

on the part of the revolutionists. But who can guarantee us a revolutionary party that is really working for the good of the people and toward a prosperous and strong China? 80 to 90 per cent of the so-called revolutionists today are politicians who have failed, militarists with high ambitions, the unemployed literati, or common people on the point of starvation. It requires but little amount of imagination and reasoning power to predict rightly what these revolutionists can give to China.

However, such political phenomena are but natural when viewed in the light of European history. The incessant wars of roses did England no earthly good, and it was after nearly one century of despotism under the Tudors that England gained economic prosperity and emerged from a dynastic state a national state of the 16th century. Without passing through this stage of development, the Puritan revolution, a revolution in the real sense of the word, could not have taken place in the following century. Similarly, France passed through the intensive struggle between the Bourbons and the Guise which ended in the victory and despotism of the former. The Bourbons' contribution to France culminated in the reign of Louis XIV, when she became a national state. Without passing through such stages of development, the French revolution could not have taken place without the country falling into smaller states. The Russian revolution, too, received a legacy of three gifts from the Romanoff dynasty: first, Russia was transformed from a dynastic state into a national state in the three centuries of the Romanoff rule;

secondly, the Russian court produced an intelligentsia class to run the communist government; and finally, the Tsars gave Russia no small amount of material progress, which enabled the "Reds" to withstand the assaults of the "Whites" with foreign aids. The moral is clear. We have not passed through despotism of the Tudor, the Bourbons or the Romanoff type yet, so we cannot have a genuine revolution.

Our heritage from the Manchus is no good as, so to speak, the capital for our revolution, for the following reasons. First, we are still a dynastic state and not a national state; we have loyalty to the family and not a native province, or place, but none to the state. Secondly, our despots did not bequeath us an intelligentsia to serve as the nucleus of the new regime; our monarchy is one which destroyed anything to hold the state together except loyalty to the emperor, so when the monarch is gone, we are like a sheet of sands which cannot stick together. Finally, the material side of our civilization lags too far behind that of other countries, and we can't resist foreigners fishing in our muddy waters. In a word, we have not built our national state yet, and we can't profit by any revolution.

We should, therefore, help the forces that work for the unity of the nation and remove all the germs that threaten to disrupt our national unity. Our problem at present is one of national existence and not a problem of which form of government we should have.

## II. For Democracy

By HU SHIH (胡適)

**A**FTER carefully examining Mr. Chiang's arguments, we may raise the following three questions: (1) Is despotism necessary in building up a modern state? (2) Why did centuries of despotism in China fail to give us a national state? and (3) Must we pass through a stage of benevolent despotism before we can build up a new state?

1. *Is Despotism Necessary in Building up a Modern State?*—On this point there is a fundamental difference, as I see it, between Mr. Chiang's interpretation of history and mine. The historical periods of the three countries which Mr. Chiang refers to are, in my opinion, history of their national construction which covers a very wide field and is due to many causes other than the despotism mentioned by Mr. Chiang. Among the Tudors there were, to be sure, despots; but they were provocators of revolution rather than builders of a national state. Such benevolent despots as Henry VIII and Queen Elizabeth, did indeed help the formation of the national state. But the coming of the national state depended not on them alone, but on such causes as the art of printing, the influence of literature, the translation of the Bible, the Oxford and Cambridge universities, the economic prosperity of London, etc. Perhaps, what Mr. Chiang means is this: the centralization of power is necessary to the building up of a national state. But his use of the word "despotism" makes people think "dictatorship" is what he means. And it can

be historically proved that the power of the English parliament greatly increased during this age of "despotism." For instance, the immunity of the members of the Parliament from arrest was established during the reign of Henry VIII. At any rate, it will be more accurate to say that centralization of power is one of the *sine qua non* in building up a national state, but this does not mean that we have to ape after the autocracy of the Romanoffs.

2. *Why Did Centuries of Despotism in China Fail to Give Us a National State?*—This is, I believe, a matter of difference in one's definition of the term "national state." In a sense, China cannot but be regarded as a national state, though unfortunately our unity and solidarity can hardly be compared with those of a modern national state. From the racial consciousness, from the one language, from the historical and cultural unity, from the one and continuous form of our governmental system—from all these, it is quite clear that our country has been a national state for tens of centuries. Although we were, at times, conquered by other races, yet in no other periods of history can our racial and national consciousness be more clearly seen. This racial consciousness always found expression in the liberation of our people under such national heroes as Liu Ju, Chu Yuan-chang, Hung Shiu-chuan, and Sun Yat-sen. On the other hand, to what status have the Mongolians been reduced since the downfall of the Yuan dynasty? And have the loyal officials of

the Ching dynasty proved their loyalty by anything better than furnishing a few laughing-stocks to the people?

