation is thought to exist, a clear brand of thoughts from thousand-year imperial age that "普天之下莫非王土，率土之滨莫非王臣" (from *诗经. Classic of Poetry*) – "No land under the heaven is not the king's territory; no one in charge of those land is not the subordinate of the king". What is intended to express by that curse is that "if/because president and prime minister make such decisions that lead US and Japan against "the Way/Mandate of Heaven" (harm China's national interests), Heaven then will release disasters to make their family and their people suffer (exactly what "遭殃" means). This reflects important content of traditional Chinese context like "天命观" (view of the Mandate of Heaven), "天人合一" (Chinese Encyclopedia, 1983) – "Heaven and people unite as one integral that their deeds can affect each other", "天子的君权神授" (divine right of the emperor as the "son of Heaven"), etc., the common ideas of those refer to that the top leader (emperors and their dynasty) can only rule when they have such "天命" – the mandate of Heaven, if he does something wrong and evil, retributions will constantly befall as warning and punishment until he loses the mandate. Apparently, the composer of this slogan hasn't jumped out of the fetters of traditional "Dynasty Identity" and the ideas of the Mandate of Heaven, all of which coexist with ideas of modern nation state, sovereignty and other identities. This also indicates that quite possibly not a small part of modern Chinese nationalism takes its roots in traditional culture and historical context – materials to mix and build the identity "Chinese", which greatly influence or even determine how people think and react.

"Opposing Japan invading and occupying Chinese territory Diaoyu Islands" (反

对日本侵占中国领土钓鱼岛) and “Opposing Japan’s ‘nationalization’ of Diaoyu Islands” (反对日本钓鱼岛“国有化”) lay particular emphasis on opposition and discontent towards what has happened or is happening, whose target is Japan and the actions performed by Japanese government on Diaoyu Islands. These slogans do clearly show that those actions taken by Japanese government, especially the “nationalization” through the year of 2012, directly stirred the oppositional sentiments in Chinese society and resulted in these people’s demonstrations against Japan. The “invading and occupying” used here somehow implies that in the composer’s understanding the situation today could be quite easily linked to the past in people’s mind when Imperial Japan invaded and occupied China. Nevertheless, “(I or we) opposing” implies an “I” or more likely a whole “we” who hold one common position, have one powerful voice and the “solidarity” of such a whole; but “opposing” implies relatively passive reaction and weaker/disadvantaged position because the time and situation to demonstrate opposition seemingly means the lack of effective measures and ability to change the status quo, which exposes a kind of understanding about power relations, i.e. the composer has his/her own judgment of the islands dispute situation when creating such slogan, consciously or unconsciously.

In Ching’s research (2012), he examined somehow similar power relations between China and Japan, through the epithets like ‘riben guizi’ or Japanese devils, ‘xiao riben’ or little Japan, which were used quite frequently in the 2012 protests slogans as well, not limiting to a case like this but in a longer span of history. He analyzed the instance of ‘riben guizi’ in Chinese popular culture in four historical moments: late-Sinocentric imperium, high imperialism, socialist nationalism and post-socialist globalization. In his words, he tried to show that “while this ‘hate word’ performs an affective politics of recognition stemming from an ineluctable trauma of imperialist violence, it ultimately fails in establishing a politics of reconciliation”. Anti-Japan epithets like ‘xiao riben’ – little Japan, “attempt at overturning the subordinated position of the Chinese vis-à-vis the Japanese”, which was caused by the rise of Japan and fall of China in modern history, “at least symbolically”. He argued that “anti-Japanism in China is less about Japan than China’s own self-image mediated through its asymmetrical power relations with Japan throughout its modern history.” (Ching, 2012)

In the slogans “Compatriots, wake up and rebel against little Japan’s oppression!” (同胞觉醒起来, 反抗小日本压迫), “Great and proud China, no fear of little Japan”

(泱泱大中华，何惧小日本!)， “little Japan, obsessed with ambitions, dare bully big China” (小日本，野心勃勃，敢欺大中国), etc., these entangled feelings or ambivalent understandings as Ching suggested could be sensed. “Japan is little but oppressing/bullying us.” Then the question would be what they think of China, large but weak and subordinate? – “compatriots remain asleep and should be awakened” “China is great and proud” – seemingly a series of contradictions, unyielding while fragile emotions exist within. Even though it is 2012 - almost 70 years after World War II, and China has overtaken Japan as the second largest economy, in an islands dispute far from China’s mainland with Japan, people still hold or easily recall such ideas – severe trauma of the past continues, memories and old ways of thinking still linger. At least for the composers of these slogans, the cognition of the relative weight of China and Japan has not been updated along with China’s recent years’ development. In the first sample, s/he first put an emphasis on Chinese people themselves – “sleeping compatriots” in his/her understanding for some reasons, which further prove Ching’s argument that expressions like this and anti-Japanese focuses revealed from them are more about China’s self-image – what “Chinese” was/is and is supposed to be like, in these people’s mind.

As we have introduced in former chapters, Chinese nationalism largely roots in the history, especially the modern history and the memories about Japanese invasion; a common feature of nationalist views about Sino-Japanese relations or Japan/Japanese itself is to mix “Japan in history” with “Japan today”, or I would argue, more possibly the failure to distinguish one from the other. China’s claim of Diaoyu Islands is also historically based; Chinese official vigilance towards Japanese domestic political trends and actions in history problems, islands dispute, etc. is also delivered as “the revival of Japanese militarism and the challenge to the outcome of world anti-fascist war” (Xinhua, 2012-09-25). Whether the official rhetoric and posture are naturally engendered response or deliberately schemed, it is indeed in accordance with the history-oriented way of thinking, which has so popular, remarkable influence on not a small number of online nationalists and offline demonstrators as well as the slogans they created. This could be obviously seen in slogans like “Japan, guilty person of WWII, has no shame/bold as brass (to occupy our land)” (日本，二战罪人，厚颜无耻。); “the pain of Nanking (Nanking Massacre), never forget” (南京之痛，永世难忘); “Commemorate 9.18 (September 18 Incident or

the Manchuria Incident), recover/take back Diaoyu Islands” (纪念九一八，光复钓鱼岛); “New hatred and old rancor, ‘bloodwash’ Japan” (新仇旧恨，血洗日本); “For 400 years, killed our parents, defiled our wives and daughters, looted our wealth, those like ambitious wolves with savage hearts, (we will) absolutely revenge/put to death even though (you are) distant” (400 年来，杀我父母，污我妻女，掠我财富。狼子野心者，虽远必诛。), etc. The weight of history is too heavy to bear and this appears especially true for China who has a long history both of itself and of its association with Japan. The disputes with Japan today are so naturally and generally put together/linked with people’s historical memories about Japan’s past and specific events. History remains dominant factor and perhaps the obstacles as well in their understanding and judgment about Sino-Japanese relations and the future. Despite understandable and necessary causes, anything too much, however, would squeeze the space for others so that it might blind people to see the rest. Just as an ancient Chinese saying “a leaf before the eye shuts the sight of a whole mountain”, if the leaf of the past – grief, grudge and hence revenge, stays too close and clinging, it is possible to lose a lot more of the present and the future. The demonstrators may not need to mind but the decision-makers of a state have to balance, which is surely not limited to Chinese side only.

