



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### **Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### **About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

A

848,877

尊

王

篇

PAPERS

FROM A

VICEROY'S YAMEN

BY

KU HUNG-MING, M.A.

鴻銘氏辜湯生著





1-10-0

352

PROPERTY OF

*The  
University of  
Michigan  
Libraries*

1817

ARTES SCIENTIA VERITAS

# 尊王篇

PAPERS

FROM

A VICEROY'S YAMEN.

▲

CHINESE PLEA FOR THE CAUSE OF GOOD GOVERNMENT  
AND TRUE CIVILIZATION IN CHINA.

BY

KU HUNG-MING, M.A.,

SECRETARY-INTERPRETER TO H. H. CHANG CHIH-TUNG, VICEROY OF HUKUANG.

MOTTO:

To reverence the King as if he were  
Their conscience and their conscience as their King,  
To break the heathen and uphold the Christ.

TENNYSON.



PRINTED AND PUBLISHED AT THE SHANGHAI MERCURY, LTD.

1901.

DS  
772.5  
.K95

*BY THE SAME AUTHOR:*

THE  
DISCOURSES AND SAYINGS  
OF  
CONFUCIUS.

A NEW SPECIAL TRANSLATION, ILLUSTRATED WITH QUOTATIONS  
FROM GOETHE AND OTHER WRITERS.

**Publishers:**  
MESSRS. KELLY & WALSH, LIMITED,  
SHANGHAI.

547265-128

## IN MEMORIAM.

---

HERMANN BUDLER

*(Late Imperial German Consul in Canton).*

---

1.

The wild prunes blossom red and white  
In wintry air,  
Heavy with orange and sun-light  
The groves are fair.

2.

The pearl-like river silent, sure,  
Glides to the sea.  
A spirit mutinous but pure  
Sets itself free.

3.

Love, flowers and music erst were thine,  
But love to thee  
A blight, was bitter as the brine  
Of the salt sea.

4.

From these thy earnest spirit yearned  
Towards nobler schemes:  
Dreams of a nobler age returned,  
Alas! but dreams.

5.

Last on the river-girdled spot,  
Thy exile's home,  
Exiled, indeed, for one was not  
Who should have come.



6.

We sat and talked of modern creed  
And ancient lore :  
Of modern Gospel, gush and greed  
Now to the fore.

7.

Thy fervent hope it was to join  
The best with best,  
To break down the dividing line  
Of East and West.

8.

O Friend, albeit of alien race,  
For ever more  
With me shall be thy noble face  
Too sicklied o'er.

9.

With a world-sorrow e'en too great  
For thy great heart,  
Since from us who still serve and wait  
Thou wouldst depart.

10.

Farewell! The swift wheeled ships will bring  
To thy Far West  
The tidings whilst I grieving sing,  
Sing thee to thy rest.

KU HUNG-MING.

NOTE.—This poem was written and published at the time of Mr. Budler's death, who shot himself at Canton in 1893.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE.
PREFACE ... ..	i
I.	
MORIAMUR PRO REGE, REGINA! A STATEMENT OF THE TRUE FEELINGS OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE TOWARDS THE PERSON AND AUTHORITY OF H.I.M. THE EMPRESS-DOWAGER... ..	1
II.	
DEFENSIO POPULI AD POPULOS: OR THE MODERN MISSIONARIES CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE RECENT RIOTS ... ..	35
III.	
FOR THE CAUSE OF GOOD GOVERNMENT IN CHINA... ..	51
IV.	
LATTER-DAY NOTES ON THE CHINESE QUESTION: A SURVEY OF THE STATE OF GOVERNMENT AND CIVILIZATION:	
No. 1.—IN GENERAL ... ..	85
,, 2.—IN GREAT BRITAIN ... ..	97
,, 3.—IN GERMANY ... ..	110
,, 4.—IN FRANCE ... ..	128
,, 5.—IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ... ..	146
V.	
CIVILIZATION AND ANARCHY: OR THE MORAL PROBLEM OF THE FAR EASTERN QUESTION ... ..	175



## PREFACE.

---



THE following papers, except one, were originally published in the "Japan Mail," printed in Yokohama. The one exception entitled "Defensio Populi ad Populos" was first published in Shanghai in 1891 during the Yangtze Riots. These papers are now republished in the present form with the object of submitting them to a wider circle of readers. The writer would have preferred to publish these papers, as nearly all of them originally were, without his name. But the nature of one of the most important papers in the series, together with the circumstances of writing it, was such that it was impossible for the writer to withhold his name. The one among other reasons why I should have liked to keep out my identity is this. As it is said of the Englishman that he dearly loves a lord, so

it is true of the foreigner in China that he dearly loves a Viceroy. Confucius says: "The noble-minded man regards the moral or actual worth of a man; the vulgar person regards only his position." These writings, therefore, will lose their force with such people, when it becomes known that these papers are written not by a Viceroy, but only by a Viceroy's interpreter.

Nevertheless, these papers are now submitted to the world in the author's own real name. For what Gordon said of Egypt, is also true of China: "As long as aliens govern Egypt and the voice of the Egyptian people is smothered, so long must Egypt be the basest of kingdoms."

What I have wished to say with these papers may be here summarised in a few words:

First, that the present pacification in China is quite hollow. The state of things in China, culminating in the events of last year, was admittedly due—I do not by any means say entirely to the fault of foreigners, but to mistakes on both sides, as Her Imperial Majesty the Empress-Dowager admitted in her decree—彼此辦理不善. That was the basis of settlement which Her Imperial Majesty's Government asked for from the civilized Powers of Europe and America. In reply, the civilized Powers demanded—heads! In the first

excitement amidst the exaggerated horror of the moment, the cry for punishment, or even for vengeance, was natural and comprehensible. But after the allied army had occupied Peking when the Powers were actually masters of the situation, the cool, callous, persistent demand for heads was, I must say, an act of moral helplessness and cynicism on the part of responsible statesmen more disgraceful to the state of civilization at the present day than even the savagery of the foreign troops in North China. I really pity the men who were responsible for the suicide of the Chinese Princes and State Ministers. As for Her Imperial Majesty the Empress-Dowager, who is reported to have remarked that one can only die *once* in this life, “non han speranza di morte,” as Dante said—she acted upon the principle: “Tout est perdu fors l’honneur !”

Mr. Montague Bernard, the Chichele Professor of Diplomacy at Oxford, says: “A Treaty of Peace must contain provisions judged necessary to remove the causes out of which the war arose, redress the grievances complained of and prevent the recurrence of them. This is the one essential thing which the negotiators have to do, and the pacification is hollow if they fail to do it clearly and effectually.” Now, so far from trying to remove the causes out of which the present state of things in China has

arisen, the Foreign Ministers in Peking have not even tried to understand them. Instead, the Ministers have tried hard to remove—the Woosung Bar! I make bold here to call the attention of the world to a more dangerous Bar in China—the Missionary Bar. I venture to predict that unless the Missionary Bar in China is properly attended to it will very soon be impossible for even foreigners in China to make a living—except, perhaps, by looting!

The next thing which I wish to say with these papers is this. Now, if even trade is to thrive in China, it is very evident, I think, that there must be first of all, good government in the country. But good government in China is an impossibility unless the Imperial Government in Peking is allowed full liberty to do what it thinks is right and best for the good government of the nation. The present policy of the Powers in China, I may say here, of supporting what is called the progressive Viceroys of the Provinces against the alleged reactionary Central Government—against Her Imperial Majesty the Empress-Dowager and her chosen advisers—is a policy which is, perhaps, adopted deliberately to break up the Chinese Empire, or at least to throw it into such disorder and confusion that in the end it will bankrupt Europe and America—or certainly Europe—to restore things to order.

The one true policy—with the present ridiculously inadequate and false knowledge of the true state of things in China among foreigners—for the Powers to adopt, or better and more practical still, for one Power to take the lead in adopting and compelling morally or otherwise others to adopt in China, is not the policy of “open door,” but the policy of “Let the Chinaman alone.” In addition to this, as long as it is impracticable to abolish exterritoriality, the Powers, or, as I have said, the one leading Power should take and insist upon others taking adequate measures for the good government of foreigners in China. To the honour of Great Britain I will say here that the only *shred* of attempt made for the good government of foreigners in all China is the British Supreme Court in Shanghai. Raw British youngsters who are now appointed to the Consular service in the treaty ports, too, I must in justice say, often try to do what is expected of an Englishman—their duty. But these poor youngsters now are not encouraged to develop their back-bones. One British Consul once said to an officer of the Viceroy in a glaring case of injustice: “I am really sorrow I am not permitted to consider the justice of the case. My hands are tied.” Another Englishman in China once wrote to me: “I must rely on your friendship for me not to get me into hot water by telling



any one that I have written you in this strain (on the missionary question) as it would damage me badly." Poor sons of Vikings, afraid now even—to get into hot water!

But to return to the true policy of the Powers in China. In order to carry out the policy which I have stated, it is necessary that the Powers should first of all send better and abler agents to China. Emerson says: "Governments must always learn too late that the use of dishonest agents is as ruinous for nations as for individual men." Now, a really honest and capable Foreign Minister in Peking would see without my telling him that his task in China is not to teach or help his nationals to trade or to earn a livelihood by selling the gospel, quack-medicine, railway shares or breech-loading modern guns. The task of a Foreign Minister in Peking is to see that his nationals in China behave themselves and conduct their business in a way consistent with the order, decency and good government in a regulated civilized country. . The late Sir Richard MacDonald, once Governor of the British Settlements in Singapore, said to a deputation of his countrymen who came to speechify him on something he had done to better the condition of the Chinese coolies in the plantations: "But you forget, you potatoe planters, that I am sent by the Queen to *govern* you." But men in responsible

positions now, from Ministers and Admirals to poor ship Captains and Inspectors of Police, seek only to be banqueted and speechified to—and yet people wonder at the rise of Boxerdom in China and Anarchism in Europe and America!

In short, the only true policy for the Powers to adopt in China is the policy of “Let the Chinaman alone and look to the good government of foreigners in China.” But what about the “open door?” Yes, open door by all means as long as you have a Rhadamanthus or at least a Sir Richard MacDonald to see that those who enter the door in China behave themselves properly. “But Oh!” say incorruptible persons to me, “what foreigner in China is not behaving himself?” This question is like the question of jesting Pontius Pilate “What is truth?” Now listen. Last summer in Tientsin and in Peking, foreign civilians, missionaries and even official persons openly and disgracefully looted. The “N. C. Daily News,” a not overscrupulous newspaper, printed in Shanghai, even was ashamed and had to cry out in a leading article: “Is there no Power or Authority in China or at Home, who can put a stop to this disgraceful state of things now going on in Peking?” Now, after just one year Sir Robert Hart comes forward before the world with his latest literary lucubration and calmly says: “There was really no true

looting after all!" Thus it is quite evident that with Pontius Pilate as judge and men like Sir Robert Hart who have a convenient moral sliding valve in their brains, as advocates, it is not easy to answer the question put recently by Mrs. Mary Fitch, a missionary lady in Shanghai, who writes on the subject of pure-mindedness among foreigners in China, the question, namely, "Who are the Devils—Chinese or Foreigners?"

I come now to the last thing which I wish to say with these papers. I have tried to say it in the series called "Latter-day Notes on the Chinese Question." These Notes, I am told, are very unpleasant reading to many foreigners—especially Englishmen. These notes are purposely written to the modern English tune of "Play the Game." The tune, however, is disagreeable, I can well understand, to Englishmen, when it is played by a Chinaman, because the modern Englishmen believe or try to believe themselves to be the only sons of Vikings, or as an Englishman said to me lately in Shanghai: "You Chinese are very clever and have wonderful memories, but still, we Englishmen consider you Chinese as an inferior race." I did not tell the Englishman who said that to me that only Dead Sea apes have no memory, but remembering Marquis Tsêng Kuo-fan's advice (see page 53 of this book), I smiled blandly and tried to

look stupid. Now, of all the disagreeable national characteristics of Englishmen, the worst is not even their stolid insolence which tries sometimes to gorgonise you with "a strong British stare:" the worst is the modern Englishmen's habit of Cant, and of all the Englishmen's Cants, the most ridiculous and insufferable is this—their Cant of their being the only sons of Vikings. It is really too late in the day for an educated man now to be sincere with such a belief, and even if the belief is partially sincere, as I have no doubt it sometimes is, it only shows that the poor modern Englishman has woefully neglected his education. For the modern European culture now, if it recognises anything at all, recognises the truth of that saying of Confucius: "Among really educated men, there is no race distinction." In fine, I would seriously advise the modern Englishman, who generally knows on which side his bread is buttered, to play the game and clear his mind of Cant; and if he really wish to be insolent, let him be at least thoroughly sincere even in his insolence.

But to return. What I wish to say in the Latter-day Notes, is this. The real Anarchy of the world to-day is not in China—although the Chinese are suffering from its effects—but in Europe and America. The sign or test of Anarchy is not whether there is more or less disorder or mal-

administration in a country. The real test is this. The word Anarchy in Greek literally means "Kinglessness." There are three stages or degrees of Anarchy. The first is when there is no real capable true King in a country. The second stage is when the people of a country openly or tacitly do not believe in a kingly rule. The third and worst stage is reached when the people of a country do not only disbelieve in a kingly rule, but even in kingliness—in fact, become incapable of recognising kingliness or human worth in man at all. It seems to me that Europe and America are fast nearing this last and worst stage of Anarchy. Goethe in the beginning of the last century said in verse :

Frankreich's traurig Geschick, die Grossen mögen's bedenken ;  
 Aber bedenken fürwahr sollen es Kleine noch mehr.  
 Grosse gingen zu Grunde ; doch wer beschützte die Menge  
 Gegen die Menge ? Da war Menge der Menge Tyrann.

In English :

Dreadful is France's misfortune, the "classes" should truly be-  
 think them ;  
 But still more, of a truth, the "Masses" should lay it to heart.  
 "Classes" were smashed up ; well, then, who will protect now the  
 "Masses"  
 'Gainst the "Masses ?" The "Masses" against the "Masses"  
 did rage.

At the present moment responsible people, even good men, in Europe and America, have out of despair thrown up the reins over the mob—the "classes," too, are become a mob. The only thing responsible men now try to do,

is to fool the mob with Patriotism, Imperialism and Kolonial Politik. Take the situation now in China. British statesmen know that they have made an awful mess. Now they try to fool the mob in Shanghai who, through the China Association, are most likely to become obstreperous—with the Woosung Bar! But responsible men in public life should be honest. What I mean by honesty, is not mere honesty in money matters, but honesty of intellect, honesty in recognising mistakes, in facing a difficult situation. Voltaire said: “C’est le malheur des gens honnêtes qu’ils sont des lâches,—it is the misfortune of good men that they are dastards.” Confucius says: “The noble-minded man or gentleman understands what is right; The cad understands only Interests—what will pay.”

That is what I mean by honesty of intellect or disinterested intellect. Finally, Goethe in his calm quiet way says :

Sage, thun wir nicht recht? Wir müssen den Pöbel betrügen;  
Sieh nur, wie ungeschickt, sieh nur wie wild er sich zeigt!  
Ungeschickt und wild sind alle rohen Betrogenen;  
Seid nur redlich und so führt ihn zum Menschlichen an.

In English :

Aren't we just doing the right thing? the mob, we can only befool them.  
See, now, how shiftless! and look now how wild! such is the mob.  
Shiftless and wild all sons of Adam are when you befool them;  
Be but honest and true. Thus you will make human, them all.

Turning now to China the state of things even now cannot be described as a state of pure Anarchy or kinglessness. During last summer when Their Two Majesties were in flight and the whole machinery of Government was shaken by the cataclysm at Peking, the population of China loyally obeyed their constituted authorities and behaved in a way which, I believe, no other people in the world would or could have done. In one word, the disorder and confusion in China to-day is only a *functional* derangement, whereas the Anarchy in Europe and America is really an *organic* disorder.

I will here give the following extract from a book written some four years ago which I will publish shortly under the title "Body Politic and Civil Service in China,"—on the present state of government in China :

"To an impartial observer, the evil in China to-day is really not mis-government so much as no-government. What I mean by mis-government is wilful unchecked abuse of power, open public sale of justice, heartless cruelty and high-handed trampling upon the interests and feelings of the people. Even corruption, *i.e.*, peculation and official mis-appropriation of public funds are not so rampant as foreigners imagine. Such things unfortunately do exist in China to-day, but they exist for the most part, I must say, in the administra-

tion of matters called "foreign affairs" such as arsenals, buying of ships, foreign machinery, war-materials, etc. Such a state of things as existed in Tientsin before the Japanese war would be properly called mis-government and has been one of the greatest sources of demoralisation of the public service in China. But as regards the public administration in the Provinces, the evil is, as I have said, not so much mis-government as no-government—utter neglect on the part of the officials of the local interests and well-being of the people.

The cause of this state of no-government in China is not far to seek. In order to meet the exigencies arising from the coming of foreigners, the resources of the country have been drained for what may be called, Imperial purposes; while provincial or local interests of the people have necessarily been neglected. While Imperial questions occupy the attention of the Government, High Functionaries, such as Viceroys or, as they should properly be called, Military Administrators 制軍 in the Provinces, who are charged with the duty of attending to Imperial questions and interests, usurp more than their due, all the power, not only of spending public money, but also of advancing men in the public service, while the Civil Governors who are responsible for provincial



or local interests have no power at all. Moreover, an oligarchy or clique of men in the public service who pose as "progressive" mandarins in order to curry favour with foreigners and who, while the policy of the Imperial Government is one of conciliation towards foreigners, are thus pushed forward to manage "foreign affairs"—such men get all the favour in the service and grow rich, while other honest officials who are responsible for the local interests are left to starve with the starving population."

I will now here sum up what I have wished to say, thus :

I.—That the present pacification in China is quite hollow, because the Powers have not tried, even honestly, to understand the causes out of which the present situation in China has arisen.

II.—That the only true policy for the Powers in China is the policy of "Let the Chinaman alone and look to the good government of foreigners in China."

III.—That the real anarchy of the world to-day is not in China, but in Europe and America.

Finally, the last thing of all which I wish to say here is, I must confess, a very undignified thing for my self-respect to say. I wish to say if

any one has a right to complain against the Government of Her Imperial Majesty the Empress-Dowager, I have that right. I have served Her Imperial Majesty's Government now for eighteen years and I am at this moment holding the same position as when I first entered the service, receiving at this day a salary less than that of a fourth-class assistant under Sir Robert Hart. I make this very undignified admission, not so much to prove my disinterestedness in writing what I have written, but to impress the moral that under the present policy of the Powers in China, men like myself who care only for the cause of good government and true civilization in China, can never reach a position in the public service where they can serve the best interests of the nation as they should; while other worthless men who favour the "charlatanry" of Progress and Civilization of the Revd. Mr. Timothy Richards or the mysterious "Manchuria" policy of the Japanese Consul-General in Shanghai—such men are by the back-stairs influence of foreigners, in Chinese Yamens, pushed forward in the public service to dishonour and ruin the country. The Government of Her Imperial Majesty the Empress-Dowager, therefore, is not perfect by any means; otherwise the present writer would at this moment be at the side of the Imperial Lady to give her

his advice, and if need be, his life—instead of writing this book here, to defend her honour and the honour of his country before the public world.

KU HUNG-MING.

WUCHANG, 18th November, 1901.



# PAPERS FROM A VICEROY'S YAMEN.

---

A CHINESE VIEW OF THE BOXER RISING AND  
EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION.

---

I.

*MORIAMUR PRO REGE, REGINA!*

---

A STATEMENT OF THE TRUE FEELINGS OF THE CHINESE  
PEOPLE TOWARDS THE PERSON AND AUTHORITY  
OF H.I.M. THE EMPRESS DOWAGER.

---

MOTTO:

“Remember this: an unsatisfied people means more troops.”  
Gordon's letter from Mauritius.

---



THINGS in China have now reached a stage when to some people the only course practicable might seem to be to maintain a system of “la force attendant le droit,” “might until right is feasible.” I am myself rather inclined to agree with the Marquis of Salisbury in the opinion which he expressed after the Cretan crisis in favour of the Admirals *versus* the Diplomats in dealing with a difficult crisis. For here again in China since the

crisis began, the wisest measure taken by the Powers has been the issue of the notification by the Admirals of the Allied Fleets. It was this timely notification which enabled the Southern Viceroys and Governors to spare the population of their provinces the horrors which are now going on in the North of China.

The question, however, to be asked by all thinking and responsible men at the present moment is: Is right yet feasible? The Viceroys of the Yangtze Valley have practically answered in the affirmative. Now, if right is still feasible, the next question to be asked is: how? In order to help towards answering this second question, I offer through the medium of the public press the following suggestions.

First, the Powers should as speedily as possible agree fully and clearly to define the object of their military operations in the North and their intentions with regard to the future of China; and they should appoint someone with full powers publicly and authoritatively to promulgate on their behalf this information to the Chinese people.

Second, unless the Powers decide to take upon themselves the responsibility of the government of China, they should first of all at once publicly and solemnly guarantee the inviolability of the person as well as the liberty, power, dignity and honour of H. I. M. the Empress Dowager equally with those of H. I. M. the Emperor of China.

I further state :—

First, that the Viceroys and Governors and all persons now directly or indirectly responsible for the good government and maintenance of order in China, have absolutely no sympathy with the so-called Reform Party, spoken of by the foreign public press of Shanghai.

Second, that the assertions of the so-called Reform Party, as represented by the native and echoed by the foreign press in Shanghai, as to the sentiments of the Chinese people towards the person and legitimate authority of H. I. M. the Empress Dowager, are absolutely false and without foundation.

Third, that by the first fundamental law of state in China, resting upon the principle of absolute obedience of children to parents (以孝治天下), the supreme authority in the Chinese body politic of H.I.M. the Empress Dowager as the mother of the nation (國母) or country, admits of absolutely no question or doubt.

Fourth, that the above false views of the so-called Refrom Party, disseminated by them in the native and foreign press of Shanghai, together with the baseless reports and unwarrantable accusations directed against the character, intentions and alleged reactionary policy of H.I.M. the Empress Dowager, have contributed in a great measure to

bring on the present calamity. For those views tended to create mutual distrust and suspicion, and to destroy that perfect confidence of the foreign Ministers in H.I.M. the Empress Dowager and in her Government which was necessary to enable H.I.M. to deal in a free, sure and steady manner with the difficulties of the many new, and intricate problems confronting the Government of the Empire at the present day.

Having now acquitted myself of the task of making the above authorised statements, I will proceed to offer a few observations on some points involved in those statements, which will help towards a clearer understanding.

First, with regard to the so-called Reform Party, foreigners favour and support it, because those "Reformers" profess themselves the champions of the cause of progress and Western Civilizations, and the friends of foreigners. But without stopping to discuss what a travesty of "progress and civilization" these young enthusiasts with their necessarily crude views and meagre knowledge must carry in their minds, it may well be asked what reason really makes these hot-brained enthusiasts wish China to progress and be strong? The answer to this question may be found in the last literary effusion of K'ang Yu Wei, translated and published in the *N.-C. Daily News*, where

the so-called reformers unwittingly showed their teeth.

But to be just. Something too may be said in favour of the "Reform" Movement. The movement arose and found support from even good and public-spirited men because the educated classes in China felt keenly the humiliation of the country after the Japanese War. But, as in all political movements, there likewise are many divergent currents in this movement to which the discontent of the country gave rise. All these currents may be grouped under two heads. One party is composed of public-spirited, and at the same time experienced men of judgment and discretion who want reform and progress, *i.e.*, the adoption of the methods of the Western Civilization so far as they are consistent and compatible with the state of the country and with the "cause of good government." The other party, which may be called the Extreme Radicals, is composed of clever, hot-headed youths, who, calling themselves patriots, are really vain, self-seeking, ambitious, without experience, judgment or discretion. These demand root and branch reform and railway-speed progress, without regard to anything that stands in their way, and even at the risk of overturning the Empire, merely in order that they may gratify their vanity and selfish ambition to gain what in their ignorance they imagine may be



easily acquired—the wealth, power and glory of the Western nations. This is the party of K'ang Yu Wei and his adherents, which, by a strange irony, finds so much sympathy and support from foreigners. This party clamours for “reform and progress.” Why? Because although ambitious and envious of the wealth, power, and glory of foreigners, they yet hate foreigners with that extreme hatred which only envy and ambition can engender. This party also hates H.I.M. the Empress Dowager. Why? Because they consider her too moderate.

Now, in my opinion, so far from there being any truth in the ignorant, wild and reckless assertions of the foreign press as to the alleged reactionary policy of H.I.M. the Empress Dowager, and as to her baneful influence on the cause of good government in China, it will be the easiest thing in the world to prove the contrary: that is to say, not only is it not true that the policy of Her Imperial Majesty is reactionary, but the fact is that it is owing to her policy of moderation and resourceful opportunism,—a policy matured by an experience of forty years at the head of the State—that the personality and influence of H.I.M. the Empress Dowager is at this moment the only guarantee for the stability and cohesion of the Chinese Empire.

In order to prove what I have said, I do not think it is necessary to bring forward any elaborate arguments. The following plain, palpable facts known to everybody, will prove what I say.

Fact 1.—Dr. Giles in his Biographical Dictionary (p. 799) thus gives the particulars of the life of H.I.M. the Empress Dowager: “Born A.D. 1835. The Western Empress Dowager; mother of the Emperor Tung Chih; secondary wife” [but on the elevation of her son to the throne ranked equal with the first and legitimate Empress] “of the Emperor Hsien Feng; and aunt by marriage” [?mother by adoption] “of the Emperor Kuang Hsu. On the death of the Emperor Hsien Feng at Jehol in 1861, eight members of the extreme anti-foreign party claimed to have been appointed Regents for the Boy-Emperor. She espoused the cause of Prince Kung, who was negotiating with the English and French in Peking and with the aid of Prince Ch’un, the reactionary leaders were seized and either put to death or allowed to commit suicide, etc.”

The evidence furnished by these last two sentences of Dr. Giles’s dispassionate historical narrative should be sufficient utterly to destroy the charge against H.I.M. the Empress Dowager of having been anti-foreign or reactionary in the past. Indeed, it may even be asked what would have

been the state of China now, if Her Imperial Majesty had been anti-foreign and had sided with the reactionary princes in 1861?

Fact 2.—Whatever excuses may be made for them, it is difficult to deny that the attitude of isolation from all except official intercourse with the Foreign Ministers in Peking maintained by the Ministers of the Tsung-li Yamen, has contributed in some degree towards bringing about the “impasse” of mutual distrust and suspicion culminating in the present cataclysm in Peking. On the other hand, the only person in Peking in authority, who notwithstanding her high station has had the courage to invite the ladies of the Legations into the very heart, and bosom of her family, was H.I.M. the Empress Dowager.\* What more touching and

---

\* I append the following cutting from the *N. C. Herald* of Shanghai of the 12th September—a date subsequent to the date when I wrote this article:—

Truly, the Empress Dowager is a remarkable woman. We glance at another side of the ex-servant girl's character in the following from the *London and China Express* of the 3rd ultimo:—

The true character of the Empress Dowager is one of the minor problems which complicate the Chinese puzzle. Her portrait has been painted in all the hues of the rainbow, the darker shades predominating. A very favourable view of her disposition is to be found in a letter, published in America, from Mrs. Conger, the wife of the United States Minister at Peking. Mrs. Conger visited the Dowager Empress, together with the


pathetic proof could she give of her desire that she and her people should live at peace with the foreigners? It is true that acute newspaper politicians see beneath all this only deep hypocrisy, yet will anyone assert that such an example of courtesy and hospitality on the part of the First Lady of the land to her foreign guests was likely to have a bad rather than a good influence upon her people in their behaviour towards foreigners. In addition to this fact, it will be remembered that, probably in despair of any help from her Ministers, Her Majesty even tried, at one time to make her son H.I.M. the Emperor, learn English!

