

Language and State

Language and State:

A Treatise on Political Linguistics and Philosophy

By

Xing Yu

**Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing**



Language and State: A Treatise on Political Linguistics and Philosophy

By Xing Yu

This book first published 2024

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2024 by Xing Yu

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN: 978-1-0364-0817-6

ISBN (Ebook): 978-1-0364-0818-3

To Canada

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Prologue.....	x
---------------	---

Part One: Language and State Formation

Introduction	2
--------------------	---

Chapter One.....	4
------------------	---

People

1. People Growing in Numbers.....	4
2. People Clustering in an Area	12
3. People Uniting by Being Literate.....	22

Chapter Two	30
-------------------	----

Community

1. Political Community	30
2. Economic Community	41
3. Cultural Community	51

Chapter Three	62
---------------------	----

Nation

1. Narrative	62
2. Symbol.....	72
3. Behavioral Communication	85

Chapter Four.....	94
-------------------	----

State

1. Language Policy	94
2. Mass Education.....	102
3. Public Media	111

Part Two: Language and State Governance

Introduction	120
--------------------	-----

Chapter Five	123
Appellation	
1. Name Adopted by the State	123
2. Forms of Address for Leaders, Officials and Citizens	136
3. Designations of Politicians and Political Parties.....	146
Chapter Six	154
Constitution	
1. A Contract Tacitly Accepted by People.....	154
2. Constitution in Speaking and Writing.....	164
3. Rationalized Politics	174
Chapter Seven.....	184
Election	
1. The Power Holder and the Masses.....	184
2. Election that Expresses Opinions.....	192
3. Citizenship	201
Chapter Eight.....	212
Representation	
1. Representative.....	212
2. Political Party.....	224
3. State Leader	235
Chapter Nine.....	248
Government	
1. Administrative Body.....	248
2. Legislative Body.....	262
3. Judicial Body	274
Part Three: Language and State Spirit	
Introduction	288
Chapter Ten	290
History	
1. The Presentation of History	290
2. The Memory of History	298
3. The Time and Space of History	310

Chapter Eleven	322
Philosophy	
1. The Dissemination of Philosophy	322
2. The Value of Philosophy	331
3. The Time and Space of Philosophy	347
Chapter Twelve	359
Literature and Art	
1. The Language of Literature and Art.....	359
2. The Charm of Literature and Art	369
3. The Time and Space of Literature and Art.....	383
Chapter Thirteen.....	395
Religion	
1. The Preaching of Religion	395
2. The Role of Religion.....	405
3. The Time and Space of Religion.....	417
Chapter Fourteen	428
Law	
1. The Promulgation of Law	428
2. The Authority of Law	434
3. The Time and Space of Law	444
Conclusion.....	455
Epilogue.....	476
Bibliography	488
Acknowledgements	496
About the Author	497
Subject Index	498
Index of Names.....	505

PROLOGUE

This manuscript studies the role played by language in the growth of the state. This is the study in the field of political linguistics. This study uses the knowledge of linguistics to conduct research in the field of politics. It adopts a theoretical premise that defines language as a means of communication necessitating the development and utilization of various media. By “media,” I mean any form or process or being, such as a person or a material that facilitates human communication. Most often, this does not mean news media or social media.

Then this study focuses on how language plays a role in the formation and the growth of the state. As this study defines the state as an organization functioning as a community comprising a people, a piece of land as its territory, and a government in charge of its governance, it argues that language plays a role in all the aspects of the formation and growth of the state. It particularly intends to argue that language is not only a tool utilized by humans in communication for the purpose of social intercourse, but also a condition for the formation and the growth of the state.

My reasoning is that when comparing a state (a typical community in civilized society) with a tribe (a typical community in primitive society), we see that these two types of human community are incomparable in terms of population and area. A state usually has a large population. In some cases today, a state has a population of over one billion. But the average size of a tribe is usually in the range of several thousand members.¹ A state usually also has a very large territory, as compared with a tribe. Why do people build a community, like a state, that is so large by population and area?

¹ The average size of a tribe may have been 3,000-6,000. We seldom find a document that states that the members of a tribe exceed 30,000. According to Frederick Engels, the average strength of American tribes was less than 2,000 members, and the Cherokee numbered about 26,000, the greatest number of Indians in a tribe in the United States. See: Frederick Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (New York: International Publishers, 1972), 154.