The slogans above mainly aim at targets outside China (like Japan or foreigners) or the group of people which the composers both they think belong to and subconsciously define (perhaps all Chinese with shared historical memories, ordinary citizens in contrast to the government or people demonstrating here to alert other fellow citizens). However large or small the range is, their arguments are designed to demonstrate a “united whole” or to call on people to unite, mainly or more directly accentuating solidarity, inclusiveness and ‘positive’ efforts to ‘close ranks’ against enemy regardless of possible differences (like not tough enough government and ‘compatriots asleep’). But there are also ones attempting to reach agreement while using different ways of speech, which I would call ‘negative’ ways like threaten, suppress or stigmatize. Although they seemingly try to unite some people by setting standards to exclude the others, they in fact emphasize the differences and fail to build/maintain an inclusive unity. In slogans like “Anyone that says Diaoyu Islands belong to Japan is traitor (to China)” (谁说钓鱼岛是日本的就是汉奸), “Punish

traitors/quislings inside and fight for sovereignty outside” (内惩汉奸/国贼, 外争国权/主权), efforts to patch up differences and to reach a consensus are replaced by measures to eliminate differences/treason and exclude the different. Then the question would be what define “traitor” and who the “traitor” is. The division line in the first slogan is quite simple and the audience set here is apparently those within the Chinese, because “汉奸” or Hanjian, a typical derogatory and pejorative Chinese term, literally means those betray their own race but specifically the traitor to Han people (not any race or country, gradually expanded to Chinese nation later) and collaborator with other enemy ethnicity (or foreign nations). This word has quite some history but it became so popular and notorious mainly due to a large number of Chinese collaborators during Japanese invasion. (Wang, 2009) However, we can find that this term is so generally and frequently used or even abused today among Chinese nationalists and in many online forums, since many of them rashly throw this word, usually as a bad label with absolute denial and severe criticism, to anyone who has a different idea with them in any topics somewhat relating to national interest or even general political issues. The composers of both slogans above used this term probably based on the assumption or imagination that there isn't, however there should be, a united opinion among Chinese in the islands dispute with Japan, and definitely the composers themselves insist that Diaoyu Islands belong to China, that is to say, they think “the truth and justice lie and only lie in their hands”. But beyond themselves or people holding the same opinion as them, there are different arguments within Chinese claiming that the dispute remains unclear or Diaoyu islands belong to Japan, etc., and as long as others have different claims, or merely “say” something different from their belief, are traitors to China. Moreover, the connotation is evident that such different voices are immoral, traitorous and not supposed to be tolerated and accepted, or should be punished. Their logic is so crude and simple while so common in their way of thinking/speech that people dominated by such logic are called and satirized as “simple patriots”, and in contrast those often receiving such “label-putting service” mock themselves as “non-simple patriots”. (Yahoo Historical, 2013; Sina, 2013) Wang Ke (2009) argues that the term Hanjian and its abuse reflect an imagined unitary nationalist or patriotic discourse which does not ever exist, and exactly because this doesn't even exist within the nationalists who take for granted that they share the same ideas and discourse, it explains why serious internal dissensions often happen within the group, and the members frequently throw this term to each other as well. A possible tendency in this logic is that patriotism or unconditionally loving

your country prevails over everything else, and shown in the case with Japan, usually to over-simply object to everything relating to Japan/Japanese – to love the country is unconditionally right, hence anything opposite is definitely wrong; we stand on the right hill or hold “truth”, so we can do anything as long as we think it runs counter to this belief/doctrine; even if we damage property, beat someone or violate the law, patriotism justifies our actions.

In this case, the composer of the first slogan apparently assumes that in a territorial dispute like Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands, anyone as one of Chinese should/ has to, as a matter of course, keep unanimous in preserving the interest of “our side/race/nation” despite any excuses – to maintain collective interest or at least verbally support it and show your determination, “patriotic heart” are superior to personal interest, independent thinking or judgment about the facts, freedom of speech and thought, etc; in this opinion, sovereignty is more important/valued than human rights, i.e. individuals can/should not, or at least are not encouraged to question and challenge your own country’s interest and stance for any reasons, and show off your unique and independent points of view in the face of national gains and losses. Slogans with similar expression, tone and logic could be found more in China’s old revolutionary ages when various radical campaigns or political practices were launched by CCP, millions of innocents were suppressed and those with different political opinions were terribly persecuted, dissident voices were silenced by political labels like “rightist”, “capitalist authority”, “reactionary”, “traitor”, etc. For example, during the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution, there were slogans like “Anyone saying People’s Communes are not good is class enemy” (谁说人民公社不好就是阶级敌人), “Proletarian Cultural Revolution is great” (无产阶级文化大革命就是好), “Any decisions made by Chairman Mao should be firmly maintained, any instructions given by Chairman Mao should be persistently obeyed” (凡是毛主席作出的决策, 我们都坚决维护, 凡是毛主席的指示, 我们都始终不渝地遵循), etc. (People, 2001-06-27)

This kind of relevance and resemblance in discourse is quite likely to make people curious about the possible deep connections in ideology between some elements of contemporary Chinese nationalism and “leftist or ultra-left” political thoughts in modern China. And not surprisingly, it doesn’t come alone in the anti-Japanese demonstrations. Apart from the slightly sensible similarity in a slogan

designed to “reassert sovereignty”, there are ones more obviously disguising political claims along with other topics into one slogan at the same time, or even directly contending political views, which in fact have little to do with islands dispute, sovereignty and anti-Japan, without camouflage. Importantly, the political opinions involved are not merely limited to leftist claims as well.

