

TRANSLATION

A Discourse on Government by Three Drunken Men

Nankai sensei¹ is devoted to drinking and discussing government. After two or three little bottles of sake he feels as if he were flying around the world. His perception is awakened and he is oblivious to all suffering and pain. Two or three more bottles make his spirits soar and his thoughts boil. From his small room his eyes penetrate the entire world, and in an instant he looks backward and forward through many years in time. He is able to reveal the ways of the world and of society. He proclaims himself the leader of mankind and berates the politically myopic people who read their compasses carelessly and misguide their ships. The ships crash against reefs or go aground and the tragedy of it lies in the harm it does to all mankind.

The sensei is physically in this world but spiritually he is with the immortals on Mt. Bakukoya² or in utopia in the village of Mukayū.³ The geography and history he discusses have the same names and terms as the geography and history we know but, in fact, the sensei speaks of a completely different world. Nevertheless there is some similarity between our world and the world the sensei describes. In both there are cold and warm countries, strong and weak countries, civilized cultures and barbarian cultures. In his history too there is peace and war, prosperity and decline.

A few more little bottles and his ears ring and his eyes blur. He waves his arms and stamps his feet, leaping and cavorting wildly. Finally he passes out. When after two or three hours he revives, he remembers nothing of what he said or did. It is as if he were delivered from the influence of a fox spirit.⁴

People who know about the extraordinary things Nankai sensei says when drunk visit his hut bringing liquor and food and they drink with him. When they see that he is getting drunk, they bring up the subject of government in an attempt to lead him into a political discussion. The sensei knows perfectly well what they are doing, but he is not unwilling to talk about government with them. "The next time I discuss contemporary government," he promises, "I will write down the important points one by one before I get too drunk in the hope that someday I can put together a little book for my own pleasure and the delight of others."

Recently it rained continuously for several days. Nankai sensei felt dreary and depressed. He called for liquor and refreshed himself. No sooner had he achieved a feeling of well-being than two guests appeared with a bottle of Hennessy's brandy.⁵ The sensei had never met them before and did not know their names, but even a glance at that Western brandy made him a little more light-headed.

One guest wore Western-style clothes. He was slender and had refined features and an elevated bearing. His speech was educated. Obviously he was active in intellectual pursuits. Philosophy seemed to be in the very air he breathed, and his thinking rambled along the meandering road of empiricism.

The other visitor was big and brawny, with deep-set eyes and a swarthy complexion. He wore a patterned Japanese coat and Japanese trousers. Anyone could see that he was the sort of swaggering fellow who loves anything grandiose and revels in danger, using life as bait to fish for the pleasures of fame.

The two guests seated themselves, finished their pleasantries and then settled down to drink the bottle of brandy. Host and guests exchanged glasses and gradually became congenial. The sensei did not ask their names; he called one guest Highbrow⁶ and the other

Swashbuckler.⁷ The guests laughed politely, afraid to offend him.

Suddenly Highbrow spoke, "For a long time I have been hearing about the sensei whose learning encompasses East and West, ancient and modern. Nankai sensei, I would like your opinion of some of the things I have been thinking about."

Highbrow began, "I think that a despotic system of ruler and ministers is a stupid thing unaware of its own faults. Constitutional government recognizes its weaknesses and corrects half of them. But democratic government is open and frank, its heart pure!

"The three principles of liberty, equality and fraternity are already well known in European countries. Why then do so few countries have democratic governments? Why do they instead oppose these principles and, very much in violation of the laws of economics, support huge standing armies which undermine their finances? By competing for empty fame they only cause the slaughter of innocent people.

"Suppose one small and culturally backward state in Asia were suddenly to emerge triumphantly from obscurity into the world of liberty and fraternity. Suppose then it destroyed its forts, melted down its guns, turned its battleships into trading ships and its soldiers into civilians. If it gave the greatest emphasis to the cultivation of liberty, equality and fraternity and to research in manufacturing techniques, it would then have put the pure philosophical principles of the West into actual practice.

"If that happened, then all the peoples of Europe, however haughty, would be ashamed to take advantage of the defenselessness of the small Asian country. Should those great foreign enemies attack anyway, what would happen if the small state welcomed them instead of defending itself? Their attack on the small state would be like a sharp sword slashing the wind. Wind offers no resistance, and the small state too would offer no resistance.

"Whenever a weak state comes to blows with a vastly more powerful adversary, the weaker state is smashed like a bird's egg against a rock.

