LECTURE V

Lesson XXI

THE Chinese at first were not convinced of the superiority of Western civilization. In 1900 the Boxers tried to challenge foreign guns with their swords. They were extremely brave. The English admiral, Sir Edward Hobart Seymour, with an army of three thousand men on his way to the rescue of the Legation at Peking, was surrounded by the Boxers at Yangtsun. The Boxers had no rifles nor guns. They had only swords. The army under Admiral Seymour had the best equipment of modern warfare. As Admiral Seymour's army was surrounded by the Boxers, they used machine guns to mow down the Boxers. Although the Boxers fell one after another before the guns, yet they were not at all frightened. They still pushed forward and would not let go their siege of Seymour's army. In consequence, Seymour had to retreat to Tientsin for reënforcements. The bravery of the Boxers was much admired by Admiral Seymour, who remarked that had the Boxers had modern arms his men would have been entirely destroyed. This is an evidence that the Chinese are no cowards.

The people of China since then, however, have come to realize that their sword-and-arrow civilization is no match for the foreign gun-and-rifle civilization. Not only do the foreigners excel us in armaments but also in the means of communication, such as railroads and telegraphs, which are much faster than our coolies and postmen. Even in the case of machines for daily work, as those used in agriculture, industry, and commerce, those of foreign make are much better. This superiority has made some believe that in order to make China strong it is necessary to imitate foreigners not only in their material things but also in political and social affairs. The defeat of the Boxers put out the last spark of self-confidence in our people, and our respect for things foreign has increased from day to day. Even such new theories as have not yet been tried in foreign countries, we expect to carry out here.

Thirteen years ago, with the hope of learning the best of the West, we imitated foreign nations in a political revolution and established a republic. This revolution marked a great change in our political thought. Formerly we were conservative, but now we try every way to reform ourselves. Formerly we had no faith in foreign civilization, but now we have overconfidence in it. After the republican form of government was established the whole country was anxious to carry out democracy

without regard to the history of its development in foreign nations.

The development of democracy in the West has not been satisfactory. Scientific studies are applied with a view to finding the best solution, but so far the problem remains unsolved. In carrying out democracy, therefore, the West cannot be our guide. In material civilization there is no dispute that the West is much superior to us, but this cannot be said of politics. The political progress of the West lags far behind that of the sciences. In the science of military strategy, for instance, books of a hundred years ago are of no value whatever at present. Even those of ten years ago cannot be used now. Every decade marks a great stride in the progress of military science. Destroyers, for instance, cost now from fifty million to one hundred million dollars each. The progress in this equipment of war has been the quickest. Those which were constructed before the World War are now scrapped. Even rifles are changed every ten years. Those which we use now are mere scraps to the West. Many guns used in the European War are now also considered out of date. This rapid progress can be found not only in military equipment but also in other machines.

But how is their progress in politics compared with that of China? During the last two or

three centuries the rapid revolutions have speeded up political progress in the West, but books on politics written more than two thousand years ago by Plato, a Greek philosopher, are still studied by students of to-day. This proves that political progress in the West is much slower than their material progress. Their political thought at present does not differ fundamentally from that of two thousand years ago. So although it is difficult for us to catch up in the material civilization of the West, yet it is not so in political progress.

A century and a half have passed since the independence of the United States. The privileges enjoyed by the people a century ago were not greatly different from those enjoyed by the people to-day. The French people to-day enjoy even fewer privileges than what their ancestors enjoyed at the time of the French Revolution. What has been the cause of this delay in the progress of democracy? The main reason is that the fundamental problem of democracy has not yet been solved; the truth of democracy has not yet been discovered. Although, during the last two or three centuries, there has been some advancement in democratic thought, yet the development of democracy was not due to scientific research, but it came all by itself.