Correlatively, a state has a government while a tribe has no government, although it may have a council. Why do people form a government when their community grows large by population and area (hence becoming a state)? While thinkers of the past gave their answers to these questions, and their answers are valuable indeed, I intend to give an answer from a new perspective. This new perspective is more meaningful in the construction of a theory. This new perspective is in relation to language. By analyzing language, I intend to elucidate people's use of language as underlying the growth of the state and the dissolution of the tribes, and I also intend to give a different interpretation of how humans build their state. This description involves an argument that when people form a tribe in a primitive society, they do so because of kinship, but when people build their state, kinship is not the prime motivator. People who form a state may share the same blood relationship, as the case of a nation-state often shows, but people are not generally connected to each other by way of kinship. If a small number of people are still connected with each other by kinship within the state, not all are connected with each other by kinship throughout the state. The reason is that since humans commenced to speak and write, they have extended the distance of communication and engaged in mutual interactions on a large scale. People build a large community. This large community grows to become a state.

The reason is that although we can conclude that language is initially spoken within a group of people or a tribe, spoken communication is not a condition for people to keep the tribe. Instead, in view of the long-term development of human community, spoken communication creates the conditions for the appearance of written communication, and written communication leads to the final dissolution of the tribe. This is because using language to communicate means creating an essential condition for the use of various media. With media enabling people to communicate with others who are physically far from each other, people extend the reaches of their communication. They expand their communication range and then can perform their productive and cultural activities on a large scale. They also engage in the governance of their communities on a large scale. These activities change the structure of their community.

Specifically, under the condition that language is used by people for their mutual communication, a change takes place in the method of the formation of the human community. If we assume that a tribe is formed because of the mutual interactions realized by those who form the tribe through kinship, a state is formed because of the mutual interactions realized by those who form the state due to the use of language. While using language, people who interact with each other provide information,

indicate intention, share ideas, show sympathy, and make friendships. When they communicate with each other, they eliminate loneliness. They feel warmhearted toward each other. They help and trust each other. They cooperate with each other in production, and help each other in living. They find the formation of their common interest. They unite to form their society and then to build their state. .

So we see evidence that language has contributed to the construction of human communities. Language underlies the growth of civilized society and the formation of the state. For example, people communicating with language may feel trust and make promises to each other. They sign a contract or an agreement or execute some other similar document such as a letter of undertaking, indemnity, recommendation, or authorization. We cannot imagine that today there is a society in which people never trust each other and make promises. We cannot imagine a society in which people do not sign contracts or similar instruments. When people make promises to each other, they trust each other. They may make a contract or similar document. They use language. For example, people indicate their intention of exchanging goods and services by speaking or writing. As people use language, they are able to make a promise and build mutual trust, even though they do not know each other personally. Even strangers can cooperate with each other. Similarly, people who build their community may argue about how people should govern the community, and who should govern the community. If one potential governor and ordinary people discuss the governance of the community, they may make an agreement on how people should govern the community, and who should be the governor of the community. We cannot imagine that when people establish democracy, they do not discuss how people should govern the community and who should be the governor and reach no consensus. In addition, by performing linguistic communication, people share ideas, as the ideas of one individual person can be passed on to another individual person. Then we cannot imagine that there is a state in which people have no traditional idea that is shared by all. We cannot imagine that there is a state in which people have no collective religious belief, historical spirit, and national consciousness. We can assume that people build a state on the basis of a society that is further built on the basis of the mutual trust of people. We can also assume that, at the same time, people build that state because people often engage in mutual discussion, reach a consensus, and hold the same traditional ideas, religious beliefs, historical spirit, and national consciousness. Then we can believe that people build the state in the context of linguistic communication because mutual trust, discussion, consensus, and the spread of traditional ideas, religious beliefs, historical

spirit, and national consciousness all appear in the process of linguistic communication.

This is unlike the situation in a tribe. In a tribe, I assume, people also, in some sense, trust each other. But they build the related trust relationship mainly because they are connected with one another by a close blood relationship. The related trust is like the trust given by a baby to its parents just after it is born. Using language is not essential. But since the dissolution of the tribe, people have been unable to build a relationship of mutual trust except through the use of language. Similarly, in a tribe, people also have a certain consciousness of the community. This consciousness takes form naturally when people grow up in a tribe. If people are obligated to help each other, this is because of the functioning of kinship or, at least, the functioning of kinship in a mutated form, namely, transfigured kinship. While describing the organization of the tribe, Stanley Diamond, an anthropologist of the twentieth century, wrote that in a tribe, “all meaningful social, economic, and ideological relations have a kin or transfigured kin character.”² The use of language may not be essential. But since the dissolution of the tribe, people have been unable to build the consciousness of the community unless by way of linguistic communication. Today, people communicate with one another using language. They build a relationship of mutual trust for cooperation. They find that they get some benefit in doing so. They create a condition for the formation of their common interest this way, even though the common interest that takes shape may be ephemeral at the outset. Yet, as long as people continue to communicate with one another using language, their common interest will remain and increase. This is because continuing to use language to communicate enables people to continue to cooperate with one another in production and maintain their common memory and experience and build their collective consciousness. They realize the formation of their common interest. The common interest that takes shape in this case substitutes for the common interest that takes shape due to the blood relationships represented by kinship. Then people dissolve their tribes and build their state.