"The big and powerful state is proud that it embodies the essence of civilization. If the small weak state admires the spirit of the big one, rather than adopting its military techniques, the small state should follow the abstract principles of the big state which the big state itself has not yet put into practice. No one in the world will oppose the small state if it uses liberty as its army and navy, equality as its forts, and fraternity as its swords and guns. Unless the small state does that, it will be entirely dependent upon real fortifications, weapons and armies. The big state also relies on fortifications, weapons and armies, and the state with the strongest military equipment will be victorious. That is a perfectly clear principle of arithmetic. Why try to confound it? The armies of the big state will occupy the small state and everything will be thrown into confusion. The occupying army will commandeer fields and houses and make the small state suffer by imposing heavy taxes. Patient people will bide their time while those who are impatient will plot against the aggressor.

"Each man is a citizen of the country in which he lives. We have not yet reached the end of the world. As long as the temporal world exists there will probably be national distinctions. I know nothing of what was written before Noah's great flood. I do know that since then, remarkably enough, I am the only one to realize the fact that the citizens of any one country consider themselves to be polite and reasonable but see all other peoples as barbarous. In the words of these people, 'Other civilizations are barbarian, but we are civilized. They explode in anger and fail to understand how we can keep our sense of humor and remain calm.' I wonder what men like Plato, Mencius, Spencer, Malebranche, Aristotle and Victor Hugo would say about this phenomenon."

After hearing what Highbrow had to say, Swashbuckler turned to him and demanded, "Are you out of your mind? It is madness to say that even though hundreds and thousands of stalwarts join together against us we should just sit silently not daring to lift a finger. Fortunately I have not lost my sanity and neither sensei nor the people of Japan are mad. Why do you think that---"

Nankai sensei laughed and said, "Now just wait a minute. Let's hear Highbrow through."

Highbrow continued, "In general one can call the men who take responsibility for government upon themselves priests who worship the god of political Evolution. These statesmen-priests must pay attention to the future as well as to the situation at hand because the god of Evolution likes to move forward; he does not like to retrogress. All goes well for the state if the road along which the god is progressing is straight and clear, but when jagged rocks impede his cart wheels and thorns grow luxuriant encumbering his horses' hoofs, he relentlessly kicks and slashes his way straight ahead. Even if misguided people acting out the drama of revolution split each other's brains and livers and drown the streets in blood, the god of Evolution looks at them without flinching. The statesmen-priests who dedicate themselves to this god believe their duty to be the clearing away of great rocks and thorns from the path of their god so that he will not display his power and wrath. This is their proper function. The rocks are the governmental systems that oppose the principle of equality, and the thorns are the laws that deny the principle of liberty.

"During the reigns of Charles I of England and of Louis XVI of France, the great ministers in power might have avoided disaster if they had been alert to the conditions of their own times and, looking ahead to the future, had cleared the road for the god of Evolution. Of course in England the ministers had no precedent of the

kind of revolution which was to occur under Charles I, and so they were not prepared to take the proper measures to prevent it. Although they were defeated, we must not be too hard on them. A century later in France, however, the ministers did have a tragic precedent in the English revolution, but they did not take warning from it. They relied on inadequate and makeshift policies and frittered away their time. The symptoms of disaster were already well apparent, but still they ignored the disease and did not call a good physician. Their vacillation aroused the people's distrust, and their words and deeds incited popular resentment. Finally they touched off unparalleled disaster. Blood and gore flooded the cities and towns, and the whole country became a slaughterhouse. Was this really the fault of the god of Evolution or was it rather the fault of the statesmen-priests?

"By the end of the reign of Louis XVI France would have been only one step away from a democracy if the great ministers in power during the reign of Louis XV or early in the reign of Louis XVI had projected themselves far into the future and had worked together to replace the evils of the old institutions with appropriate new plans. King Louis could have gone calmly before the Estates General, removed his crown, loosed his sword and said with a bow and a smile to Robespierre's followers, 'I will become an ordinary citizen and devote myself to the good of the nation.' He could have taken his wife and children to some lush and scenic estate in the provinces. He would have ended his days in leisure leaving to posterity a fine reputation for his brave and highminded abdication.

"Had there been no precedent in the English revolution, the French ministers would not have been completely to blame, and I would not be so harsh in judging them. But they did have a clear precedent, and still they did not recognize its lesson. They merely repeated the mistakes of their fathers before them. The great French ministers purposely left misfortune to their descendants. They were the devils who impeded the god of Evolution. They

were the criminals responsible for the overthrow of Louis XVI."