One example is “Little Japan, get out! Secretary Bo (one of Bo Xilai’s official positions), come back! Strongly resist GM food (genetically modified food)! Punish severely traitors and quislings!” (小日本滚出去, 薄书记快回来! 坚决抵制转基因, 严惩汉奸卖国贼!) This slogan is indeed rich in content since it includes four distinct arguments at the same time. Although it has a symmetrical style, there isn’t much coherence among different claims. Except the first and the last short sentence which are similar to what have been discussed above, there are two different concerns here that the composer tries to demonstrate. It has been introduced in the background chapter that, Bo Xilai, the highly controversial, conceited governor of Chongqing with high position and Princeling birth, had been dismissed in March, 2012 due to the impact of a series of incidents like the betrayal of a crucial subordinate, his wife involved in murdering a British man, etc. (BBC, Nov. 11 2013) Due to his radical political practices in Chongqing, advocacy of Maoist thoughts and campaigns of “sing red songs and striking the black (gangsters)”, he was known both at home and abroad, and regarded by new and old leftists and conservative forces as the beacon-like politician of leftism and Maoism as well as a powerful candidate for Member of the Politburo Standing Committee. Some of his policies like infrastructure construction and increasing wage level in Chongqing also helped him win the “trust and respect” of some ordinary people. His downfall was out of question a hard blow to those in favor of him. “Secretary Bo”, similar to “Chairman Mao”, instead of calling directly by name, reveals the emotions of fondness and respect. The composer obviously tries to express his support/favor to Secretary Bo Xilai and grievances about his dismissal, which most likely aim at the central government and politicians opposing Bo Xilai as well as his deeds.

As for the part “resist genetically modified food”, it turns to a social issue – the public doubts about the safety and reliability of genetically modified food (GM Food) in Chinese society, which remains a controversial topic, accepted/supported by some and rejected by others. (Tencent, 2013 – *controversy over GM food rises again*) Even though many scientists and government officials repeatedly explained and insisted on

its safety and benefits, not a small number of people remain very doubtful about it and the official credibility since serious food safety problems and the government's dereliction of duty still happen sometimes in recent years, leading to popular distrust and caution. This part of the slogan reveals such doubt and concern of the composer over this issue.

These two parts of the slogan are designed to discuss/demonstrate concerns about domestic political or social issues rather than islands dispute, although they are put between claims dealing with the dispute, which appear more like the smoke bomb and cover up the true intentions/key points. The reasons why the composer do so - like playing edge ball, to mix relatively sensitive issue with more general topics or politically "more" correct ones such as the islands dispute, may to some extent imply his/her worry and hence adopting ways to lower risk since domestic politics, especially involving high level factional struggles, largely remain taboo in public.

However, there are quite many slogans evidently/directly focusing on political opinions without using camouflage of islands dispute or anti-Japanism, that is to say, more "audacious and confident". In slogans like "Secretary Bo, people's good secretary" (薄书记, 人民的好书记), "Chairman Mao, people miss you so much" (毛主席, 人民好想你), "Great Chairman Mao, we need you, we call you ('you' with respect in Chinese)" (伟大的毛主席, 我们需要您, 我们呼唤您), "Only Mao Zedong Thought can save China" (只有毛泽东思想才能救中国), "Hold high the great banner of Mao Zedong Thought and advance courageously" (高举毛泽东思想伟大旗帜奋勇前进), etc., the judgment and appraisal of representative figures like Bo Xilai and Mao Zedong as well as the political thoughts dominate the whole content. Composers of these slogans use more straightforward and plain way of speech to demonstrate their political opinions and support to certain leaders or ideology. The appraisal of Bo Xilai as "people's good secretary" made a direct challenge to the official announcement which harshly criticized Bo and his rule in Chongqing. (Fenghuang, 2012-09-29) The use of "people" and "we" imply the composers' assumption that their opinions are representing more Chinese people or the masses and therefore the government should listen to people's voices and do what "we" claim. The highlight of Mao Zedong and his political thoughts - "great" "hold high" "only it

can save China”, reveal the political/emotional tendency of the composers who greatly value Maoism and cherish the memory of Mao’s era, Mao’s rule and Mao himself, while quite possibly, deny/dissatisfied with China’s other leaders, current road of development and social conditions which basically happened under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping and his political thoughts of Reform and Open after Mao’s period. (Hu, 2007) “Only Mao Zedong Thought” indicates their “strong while exclusive” belief and that they reject any other political ideas; “save China” quite likely shows their disappointment and grievances, or even despair with China’s status quo. Whether it is living conditions, economic development, wealth distribution, foreign policies or some other aspects, they think Bo Xilai’s Chongqing Model or China in Mao Zedong’s age, meaning “justice, equality, security, toughness, etc.” according to their understanding, could better match their expectations and bring better lives, therefore, they appreciate Bo and Mao, claim to change and return to that kind of guiding thoughts on behalf of “the interest of all Chinese”.

Nevertheless, as mentioned above, some other distinct political claims in sharp contrast to the leftists exist in the demonstrations, although such slogans apparently try to play edge ball as well with the cloak of islands dispute. In both “Want democracy, want freedom, defend Diaoyu Islands!” (要民主, 要自由, 保卫钓鱼岛) and “Turn anger into strength, want political reform, want freedom!” (化愤怒为力量, 要政改, 要自由!), sentence except respective “two wants” serves more as a foil or camouflage to the real purposes. The target of both slogans is most likely to be Chinese government and party leaders, although “turn anger into strength” in the second one make it sound like suggestion or call for everyone who feels angry in the islands dispute or for other possible reasons, to guide them towards more important issues that the composer think we should be concerned and use our strength to solve. The main claims in both slogans directly deal with the politically most sensitive topics in China – universal values and political reform, and hence are extremely rare to be observed in public occasions after 1989 Tiananmen Incident, since this kind of demands, usually seen as “liberalist or rightist” in Chinese context compared to the leftism, make more serious challenge and greater pressure to the Party authority and government than Maoist claims. (Zhao, 2013) Apparently, the composers focus and put more emphasis on China’s internal problems instead of dealing with external conflicts like Japan. With this tendency, they try to divert people’s attention back to internal affairs, which sometimes exactly contradicts to what the government intends

to do. Another sample from the slogans is simply made up of several separated words - “Freedom, Democracy, Human Rights, Constitutionalism, Defend Diaoyu Islands” (自由 民主 人权 宪政 保钓). Similar to the above one, claim directly relevant with the original causes of the demonstrations – Diaoyu Islands, is attached after the main points of modern politics, which are obviously what the composer mainly attempts to present, more like “by the way” to make the whole slogan appear less abrupt with the whole demonstrations. If values like freedom, democracy, human rights and constitutionalism are main concerns, it implies the composer’s assumption that China lacks those necessary elements and should do more to improve/get closer to these goals.

Composers with similar political tendencies and internal-oriented focuses are more inclined to create/use complex type of slogans in which many issues could be demonstrated at the same time while some relevance among different materials could be drawn as well. *See the following one:*

“Not have health care, not have social security, but we should have Diaoyu Islands in our hearts. Even though the government doesn’t provide pensions, (we) should/have to take back Diaoyu Islands. Without property rights, without human rights, (we) fight for sovereignty over Diaoyu Islands. Cannot afford a house, cannot afford a tomb, (we) will not yield an inch of ground to Japanese.”