What makes linguistic communication so essential for the formation of the state? The linchpin is the extension of the distance of communication—people lengthen the distance of communication, step by step. As people become able to communicate with each other on a large scale, the common interest of all those inhabiting a large area takes shape on a new basis.

² Stanley Diamond. *In Search of the Primitive: A Critique of Civilization* (New Brunswick, U.S.: Transaction Publishers, 1974), 145.

Then the state emerges and grows. Without language, no state would take shape.

Of course, we do not clearly know how the use of spoken language resulted in the growth of the tribe in primitive society, but we can believe that language was spoken in all of the tribes of the primitive societies we can imagine. When people lived in communities in the form of tribe consisting of gentes and phratries, or gentes only, they spoke a dialect. Since people started to use a written language, they have been able to form their state on the basis of the confederacy of tribes. Lewis H. Morgan once indicated that the state of the human community commenced at the bottom of the scale and worked its way up from the state of savagery through the state of barbarism to the state of civilization.³ His study reminds us of the long-term evolution of human society. His study also indicates that while humans move to build their civilized society, they dissolve their primitive society. The process of forming the civilized society is also the process of dissolving the primitive society. Language leads to both the formation of the civilized society and the dissolution of the primitive society. As I assume that civilized society is a large society and primitive society is a small society, I believe that a change in the method of human communication dictates a change in the formation and the growth of the society. This underlies the evolution of human society. The reason is that when humans use language, they need to use media. Media dictate how humans build their society. In the beginning, people communicated with each other by displaying their body movements. I define this way of communication as the “communication of behavior.” Behavior was the medium used by people in their mutual communication. I call this medium the “original medium.” This is because people communicated with one another by showing their varying behaviors. For example, people communicated through their facial expression or gestures. The related communication happened face-to-face. People performed this sort of communication using the “original medium.” People performed such communication largely within the reach of human audio or visual perception. People, living in a tribe, usually performed such communication. Later, the birth of written language allowed for people to extend the reach of communication. Many people began to communicate with one another in their society. The reason is that they could use some media other than the original media used in the communication of behavior or some media used in spoken communication.

³ Lewis H. Morgan, *Ancient Society* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1964), 11.

Such media assisted people in performing long-distance communication. Such media can be called “material media.”

People then change their way of forming society due to long-distance communication. People no longer form their communities in the principle of kinship, and people coming from different tribes begin to form their new communities, namely, states. They formed city-states and kingdoms on the basis of the amalgamation of different tribes. They even built empires by forcing the combination of various ethnic groups of people into one state. In modern times, people build nation-states. In each nation-state, people usually communicate with one another using the same language. As kinship no longer plays a role in the formation of the state, the use of language in communication over long distances proves to be an essential condition for the formation of a state. This is an interpretation of the formation of the state I give.

When scholars study the formation of the state, they give different interpretations and create different theories. These interpretations and theories show many insights. These insights sometimes include some discussions of language. Aristotle, an ancient Greek philosopher, alludes to the role of language in the formation of city-state or society, for example; he states that a human being is more of a political animal than any of those animals that live in herds because “humans are the only animals who possess reasoned speech.” In the meantime he famously discusses the growth of city-states in ancient Greece. For example, he mentions that along with an increase in population, people form villages and cities.⁴ But his study focuses mainly on the building of the city-states and the comparison of the forms of government of ancient times. He does not directly narrate the correlation between language and the formation of city-state. He only simply studies the growth of city-states in ancient times. By contrast, I intend to study the correlation between language and the formation of the state in light of a sort of linguistic ontology about the state. I intend to study systematically how language plays a role in the formation and growth of the state through history.

As scholars have created quite a few new branches of learning or theories, including the theory of media, in modern times, we can now see the essence of language, a situation unlike that faced by Aristotle. I mean that we can explore the role of language in the formation and growth of the civilized society or the state from the perspective of linguistics together with the study of media. This new situation reminds us of the possibility of

⁴ Aristotle, *The Politics of Aristotle*, trans. Peter L. Phillips Simpson (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 10-11.

creating a unique theory about the role of language in the formation and growth of the state in modern times. We can even credit the origin of the states of all types to language, for the reasons mentioned above, in order to create a theoretical system because, I argue, political linguistics in a narrow sense or political theory in a broad sense needs a comprehensive system. Judging by the status quo of existing political linguistics or political theory, we need to engage in a new study. The study of a correlation between language and state can be this new study because it cannot be denied that without language, humans would not build their state. A view of language in the formation of the state can deepen and broaden our understanding of the state. Conversely, if scholars merely credit the origin of the state to any act committed by humans in the formation of the state, or any matter in the formation of the state other than language, their views or theories will usually, if not absolutely, end up being controversial or single-faceted. Whenever a theory is controversial or single-faceted, it tends to be incomplete or immature.