---

wives of the other Ministers. She was charmed with her hostess, who certainly did her best to please. Whatever hatred of the "foreign devils" the Dowager Empress may have been cherishing in her heart found no expression in her countenance or words. "She seemes bright and happy," says Mrs. Conger. "Her face was aglow with good-will. There was no trace of cruelty to be seen. In simple expressions she welcomed us, but her actions were full of freedom and warmth. She arose and wished us well. She reached both hands towards each lady, and said, with much enthusiastic earnestness, 'One family.' She was very cordial, and when tea was passed to us she stepped forward and lifted each cup of tea to her own lips. She took a sip, then lifted the cup on the other side to her lips, and said again, 'One family, all one family.'" The events of the last month have probably somewhat shaken Mrs. Conger's confidence in the sincerity of the Empress Dowager and in her methods of treating a "family."

Fact. 3—It is admitted that the peace which we are now enjoying on the Yangtze Valley is due to the wisdom, humanity, and statesmanship of H.E. the Viceroy Liu at Nanking. I refrain for obvious reasons from speaking of H.E. the Viceroy Chang. Now, is it not a well-known fact that it was solely owing to the earnest appeal and personal entreaties of his Gracious Imperial Mistress that the “grand old man” Liu K’un-yi happens to be Viceroy at Nanking at the present crisis? If therefore there is such a thing as logic of facts, we Chinese as well as foreigners, even including these who are now shrieking in the Shanghai papers with the rage born of ignorance, spite and prejudice against the Imperial Lady, should all recognize that we owe the blessings of our present peace and security to the wisdom and foresight of H.I.M. the Empress Dowager. So much for the charge against her of being anti-foreign and reactionary.

I am afraid it is difficult to make foreigners, unacquainted with the history of China for the last forty years, understand what statesmanship, courage, patience, steadfastness and political wisdom have been required to steer the ship of State as H.I.M. has done during these forty eventful and stormy years. But let one fact suffice. In 1861, when H.I.M. the Empress Dowager, together with H.I.M. the late Eastern Empress Dowager (who,



it is well known, did not take much share in the actual work of government), became Regents for H.I.M. the late Emperor T'ung-chih, thirteen out of the eighteen provinces of the Empire were devastated by rebellion. But by her present Gracious Majesty's womanly sympathy and insight, her tact and her knowledge of character enabled her to choose wisely her public servants, to inspire loyalty and devotion in the Ministers about her person,\* and to evoke at the same time the spirit of chivalry of the country gentlemen of China. Thus for her, a poor, helpless, widow woman with a baby Emperor on her knee, gentlemen of Hunan and other provinces, under the leadership of the Marquis Tseng Kuo-fan, arose and rallied round the Throne, crying with burning hearts and grief-choked voices † "Moriatur pro rege, regina!" In this way H.I.M. the Empress Dowager was enabled to crush the formidable rebellion, and afterwards gradually to restore the country to comparative order and prosperity.

I have already spoken of the rise of the "Reform Movement." I have said that the movement arose from the supreme sense of humiliation and

---

\* *E. G.* 文祥 *vide* notice of him in U. S. Diplom. Corresp.

† This is true—The late Peng-yü-lin of Hunan on receiving presents from H.I.M. the Empress Dowager used to roll on the floor and sob like a child.

despair on the part of the educated and governing classes in China, concerning the state and prospects of the country after the Japanese War. At the time of the rise and sudden flooding onrush of this movement, which, as I have said, is composed of many currents and shades of opinion, there was at one moment an imminent danger of the different parties among the governing class in China flying at each others' throats, and thus causing the overthrow of the Government and the disruption of the Empire. For, as strangely enough often happens in political crises in all countries, the bigoted Ultra-Conservative, or Pharisee party, represented by the Imperial tutor Weng Tung-ho, had out of sheer despair joined hands with, or, to put it more correctly, had placed themselves blindly and unreservedly in the hands of, the unscrupulous Ultra-Radical party, or party of sinners and publicans, for the latter to play havoc with the delicate machinery of State and administration. H.I.M. the Empress Dowager hearing of this, had to come out from her long-sought and much needed rest and retirement to help H.I.M. the Emperor to steer the ship of State. Now see how she met the situation. She saw at a glance, with the clear and sagacious insight of a born and experienced statesman, that in all political crises the two parties most dangerous to the State are Ultras. She

therefore did not hesitate for a moment, but raising her hand, struck with a swift, sharp, decisive stroke at the heads of the two Ultras—the Ultra-Conservatives and Ultra-Radicals. She stripped

---

not pro-foreign, neither reactionary nor progressive. If anything at all, I am inclined to think she leans somewhat to the side of the Progressives, as may be inferred from any classified list of the political



despair on the part of the educated and governing classes in China, concerning the state and prospects of the country after the Japanese War. At the time of the rise and sudden flooding onrush of

## ERRATA.

After the words "K'ang Yu Wei and his adherents" comes the following:—

"these, in the general opinion even of the educated class, had no claim on her mercy. She therefore thought it necessary to make a severe example of a few of the most notorious of them in order to strike terror into the hearts of those who were trying to take advantage of the national discontent after the Japanese War to push themselves into power by intrigue and charlatanry of progressive ideas. In fact, she made, as everybody now knows, newspaper martyrs of K'ang Yu Wei and his adherents."

SITUATION. SHE SAW AS A GLANCE, WITH THE  
 sagacious insight of a born and experienced states-  
 man, that in all political crises the two parties  
 most dangerous to the State are Ultras. She

therefore did not hesitate for a moment, but raising her hand, struck with a swift, sharp, decisive stroke at the heads of the two Ultras—the Ultra-Conservatives and Ultra-Radicals. She stripped the Imperial tutor Weng Tung-ho of all his honours, and with a mercy and moderation that did credit no less to her head than to her heart, she sent him to his home with orders never to enter the public service again. As to the young, unscrupulous Ultra-Radicals, K'ang Yu Wei and his adherents, sending those she could seize to the sword of the executioner, and issuing a decree of outlawry against the rest. Thus in a very short time she was complete mistress of the situation and the crisis was over.

Since this last crisis which I have tried to describe, H.I.M. the Empress Dowager has avoided all extremes, and has wisely and consistently maintained the middle course of moderation and opportunism. As the supreme head of the Government, whatever her sympathies may be, she knows it is a duty which she owes to the cause of good government and the stability of the State, to declare for no party. She is neither anti-foreign nor pro-foreign, neither reactionary nor progressive. If anything at all, I am inclined to think she leans somewhat to the side of the Progressives, as may be inferred from any classified list of the political

tendencies of the high officials in the provinces. In the employment of public servants she chooses them according to the ends which she wished to attain. Thus men of such divergent political views and tendencies as Their Excellencies the Viceroy Li Hung-chang, Liu K'un-yi, Chang Chih-tung, and the Governor Yuan Shih-kai on the one side, and Their Excellencies the Imperial Chancellor (Grand Secretary) Hsu Tung, Li Ping-heng, Kang Yi, and Ch'ao Su-chiao on the other side, all find favour and employment in her service. What a mastery of resources, what breadth of mind, what judgment and tact in adopting means to ends H.I.M. shows in this one point alone!

But it is not only her ability and wise statesmanship that constitute her a guarantee for the stability of the Empire. Her real influence lies far deeper. It lies in the powerful influence given her by the forty years of stress and storm during which she, notwithstanding the sorrows of a blighted life, has guided, watched over and shared the destiny and fortunes of her suffering people—the hold which all this has upon the memory and sympathy of the educated classes and the people of China. It is to me a sign of the moral worthlessness of men like K'ang Yu Wei and his adherents, that all this—for they as educated men must know the history of their country during the last forty years

---

—has proved of no avail to moderate the indecency, the temper, the virulence of their hatred and abuse against H.I.M. the Empress Dowager.

I cannot refrain even here from remarking that it is really not to the credit of foreigners resident in China that it should be left to me to be the first to lift up my voice against the crusade of unwarrantable attack and unseemly vilification which the foreign public press of Shanghai has thought fit to carry on against the personal character of this Imperial Lady. Whatever may be her shortcomings, she has at least worked to preserve order in China where so many foreign exiles have made their homes. It is needless to refer to her high rank and high station, as the First Lady of the land where foreigners are actually living as guests. But her sex, her age and the known sorrows of her life,—the blighted hopes of early youth, the long lonely years of widowhood burdened with the cares of Empire and the fears and anxieties of a fond mother for an only son, whose sudden death, most cruel blow of all, left desolate the heart of the careworn Empress and sorrow-stricken mother,—all these considerations, I should think, might surely secure even from an ignorant and reckless public press, much more from newspapers conducted by civilised Europeans, immunity from unseemly libels on H. I. M.'s private life.

But in the immortal words of Burke "The age of chivalry in Europe is gone!"

I come now to the most difficult part of my subject, difficult not from any apprehension I have of danger or prejudice to the cause for which I speak, but difficult because of the strong feelings excited over recent events. I mean the Boxer movement.

As in the reform movement, so also here, there are really two distinct currents which foreigners have failed to distinguish. One, which may be called the defensive movement, is a revival of a very ancient system of local militia corresponding to the old Anglo-Saxon *fyrð* or to the *Landsturm* of Germany. The custom of forming societies or associations in village communities for purposes of mutual defence has from time immemorial been perfectly legitimate in China, and, in times of internal troubles, has often been encouraged by the Imperial authorities. The generic name for such a system of village or communal defence was in old time *pao chia* (保甲) and in modern times, *t'uan lien* (團練). The word *yi* (義) meaning here good, honest or rightminded (the French "brave") indicates that all members are to be good men and true, no sneaks or cads to be admitted. The word *ho*, meaning literally harmonious, expresses the idea that the society is to be a friendly one, imply-

ing also the meaning of the word "mutual." The word *t'uan* (團) means a gathering or society.

The name of the original legitimate first so-called Boxer society "Yi-ho-t'uan" may be translated as "friendly society of good men and true" or "society of honest men for mutual defence." In order to carry out the object for which the societies were formed, viz., the defence of their persons and property in their village homes, the members of these societies were required to practise "boxing" and other gymnastic exercises. Hence "the noble art of self-defence," including other exercises as well, practised and taught by these societies—the art or science—and not the societies themselves—was called the "Yi-hoch'uan."

This, I say, was the original so-called Boxer movement. It was quite a legitimate system of village or communal defence; its object was defence not defiance.

The other later current or rather development of the movement arose no doubt owing to special local conditions out of the original movement, but grew to be a more defiant, militant and eventually uncontrollable fanaticism, disastrous to friends as well as enemies. How this fanaticism culminated in the present cataclysm, I leave to the impartial judgment of the future, when the full facts of the case have been investigated and brought to light.

Then only will it be possible to pronounce whether it was due to wickedness, weakness, error of judgment or misplaced confidence in her servants on the part of H. I. M. the Empress Dowager, or whether it was due to "local difficulties" intensified by interference and pressure from the foreign Ministers which hampered H. I. M. in dealing consistently, steadily and firmly with the situation. Among local difficulties I would specially refer to "missionary methods" and the careless dumping down of strange foreign engineers from all countries of Europe,—Greeks, Italians, etc.,—with the manners if not the morals of "l'home sensuel moyen" of modern European civilization, among a poor and primitive, peaceful and helpless population of women and long-gowned men in the interior of China.

In the meantime, while the facts have not all been ascertained, I would appeal to the people of Europe and America not to forget the first principle of justice; not to pronounce judgment first and hear the evidence afterwards.

But my present purpose is specially to deal with the charge that H.I.M. refused from the beginning to punish and suppress the Boxer movement. Now it is not true that H.I.M. refused absolutely to do this. What she did refuse was to punish and suppress without discrimination. The

defiant, militant and really rowdy element in the Boxer movement she instructed her officials to punish and suppress; but the good element, the defensive and not defiant movement, the effort made by her people for self-defence, she would not consent to punish and suppress. It will be asked why not? The answer to this question includes the refutation of her alleged conspiracy with the Boxers to drive the foreigners out of China. The latter charge, I need not say, is ridiculous on the face of it. But the foundation for such an outrageous charge is, I believe, this. H.I.M. the Empress Dowager, after the Japanese War, could not fail to see that troublous times were coming upon her people, arising not only from direct foreign aggressiveness, but also because the disorganized economic conditions of the country were likely to produce a serious state of lawlessness in every quarter. She saw in fact that China at no distant future was likely to run great risk of drifting into a state, to adapt Carlyle's phrase, of anarchy minus a constable. Under these circumstances her love and solicitude for her people made it a duty to her to encourage them to prepare and organize themselves for the defence of their hearths and homes. Could any right-minded man on any principle of justice condemn her for doing this? Indeed, let anyone



with a heart in him, who understands the force of feeling underlying the Chinese language, read her many recent decrees laying stress upon the necessity of Viceroys and Governors preparing to defend the territories entrusted to each of them, and of her people reviving the ancient system of village or communal organization for mutual defence, of which I have spoken. He will then feel the infinite pathos of her words as the sorrowful parting advice of a beloved mother to her children, saying in so many words:—"My children, the times are troublous and I who with pain and sorrow have watched over you for so many years am now growing old. The time is not distant when I shall be taken away from you. Be brave then, my children, and prepare each of you to defend his hearth and home in the time coming when I shall no longer be with you to hold the Empire together and to watch over you."

Now, if I have in the above succeeded in any measure in expressing and conveying the feelings and sentiments of the Chinese people towards the person of H. I. M. the Empress Dowager, foreigners should be able to understand why young Chinese boys of thirteen and fourteen have been able to rush with "stupid infatuated recklessness" up to the very muzzle of modern European guns. Whenever modern scientific men of Europe meet with any

extraordinary manifestation of human soul which they cannot explain, they call it fanaticism. But what is fanaticism? It is this. The only impulse which can drive men to extraordinary acts of courage and heroism, and make them sacrifice themselves, is the impulse inspired by a desire to defend something which they in their hearts admire, love and reverence. Now, when that admiration, love and reverence become infinite and transcendental, the courage and heroism also become infinite and transcendental—that is fanaticism.

Now, what is it which the Chinese people as individuals and as a nation, love, honour and reverence? In private life the Chinese love, honour and reverence their parents, and this feeling is entwined with and sanctified by all the memories of childhood and home. As a nation, the Chinese now love, honour and reverence H. I. M. the Empress Dowager, as the mother of the nation, and H. I. M. the Emperor, as heir and inheritor by the will and appointment of Her Majesty of the fortunes of the Imperial Dynasty, which has beneficently ruled over the Chinese nation for the last two hundred and fifty years. How deep this feeling is in the hearts of the Chinese people, the fanaticism of the Boxer boys has amply proved—fanaticism, as I have said, being the infinite and transcendental impulse of courage which drives

men to defend what they in their heart of hearts infinitely and transcendently love, honour and reverence. Now, from all information hitherto received at this Yamen, it had not been possible to obtain an explanation of the sudden intensity of the crisis which led to the cataclysm in Peking. But a private authentic piece of information only recently received at once explains what before was not quite clear. According to this information the last straw, to use a familiar expression, was a rumour which, just before the proposed conference at the Tsungli Yamen, ran through Peking like an electric shock. This was to the effect that one of the four conditions which the foreign Ministers intended to impose, was the retirement from the conduct of affairs of H. I. M. the Empress Dowager. It was this rumour which suddenly and immediately made the Imperial troops and the populace rise "en masse," to join the Boxers and thus bring on the crisis which culminated in the unfortunate and deplorable capture of the Taku Forts.

It is plain therefore that the real "causa belli," the real passionate impulse which has led the people of China to assume a warlike attitude actually in the North and virtually in the South, is the conviction that insult was offered or intended to be offered to the person and liberty of H. I. M. the Empress Dowager. It is, I may say, a war of the

people, not of the Government; in fact, it is rather in spite of the Government. That is the unfortunate reason why what are called the strict rules of civilized warfare have not been scrupulously observed.

Now, I do not know whether the more or less democratic people of Europe and America, who are at the present day very enthusiastic about "patriotism," are able or willing to remember from their past history that there is a still more genuine word than modern patriotism, a word the meaning of which I have tried to convey by using the Latin phrase at the head of this article, namely "Loyalty," the loyalty of a servant to his master, the loyal devotion of a child to his parents, of a wife to her husband, and lastly, summing up all these, the loyalty of a people to their sovereign! If the people of Europe and America will remember the meaning of that word, they will understand why the Chinese people—and not the Government—are now in a state of war, at bay against the whole world. For the cry from one end of China to the other is "Moriatur pro Rege, Regina!"

But to conclude. I have said that to the question, "Is right still feasible?" in the present state of things in China, the Viceroy of the Yangtze Valley have for the present answered "Yes." The next question is:—"How?" This can now be answered in a few sentences.

1. The "causa belli" of the Chinese people is their belief that the Powers have taken, or intend to take, steps against the person and liberty of H.I.M the Empress Dowager.

The "causa belli" of the Powers is danger of the Legations in Peking.

It is clear that before the hope of an understanding can be even entertained, these two primary "causa belli" must first be removed. The Imperial Government at Peking is doing its utmost to remove the "causa belli" of the Powers, and, I am now certain, will succeed in bringing the Ministers safely to Tientsin. It therefore remains for the Powers to decide whether they on their part are willing to remove the "causa belli" of the Chinese people. I venture to add that, in justice to the Viceroys and others who are being tasked to the utmost to keep the peace, the Powers should lose no time in coming to a decision. Every delay not only makes the keeping of the peace more difficult, but even impairs the hope of maintaining it.

*P.S.*—The reigning prince of his native state asked Confucius what should be done to secure the submission of the people. Confucius answered: "Uphold the cause of the just and put down every cause that is unjust, and the people will submit. But uphold the cause of the unjust and put down every cause that is just, then the people will not submit."

The preceding article was published in the "Japan Mail," an English newspaper printed in Yokohama, with the following introductory letter:—  
TO THE EDITOR OF THE "JAPAN MAIL."

SIR,—In asking you to publish the following article, I wish to say that I do so entirely on my own responsibility. The article was written and ready for publication on the 27th July. At that time H.E. the Viceroy had just sent, in the joint names of himself and of H.E. Liu, of Nanking, a long telegram to the British Government on the subject of this article. The statements given in the present article as "authorized statements" are a free translation in the English press in the sense and spirit of that telegram. The rest of the article are my own comments in order to make those statements intelligible and clear.

I had at first obtained authority from H.E. the Viceroy to prepare a translation of the substance of his telegram for publication. But afterwards on learning that I had made a long article of his telegram, His Excellency, under advice and other extraneous influence, which I could not control, withdrew his authorization. I did not submit to His Excellency my whole article beforehand, because, for one reason, in order to make him see the force of it, it would have taken me a long time to put the article into proper Chinese

literary form, and, in the agony of the situation, every minute was precious. For I had intended with this article to save Peking as well as the Legations there. I believed then,—and I almost believe it now,—that if I could have succeeded in arresting and allaying somewhat the storm of indignation, natural at the moment, on the part of foreigners against H.I.M. the Empress Dowager and her Government, the panic and mutual agony on both sides would calm down a little to enable those responsible persons in authority to take a clearer view of the situation and to solve it without any unnecessary bloodshed.

But as that could not be, I then took steps so that the article might reach the Marquis of Salisbury. I believed in Lord Salisbury and in, if not the generosity, at least in the love of fair play of the Anglo-Saxon race. I do not know to this day whether the article has reached his Lordship. In any case, if it has, I do not now find that the article has had the influence upon the policy of Great Britain and of the Powers which I had hoped for. I therefore now take solely upon myself the responsibility of publishing this article to the civilized world.

As I propose to write a full criticism of the present policy of the Powers in China in another paper, I shall limit myself here by saying that I do

not think the Powers have yet adopted a policy which will solve the present Chinese question.

In the meantime I venture in addition to the suggestions already contained in the present article, to offer three more :—

I. That H.B.M. the Queen, as the Doyenne of the Lady Sovereigns of the world, be graciously pleased to send, as soon as possible, a direct open telegram to H.I.M. the Empress Dowager—not in official language, but in simple language of the heart,—expressing sympathy for the trials and hardships which H.I.M. the Empress Dowager, her son and her suffering people have gone through, in the present trouble.

II. That the foreign Ministers, and especially the British Minister, should issue an ordinance making it penal for any foreign or Chinese newspapers published in the Treaty ports in China to publish anything which is insulting or disrespectful to the person of H.I.M. the Empress Dowager as well as of H.I.M. the Emperor of China.

III. That Sir Robert Hart should instruct the Commissioner of the Statistical Department in Shanghai to publish an Imperial Gazette of China giving besides regularly, an accurate translation of the *Peking Gazette*, such authoritative information about the public events in China, which may from



time to time be necessary to contradict the mischievous rumours of the public press.

The first two of the above suggestions may appear sentimental. But I will support this "politique du cœur"—to adapt the beautiful French expression "la politesse du cœur,"—by hard, commonsense practical reasons. The Chinese, as a nation, by the very foundation of their civilization, admire, respect and fear moral force more than mere physical force. Blind, unintelligent physical force as that of the foreign Powers necessarily is from insufficient knowledge, will only demoralise the Chinese. If therefore the foreign Powers or their high responsible agents now in China really wish for a peaceful settlement, the sooner they apply real, intelligent, moral force the better. What is most urgently needed at the present moment is to convince the Chinese nation that the people of Europe and America are really not "devils," but human beings like themselves with a heart.

The foreign press—especially the foreign press in Shanghai—have completely lost their commonsense. But it would be a terrible misfortune if responsible foreigners now in China should also lose their commonsense. Appealing to this commonsense I would use for the defence of the Chinese people—for even the horror of Paoting-fu and Tai-

yuan-fu in the present Boxers trouble,—the same argument which the Hon. Mr. A. J. Balfour with his admirable English good sense had used when the local authorities in Great Britain with all their police machinery, could not control the mobs from violence and breaking up the Pro-Broer meetings of Mr. Stead and his friends. Mr. Balfour, on that occasion, said that people must not expect too much of human nature. Chinese human nature is the same as European human nature and the Chinese with that human nature, when under the terrible impression that people are going to exterminate them and not allow them to live, will do terrible things against such people. Moreover, the Chinese, too, have a national feeling, and when that is outraged, they will resent that outrage.

The whole situation in China now is a terrible mutual scare. The Chinese are in a scare for their national existence as a race, and the people of Europe and America are in a scare for the lives and properties of their fellow countrymen in China. I am sorry to see that Sir Robert Hart by his article has helped to intensify the scare on the European side.

I am not pessimistic like Sir Robert Hart. I therefore think I am doing a service to both Chinese and foreigners, even in China, by unloosening this terrible mutual scare.

Now, from my official position here as well as from my knowledge of the present state of Government in China, acquired after sixteen years spent in three of the greatest Yamens,—the Viceregal Yamens of Canton, Wuchang and Nanking—I say emphatically that the one and only person at the present moment in China who is fully able to prevent a not improbable terrible civil war in China, or at least a state of disorder and anarchy equally disastrous for all true and legitimate interests of foreigners as well as Chinese—is H.I.M. the Empress Dowager, if she is strongly, morally and intelligently supported.

I therefore make the commonsense suggestion of appealing directly to the heart of H.I.M. the Empress Dowager to convince her that foreigners, even in China, are not “devils,” but human beings with a heart. If the latter suggestion in the above sentence should appear unjust, I would refer to the atrocious charge which foreigners in China have allowed the foreign press of Shanghai to make against H. I. M. the Empress Dowager of attempting to poison her son, H. I. M. the Emperor. I can excuse the foreigners in China for allowing such a charge to be publicly made, only under the supposition that they are in a terrible scare. It will be remembered that under the terror of the French Revolution a similar atrocious charge was

made against the French Queen, Marie Antoinette, who defended herself by simply saying :

“ I appeal to all the mothers of the world ! ”

I have thought it necessary to refer to this atrocious charge, because the one grave danger of the situation in China now lies in the well-known feeble health of H.I.M. the Emperor, and in the fact that the Heir Apparent to the legitimate Government in China now is the son of Prince Tuan.

The foreign Ministers in Peking by presenting the “ irrevocable terms ” have put the accused, China, *hors de débats*, *i.e.*, pronouncing judgment and passing sentence without hearing what the accused has to say,—a judicial procedure adopted in civilized Europe only during the reign of terror of the French Revolution. Now, I would ask all foreigners in the Far East who wish for peace, even for their own interests, to support me to find some means of stopping the execution of the sentence which the foreign Ministers have passed upon China,—especially upon Prince Tuan and the alleged offenders in the present trouble, until they have read the series of articles which I propose to publish for the solution of the present Chinese question.

Some years ago, during the Yangtsze Riots, I ventured by the courtesy of the *N.-C. Daily News*, to publish an article entitled “ *Defensio Populi ad*

Populos." The London *Times* in a leading article commenting on it said that the article was probably not written by a Chinaman, or if it was, "the language had not that repose which stamped the caste of Vere de Vere."

Now, as an unknown Chinaman appearing to speak publicly for the first time in his own name and on his own responsibility, I think the civilized world has a right to ask my qualifications to speak on this great and important question. I think it therefore necessary to say that the present writer is a Chinaman who has spent ten years of his life in Europe in studying the language, literature, history and institutions of Europe, and twenty years in studying those of his own country. As for his character, I will only say this much: although the present writer cannot boast to be a *chevalier sans peur et sans reproche*, yet, I think those foreigners in China who have known me personally and come in contact with me in any relation will bear me out when I say, that the present writer has never, by any unworthy act, sought the favour or deserved the disfavour of the foreigners in China.

In conclusion, I take the liberty of publicly asking H.E. the Russian Minister in Japan to most respectfully and humbly bring what I have here written to the notice of H.I.M. the Emperor of Russia. His Imperial Majesty will graciously

remember that I had the honour of acting as interpreter between His Imperial Majesty and H. E. the Viceroy when H.I.M. visited Hankow some years ago.

I also take the same liberty of asking H. E. the German Minister in Japan to most respectfully submit the same to H. H. Prince Heinrich of Prussia, who during his visit to Wuchang honoured me with special marks of his friendship.

In thus taking the liberty of publicly making use of their high names, I hope H.I.M. the Emperor of Russia and H. H. Prince Heinrich will pardon me for so doing. For I am compelled to do so, not only on behalf of China and the Chinese, but also in the cause of the peace and civilization of the world, which, I know and believe, having heard it from their own lips, both His Imperial Majesty and His Royal Highness are most anxious to preserve.

WUCHANG. KU HUNG-MING, M.A.  
(Edinburgh).

---

*P.S.*—I am exceedingly grieved to say that just as I had finished writing the above, the news came that the carrying out of my second suggestion given above in its present form has become impossible. I had intended, by making the above suggestion, the honour and glory of helping towards

a solution of the Chinese question and the peace of the world for the much revered and August Lady just departed, as the crowning act of her long life. But I am grieved that now it cannot be.

I therefore now modify the above suggestion by asking H. E. the Russian Minister to most respectfully and humbly bring my suggestion to the notice of H. I. M. the Empress Dowager of Russia, who, I think, now is the most fit August Person to carry out the suggestion.

K. H. M.



II.

