

LECTURE IV

LESSON XVII

IN THIS lecture we shall discuss to what extent Western nations have won democracy and what their present state of progress is.

We have learned of Western democracy from books and periodicals. These being in favor of democracy, we are always told how democracy prospered, how every democratic war was finally a success. Thus we are led to believe that democracy is bound to prevail in the whole world. We must have democracy. Should we reach the stage of the Western nations, our country would be highly civilized.

In reality, these books and periodicals have exaggerated the advancement of democracy in the West. How much democratic power have the people of France and the United States actually won? In the eyes of those who advocate democracy, Western people have obtained only a little.

The United States won her independence after eight years of war against England. When she succeeded in breaking the shackles of England,

there should have been complete democracy for all her people ; but when democracy was put into practice, the problem as to its degree of functioning arose, and opinions differed.

The American people were divided into two groups : one group followed Hamilton and the other Jefferson. Jefferson and his followers believed in the natural right of democracy. They claimed that if the people were given full democratic rights they would use the rights with discretion. The result would be for the good and the progress of the nation. If the people should do bad things with the rights they obtained, it was because they were handicapped in their actions. If they were allowed full freedom and equality, which were their inherent rights, they would be able to accomplish great deeds, because all the people would shoulder equally the national responsibility and work for the public weal.

Hamilton and his followers maintained the opposite theory. They believed that if all the people should be given full democratic rights, the wicked would do evil. They would seek their selfish ends at the expense of the nation. National morality, law, justice, and order would be disregarded. The result would be mob rule. This would be anarchy, because they would carry freedom and equality to the extreme. A democracy like this would only create disorder

and retard national progress. Hamilton maintained, therefore, that the powers of government should not be given entirely to the people. National powers should be concentrated in the Federal government. Ordinary people should be given only limited democratic rights. The danger of mob rule was even greater than that of an autocracy; because if an emperor should be bad, he could be watched and restrained in his actions, but when the masses were inclined to do wrong, nothing could stop them. Hamilton accordingly organized the Federalist party, advocating the centralization of power.

The thirteen states were united only because they wanted to fight England. When they won independence, they separated again. The population of the thirteen states was then about three million. Out of this, one third were monarchists, and only two thirds were revolutionists. The monarchists did all they could to create dissensions among the Americans. This was why the war had to last for the long period of eight years.

When the war of independence was won, the noted monarchists were obliged to make their escape. They fled to the north of the St. Lawrence River and formed the colony of Canada, which has remained a dependency of England.

After they had won independence the thirteen states had no more enemies; each, with an average population of more than two hundred thousand, wished to remain independent. A few foresaw the danger of separation. They realized the need of a strong union and proposed to enlarge the power of the Federal government. They were the Federalists. They won the majority vote after a hot debate and succeeded in forming a union, which adopted the Constitution of the United States.

This constitution has lasted till to-day. It embodies three separate powers: the legislative, the judiciary, and the executive power. This is the first written constitution in history that recognizes three independent powers. It is known as the Federal Constitution of the United States. This constitution has made the United States the wealthiest nation in the world, and since the World War it has also made her one of the strongest nations.

LESSON XVIII

SEEING the prosperity of the United States, our people wanted to copy the federal system, because they thought that it was this system which had made her strong and wealthy. We have accordingly heard of the proposition to have the different provinces of China turned into states, each having its own constitution and independent

government. The national constitution was to be adopted only after the provincial constitutions had all been passed. In other words, they advocated the division of China into twenty-two independent states, like those of the United States a century and a half ago.

Nothing could have been a greater mistake than this proposition. The advocates wrongly judged the cause of American prosperity as they wrongly judged the value of liberty and equality. They accepted foreign ideas without thinking. This action proved their ignorance of the situation in which the American states were before being united. They did not know that these states were formerly independent of one another, and it was impossible to consolidate them and make them a compact whole.

The situation in China is different. The twenty-two provinces and the dependencies were all under Manchu rule for more than two hundred and sixty years. They were all united under the Ming dynasty. At the time of the Yuan dynasty not only were these provinces and dependencies under Mongol control, but almost the whole of Europe and Asia were combined. Again, China was united under the Sung régime; and even during the Southern Sung dynasty the southern provinces were united. Tracing back to the time of the Tang and Han dynasties we find that the

provinces were never separated. Moreover, history tells us that when the provinces were united there was peace; otherwise, there was disorder.

American prosperity does not come from her separation; but, on the contrary, from her union. Since China has all the time been united, why should we divide her? The present separation is merely a temporary phenomenon. It is caused by the usurpation of the militarists. These usurpers must be removed, and we should not propose the separation of provinces to protect their illegal position. China can never be prosperous when she is divided by the militarists. A wrong proposition like this is most apt to invite international control, because by going against the current of the world we expose to foreign nations our inability of self-government.