First, some of the thinkers of the past held a theory of the matriarchal or patriarchal society, arguing that the state may evolve from the enlargement of an original family under the authority of the parents or elders because, with an increase in population, a family evolves to be a tribe, and a tribe evolves to be a state. Jean Bodin holds the view that a state takes shape because of the evolution of a community growing from matriarchal or patriarchal society.⁵ And Sir Henry Maine goes further, insisting that states are invariably formed this way.⁶ They confirm the role of the common lineage of people in the formation of the human community, along with an increase in population. They imply that the matriarchal or patriarchal society gives origin to the state. Yet, to me, this theory merely confirms the role of common lineage in the organization of the human community without interpreting why humans can build one community with a large population and area. While it can interpret the origin of a state of a traditional type formed by a nation in some sense, it cannot interpret the origin of some other states of a non-traditional type in modern times. In modern times, states large in population and area emerge

⁵ Jean Bodin wrote that: "Commonwealth refers to the family because it is not only the true source and origin of the commonwealth, but also its principal constituent." Jean Bodin, *Six Books of Commonwealth*, Trans: M.J. Tooley (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 6.

⁶ Henry Maine said, "In most of the Greek states and in Rome, there long remained the vestiges of an ascending series of groups out of which the State was first constituted. The Family, House, and Tribe of the Romans may be taken as the type of them." Henry Maine, *Ancient Law* (London: John Murray, 1866), 128.

and these states are often formed by people coming from many different ethnic groups. Can we use this theory to interpret the origin of the United States or Canada? We have to interpret why humans can build a community with a large population consisting of people coming from many different ethnic groups. When a state grows in population and area, the common lineage of people attenuates.

Second, some scholars, including David Hume, insist that the state is often built through the use of force. He maintains that in every case, rulers asserted their independent right of sovereignty from conquest or succession.⁷ His argument is true in many cases. The reason is that the conquerors are often military leaders. These military leaders become the rulers because they have a tool of coercion. Yet can we claim that the conquest is the only path for people to build their state? Is there any case in history in which people voluntarily form a state? How can we interpret the formation of the United States, modern Italy and Germany, and many other nation-states in Latin America, Asia and Africa? Indeed, the conquest of a group of unarmed people by another group of armed people leads to the building of a regime. Without a regime controlling a population and an area, humans will not build a state. Yet if we suppose that humans do not speak or write, we are likely to believe that they will not be able to build a large community. In this context, the conquest will mean only the conquest of a tribe by another tribe. Therefore, the conquests that often happened in history only accelerated the formation of the state, as a medium. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, in their work, *The German Ideology*, which describes the ancient history that Germans invaded and occupied the Roman Empire, write that: "The conquerors very soon adopted the language, culture, and manners of the conquered."⁸ Likewise, the Mongolian people and the Manchu people conquered the Han Chinese in the thirteenth century and the seventeenth century respectively, but later they were assimilated by the Chinese people because the Chinese language, spoken by the majority, was adopted by the minority (which ruled the majority).⁹

⁷ Jerry Z. Muller (ed.), *Conservatism: An Anthology of Social and Political Thought from David Hume to the Present* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 54.

⁸ Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The German Ideology*, edited by C.J. Arthur (New York: International Publishers, 1970), 90.

⁹ Benedict Anderson writes that at that time Sinicized Mongols and Manchus were already half-way to full absorption and were accepted as Sons of Heaven. Please see: Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism, Revised Edition* (London: Verso, 2006), 13.

Third, some thinkers, such as Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, contend that the government takes form because people make a social contract.¹⁰ They argue that people, originally in the natural state and in need of security and the protection of their private property, inevitably move to make a social contract, and cede some of their freedoms for security ensured by a government, although they sometimes view the social contract in different ways. Their theories are considered by some modern scholars to be the theories interpreting the origin of the state. Yet this theory may not be in line with reality. Anthropology indicates that all humans were tribal people before the formation of the state. The state took form because of the dissolution of the tribe. The tribe was an organization. People were not isolated individuals in the natural state at the outset. How can we interpret the formation of some ancient despotic states if we assume that an ideal government can be established on the basis of a social contract? While we hold that a social contract is a basis for the building of a democratic state, we cannot interpret the formation of a despotic state according to this theory. The formation of the government does not necessarily mean the formation of the state. The conditions for forming a state are more than the conditions for forming a government. If people do not have a common memory, common religious belief, and common culture, they may not be willing to form a state. In modern times, a state is usually formed on the basis of the formation of a nation. A nation is usually a group of people or a community formed by those who have the same ethnical characteristics. They have a national consciousness. People are often motivated by their national consciousness to build their states.