(没医保，没社保，心中要有钓鱼岛；就算政府不养老，也要收复钓鱼岛。

没物权，没人权，钓鱼岛上争主权；买不起房修不起坟，寸土不让日本人。)

This long and complex slogan includes various materials involving different issues at one time, and goes in two pairs of couplet sentences in Chinese (easily pronounce and remember). To view its content, the composer seems to put stress on the latter part of each sentence – the claim about cherishing, taking back Diaoyu Islands and not yielding to Japanese, etc., due to the grammatical order. However, the problems and conditions described before those are what really catch viewers’ attention and raise their wonder at the first glance. Issues mentioned as the lack of social security and medical care, inadequate and untrustworthy pension system, deficiencies in preserving property and human rights, skyrocketing housing prices and expensive tombs, etc. are livelihood issues that have long been the focuses of people’s concern in Chinese society. “Cannot afford housing prices, cannot afford medical costs, cannot afford education expenses” are teased by the public as “the new three big mountains” compared to old ones in Chinese history (imperialism, feudalism and bureaucratic-capitalism). (Wu, 2013; Shi, Hanbing) The composer adopts a somewhat

sophisticated way of speech to express his/her support for China's claim over Diaoyu Islands, however, the addition of reporting extra materials, which somehow sounds like complaints, makes the claim and whole slogan appear a bit ironic. In this slogan, the apparent discontent with livelihood conditions is dramatically linked together with islands dispute and nationalist claim. The focus and description on internal social problems and livelihood difficulties, most likely to affect lower class people and invulnerable groups, turn out to be what the composer truly attempts to discuss and demonstrate, towards both the government and other people. There can be a different interpretation about this slogan as well – that people try to show their fortitude and solidarity in a national conflict with Japan despite so many hardships. It is partly true but I would argue that, in this sense, it is exactly what they try to play down that reversely exposes the serious problems and stratum division, that is to say, not monolithic or united. Anyway, such different characteristics and focuses altogether make slogans similar to this one appear less nationalist than populist.

There is another sample actually focusing on more private appeals of smaller groups, which make it appear more like being used in a strike instead of nationalist demonstrations. “Strongly protest that Japanese bosses punish and fire workers at will! Raise wages and improve working conditions!” (日本老板乱惩人乱炒人强烈抗议!

提高工资，改善待遇！) The only relevant point here with the anti-Japanese demonstrations is “Japanese bosses”. The claims in this slogan are very clear – to oppose bosses’ management and ask for better treatment. However, the “shrewd” composer very likely tries to take advantage of the timing when the whole society was under the shake of nationwide anti-Japanese demonstrations, to help/make the claims appear stronger and use the social ambience to cause more pressure on the Japanese boss. In this sense, the specific issues and concerns in work are viewed along with large aspects of Sino-Japanese relations, which are used to raise the stakes and success rate of negotiation. When we look back to these slogans, we could see a lot of calculating and weighing work behind these simple texts.

Conclusion

Slogans, as an important form of discourse, are reflections of the composers' judgments, intentions, concerns and opinions about a wide range of issues from international politics to social hot spots. More than eight sorts of elements and content are involved in the slogans collected from the demonstrations; however, they are surely not all of it. With the help of critical discourse analysis, more hidden information can be unlocked from them than they appear to be. The slogans mentioned/analyzed above more serve as the introduction to what people said and why they said so in the case of 2012 protests, more importantly, help us to better understand Chinese nationalism, Sino-Japanese relations or China itself.

Just as argued in this article, nationalism or patriotism is generally viewed as a flag or tool in China that could be used to justify or cover up many acts bound with it, which explains why so many slogans, with various distinct opinions and concerns, emerged at the same time and places in the same demonstrations. We can definitely say that the anti-Japanese demonstrations triggered by the Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands dispute are nationalist protests since they are closely connected with Chinese nationalism, with the situation of China itself and its perplexing relations with Japan. It is also not wrong to say that the discourse used by those participants and in these processes are nationalist discourse. Nevertheless, just as Chinese nationalism is the outcome of various complex issues, the nationalist discourse in such demonstrations is numerous and jumbled as well.

Through former discussions, three basic conclusions can be reached in this thesis. Firstly, quite a few slogans indicate that Chinese nationalism and the discourse among nationalists are greatly tied up with history and memories, whether nationalism itself or Chinese claim and understanding about the Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands dispute. Secondly, the demonstration itself provides a chance and platform for all kinds of arguments and ideas to be made public, various social sentiments to be released, which are hardly possible in normal times due to Chinese government's strict "*Wei Wen*" – preserving stability policy. These ideas and concerns are not limited to the islands dispute, anti-Japanism or even nationalism but originate widely from different aspects of Chinese society and development. The inherent nature of nationalism – an ideology dealing with people and their identity, makes it available for both the origin of legitimacy for the government and an effective means for ordinary people to express/justify their claims. Thirdly, nationalism or patriotism in China is a large flag

under which people seemingly originally gather, or be gathered, to demonstrate their solidarity and uniformity, however, eventually ironically exposed their serious division and divergence. The diversity of concerns and opinions in the slogans on the other hand reveals many realistic problems and the fragmentation of people participating in those demonstrations, quite possibly an epitome of Chinese society. Led and covered by this large flag, people with different political views, social status, intentions, concerns and backgrounds join and mix into the demonstrations in the name of defending sovereignty and opposing a foreign nation. It seems that they are all moving forward on the road in one direction for similar goals, but the answer would probably be no.

References

- Albrecht, Eduardo Zachary; Chemier, Betty. *A Review of the Social, Cultural, Political and Economic Dimensions of the Senkaku/Diaoyu Island Dispute*. 동북아문화연구 제 38 집 (2014) pp. 491~515
- BBC. “China sends patrol ships to disputed East China Sea islands.” September 11, 2012. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-china-19553736>
- BBC. March 27, 2014. “分析：中国稀土博弈继续下去” http://www.bbc.co.uk/zhongwen/simp/china/2014/03/140327_ana_wto_rareearth.shtml
- BBC. November 11, 2013. *Bo Xilai scandal: Timeline*. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-china-17673505>
- BBC. October 26, 2013. “日媒关注中国稀土能源外交或失败” http://www.bbc.co.uk/zhongwen/simp/world/2013/10/131026_japan_china_rare-earth.shtml?
- BBC. September 15, 2012. “反日游行之际多家日本商铺遭砸抢” http://www.bbc.co.uk/zhongwen/simp/chinese_news/2012/09/120915_china_japan_violentdemo.shtml
- BBC. 中国网民“发起多个城市反日游行”. August 16 2012. http://www.bbc.co.uk/zhongwen/simp/chinese_news/2012/08/120816_china_japan_protest.shtml
- Breslin, Shaun; Shen, Simon. *Online Chinese Nationalism*. Asia Program Paper. September 2010.
- Center for American Progress. *China's Forthcoming Political Transition - The 2012 Communist Party Leadership Changes Will Require U.S. Policymakers to Know What's Going On*. February 9 2012. <http://americanprogress.org/issues/china/news/2012/02/09/11028/chinas-forthcoming-political-transition/>
- Chen, Xueming. 陈学明. 当代中国民族主义思潮研究综述. (Review of Researches on Contemporary Chinese Nationalist Trends of Thoughts) 广东省社会主义学院学报. 2006.1. - Journal of Guangdong Institute of Socialism.