Lesson XXII

SINCE our Revolution, we have been attempting to imitate the West. As European democracy has only reached the stage of representative government, we also adopted the representative form of government with the hope of keeping abreast with the West. Instead of gaining the advantages of this form of government, however, we reaped all its disadvantages. The members of our Parliament were so mean and rotten that they sold themselves for money. This queer phenomenon of the representative form of government is the result of our mistake in imitating foreigners. As Western nations have not yet solved the problem of democracy, we should not imitate them without discretion.

What should we do if we do not imitate Western nations? Should we follow the conservatives to restore monarchy? This, of course, should not be done, because it goes against the world current. Our ways of managing public affairs have been different from those of the West. Our customs and habits are in many instances unlike those of foreigners. When these are neglected by merely imitating foreign politics, we are apt to make serious mistakes. A machine is made upon the principles of physics, but a government is conducted on the basis of psychology. Psychology is yet a new learning. In the control of things

we can therefore safely follow the West, but in the control of men it is unwise to ape foreigners. We have to discover our own methods of reformation by basing our form of government on the social conditions at home as well as moving in the direction of the world current.

In our solution we have to use for reference the experiences and the philosophy of the West. By so doing we can avoid repeating the errors of the West. Students of political science in the West have now learned new theories. An American student has recently enunciated a new theory in relation to the government. He says that the most dangerous thing in a democratic state is an all-powerful government when it is not controlled by the people; but when the all-powerful government is completely directed by the people it is the best thing to have. So both what is feared and desired are the same all-powerful government. When this government cannot be controlled by the people, it is to be feared, but when it can be directed to promote public welfare it is highly desirable. In a democratic country the government usually is made powerless, while in a country in which democracy is not developed, the government is often strong. The government of Bismarck was certainly all-powerful, but it did not want to promote democracy.

A Swiss student has pointed out that in those nations which have adopted democracy, the powers of the government have, as a rule, been curtailed. The reason has been that the people are afraid of a powerful government because it is difficult for them to control. As a precaution for avoiding an unwieldy government, they diminish its powers.

In order to solve this problem the attitude of the people towards the government should be changed. If we allow people excessive liberty and equality so that the government becomes incapable, that government will be of no value. In China we have always admired Emperors Yao, Shun, Yü, T'ang, Wen, and Wu, because they did their best in promoting the welfare of the people. Before the democratic thought of the West was introduced into China, our people always hoped to have good emperors like these. But after the Revolution, as we had imbibed modern democratic ideas, we were no longer satisfied with these emperors, in as much as they were autocrats. Although they were good, yet we did not want them. This attitude of mind, when applied to the government of the Republic, however, will greatly handicap our progress in politics, since we cannot have a strong government without having confidence in it.

Is the problem of democracy capable of solution? It is. Here is my solution. It lies in the

separation of power and ability. No student of politics has ever suggested this. It is an entirely original idea of mine. In a previous lecture I divided human beings into three classes: the seers, the spokesmen, and the doers. Any accomplishment needs these three types of people. To construct a building, for instance, there must be, first, an architect who makes the design and estimates the cost. Then there are foremen who understand the design and give instructions to the workers. The workers follow the directions of the foremen and in turn the foremen follow those of the architect. The architect is therefore the seer, the foremen the spokesmen, and the laborers the doers. All these three types of persons are essential. Without the seers there can be no progress in the world. Without the spokesmen no knowledge can be made known to the masses, and without the doers nothing can be accomplished. The responsibility of government therefore rests on everybody. The seers have their responsibilities; so have the spokesmen and the doers.

Lesson XXIII

DEMOCRACY is not natural, but artificial. We must, therefore, extend democracy to the people and not wait till the people come struggling for it. A few days ago a Japanese

officer in Korea came to see me. During the course of conversation, I asked him whether or not the Korean revolution would be successful. He made no reply. I asked him again what the attitude of Japanese officials in Korea was towards the democratic movement in that country. He said that it depended upon the progress of the democratic thought of the Koreans. "If all the Koreans should ask for democracy, we would certainly return the political power to them." This statement seemed to be fair and aboveboard; but as revolutionists, we should not treat our people as the Japanese have been treating the Koreans. We should not take into consideration our own benefits alone, but should strive to obtain benefits for the people.