Fourth, Frederick Engels contends that the division of labor in the enhancement of productivity in the economic development of human society leads to the emergence of different social classes. As upper social classes oppress and exploit the lower social classes, they are often in conflict. Then, to control social class antagonism and establish order, "it became necessary to have a power seemingly standing above society that

¹⁰ Hobbes held that men are unable to establish order unless they cede some of their rights to the sovereign and confer all their power upon one man. See: Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. C.B. Macpherson (New York: Penguin Books, 1985), 227. Locke believed that government is formed because men make a social contract; he said that an original contract is entered into to make one body politic under one government. See: John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, ed. C.B. Macpherson (Indianapolis, Indiana: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 1980), 52. Rousseau wrote that: "The social order is a sacred right which [...] must therefore be founded on conventions." See: Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract*, translated by G.D. H. Cole (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1952), 387.

would alleviate the conflict and keep it within the bounds of ‘order’.” But actually, this power would be used by the economically dominant class to hold down and exploit the oppressed class. This power became the state.¹¹ He was clearly aware of the role played by the ruling class in the formation of the state. He may not have objected to the view, advanced by Hume and others, that the state takes form through the use of force, because he believed that the ruling class relies on the use of force to keep their rule. Yet, should we believe that the formation of the state is always due to the confrontation between different social classes? Is there any case in history in which people united to build an independent state on voluntary basis? How can we interpret the formation of many African and Asian nation-states in the process of decolonization since the end of World War Two? Are these not the cases in which different social classes united to build one state voluntarily? Did these states not take form due to the formation of the common interest of all? While those who organize the state play an important part in the building of the state, the masses may also take part in the building of the state. Do we not believe that sometimes different social classes cooperate to build their state? How do we interpret the growth of the motherland? Do we also disbelieve that sometimes the state takes form because people expect the state to keep social order, which may be threatened by some social crimes such as robbery and stealing? Do we not believe that the state needs to perform some internal functions according to the expectations of ordinary people?

Fifth, Karl August Wittfogel offers a unique theory of the origin of the state. He describes a sort of agricultural society emerging on the basis of an irrigation system, as the hydraulic economy in ancient China, India, Japan, Egypt, and so on. According to Wittfogel, “Irrigation farming depends on the effective handling of water.” Channeling a large quantity of water needs the use of mass labor, which “must be coordinated, disciplined, and led.” Thus, hydraulic economy involves a specific type of division of labor that “necessitates cooperation on a large scale.” As farmers must “subordinate themselves to a directing authority,” cooperation in the division of labor produces hydraulic leadership. Such leadership tends to change into political leadership.¹² My understanding is that this implies that the organization of a large-scale irrigation project gives rise to the formation of a regime in agricultural society, and this regime builds a state. According to Wittfogel, people unite to form a state because they

¹¹ Frederick Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (New York: International Publishers, 1972), 229-231.

¹² Karl August Wittfogel, *Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study of Total Power* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957), 18; 22; 27.

need cooperation in the division of labor in the agricultural production so important for people to survive and grow. Though his description may interpret the organization of agricultural production in history in some areas, I believe that Wittfogel regards the origin of the government as the origin of the state. Like the theory of social contract, his theory interprets the origin of the state in a single-faceted way. The origin of government can be part of the origin of the state, but not all of it. Culture or history or religion may play a role in the formation of the state. Each state has its own spirit. Without a shared spirit, people may not be able to unite to form a state. He seemed to be trying to build a theory about the origin of the state in Asian societies, and some others. This theory, unfortunately, only interprets some aspects of the formation of the state in a certain period, in some regions in the world. We have to ask this question: Does irrigation alone underlie the formation of a large community? Can a ruler who controls a local irrigation system control a state large in population and area? Is there any case in which irrigation for the development of agriculture is not so important in the formation of the state? How do we interpret the origin of some states built by nomads in history?