Vol.22, No.1, January 2006.

- China Daily. January 09, 2014. *Japanese cars hit road to recovery in China market*.
http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/business/motoring/2014-01/09/content_17224782.htm
- China Daily. October 20, 2012. *Islands dispute hurts investment, trade with Japan*.
http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/business/2012-10/20/content_15833642.htm
- China Finance. April 4, 2014. “日系车3月中国市场销售增速放缓 市场份额提升” <http://finance.china.com.cn/industry/auto/20140404/2311467.shtml>
- Chinese Encyclopedia Online - 西元 1983 年典藏版. “天人合一”
<http://ap6.pccu.edu.tw/encyclopedia/data.asp?id=1370&forepage=1>
- Ching, Leo. “JAPANESE DEVILS” *The conditions and limits of anti-Japanism in China*. Cultural Studies, 2012, Vol.26(5), p.710-722
- Cho, Il Hyun; Park Seo-Hyun. *Anti-Chinese and Anti-Japanese Sentiments in East Asia: The Politics of Opinion, Distrust and Prejudice*. The Chinese Journal of International Politics, Vol. 4, 2011, 265–290.
- CNN. “Japan deporting Chinese held over island landing”. 17 August 2012.
http://articles.cnn.com/2012-08-17/asia/world_asia_japan-china-island-dispute_1_uninhabited-islands-chinese-nationals-diaoyu-islands
- CNN. *After months of mystery, China unveils new top leaders*. November 16, 2012 <http://edition.cnn.com/2012/11/14/world/asia/china-leadership-transition/>
- Cumings, B. *Why Memory Lingers in East Asia*. Current History (2007), 107(701), 257-262.
- Dai Weihua. Linguistic Analysis and Intertextual Analysis in Textual Analysis. Foreign Languages, 2000. 戴炜华. 语篇分析中的语言分析和篇际分析 [J]. 外国语, 2000, (1).
- Drifte, Reinhard. *The Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands Territorial Dispute between Japan and China: Between the Materialization of the “China Threat” and Japan “Reversing the Outcome of World War II”?* UNISCI Discussion Papers, 2013, Vol.0(32)
- Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. *Critical discourse analysis*. In T. VAN DIJK(ed.) *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage, 1997.

- Fairclough, N. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London : Longman , 1995.
- Fairclough, N. *Discourse and Text: Linguistic and Intertextual Analysis within Discourse Analysis*, Discourse Society April 1992 vol. 3 no. 2 193-217
- Feng, Chongyi. *Preserving Stability and Rights Protection: Conflict or Coherence?* Journal of Current Chinese Affairs, 2013, Vol.42(2), p.21
- Fenghuang. “光明网评论：薄熙来下场再证文革模式是一条死路”
2012-09-29
http://news.ifeng.com/history/shixueyuan/detail_2012_09/29/18004760_0.shtml
- Fenghuang. “美国回应保钓冲突：将不会采取任何立场”。 2012-08-16
http://news.ifeng.com/mainland/special/diaoyudaozhengduan/content-3/detail_2012_08/16/16844487_0.shtml?from_ralated
- Fenghuang. “美国首次就日本购买钓鱼岛表态”。 2012-07-10
http://news.ifeng.com/mainland/special/diaoyudaozhengduan/content-3/detail_2012_07/10/15918298_0.shtml
- Fowler, R. *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge , 1991.
- Gao, Chengjin; Zhao, Changfeng. 高成璠; 赵长峰. 中日关系 “政冷经热”再思考——“结构性相互依存”的视角. (Rethink the “cold politics and hot economy” in Sino-Japanese relations – from the perspective of “structural mutual dependence”) 日本问题研究. 2012 年第 2 期, 第 26 卷. Japanese Research. Vol. 26, No. 2. June 2012.
- Gao, Mingshi. 2004. 高明士. “东亚古代的政治与教育”. (Politics and Education in Ancient East Asia) 国立台湾大学出版中心. 2004 年
- Gries, Peter Hays. *A Preliminary Analysis of Chinese Nationalism: The People, Their Pasts, and Their Passions*. World Economy and Politics 11, (2005). 浅析中国民族主义：历史、人民和情感. 世界经济与政治, 2005 年第 11 期.
- Gries, Peter Hays. *China's New Nationalism: Pride, Politics, and Diplomacy*.

- Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2004.
- Hagstrom, Linus. “*Power Shift*” in *East Asia? A Critical Reappraisal of Narratives on the Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands Incident in 2010*, *The Chinese Journal of International Politics*, Vol. 5, 2012, 267–297
 - Halliday, M. A. K. *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 2nd edn. London: Edward Arnold, 1994.
 - Horiuchi, Toru. *Public Opinion in Japan and the Nationalization of the Senkaku Islands*. *East Asia* (2014) 31:23–47
 - Hu, Andy Yinan. *The Revival of Chinese Leftism Online*. *Global Media and Communication* 2007 3: 233
 - Huanqiu Finance. December 6, 2012. “日系车在华市场份额已不足8% 辉煌时期曾占三成” <http://finance.huanqiu.com/industry/2012-12/3349862.html>
 - International Business Times. Sep.17 2012. “*Anti-Japanese Protests Erupts Across China; Beijing Raises Trade Threats Over Disputed Islands*” <http://www.ibtimes.com/anti-japanese-protests-erupts-across-china-beijing-raises-trade-threats-over-disputed-islands-789678>
 - *Island dispute stirs Sino-Japanese tensions*. *Strategic Comments*. Vol. 18, Iss. 7, 2012. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13567888.2012.743239>
 - Ji Yuhua. *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theories and Approaches*. *Journal of Xiamen University (Arts & Social Sciences)*, No. 3 2001; 纪玉华, *批评性话语分析:理论与方法*, 厦门大学学报(哲学社会科学版), 2001 年第3 期
 - Jiang, Yonglin. *The Mandate of Heaven and The Great Ming Code*. Issue 21 of Asian law series (2011). University of Washington Press.
 - Kang, Su-Jeong. *Anti-Japanese Popular Nationalism and China’s Approach Towards Japan amid Sino-Japanese Political Tension, 2001–2006*. *East Asia* (2013) 30:161–181
 - Ken’ei, Shu. “*Senkaku mondai ga utsusu Chugoku no ronri to hone*” (*China’s Logic and Real Intentions as Reflected in the Senkaku Problem*), *Gaiko (Diplomacy)*, Vol. 4 (2010), pp. 53–61
 - Kimura, K. *Introduction to the special issue: regional rivalries and order in East Asia*. *International Relations Of The Asia-pacific*, 2014, Vol.14(1), pp.1-5
 - Lam, Willy. *The Maoist revival and the conservative turn in Chinese politics*. *China Perspectives*, 2012, Issue 2, p.5-15
 - Lee, Seokwoo. *Territorial Disputes among Japan, China and Taiwan*