*DEFENSIO POPULI AD POPULOS,*

OR

THE MODERN MISSIONARIES CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO  
THE RECENT RIOTS.

---

MOTTO :

“It is men that can make a religion great and not religion that  
can make men great.”

Discourses of Confucius : Bk. XV. chap. 28.

---



IN view of the recent repeated popular outbreaks against the missionaries, I propose here to examine the activities and objects of the missionary enterprise in China and, after such an examination, to see if the time is not come, both in the interests alike of Chinese and foreigners, when the foreign Governments should be asked to undertake, if not the entire withdrawal, at least some modification and control of the whole mission scheme as it now exists in China.



The avowed objects of the missionary at the present day, which I will proceed to examine, may, I think, be summed up thus :—

I.—The moral elevation of the people.

II.—The intellectual enlightenment of the people.

III.—Works of charity.

I.—Now, this was the real legitimate object for which the Chinese Government was originally asked to sanction the preaching of Christianity in China. As originally conceived, it is surely an object worthy of all support. Any scheme that could raise the people morally higher and make them better citizens and nobler men, would be a scheme worth the costs of all merely temporal interests. If, therefore, it can be shown that the modern missionaries by their present modes of preaching Christianity in China, are or have the remotest hope of carrying out this object, then, I say, let them be protected and, if need be, supported by gunboats and grape-shot against the people. But can it be shown? If the mere embracing of the forms of Christianity which the modern missionaries are bringing into China, were really the means of making men morally higher, better and nobler, one would surely think that the best of the nation—and it is not denied that there are still good and noble men in China—would be the people

most likely to be attracted by it. But is it so? I appeal to every foreigner who is at all acquainted with the minds of the best and most educated Chinese to say whether such can be converted, whether the very foundation of their national faith and culture can bear such a superstructure as the forms of Christianity which the missionaries bring into China. Is it not, I say, on the contrary an open secret that it is only the worst, the weak, the ignorant, the needy and the vicious among the Chinese, who have been or could be what the missionaries call converted? If any one should think that this is too strong a statement, I challenge him to show me that the missionary converts are as a class not to say morally higher, but even as educated and as good and useful citizens as those of the Chinese who have not been converted; I ask him to show that these converts, men who have lost the faith of their fathers, who are bidden by their foreign teachers to have no sympathy with, if not to despise the traditions or memories of their own past history, who live isolated and as outcasts in the midst of their own race and people; that these men, when once the mere hope of pecuniary benefits and other external influences are withdrawn, will not turn out to be worse than the worst of the Chinese are at present. If any one should still doubt the truth of what I

say here, I would ask him to read the story of the Taiping Rebellion which ought properly to be called by the future historians of China, the Rebellion of the Chinese Outcasts of the Christian Missions in China. Morally and intellectually the Taipings are a type of the Christian converts in China.

I appeal, therefore, to every foreigner in China who has any opportunity of judging, yes, I appeal to the missionary himself, to ask his conscience and say whether the carrying out of this part of the programme, namely, to make the Chinese by evangelising morally better and nobler, has not turned out to be a miserable failure. I ask him, the Protestant missionary, to search his heart and say whether it is not the sense of this miserable failure which has lately made him turn to what he calls the teaching of science and works of charity; the two other objects of the mission which we will now proceed to consider.

#### II.—Intellectual Enlightenment.

This surely is also a great and noble work. If the exchange of perishable commodities is necessary and valuable, how much more so is the interchange of imperishable ideas between nations. If then it can be shown that the missionary enterprise in China is an intellectual movement; that the missionaries are bringing light where before there was only darkness; that they, by connecting, so to

---

speaking, the higher currents of thought, are bringing the East and West closer together: then, I say, let them have the support of all good men. But I ask again; *can* it be shown? No doubt the protestant missionary has lately taken a great deal to what he calls science and scientific teaching. He can no doubt tell his native pupils that the mandarins are foolish to make a fuss about the eclipse of the moon; but will he not in the very next hour have to tell the same pupils that the sun and moon *did* stand still at the bidding of the Hebrew General Joshua, and that the book in which this true fact is recorded, is a holy book written at the dictation of the all-wise Author of the Universe? Now, I appeal to every one who has the cause of intellectual enlightenment at heart, to say whether anything can be more anti-scientific than this—to call it by no harsher name—intellectual jugglery. The fact that the missionary is himself unconscious of it, only proves the subtlety and magnitude of the mischief it can do. I say, therefore, whatever amount of mere scientific information the Protestant missionary is capable of bringing into China, they bring also with them a canker worm which must eventually put an end to all hope of intellectual enlightenment for the Chinese. For was it not against this same intellectual jugglery that all the great emancipators of the human spirit in Europe

have fought and are fighting to this very day? Indeed, to any one who knows anything at all of the struggle for intellectual enlightenment in Europe, how curious and absurd it must seem to see these men of religion, who in Europe have burnt and persecuted, here in China pose themselves as the champions for the cause of science and intellectual enlightenment. So far then is it from being true that the missionary enterprise in China is an intellectual movement, any one who will take the trouble to look into that mass of impenetrable darkness that goes under the name of missionary publication in China, can easily convince himself that it is this mass of darkness that really makes the educated Chinese intellectually despise the foreigner; and when the educated Chinese see that this mass of darkness is being thrust upon the people with all the arrogant and aggressive pretensionsness of the missionaries on the one hand, and by the threat of gunboats on the part of the foreign governments on the other hand, it makes him hate the foreigners with a hatred which only those can feel who see that all which they hold as the highest and most sacred as belonging to them as a race and nation, their light, their culture and their literary refinement, are in danger of being irreparably defaced and destroyed. This, let me say here, is the root of the hatred of foreigners among the educated Chinese.

I say, therefore, if to the missionary's legitimate object of evangelising a certain indulgence is due from those who still believe that the spirit apart from the mere form of Christianity can at least do the Chinese no harm, certainly this pretence of theirs to preach science with anti-scientific jugglery deserves no such indulgence. If I have said that the work of evangelising in China is a failure, I must say that the loud talk on the part of the missionaries lately of science and scientific appliances to make China strong and powerful (with the eventual object, no doubt, of fighting against their own nation) is either a palpable imposture or a delusion.

### III.—Works of charity.

This, although surely a well deserving one, is, it must be admitted, a secular work, and as such must be judged by the balance of merely temporal interests. If the Christian missions in China are to be but a mere scheme of charity, let it be proved that, as a charity, it is worth its cost. No doubt the Protestant hospital and Catholic orphanage are the means of doing good to a number of individual Chinese. But can it be shown that even this amount of good is an adequate compensation for the outlay in money alone, apart from other considerations, which the people through their Government, have had to pay for the special

protection and indemnification of the missionaries in China? I should think the interest of all the money which has been thus spent alone would pay for an infinitely larger and more efficient staff of mere secular doctors and nurses (European if you will) to do the good which these missionary institutions are now supposed to do. If, then, the Christian missions are to be regarded as a charity for alleviating Chinese suffering, let me ask again, whether the work actually done is worth the enormous sum of money which the missionaries are so loud in proclaiming that they, forsooth, are spending every year for the benefit of the Chinese? Let it be shown, I say, how much of the millions which the people in Europe and America subscribe for the support of the missions, goes actually to the alleviating of Chinese suffering, and how much of it goes to the maintenance of the missionaries and their wives, to the building of their fine houses and sanitariums, to the cost of postage and paper for their voluminous letter writing, and to the holding of their conferences and other fads. Considered, therefore, as a mere scheme of charity, I ask, is it not an open secret, known to every disinterested foreigner in China, that the whole missionary enterprise in China is but a huge scheme of charity for the benefit of unemployed professional persons from Europe and America?

In presence of this subject of charity one really feels loth to have to speak like this ; but I think the truth should once and for all be spoken. Moreover, I would ask the most generous to say, when these men who are paid to bring peace and good-will to this nation, now heap insults and cry vengeance upon the Government which with all its difficulties, is still honestly trying to protect them ; when these men, who profess to preach mercy and loving kindness to this people, now threaten them with shells and grape shot for what, even in these late riots, the most hardened legal prosecutor in a court of justice could prove to be nothing worse than excusable ignorance : I call, in fact, upon the most generous to say whether these men can ask that tenderness should be shown, when one is but speaking the truth to them.

But my object here is not to have the mere wanton satisfaction of speaking home truths to the missionaries. I have now shown you that their work of evangelising is a failure. I have proved that their pretence to teach science and carry intellectual enlightenment is either an imposture or a delusion. I have further shown that, regarded as a mere scheme of charity, the whole missionary enterprise in China, taken at its best, is but a huge scheme of charity for unemployed professional persons and, as such, not worth its cost,



even in the money spent on its support. And my object in showing this is to ask every intelligent and disinterested foreigner to say, if he finds what I have shown (make what exception and modifications he will) to be substantially correct, I ask him to say whether this huge and worthless scheme of charity should be allowed to imperil—as at this moment it threatens more than ever to do—not only the lives and properties of four hundred million Chinese, but also the large commercial, industrial and other interests which the people of every nation in Europe and America have now at stake in this country. For it is, I think, not difficult to show that the presence of the missionaries in China is a danger and injury to the interests alike of Chinese and foreigners.

I will now prove that the present support of the missionary enterprise in China by the foreign governments is both an insult to the Chinese nation and an injury to their interests. I say it is an insult to the nation because, when the high Chinese officials, who now employ a large staff of technical and educated foreigners in their service, see that even these men do not believe in what the missionaries say, what must they think to see the foreign government still back up these missionaries as religious teachers sent to raise the morality of the people? I say further, it is an insult, because

while the Consuls are seen ordering up gunboats for the support of the mission cause, the very coolies in their Consulates know that the missionaries, as a body, are not looked up to by the better class of foreigners as their moral teachers.

But it is not only as insults that the Chinese people complain against the presence of the missionaries in China. I have already alluded to the vast outlay of money which the people through their government have had to pay for the special protection and indemnification of the missionaries and their property. Moreover, in all cases of these riots, the foreign public can only judge from what the missionary, an interested party, has to say on his side of the question, and the people are not heard. Now, on behalf of the people, I think it is but fair to submit the following considerations to every candid and fair-minded foreigner.

It is, I think, admitted that the only two effective checks upon wrong-doing of every kind are the law and public opinion. But the missionaries here in China, who are allowed to gad about the country with a *comitatus* of what I have called the outcasts of Chinese society, their converts, have no law immediately before their eyes, because the Consuls are far away and the Chinese have no jurisdiction over them. They have no fear of public opinion, because they are in touch, with a few

exceptions, only with the Chinese outcasts, their converts. I submit, therefore, before the people are condemned, even in these riots, that it should be shown that the missionaries, without the two restraints which I have said are necessary for ordinary men, are capable of doing no wrong; that they, with their natural partiality for their Chinese outcasts, their converts, and their high notions of their own saintliness, are incapable of insolence and aggressiveness, of high-handed meddlesomeness and petty tyrannies to the Chinese among whom they live. If any one should doubt whether the missionaries as a body are capable of these things, let him read and note the tone and spirit of the public utterances of these men in the newspapers, not only on questions where Chinese are concerned, but on social questions concerning foreigners only, whenever the particular facts and other selfish interest of the missionary bodies happen to be concerned. I say, therefore, before the Chinese people are morally condemned in the Court of foreign public opinion, let it be shown that these riots are not the explosions of popular indignation at the accumulated amount of petty insults and injuries, to which the stories about the babies and their eyes are but as matches to set the already heated mass ablaze. (See Foochow Wu-shi-shan riot case, 1879.)

This, then, I say, is the real burning grievance of the masses of the Chinese people against the presence of the missionaries in China ; the fact that this class of what I have called the unemployed professional persons from Europe and America, with a *comitatus* of the Chinese outcasts, their converts, should be let loose upon the country with no other restraint to keep them from insulting and injuring except their mere profession of godliness. This, let me here emphasise, is the root of the hatred of foreigners among the masses of the Chinese people, whereas that which I have shown under II is the root among the educated classes. The missionaries are thus responsible for these, the only two deep causes of the hatred of foreigners among the Chinese.

But all the miseries which the Christian missions have brought upon China may be summed up in that one ugly diabolic fact: the Taiping Rebellion, which I have already called the Rebellion of the Chinese Outcasts of the Christian Missions in China. It was this rebellion which has changed the face of what we once fondly and proudly called our Flowery Land as from the face of a smiling maiden into that of an old haggard woman.

I will only here spend a few words to show that the presence of the missionary in China is also a danger and an injury to foreign interests. I need here only ask every intelligent foreigner to consi-

der what an old experienced foreign Consul once said to me: *that what permanently injures the Chinese must in the end also injure the foreigners.* Therefore, if there is any truth in what I have shown, that the missionaries, instead of doing good, do real harm to the Chinese, it follows necessarily that the presence of the missionaries is also an injury to foreigners. But I have said that the missionaries are also really responsible for the Chinese hatred of foreigners. Now, surely the hatred of the Chinese cannot possibly do the foreigners any good. At this critical state of China, I maintain that this hatred is threatening to do a great deal of harm to the large commercial and other interests which foreigners have now in China. All silly and sentimental hatreds ought, of course, to be put down. But the hatred that is just in the core of it, I am convinced, no amount of shells and grape-shot can put down. Those who will try to do it will only demoralise and in the end injure themselves. The missionaries are now clamorous for gunboats, and would lead the foreign public to believe that the officials are merely selfish in asking foreigners not to make a display of gunboats in these missionary riots. But those who know the temper of the people ought, I think, to tell the foreign public that the first shot from a foreign gunboat fired in a missionary cause will be the signal of a war, not against the Government—as our foreign

wars have hitherto been—but a war against the Chinese people. The missionaries have been loud in their denunciation of the “opium war”; but what will they say to a “missionary war,” of which we are now on the eve, unless there is enough of commonsense, if not the sense of justice among disinterested foreigners, to prevent it. I appeal, therefore, to this commonsense, the sense of justice among foreigners, to say whether the time is not come when the foreign Governments should be asked in the interests alike of Chinese and foreigners to undertake, if not the entire withdrawal, at least some modification of the missionary enterprise in China, which I have shown at present to be a mere worthless scheme of charity for unemployed professional persons from Europe and America.

I have now spoken of what I have for long years meditated, and hesitated, from personal and other deeper considerations, to speak. But now I have spoken. *So hilf mir Gott: ich kann nicht anders.\**

A CHINESE.

*P.S.*—What I have written above applies equally to Protestant and to Catholic missions in China. But I should be wanting in justice and to the cause of truth if I do not append this *morceau* from the *Journal d'un interprète en Chine*, by Mons. le Comte d'Hérisson. The ardently patriotic Count,

---

\* 吾豈好辯哉吾不得已也

I may say here, was the interpreter and confidential secretary of the French General who led the French forces, together with the English, in their march upon Peking. The Count says:

“Je manquerais à la fois à la justice et à la vérité si je ne rappelais pas ici quel puissant concours nous trouvâmes en Chine dans le personnel des missions catholiques. Tous les renseignements qui parvenaient au général—et l'événement démontra leur précision—tant sur les ressources des provinces que nous allions avoir à traverser, que sur les effectifs des troupes que nous allions rencontrer devant nous, lui étaient procurés par l'intermédiaire des jésuites, qui les faisaient relever par des Chinois à leur dévotion. Les rapports confidentiels exigeaient, non seulement une profonde connaissance des hommes et des choses, mais encore ils indiquaient chez leurs auteurs un véritable courage car ils pouvaient les exposer à des représailles terribles de la part des Chinois quand nous aurions quitté le pays. Les jésuites ont, à cette époque, fait preuve d'un patriotisme ardent et du plus admirable dévouement.”

Now, I appeal to every foreigner, be he Frenchman, English or German, to say whether against a body of men who are capable of this *patriotisme ardent* the Chinese people are not morally right in hurling, as they are now doing, with what power they have, their “*Ecrasez l'infâme?*”

III.  
*FOR THE CAUSE OF GOOD GOVERN-  
MENT IN CHINA.*

---

PRACTICAL CONCLUSIONS.

---

MOTTO:

“Depend upon it, when we grope in the dark, as we must in the East, the best course is that which is just and right.”

GENERAL GORDON.

---



THINK the time has now come when it is both opportune and necessary to examine into the present policy of the Powers in China. I wish only to repeat here that I am writing entirely on my own responsibility and I alone am responsible for my opinions.

SPIRIT AND ATTITUDE.

Now, before any hope can be entertained for a satisfactory solution of the Chinese problem, it is first of all absolutely necessary for the Powers radically to change the spirit and attitude of their



policy in dealing with the Chinese Government and Chinese officials. A writer in the *Japan Mail*, Mr. E. H. House, writing on the past policy of the Western nations towards Japan, says, "Strangers to the country chose to set up a theory that the policy of Japan was a maze of dissimulation and fraud; and that any action which aliens could not comprehend at all, must necessarily be part of a deep and all-embracing scheme of deception. It was the absurdest of fallacies, yet it stood as the basis of European diplomacy for a score of years." This, then, I have no hesitation in saying, is the *fons et origo*, the fountain-head of old disasters in the intercourse between the foreign Powers and China. It is this spirit of suspicion which, being as it were in the air, infects every foreign Minister and especially every British Minister, and produces a kind of jaundice which makes him see everything yellow in China.

As I am here not writing as a mere partisan for the Chinese, but in the cause of truth, I will deny that there is certainly a certain want of frankness and plain dealing among the Chinese generally in their intercourse with foreigners. But the reasons for this should be known. Count Cassini, the late Russian Minister, said recently: "The Chinese are a polite people and the English and Germans are—well,—as a rule, not very polite." The fact is,

the average foreigner in China is often very unreasonable and hasty, and the average Chinaman is polite and reserved. When you make an unreasonable request to a really educated Chinaman, it is impossible for him to say "no." His innate politeness will prompt him to use polite evasiveness by giving you a conditional "yes." The late Marquis Tsêng Kuo-fan, in a letter to a friend in 1860 (洋務尺牘) says, "When you meet with foreigners who make insolent and insulting remarks to your face, the best course to take is to smile blandly and look stupid as if you did not understand them." Sir Robert Hart once said to Marquis Ito that the principle with the Chinese is: "It is better to bend than to break." Thus against foreign unreasonableness the educated Chinese are often prompted to use polite evasiveness and against foreign unreasonable violence the Chinese sometimes use a weapon which in Chinese is called *Chi mi* (壓羈), translated by Dr. Giles as "to halter."\* In fact when you meet a violent mad bull, it is of no use to reason with him; the only thing you can do is to halter him!

But Sir Claude Macdonald shall explain what this Chinese *Chi mi*, "haltering" means. Sir Claude's despatch of the 20th Sept., 1900, to Lord Salisbury says:

---

\* Translated by foreigners "to humbug."

“With the object of procuring a postponement or relaxation of the attack, we allowed the Chinese to indulge in the belief that there was a chance of our placing ourselves at their mercy by proceeding under Chinese escort to Tientsin. . . . What we did was neither to accept nor reject it in principle, but to gain time by asking for more details as a preliminary to our final decision.”

It is curious to note here that Sir Claude Macdonald, while in the same breath denouncing Chinese bad faith and treachery, did not seem to realise that there was any moral delinquency in the actual *ruse* and really a kind of treachery which he himself was practising upon the Chinese. It will be said, perhaps, that it was the action of the Chinese which placed Sir Claude in a position forcing him to act as he did. But surely in almost every case the same thing may be said with even greater force for the Chinese.

Now, having made the above concessions as to certain reasonable grounds for foreign suspicion of Chinese ways and methods of action, I think it necessary to say emphatically here that as far as the Imperial Government in Peking is concerned in the present trouble,—from my knowledge of the telegrams and State papers to which my position in the Viceroy's Yamen gave me access—I say emphatically that there has not been the smallest

iota of truth or ground for charging the Imperial Government with bad faith and treachery. Indeed, I think it pertinent here to quote again the words of Mr. House in what he said of the past foreign relations of Japan. Against the statement that large allowances should be made on account of the perplexity and not unnatural suspicion on the part of the foreign envoys, Mr. House asks: "Was any allowance ever made for the perplexities, the torturing anxieties and frequent deadly peril of the Japanese? \* \* \* The officials at Yedo were as open and straightforward as the rulers of a nation could be. They were almost childlike in their frankness. Over and over again they laid bare their troubles and threw themselves upon the mercy of their adversaries, only to be repulsed with contumely and subjected to fresh hardships and indignities."

Now, by changing the words Chinese for Japanese and Peking for Yedo, one would think Mr. House was writing on the events of last summer in China, instead of on those in Japan forty years ago. Indeed, any unbiassed, impartial person who will carefully read the Imperial Edicts and other State papers,\* will see the appositeness of Mr. House's remarks.

---

\* Published now in book form by a Japanese Editor, Mr. 佐原篤介, and called 拳匪紀事.

Now, to give just one instance of the perfect and absolute frankness of the Imperial Government. On the 3rd day of the 6th moon an Edict was sent to the Chinese Ministers abroad instructing them to lay bare the difficulties of the Imperial Government. That Edict said: "We are still at the present moment giving strict instructions to commanders of our troops as before to protect the Legations as far as they see their power of doing so—惟力是視." Thus the Imperial Government did not try to hide from the foreign Governments the danger of the Legations. The Edict did not even simply say that "we have given instructions to protect the Legations," leaving it to be inferred that the protection was absolute and at all cost. The Edict said with perfect and absolute frankness that the instructions were to protect *as far as possible*.\*

VITAL ISSUE.

Having in the above spoken of the spirit and attitude of the foreign Powers towards China, I come now to the broad and vital issue of the Chinese Problem. The broad and vital issue is this. While the Powers require from China the responsi-

---

\*It has been repeatedly asserted that the Imperial Government issued a Decree for the extermination of foreigners. Now, there never was such a Decree. The Decree of 24th of the 5th moon was simply a declaration of war. It is useful to nail this lie here on the counter.

bility of an independent sovereign State, they yet in their dealing with China, take no pains whatever to recognise and respect the rights and conditions by which alone the Imperial Government can fulfil its duties and carry out the responsibility of independent government.

Sir Robert Hart in his generous Irish way has proposed to abolish ex-territoriality. In principle, Sir Robert's contention—to any one capable of political thinking—is incontestable. But let it be frankly admitted here that to abolish ex-territoriality under the present circumstances is impracticable. Goethe says: "There are two peaceable powers: justice and commonsense (es giebt zwei friedliche Gewalten; das Recht u. die Sthicklichkeit)." Sir Robert Hart's proposal is justice: it is not commonsense.

But if the abolition of ex-territoriality is impracticable, it is evidently but just that every care should be taken to minimise its evil effects. Ex-territoriality is an anomaly—injurious already in its moral effect to the cause of good government in China. But instead of minimising the evils of this anomaly, the Agents of the foreign Powers are allowed to introduce a still worse anomaly, namely *in-territoriality*. Not content that the Imperial Government in China should have no jurisdiction over foreigners, the foreign Powers have

allowed their Agents to deny jurisdiction to the Chinese Government over Chinese subjects. The missionaries have been justly blamed for interfering with lawsuits, thus encroaching upon the jurisdiction of magistrates over Chinese subjects. But when the British Minister peremptorily demanded the dismissal of the Viceroy of Szechuan, he was also interfering with lawsuits, only on an infinitely larger scale. The encroachment in this case was not merely upon the jurisdiction of magistrates over Chinese subjects; the encroachment was upon the supreme prerogative of the Emperor; his authority over his public servants. A Viceroy, of course, is punishable for wrong done to foreigners, but he must be punished by the authority of the Emperor and in due accordance with the laws of the Empire.

This principle can be best illustrated from the recent punishment question. The U. S. Secretary of State was the only one who seemed to have had an idea of the principle involved in the punishment question. Now, let me put the case entirely from the foreigners' point of view.

Last summer the Imperial troops in Peking without any justification attacked the Legations, thus outraging the laws of civilised nations. The Imperial Government instead of properly repudiating the action of its Agents, declared war on the Allied Powers. In consequence of this a state of

war existed *de facto* between China and the Allied Powers. Immediately after, however, China sued for peace. The Allied Powers were justified to refuse to make peace until satisfaction had been obtained for the wrong complained of. The wrong complained of was the attack on the Legations. The Allied Powers were right to demand as a condition for making peace that the Imperial Government should absolutely repudiate the acts of its Agents in the attack upon the Legations. But here now comes in the principle I speak of.

An act of war is to inflict punishment upon the nation, not upon individuals. But as in this case certain Agents of the Imperial Government were believed to have been guilty of acts outraging the laws of nations, the Allied Powers were justified, if they thought fit, to exercise what in modern usage of war is called the right of reprisals, *i.e.*, to seize and summarily punish the guilty Agents.\* Such a punishment, however, is an act of war : it is not a judicial punishment.

---

\* Such as the execution of the Provincial Treasurer at Paoting-fu, assuming that he was really guilty of the outrage charged against him. In this case, however, the Allied Army gave no notice of their intention to be unfriendly : therefore, the Chinese looked upon the execution as an act of bad faith and treachery. H. E. the Viceroy Liu's feelings on the execution were 哀憤 pity and indignation.



But the punishment of the guilty by the Imperial Government is quite a different thing. The question for the Allied Powers to decide at the time was whether after such an outrage as the attack upon the Legations, they were willing still to recognise the existence of the Chinese Government. If the Powers decided not to recognise the existence of the Chinese Government, then it was evidently the duty of the Powers to immediately take over the responsibility of Government in China. But if the Powers recognised the existence of the Chinese Government, as they evidently did, then the Powers were bound to respect the sole and absolute jurisdiction of the Imperial Government over all Chinese subjects.

Now, as soon as a state of war is created, the right and wrong of the quarrel becomes at once one, not between individuals in the nation and the foreign Powers, but between the Chinese nation and the Allied Powers. As far as punishment is concerned *vis-à-vis* the Allied Powers, war with its consequences, is, in itself, a punishment. What then the Imperial Government really owed to the Allied Powers was simply to absolutely repudiate the act of the attack on the Legations. But as soon as the Imperial Government repudiated the act of the attack on the Legations, all persons responsible for the attack were guilty of crime—not *vis-à-vis* the

Allied Powers—but against the authority of the Sovereign and against the peace and security of the Empire: all such persons were liable to punishment. But the punishment of Chinese subjects from the highest State Ministers to the meanest Chinese subject—as long as China is recognised as an independent sovereign State—can only be carried out by the sole authority of the sovereign and in accordance with the laws of the Empire.\*

I have in the above purposely assumed the case entirely from the foreign point of view, namely, that the Chinese were entirely in the wrong. But in reality the attack on the Legations was merely the result of a *fracas* between the Legation guards and the population of Peking, joined in and aided by Chinese soldiery. The deplorable thing about the incident was that foreign Ministers as well as inoffensive persons, and helpless women and children

---

\*As a matter of fact, H.I.M. the Empress-Dowager actually entrusted the trial of the guilty persons to the highest recognised Tribunal in China for trying State criminals. The Tribunal called 三法司 (San Fatse) is composed of the chapter of the Lord Chancellor (大理寺卿) corresponding to the House of Lords: of the Presidents of the Censorate (equivalent to the House of Commons), and of the Minister of the Department of State for Justice, acting as Law Adviser to the Crown. In the present case, as there were Princes among the guilty, the Department of the Imperial House was substituted for that of the Lord Chancellor.

were involved in the danger resulting from the *fracas*. Indeed, to the last, that was the view taken by the Imperial Government. On the 14th July, the Chinese Ministers, as soon as they could put themselves in communication, solemnly invited the foreign Ministers to "transfer themselves, their families and their staff to the Tsungli Yamen for safety, without, however, taking a single armed foreign soldier." The object of the proposal, the Chinese Ministers said, was to preserve friendly relations intact from beginning to end. The *fracas*, in fact, had become too serious, and the only feasible way to save the foreign Ministers and non-combatants, women and children, was to separate them from the actual participators in the *fracas*. Sir Claude Macdonald, however, could see in the proposal nothing but treachery and cynicism!