In ancient China good kings, such as Yao, Shun, Yü, T'ang, Wen, and Wu, placed upon themselves the responsibilities of doing nothing against Heaven and the people. They had special qualifications. First, they had a high degree of ability in maintaining good governments. Second, they had a high standard of morality, in loving their people as children. It is because of these two special qualifications that they succeeded in fulfilling their responsibilities. Most kings lacked high morals, but they wielded absolute powers. As a consequence, they could not rule their countries wisely.

During the period of the Three Kingdoms, Chu-ko Liang was a man of great ability. He first served Liu Pei and then Ah Tou, the son of his first lord. Ah Tou was very stupid, and had no ability. Liu Pei, on his deathbed, told Chu-ko Liang that if he could serve Ah Tou, well and good; but if not, he might as well take over the throne for himself. Chu-ko Liang had high principles of morality. Though Ah Tou was useless, yet Chu-ko Liang served him faithfully. Here we see that Chu-ko Liang had ability but no power, and Ah Tou had power but no ability. As Ah Tou intrusted ruling powers to Chu-ko Liang, the latter was able to function an efficient government and to carry out six expeditions across the Chi Mountains, thereby maintaining the prestige of his state.

In a republic, the people are most powerful. They are, however, like Ah Tou, who, being ignorant, could do nothing. They must have able men like Chu-ko Liang at the helm of the ship of state. Chu-ko Liang separated the affairs of the palace from those of the government. Ah Tou had only control of the affairs within the palace. He could not interfere with any affairs of the government. In so doing, Chu-ko Liang actually separated ability from power. In the control of a nation it is necessary, therefore, to separate power from ability. In the long history of autocracy

the emperors were usually men of no ability, but by their power they made the people their slaves. After the establishment of the republic there has still been the fear in the minds of the people that the government might be as autocratic as the emperors used to be. So they hold an antagonistic attitude towards the government. This attitude is a mere reaction of the former attitude of worship for the king. It is wrong to worship the king, but it is equally wrong to antagonize the government.

In early times there were no monarchs by birth. Able men were made emperors. For instance, Sui-jen Shih bored wood for fire and taught people to cook, so he was made king. What was his work?—That of a cook. Sui-jen Shih was thus merely a cook king. Shen Nung tasted the herb and discovered many kinds of drugs for the cure of diseases, so he was made king. What was his work? — That of a physician. Shen Nung was thus a physician king. Hsien Yüan taught people to make clothes. He was also made emperor. So Hsien Yüan was a tailor king. Yu Ch'ao taught people how to construct buildings and he was also made king. So he was a carpenter king. In the history of China we find that those who had great ability and who were capable of serving the people by new discoveries were made kings. The cook, the physician,

the tailor, the carpenter, were all men of special ability, and so they were made kings.

Dr. William P. Martin once went to the Western Hills and met a farmer. The farmer asked Dr. Martin, "Why do foreigners not come to China to be emperors?" Dr. Martin replied, "Can foreigners be emperors of China?" Pointing to the electric wires alongside the field, the farmer said, "Those who can make such things can certainly become emperors of China." The farmer apparently thought that those who could transmit messages by a wire must be men of great ability, competent to be emperors. This was a good evidence of the Chinese thought that the emperor must be a man of great ability. Should an absolutely free and universal suffrage be given our people, and at the same time if we had men like Yao and Shun, there could be no doubt that Yao and Shun would be elected emperors.