Sixth, Immanuel Kant insists that the defense of the community leads to the formation of the state, arguing in his insightful meditation that people whose subsistence depends on the earth's cultivation and planting require permanent housing. Defense against all intrusions, prompts men to support one another. They no longer remain as scattered families, but come together to found a village to protect their property against wild hunters and hordes of wandering herdsmen. The custom of industriousness and culture spring from the union of people. Some forms of civil constitution and public justice begin to appear. A government is formed in the aftermath.¹³ Herbert Spencer further summarizes directly that war unites otherwise disparate parts against a common enemy, and he contends that if warfare is prevalent, the subordination of the social division to the military governing center will stabilize, leading a loosely compounded social aggregate toward a more consolidated society with a general governing center.¹⁴ In short, he insists that "wars between societies originate government structures."¹⁵ His view is often regarded by scholars as an interpretation of the origin of the state given from the perspective of

¹³ Immanuel Kant, *Perpetual Peace and Other Essays on Politics, History, and Morals* (Annapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1983), 56.

¹⁴ His remark is cited from: Elman R. Service, *Origins of the State and Civilization* (New York: W.W. Norton Inc., 1975), 38-39.

¹⁵ Herbert Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, (ed.) Stanislaw Andreski (Hamden, Connecticut: Anchon Books, 1969), 80.

war. Since the twentieth century, following these philosophers, some scholars have been further firmly affirming that war forces the power holder of the state to strengthen the building of army, the establishment of a bureaucracy for taxation, and the mobilization of the masses. Charles Tilly confidently ascribes the growth of nation-states in early modern times in Europe to the frequent outbreaks of a war between or among European nations, and concludes that “war made the state and the state made war.”¹⁶ Should war, however, always result in the formation of the state? In the primitive societies, humans also waged war between different tribes. Humans waged war frequently. Why was there no state at that time? In a civil war, the war breaks out in the existing state. If the war is a war between two states, these states have been formed prior to the outbreak of the war. Waging a war does not necessarily lead to the formation of a state. In China, a civil war of the last century resulted in the split of one country into two parts against each other. A war may not always lead to the formation of a state.

In short, I argue that language enables humans to create and use various media. Media enable humans to extend the distance of their linguistic communication, a fact that enables them to interact on a large scale and form a large community. This large community becomes a state. The related reasoning is that whenever people communicate using language, they have to use a certain medium. I regard the use of language as the reason for the proliferation of media. There is a relationship between language and media. Language interacts with each medium. Language plays a pivotal role, and media assist language in playing this role. Language functions in all aspects, but a certain medium cannot. Then I explore the formation and growth of the state through the analysis of language first, and then media. This approach makes it possible for scholars to study all aspects of the state, and states of all kinds throughout history, because language makes it possible to study all kinds of media. The operation of media further represents the formation and growth of the state. Please allow me to give an interpretation of the state in all possible aspects from this perspective in the following text.

¹⁶ Charles Tilly, “Reflections on History of European State-Making” in Charles Tilly (ed.), *The Formation of National States in Western Europe* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1975), 42.

PART ONE

LANGUAGE AND STATE FORMATION

INTRODUCTION

When people communicate using language, they create and use media. Using media, they extend the distance of linguistic communication. They interact with one another on a large scale. They form a large community. They may establish a government. This large community is often a state. For instance, whenever people interact on a large scale, people from a large area may come to cooperate in production. As they cooperate in production, their cooperation in production may mean the formation of a common interest. Similarly, when people interact on a large scale, they may disseminate their social ideas and beliefs over a large area. When people interact on a large scale, people may keep their common memory of history in a large area. People holding the same social ideas and beliefs and the same memory of history usually have a common interest. They unite. They form a large community. This large community is a civilized society. They may build a government. This large community may be a state. Linguistic communication is essential for the formation of the state.

By contrast, when people formed a tribe, they usually communicated with each other through face-to-face contact. They may have communicated with one another mainly through the display of their behavior. They may have also communicated with one another using only spoken language. They were tribal people. They were usually small in number. They united with one another mainly because of kinship, though they may have also had their own social idea, or memory of their past. If their community was also formed on the basis of common interest, this common interest normally took shape due to kinship. Their common interest took shape naturally. There was no government in the tribe.

Then, I argue that whenever humans communicate using language, they create a condition for the formation of their community. Language connects all. As humans use language in communication, they also create and use media that extend the distance of linguistic communication. Then such linguistic communication leads to the formation of the state. The study of linguistic communication can be the study of the formation of the state. For instance, since all people are able to communicate using the same language, their common memory, their communal consciousness, their social belief, and their culture, formed in linguistic communication, always enable them to come up with the same mainstream idea of building their community, and their cooperation in production always reminds them

of the fact that they are all members of the same community. They find that they have certain common interests. They gradually become aware of this situation. They build their mindset, which fits in with the building of the related community. They even form their government. They form their state.

Part One is intended to narrate the formation of the state, step by step, in light of the role of language; I will show, in detail, that extending the distance of linguistic communication results in the formation of the state. Some key aspects are especially selected as topics of discussion that show that extending the distance of linguistic communication underlies the formation of the state.