The fact is, the final verdict of a dispassionate and judicial mind on the events of last summer, it seems to me, would be: The foreign Ministers first lost their commonsense; then the Chinese lost their temper; finally, the people and Governments in Europe and America lost both their temper and their commonsense.

The admirals have been blamed for taking the Taku Forts. The blame is unjust. The attack on the Taku Forts was no doubt deplorable—because after that, the Imperial Government, to preserve its

self-respect, had no alternative but to declare war. But the admirals were military men and they had to judge the situation given them by the diplomats, only from purely military considerations. In fact the admirals were committed to the situation by the acts of the Ministers. The real and initial *blunder* in the whole crisis, however, was the sending of the Legation guards. The most ordinary dictates of commonsense would say: If you show and appeal to force, you must show and appeal to sufficient force. Now, when the whole population, not only of Peking, but of all North China, were seething with strong feelings,—if matters not rightly or wrongly—against foreigners, to send into the middle of that population a mere handful of strange-faced, strange-garbed, strange-speeched, swaggering soldiers, and that, too, not under one commander, but in batches under different independent commands! Well, I think, loss of commonsense is a very mild expression to use in characterising the action of the foreign Ministers.

Technically, the protection for the foreign Ministers was their credentials, as the protection for a *parlementaire* in war is his white flag of truce. When the foreign Ministers brought Legation guards, the credentials technically lost their value or,—as it might be argued, that the Chinese Government consented,—at least to the extent that the

Imperial Government was relieved from the duty of protection, the Ministers having chosen to protect themselves instead of depending upon the Imperial Government for protection.

In fact the vital issue of the whole Chinese Question is here very forcibly illustrated. The Powers are indignant and horrified. Lord Salisbury spoke of the outrageous conduct of the Chinese—because China is supposed to have violated the law of *sanctitas legatorum*. But nobody seemed to have been aware that the foreign Ministers first also outrageously violated an equally important law of nations—the inviolability of the soil in China—by sending soldiers into the Capital of the Empire. Now, after the experience of the disastrous results of such a policy, the Powers, while swearing to uphold the integrity of the Chinese Empire, build a fortress commanding the Emperor's Palace. As I have said, if you appeal to force you must appeal to sufficient force. If the Powers wish to dragoon China, well and good; but they should at least maintain an effective dragooning; otherwise the Chinese Empire will fly to pieces.

Indeed, since the experience of last year, the Powers instead of reconsidering their past policy and recognising past mistakes, have determined, it seems, not only to persist in, but even to aggravate the mistakes of their past policy. In the first

place, instead of immediately sending out new men with fresh minds to obtain new light on the situation and to seek a satisfactory solution, most of the Powers persisted in keeping the very men who had brought about the situation, whose nerves had been broken and whose feelings must have been embittered by their experience—to conduct the negotiations for peace. The result, of course, was the twelve irrevocable Articles.

1. The very objection which the Foreign Ministers have made to the constitution of the Tsung-li Yamen\* applies with greater force to the constitution of the concert of foreign Ministers.

---

\*The Tsung-li Yamen is properly a Committee of Council for Foreign Affairs like the Foreign Affairs Committee in the U. S. Senate. It is a deliberative and consultative body. Its great defect no doubt is the want of an Executive Head. But there is a reason for its present constitution. In the first place, all the State Departments in Peking are really deliberative and consultative rather than executive bodies. The only really executive body in Peking is the Chün Chi Chü or Cabinet (erroneously named the Grand Council). In the second place, as China is really a constitutional Government, *i.e.*, a Government which has to depend for support upon the public opinion of the educated classes, it was necessary to have in the Committee of Council for Foreign Affairs all the Great Notables in the Metropolitan Government to satisfy public opinion. But the foreign Ministers, instead of trying to understand the *raison d'être* of the Tsung-li Yamen, object to its name, as if a rose by any other name would not smell as sweet!

Without a recognised and responsible head, it was not possible to conduct the negotiations speedily and satisfactorily to a definite conclusion.

2. The dictation of irrevocable terms is justifiable after a success in war, but such terms are generally confined to the immediate reparation of present and past wrong and to the state of military operations. In so far as guarantee for the future is concerned, the presentation of the irrevocable terms is a mistake in that for the foreign Ministers to assume that they know better than the Imperial Government what will prevent future popular outbreaks against foreigners, and was the very policy which had brought on the present disaster. It could not have done any harm, so far as guarantee for the future is concerned, to have asked the Imperial Government to state what measures it had to propose as guarantee for the future.

3. In fact most of the terms of the 12 Articles are on the principle not of the robber's "money or your life," but of money *and* your life. For to carry them out means the impossibility of good Government in China. I have already spoken of the Punishment Question. The carrying out of that article is the most serious blow to the stability of the Empire. It was solely the personal influence of H. I. M. the Empress-Dowager which had made

it possible to carry out that sentence without causing the Chinese Empire to fly to pieces. Then there is the erection of a fortress in the heart of the Capital, of which I have also spoken. I will only here further mention the stopping of examinations. Apart from the question of justice, I would point out here that the holding of examinations in China is not so much a privilege for the people like the franchise in Europe; but it is rather a function, a very vital function, of the Government in China for carrying out the principle of the open door,—*carrière auverte aux talens*. Now, to demand from an engineer that he should keep his engine in order and at the same time to order him to stop up one of the most important tubes in the engine that, I think, would be considered egregiously unreasonable. Nevertheless, that is what the Powers have asked of the Imperial Government in stopping the examinations.

Now, I think I have said enough to show that the foreign Powers in China do not only exercise ex-territoriality, but also in-territoriality. At present it would seem further that Chinese officials appointed to important positions in China must first receive a semi-official *exequatur* from the foreign officials. As a consequence of this, I may mention here, this province of Hupeh has been deprived of a Civil Governor for the last 8 months,



and H. E. the Viceroy having to occupy himself with Imperial questions and protection of missionaries, the actual civil administration of the province is in danger of going to the dogs! Another consequence of the interference of foreigners in the appointment of Chinese officials is that men of the most worthless character, reputation, education, and ability, merely by acts of subserviency, intrigue, if not actual corruption, in order to curry favour with foreign officials and foreigners of influence, are enabled to push themselves forward in the public service. The latest example of this is the appointment of the new Chinese Minister\* to Japan, to which I would venture to direct the attention of the Foreign Office in Japan in order that it may investigate whether Japanese officials in China had taken any part in connection with this appointment. Indeed, it is the favour and countenance shown to such men in China by foreign officials and foreigners that makes it hopeless to reconcile some of the best elements of the Chinese nation to a friendly attitude towards foreigners and things foreign.

In addition to all the above, it is only necessary to mention the well-known facts that Roman Catholic missionaries are allowed openly to interfere in lawsuits between their converts and the

---

\* An Ex-Taotai of Shanghai.

non-Christian Chinese population. The Protestant missionaries not only interfere with lawsuits, but openly preach rebellion in the foreign newspapers and through the native press. Lastly, there is an increasing number of foreigners whose sole business is to lend their names to every disreputable business carried on in all the Treaty ports.

In view of all the above, I think any one who will take the trouble to study the facts must see that it is really a heart-breaking business for the Imperial Government to maintain good government in China. China, too, in its government, is a country without the machinery of police. Peace and order are maintained by the commonsense and goodwill of the population. Now, when the commonsense of justice and propriety of the population is outraged, a riot breaks out which the local authorities have no means wherewithal to quell, and after the riot, the people have to pay—and that exorbitantly—as may be seen from the bills of the Roman Catholic missionaries, yes, and of the Protestant missionaries too, lately sent in to the Provincial Governments.

But all those local and particular injuries are nothing to the sum of all injuries which is effected by the exercise of in-territoriality by foreign officials; the people of China are deprived of the benefits of good government. Lord Beaconsfield said:

“Unless the actual Government which exists in a country has absolute power to do what it thinks right, good government in that country is an impossibility.” Now, the Powers in China will neither take the responsibility of Government in China nor will they allow the Imperial Government to do what it thinks right. What the Powers actually do, is to paralyse the Central Government. When the Central Government is paralysed, then the Provincial Governments and the officials of the Empire are demoralised. I will say here that there is at bottom a great deal of justice in the recent and present clamour for Reform. The actual administration of the country is getting worse and worse. This is not the place to enter into the question of the present state of Government in China. I will do that in another series of papers. What I want to say here is that reform is only possible when the Central Authority in the Imperial Government can do what it thinks right and the laws of the Empire have sole and absolute force over at least all Chinese subjects. In short, the only condition under which good government in China is possible is when every Viceroy and Governor as well as all high officials entrusted with an office are made to feel responsible with his head to Th.I.M. the Empress-Dowager and the Emperor, not merely for the protection of foreigners, much less for gain-

ing the favour of foreign Governments, but for good government, *i.e.*, for the character, conduct and competency of every subordinate official under them, and for the well-being and good government of the people entrusted to them.

Now, to sum up. The broad and vital issue of the Chinese Problem is this. The foreign Powers must distinctly and absolutely decide either to take over the responsibility of Government in China or to leave that responsibility to the Imperial Government. If the Powers decide to take over the responsibility: well and good. But if the Powers, on the other hand, decide to demand responsibility of good government from the Imperial Government, then the Powers' plain duty is to absolutely recognise and respect all the rights of the Imperial Government as an independent State—with the exception, at present, of jurisdiction over foreign subjects.

#### GOVERNMENT OF FOREIGNERS.

The exercise of ex-territoriality in China, however, renders the Powers responsible for the good government of their subjects. Anyone who will take the trouble to read the Blue Books and Parliamentary papers of Great Britain of the early thirties of the last century will see clearly that what actually moved the British nation to send a Representative of the Crown to China was because

at that time no one was responsible for the good government of British subjects, and the state of no-government among British subjects at Canton had become too scandalous. The chief and original object of keeping a British Minister in China—is not to further trade, but to look to the good government of British subjects.

People now talk a great deal about Imperialism. Imperialism means disinterested government—a government absolute in power without fear or favour to do what it thinks right for the good government of the nation. But it is now difficult for a British Minister to be disinterested. The British Minister is now made responsible, not to his King for the honour of his country, but to the 600 odd petty kings who sit in the House of Commons. The British Parliament was originally a *witan*, a meeting of wise men: it is now a meeting of interested men.

I really wonder it never occurred to men of the English governing class; that it is, to say the least, rather mean to speak so much and so loud about British interests. The reason why the English gentleman despises the mere “professional” is because the latter is supposed to think of and care only for interests, *videlicet* money. At any rate, the men who built up the British Empire did not

speak of interests, but of duty. Sir Richard Macdonald, a soldier like Sir Claude, who was at one time Governor of the Straits Settlements, said to a deputation of his countrymen in Singapore: "I am sent here by the Queen to *govern* you, you potatoe planters." In the British Colonies, where Chinese settle, the British Government has had the common-sense to appoint an official as Protector of Chinese. In the Treaty ports in China, the British Government might do well to appoint a similar official as in the Colonies, for the benefit of the poorer class of Chinese who cannot afford to engage lawyers as bullies to protect them from rowdy and unscrupulous British subjects. As for trade, instead of appointing a Commercial attaché to teach British merchants how to trade, or to act as *touts* for them to influential progressive mandarins, a Commission composed of men like the above Sir Richard Macdonald might be advantageously appointed to enquire what is legitimate trade, *i.e.*, trade which benefits the British nation as well as the Chinese; and what is illegitimate trade, *i.e.*, trade which merely benefits British individuals to the injury of the abovementioned legitimate trade beneficial to the Chinese as well as the British nation. For, as the late Sir Thomas Wade said: "What permanently injures the Chinese, must in the end also injure the foreigners, even in China."

But to sum up. The first and paramount duty of foreign Powers, while exercising ex-territoriality is to take strict, adequate, and effectual measures for the good government of each of their respective subjects. The problem of maintaining good government among foreign subjects is not, it must be admitted, easy, for ex-territoriality is an anomaly in the law of nations. But as if the above problem is not a sufficiently difficult one, the Powers have now tried to increase its difficulty, by senselessly claiming a separate concession each for itself, at every Treaty port. Thus, each Treaty port now is become a Balkan Peninsula, with miniature petty States, each bristling with materials for explosion. The one reasonable cause, it should be said here, for the European Powers to claim a separate concession, lies in the mistake of the British Government in investing the chief authority and power over the British settlements, not in the British Consul, but in the municipality composed of a majority, in every case of British merchants. For a foreign Power to submit its subjects to the authority, although municipal, of a British official, is bad enough, but it is too much to expect a foreign Power to submit its subjects to the authority of British merchants. In fact, as the late Mr. A. J. Froude,\* once pointed out, in a community of

---

\* "Ulysses' Bow."

a mixed population, it is impossible to carry out representative Government: in such a place, you must have Imperial Government. A population with strong racial and national prejudices can never succeed in electing a truly representative Government. In order to abolish the senseless separate concessions, which in the interests of good government of foreigners should be done, the constitution of the foreign settlements should be inquired into and modified.

**THE REAL DIFFICULTY.**

But the real and, I am afraid, almost insurmountable difficulty in the Chinese Problem, is—the Concert of the Powers: the Concert only in name, not in reality. Indeed, the late events in North China showed clearly that, as during the terror of the French Revolution, because the different political parties were afraid to quarrel, they allowed all kinds of atrocities to be perpetrated; so in China, because the Powers are afraid to go into war, they prefer to allow all kinds of atrocities to be done to the Chinese. But it is of no use for the Powers to shirk their duty: the duty which they owe not only to the people of China, but to the cause of civilization. The Powers must peacefully agree to absolutely respect the integrity of China as a Sovereign State, or they will have to fight. As



to the other alternative of a peaceful partition, apart from the impossibility of such a solution, the Hon. Mr. Brodrick has said: "As far as Great Britain is concerned, it would be madness to attempt to administer any portion of Chinese territory."

There are three Powers with whom the solution of the Chinese Problem lies: Great Britain, Russia and Japan. Englishmen like Admiral Seymour are fond of calling the attention of the world to the fact that they opened China to the Western nations, but they never think of their responsibility for the consequence of the act. The fact is Great Britain is still the paramount Power in China to-day, for good as well as for evil. As by my recent writing I have even incurred the ill-will of many Englishmen, I shall not incur the suspicion of wishing to court their favour when I say here that among the elements of the foreign influence in China, the British element to-day is still best. For instance, the British Consular service is not merely the only one organised and regulated service, but it includes within it some of the best types of foreigners in China. But in saying that Great Britain is the paramount Power in China to-day, I have no hesitation on the other hand in saying that Great Britain is *mainly* to blame for the present state of things in China. The reason why things in China have got into such a mess, is because

British Statesmen have had no policy in China ; even the wrong policy, "putting money on the wrong horse," is not consistently carried out ! I can hear British Statesmen say to themselves : "We are willing to do right towards the Chinese, but you see other people won't ; therefore, the only thing we can do is to look after our own interests, honestly if we can but"—Now, it is this "but" policy of Great Britain which has brought about the present pitiful, pitiable, tragic muddle. If, however, British Statesmen lose their sense of duty, and think of only their interests, and that, too, with a "but" and an "if," then Great Britain will cease to be the paramount Power in China. The policy for Great Britain, even for her own interests, is given in the words of Gordon I have put as the motto to this article. Great Britain, however, must be ready to fight for maintaining that policy and, being willing to fight, may escape the necessity of fighting after all.

As far as Russia is concerned, if she becomes the paramount power in China, it will not be of her own inclination. The British newspapers and the uncontrollability of the British democracy alone will force Russia, against her will, to assert her power in the Far East and become the paramount Power in China.

The last Power in whom lies the solution of the Chinese Problem is Japan. In so far as the

interest of the well-being of her people is concerned, Japan has a larger stake in the solution of the Chinese Problem than any of the Powers in the present Concert. With her present armament alone, Japan can dictate a policy to the foreign Powers in dealing with China. But in order to do that Japan must not study the Chinese Question with foreign spectacles. As soon as Japan gets a right and clear view of the real issues in the Chinese Question, Japan will perhaps be the Mark-graf (*Jo-i shogun*) of the civilization of the Far East.

#### A QUESTION OF CIVILIZATION.

Foreigners say to me: "All that you advance is very fine and true. But why doesn't China arouse herself and fight? The world now recognises no right, but force, physical force." To this objection, I will say that the "Boxers" ought to convince the world that the Chinese are not unwilling to fight. Sir Robert Hart's countrymen think that Sir Robert lost his wits when he prophesied about the future of "Boxerdom" in China. But I will here give two facts from Chinese history which will show that Sir Robert Hart may not be very far wrong after all.

I. In the 12th Century of the Christian Era, the Chinese nation, having found out that civilization, as Mr. Ruskin says, means the making of civil

persons, had in consequence forgotten or lost the art of war. When, therefore, the Chinese then came face to face with the Mongol hordes from the North, they were helpless. In 1260 the Mongol Chieftain, Kublai Khan, actually seated himself on the throne of China to *dragoon* the Chinese nation. In 1361, just one hundred years later, the Chinese had re-learned the art of war and, under the first Emperor of the Ming dynasty, Chinese chivalry again arose and drove the Mongol hordes out of China, back to their homes; at least, such portion of the savage intruders as would not take to the Chinese civilization and become civil persons.

II. When in 1850 the Taiping Rebels raised the standard of rebellion in Canton, the "literati" governing class were helpless; but in about ten years the "literati," who took off their long gowns, had learned something of the art of war, and in 1864 the rebellion was at an end.

But what I want to say here is that the question whether the Chinese nation will have to fight or not, is a very grave question for the cause of civilization in the world. In a fair fight, I have no fear as to the issue for the Chinese. But the danger to civilization is even this. Before the Chinese are ready to fight, the present policy of the foreign Powers may drive the Chinese nation to bolt and run "amok." What can be possibly done by

human means to prevent such "an amok," should be done, if not for the sake of humanity, at least for the sake of material interests. The people of Europe and America do not realise the present state of suffering of the Chinese population. Even the middle classes in China, not to say the lower classes, are now living just on the verge of starvation, and the foreign diplomats fondly think the Chinese people will quietly starve themselves to death—to pay not only for the actual damage done, but also for the glory and fireworks of modern Kolonial Politik. Moreover, if the Western nations wish to rob the Chinese people, then let them do it at least by open violence, as lately in North China; but for the love of God and man, let them not hand the Chinese people to the tender mercies of modern European usurers, called financiers and capitalists. I will say here that the Chinese people can even now, for the sake of peace, afford to make the sacrifice of paying for a reasonable indemnity. But in order to do this the Central Government must have perfect freedom of action, *e.g.*, absolute power to command every Viceroy and Governor to give a faithful account for every tael of public money, or to answer it with his head.

I have said that the issue at bottom of the Chinese Problem is a grave question of civilisation. In Europe, after the Thirty Years' War, the Congress

of Westphalia was called to consider questions which, like the present questions in the Chinese affairs, concerned the interests of civilisation. I venture, then, to ask that, before the present final treaty of peace is ratified, it should be submitted to such a Congress as the Westphalia Congress, not only to revise, but, if necessary, to completely change the whole treaty.

Mr. Montague Bernard Chichele, Professor of International Law and Diplomacy, speaking of the Peace of Westphalia says :\*

“The work of the Westphalian Congress was a Treaty of Peace. A Treaty of Peace, if you dissect it, commonly divides itself into several distinct parts. First, there are what diplomatists have called the general articles—a declaration that peace is restored and a clause of *Amnesty*. Secondly, there are provisions judged NECESSARY TO REMOVE THE CAUSES OUT OF WHICH THE WAR AROSE, REDRESS THE GRIEVANCES COMPLAINED OF AND PREVENT THE RECURRENCE OF THEM. This is the one essential thing which the negotiators have to do, and the PACIFICATION IS HOLLOW and imperfect if they fail to do it clearly and effectually. Thirdly, there is the Indemnity or satisfaction exacted by the stronger belligerent for

---

\* Four Lectures on objects connected with Diplomacy. McMillan & Co., London, 1868.

the injury sustained and for the cost of the war. Lastly, provision is made for the due execution of the foregoing stipulations.”

---

The above was originally published in the *Japan Mail* with the following introductory remarks :—

I have not kept my promise to write a full criticism of the present policy of the Powers in China, for two reasons.

First, because I understand the British authorities have taken umbrage at my writing, and have formally complained to H.E. the Viceroy. I, of course, hold myself amenable to His Excellency's displeasure. I do not know whether the action of the British authorities is sanctioned by the British Government. But in view of it, I think it useful here to bring publicly to the notice of Lord Salisbury, a cipher telegram which I sent to his Lordship last summer.

During the most acute period of the crisis last year, while the Shanghai papers had telegrams saying that the Viceroy here was training his guns on the foreign settlement in Hankow, our Yamen's telegrams from Shanghai were unanimous that Admiral Seymour had designs on the Yangtze. Sure enough, Admiral Seymour was bringing troops to Shanghai, and an officer of the British Army was

prowling round Wuchang. One foreign Consulate sent its Agent to me repeatedly, telling me to warn the Viceroy against British designs. I bluntly told the Agent that his Consul was off his head, and I showed him the Reuter's telegram in which the Hon. Mr. Brodrick said it would be madness to attempt to administer any portion of Chinese territory. Lastly, came a telegram from H.E. Viceroy Liu, of Nanking, in which H.E. expressed his conviction that we were merely sitting and waiting for destruction—*坐以待斃*. Thus the mutual scare was serious, and was likely to produce a catastrophe. I was helpless and in despair because I could not convince our people of the baselessness of the reports of British designs: while on the other hand I did not know what mischievous report might have reached Lord Salisbury.

Just at this juncture a telegram came from Lord Salisbury offering to fight Prince Tuan for the Viceroy!! I at once saw a chance of relieving the tension of the situation. The Viceroy was in need of money. I boldly advised the Viceroy to ask for a loan from Lord Salisbury. That was my cipher telegram. My object was to tell Lord Salisbury to have confidence in us and not to send troops. I knew the Hongkong and Shanghai Bank would jump at the business under Lord Salisbury's



guarantee. The loan, which was thus sure to succeed, would be the means of restoring mutual confidence, which I have reason to believe, it did. I was only sorry Lord Salisbury did not sufficiently understand my cipher to stop the landing of troops in Shanghai. I was still more sorry to learn, semi-officially, that Lord Salisbury was disappointed because the British Government did not get any "substantive" advantage for the loan. I should have thought peace on the Yangtze was worth half a million taels, not to say merely the loan of that amount.

I am really sorry to have to introduce this personal element here. But in view of the action of the British authorities to injure me with the Viceroy, I think it right that Lord Salisbury and the British people should know what I have personally done for the preservation of peace on the Yangtze.

My other reason for not writing on the actual situation is this: While I felt myself perfectly at liberty to expose my own person to any unpleasant consequences by my writing, I did not yet think it right from my subordinate position in the Government service to embarrass the responsible high Agents of the Imperial Government who were conducting the negotiations, by writing on the details of the negotiations, especially while the case was, so to speak, still *sub judice*.

IV.

LATTER-DAY NOTES ON THE CHINESE  
QUESTION.

---

[No. 1.]

(First published 22nd December, 1900.)

---

MOTTO:

Sunt quibus in satira videor nimis acer et ultra legem  
tendere opus.

---

1.



THE last *N.-C. Daily News* has an article:  
“The Signs of a Break-up.” The  
editor and his friends are of course  
jubilant. But I think foreigners in  
China have not seen “the last of the  
bonnets of bonnie Prince Tuan.”

“Ere the King’s crown go down, there are crowns to  
be broke.”

2.

The Powers are certainly going the right way  
about it for a break-up, *i.e.*, by taking sides with  
the parties and persons in the country. *Divide et  
impera.* That was how Poland was partitioned.

The Yangtze Viceroys are now on the same footing as the Shanghai tea-shops who put up sign-boards with the characters "foreign merchants," to tell people that they are under the protection of some unscrupulous alien.

## 3.

Frederick the Great said of Maria Theresa that she was always crying and stealing. The British nation, I mean the man in the street, who has now the keeping of the conscience of the British nation,—is always protesting and stealing. In Africa, Mr. Chamberlain tried to steal and when caught, denied; then bullied the Boers into sending the ultimatum which made proud but unthinking Lord Salisbury flare up, and now—the Transvaal is annexed.

## 4.

I prefer the German method of open robbery to Mr. Chamberlain's method of stealing. The German method has the look of the old Viking method. Mr. Chamberlain's method looks very like Judas Iscariot's.

## 5.

Barrabas the Robber and Judas Iscariot have now entered into partnership to uphold the integrity of China! Judas' game is apparent enough.

He wants to steal, and if he should be caught, he can call upon Barrabas to back him up.

6.

It is time the sham of the "open door" policy is exposed. The British—I mean the British Judas, not the British nation,—have invented the "open door" policy, because they want to leave the cost and responsibility of government in China to the poor Empress-Dowager and her mandarins, while they get what they want—all the benefit. Heads I win, tails you lose. The British Judas knows, too, that while he has the "Opium monopoly" and a Sir Robert Hart in Peking, he is better off *statu quo* than Barrabas or anybody. *Voila tout!*

7.

It is a wonder to me that the Empress-Dowager does not "strike." I really don't see the fun of being the master of a house with an "open door" by which every vagabond, mischief-maker and busybody, over whom I have no control, can come and do what mischief they like, and when in consequence my house is set on fire, nobody pays me compensation, but instead I have to apologise to the mischief-maker and pay him damages! That is the plain matter-of-fact side of the "open door" policy.

## 8.

Great Britain and America send all their unemployed mischief-makers and busybodies who domineer and intermeddle with everything from the Empress-Dowager to the poor women's feet. Germany sends all her German-Jew doggery, who swindle and demoralise the mandarins. France sends all her "black dragoons" who protect all scoundrels and rascals. When China, under such circumstances, gets on fire,—all the world and his wife wonder!

## 9.

A poor widow lately had guests in her house who would not allow her to manage her own house in her own way and who willfully or ignorantly sets the house on fire. Then when distracted with distress and not unnatural resentment, the old lady still tries to send servants to their rescue, these guests barricade the door and shoot at the servants. What is the old lady to do? All sensible people would say—to leave such unreasonable guests to take care of themselves and take care of her own house in the best way she can. That is the pitiable tragedy of the siege in Peking in A.D. 1900.

## 10.

A true guest in your house is a friendly, unarmed, helpless person, who trusts wholly to you

to protect him from harm. The more wholly he trusts to you to protect him, the more he approaches the true character of a guest and the more sacred your duty to protect him. But a person who is not friendly to you, who tells you to your face that he does not trust you and who, in your house, not only arms himself to defend his person against you, but flourishes his pistol in your face, such a person is not a guest, but an intruder, and an enemy whom you have a perfect right, if you like, to shoot down. I wonder why publicists will talk Latin and not tell people in plain common-sense English what *sanctitas legatorum* means.

11.

As all the Powers are complainants, judges and executioners all at once, I suppose the Empress-Dowager will have to pay—pay—pay! But if I were the Empress, I would refuse to pay—even if the Powers had hold of me to send me to St. Helena—unless the Powers promise in future not to send to China any more of the three items—the German-Jew doggery, the black dragoons, and the busybodies.