If we say that we want a United States of the Orient, we should unite China with Japan or with Annam, Burma, India, Persia, and Afghanistan, because these are now separate states. By making a union of the provinces of China we make a serious mistake, because the provinces are in no way separate states but the integral parts of China. Why should we divide a united China? This proposition must have come from the usurpers, like Tang Chi-yao, of Yünnan, Chao Heng-ti, of Hunan, Lu Yung-ting, of Kwangsi, and Chen Chiung-ming, of Kwangtung.

A federation of the usurped provinces is not a union of the people. It does no good to China, but only to the militarists themselves.

It was a tremendously difficult task for the thirteen American states to form the United States of America. When the Federal Constitution was drawn up, the states were requested to give their free votes. A majority of the states gave it support. But it was on account of the division of opinions that the constitution was made a mere compromise. All important political powers that are invested in the Federal government are expressly mentioned in the constitution, and those powers that are not stated belong to local governments.

What democratic powers did the people get out of this compromised constitution? They got only a limited voting power. It applied only to the election of the members of the House of Representatives and some local officials. The members of the Senate and the president were indirectly elected. The people first elected representatives and these in turn elected the members of the Senate and the president. It was not until recently, when democracy was developed, that the power was given to all the people to vote directly for the members of the Senate, the president, as well as those officials having direct relationship with the people. So in the

United States the power to vote was gradually extended from a limited to a general suffrage.

The suffrage, again, was first limited to men. The right of women to vote was unknown. The movement of woman suffrage in the West during the last two decades has been most energetic. Many men, however, strongly opposed it and thought that it would never be realized. The British women won the power to vote only seven or eight years ago. After that the American women got it. The chief reason for success was the World War. When men went to fight, many jobs were left unfilled. As no men were available, women took up men's positions as day workers in arsenals, tramcar conductors and motormen, and served in various capacities at the home base. Those who opposed woman suffrage on the ground that women could not do men's work had now nothing to say, because women had proved their competency in doing men's work. Woman suffrage thus became a reality.

LESSON XIX

THE French Revolution also aimed at democracy. Full democracy was given the first trial in France, but it failed, because the people had not adequate knowledge and ability to carry it out. Any one who would say a word against

the government was sent to the guillotine. It was mob rule. Many nobles and princes were executed. Even great revolutionists such as Danton were victims of the guillotine for slight offenses to the masses.

Mob rule caused the restoration of the monarchy, and Napoleon became the emperor of France. This was a great obstacle to the development of democracy. Thus the greatest hindrance to democracy did not come from those who opposed it but from those who ignorantly favored it.

Besides France, Denmark, Holland, Portugal, and Spain unconsciously moved towards democracy. Democracy has progressed in spite of the obstacles set before it by opponents and ignorant supporters. The British nobles were more tactful. Seeing the advancing progress of democracy, they offered no resistance but tried to meet the desires of the people. During the time of the restoration to monarchy, the power of the government was in the hands of the peers. After 1832 the power to vote was extended to a limited number of people, but after the European War even woman suffrage was granted.

In the treatment of her dependencies, England has wisely adopted the policy of conceding sovereign powers to them as their desires for democracy grow. Ireland, for instance, was a part of the British Isles. At first she was subdued

by England with force, but owing to her democratic aspirations freedom was allowed her. The same policy was applied to Egypt. During the European War England persuaded Egypt to join her in the war and, as a reward, promised Egypt independence. After the war she did not keep her promise. Egypt, however, raised great objections; and the trouble became so serious that England acceded to the wishes of Egypt by allowing her independence. India demanded more popular voting power. In the same way England sanctioned it. At the present time the British government formally recognizes the Labor party and permits that party to organize a labor cabinet. All these are evidences showing the recessions of the British government in meeting the progress of democracy.

Democratic thoughts have rapidly grown since the American and French revolutions; but, fundamentally speaking, the most recent development of democratic thought originated in Germany. Labor unions are numerous in Germany. Their organizations are the largest in the world. In spite of the rapid development of democratic thought, German people, however, did not get so much freedom as is seen in France and England. Why? Many students trace this backwardness in the development of democracy to the policy of Bismarck.

cBismarck was an able statesman. Some thirty or forty years ago Bismarck had the diplomatic affairs of the whole world in his hand. Before Germany was headed by Bismarck; there were more than twenty small states, each more or less independent. The rivalry and the dissension of these states were even more serious than those of the thirteen states of America. This disunion was the root of troubles for the people. When Bismarck took up the premiership, he united these states and formed a federation. The result was a strong and wealthy Germany. Ten years ago Germany was the strongest nation in the world, just as the United States was the richest.