CHAPTER ONE

PEOPLE

1. People Growing in Numbers

When people grow on the earth, they communicate with one another using language. As they use language in communication, they also use and develop media. Media extend the distance of linguistic communication. People interact with one another on a large scale. They form an increasingly large group. As they form a large group, they grow in numbers within the group. Then we see that when people form a small group, this small group may take form because of kinship and when people form a large group, this large group may take form because of language. Then it follows that when people form a small group, kinship plays a role in the formation of this group. When people begin to form a large group, language begins to supersede kinship in playing a role in the formation of this group—this characterizes the evolution of human community from the primitive society to the civilized society. Then, the effect of kinship is attenuating when people form a large group. This means that people dissolve their tribes and build the state. So we see that people who use language are able to form themselves into a people, and a people can form their state because only a large group of people can become a people. People are no longer bound together by kinship. This means that language leads to the dissolution of tribes and the formation of states. Then as people who form this community communicate with one another using the same language, many people share the same experience, cooperate with one another in production, and construct the consciousness of the collective being. They find the formation of their common interest. They become a people. They form their state.

In short, due to the attenuation of kinship, we see the situation that people who use the same language may form a state as they no longer group themselves by kinship. Language plays a role in the formation of the state because people use it. The state owes its existence to a role played by language and language owes its existence to people who use it.

The result is that while kinship is the reason for the formation of the tribe, language gradually becomes the reason for the formation of the state formed by people using the same language. In a primitive society, people built their matriarchal society and patriarchal society in tandem. Thinking that they had a special relationship with certain animals, plants, or non-living objects—like the bear, wolf, or eagle or a tree, star, mountain or river—people addressed their tribes or clans respectfully, using the names of these animals, plants, or non-living things. These names became the titles of honor, namely, totems. People believed that totems had sacred power and could protect them. The terms that denoted totems gradually became the names of clans. All clans had a totem, or had one in their past, and in each clan denoted by the totem, all the members of the clan were connected with each other by a blood relationship or kinship. Whether or not the members of the clan were connected with each other by blood relationship or kinship, the size of a clan was always small, as far as the population of each clan was concerned. But along with an increase in population in the society and the development of linguistic communication in an increasingly large area, people began to group themselves in mutual interactions assisted by linguistic communication.

In ancient China, family names that stemmed from the names of clans were, in the beginning, used to determine whether a man could marry a woman, because the names of clans could be used to judge whether a man did or did not have a very close blood relationship with the woman. In later times, the clan names were sometimes used to identify the social status of some people. Some families emerged as powerful and rich, resulting in a distinction between the family of a noble and the family of a commoner. From the period of the Xia Dynasty (2070–1600 BC) onward, however, people gradually adopted other terms as their family names, and these could not identify kinship or close blood relationship, even though blood lineage was emphasized from time to time when a title of nobility was granted. For example, in the Spring and Autumn Period (770–476 BC), each kingdom set up a system of prefectures and counties. These prefectures and counties needed to be governed. People needed to set up an administrative system. While nobles were appointed as the officials for governing the prefectures and counties, the authorities inspected their pedigrees of clan. Yet, as kinship discontinued functioning, family names were increasingly used for the organization of the state, with the so-called blood lineage functioning as a medium in the organization of the ruling class only. Some people adopted the name of a kingdom or a manor as their family name. Others adopted the name of a place of residence, such as a village or township, or the name of an official post, or a title of nobility,

or the name of a skill as their family name. Some people even had a family name bestowed by the emperor after the emergence of the empire. Kinship or blood relationship between them was obscured or blurred. According to legend, all Chinese people are the offspring of the Yellow Emperor. Yet some of them may not have a blood relationship with the Yellow Emperor. Family names were gradually used for administration because the authorities standardized the naming system to facilitate census-taking and the use of census information.

In the Roman Empire, the nomen, the gens name, was used to identify group kinship with the praenomen being used as a “forename.” Family names were, however, uncommon in the Eastern Roman Empire and non-existent in Western Europe from the fifth to the tenth century. Though family names became prevalent in Europe from the tenth century onward, these family names were not usually used to identify kinship or blood relationship. In England, the introduction of family names is generally ascribed to the compilation of the *Domesday Book* in 1086, following the Norman Conquest. Under the decree issued by William the Conqueror, people completed a large-scale survey used to check the population and properties of various areas—similar to a census—for the purpose of taxation. Although from the thirteenth century onward, people had adopted hereditary family names in Britain, most family names are no longer used to identify kinship or blood relationship. Some family names are now the original given names, such as “Anderson.” Some family names are now an occupational name, such as “Smith.” Some family names are now a name of the place of inhabitation, such as “London.”