12.

Ruskin once said that all bishops should be hanged. I would not even hang all missionaries in China. The man in the street is now trying to

throw the whole blame of the present trouble on the missionaries. But honest Injin! If I have to choose between German-Jew doggery and bishops, I think I would vote for bishops.

## 13.

Nevertheless, I think all bishops and missionaries in China who have ever made common cause with the German-Jew doggery and now join him in his howl against the Chinese,—such missionaries should be hanged right off like Judas Iscariot who sold his Master for thirty pieces of silver. The rest of them should be horse-whipped because, like Peter, they have denied their Master and not stood up and spoken for the weak against the strong,—for Prince Tuan against the Allied Army. Practical men nowadays do not believe in God or the Devil; they believe only in Interests. What interests then have practical men to still pay for bishops? That is perhaps because bishops are useful to practical men in exemplifying the modern gospel of knowing on which side the bread is buttered.

## 14.

Confucius says: “The gentleman understands what is right; the cad understands what will pay.” He says again: “The meek respectable men of a place, who always rub their hands, agree with you, and take the respectable popular side of every

question, such people are they who unmercifully destroy all feeling and sense in man for virtue, honour and manhood (*virtus*).”

15.

A man in a crowd during the French Revolution, excitedly bawled out, *je demande l'arrestation des lâches et des coquins*. “I ask for the arrests of sneaks and cads.” Now, the real culprits responsible for the present state of things in China are not—by almighty God, no,—not Prince Tuan and his Boxer lads. The real culprits are not even the German-Jew doggery and the missionaries. The real culprits are the sneaks and the cads. Without the sneaks and the cads, the German-Jew doggery would not exist and the missionaries would not do harm—might even do good in China.

16.

In old Jewish times, a cad was called a Scribe, and a sneak a Pharisee. Now, if you want to see the utter caddishness of the modern Scribe, you have only to read the Shanghai papers and see how they speak of the Empress-Dowager. Indeed, it is really funny to see how a writer in the *N.-C. Daily News* tries to show his caitiff spite to the last drop of his thin sour, *petit bleu* blood, by repeating the word “slave girl” every time the name of the Empress-Dowager is mentioned.



## 17.

Another leader writer in North China, just before the present trouble, expressed the opinion that the Empress-Dowager had saved enough of money to make her wish, in case of trouble, to fly to Shên-si and make herself comfortable for life. It never occurred to this writer that it is impossible for the *aristocratissime* Empress of the Chinese Empire—like a Commissioner of Customs under Sir Robert Hart—to go home and make herself comfortable for life. The sneak's only and constant fear in life is lest he has not somewhat to put between his upper and lower mandibles!

## 18

Two thousand years ago, a Czar of China gave peace to the then Chinese world by burying alive four hundred scribes—called *literati*—who were at that time the ablest editors of the yellow press in China. The present Czar of Europe has tried to give peace to the world by the Hague Conference and has failed. The next Czar of Europe who wants to succeed must employ the ancient Chinese Czar's method.

## 19.

The Chinese Minister at Paris has told the world that the present peace negotiations are a mere show. It needs no ghost from the grave to

tell us that. For there will be no peace for China, or for the world, while the sneaks and cads are having it all in their own way, no peace possible until some honest thinking Czar in Europe, rallying all good men and true, starts on a cad and sneak hunt—where there will be real fine noble excitement and fun, which the present disgraceful Boxer hunt of the Allied Army has not. The only excitement of the Boxer hunt is loot.

20.

But what I want to call the attention of the world to—and of any strong honest Czar, Kaiser, President, Emperor, King, Statesman, who will listen to me, is this: that the sneak and the cad have entered into partnership. The sneak in Great Britain is known as the man in the street. His official title is Imperialist. Genealogically, he is the true descendant of Judas Iscariot. The cad in Germany is the German-Jew doggery. His official title is Kolonial Politik. Genealogically, he is descended from Barrabas the robber.

21.

I have been trusting for these four months, before speaking, to the traditions and feelings of the British nobleman, the English gentleman in Lord Salisbury to see him, while dealing with China, put his foot down upon the sneak, the man

in the street,—the Imperialist in Great Britain. I have also been trusting to the traditions and feelings of the Hohenzollern race, the preussische Officier, in H.I.M. the Kaiser, to put his foot down upon the cad, the Germany-Jew doggery, Kolonial Politik in Germany. But since they have failed me, now I have to tell them that if they will not take care of civilization, the Empress-Dowager, Prince Tuan and his Boxer lads will have to take care of it.

## 22.

The friends of Mr. Kang Yu-wei are now very sad because they cannot reform China and the Empress-Dowager. They will be very much sadder when they find in the end that instead of Mr. Kang Yu-wei reforming China and the Empress-Dowager, Prince Tuan and his Boxer lads will reform and change the face of Europe and America.

## 23.

The Empress-Dowager, Prince Tuan and his Boxer lads are not the enemies, but the real true friends of Europeans, and the true European civilization that has been trying to realise itself since the last Great Boxer rising in Paris in '89. For the Empress-Dowager, Prince Tuan and his Boxer lads have risen against the real enemies of

Europe, of the world and of true civilization,—the sneak and the cad who have just entered into partnership to cheat, swindle, bully, murder and rob the world and finally to destroy all civilization in the world.

24.

Now, in conclusion, I would ask you, Mr. Editor,\* to rally all good men and true to join with us first in wishing bad luck and eternal damnation to the new partnership of the sneak and the cad, and then to commence and wage an unceasing relentless war of extermination against the two species—wherever and whenever we find them—the sneak and the cad.

25.

Last of all, as to-day is the 66th birthday of H.I.M. the Empress-Dowager, I take the opportune occasion to ask you, Mr. Editor, and all good men and true who read these notes of mine, whenever they meet at this Yule-tide of the year, to drink as I am going to do to-day, to drink a big bumper to the health, happiness, long life—ten thousand years—and prosperity of Her Imperial Majesty the Empress of China, coupled with the name of Prince Tuan and his brave, braw, bonnie laddies.

---

\* This article was originally addressed to the Editor of the *Japan Mail*.

To the Lords of convention 'twas Prince Tuan who spoke :  
 E're the King's crown go down there are crowns to be broke ;  
 Then each Boxer lad who loves fighting and fun,  
 Let him follow the bonnets of bonnie Prince Tuan.

    Come fill up my cup, come fill up my can ;  
 Come saddle my horses, and call out my men ;  
 Unfurl the banner and let fire the gun,  
 For it's up with the bonnets of bonnie Prince Tuan.

Prince Tuan he is mounted, he rides up the street,  
 The yells they shout backward, the drums they are beat ;  
 But Li Hung-chang (douce man) said : " Oh ! please sir man man  
 We will try to get rid of that de'il of Prince Tuan."

    Come fill up my cup, come fill up my can ;  
 Come saddle my horses, and call out my men ;  
 Unfurl the banner and let fire the gun,  
 For it's up with the bonnets of bonnie Prince Tuan.

There are lands beyond Shense and hills beyond Szechuen ;  
 If there's " Changs " in Hupeh, there are " Lius " of Hunan ;  
 There are brave men millions four hundred and one  
 Will cry : " Hey for the bonnets of bonnie Prince Tuan."

    Come fill up my cup, come fill up my can ;  
 Come saddle my horses, and call out my men ;  
 Unfurl the banner and let fire the gun,  
 For it's up with the bonnets of bonnie Prince Tuan.

Then away to the hills, to the lea, to the rocks,  
 E're I own a usurper I'll crouch with the fox ;  
 And tremble, ye de'ils in the midst of your glee,  
 Ye hae no seen the last of my bonnets and me.

    Come fill up my cup, come fill up my can ;  
 Come saddle my horses, and call out my men ;  
 Unfurl the banner and let fire the gun,  
 For it's up with the bonnets of bonnie Prince Tuan.

IV.  
*LATTER-DAY NOTES ON THE CHINESE  
QUESTION.*

---

[No 2.]

*(First published 5th January, 1901.)*

---

MOTTO :

Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento !

---

1.

66  
11  
11



PERSON who tries to put on the air of a strong and proud man, but who in reality is a weakling and coward at heart—is he not like one of your mean, small men? Yea, is he not like a cowardly thief or a sneaking pickpocket?''\* That is a Confucian description of one type of Englishmen at the present day, of whom Lord Rosebery is the most conspicuous representative.

---

\* Confucius' sayings, Chap. XVII., sec. 12.

## 2.

“In ancient times,” says Confucius again, “men had three kinds of imperfections which are perhaps now not to be found \* \* \* Proud men in old times were unexacting and reserved, but pride nowadays merely shows itself in touchiness and wilfulness of temper.” † That is the description of the other type of Englishmen at the present day, of whom Lord Salisbury is the best representative.

## 3.

The British aristocracy are very proud and sometimes overbearing because they were originally conquerors who came into the country in 1066. That is the origin of the English pride. To this day, the British Army is not like the Continental system, a national army to protect the land and people, but it is like the Manchu Army in China: a Royal Army, an army of occupation to defend the person and honour of the Queen and the governing class.

## 4.

Emerson says: “In England, the fact seems to me intolerable, what is commonly affirmed that such is the transcendent honour accorded to wealth and birth that no man of letters, be his eminence

---

† Idem sec. 16.

what it may, is received into the best society except as a lion and a show."

5.

In consequence of this, when in the middle of the last century, Great Britain was in the throes of a revolution, no real able man could come to the help of the aristocracy or governing class. The greatest intellect living then, Thomas Carlyle, was vegetating and spoiling his temper in a Scottish bog. In their helplessness, the British aristocracy met a young Jewish lad who was not particular in making up to them. This Jewish lad, who fortunately proved to be a man of imagination and no common ability, became Lord Beaconsfield.

6.

Lord Beaconsfield said that he first understood the state of Government in Great Britain when he discovered that the so-called Liberal Party was really an oligarchy—of the *bourgeois*, or Cockney class. Lord Beaconsfield then led the mob to help the gentlemen to pull down the Cockney and to destroy the oligarchy. After having destroyed the oligarchy, Lord Beaconsfield saw that the mob could not govern; he therefore proclaimed Imperialism.

7.

Lord Beaconsfield in his latter days said: "I do not know whether the theory of the divine



right of kings is any longer tenable, but I believe unless the Government which actually exists in a country has absolute power to do what it thinks right, good government in that country is an impossibility." Lord Beaconsfield's Imperialism, therefore, meant government absolute in power, without fear or favour, to do what it thinks right—in fact, Imperialism means disinterested government.

## 8.

After Lord Beaconsfield's death, the British aristocracy again became helpless, and their doyen, Lord Salisbury, met a Birmingham lad with a Cockney intellect. This Birmingham Cockney has been trying to toady to the pride of the British aristocracy by copying the flag of Lord Beaconsfield's Imperialism and waving it aloft for the self-assertion of the Anglo-Saxon race!

## 9.

Really, were it not so tragic, the picture of the fine old British aristocracy, now hard-up for money as well as in ideals and ideas, being led by a small Birmingham Cockney lad with his "Imperial" rag of Anglo-Saxon self-assertion, would be as comical as the picture of the Scotch "pennyless lass with a lang pedigree."

10.

A boy in a Board school was lately asked to define Roman citizenship, when he gave this answer :

“Roman citizenship was a ship on which the Romans went out ‘fishing free of charge.’”

I wonder whether Lord Salisbury and the real British nation know how many British subjects of the mean and greedy Cockney class have come out under the flag of the bastard Imperialism through the “open door” into China with the purpose of “fishing free of charge.”

11.

But I do not blame these poor hungry Cockneys in China. I am only sometimes disgusted to see these Cockneys who, though living beyond their means, have lately, as I can see, become barefacedly dishonest, try to swagger over honest Chinese coolies, and twaddle about the corruption of Chinese Mandarins. Poor devils! The only hope of these mean, hungry Cockneys in China now is some kind of windfall such as the “loot” of Tientsin and Peking. *Non ragionam di lor.*

12.

Confucius says : “Perfectly honest men it has not been given me to see, but if I could only meet

with men of some kind of principle, I would be satisfied. But in a state of society in which men must pretend to possess what they really do not possess; pretend to have plenty when they really have nothing; and pretend to be in affluence when they are really in actual want—in such a state of society it is difficult to be a man of principle.” (Chap. VII., sec. 25.)

## 13.

The men, however, who are really responsible for the “free fishing” of the British Cockneys in China are the “sneaks and cads,” who now honeycomb the public service of the bastard Imperialism of Great Britain. I could see from one instance. Sir Claude MacDonald honestly tried to clean the public service in China. But poor Sir Claude! What a mess he has made of things now. His was, it must be said, an impossible task. The special mandate given to him was not to uphold the honour of his Queen and the good name of Englishmen; his special mandate was to uphold—not right, but the “rights,” of British merchants,—nay, even to join the game of grab at Peking for substantive advantages for British merchants. I could see at one time the problem of reconciling his instincts as a soldier and a gentleman and the task set for him to do nearly drove him mad.

14.

I remember reading Sir Claude's first speech, on China in Hongkong, when he spoke of "fighting to uphold the rights in China which his forefathers gave their blood to acquire, &c." To fight for and stick to "cattle and chattel" which one has openly robbed. Certainly, that old Scotch Highland method is not dishonourable. But to fight for and stick to the right of stealing! In all conscience, although open robbery under circumstances may not be disgraceful, yet stealing, I should think, is always disgraceful.

15.

Indeed, it was tragic to me to see how the "Jackal" theories of the life of the political economists, against which Carlyle and Ruskin spent their lives in fighting, have turned even the hard Scotch head of a soldier and gentleman such as Sir Claude—as far as I can read—really is. But for the baneful influence of those "Jackal" theories and the choking pestiferous air of sneakhood and caddom, which weighs upon the foreign population in China, I believe Sir Claude would have seen on examining into it, that the present treaties of China with the foreign Powers are what Sir Claude's fathers would have called an Iniquity decreed into a Law!

## 16.

I transcribe here the following for the benefit of the true British soldier and gentleman who may be at this moment in China. In addressing the cadets at Woolwich, Ruskin says: "The fatal error of modern institutions is to take away the best blood and strength of the nation, all the soul substance of it that is brave, and careless of reward and scornful of pain, and faithful in trust; and to cast that into steel and make a mere sword of it, taking away its voice and will; but to keep the worst part of the nation—whatever is cowardly, avaricious, sensual, and faithless—and to give to this the voice, to this the authority, to this the chief privilege, where there is the least capacity of thought. The fulfillment of your vow for the defence of England will by no means consist in carrying out such a system. You are no true soldiers if you only mean to stand at a shop-door to protect shop-boys who are cheating inside."

## 17.

But to return. I have said in the last of these notes, that the real culprits responsible for the present state of things in China are the sneaks and the cads. I will now go further and say that the real source of evil in China and in the world at the present moment is not even the sneak and the cad;

but the "devil of pride" in the British nation, in the British aristocracy, in Lord Salisbury. It is this "devil of pride" which now threatens to break up—not China—but the British Empire.

18.

Mathew Arnold has already remarked that it is really not so much the selfishness and injustice of the British nation as the want of amiability of the British governing class which has kept and will always keep the "Irish sore" open.

19.

Recently, it was the pride, the untutored excessive wilful pride, and not selfishness, of Lord Salisbury which enabled Mr. Chamberlain and his Cockney class to shout "Majuba" with effect and to let loose hell in Africa. Lord Salisbury's speech, after the Boers' ultimatum, was veritably a lion's roar, of pride, not of selfishness.

20.

In fine, this "devil of pride" in Lord Salisbury is the real culprit responsible for Mr. Chamberlain and the bloodshed in Africa, for the bastard Imperialism, for spheres of influence in China, for the Cockney oligarchy called the "China League" and for the game of grab in Peking—in short, for the present pitiful, pitiable, tragic Chinese Muddle.

## 21.

Emerson, when reprobating the honours paid to Louis Napoleon by the aristocracy of England at the time, remarked: "But—how to resist one step, though odious, in a linked series of State necessities? Government must always learn too late that the use of dishonest agents is as ruinous for nations as for single men."

## 22.

A party of men forcibly set themselves to play a game of grab in an old widow lady's house and in the excitement of the game set the house on fire. Now, what are these men to do? The cad says: "Kick the old woman out of the house." The sneak says: "Well, let her pay for the damage and continue to take care of the house for our benefit." But the honest man, the gentleman's advice, would be: "Gentlemen, if you have really not enough of honesty or money to pay the old lady compensation, you ought at least to have the gentlemanly feeling to apologise to her. At the very least, one thing you ought to do: behave yourselves better in future."

## 23.

In fact, I have come to the conclusion that the only possible peaceable solution of the present Chinese Problem lies in the reform, not of China,

but of Europe, the urgent reform of Great Britain. The reform of China is easy for this one reason: because the sense of common reason and common morality, which is expressed by the Chinese words *tao-li*,\* has so penetrated and permeated into the people that it is now easily and universally understood. It is this "sense" and not cowardice which has for these six months prevented a terrible world explosion.

24.

The Reform of Europe, of Great Britain, is difficult because, as Ruskin says, the only result of the general run of modern European education is to make a man think wrong on every possible subject important to him in life. But reform Europe must, Great Britain urgently must, not only to solve the Chinese Problem, but to save civilization from complete destruction.

25.

Now, for the British nation the first thing to be done in order to make reform possible is to cast the "devil of pride" out of the nation, out of the aristocracy. When that "devil" is cast out, the sneaks and cads who now block the "open door" of the public service will be cleared out.

---

\* In Pidjin English, "Savey."



It was for this "open door" in Great Britain, and not in China, that Robert Burns sang his song of, "A man's a man for a' that." It was for this "open door" that Carlyle preached hero-worship. When the principle of the "open door" is fully recognised and carried out, a new Staatsdienst Adel—to use Heine's words—a new civil or public service aristocracy will arise, which will retain the fine feelings and fine manners of the old aristocracy, and combine with these the ripe culture of modern true Liberalism. Then upon that new aristocracy as a foundation will be constructed the structure of the true Imperialism, more permanent and beautiful, perhaps, than the ancient Roman was, because the new Imperialism will have in it the strongly accentuated Christian element which the Roman Imperialism had not, or not to such a degree. This new true Imperialism of Great Britain, instead of merely asserting by gunboat policy the Anglo-Saxon bully's prestige, will, together with other nations, watch over the civilization of the world.—*Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento.*

## 26.

I have been moved to write these strong words to the British people, because I believe that a peaceable solution of the Chinese Question is

possible. I base my belief and hope for this upon the speech of Lord Salisbury, reported by Reuter, just before the present trouble, in which the noble Marquis said he was convinced four hundred millions of brave people like the Chinese will not, could not perish. To me those few words of the telegram sounded like the brave, chivalrous, but almost agonised cry of cheer to the Chinese nation from, as it were, the soul of the true British nation, voiced by the first British nobleman now living. *Ultime Romanorum! Se tu sequi tua stella!*



IV.

LATTER-DAY NOTES ON THE CHINESE  
QUESTION.

---

[No. 3.]

(First published 12th January, 1901.)

---

MOTTO :

Uneigen nützig zu sein in allem, am uneigen nützigsten in Liebe u. Freundschaft war meine höchste Lust, meine Maxime, meine Ausübung so dass jenes freche spätere Wort: Wenn ich dich liebe, was geht's dich an? "mir recht aus der Seele gesprochen ist." Aus Goethe's Dichtung u. Wahr heit. \*

---

1.



USKIN said a German is selfish even in his virtues. When Ruskin said that he was thinking of Prince Bismarck, not of Moltke, not of Goethe: the two beatified incarnations of Zucht u. Ordnung (order and discipline).

---

\* To be disinterested in all things, and above all in love and friendship, was my highest aspiration, my guiding principle, my rule of life, so that in later days when I wrote the poem beginning with the words "If I love thee, what is that to thee?" the words came direct out of my heart.—Goethe.

2.

M. Waliszewski, in his "Romance of an Empress," speaking of the German Katherine II. of Russia, says: We once heard a German, who occupies to-day a high position in Vienna, declare that, being a cosmopolitan in his tastes, he liked every nationality equally except his own for, said he, along with many good qualities it had one defect which he disliked above all others, it did not know how to be generous.

3.

Indeed, the Chinese, the Scotch and the Germans are the three most selfish nations that I know of in the world. The reason for this, however, is very simple. In Scotland and in North Germany where the climate is cold and the soil not productive, the conditions of life are hard. In China the social custom of early and universal marriage, together with the peaceful pursuits of the people, increases the population to such an extent that the conditions of life also become very hard.

4.

But the Germans, to this day, are not yet a homogeneous nation. Martin Luther was the first to give them a common standard language. But Luther in Germany as John Knox in Great Britain, only prepared the ground of national unity to receive the modern civilization of to-day.

## 5.

As Cromwell became Imperialist to protect the development of the work of John Knox, so Frederick the Great became Imperialist to protect the work of Luther. So great and disinterested was the insight of Carlyle that he could recognise the true Puritan beneath the persifleur, sceptic, *philosophe* figure of Frederick. For in the seven years' war the struggle was really between Prussia the Puritan and Austria the Cavalier.

## 6.

After Frederick, Germany is Prussia. Germany is the Scotland of Europe. The Prussian is the Lowland Scot who, living in a flat country, is devoid of imagination. Moreover, the climate in Prussia is much more severe. Therefore, the Prussian, besides want of imagination, has—a terrible appetite. “In our family,” says Prince Bismarck, “we are all great eaters (lauter starke Esser). If many had such an appetite (Kapazität!) like us, why! the nation would not be able to exist. I would have to emigrate.”

## 7.

Frederick had no imagination. But he had besides geniues, the French culture, *l'esprit*, the quick movement of mind and lucidity of the French culture. After Frederick, the Prussian Puritan for

want of imagination could not continue the Lord Protectorate over Germany. Therefore, Napoleon had to come back with the glorious Restoration at Jena.

8.

Wordsworth, speaking to Emerson of Goethe's "Wilhelm Meister," abused it heartily. "It was," he said, "full of all manner of fornication. It was like the crossing of flies in the air." Now, "Wilhelm Meister" is the great Goethe's picture—true, clear and calm like Shakespear's—of the state of society in Germany under the Napoleonic Restoration.

9.

Intellectual Germany, as was the case in Great Britain, hailed the Napoleonic Restoration, while the Prussian Puritan gnashed his teeth and retired to seek consolation from the *schöne Seele* of his women folk.

10.

Emerson, with great insight, has remarked that what sent Napoleon to St. Helena was not loss of battles, but the vulgarity, the *bourgeois*, the Cockney in him. All the cultivated gentlemen of Europe hailed Napoleon when he came as the bringer of the great Liberal ideas of the Revolution. But when they found out that the Corsican *bourgeois* only wanted to found a dynasty, all the gentlemen

of Europe were disgusted. Then the Prussian Puritan in the uniform of Marschal "Vorwärts" arose and joined the gentlemen of Europe in their chase of the Corsican *bourgeois*.

## 11.

Heine's picture of the Prussian Puritan, the hard unimaginative Lowland Scot, drilled and put into the uniform of Marschal "Vorwärts," is very bitter, but it is a true picture even to this day.

Noch immer das hölzern pedantische Volk,  
 Noch immer ein rechter Winkel  
 In jeder Bewegung u. im Gesicht  
 Der eingefrorene Dünkel.  
 Sie stelzen noch immer so steif herum  
 So kerzengrade geschniegelt,  
 Als hätten sie verschluckt den Stock,  
 Womit man sie einst geprügelt.

## 12.

It is incomprehensible to me how the Powers should have chosen a German Field Marshal, a disciple of Moltke it is true, but still of the "blood and iron" system of Bismarck—to be the Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Army in China. When Katherine II. appointed Prozorofski Governor of Moscow, Patiomkine wrote to the Czarina:

"You have taken out of your arsenal the most ancient piece of artillery which will certainly shoot

in the direction you set it, for it has no motion of its own; but beware lest it covers with blood for ever the name of your Majesty."

13.

But to return. When Marschal "Vorwärts" chased Napoleon out of Germany, he wanted to chase also the great Liberal ideas of the French Revolution. Against this the whole of intellectual Germany arose to fight him. That was the beginning of the "Kultur Kampf."

14.

The true great Liberal ideas of the French Revolution are for "open door," *carrière ouverte aux talents*, in politics and for "expansion" in religion. The inclination to selfishness of the Lowland Scot in Marschal "Vorwärts" made him dislike the "open door" and the want of imagination of the Prussian Puritan hindered him from understanding what "expansion" means in religion.

15.

It is beautifully pathetic to see the *schöne Seele* of the Emperor Wilhelm in his first conversation as Prince of Prussia with Bismarck. The Prince expressed an antipathy against a certain man, because, the Prince said, he was a Pietist. "What is a Pietist?" asked Bismarck. "A person who tries



under the guise of religion to further his own selfish interests," replied the Prince. "That is not the common acceptation of the word," said Bismarck; "A Pietist is a person who believes literally that Jesus Christ is the only begotten Son of God who gave his life as atonement for our sins," etc. "What," cried the Prince, "Is there a man so forsaken of God that he does not believe in that?" "Take care," Bismarck had to say; "if people hear you say that, they will take your Royal Highness for a Pietist."

## 16.

Heine knew the "Pietist" whom the Prussian Prince Wilhelm meant. Heine says:

Ich kenne die Weise, ich kenne den Text,  
 Ich kenne auch die Verfasser  
 Ich weiss, sie tranken heimlich Wein  
 Und predigten öffentlich Wasser.

The "Pietists," in fact, taking advantage of his want of imagination, not only threatened to choke out the *schöne Seele* in the Prussian Puritan, but also the life out of the German people. The struggle between Marschal "Vorwärts" and the great Liberal ideas came to a crisis in 1848.

## 17.

In 1848, the whole German people rose against Marschal "Vorwärts" and his protegés, the

“Pietists,” and threatened to destroy “kingship” and all order and discipline (*Zucht u. Ordnung*) in Germany. As Lord Beaconsfield led the mob to help the gentlemen in great Britain, so in Germany the first thing Bismarck did, on hearing of the row in Berlin, was to call together his Pomeranian *Bauer* (peasants) and ask them if they would go with him to the rescue of the “kingship”—the dynasty, as he called it, in Prussia.

18.

What both Lord Beaconsfield and Prince Bismarck tried to establish was a true Imperialism, *i.e.*, Government absolute in power to do what it thinks right, in fact, disinterested Government. Thus it was that the “blood and iron” system of the great Chancellor came to be instituted in Germany. It was to preserve *Zucht u. Ordnung*, order and discipline, from the violence of the mob—*la force attendant le droit*, might until right is feasible.

19.

The difference between the two—Lord Beaconsfield’s Imperialism and the “blood and iron” system of Prince Bismarck, is very great. In the first place Lord Beaconsfield was an “Oriental” with a fine imagination, whereas Prince Bismarck was only a cultured Lowland Scot with no imagination, with an inclination to selfishness and the ter-

rible appetite of a Pomeranian great eater! But the fundamental difference between the two systems is that whereas Lord Beaconsfield's Imperialism tried to be a Constitutional Imperialism, that of Prince Bismarck was very much a Military Imperialism.

## 20.

Confucius was once asked to say if the principle to ruin a nation could be expressed in one single sentence. "That is difficult," said Confucius, "but there is a saying among the people, 'I find no pleasure in being a ruler except what I order, no man shall oppose.' Now, if what is ordered is right, it is well and good that no man oppose it. But if what is ordered happens to be wrong, and there is no man found to oppose it, well, is not that alone sufficient to ruin a nation?" *Voluntas regis, suprema lex*, therefore, is not accepted by Confucius.