concerning the Senkaku Islands. Boundary & Territory Briefing Vol.3 No.7, 2002.

- Li, Baoguo; Lin, Bohai. 李保国; 林伯海, 当代中国民族主义: 演进、表现形态与话语, 前沿 (Contemporary Chinese Nationalism: Evolution, Characteristic and Discourse) - Forward Position, 2012, Issue 05, pp.159-161
- Liu, Jiangyong. 刘江永. 中国与日本: 变化中的“政冷经热”关系. (China and Japan: “Cold Politics and Hot Economy” in Change) 人民出版社. 2007-2-1.
- Mainichi Shimbun. “Japan buys three of Senkaku Islands from owner”. 2012-09-11.
<http://mainichi.jp/english/english/newsselect/news/20120911p2g00m0dm074000c.html>
- McCormack, Gavan. *Much Ado over Small Islands: The Sino-Japanese Confrontation over Senkaku/Diaoyu*. The Asia-Pacific Journal, Vol. 11, Issue 21, No. 3, May 27, 2013
- NHK. “中国 110 余都市で反日デモ”. 2012-09-18
<http://www3.nhk.or.jp/news/html/20120918/k10015111541000.html>
- People. November 21, 2013.人民日报海外版 第01版. 中日“政冷”终难“经热”
http://paper.people.com.cn/rmrbhwb/html/2013-11/21/content_1327966.htm
- People. 人民网时政专题. “中共党史上的80句口号”. (80 slogans in the party history of Chinese Communist Party) 2001-06-27
<http://www.people.com.cn/GB/shizheng/252/5303/index.html>
- Philipps, Axel. *Visual Protest Material as Empirical Data*, Visual Communication 11, no. 1 (2012): 3-21.
- Ramzy, Austin; Lin, Yang. *Above the Law? China's Bully Law-Enforcement Officers*. TIME Asia (Asia: TIME Asia (Hong Kong) Limited). 2009-05-21: (24 – 25) [2009-06-06]. “The word chengguan has even taken on an alternate meaning in Chinese.” Don't be too chengguan" is an appeal not to bully or terrorize. In other words, chengguan has literally become synonymous with

- violence. <http://content.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1899773,00.html>
- Reuters. “China dismisses Japan plan to buy disputed islands”. 8 July 2012. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/07/08/us-china-japan-islands-idUSBRE86701A20120708>
 - Shi, Hanbing. 时寒冰. 中国民生问题清单 (The list of Chinese livelihood issues) http://www.360doc.com/content/09/0422/08/43201_3221578.shtml
 - Sina Blog. 新浪博客. “汉奸”是一顶帽子还是一项罪名? (Hanjian – is it a label or a crime?) 2013-12-03 http://blog.sina.com.cn/s/blog_485dcc670102e1fx.html?tj=2
 - Stockmann, Daniela. *Who Believes Propaganda? Media Effects during the Anti-Japanese Protests in Beijing*. The China Quarterly, (2010) 202, pp 269-289
 - Tang, Wenfang; Darr, Benjamin. *Chinese Nationalism and its Political and Social Origins*. Journal of Contemporary China (2012), 21(77), September, 811–826
 - Tencent News. “转基因食品争议再起”. (Controversy over GM food rises again) 2013 <http://news.qq.com/zt2013/zhuanjiyin/>
 - The Diplomat. *China's New Leadership: Unveiled*. November 16, 2012. <http://thediplomat.com/2012/11/chinas-new-leadership-unveiled/>
 - Time. December 01, 2013. *China and Japan May Not Like Each Other, but They Need Each Other*. <http://world.time.com/2013/12/01/china-and-japan-may-not-like-each-other-but-they-need-each-other/>
 - Wang, Dong. 王东. *政治与外交阴影下的中日经贸关系*. (Sino-Japanese Economic and Trade Relations under the Shadow of Politics and Diplomacy) 中国经贸 2010 年 11 月刊. China Business Update, November 2010.
 - Wang, Ke. 王柯. “汉奸”: 想象中的单一民族国家话语. (“Hanjian” – the unitary nationalist discourse in imagination) 2009-04-23 <http://www.aisixiang.com/data/26582.html>
 - Wang, Zheng. *National Humiliation, History Education, and the Politics of Historical Memory*, International Studies Quarterly 52, no. 4 (2008).
 - Wikipedia. “2012 China anti-Japanese demonstrations”

- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2012_China_anti-Japanese_demonstrations
- Wikipedia. “Wang Lijun Incident”
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wang_Lijun_incident
 - Wikipedia. *Tianxia* - “Under Heaven”. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tianxia>
 - Wodak, Ruth (Ed.). *Language, Power and Ideology: Studies in Political Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1989
 - Wu, Xu. *Chinese Cyber Nationalism: Evolution, Characteristics, and Implications*. Lexington Books. 2007.
 - Wu, Zhongmin. 吴忠民. 中国目前社会矛盾的基本根源是民生问题 (The fundamental origins of current Chinese social tensions are livelihood issues) 学习时报. 2013-10-29
<http://theory.people.com.cn/n/2013/1029/c40531-23358504.html>
 - Xinhua Net. “中国 10 多个城市的群众游行抗议日本右翼分子非法登上钓鱼岛”. Retrieved 2012-08-19
http://hlj.xinhuanet.com/news/2012-08/19/c_131794800.htm
 - Xinhua Net. White Book “*Diaoyu Islands are China’s inherent territory*”. 《钓鱼岛是中国的固有领土》白皮书. 2012 年 9 月 25 日
http://news.xinhuanet.com/2012-09/25/c_113202698_2.htm
 - Yahoo Historical. “较真:卖国贼的帽子为什么还在满天飞?” (Why are the hats of “traitor” and “quisling” still flying everywhere?) 2013-08-17
<https://web.archive.org/web/20130817224528/http://cul.cn.yahoo.com/jiaozhen/maiguozei/>
 - Yang, Guobin. *The Power of the Internet in China: Citizen Activism Online*, Contemporary Asia in the world, Columbia University Press, 2013
 - Zhang, Huiyu. 张慧玉, 日本首相公开加入“购岛”闹剧, 世界知识 - World Affairs, 2012, Issue 15, pp.26-27
 - Zhang, Jifeng. 张季风. 中日经贸关系的发展与面临的挑战. (The development and challenges of Sino-Japanese Economic Relations) 收录张蕴岭主编《中国的对外关系: 回顾与思考 (1949-2009)》, 社会科学文献出版社

