

LECTURE III

LESSON VIII

THE principle of nationality is a jewel which we have lost for centuries. Arguments against revolution before the establishment of the Republic show that nationalism was utterly unknown at that time. So-called great scholars helped the Manchus in claiming that, in as much as one of the Manchus had received an honorable title of the "dragon and tiger general" during the Ming dynasty, the Manchus were not foreigners. The conquest of China by the Manchus was similar to any previous change of dynasty. China did not lose her national independence. Now, should Sir Robert Hart, once given the title of the minister of the board of the interior, become emperor of China, could we say that China was still independent? Those scholars not only helped the Manchus with their talk, but they actually organized a monarchical party for the protection of the Manchu emperor.

The monarchists were not Manchus but Chinese, most of them Chinese colonists in foreign lands. There were many secret societies among the

Chinese colonists. One of these was known as the Hung Mên San Ho Hui, or Chi Kung T'ang. Their original aim was to upset the Manchu and restore the Ming dynasty. As there was a strong campaign for monarchism in foreign countries, they faced about in favor of the Manchus. How could a society with nationalistic ideas be so easily changed? The reason is not far to seek. Nationalism was simply not known to our people.

Many societies could be found in the time of K'ang Hsi. People who were loyal to the Ming dynasty tried to rebel against the Manchus. Such people, however, died away gradually, and at the close of K'ang Hsi's reign only a scattered few were left. Some of these were full of nationalistic spirit. Just at the time when they were trying to organize a secret society, K'ang Hsi started the School of Doctors of Literature. With this bait he succeeded in catching all the highly educated left over from the Ming dynasty. The thoughtful few, finding that the educated could not be trusted with the idea of nationalism, went to the lowest classes of society and organized them into a body, afterwards known as the Hung Mên Hui. The seed of nationalism was sown in this body, so that it might not be detected and destroyed.

This was a wise action. For, in times of peace, valuables are usually kept in a safe: but in

times of danger, they are more safely kept in places where they are not likely to be noticed. Sometimes they may even be thrown into the most filthy place. This was why nationalism was planted in the minds of the lowest classes of the people. For more than two hundred years, in spite of the cruelties of the Manchus, nationalism was preserved by being passed on from mouth to mouth.

Why did the Hung Mên Hui use no books to teach nationalism? It is difficult to preserve an idea which has not been put into writing. Errors are apt to creep in when it is passed from mouth to mouth. Books, however, are not safe. Many of them were destroyed by Ch'ien Lung. This emperor was more cunning and cruel than his father. While Emperor K'ang Hsi only tried to make people believe that foreigners could rule China because Shun and Wên Wang were foreigners, Emperor Ch'ien Lung went so far as to change the history of China. He cut out all the parts referring to the connection between the Sung and Yuan dynasties and those between the Ming and Ch'ing dynasties. He destroyed all books unfavorable to the Manchus, and forbade them to be printed, kept, or read. After a few cruel prosecutions against so-called seditious writings, nationalism in literature was completely destroyed. It was fortunate that the attempt

was not made to preserve the gem of nationalism in books.

LESSON IX

THE name of the Hung Mên Hui was not derived from Hung Shiu-chuan, but probably from Chu Hung-wu, the first emperor of the Ming dynasty, or Chu Hung-chu, a revolutionary leader at the time of K'ang Hsi. The Taiping Rebellion, led by Hung Shiu-chuan, however, revived the idea of nationalism. After the failure of Hung Shiu-chuan, the principle found root in the army and with the unemployed. Hunan and Anhwei soldiers then were all members of the Hung Mên Hui, which was known by different names in different places. The names of the Blues and the Reds came from the army. The lower classes are, however, too ignorant. They are easily fooled by others. Here is an example.