## 21.

The terrible failure of a purely Military Dictatorship in time of peace is that the bayonet of the soldier, which is meant to keep down the violence of the mob, is perfectly helpless against the cunning, the selfishness of the *bourgeois*, the Cockney, the *Philister*.

## 22.

The German *Philister* like his brother Bret Harte's *Ah Sin*, was originally the least unlove-

able of his tribe. He was a simple, sober, patient, industrious, docile, obedient "Michael" with a little selfishness, but with also a strong family attachment. He had, besides, the untranslatable German *Gemüth* (good nature?) and music and Volkslieder in his heart.

23.

Now, this good *bieder* German Michael under the pedantic and harsh treatment of Marschal "Vorwärts" became a shuffling sneak, and his name was changed into *Philister*. Under the selfish, stern "blood and iron" system of Bismarck, the Philister became a *Streber*, a terrible sneak. Dr. Bursh, author of "Graf Bismark u. seine Leute," is a fair and yet sufficiently appalling specimen of the terrible sneak.

24.

In 1870, the Christian Gentleman, Emperor Wilhelm, the Prussian Gentleman, Prince Bismarck, and the modern gentleman Graf Moltke, all three went into France to destroy the insolent *bourgeois* or Cockney Louis Napoleon and his dishonest "tinsel" imitation of his great uncle's grand, if not all pure, Imperialism.

25.

When Bismarck returned from the French expedition, an old woman, Dr. Falk, as in Goethe's

Märchen, frightened him with the story of a big "shadow," and persuaded him to fight that "shadow," called "Ultra-Montanism." While Bismarck was fighting this "shadow," Professor Haeckel, in Jena, was doing his very best to transform the German "Michael," now become a *Streber* and terrible sneak, into a carnivorous animal.

## 26.

I remember Prince Bismarck's great speech on Kolonial Politik. He said he himself did not believe in it, but the current of public opinion was too strong for him. The innate gentleman in Prince Bismarck made him hate the Kolonial Politick, but the inclination to selfishness, the want of imagination of the Lowland Scot in him and his terrible appetite, made Prince Bismarck give way.

## 27.

The German *Philister*, now a *Streber* and terrible sneak, thus became "official," and being "official" he became a *cad*. He then changed his clothes and came out to China to pay his respects to Li Hung-chang in Tientsin, where he was induced to stay and became known as Herr Diwacter German-Jew doggery!

28.

A Bavarian professor came to me last year for information where to find the bones of anti-diluvian animals in China. I wish I had the Professor here with me now to help me to describe this modern *Deinotherion*, terrible beast, Kolonial Politik. Fixing my eyes steadily upon him I would describe him as, a big fat bulged, greasy, swaggering, tottering low, Judaized, mean, Lowland Scot, not so cunning as the English Cockney sneak, more a cad now than a sneak, but a past master in the Lowland Scot's arts of "boosing," to be used when necessary, with the scientific intellect of Professor Haeckel's *carnivorous* animal and with the terrible appetite, *Kapazität*, colossal belly of a Pomeranian *Stark Esser*—or great eater!

29.

The German Kaiser's dream of the "Yellow Peril" was veritably a mere nightmare. But this monstrous man-eating, modern *Deinotherion* called Kolonial Politik is a terrible reality of the present day. This man-eating terrible beast is actually at this moment crunching the bones of little children in Berlin! *Seht zu! Völker Europa's! Wahret eure heiligsten Güter!*

30.

Christianity was the power formerly that kept down the selfishness of the Lowland Scot and the

terrible appetite of the Pomeranian great eater in the German nation. But now Christianity in Germany is as dead as the dodo. In its place they have officially set up the Christianity of Bishop Anser, of Kiaochow fame, or perhaps of that National-socialist and political person who thus writes in the last number of the *Zu Kunft* on the "No Pardon" speech of the German Kaiser: "What are we to do with fifty thousand Chinamen to surrender? To feed them won't do." Therefore, when we meet with fifty thousand caterpillars, what are we to do? Crush them with a roller. Disgusting business! but it cannot be helped. We do not know how Jesus might have spoken if He had lived not in a world of peace, but of wars. Jesus Christ, too, according to this parson, would become a carnivorous animal!

## 31.

The German political parson's "caterpillars" remind me of Carlyle's description of a certain temple "founded some eighteen centuries ago, now the habitation of *beetles* and all manner of *unclean* creatures!" Indeed, loving as I do the hallowed memories of Weimar, it is to me of infinite pathos and interest to note that the beautiful *schöne Seele* of the German nation should have kept the fire of the altar of the temple of which Carlyle spoke,

---

burning in Weimar. I wonder now whether the fire of that altar is not quite gone out with the recent death of the late Duke of Weimar!

32.

Perhaps Prince Heinrich of Prussia will take care of the fire of that altar. But they have made Prince Heinrich a doctor of engineering! Prince Heinrich with the *schöne Seele* of his grandfather in him, a worshipper of the bow-legged Vulcan and son of Tubal Cain! Ach! du lieber Himmel! When the French Academy offered to make the famous Maréchal de Saxe, who did not know even how to spell, an Academician, he wrote back: "Cela me convient comme un bague à un chat; you might as well put a ring on the finger of a cat!"

33.

But to return to the question of how to destroy the monstrous modern German *Deinotherion*. The first thing for the German nation to do is to cast out the "devil of selfishness." But in order to do that, the mind of the German nation, of the German aristocracy, the Officier Korps, and of the German Kaiser, must expand. The Prussian Puritan must cease to be a *hölzern pedantisches Volk*. In fact, as the Erlösungs-Wort (saving word) for Great Britain is "open door," that for Germany is "expansion!"



## 34.

*Du gleichst dem Geist, den du begreifst!* cried the Erd-Geist to Faust. That was the incantation the great Goethe used to disenchant the German nation from the Prussian Puritanism. Confucius says in prose: "It is the man that makes the religion, and not the religion that makes the man." To put it simpler still: "It is what you are: that is your religion. It is not your religion which makes you what you are. Be unselfish and merciful,—then, no matter whether you are a Jew, Chinese or German, a merchant, missionary, soldier, diplomat or coolie—you are a Christian, a civilized man. But be selfish, be unmerciful, then you are a sneak, a cad, a Philister, a heathen, an Amalekite, a savage, a brute beast, even if you are the Emperor of the world."

## 35.

Welchen Weg musste nicht die Menschheit machen, bis sie dahin gelangte, auch gegen Schuldige geling, gegen Verbrecher schonend, gegen auch Unmenschliche menschlich zu sein. Gewiss waren es Männer göttlicher Natur, die dies zuerst lehrten, die ihr Leben damit zubrachten die Ausübung möglich zu machen, u. zu beschleunigen. (What a long way mankind must have travelled before they could arrive at the stage to know how to be merciful to others, considerate

to law-breakers, and human even to the inhuman. Truly, they were men of divine nature who first taught this and who gave their lives to make the realisation of this possible and to hasten the practice of it.) That is Goethe's *Begriff*, conception of Christianity, of Progress, of Civilization. It will have yet to be seen whether Europe and America in dealing with the Chinese Problem, will adopt Goethe's conception of Civilization for that of the German political person who, with his steam-roller, wants to make Jesus Christ a carnivorous animal!

36.

I have been moved to write at this great length to the German nation, because I believe a peaceful solution of the Chinese question is possible. I base my hope and belief upon the strong, though wilful, yet not ungenerous nature of H.I.M. the German Kaiser. H.I.M.'s chivalrous nature I recognised in the famous telegram he sent to President Kruger. That telegram was not an insult to the true British nation. That telegram was the gentleman's, the Prussian officer's expression of hatred of Mr. Chamberlain and his Cockney class. That speech of H.I.M. with the "mailed fist" I also understand. H.I.M. simply told his brother Prince Henry, in the words of Tennyson, like a good Christian knight,

"To break the heathen and uphold the Christ!"

## 37.

But the Chinese are not heathen. The real heathen of to-day is the *sneak*, the *cad*, the *Cockney*, the *bourgeois*, the *Philister*, the *Streber*, the *Kolonial Politiker*, the political person who wants to make Jesus Christ a carnivorous animal! The religion of the Chinese people cannot be better expressed than in the words of Heine,—

Wir wollen auf Erden glücklich sein,  
 Und wollen nicht mehr darben;  
 Verschlemmen soll nicht der faule Bauch,  
 Was fleissige Hände erwarben.  
 Es wächst hienieden Brot genug  
 Für alle Menschen Kinder,  
 Auch *Rosen* u. *Myrten*, *Schönheit* u. *Lust*,  
 Und Zuckererbsen nicht minder.  
 Und Zuckererbsen für Jedermann,  
 Sobald die Schoten platzen!  
 Den Himmel überlassen wir  
 Den Engeln und den Spatzen.

## 38.

Lastly, I should like to be able to ask Prince Heinrich to convey this message to his Imperial brother and master!

Sagen Sie  
 Ihm, dass er für die Träume seiner Jugend  
 Soll Achtung tragen, wenn er Mann sein wird;  
 Nicht öffnen soll dem tödtenden Insekte

Gerühmter besserer Vernunft das *Herz*  
Der zarten Götterblume—dass er nicht  
*Soll irre werden*, wenn des Staubes Weisheit,  
Begeisterung, die Himmelstochter lästert !

39.

A man of the Eastern, of the Jewish race in the middle of the last century, saved the British aristocracy and the British people and became Lord Beaconsfield. Another man of the same race, Heinrich Heine, tried to save the German nation, and for thanks, got kicked out of Germany, had his back broken and died as a Parisian “ gamin ” in the streets of Paris. Heine called himself a *Ritter in dem Menschheit-Befreiung's Kriege*, a Knight in the War for the Emancipation of the Human Spirit:—

Nun so schau mich an, mein Kindchen,  
Küsse mich und schaue dreist ;  
Denn ich selber bin ein solcher  
Ritter von dem heil'gen Geist.



IV.

LATTER-DAY NOTES ON THE CHINESE  
QUESTION.

---

[No. 4.]

*(First published 16th March, 1901.)*

---

MOTTO :

C'est le malheur des gens honnêtes qu'ils sont des lâches.

VOLTAIRE.\*

---

1.



CONFUCIUS says: "To show generosity and gentleness in teaching others, and not to revenge unreasonable conduct, that is the force of character of the Southern regions, and the good man makes it his study. To lie under arms and meet death without fear, that is the force of character of the Northern regions, and the strong man makes it his study."

---

\* It is a misfortune of good people that they are dastards.

2.

If the Germans are the most selfish, the French are certainly the most unselfish people in Europe. Bayard, le chevalier sans peur et sans reproche; Jeanne d'Arc, Maid of Orleans; the great Condé, Henry of Navarre; Charlotte Corday, la républicaine bien avant la revolution; all are French characters.

3.

As Germa is the Scotland, France is the Ireland of Europe. But the true aristocracy of Great Britain is French—Norman-French. Sir Philip Sidney, "the president of noblesse and chivalry," who yielded the cup of water to the dying soldier, is of French origin. Shakespeare himself by his ridicule of the English cockneys, Bardolph, Nym and Pistol "who will steal anything and call it purchase!"—the prototypes of Mr. Kipling's Tommy Atkins; of Captain Jamy, the Lowland Scot—Shakespeare himself is French—in heart.

4.

If the French are the most unselfish people, they are nevertheless at the present moment in a more pitiable state than any other people in Europe—except, perhaps, the Portuguese, who have just concluded an alliance with the English!

## 5.

A correspondent of the *North China Daily News* in Shanghai thus describes the last municipal fête in Paris: "The guests were requested to appear in evening dress—but one good lady trod heavily through the gilded rooms in a short black stuff skirt, baize alpaca blouse and green velveteen toque with bedraggled black feather; one young man calmly promenaded through the ball-room in a brown suit, coloured tie and yellow gloves. As soon as the buffets were open, they were taken by storm. There is no hope of getting anything to eat unless you charge into the thick of the fray. The pocketing of eatables is another practice favoured by certain guests whose commercial instincts lead them to get the utmost possible value for the money they have to disburse in taxes!"

## 6.

Bismarck said: "France may, in a certain sense, (gewissermassen) be divided into two nations, the Parisians and provincials—the last willing drudges (freiwillige Heloten) of the first. It is a question now of emancipation, of liberation for France from the rule of the Parisians. The peasants do not wish to be tyrannised over by the Parisians."

7.

But the French peasants are now helpless because they are without a Master to lead them. The French nation have now not even a "roi d'Yvetot," but instead they have *bon citoyen* Loubet as President, a shrewd business man and a "modèle des potentats," because he knows how to keep quiet. The last true, if not perfect, Master the French nation had, died at St. Helena.

8.

But worse than having no Master, the French nation now have no recognised aristocracy. The nominal aristocracy in France now are the Parisians, "the young man in brown suit, coloured tie and yellow kid gloves." But the Parisians are not gentlemen; they are *bourgeois*. "J'appelle bourgeois," said Flaubert, "tout homme qui pense bassement."

9.

What Bismarck arrogantly says of the French nation is certainly true of the Parisians: "They are a nation of nullities (eine nation von Nullen) a mere herd; they have money and elegance, but no individuality, no individual personality (kein individuelles selbestgefühl)—except in the mass."

10.

"In France," said the great Napoleon to Metternich, "talent is common enough, but it is only



talent; there is nothing beneath it which resembles character, and still less principle. Every one runs after applause, whether it comes from above or below, no matter; they want to be noticed and applauded."

## 11.

But without character and without principle, how can there be an aristocracy? Instead of aristocracy, France now has *bureaucrats*. The peasants, the masses in France are ready even to die *pour la patrie*. But the *bureaucrats* of official France will not do anything for la France—without pay. All that official France thinks of, is—its salary. It is even well if official France will content itself with the regulation pay, and not put out its greedy hands for Panama shares and other *pots-de-vin*.

## 12.

"Le pays appelle le gendarme," says Mr. Paul Boel bitterly, "le gendarme fait la fête avec les voleurs. The country calls for policemen, but the policemen joins in the fun with the thieves," I see in a recent telegram 40 cases of "loot" from Peking for General Frey have been seized by Government at Marseilles.

## 13.

But the source of disease in France lies much deeper. Mr. Mathew Arnold has said a great deal of the French worship of "Aselgeia," the goddess

of lubricity. But the real root of the evil in France is not there. In the warm climate of the South, the riot of the senses takes to "lubricity" as in the cold Northern regions it takes to "gluttony." The real "evil spirit" which has taken possession of the French nation and which is eating into, not only the body, but the soul of the French people, is a much more malignant witch than "Aselgeia," the goddess of lubricity.

14.

Hommes moirs d où sortez vous ?  
Nous sortons de dessous terre ;  
*Moitié renards, moitié loups,*  
Notre règle est un mystère.  
Nous sommes fils de Loyola ;  
Vous savez pourquoi l'on nous exila.  
Nous rentrons, songez à vous taire !  
Et que vos enfants suivent nos leçons,  
C'est nous qui faisons  
Et qui refaisons  
Les jolis, petits, les folis garçons.

15.

More than two thousand years ago, Julius Cæsar with his handful of Romans attempted to civilise the people of Northern Europe. But Romans, like the English of to-day, were a proud, practical, but not a thinking people. In their practical pedantries, the Romans instead of civiliz-

ing, threatened to destroy altogether the races they tried to civilize. Besides this, the "Cockneys," Greeks of the Lower Empire, who followed in the train of the Romans, carried, if not "gin and opium," at least all the life-destroying vices of a bastard civilization to the people whom the Romans wanted to civilize.

## 16.

Therefore, Providence, as the Chinese would say, had to take away the "Mission" from the practical Romans. Instead, Providence sent down from Heaven a meek, lowly Maiden and entrusted to her the "Mission" of civilizing the savage Northern people of Europe. This meek, lowly Maiden became known as the "Mediæval Roman Catholicism."

## 17.

In little more than a thousand years, this is the picture of what the meek, lowly Maiden with her fostering care, had made of the wild, naked, unkempt, hairy savage of Europe :

I saw young Harry with his beaver on,  
His cuisses on his thighs, gallantly armed,  
Rise from the ground like feathered Mercury,  
And vaulted with such ease into his seat,  
As if an angel dropped down from the clouds  
To turn and wind a fiery Pegasus,  
And witch the world with noble horsemanship.

18.

After she had accomplished her work, the spirit of the meek, lowly Maiden withdrew back to Heaven. Into her still beautiful, but lifeless body, there entered the soul of an arrogant, cruel, greedy, Malignant Witch. Martin Luther in Germany was the first to raise serious alarms as to the true nature of the Malignant Witch; and it took the Germanic nations thirty years' hard fighting to drive out the Malignant Witch.

19.

In France, the great Condé, Henry of Navarre and his Huguenots also started to kill the Malignant Witch, but the generous French heart of Henry of Navarre failed him at the last moment, and he made peace with the Malignant Witch, who promised to behave herself better in future.

20.

But the French nation had to pay dearly for the weakness of Henry of Navarre. Because Henry of Navarre was weak enough to spare the Malignant Witch, the French nation had to go through the horrors of the French Revolution. Anybody who wants to see what havoc the Malignant Witch made of the soul of the old *noblesse*, or governing classes in France, can read the mémoires of Philip Egalité, of Cardinal Rohan and the story of the Diamond Necklace.

## 21.

After the first Napoleon had put down the Revolution and become Master of France, he made the fatal mistake of marrying regenerated young France to—the new decrepit old hag—the Malignant Witch. Like Henry of Navarre he was foolish enough, as Béranger sings, to

Faire un concordat ridicule  
Avec son père en Jésus-Christ!

From that moment, the soul of Napoleon became vulgar, and he had to die at St. Helena,

Lui qu'un pape a couronné  
Est mort dans une île deserte.

## 22.

The second Empire of Louis Napoleon with its tinsel glitter was also an enchanted dome raised by the magic wand of the Malignant Witch. Then came the natural consequence, la Débâcle, and the Commune of Paris with all its horrors.

## 23.

But to speak now without figure. What at this moment is eating out the soul of the French nation, of the educated class, of the gens honnêtes in France, is not sensuality or lubricity, but—*Jesuitism.*

24.

A Chinese boy one day came home with a huge bundle of books. "I am very glad," said his mother then to him, "that you are going to study these books instead of playing all day." "No, mother," replied the boy, "I am not going to read them myself. I want father to read them so that he may be able to pass his examination and become a mandarin. I don't want to be a mandarin myself, but I want to be a mandarin's son!"

25.

Now, what has particularly struck me in Sir Robert Hart's recent article on the Chinese Problem is his pious wish for a miraculous spread of Christianity in China so that the Chinese nation may become, *Kwai*; become the friendliest of friendly Powers and Europe be saved from the "Yellow Peril."

26.

The astounding naïvety and stupendous, unconscious cheek implied in Sir Robert Hart's pious wish is really enough to take one's breath away. The Chinese to become good Methodist Christians, ready to offer the other cheek and let people have their cloaks as well as their coats; all in order that Sir Robert Hart may continue to double the pay of his Commissioners of Customs, and the

Customs staff in Shanghai may not be interrupted in their weekly dances while human flesh is being offered for sale in Shensi!

## 27.

It is a wonder to me that "opium" has not occurred to Sir Robert Hart as being as good a narcotic as Christianity, for saving Europe from the "Yellow Peril." At any rate, the extensive spread of the "opium habit" would be a much more feasible and less miraculous thing to be wished for than the spread of Christianity.

## 28.

In the depth of his heart, I am sure Sir Robert Hart means well to the Chinese people, among whom he has lived for forty years. It is therefore the more curious that Sir Robert Hart should honestly not be himself conscious of the astounding *baseness* and stupendous cheek of his pious wish. Novalis says: "We are near wakening when we dream that we dream.

## 29.

Sir Robert Hart has suggested two solutions of the Chinese Problem—partition with strong militarism and miraculous spread of Christianity. I venture to suggest a third—*Justice!*

30.

But the well-to-do classes in Europe—the “pampered units,” as Carlyle in his strong language calls them—are afraid to look straight into the awful face of Justice, which, like Medusa’s head, would turn them into stone. The English have “pride” in them; the Scotch and the Germans have “selfishness,” to help them not to see the awful Medusa face of Justice. But the French, the Irish and all people who have the generous French nature in them—as soon as they catch a glimpse of the awful face of Justice—try to hide their heads and cover up their face with a pious wish for the miraculous spread of Christianity!

31.

The English Bishop Butler says: “Things are what they are and the consequences of them will be what they have been: why should we then try to deceive ourselves?”

32.

Confucius says: “To worship a spirit to whom one is not bound by a real feeling of duty or respect (lit. a spirit that is not the spirit) is idolatry; to see what is right and act against one’s judgment shows want of courage.” The Chinese word Ch’an for idolatry means literally “toadyism.” Confucius’



definition of idolatry is worship actuated by mean motives of self-interest. To this day the educated Chinese say of the Buddhists that they *mei foh*, pay court to, flatter or toady to Buddha.

## 33.

The true Christian is one who is a Christian because "it is his nature to be so," because he loves holiness and all that is loveable in Christianity. As the artists speak of art for art's sake, so the true Christian loves Christianity for Christianity's sake. That is the true Christian. The sneak Christian is one who wants to be a Christian because he is afraid of hell fire. The cad Christian is one who wants to be a Christian because he wishes to go to Heaven to drink tea and sing hymns with the angels. Now, the true Jesuit is one who does not very much believe in Heaven, angels or hell fire, but he wants other people to believe in these things—to be a Christian for his benefit! That is the Jesuit.

## 34.

Ruskin says: "I do not merely believe there is such a place as hell. I *know* there is such a place; and I know also that when men have got to the point of believing virtue impossible but through the dread of it, they have got into it."

35.

The brains of the people in modern Europe, it seems to me, are divided into two compartments with a very convenient sliding-valve. When you tell an Englishman that a live dragon is the cause of rain in China, the sliding-valve is open and he laughs at you in the face. But when the Bishop tells him that Balaam's ass spoke—the sliding-valve is immediately shut and he believes it. From the habitual use of this sliding-valve in things intellectual, people come to use it in things moral in their judgment of right and wrong in the ordinary affairs of life. The incentive for using this convenient sliding-valve in the ordinary affairs of life, moreover, is much more powerful—the incentive of interests, of personal interests.

36.

Mr. Robert L. Stevenson in his wonderful story of "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde" has given a terrible illustration of the *Jesuit* nature of the intellectual man of modern Europe.

37.

Confucius says: "Man is born to be upright; when a man ceases to be that, it is by the merest chance that he is alive." *Jesuitism* is an outrage against human nature and its natural results are, as Carlyle says, "widespread suffering, mutiny

and delirium; the hot rage of Sansculottic Insurrections, the cold rage of resuscitated Tyrannies; the brutal degradation of the millions, the pampered frivolity of the units: that awful spectacle, the Throne of Iniquity decreeing injustice by a law!"

## 38.

I have in these notes gone fully into this subject of Jesuitism because it is not the French nation alone whose soul is being eaten out, but all nations of the world to-day are being ruined by the deadening leprous influence of Jesuitism. The false Imperialism of Great Britain and the man-eating Kolonial Politik of Germany are but the bastard offsprings of Jesuitism and false democracy. I have called the Kolonial Politik of Germany a "deinotherion," a terrible beast. Now, this Jesuitism of the French nation is a vile, slimy, leprous, poisonous, blood-sucking snake or reptile.

## 39.

Here, in China, I date the true beginning of the present state of things from the day when the U. S. Minister, Colonel Denby, made his "swell" speech in French at the opening of the Pei-tang Cathedral in Peking. Colonel Denby and the whole Diplomatic Corps in Peking knew perfectly well that the present *status* of the Catholic missionaries in China is

founded upon an *impudent forgery*—a forged clause in the Franco-Chinese Treaty of 1860.\* When the foreign Diplomatic Corps in Peking helped to invoke the blessings of the Holy Ghost upon an impudent forgery, what could the Chinese do but throw shot and shell into the Legations!

Hier Monseigneur, le front ceint  
De sa mitre épiscopale  
En ces mots a l'Esprit Saint  
Parlait dans sa cathédrale:

\* \* \*

“Saint-Esprit! descends jusqu'en bas,”  
“Non,” dit l'Esprit-Saint descends, je ne  
descends pas.”

40.

As it was a man of the Jewish race, Lord Beaconsfield, in Great Britain, and a man of the same race, Heinrich Heine, in Germany, who really understood what was wanted in the government of those countries, so in France, it was Gambetta, also a man of the Jewish race, who saw into the real root of evil in France, the real root of evil which he called *Clericalism*. If Gambetta had

---

\*In the Treaty the Chinese text contains a clause giving Roman Catholic Missionaries, among other privileges, the right of acquiring land and property in the interior of China. But the French text has not the shadow of such a clause! The clause of the forgery by the Catholic Bishop who acted as interpreter,

lived long enough, what might have been the state of France to-day?

## 41.

When Louis Napoleon sent French troops to guard the Pope's palace in Rome, Clericalism was supreme in France. But since Gambetta's time the influence of Clericalism in France has been held somewhat in check. Still its power is very great, because there are public men in France who say "l'anti-clericalism n'est pas un article d'exportation." Thus, although French troops are no longer sent to protect the Pope, yet the poor French people have to pay taxes in order to send men of war to China to protect the Pope's bishops and agents.

Pour rédorner son tiare

On nous surchargerait d'impôts!

But that is not worst. The worst of it is: Clericalism uses the missions étrangères abroad as a basis of operations to maintain its power in France itself. The Jesuits can truly say of their missions in China,

Les missionnaires sants tous.

Commis voyageurs trafficant pour nous.

The French Government should send out a commission to inquire to what extent these "commis voyageurs" of the Jesuits have carried their flourishing business of land speculation alone, not to say of other disreputable business, in China. Besides,

a riot in China is always a windfall to the Jesuits. For one tael of property damaged or destroyed they charge the Chinese Government from fifty to one hundred taels, making a profit of—I do not know how much per cent!

42.

I have said that there is now no recognised aristocracy in France. But France, modern France, has an aristocracy. The true aristocracy of modern France are its great literary men, from Voltaire, with his “*écrasez l’infâme*,” to M. Emile Zola with his “*J’accuse*.” But as Voltaire said of the men of his time, “*c’est le malheur des gens honnêtes qu’ils sont des lâches!*” What France wants at present is a man like the great Danton who will cry, “*De l’audace! encore de l’audace! et toujours de l’audace!*”

Gai! gai! serrons nos rangs,

Esperance

De la Fance!

Gai! gai! serrons nos rangs.

En avant, Gaulois et France!



IV.  
*LATTER-DAY NOTES ON THE CHINESE  
QUESTION.*

---

[No 5.]

*(First published 25th May, 1901.)*

---

MOTTO :

Emerson says: "My English friends asked whether there were any Americans? Any with an American idea? Thus challenged, I bethought myself neither of caucuses nor congress, neither of presidents nor of cabinet-ministers, nor of such as would make of America another Europe. I thought only of the simplest and purest minds. I said, 'certainly, Yes' So I opened the dogma of no-government and non-resistance. I said, it is true that I have never seen in any country a man of sufficient valour to stand for this truth, and it is plain to me, that no less valour than this can command my respect. I can easily see the bankruptcy of the vulgar musket-worship—though great men be musket-worshippers:—and'tis certain, as God liveth, the gun that does not need another gun, the law of love and justice alone can effect a clean revolution."

---

1.