In some countries, people used no family names until early modern times. For example, family names were adopted in the Netherlands in 1811, in Japan in the 1870s, and in Turkey in 1934. These family names usually cannot denote any kinship through history. If they do denote a blood relationship, this blood relationship is no longer kinship. Kinship no longer functions as a basis for the union of all.

I believe that this change takes place because people use language in communication. Language provides a condition under which people group themselves in a new method. Prior to the grouping of people in this new method, people who formed the tribe in the primitive society were grouped by blood relationship, represented by kinship. Tribes were usually isolated from one another. They could not be amalgamated. They could not continuously grow in size. They were always comparatively small in size. If they wanted to form a community larger than a tribe, they had to form an ethnic group on the basis of the union of different tribes first. Forming an ethnic group of people who speak the same language should be a

foundation for the formation of a state. In ancient Greece, people speaking the same language built several different city-states. Though they formed several different states, they spoke the same language. They formed an ethnic group. In Rome the state was built by people who spoke the same language and formed an ethnic group or even a nation in some sense. In medieval Europe, states were often built through the use of force. People however did not stop grouping themselves as various ethnic groups as language played a role in the formation of those ethnic groups. As humans extended the distance of linguistic communication using language, a number of tribes might happen to join together to form an ethnic group, and a number of ethnic groups might happen to join each other to form a nationality, or an ethnic group of people might happen to grow to be a nationality. Their blood relationship attenuated. This description cannot even exclude the case that people might be grouped time and again by changing blood relationships—the blood relationships of some people might change since people grouped themselves as a people because of language. If some ethnic groups of people joined each other to form a nationality, they got mixed. A change took place in their blood relationship. Conversely, if a nationality split into several different ethnic groups, changes also took place in the blood relationships. This evolution of blood relationships may factor into a process in which a certain group of people become a people even though an ethnic group of people may reside in several different territorial states or several different ethnic groups of people may reside in one territorial state for a period of time. What is a tendency is that language often plays a role in the growth of the community when people communicate and interact with one another in the exchange of feelings or in the cooperation of production, etc., regardless of blood relationship. Therefore, we sometimes see that an ethnic group of people may evolve to be a nation, and a nation may also evolve to be an ethnic group of people. Yet in terms of a process that leads to the making of a people, whenever different ethnic groups or different nationalities evolve to be a nation, and hence form a state, along with an increase in population, all people residing in the state are required to speak the same language, or a lingua franca. This is because by communicating with each other using language, people create a condition for the formation of their common national character, and therefore, become a nation. A nation often constitutes a people. This is because the character of a nation is ever-changing, and nearly all nations undergo a certain change in their growth, including changes due to the split of the nation or the fusion of nations. This is because people are animals using language. They can learn a new language. In particular, when a group of people learns the language used

by another group of people, the two groups of people may unite to form a nation. Then there will be a condition for the making of a people. This is the reason why some nations can fuse into one, leading to the making of a new people. For instance, when two nations fuse, the process of fusing these two nations often involves a process in which one nation pivots to using the language of the other. Karl W. Deutsch writes that:

[T]he Slavic settlers in the Peloponnesus were assimilated to the Greek speech of the towns during the “dark ages”; the peasants of Egypt gradually changed their Coptic speech for Arabic between the seventh and the twelfth centuries A.D. (although the process may not have been completed until the sixteenth).¹

A.C. Woolner also writes that: “The ‘Long Beards’ of Lombardy were Germanic invaders of Italy. Now all their descendants speak Italian and pride themselves on their ‘Latin blood’.”²

In the ethnological view, a member of an ethnic community is supposed to be connected with all the other members of this ethnic community by the same blood relationship. People of an ethnic community are supposed to have a common ancestor. The blood relationship shared by them might be the kinship ties of the past. The blood relationship among the people of an ethnic community may even be highlighted to hold the members of the community together and differentiate them from those who are the members of other ethnic communities. But when a community grows large in population and area, people of different ethnic origins may reside in the same area. They may form a new community in which there are many different ethnic groups. They may be mixed. This community may gradually evolve to become the state. In fact, a nation-state is often formed by various ethnic groups through the process of their fusion with a language spoken and written by all. When different ethnic groups interact with each other because they are governed by the same one regime or because of the relocation of one ethnic group or a part of it, and because of the appearance of a language spoken and written by all of the different ethnic groups, the fusion of various ethnic groups may take place. A new group of people in a large size emerges. The related language serves as a medium. It serves as a medium in the making of a people. From ancient times forward, the state has been more and more often formed by a group of people who speak the same language. In the past, people who spoke

¹ Karl W. Deutsch, *Nationalism and Social Communication: An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1966), 120.

² A.C. Woolner, *Languages in History and Politics* (London: Oxford University Press, 1938), 9.