General Tso Tsung-tang was ordered to effect peace in Sinkiang, and he was going to move his troops from Hankow to Sianfu. The Hung Mên Hui in the Pearl River valley was then called San Ho Hui; and that in the Yangtze valley, Ko Lao Hui. The chief of the Ko Lao Hui was called the Great Dragon Head. The head at that time committed a crime and fled to Hankow. The Hui had a much quicker system of communication

than the Manchu government. One day, to the great surprise of Tso, his troops suddenly without his command formed into a line several miles long. They were going to give a welcome to the Great Dragon Head. Later, Tso received a document from the Liang Kiang governor with a request to arrest a well-known criminal who was fleeing from Hankow to Sianfu. This Tso could not do, however, because he learned with great fear that the Head was the very man wanted, and all his troops belonged to the Ko Lao Hui. He was informed that unless he should make himself the Great Dragon Head, it would be impossible for him to move his troops to Sinkiang. No better road was open to him, so he yielded to the plan and made himself the Great Dragon Head. His success in the Sinkiang campaign was largely due to the Ko Lao Hui, but he destroyed the organization afterwards. The men were fooled by him because they did not understand nationalism.

How did our people lose nationalism? The main reason was because we were ruled by foreigners. A conquering nation hates to find any thought of independence in the minds of the conquered. Korea under the control of Japan is a good example of this. No word for nationalism can be found in a single textbook used in Korean schools. Thirty years from now Korean children will scarcely know that they are

Koreans. The Manchus did the same thing. They prosecuted seditious writings, destroyed unfavorable books, and changed our history. Their methods bore fruit; for we lost all idea of nationalism.

China lost nationalism because she lost her independence. There are other nations which have lost their independence, but not their nationalism. The Jews, for instance, lost their independence before the time of Jesus. When Jesus was preaching his religion, his disciples took him for a revolutionary leader, and the people called him the King of the Jews. Parents of two brothers once requested Jesus to allow their sons, both his disciples, to sit on his right and on his left when he came into power. One of his disciples, seeing Jesus fail in what he had expected Jesus would accomplish was so disappointed that he sold his master to the enemies. They did not know that Jesus was a revolutionist, not in politics but in religion. Although the Jews lost their independence long ago, yet their national quality still exists.

India lost her independence a hundred years ago, yet her people still preserve their national character. Poland also lost her independence for more than a century. But as she never lost her national character, she regained her independence after the European War. Why did

we lose nationalism as soon as we lost our independence, while other nations did not? A study of the reasons will be of interest.

LESSON X

BEFORE China ever lost her independence, she was the only highly civilized and powerful nation in the East. The West being unknown to her, she considered herself the center of the world, and called herself the "Middle Kingdom." Her idea of nationalism was gradually given up for cosmopolitanism. She subdued other nations always by imperialism. Chang Po-wang and Pan Ting-yüan, of the Han dynasty, for instance, conquered more than thirty small nations, in the same way that Robert Clive, of the East India Company, brought scores of small Indian states under the control of Great Britain. The only difference between China and other nations lies in the methods of control. China always used mild policies and tried to refine the conquered by her own high civilization, while the powers to-day use force.

The root of the reason why China so easily lost nationalism lies deep in her imperialism. Great Britain to-day and Russia before the World War are the two most imperialistic nations of our time; but old China was even more imperialistic.

In Russia and England a new philosophy has been born. This philosophy is against nationalism, which is considered to be too narrow. It is cosmopolitanism. England to-day and Russia and Germany before the World War have been its advocates. A few modern youths of China have also supported it. They say that the Three Principles are out of date because they do not keep pace with the new world movement. The best principle to-day is cosmopolitanism.

Is cosmopolitanism really a good principle? If so, why did China lose nationalism soon after she lost her independence? Cosmopolitanism was at high tide in China two thousand years ago. It was known as the universal principle. Theoretically the principle is not bad. But this has made our educated class think that it makes no difference who rules over China. The world is but one family. It does not matter whether the ruler of China is a foreigner or not.

The value of a philosophy depends upon its usefulness. If it yields no benefit to the world it is not a good philosophy. The powerful nations, after having subdued weaker states and secured the position of the masters of the world, now try, as China did in early days, to persuade the whole world to accept cosmopolitanism. But we have seen that cosmopolitanism has made us forget nationalism. So when our people were

conquered by the Manchus, they offered no resistance. The Manchus were but a hundred thousand. How were they able to subjugate a people whose number was several hundred millions? The reason was that at that time too many of our people believed in cosmopolitanism. They would have given welcome to any one who would come and rule China. Shih Ko-fa tried to fight against the Manchus, but it was of no avail, because few rallied to his side, and the nation as a whole bowed down before the Manchus.