As both of these countries are unions, many think that China, in order to be strong, should follow the example of Germany and the United States. They do not know, however, that Germany thirty or forty years ago consisted of but the state of Prussia. Bismarck, taking Prussia as the basis for a strong army, reformed the internal administration, and effected the union of the other states to form a great German Empire. Austria and France at first objected to this German union, because both of them were anxious to be the leading power of Europe, but the unexcelled ability and wisdom of Bismarck made the union a success. In 1866 Germany defeated Austria in a short war. Although Austria was defeated,

Bismarck did not destroy her, because the people of Austria are of the same Teutonic race as those of Germany. He foresaw that the nations which would be a menace to Germany would be England and France, so he made peace with Austria by offering very liberal terms. His action obtained for him the good will of the Austrian people. Six years later, in 1870, Germany declared war against France. Napoleon III was defeated and Paris was captured by German soldiers. In concluding the treaty for peace, France was obliged to cede to Germany Alsace-Lorraine. The victory at once made Germany the leading power of Europe, and all this was accomplished within twenty years.

LESSON XX

THE ability of Bismarck was not limited to military and diplomatic affairs. He was also able to control the masses. Democratic movement was then very strong in Germany. A new philosophy, namely, socialism, was born at that time. This principle is similar to my Principle of Livelihood. Since the German people learned of this philosophy, they stopped struggling for democracy, but struggled for economic power. It was a struggle between laborers and the wealthy class. Marx was the exponent of this theory.

Socialism and democracy are closely related. Since socialism flourished in Germany, democracy should also have been prosperous, but by adopting state socialism Bismarck prevented the development of Marxism. Bismarck did not attempt to suppress socialism by political power. He knew clearly that because the German people were intelligent and the labor unions were strong, the use of political power would be futile. He applied state socialism, enabling people to enjoy such prosperity that they would no longer desire the realization of Marxism.

The railway is a basic industry. Without it no other industries can prosper. Before the Tientsin-Pukow Railway was constructed in China, Shantung and the northern part of Kiangsu were very poor. After the road was completed, the places along the railroad became prosperous. The same may be said of the places along the Peking-Hankow Railway.

In Bismarck's time, railways in Germany and France were all private enterprises, so the industries in these countries were monopolized by the wealthy people. Bismarck took over the railways and made them government industries. He regulated the working hours of the laborers, fixed the retiring allowances and insurance for them, and carried out such things as are usually advocated by socialists. As large industries were

made government enterprises, he used profits obtained therefrom for the benefit of workers. This gave satisfaction to the laborers.

Before the time of Bismarck thousands of German laborers went to foreign countries for work; but after the economic policies of Bismarck were put into force, no German workers would seek employment abroad, but on the contrary a large number of foreign workers went to Germany for work. By this means Bismarck succeeded in pulling out the root of the unrest which would give rise to socialistic propaganda.

From history, we find that democracy met with its first obstacle in the United States when Hamilton succeeded in limiting its application. Then in the French Revolution it suffered another setback when the masses abused their rights and turned it into a mob rule. Again it was checked in Germany by the clever counteraction of state socialism by Bismarck. In spite of these obstacles, however, democracy has grown of itself. It cannot be stopped by human power, neither can it be hindered in its growth by human interference. That democratic thought cannot be destroyed is now recognized by both conservatives and radicals.

To sum up, Western nations fought for equality and liberty. The result obtained was democracy. During its development democracy saw many

difficulties. At first autocracy tried to destroy it, but it still prospered. Then the advocates of democracy became its stumblingblock. Finally, by introducing state socialism, Bismarck removed the stimulus for its development in Germany.

The first power obtained by the American people was the power to vote. Western nations were then satisfied with having this power and thought that by this means they had reached the goal of democracy. But soon they found that their power was very limited.

In Switzerland, besides the power to vote, the people have two other powers: initiative and referendum. Any law that seems to the people to be harmful may be rejected, and that which seems to be good may be initiated by them.

A few new states in the northwestern part of the United States are enjoying one more power than those enjoyed by the Swiss people. This is the power of recall. By this power the people not only can elect public officials themselves but also can recall those who do not act in accordance with their wishes. So a part of the Americans are enjoying four kinds of democratic rights: suffrage, recall, initiative, and referendum. Most likely this system will be adopted by other American states before long.

With these four kinds of democratic rights the problem of democracy can be solved in time to

come. Theocracy lasted for many thousand years. Autocracy has also lasted for many thousand years and is still lingering in a few leading countries, though it is sure to disappear soon. Democracy is new, and since sovereign rights have been returned to the people for only a few score of years, we cannot expect a solution of this great problem yet.

The Nationalist party advocates the Three Principles as a tool to rebuild China. The kind of democracy we propose is different from that now ruling in the West. Historical facts of the West can only serve as our reference material. We should not follow their steps. We aim at making China a better republic than can be found in the West. For more than a century the West has obtained only a parliamentary system of government. When this system was transplanted to China, it yielded much bad fruit. We need a more fundamental solution. If we find our solution, we can beat Western nations in democracy.