R. CONGER, U.S. Minister, said lately before he left Shanghai for America: "We have no fear that the Chinese would ever attempt another outbreak of the same kind. *They have got a lesson.*" Now, this is not the language one would have expected from an American Minister, a

countryman of Emerson. This is the language of a *vulgar* matron of an Orphanage who, after a long course of senseless cruelty to the defenceless children, and when the children rebel, gives them an inhuman, brutal thrashing, then sits down to her tea and says: "Now the brats will never do it again. They have got a lesson!"

2.

Ruskin says: "The essence of all vulgarity lies in want of sensation." Simple and innocent vulgarity is merely an untrained and undeveloped bluntness of body and mind; but in true inbred vulgarity, there is a deathful callousness of body and soul, which in extreme cases, becomes capable of every sort of bestial habit and crime.

3.

But the Americans, as well as the Russians, as a rule, are, of all people at the present day, least liable to this deathful callousness of body and soul. The Russians—the lower classes, the soldiery in Russia, are cruel—"Grattez un Russe et vous trouverez un Tartare." The cruelty of the Russian troops recently in North China is certainly dreadful, but it is still the *natural* cruelty of a wild *untamed* animal. The Russian cruelty therefore is not the most dreadful. The most dreadful is that species of cruelty which the Germans characteris-



tically call *rohheit* (lit. rawness)—the dull, gross, passionless, brutish, bestial, truculence of the “Yahoos.”

## 4.

In the same way as the Russians are said to be cruel, the Americans are said to be vulgar. But the apparent vulgarity of the Americans—of the badly educated classes in America, as a rule, is, as Ruskin says, the simple and innocent vulgarity of the untrained and undeveloped bluntness of body and mind. The vulgarity of the English Cockney or the European *bourgeoisie*, on the other hand, is inbred in the bones.

## 5.

An officer of the U. S. Navy last summer explained to me the simple structure of the American civilization. “In America,” he said, “whenever we laid out a town, the first thing our people did, was to build a school-house, a church, and court-house.” The school-house represents man; the church, God; and the court-house with its gallows, the Devil. The man is first sent to the school-house to see what can be made of him. If he turns out well he is sent to the Church to be made like God. If he turns out badly, he is sent to the court-house, to the gallows, —to the Devil.”

6.

This was the simple American log-cabin civilization. But the modern Americans have "progressed." In addition to the school-house, they have started the newspaper. In addition to the Church, they have invented the small variety show and the big variety show called the world's fair. In addition to the court-house, they have founded the banking-house. Therefore, those who ought to go to the school-house, to be educated, now read the newspaper to be distracted and to lose any education they have had. Those who ought to go to the Church to reverently worship, to be nobly edified, now go to the small and big variety shows to basely enjoy themselves, to be vulgarly amused. Finally, many of those who ought to go to the court-house, to the gallows to be hanged, now ride in carriages to the big banks to draw their dividends and deposits.

7.

The school-house and college in America, in the meanwhile, where the rising generation ought to be taught and trained in human conduct and human manners, have now become mere Smithsonian workshops, where the pupils are taught how they make money or, as it is called, how to get on, by learning either the coarse jugglery

of the hand, called modern mechanical arts, or the fine jugglery of the head called law and theology. In many American universities, dentistry and chiropody, or the science of toe-nail peeling, are put on the same level with Plato and Virgil.

## 8.

The Churches in America again, in the meanwhile, have become mere alms-houses for sneaks and drones. One of the true functions of the original Christian Church was certainly to collect and distribute alms. But the modern American Church collects alms, not for distribution, but for its own use. There is, of course, nothing iniquitous or disgraceful, when one is really unfortunate, in taking or living on alms. But the iniquity of taking alms becomes palpable when one is really not unfortunate, but only "acute" to find a soft and easy way of living by eating the alms which should go to the really unfortunate. The infamy of taking alms comes in when one is ashamed of taking alms, not of stealing alms. But in justice, it must be said that the Christian Church of Europe and America of to-day is not ashamed of anything; not even of "missionary looting." If the modern American Church were capable of shame, it would not have written a plausible public letter to the "heathen" Buddhists in Japan to prove that it

had a right to demand compensation from the starving people of China whose house its agents had helped to set on fire and among whom human flesh is being sold in Shensi. But the compensation and the "loot" are of course not for the Church or the missionaries themselves, but for the dear Chinese converts. This he said, not that he cared for the poor, but because he was a thief and had the bag.

9.

Lastly, the Court-house representing the gallows in America, where those who now go to the banks ought to be sent—has become a Gethsemane, which is reserved for the unsuccessful, composed, as Ruskin says in modern days, for the most part of the entirely wise, the humble, the sensitive, the imaginative, the entirely merciful, just and godly; such persons, for instance, as Edgar Allan Poe or the starving American artist whom I once met travelling as deck passenger and smoking opium on board a Canton river steamer, who spoke French, German and Italian fluently; in short, the Court-house in America now is specially reserved for the weak and unfortunate, the poor street girls of the great cities:—

“ For as Love’s wild prayer dissolved in air,  
Her woman’s heart gave way;  
But the sin forgiven by Christ in heaven,  
By man is cursed alway!”

## 10.

In Shakespear's "Macbeth," Lady Macduff's son says to his mother: What is a traitor?

L. Macd.—Why, one that swears and lies.

Son.—And be all traitors that do so?

L. Macd.—Every one that does so is a traitor and must be hanged.

Son.—Who must hang them?

L. Macd.—Why, the honest men.

Son.—Then liars and swearers are fools, for there are liars and swearers enow to beat the honest men and hang them all.

But the modern American traitors, liars and swearers are not fools. Therefore, the result of giving every man a vote according to the constitution is: All honest men in America have been or are in danger of being hanged.

## 11.

The truth is, it seems to me, the modern Americans have become unworthy of the institutions which their fathers intended for them. As the Chinese say, it is the men in the nation who make the institutions and not the institutions that make the men.\* At any rate, the modern Americans, while fetishly worshipping the letter of

---

\*Note. 有治人無治法, *i. e.*, Men and not System.

their Constitution, have lost the spirit of their fathers, those true, early Americans, of whom the American poet says,

These were they who gave us birth,  
The pilgrims of the sun-lit wave ;  
Who found for us this virgin earth,  
And freedom with the soil they gave.

12.

It has often been asserted that the Chinese have no word for liberty. But the curious fact is, not only the Chinese *have* a word for liberty, but the Chinese word for liberty expresses precisely the original American notion, the true meaning of liberty as distinguished from the modern Cockney, or Tammany notion of liberty. The Chinese word for liberty is *tao* 道. When the Chinese wish to say that there is no liberty in a nation, they say there is no *tao* in the nation 國無道. The Chinese word *tao* for liberty means literally a way. But when used in the sense of liberty the word *tao*, or liberty, is defined as the fulfilling of the law of our being,—率性之謂道.\* The word *shing* (lit. nature) for the law of our being, is defined as the commandment or will of God,—天命之謂性. The Chinese word for liberty therefore means liberty to fulfill the law of

---

\* From the 中庸—or The Book of "Eternal Order."

our being,—to do the will of God. Now, the liberty for want of which those Pilgrims of the sun-lit wave left the old for the new world, was precisely, as they expressed it, the liberty to do God's will. The liberty, in fact, which the early Americans wished to leave with the soil to their children, was not, as the modern Tammany thinks, the liberty to be vulgar, to swindle, or to be heartless and cruel; liberty to the early Americans meant, as the Chinese say, liberty to fulfill the law of our being to do God's will—"I will walk at liberty, for I seek thy precepts."

## 13.

But the word "liberty" nowadays in America is overshadowed by the great American word "equality." Indeed, the true meaning of the word liberty is now made impossible by the modern American notion of "equality." The true meaning of liberty says, "You must fulfill the law of your being." But the modern American notion of "equality," among other things, means head or brain flattening. There are so many men in a nation who are duffers and so many who are not duffers. The modern American notion of equality demands that the non duffers must flatten their heads or brains in order that the duffers may not be deprived of their rights, their rights of

“equality”—right of shaking hands with the President at the White House! \*

14.

But the Americans and the French in Europe are certainly right to cling tenaciously to the word “equality.” For it was for “equality” in its true sense, equality against “privilege, that the Americans in their war of Independence and the French in the first Revolution, gave their best blood. But “equality” in its true sense does not mean the modern American notion of head flattening that the best of the nation should become as bad as the worst; or the French notion of kinglessness that the soldiers should command the general, and the horses should drive the coachman (*les chevaux doivent mener le cocher*). Equality in its true sense means *carrière ouverte aux talens*—open door. Equality in its *truest* sense means—Expansion. Confucius says: “Among really educated people there is no race distinction.”† That is the real meaning of Expansion.

---

\* I am sorry to see that some of my Japanese cousins have taken to this American idea of head flattening. They wish to abolish or limit the use of Chinese writing because there are men in Japan who cannot acquire both the Chinese and Japanese writing!

† 有教無類. “Confucius’ Sayings,” Chap. XV., Sec. 38.



## 15.

Liberté, Egalité, and Expansion in its *deepest* sense—Fraternité, means Christianity or, as the Chinese say, to look upon all men as belonging to the same humanity.\* It was with the word fraternité in his heart that the Frenchman Camille Desmoulins, just before he went to the guillotine, jestingly compared himself to the bon sans-culotte Jésus. The Empress-Dowager with her “One family! all one family” to Mrs. Conger and the Legation ladies, was trying to teach them, little as Mrs. Conger and her husband knew it, the true meaning of Christianity—Expansion in the *deepest* sense. It was because the Empress-Dowager made her appeal in vain that the Chinese bon sans-culottes, the “Boxers” had to make, like their French brothers it '89, the bloody appeal to the world that the Chinese people too should be treated as human beings, as brothers belonging to one family, of the same human race.

## 16.

But the great practical idea of modern Democracy and modern Liberalism, the idea which lies especially at the bottom of American institutions as distinguished from what may be called the European civilisation in modern times, is that

---

\* Note.—視同仁.

“American idea” of Emerson’s. Goethe was once asked what form of government he thought best. He answered: “That form which tends to make all government unnecessary.” Now, the modern European idea of government, how to keep the people, the “masses,” in order, is by using the policeman’s baton and the soldier’s bayonet. The peculiarly American idea of government, how to keep the people, the “masses,” in order, is to use the school-house and the Church. This is the essence of Emerson’s American idea, as it is of the Chinese civilisation; by use of the school-house and the Church, to dispense with the “knout,” the baton, and the bayonet.

17.

But the Americans early made the mistake of not knowing that the American civilisation is founded upon the school-house and the Church and not upon the American Constitution. Instead of reading the Constitution by the light from the school-house, the Americans insisted upon building the school-house and the Church after the pattern of their early log-cabin Constitution. The result is, as we have seen, the awful state of the American school-house and the American Church at the present day.

## 18.

Indeed, it is piteous to see the American people with their belief in their Constitution. "He will never march, an't please your honour, in this world," said the Corporal in Sterne's novel. "By God, he will march," said my Uncle Toby. In his perplexity, Uncle Sam called in the aid of lawyers. But lawyers do not, as a rule, declare the law of God or of God's justice but only the law according to the Constitution. The people, "the masses," of course, do not know the abstruse law according to the Constitution. Thus the lawyers had a good time of it to themselves. In short, the lawyers make and interpret the abstruse law according to the Constitution to suit themselves and anybody who is rich enough to pay them.

## 19.

Thanks to the respect for the very name of law and Constitution which had been drilled into the race in their old homes, of which the American people are principally composed, the people, the "masses," in America are for a time kept quiet under the abstruse law according to the Constitution. Nevertheless, the people, the "masses," in America, badly educated though they have been in the school-house, still know, some of them, of the law of God's justice in their hearts. They there-

fore now and then find out that the abstruse law according to the Constitution is contrary to the simple law of God's justice.

Then the people, the "masses," apply "lynch-law." But lynch-law is against the Constitution. Therefore policemen with batons and soldiers with bayonets have to be called; have to be increased against the increasing number of lynch-law lawyers.

20.

Thus the American people, who set out with the American idea to depend upon the school-house and the Church, to dispense with the baton and bayonet, have to take to the European idea, to the vulgar musket worship and, in the end, America will become only another Europe.

21.

The American "lawyer" is next sent abroad as a diplomat. The American diplomat in treating with the Filipinos and in making treaties with the Chinese, is not guided by the law of God's justice, but by the law according to the Constitution, which, when abroad, the lawyer expands and calls the law of Progress and Civilization. But the Chinese with their peculiar "savez" find out that law according to the Constitution, progress, and civilization, means robbery; and robbery, although

it be of the poor by the rich, or of the weak by the strong, is clear against the law of God's justice. Therefore, the Chinese rise up as "Boxers" and apply "lynch-law."—There you have America's contribution to the present pitiful, pitiable, tragic Chinese muddle. There you see the spectacle of the American people assisting, supporting, and in the end perhaps adopting the vulgar musket worship of the European Concert.

## 22.

Thus we see that the modern "lawyer" is the real and direct cause of the modern "policeman," the representative of the modern European vulgar musket worship. The modern "lawyer" is a false priest as the modern policeman is a false soldier. Indeed, it was originally the false priest in Europe who first gave rise to the European militarism or musket worship. In mediæval times in Europe, the true Church with its pious, honest priest was able to keep the people, the "masses," in order at home without gens d'armes, men of arms. The gens d'armes, true soldiers, went to guard the Marches against the hordes of heathen, *i.e.*, wild, savage men; in fact, to tame the savagery of wild men. But when the Church became a false Church, its priests dishonest priests, then the people, the "masses," at home could

not be kept in order. Therefore another kind of gens d'armes, called Imperialists—Gustavus, Cromwell, Frederick—had to rise and keep the peace and order at home, waiting for the true priests to come—*la force attendant le droits*.

23.

The true priests, however, did not come but—lawyers came. The lawyers began by building a new Church called the Constitution. But instead of relieving the gens d'armes at home from the task of keeping the peace and order at home and the people from the burden of paying for the gens d'armes, the lawyers declared that more gens d'armes were necessary, not, of course, to keep the peace and order, but to uphold the dignity of the law and guard the Constitution—and the Constitution means property, the property of the lawyer, and the rich man who pays the lawyer. Thus the gens d'armes, developed, became the modern "policeman;" not a Ritter, chevalier, or true knight now, but "soldier," a hireling, mercenary, fighting man, a "Knecht" or knight in its original sense, *i.e.*, a paid slave of the lawyer and the rich man; of the diplomat and the capitalist; employed, not to keep peace and order, but to guard Property, to protect Syndicates railway sidings and opium godowns. This is the

origin of the modern bastard Imperialism or Kolonial Politik, the latest development of the vulgar musket worship of Europe.

## 24.

The sword, or bayonet which represents the sword, is not a base or ignoble instrument; on the contrary, it is the highest and most sacred symbol of human manhood. The gens d'armes, or man who bears the sword, so far from being vulgar, has been the source and fountain-head of all true politeness, courtesy, civility—the true meaning of civilization—in Europe as in all countries. But the modern poor absent-minded beggar inside the khaki frame, with his chocolate box and machine gun, has become vulgar, not because he is a beggar, but because he has become a paid policeman. The modern big automaton with epaulets, too, has become vulgar, because he has become like the only thing he worships, his machine gun, a mere automaton with neither moral feelings nor moral duties; who marches to Peking to play the pantomime and insult the Empress-Dowager—leaving his countryman, the poor missionary, to the really cruel alternative of starvation or looting.

## 25.

Indeed, any one who has taken the trouble to see that the "soldier" in modern Europe has

really become a mere "policeman," will not be astonished at anything which the allied army in North China has done. The French Marmontel says, *Que le soldat (common soldier) soit attiré par le vil appât du butin; qu'il s'expose à mourir pour avoir de quoi vivre: je le conçois. Mais—quiconque s'attend à un salaire est un esclave. Ce que je dis de l'intérêt, je le dis de l'ambition; car les honneurs, les titres, le crédit,—tout cela est une solde, et qui l'exige se fait payer—C'est la base de toute vertu militaire (bushido).*\*

26.

The absent-minded British statesman who really wants to reform the British army should, of all things, "de-professionalise" the British officer and make a gentleman of him, instead of a mere sham automaton "made in Germany." Even in their games of sport, the English used to refuse admittance to "professionals," those who play pour avoir de quoi vivre, among "gentlemen;" much more should they do so in the terrible game of war.

27.

In ancient feudal France, a country which has produced the truest soldiers in Europe, before they

---

\* (From the *Béliasaire*, a novel by Marmontel, which, I venture to suggest here, H.I.H. the Crown Prince of Japan, who understands French, should read and perhaps order it to be translated into Japanese.)



admit a man to be a mounted officer or Chevalier, this was the form of examination which they rigorously submitted a man to: "En quel dessein" lui demandait le seigneur, "désirez-vous entrer dans l'ordre? Si c'est pour être riche, pour vous reposer et être honoré sans faire l'honneur à la chevalrie, vous en êtes indigne et seriez à l'ordre de chevalrie que vous recevriez, ce que le clerc simoniaque (the false priest, lawyer, scribe or literati who becomes such pour avoir de quoi vivre) est à la prélatrice." If the man passes satisfactorily this examination, then le seigneur, his superior officer, says to him, "Au nom de Dieu, de saint Michel et de Saint George, je te fais chevalier: sois preux, hardi et loyal!"

## 28.

That was the bushido, chivalry, or true Militarism of Europe, as distinguished from the modern automaton, policeman or vulgar musket worship. Indeed, la base de toute vertu militaire or bushido, the basis of all true militarism in Europe, in Japan as well as in China, is the same: namely, to put down savagery and rowdyism, to uphold the noble, the true kingliness and to put down the base in man or, as the Chinese say, to honour the King and break the

heathen.\*” Tennyson interpreting the meaning of the Chinese word in the dialect of Europe, makes his Knights of the Round Table swear

To reverence the king as if he were  
Their Conscience and their Conscience as their king,  
To break the heathen and uphold the Christ!

29.

But the Americans now do not believe in “Kingliness.” They believe in liberty and kinglessness; the French now believe in liberty, kinglessness and Christlessness. But the Chinese believe liberty to be impossible except with kingliness. The Chinese idea of kingliness is—hero worship. The Chinese word which Confucius uses for Carlyle’s “Hero,” translated by Dr. Legge as the superior man, means literally a little king or kinglet—“Koen-tzu” (Chüntzu in modern mandarin), the same as the German *Koen-ig*, English, king.

30.

But it is no wonder that the Modern Americans should believe in kinglessness, no more than

---

\* 尊王攘夷. The word “i” 夷 heathen, tabooed word of the treaties, is commonly and incorrectly translated as barbarian. The four words were adopted as their watchword by the patriots of Japan in 1860, who were called Jo-i’s and hunted down by the progressive and impeccable diplomats as “Reactionaries.” The war cry of the “Boxers” in 1900, Fu Ching Mieh Yang (up with the Ching dynasty and down with oversea men) is a translation in spirit of the four words.

that the French should now believe in Christlessness. There is really now no king in all Europe except, perhaps, in Russia where Heine says: "The absolutism in Russia is really dictatorship for carrying out the liberal ideas of modern times—der absolutismus in Russland ist vielemehr, um die liberalen. Ideen unserer nenesten zeit, in's Leben zu lassen. In all other countries in Europe and America, the "King" has become only a more less expensive ornament to the lawyer's Constitution, just as the "Christ" has become merely the Christian priest's "Joss" to his Church.

## 31.

The modern Christian priest finds that many people now do not care for his "Joss" or sham Christ. Therefore, many a Christian priest, now, pour avoir de quoi vivre, turns lawyer as well as newspaper writer; in fact, becomes a political person. The typical Christian priest who comes to China, talks "Joss" to some people at home to get subscriptions for his mission, and to others he talks "patriotism and prestige" in order to get the jingo press to support and not abuse him; but when he gets to China he talks pure "Progress and Civilization" to the mandarins with the view of benefiting the Chinese people in a wider sphere by becoming legal adviser to some Viceroy or even succeeding Sir Robert Hart!

32.

The "lawyer" with his king, on the other hand, sticks it on with the glue of constitutional safe-guards to his Constitution or drops it altogether just to suit the people's taste, exactly in the same way as the baker does with the figure-head ornament of his Christmas cake. If the people like a "king" the lawyer calls his Christmas cake a limited or constitutional monarchy, if the people do not care for the ornament, he calls it a republic. But all the same, whether republic or monarchy, while the people vote, the lawyer, and the rich man who pays him his fees, eat the cake.

33.

But what—it is very plain to me—in the end will swallow up priest, lawyer, constitution, church, and cake in Europe and America, is the modern monstrous automaton with neither moral rights nor moral duties, but with only a diseased craving for newspaper prestige and notoriety, with a deathful callousness to pain and suffering, and with an insatiable appetite for expensive machine guns. Indeed, it is this monster automaton in Europe which, threatening to swallow him and his cake up, has driven the now distracted lawyer at home, in order to feed the monster, to carry his vulgar musket worship abroad and call it Imperialism or Kolonial Politik.

## 34.

It was this modern automaton which destroyed the ancient Roman Empire. It was the vulgar musket worship abroad, called Imperialism, among the ancient Romans which produced the deathful callousness of body and soul, becoming capable of every sort of bestial habit and crime, and thus eventually destroyed the ancient Romans. Among the modern Romans, anyone who has eyes can see the very serious symptoms of this dreadful Empire-breaking malady, the deathful callousness of body and soul, have made their appearance. The symptoms are: at first absent-mindedness, then incapacity for ideas and profound helplessness in presence of all spiritual movements, joined with a proud, foolish recklessness in throwing away their lives among the higher and better classes; and a morbid, hysterical, delirious passion for amusement, distraction and gross excitement among the lower orders.

## 35.

Now, were I an American, I would not accept even as a free gift, the Empire, the whole continent of Asia, including the Philippines, although the whole continent were made of pure solid gold, if the acceptance of such a gift had the remotest possibility of bringing with it, this worse than the

European plague, the dreadful malady of the deathful callousness of body and soul—to which, as I said in the beginning, the Americans and the Russians have hitherto been least liable—among my people. For the saying, “what doth it advantage a man if he gains the whole world and loses himself,” applies also to nations.

36.

But to sum up. The Militarism of modern Europe is now become a false Militarism because the “soldier” in Europe has become a policeman. The policeman is a false soldier because he becomes a *gens d’armes* merely pour avoir de quoi vivre, a paid or hired servant; a “professional,” who not only takes, but *wants* pay, instead of being a gentleman who does not want pay, whether in the shape of money, prestige or newspaper notoriety. In the second place, the policeman is a false soldier because he is employed not to uphold the noble and keep down the base in man, to keep down rowdyism, but to protect property. In the last place the modern policeman has become a terrible false soldier, because he has become like his machine gun, a mere automaton and “au lieu de faire l’honneur à la chevalrie,” he merely cultivates “l’art d’egorger son prochain,” in fact, merely worships his machine gun!

## 37.

But the real and direct cause of the modern policeman is the modern lawyer. As the policeman is a false soldier, the lawyer is the false priest. The priest of the old Roman Catholic Church became a false priest when he taught, not God's law, but the law of his Church. The later Protestant priest became a false priest when he taught, not God's law, but the law of his Bible, his loud positive assertion of the correctness of *his* interpretation of the Bible. Now, the modern lawyer is a false priest because he makes and declares, not the law of God's justice, but the law according to his Constitution.

## 38.

The true Church now is not the Christian priest's Church. The true Church now and at all times is the Church that teaches the true law or will of God. The true state or constitution now is not the modern lawyer's Constitution. The true state now and at all times is the state that makes and declares the true law of God's justice. But what is the true law of God, the true law of God's justice? The Chinese say the commandment or will of God is the law of our being. The law of our being therefore is the only true law of God. The law of our being, however, does not mean the law of being of the average man in the street or of the

vulgar and impure person. The law of our being means the law of being, as Emerson says, of the "simplest and purest minds" in the world. That is the only true law of God now and in all times. The priest or lawyer who represents the simplest and purest mind is the true priest, the true lawyer or statesman. The state which is willing and can be influenced and guided by the wisdom, wishes and aspirations of the simplest and purest minds in the nations is a true state. In short the true Church, the true real Catholic Church of to-day, although it is not formally constituted, is formed of all the best educated men, of all the simplest and purest minds of all nations. That is the meaning of Expansion. "Among really educated men, there is no race distinction"—有教無類.

39.

I began these notes by speaking of vulgarity. Now, the most unmistakable sign of a base and impure mind is—vulgarity. The surest sign of a simple and pure mind, on the contrary, is politeness, good taste, absence of vulgarity. Here I will give two examples, one of true inbred vulgarity and the other of true politeness, *la politesse du cœur*.

Last summer when Tientsin City was taken by the allied troops, the telegrams to the newspapers in Shanghai thus described the awful state of things in the North: "Tientsin, 15th July.



Thousands of corpses blister in the streets under the terrible sun. A great part of the city is still burning and the great glare of the conflagration throws a lurid light on the surrounding country when darkness falls." Now, with this telegram and the thousand blistering corpses still staring them in the face, the foreign community of Shanghai decided to celebrate the Fall of Peking and the relief of the Legations, with painted poles, illuminations, and torch-light bicycle rides! During the last Spanish-American War at a naval battle, one of the American ships splendidly signalled herself by her terrible marksmanship with her guns. While the swift, successive, unerring shells were making havoc on one Spanish ship, the men on board the American ship, excited naturally to see the splendid target practice of their ship, involuntarily gave a cheer. But the American Captain standing exposed as he was to the Spanish shots—not like the Shanghai community behind their painted poles—quietly said to his men: "Don't shout, boys, the poor devils are dying." That is what I mean by true politeness, "la politesse du cœur" which forms la base de toute vertu militaire, or bushido; which shows the still soundness of the American nation, notwithstanding the many things one sees in America to-day.

## 40.

Ruskin says: "The soldier in all times and in all countries is held in honour more than the merchant, because the soldier's trade is verily and essentially not slaying, but being slain." When the great soldier and Markgraf (Jo-i Shogun) of Japan, Iyeyasu,—the man who with his strong sharp sword cast the "devil of cruelty" out of old feudal Japan and created the true, beautiful, polite, artistic Japan of Sir Edwin Arnold, was on his death-bed, he sent for his grandson Iyemitsu, and said to him: "You will one day have to govern the Empire. Remember, the true way to govern the Empire is to have a mercy-loving and tender heart—慈 (Latin alma, or mercy and loving kindness of the Bible)—"汝他日治天下者也治天下之道在於慈。"\*

## L'Envoi !

Mencius says: "When Confucius wrote and published his Latter-day Pamphlets (called 春秋 Spring and Autumn Annals), the Sneaks and Cads of his time were afraid." The Chinese words 亂臣 which I have translated as the Sneak are generally translated as a traitorous minister. The words, however, mean an anarchic public servant, or as Carlyle would say, an anarchic person, who not

---

\* Guai shi 外史, Book XXII.

necessarily from wilfully selfish motives, but from the anarchic state of his mind, from a mixture of modern "Jackal theories of life and sincere cant, betrays the kingliness in his nature, betrays his king; the people and his country; in fact, brings, instead of order, peace and goodwill among men—anarchy into the world. The Chinese words 賊子 which I have translated as the Cad, are generally translated as robber, or son of a thief. But the words mean literally a senseless feeling, less destructive person.\* Ruskin says: "The thing or power, opposed to God's power, called "mammon," the "Arch enemy," is always recognisable briefly in two functions. He is pre-eminently the "Lord of Lies and the Lord of Pain." Now, modern Politics or Diplomacy in Europe and America with its false lawyer, politician or diplomat and its lying newspapers, is the incarnation of the Lord of Lies, the Sneak. The modern Militarism with its automaton policeman as soldier and its machine gun, is the incarnation of the Lord of Pain, the Cad. An excited man during the French Revolution bawled out: "I ask for the arrest of sneaks and cads" (*je demande l'arrestation des lâches et des coquins*). Et nunc, reges, intelligite; erudimini, qui judicatis terram.