版社, 2009, 9, 独著

- Zhang, Lin. 张琳. *中日经贸关系: 真的会“凉”下去吗? (Sino-Japanese Economic Relations: Really Remain “Cooling Down”?)* 博士点击. 中国社会科学院. 2014
- Zhao, Dingxin. 赵鼎新. “天命观”及政绩合法性在古代和当代中国的体现. (The Mandate of Heaven: meritocracy, legitimacy and its embodiment in ancient and contemporary China) 2012.
<http://www.aisixiang.com/data/50306.html> (in Chinese)
- Zhao, Jing. *State, Market and the Internet: Critical Discourse Analysis to China's nationalistic discourse in 2008*. Fu Jen Catholic University, Taiwan.
赵菁. *国家、市场、互联网: 对零八年中国大陆民族主义话语的批判性分析*, 中华传播学会年会, 辅仁大学, 台湾. 2013年7月。
- Zheng, Dahua. *On Modern Chinese Nationalism and its Conceptualization*. *Journal of Modern Chinese History*. Vol. 6, No. 2, December 2012, 217–234

Appendix

Serial Number & Main Points of Elements

1. Diaoyu Islands; territory, sovereignty and national interests
2. History memories, patriotism; symbolized understanding of Japan
3. Counter measures and retaliation
4. Personal life, social problems and livelihood issues
5. Image of authorities; domestic politics, ideologies and representative figures
6. Opposing violence, rationality
7. Identities relating to home cities, stratum or the same occupation
8. Other