When the government is under the control of the people, the latter can easily overthrow the former. Ah Tou, for instance, could easily dismiss Chu-ko Liang, but should the latter be dismissed, it would be impossible for the state of Hsi Shu to have a stable government and to carry out six expeditions against the North. Ah Tou realized that, so he gave all his political powers to Chu-ko Liang We should follow the example of Ah Tou in welcoming Chu-ko Liang to our government.

We should not repeat the mistakes of the West. We should separate power from ability. When we do so, we would not antagonize the government. Should the government be bad, we could exercise our sovereign power to change it.

Lesson XXIV

LET us again take historical facts for illustration. In ancient times a good fighter was often made king. But now rich persons, such as militarists and ex-officials, after squeezing a great deal of money, live in Shanghai and engage a number of strong men to protect them. Sikh policemen, for instance, are used as doorkeepers. If strength for the protection of others should be possessed in ancient times, the policemen would have been emperors of the militarists and the officials; but now the policemen cannot interfere with the affairs of the militarists and the officials. Instead, the policemen are treated as servants. They have guns and are powerful, but they are nevertheless servants. A government with ability to protect the people may be taken as the Sikh policeman. If we take the government as such, we would not antagonize it.

In running a factory we must have a capable manager. This manager must be an expert. The shareholders are men who have power, but

the manager is one who actually controls the factory. It is only necessary for the shareholders to supervise their manager in his actions. In a republic the people are shareholders and the president is the manager. If we take the president as the manager of the factory, who knows how to control the factory, how to produce goods at low cost, and how to make profit for the factory, then the president is but a type of experts.

The slow progress of democracy in the West is chiefly caused by the antagonistic attitude of the people towards the government. The prosperity of the countries with an autocratic form of government was even greater — for instance, Japan and Germany before the War. Both of them became the strongest of nations in less than a generation.

In industries we recognize the need of experts. In military affairs we also need experts. Why, in politics and government, should we ignore them? This is only because we are not accustomed to separating power from ability.

A score of years ago, when automobiles were first introduced into China, there were no chauffeurs and mechanics. A friend of mine bought a car. He had to be his own chauffeur and mechanic. It was very troublesome to him. But now the owners of automobiles can employ

chauffeurs and mechanics. A nation is but a large automobile. Government officials are but chauffeurs. To have a good government the people should invite experts to manage their national affairs. If we treated the officials of the government, who were able and loyal to the nation, as chauffeurs, we would put our trust in them and would not limit their actions. Then our national progress would be rapid.

Let me tell you a story. Once, when I was living in Shanghai, I had an appointment with a friend at Hongkew. For some reason or other I forgot the time until it was fifteen minutes before the appointed hour. I was then living in the French Concession, and it was difficult for an automobile to go from the French Concession to Hongkew in fifteen minutes. I sent for my chauffeur and asked him in a hurry whether he could reach Hongkew in fifteen minutes. "Certainly," he said. I got in the car and let my chauffeur drive freely. Roads in Shanghai are quite familiar to me. But the route which the chauffeur took did not seem to me to be the shortest. I was afraid that he might not be able to get there, but he actually did.

To satisfy my curiosity I asked the chauffeur why he followed the roundabout route. The chauffeur said that if he had taken the straight route, he would have had to pass Nanking Road,

where traffic was always heavy, and it was not easy for the car to get through. Then I understood why he went a roundabout way. He had experience. He knew that the car could run thirty or forty miles an hour. It did not make much difference to run a few miles more should the speed be increased. The chauffeur was not a philosopher. He did not think abstractly of time and space. He was an expert, knowing that an automobile has the power to shorten distance. Had he followed the straight way, I could not have reached Hongkew on time. His expert action aroused my doubt and fear until he finally succeeded.

As citizens of the Republic, if we treat our government in the same manner as I treated the chauffeur, giving its officers full liberty in their actions, we should hold a friendly attitude towards the government. In order to take governmental officials as chauffeurs, Sikh policemen, cooks, physicians, carpenters, or tailors, we should separate ability from power. Only by this method can we solve the problem of democracy.