Highbrow emptied another glass and said, "There are men in elegant dress who, without a glance to left or right, drive their fine carriages and sleek horses through throngs of men and women on the main thoroughfares. Are these men the great ministers who discharge official duties at the palace for the emperor? Have they the talent to manage the whole country or the will to rule the people? Do they have the natural shrewdness of clever speculators? Are they great men who look for assistance to literature and scholarship, to Cervantes and Pascal? No, they most certainly are not! Their remote ancestors received peerages and land for taking up arms against enemy generals and vanquishing them. Today the descendants have inherited noble ranks from those ancestors. They have no talent or learning themselves but merely bask in the glow from the tombs where the rotting bones of their ancestors lie. They pass their days in idleness collecting rich stipends, drinking good wine and eating fine food. We call this select group the nobility. Unfortunately, because of the great numbers of nobles in the nation, genuine equality and freedom will not exist even if a constitution is promulgated. Should freedom be granted to the people it will not be true freedom. The people work hard from morning to night and submit some part of their harvest to taxation. They not only must feed the officials who administer the government, they must support that do-nothing group of nobles as well. That is hardly freedom!

"Are the royalty and aristocracy in any way mentally or physically superior to the rest of us? If Galen examined their brains would he find them in any way different from ours or, if he did make a distinction, in whose favor would it be?

"I understand that the back part of an animal's brain is highly developed whereas it is the front part of the human brain which is

the most advanced--

"Come to think of it, are the aristocrats really born wearing their brocades? Aren't they naked at birth as we are? When they die, don't their bones and flesh rot--

"If there are three aristocrats in a million people, 999,997 of them would have to serve those three in some way or other. This is a principle of arithmetic, an extremely clear--

"And besides, our flesh and the nobles' flesh are composed of the same undetermined element; yet when we encounter the nobility, we bow down while they remain erect and barely acknowledge us with a slight nod. We show them great deference by calling them 'sir' or 'my lord' and just how do they address us in return? It's very insulting, disgraceful!

"At one time--I don't know when--there were wise and virtuous men who were ennobled because of their great courage and ability. Now, according to the theory of heredity, the descendants of those nobles are also superior to ordinary men in talent, intelligence and courage, and so under a system which is in keeping with this theory it is only just that the descendants of the original nobles should become nobles too. You have heard the theories of Darwin and Haeckel,⁸ haven't you? They state that characteristics are passed down generation after generation--

"It is completely absurd!

"In general all of the laws of nature have rules and exceptions to them. A man's ancestors may have lacked wisdom, virtue and talent and so were not ennobled. Yet as often happens, the man himself, unlike his ancestors, may be a superior person. He is the exception which proves the rule. It is precisely because of such exceptions that new nobles are created. Contemporary science has not yet been able to investigate this kind of thing thoroughly, but when students of anatomy, biology and zoology do examine this

problem in further detail in the future, we will certainly be able to distinguish between rules and their exceptions. Before we can advocate the principle of equality, we must prove by scientific investigation that the children of sage men are not always sage and the children of fools are not always fools.

"Suppose a slum child named Hachi or Kuma has a picture of a red carp tattooed on his arm or a picture of a blue dragon on his back. He is delighted when people give him the title of Hachi of the Red Carp or Kuma of the Blue Dragon. Isn't this the same thing as giving titles like duke or marquis to the nobility? The only difference is that the titles of the nobility are a kind of abstract tattoo which signifies rank. An abstract tattoo of this kind is considered civilized. The title of the slum child designates an actual tattoo and is thought to be crude and barbarous--

"And what's more, the nobility say that their titles are rewards for meritorious service to their country and are equivalent to an ordinary salary. But I say why not reward extraordinary deeds with something worthwhile? Why give an outdated tattoo?"

Nankai sensei downed a few more shots of brandy. Then he said, "I'm sure your discourse, Highbrow, is quite remarkable, but it is just a bit disjointed. There isn't any connection between beginning and end!"

Highbrow answered, "I have the greatest respect for your opinion, sensei. Please criticize my confused prattle and show me where I go wrong. I hope you won't be offended if I am too obvious."

The sensei replied, "No, no, but I wish you would follow some sort of logical organization so that some day I can write it all down and turn it into a little book."

Highbrow went on, "England, France, Germany and Russia are the four strongest states in Europe. They lead all others in art, technology, agriculture and industry, and their resources are

abundant. Thousands of their stout ships wait in the sea like phantoms. Never has such prosperity been equalled. They have all of this great wealth because their states are founded on liberal principles. England has a heritage of riches from her ancient kings, but her real power dates from the reign of Charles I when the first waves of freedom swelled and broke the dikes which shored up old abuses. These waves rose up again during the period of the famous Constitution of 1688. France, too, early in the reign of Louis XIV extended the power of its army and encouraged arts and letters, but that was only the efflorescence shining from the rotting corpse of a despotic society. It was the tremendous legacy of the French Revolution that really secured the prosperity of France. In the eighteenth century the courageous Frederick II of Prussia imposed his military strength upon his neighbors, and from then on Prussia flourished. Yet the whole of Germany was still divided. It was just like a bundle of faggots from which someone had drawn away the cord until Napoleon I and his French Republican Army invaded Vienna and Berlin bringing with them the principles of the French Revolution. The German people tasted the flavor of liberty and fraternity for the first time. Conditions and customs were changed radically enabling Germany to achieve its present prosperity.