The two strongest nations in the world to-day are Great Britain and the United States. There are, of course, other powers. Now, suppose that in the future Great Britain and the United States should be able to conquer the whole world. If at that time English- or American-nationalized Chinese should help the British or Americans fight China, saying that they believed in cosmopolitanism, could we find peace in our hearts? If not, then there is nationalism in our hearts. Nationalism is the precious principle which can help us survive. As the pen is a tool of the writer, so is nationalism our tool in the struggle for existence. When our people first came into this land they drove out the San Miao, who were the aborigines of the land, to the borders of Yunnan and Kweichow. There they perished. Under foreign domination we may be treated similarly.

LESSON XI

JUDGING from the history of China, the statement that our people came from the west, passing over the Pamir and Tienshan Mountains, crossing Sinkiang, and coming to the Yellow River valley, seems to be correct. If the Chinese were the aborigines of China, then Chinese civilization should have begun in the Pearl River valley where the climate is warm and things are abundant and therefore living was easy. But our civilization began in the north; and even at the time of the Han dynasty, people in the Pearl River valley were still barbarians. These afterwards either perished or were assimilated.

The "survival of the fittest" is a law of evolution. Our people were the fittest, so we survived. But can we still survive in the future? As foreign populations are increasing and ours is standing still, and, in addition, as there is heavy political and economic pressure upon us, the future of our existence is in great danger. The pressure of foreign populations, however, will not be felt until the next century, and if we believe in nationalism we can still hope for survival. It is only through our loss of this precious principle that foreign political and economic pressure can crush us.

Let me tell you a story. Once there was a coolie at Hongkong who, with a bamboo pole

and two ropes, worked on the wharf carrying the baggage of passengers. This was his only means of livelihood. Out of his earnings he had saved about ten dollars. With these he bought a lottery ticket. He had nowhere to keep the ticket, so he put it inside the bamboo pole and remembered the number. He learned on the drawing date of the lottery that he had won the first prize. He was so frenzied with happiness at winning this great fortune which would at once make him a rich man, that he threw his bamboo pole and the two ropes into the sea.

Now, the lottery ticket is cosmopolitanism, and the bamboo pole is nationalism, a tool for earning a living. The drawing date of the lottery was the time when China's imperialism enjoyed its highest prosperity. Our ancestors thought that, since all nations were at our feet, we no longer needed nationalism. Cosmopolitanism was the only thing for China; so they threw nationalism, the bamboo pole, into the sea. They never would have anticipated that we not only have not succeeded in becoming the masters of the world, but are even unable to be our own masters. So when the Manchus invaded China, Wu San-kuei led the way. When Shih Ko-ia tried to defend the Ming dynasty by supporting Fu Wang at Nanking, To-Erh-Kun said to him that they got China not from the Ming dynasty but from Li Ch'uang,

the rebel. His idea was that the Ming dynasty lost its own empire as the coolie lost his bamboo pole.

The modern youths of China want to advocate cosmopolitanism. If a support of this principle had come from Englishmen, Americans, or our ancestors, it would be understandable; but from our youths to-day it is most unbecoming. If we had not thrown away the bamboo pole, we might have won the first prize; but as we threw it away too early, we threw away the ticket as well.

If there is any method whereby we may get another bamboo pole, that is, whereby we may regain the lost principle of nationalism, we shall be able to exist for thousands of years more in spite of foreign political and economic pressure. As to the future of our population, since Heaven has kept us till to-day, she has given us a heavy responsibility to develop the civilization of the world. Now, if our large population should cease to exist it will be because of foreign aggression. If they do this the powers will be standing in the way of world progress.

A Russian once remarked: "Why do the powers attack Lenin so much? It is because Lenin said that in the world there are two classes of people; the number of one class is twelve hundred and fifty million and that of the other class is two hundred and fifty million. The larger number of people are being oppressed by the

smaller number. The oppressors are doing this against the will of Heaven. It is the will of Heaven for right to overcome might." So the four hundred million of China should join the other twelve hundred and fifty million in their struggle. To do this we have first to believe in nationalism and unite ourselves. Only when we have done this and right has overcome might can we talk about cosmopolitanism.