Our provincialism is a product of our *laissez faire* policy in the past. Edmund Burke said that in order to make people patriotic, the statesmen must make the country lovable. Are we then to conclude that England of the 18th century is not a national state?

The view held by Mr. Chiang that our absolute monarchy failed leave us the legacy of a nucleus to form the new regime, can be historically explained too. The European countries have but recently emerged from their feudalism and they have therefore a relatively fixed ruling class; but our feudalism passed away thousands of years ago, and with the abolition of the competitive examination the literati class lost its importance in our society.

Finally, the backwardness of our "material civilization" is due to our lack of knowledge of science and technology, lack of engineers and technical experts, to our social inertia, etc. All these have no bearing upon the question whether or not we are a national state and can by no stretch of imagination prove that we need a despotic government.

3. *Must We Pass Through a Stage of Benevolent Despotism Before We Can Have our National Reconstruction?*—This is, by no means, a new question, as passages from *The Hsin Min Pao* and *The Min Pao*, edited respectively by Liang Chi-chao and Wang Ching-wei, clearly show that our Royalists and Revolutionists had it out during the pre-republican days in Japan. However, the debate was not whether or not we should have benevolent despotism but whether it should be had immediately or be preceded by revolution. The debate came to an end when the Ching dynasty fell, and in 1912 Mr. Liang owned that he was mistaken. Those who advocate immediate benevolent despotism today were at one time either revolutionists themselves or sympathizers of the revolutionary cause. Twenty years ago, democracy was the most attractive political ideal, but today dictatorship, another name for benevolent despotism, seems to have the biggest vogue. This is the change of our political creeds in the last twenty years.

Now, there are three types of dictatorship: 1. personal dictatorship; 2. party dictatorship; and 3. class dictatorship. I am against dictatorship of any brand. My reasons are three:

First, before we launch upon dictatorship, we must first ascertain whether or not we have one man, a party, or a class, who, as an individual or a party or a class, is

fully qualified to be the dictator. "If the ruler could only appreciate how difficult his task it," says Confucius, "would not this appreciation alone be almost enough to start a state on the road to prosperity?" (爲君難……如知爲君之難也，不幾乎一言興邦乎?) But our proponents of dictatorship do not appreciate the fact that dictatorship or political tutelage is among the most complex and difficult achievements in the world. To be successful, he must be a born dictator, but he must be also a man of experience and with learning. However liberal we may be, we cannot yet find one dictator from among the militarists or politicians, nor can we find, say, 100,000 or 150,000 men from among our literates to form a personal, party, or class dictatorship for the no mean task of transforming 450 million people with our old concepts into a modern state.

Second, I do not believe it possible for us to find a magic formula with which the supporters of dictatorship may captivate the sentiment and reasoning faculty of the entire nation and rally the people to one leader, party, or class so as to make the dictatorship possible. But such a formula magical in power is absolutely necessary for dictatorship in the 20th century, as the history of Soviet Russia, new Turkey, fascist Italy, and nazi Germany clearly shows. Even such a slogan as "National salvation through resistance to Japan" lost its appeal before the end of two years. If the nation can't rally to a cause of national salvation, can it rally to a leader?

Third and my last argument is that my observation of politics in the past few decades convinces me that democracy, an infantile political system, is most suitable as a drill for our people who are still lacking in political experience. Our observation of the working of the parliaments and local assemblies of different democratic countries tells us, that high praises of the worshippers of the democratic ideal notwithstanding, the system is childish to a degree. It has not attracted to it the best talents in the country. However, its strength lies in the fact that it works tolerably well without the unusually well gifted persons at its helm. It is the government of common sense, and not of the best talents which benevolent despotism requires. It may begin with a humble beginning, but is capable of gradual development and attainment. It will give us the best exercises in politics, both in governing and being governed. If we take to heart the lessons that the democratic countries in the west have for us, then after a few decades we may try a hand in the benevolent despotism.

## Dictatorship As A Panacea

BY RANDALL GOULD

NATIONS are as subject to the lure of panaceas as any rural patent-medicine guzzler. The panacea about which the flares are burning and the drums thumping at present is that of the national dictator, and it is no reason for surprise that China should be sidling up, dollar in hand, with intent to buy and be saved. Now the panacea is a splendid idea. We all more

or less secretly hug the notion that for any ill, there must be a single simple cure could we but find it. That is why women suffering from excess fat, indigestion, falling arches, blotched skin and pimples triumphantly pounce upon some new fangled powder which will fix everything in a jiffy, if mixed with the morning bath; and it is likewise why nations suffering from bloated