---

\* The word 賊 is used as a verb meaning to wilfully and unmercifully injure or do harm 害也

V.

*CIVILIZATION AND ANARCHY,*

OR

THE MORAL PROBLEM OF THE FAR EASTERN QUESTION.

---

MOTTO:

Was ist aber die grosse Aufgabe unserer Zeit?  
Es ist die Emancipation, nicht bloss die der Irländer, Griechen,  
&c., sondern es ist die Emancipation der ganzen Welt,  
absonderlich Europa's, das mündig geworden ist.

HEINE "REISEBILDER."

---



SO many people, no doubt, what is called the Far Eastern question means merely the immediate future of the Chinese Empire. But any one who will give a moment's serious thought to the subject, cannot fail to see that the question does not end there. For, rising far above mere economic questions of trade and finance and political questions of peace and war arising out of international disputes over material interests, there is involved in

the Far Eastern question also a moral issue; an issue immensely more serious and perhaps more real than the political future of the Chinese Empire.

In the history of the first Christian Crusade in Europe we are told that "at the second Council held at Clermont in France, the Pope (Urban II.) himself delivered a stirring address to the multitude and as he proceeded, the pent-up emotions of the crowd burst forth and cries of *Deus vult* rose simultaneously from the audience." To us now the emotions of that crowd seem very inexplicable. Indeed, the Christian Crusades, when we look now with the light of this century at the foolish, religious, and narrow political objects for which they were undertaken, appear to have been extravagant and infatuated enterprises on the part of the people of Europe wilfully to disturb the people of the East. But when we study the intellectual and moral development of the people of Europe, we cannot help admitting that the Christian Crusades, wilful and infatuated expeditions of fanaticism and cupidity though they were, had nevertheless a serious moral design and function to fulfil in the civilization of the human race. There was truly a veritable *Deus vult* (God's will) in that movement, apparently of bigotry and greed. For the eventual result of the Christian Crusades of the middle ages, was, as we know now, the first means of breaking

up the then strict monastic civilization of Europe. After the Crusades, came Martin Luther and the Protestant Reformation. "The final result of the Crusades," says M. Guizot in his History of Civilization, "was a step taken towards the emancipation of the human spirit."

Looking now at the present movement of the European nations to the Far East, which in Germany is called Kolonial Politik—who can doubt but that the modern Crusade of this Nineteenth Century, although apparently a movement with only grossly material and selfish objects of trade in view, has also a moral design and function to fulfil in the civilization of the human race. The scene at Kiel in Germany and the strangely mediæval language of the German Emperor when he solemnly pronounced the *Deus vult* upon the modern Crusade, reminded one very strangely of the scene at Clermont in France in 1095. Who knows, then, if the eventual result of the modern Crusade, called "Kolonial Politik," may not, like the Middle Age Crusades of Christendom, end in modifying, if not entirely changing, the civilization and structure of society in modern Europe. It was this thought, rather than any idea of the probable future aggressiveness of the yellow race, which inspired the apparently last of the mediæval Emperors of

Europe to paint his famous picture of the Yellow Peril (*die gelbe Gefahr*).

But, truly, to any one who takes the trouble to study the moral culture and social order of the people of the Far East, it is really inconceivable how the civilization of the yellow race can in itself be a source of danger to the people of Europe. To Europeans, and especially to unthinking practical Englishmen, who are accustomed to take what modern political economists call "the standard of living" as the test of the moral culture or civilization of a people, the actual life of the Chinese and of the people of the East at the present day, will no doubt appear very sordid and undesirable. But the standard of living by itself is not a proper test of the civilization of a people. The standard of living in America at the present day, is, I believe, much higher than it is in Germany. But although the son of an American millionaire, who regards the simple and comparatively low standard of living among the professors of a German University, may doubt the value of the education in such a University, yet no educated man, I believe, who has travelled in both countries, will admit that the Germans are a less civilized people than the Americans.

In fact, standard of living may properly be taken as the *condition* of the civilization, but it is not the civilization itself. To take a physical illus-

tration. Heat is the condition of life and health in an animal body; but the degree of heat in the body is not in itself a true and absolute test of the fineness or coarseness of the structure and organisation of that body. An animal body of really fine structure and organisation may from abnormal causes become very cold. In the same way the standard of living among a people may from economic causes become very low; but that in itself is not a proof that the moral culture or civilization of that people is a low one. The failure of a potato crop in Ireland and a long period of continued trade depression in Great Britain may very considerably lower the standard of living in those countries, but one would not, judging from that alone, say that the Irish or the British people have become less civilized.

But if mere standard of living is not civilization—what is civilization? It is really as difficult to define what civilization among nations is as to pronounce what real education is among individual men. I will, however, illustrate what I mean by civilization by a concrete example. Captain Basil Hall, R.N., visiting Korea in 1816, thus gives his impression of an old petty Korean magistrate:

“The politeness and ease with which he accommodated himself were truly admirable; and when it is considered that hitherto, in all proba-



bility, he was ignorant even of our existence, his propriety of manners would seem to point not only to high rank in society, but also to a high degree of civilization in that society not confirmed by other circumstances. Be that as it may, the incident is curious as showing that however different the state of society may be in different countries, the forms of politeness are much the same in all. This polished character was very well sustained by the chief, as he was pleased with our efforts to oblige him and whatever we seemed to care about, he immediately took an interest in. He was very inquisitive and was always highly gratified when he discovered the use of anything which had puzzled him at first. But there was no extravagant outbursts of admiration, and he certainly would be considered a man of good breeding and keen observation in any part of the world."

Now, what I mean by civilization is this. Any state of society that can produce such a type of humanity as Captain Hall in the above describes, is a civilized society. If the above account gives the type of character of the educated or upper classes of society under the civilization of the people of the Far East, the following description of the characteristics of the Chinese by the late Dr. D. J. Macgowan may serve to show the influence of that civilization upon the common people:—

“In the foregoing survey of the industrial and mercantile life of the Chinese” says Dr. Macgowan, “the one notable feature to be observed in this people is their capacity for combining, which is one of the chief characteristics of civilized men. To them organisation and combined action are easy, because of their inherent reverence for authority and their law-abiding instincts. Their docility is not that of a broken-spirited emasculated people, but results from habits of self-control and from being long left to self-government in local communal or municipal matters; as regards the State, they learn self-reliance. Were the poorest and least cultured of these people placed by themselves on an island, they would as soon organise themselves into a body politic as men of the same station in life who had been tutored in rational democracy.”

From the above accounts of the civilization of the people of the Far East, it should be abundantly evident that such a civilization cannot in itself possibly be a source of danger to the people of Europe. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that there is undoubtedly a conflict of civilization going on at present between Europe and the Far East. The conflict, however, it seems to me, is not a conflict between the civilization of the yellow race and the civilization of the white race. It is rather

a conflict between the civilization of the Far East and what may be called the mediæval civilization of Europe.

Any one who has given any attention to the study of the spirit of modern institutions in Europe cannot have failed to observe that for the last hundred years there has been growing up in Europe under the general name of what is called Liberalism, the consciousness of a new moral culture and notions of a new social order quite distinct from what may be called the old mediæval culture and social order. At the end of the last century, just before the first French Revolution, a Frenchman, Du Clos, said: "Il y a un germe de raison qui commence à se développer en France."\* Indeed, it is now generally recognised that the ideas and notions of what is now called Liberalism were first properly understood and promulgated by the French philosophical writers of the last century. But it is curious that it should hitherto have remained unrecognised and unsuspected how much the French "philosophers" owe to their study of Chinese books and of Chinese institutions, the knowledge of which was then brought to Europe by the Jesuit missionaries. Any one now who will take the trouble of reading the works of Voltaire, Diderot, and especially *L'esprit des lois* of Mon-

---

\* Lord Chesterfield's letters.

tesqieu, can see for himself what an impetus that knowledge of Chinese books and institutions gave, if not to the rise of the "germe de raison" spoken of by Du Clos, at least to the rapid development and expansion of what are now called Liberal ideas. That "germe de raison" developing into Liberal ideas finally, as we now all know, brought about the "culbute général" or general breaking-up of the mediæval institutions of Europe in the last century.

What an irony of Providence, I cannot help remarking here, that the Roman Catholic missionaries who came out to China to convert the heathen Chinese, should themselves have been the means of carrying the ideas of the Chinese civilization to Europe, ideas which were the means of breaking-up that very mediæval civilization to which those missionaries spent their lives in trying to convert the Chinese!

I have been a long way—but now we have come to the subject of my essay. This conflict of civilization, or rather the conflict of modern Liberalism and ancient Mediævalism, is the Moral Problem of the Far Eastern question. It is not a conflict of the white race with the yellow race, but it is rather a struggle on the part of the people of Europe to free themselves completely from their ancient mediæval civilization. It is, in one word, what the Germans call the *Kulturkampf* of the present day.

The source of the mediæval moral culture of Europe is the Christian Bible. The Christian Bible, taking it as a book of what Goethe calls world literature (*Welt-Literatur*), like the Iliad of Homer or Æneid of Virgil, is a very grand book and will never be wholly lost to the world. The moral grandeur of the Old Testament and, as Mr. Mathew Arnold points out, the prepossessingness of the personality of Jesus Christ and the directness and simplicity of his teaching in the New Testament—all these have gone into the bones, so to speak, of the best types of humanity which Europe has produced. What is more, it will always remain of permanent force and value to those upon whom Goethe's *Welt-Literatur* can exert an influence. But it is not so with ordinary men. For the average men of Europe, in order fully to feel the force of the Christian Bible, they must be in the same intellectual state as the people who produced the Bible. But now it is, I think, generally admitted, that the "germe de raison" of Du Clos has greatly changed the intellectual state of the average men of Europe. For such men the Christian Bible becomes difficult of understanding, if not altogether unintelligible, and as a consequence must cease to be a source of true moral culture. The late Professor Huxley said once at a school board meeting in London that if these (British) Islands had no

religion at all, it would not enter into his mind to introduce the religious idea by the agency of the Bible.

In one word, we believe the true moral culture of modern Liberalism, if not so strict, perhaps, is a much broader one than the mediæval culture of Europe derived from the Christian Bible. The one appeals chiefly to the passions of hope and fear in man. The new moral culture on the other hand appeals to the whole intelligent powers of man's nature: to his reason as well as to his feelings. The theory about man's nature in the old culture was; "all men are born in sin," *i.e.*, human nature is radically bad. The theory of the modern moral culture is that man's nature is radically good and if properly developed and appealed to, will of itself produce moral well-being and social order in the world. The method of the old culture began with "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of Wisdom." The method of education of modern culture says: "A course of higher education consists in bringing out (*educere*) or developing the intelligent powers of man's nature."\* The language of modern moral

---

\* From the *Ta hsio* 大學, or the Method of Higher Education translated by Dr. Legge, and known to foreigners as the Book of the Great Learning. The language of the old culture derived from the Christian Bible is figurative language: language of pictures, symbols and metaphors.

culture is concrete language: the language of science. In the language of the one it is said: "To him that ordereth his conversation aright shall be shown the salvation of God." In the language of the other it is said: "He who would have good government in his country must begin by putting his house in order, and to do that, he must begin by attending properly to his personal conduct."

The above, then, is a summary of the difference between the old mediæval moral culture and what we have called the modern moral culture of Europe in the theory with regard to human nature, in method of education and in language. The effects of the old and modern cultures of Europe upon the life of the people and their social and civil institutions will, we believe, also be different. The effect of the one upon the people is blind, passive obedience to power and authority. The effect of the modern moral culture will be what Dr. Macgowan, speaking of the characteristics of the Chinese, says: "self-reliance on the part of the people as regards the State." The result of the mediæval moral culture of Europe, in one word, was Feudal Government. The result of the modern moral culture which goes under the name of Liberalism will be what Dr. Macgowan calls "rational democracy" *i.e.*, government by free institutions.

Now, European writers are accustomed to speak of the higher Christian civilization as compared with what is called the Confucian civilization of the people of the Far East. The object of the two civilizations no doubt is the same; the moral well-being of man and the keeping of civil order in the world. But if what I have said of the old and modern moral culture of Europe is true it must, I think, be admitted that although perhaps the civilization founded upon a moral culture which appeals to the passions of hope and fear is a stronger and even a stricter civilization, yet surely the civilization founded on a moral culture which appeals to the calm reason of man, is, if not a higher, yet a broader civilization, one more difficult to attain, and once attained, more enduring and permanent.

In fact, it seems to me that it is really the difficulty of attaining the new modern moral culture on the part of the people of Europe and not the civilization of the yellow race which is at present the real danger, not only to the people of Europe, but to the destiny and civilization of the human race. The population of Europe, having for the most part lost the sense of the force and sanction of their old mediæval moral culture and not having sufficiently attained to the modern moral culture to use it as a restraining force for keeping civil order,



have now to be kept in order, not by any moral force at all, but by sheer physical force of police or what is called Militarism. "The state of modern Europe, said Carlyle "is Anarchy *plus* a constable." A French writer put it better: "C'est la force attendant le droit."

But the enormous cost necessary for maintaining this immense scale of militarism in modern Europe is becoming ruinous to the economic well-being of the people. To escape from this ruin the people of Europe, it seems to me, have two courses open to them: either to struggle hard for the attainment of the new modern culture or to return to mediævalism. But back to mediævalism the people of Europe will never consent to return. "Wir gehen nicht nach Canossa," the great Prince Bismarck has said. Indeed, the people of Europe, even if they are willing, cannot now get back to the true mediævalism of the past. The people of Europe in trying to return to mediævalism will only arrive either at the extravagances of the Salvation Army or the jugglery of the Ultramontanism of the Jesuits.

Now, if any one would like to know what a force destructive of civilization and all true moral culture the extravagances of the Salvation Army may one day become in Europe, he should read the history of the last Taiping Rebellion in China.

The Chinese Christians of that rebellion, losing their national moral culture, appealing to reason, went back to the moral culture of mediæval Europe, which appeals to the passions of hope and fear in the hearts of the multitude, and the result was devastated provinces and the sacrifice of a million lives.

As for the Ultramontanism of the Jesuits, it is even worse than the extravagances of the Salvation Army. The intellectual jugglery of Ultramontanism is an outrage upon human nature. The reaction against such an outrage will be, as Carlyle has pointed out, "widespread suffering, mutiny, and delirium ; the hot rage of sansculotic insurrections, the cold rage of resuscitated Tyrannies ; brutal degradation of the millions, the pampered frivolty of the units ; that awful spectacle, 'the Throne of Iniquity decreeing injustice by a law.'"

In plain language the practical outcome of Jesuitism may be defined as the Gospel, to use a vulgar expression, of knowing on which side your bread is buttered. The social order founded upon such a mean and base mental habit cannot last. After Louis Napoleon of France came *La Débâcle*, the Commune of Paris. Who knows what is in store for the people of Europe if they were to go back to mediævalism and succeed only in arriving at the Ultramontanism of the Jesuits ?

I have said that the civilization of the yellow race can never be a danger to the people of Europe. The danger lies rather, it seems to me, in the ignorant and the wanton way in which the "pampered units" of Europe are urging their governments to deal with this civilization. The press in Europe, and especially in England, which is the mouth-piece of the "pampered units," unites in urging what is called the gunboat policy in China and writes with equanimity upon the partition of China. But I wonder if it ever occurred to anyone to calculate how much it would cost the nations of Europe to restore order and police the four hundred million people of China when once the rule of the mandarins is broken up and the population becomes rabid like the people lately in Armenia, in Turkey. The late General Gordon said: "Remember this: an unsatisfied people means more troops." Whatever may be said of the helplessness and abuses of the rule of the mandarins in China at the present day, their rule is a moral and not a police rule. Militarism is necessary in Europe but not in China. The foreign gunboat policy has done and will only do harm to the interests of all concerned, foreigners as well as Chinese. In my opinion, the establishment of an International School for the higher study of Chinese history and literature in Shanghai and at the

same time the sending of a large number of Chinese students to Europe and America will do more to foster even the interests of foreign commerce than the most powerful fleet the European nations can send out. But if once Militarism becomes necessary in China, the Chinese will have to become a military power or will have to be kept down by military power from outside. In either case the whole world will have to pay for this added military burden of the world.

Militarism is necessary in Europe because the people are unsatisfied. Militarism is the knight or protector of civilization—*C'est la force attendant le droit*. Its true function in the mediæval language of Tennyson, is

“To break the heathen and uphold the Christ,”

*i.e.*, to keep down rowdyism, savagery and anarchy. But the Militarism of Europe lately is being made use of, not against anarchy and rowdyism, but against true civilization, against the good government of the Chinese people. The more the Militarism of Europe is thus misused, the more the burden of its cost will increase.

The only possible way, therefore, for the people of Europe to escape from the ruin resulting from the burden of their Militarism, is to struggle for the attainment of what we have called the new moral culture, which now lies under the general

name of Liberalism. How long it will take for the people of Europe to attain this, it is impossible to say. Indeed, it seems to me that the Liberalism of Europe at the end of this century has retrograded. Lord Beaconsfield, speaking of the Liberalism of the England of his time, said that he was astonished to find that it had become an oligarchy. The Liberalism of Europe to-day, it seems to me, has become also an oligarchy: an oligarchy of "pampered units." The Liberalism of Europe of the last century had culture, but the Liberalism of to-day has lost its culture. The Liberalism of the past read books and understood ideas. Modern Liberalism reads only newspapers and makes use of the great liberal phrases of the past only as catch-words and cant phrases for its selfish interests. The Liberalism of the last century fought for right and justice. The false Liberalism of to-day fights only for rights and trade privileges. The Liberalism of the past battled for humanity. The false Liberalism of to-day only tries to further the vested interests of capitalists and financiers. If we can imagine one of the great Liberals of the last century who had to do the cruel work of killing kings and almost destroying kingship, rise from the dead, what he would say to the false Liberal of to-day would be in the language of Shakespeare's Brutus:—

What, shall one of us,  
That struck the foremost man of all this world  
But for supporting robbers, shall we now  
Contaminate our fingers with base bribes  
And sell the mighty space of our large honours  
For so much trash as may be grasped thus?  
I had rather be a dog and bay the moon  
Than such a Roman.

But we will not be altogether hopeless. I believe the immediate result of the present movement called Kolonial Politik will be a revival of true Liberalism in Europe. M. Guizot, in his lectures on European civilization, speaking of the design and function of Middle-age Christian Crusades upon Christendom in Europe, says :

“To the first chroniclers, and consequently to the first Crusaders of whom the former were but the expression, Mohammedans were only objects of hatred and contempt; it is evident that those who thus speak of them do not know them. The histories of the later Crusades speak quite differently; it is clear that they look upon them no longer as monsters; that they have to a certain extent entered into their ideas; that they have lived with them; that relation and even a sort of sympathy have been established between them.” Thus, the kinds of both. M. Guizot goes on to say, but particularly of the Crusaders who were delivered from those

prejudices which were the offspring of ignorance. "A step," he says finally, "was thus taken towards the enfranchisement of the human spirit."

This modern Crusade of Europe called Kolonial Politik will eventually complete the enfranchisement of the human spirit in Europe and America. The complete enfranchisement of the human spirit will at last produce a universal true Catholic civilization; a civilization founded not upon a moral culture appealing merely to the passions of hope and fear in man, but upon a moral culture appealing to the calm reason of man, deriving its sanction not from any power or authority outside, but as Mencius put it, from the innate love in man's nature for mercy, for justice, for order, for truth and for truthfulness.

Under the new civilization freedom for the educated man will not mean liberty to do what he likes, but liberty to do what is right. The serf or the man not yet civilized does not do wrong because he fears the *knout* or the policeman's baton in this world and hell fire in the next. But the freed man of the new civilization is he for whom neither the *knout*, nor policemen, nor hell fire is any longer necessary. He does right because he loves to do right; and he does no wrong, not from motive or of abject or craven fear, but because he hates to do wrong. In all matters in the conduct of life, he

makes the rule not of authority from without but of reason and conscience from within his one rule to follow. He can live without rulers, but he does not live without laws. Therefore, the Chinese call an educated gentleman a 君子 Koen tzu (君 Koen is the same word as German Koenig or King, a kingly or a little *king* of men.)

The American Emerson, relating an incident of his visit to England when he and Carlyle together visited Stonehenge, the oldest monument in that country, says:

“On Sunday we had much discourse on a rainy day. My friends asked whether there were any Americans—Any Americans with an American idea. Thus challenged I bethought myself neither of caucuses nor of congress, neither of presidents nor cabinet ministers, nor of such as would make of America another Europe. I thought only of the simplest and purest minds. I said ‘certainly, yes; but those who hold it are fanatics of a dream which I should hardly care to relate to your English ears, to which it might be only ridiculous, yet it is the only true one.’ So I opened the dogma of no-government and non-resistance. I said: ‘it is true that I have never seen in any country a man of sufficient valour to stand up for this truth; and yet it is plain to me that no less valour than this can command my respect. I can easily see the bankruptcy of the



vulgar musket worship and 'tis certain as God liveth, the gun that does not require another gun, the law of love and justice alone can effect a clean revolution."

The future civilization of the world lies as a "germe de raison" *qui commence à se développer*, as Du Clos said of the modern Liberalism, in this American idea of Emerson. What is more, this American idea of Emerson lies at the bottom of the Chinese civilization, or rather what may be called the Confucian civilization of the people of the Far East. Herein then lies the moral problem of the Far Eastern question. The solution of that problem does not lie entirely with congress nor with parliaments, neither with emperors, presidents, kings, nor with cabinet ministers. The solution lies, to use Emerson's words, with the simplest and purest minds that are to be found in Europe and America. The poets have sung the hymns of this new civilization. The German Heine, who calls himself the Knight of the Battle for the emancipation of the Human Spirit (*Ritter des Menschheit-Befreiungskrieges*) sings,

Ein neues Lied, ein besseres Lied,  
O Freunde, will ich euch dichten :  
Wir wollen hier auf Erden schon  
Das Himmelreich errichten.

The Scottish Robert Burns sings,

Then let us pray that come it may,  
 As come it will for a' that,  
 That sense and worth o'er a' the earth,  
 May bear the gree and a' that :  
 For a' that, and a' that  
 It's coming yet for a' that,  
 That man to man the wide warl' o'er,  
 Shall brithers be for a' that.

Lastly, the French Béranger sees as in a vision,  
 what he calls the holy alliance of the people (Sainte  
 alliance des peuples) and sings,

J'ai vu la Paix descendre sur la terre,  
 Semant de l'or des fleurs et des épis :  
 L'air était calme et du dieu de la guerre  
 Elle étouffait les foudres assoupis.  
 Ah ! disait-elle, égaux par la vaillance,  
 Français, Anglais, Belge, Russe ou Germain  
 Peuples, formez une sainte alliance  
 Et donnez-vous la main.





## ERRATA.

---

Page	4,	line	15, “Refrom”.....	should read	“Reform.”
”	9,	”	18, “seemes” .....	”	“seems.”
”	11,	”	20, “other”.....	”	“order.”
”	15,	”	13, “perserve” .....	”	“preserve.”
”	18,	”	13, “l’home” .....	”	“l’homme.”
”	27,	”	6, “Doyenne” .....	”	“Doyen.”
”	32,	”	18, “réproche” .....	”	“reproche.”
”	40,	”	18, “pretentionsness”	”	“pretentiousness.”
”	49,	”	26, “ <i>intèrprete</i> ” .....	”	“ <i>interprète</i> .”
”	50,	”	9, “l’évènement” ...	”	“l’évènement.”
”	63,	”	13, “if” .....	”	“it.”
”	67,	”	12, “auverte aux talens”	”	“ouverte aux talents.”
”	86,	”	21, “Barrabas” .....	”	“Barabbas.”
”	87,	”	2 & 13, “Barrabas” ...	”	“Barabbas.”
”	87,	”	14, “Voila” .....	”	“Voilà.”
”	93,	”	20, “Barrabas” .....	”	“Barabbas.”
”	105,	”	6, “Mathew” .....	”	“Matthew.”
”	112,	”	22, “geniues” .....	”	“genius.”
”	119,	”	2 & 7, “Michael” .....	”	“Michel.”
”	119,	”	9, “Vorwärts” .....	”	“Vorwärts.”
”	119,	”	13, “Bursh” .....	”	“Bursch.”
”	120,	”	6, “Michael”.....	”	“Michel.”
”	120,	”	13, “Politick” .....	”	“Politik.”
”	122,	”	7, “ <i>Kunft</i> ” .....	”	“ <i>kunft</i> .”
”	129,	”	6, “revolution”.....	”	“révolution.”
”	129,	”	8, “Germany” .....	”	“Germany.”

Page 131, line 14,	“bourgeois”	.....should read	“bourgeois.”
” 131, ” 22,	“selbstgefühl”...	”	“Selbstgefühl.”
” 131, ” 22,	“individues” .....	”	“individuelles.”
” 132, ” 24,	“Mathew” .....	”	“Matthew.”
” 133, ” 10,	“moirs d où” ...	”	“noirs d’où.”
” 133, ” 12,	“Moité” .....	”	“Moitié.”
” 133, ” 20,	“folis” .....	”	“jolis.”
” 136, ” 8,	“père” .....	”	“père.”
” 136, ” 12,	“deserte” .....	”	“déserte.”
” 144, ” 20,	“sants” .....	”	“sont.”
” 145, ” 18,	“Espérance” ...	”	“Espérance.”
” 145, ” 19,	“Fance” .....	”	“France.”
” 148, ” 1,	“rohheit” .....	”	“Rohheit.”
” 149, ” 24,	“they” .....	”	“to.”
” 156, ” 24,	“civilisation” .....	”	“civilisation.”
” 161, ” 5,	“droits” .....	”	“droit.”
” 169, ” 25,	“d’egorger” ...	”	“d’égorger.”

## ERRATA.

---

Page	v,	line	24,	"sorrow".....	read	"sorry."
"	ix,	"	4,	"strong" .....	"	"stony."
"	12,	"	28,	"ultras".....	"	"the ultras."
"	25,	"	14,	"the English"...	"	"English."
"	"	"	"	"press" .....	"	"dress."
"	33,	"	24,	"second".....	"	"first."
"	103,	"	13,	"the life".....	"	"life."
"	122,	"	6,	"person".....	"	"parson."
"	124,	"	19,	"geling" .....	"	"gelind."
"	124,	"	28,	"others".....	"	"eyil-doers."
"	125,	"	10,	"person".....	"	"parson."
"	126,	"	4,	" " ".....	"	" " "
"	128,	"	3,	"revenge".....	"	"avenge."
"	143,	"	11,	"descesends"....	"	"descends, descends."
"	"	"	12,	"descends" .....	—	<i>dele.</i>
"	145,	"	21,	"France" .....	read	"Francs."
"	161,	"	20,	"soldier".....	"	"sold-ner."
"	166,	"	6,	"vielmehr" .....	"	"vielmehr Dictatur."
"	"	"	8,	"zu lassen".....	"	"treten zu lassen."
"	"	"	18,	"person".....	"	"parson."
"	193,	"	26,	"the minds".....	"	"the minds of both."