钓鱼岛是中国的固有领土 1

钓鱼岛是我国的神圣领土 1

Diaoyu Islands belong to China since 1372! 1

人人保卫钓鱼岛 1

维护主权，寸土不让 1

保卫河山，寸土不让 1

钓鱼岛是中国领土，日本滚出去 1

保卫钓鱼岛，赶走日本人！ 1

还我河山，还我保钓人士！ 1

谁说钓鱼岛是日本的就是汉奸 1

中国很生气，后果很严重 1

中国的领土不容侵犯，中国主权不容挑衅 1

反对日本侵占中国领土钓鱼岛 1

反对日本钓鱼岛“国有化” 1

头可断，血可流，钓鱼岛不能丢！ 1

反日大游行，小日本滚出中国 1、2

保我中华，还我钓鱼岛，抗击鬼子，有我一份 1、2

对日宣战，我捐一万，保卫钓鱼岛，我是中国人 1、2

替天行道，邪恶的美国与日本，如敢损害我国安全与利益，美国总统与人民及日本首相同人民全家遭殃 1、2

保钓抗日寇，寸土不能丢 1、2

保卫钓鱼岛，打倒法西斯 1、2

纪念九一八，光复钓鱼岛 1、2

誓死捍卫祖国领土完整，让爱国主义旗帜高高飘扬 1、2

中国钓鱼岛，中国必胜，中华人民共和国万岁！ 1、2

中国国大，无一寸领土多余 1、2

美日勾结侵占钓鱼岛无耻！ 1、2

为钓鱼岛而战，如国家需要宁做战死第一人。 1、2

祖宗基业誓死必保，收复钓鱼岛武力解决 1、2、3

中华儿女，团结抗日，对日宣战，抵制日货，保钓光荣！ 1、2、3

永不忘九一八！钓鱼岛是中国的！我们爱好和平，但从不惧怕战争！只做爱，不做战！ 1、2、4

日本购岛出兵无凭无据无理，政客媚外勾美可悲可耻可恨 1、2、5

还我自由，还我国土。 1、2/5

钓鱼岛是我们中国的，本商场拒绝日货 1、3

灭日之灾，由今开始。炮轰东京，捍我钓鱼岛 1、3

哪怕……也要…… 1、3、4

哪怕华夏遍地坟，也要杀光日本人。宁肯大陆不长草，也要收复钓鱼岛。

哪怕天天被代表，也要收复钓鱼岛。哪怕顿顿瘦肉精，也要出兵灭东京。哪怕喝遍地沟油，也要挥刀斩倭寇。

宁愿我们吃不饱，也要收复钓鱼岛。哪怕养老没人管，也要占领富士山。

捍卫主权，不辱使命，抵制日货，表我决心。 1、3、5

钓鱼岛是中国的，苍井空是世界的！ 1、4

内忧转基因，外患钓鱼岛 1、4

没医保，没社保，心中要有钓鱼岛；就算政府不养老，也要收复钓鱼岛。没物权，没人权，钓鱼岛上争主权；买不起房修不起坟，寸土不让日本人。 1、4、5

小日本滚出去，薄书记快回来！坚决抵制转基因，严惩汉奸卖国贼！ 1、4、5

维护领土主权，不做缩头乌龟，政府担起责任，保卫南海，保卫钓鱼岛 1、5

驻军钓鱼岛 1、5

拿出行动，拒绝谴责 1、5

要怎么收回国家领土——钓鱼岛？哎，不如叫城管和中国的贪官去吧 1、5

给我三千城管兵，一定收回钓鱼岛；给我五百贪腐官，保证吃垮小日本。 1、5

派出一队城管，日本立马完蛋 1、5

我们的武警战士城管队伍莫要在家逞威风，去日本吧！ 1、5

我本谦让，怎奈鬼子猖狂。烦我国土，气焰甚是嚣张。 1、5

钓鱼岛是中国的，薄熙来是人民的 1、5

要民主，要自由，保卫钓鱼岛 1、5

自由 民主 人权 宪政 保钓 1、5

化愤怒为力量，要政改，要自由！ 1、5

百万市民网上请愿——阻止日本侵犯钓鱼岛 1、5

内惩国贼，外争主权。/内惩汉奸，外争国权。 1、5

湘军保钓 1、7

日照人民声援保钓 1、7

常德越战老兵支持为国捐躯 1、7

你 MLGB 的小鬼子在俺们这噶哒舞舞扎扎的，瘪犊子脑瓜子给你削碎乎喽！ 钓鱼岛到是中国的。 1、8

消灭倭寇 2

世界警惕日本军国主义，死灰复燃，世界灾难 2

维护世界正义，警惕军国主义 2

日寇必须下跪谢罪 2

十亿青年十亿兵，国耻岂待儿孙平 2

日本，二战罪人，厚颜无耻。 2

同胞觉醒起来，反抗小日本压迫。 2

南京之痛，永世难忘。 2

华夏儿女千千万，何惧倭寇小弹丸 2

泱泱大中华，何惧小日本！ 2

小日本，野心勃，敢欺大中国 2

宁为床前不孝子，勿忘国耻醒世人。 2

日本军国主义借尸还魂，中华民族众志成城 2

起来，不愿做奴隶的人们！把我们的血肉铸成我们新的长城！（国歌歌词） 2

扬我国威，历练斗志，勿忘国耻，振兴中华 2

靖国神社是猪窝，哦！对不起，不对，是狗窝！ 2

日寇卑鄙，勿忘南京大屠杀，勿忘九一八。 2

新仇旧恨，血洗日本 2、3

技术立国，打败日本 2、3

大刀砍下鬼子们的头颅 2、3

万里长城十亿兵，越马扬刀入东京。 2、3

干掉日本，铲除东亚毒瘤 2、3

东京大屠杀，炸沉日本岛 2、3

抵制日货，支持国货 2、3

抗击倭寇，收复琉球 2、3

向日本宣战，新帐旧账一起算 2、3

再次炸平广岛长崎 2、3

心系国事，驱逐日寇 2、3

核灭日本野狗，铲除民族后患 2、3

辱我华夏，虽远必诛。/犯我强汉，虽远必诛。 2、3

400 年来，杀我父母，污我妻女，掠我财富。狼子野心者，虽远必诛。 2、3

爱我中华，请求宣战！驱逐日寇，血债血偿！ 2、3

全球华人大集结，坚决、彻底、干净的消灭日本军国主义！ 2、3

十三亿中国人踏平小日本 2、3

粉碎日本霸权主义卑劣伎俩 2、3

日本翻案二战胜果，中国亮剑诛杀无赦。 2、3

反对日本篡改历史教科书！反对日本加入安理会！ 2、3

日本自卫队，你回家自慰去吧 2、3

日本明仁天皇谢罪！ 2、3

恶狗小泉，疯狗野田，鬼子豺狼，统统杀光，清算历史，血债血偿。 2、3

华夏儿女，铮铮铁骨。勿忘国耻，以血雪耻。拔刀亮剑，对日宣战。干掉野田，踏平东京。 2、3

爱国爱党爱 AV，反日反美反涨价 2、4

动漫只看喜羊羊，COSPLAY 灰太狼 2、4

中国是剩女吗？被人奸过 N 次了，穿铁裤衩反抗吧 2、5

没有义和团中国就没有百年耻辱了吗？推脱什么责任！ 2、5

警惕日本帝国主义，人民子弟兵要给力 2、5

草根爱国，仗义执言 2、5、7

唐山人民抗震也抗日，我们 80 后不惧怕战争 2、7

坚决抵制日货，从我做起！ 3

野田佳彦千刀万剐，天诛地灭 3

野田请罪 3

野田必死，日本必亡 3

宁可不洗澡，不泡日本汤 3

向日宣战，踏平东京。 3

审判战争贩子！野田佳彦，石原慎太郎！ 3

凡进店大吼一声“钓鱼岛是中国的”，打 8.5 折；大吼一声“日本也是中国的”打 8.0 折。 3

中日宣战，血洗东京！ 3

亮剑！人不犯我，我不犯人；人若犯我，我必犯人！ 3

中国人不购日本货，日本不攻自破！ 3

一夜踩碎狗奴才，太平洋水漫东京。 3

抵制日本品牌康师傅、日清、朝日啤酒、索尼、松下。 3

抵制日货，停供稀土。 3

中国，闹他！ 3

石原慎太郎，狂妄又疯狂！ 3

以后再买日本货就不是中国人！ 3

东京只要 5 毛钱特价！ 3

每人 10 元，购买日本！ 3

日本对中国的依赖程度现排最前，特别是对中国市场的依赖，如果中国人 1 个月不买日货，日本将有数千家企业面临破产。如果中国人 6 个月不买日货，日本将有一半人失业。如果中国人 1 年不买日货，日本经济结构彻底瓦解。考验的就是

你那颗国心，也许你发布一次，就牵动日本经济一亿元。 3

强拆日本，向小日本开炮！ 3、4

理性爱国，拒绝打砸，抵制日货，AV女优除外。 3、4、6

红动中国，抵制日货！ 3、5

强烈要求中日断交，同禽兽之国交往是和谐社会的最大耻辱。 3、5

郑州市出租车司机，号召大家抵制日货，大规模经济制裁小日本；坚决支持政府武力保卫钓鱼岛。 3、5、7

如果终有一战，请不要为小日本的炮弹买单。（保卫钓鱼岛，文明游行，珍爱市容） 3、6

日本老板乱虐人乱炒人强烈抗议！提高工资，改善待遇！ 4

铲除内奸复兴中华，“裸官”下台！ 5

中日断交！ 5

支持海监船暴力执法钓鱼岛！ 5

薄书记，人民的好书记。 5

东风浩荡气象新，红日东升山河壮。毛主席我们好想您 5

毛主席，小日本又欺负我们了 5

毛主席，人民好想你 5

只有毛泽东思想才能救中国 5

高举毛泽东思想伟大旗帜奋勇前进 5

伟大的毛主席，我们需要您，我们呼唤您 5

毛主席，小鬼子找茬要打大架 5

毛爷爷，快回来吧！我们想你！小日本又来了，您的这些晚辈总是抗议谴责，或是徒劳的，无效的打嘴仗，您说句话他们害怕，我去就是了，还有十三亿中国人民呢！ 5、2

毛主席，你所感谢的日本帝国主义又回来了！ 5、2

谁不灭日本，谁就去棺材里替换毛泽东！ 5、3

拥护党中央，拒绝打砸抢。 5、6

生气却不要犯罪，不可含怒到日落，也不可给魔鬼留可趁之机。 5、6

前方砸车，日系车掉头！ 6

请文明爱国，请理性抗日。 6

理性爱国，誓不当爱国贼。 6

战争，地震，水灾，我们都过去了。这不是法西斯，我们的领土不是靠打砸烧。

这不是文革，我们的奥运会全世界都看了。请停止伤害，我记得，我们的祖国充满爱。 6、5

爱广州，非暴力！ 6、7

愤怒的鸡蛋免费领取处 8

FUCK Japan! 小日本我操你祖宗！ 8