"Russia has always been first in the world in land mass and in the size of its army. Because of its disastrous heritage of oppression, however, Russian civilization is far inferior to that of the other three great European powers.

"Human undertakings are like liquor. Liberty is the yeast. With wine and beer no matter how good the other ingredients, without yeast everything will settle to the bottom of the vat and will not ferment. Everything in a despotic country is like liquor without yeast--like sediment at the bottom of the vat. Take for example the art of a despotic country. Although at times it seems attractive, when we examine it in detail, we find a single style

persisting for thousands of years without variety. There is no disposition to change this situation. Everything that comes to the artist's attention is merely sediment, and it is with the spirit of such sediment that the artist paints. It is hardly surprising that there is no change under such circumstances.

"Some people say that the strength of a country is not the result of a liberal system, but on the contrary, that a country is strong because it is financially prosperous and it is prosperous because its technology is highly developed. This in turn results from the fact that the findings of all branches of science and of mathematics are put into actual practice in industry. The result is an economy of time and of physical power and the production of articles far superior in quality and quantity to those made directly by hand. These same people further say that when a country is rich it builds up its standing army and constructs stout ships to use in case of any threat to its interests. It conquers land in the Far East and in Africa and sends in colonists to establish markets. It buys native goods cheaply and sells its own products at high prices thus amassing enormous profits. It is only natural that industry would become increasingly profitable while markets expanded further and further. Military buildup becomes increasingly extensive. Unfortunately the people who say this kind of thing know a little, but they do not understand the entire picture.

"Generally everything men do is characterized by the interaction of cause and effect. When their undertakings are examined in detail, however, we see that beneath the surface there is always a more fundamental reason that things occur. A country is financially prosperous because its technology is highly developed, and its technology in turn is advanced because the country is rich. Obviously this is a cause-and-effect relationship. However, there is more to it than that. Technology is highly developed primarily as a result of the expansion of human knowledge. Once knowledge

expands people naturally become aware of technology, but at the same time they are also more aware of political issues. In every country from time immemorial technology and political thought have progressed side by side. They are like branches and leaves of the same tree, the tree of human knowledge.

"Just as soon as knowledge expands and political discussion becomes widespread, the fulfillment of liberal doctrines becomes the preponderant aim of the common people. Day and night scholars, artists, farmers, artisans and merchants are all obsessed with developing their own ideas and goals as they see fit. If in these circumstances the ruling classes are sufficiently in tune with the times and sympathetic to human nature to overcome their own selfish desire for power and act as popular leaders in getting rid of ancient abuses and in promoting the spirit of liberalism, the machinery of society will be set in motion properly. The obsolete dregs of the past will as a matter of course be washed away, and a fresh and nutritious liquid will be drunk in their place. Scholars and artists will refine their works, and people of all occupations will be diligent, and all levels of society will profit.

"It is an unchanging law that the world moves forward and not backward. Scholars in ancient Greece understood this very well. Heraclitus expressed it precisely when he stepped through a stream and then sighed and said, 'The water which I am now crossing has already flowed far beyond.'⁹ Of course in Heraclitus' time the experimental method was not yet in use, and the techniques of scholarship were undeveloped. Consequently scholars could only speculate about things. Later in the eighteenth century, Diderot and Condorcet discovered that particularly in human society the law of evolution is always in effect. When Lamarck¹⁰ first studied biology, he formulated a theory that all species of animals change from generation to generation and do not long remain in a fixed genus. After that Goethe and Joffre both enlarged upon Lamarck's theory and made it

more precise. Darwin drew upon these earlier theories, and today there is no longer any doubt that the law of evolution determines that all things develop by a process of gradual, continuous change. . . .

"Man too has developed in accordance with this law of evolution. In the beginning he lived in caves or on the plains and ate and drank whatever he could find. Even though men and women lived together there was no such institution as marriage. In time man learned to fell trees and to build houses out of stone. The men tilled the fields while the women worked inside the houses raising their children and grandchildren.

"The law of evolution also applies to government. In the beginning the strong oppressed the weak and the clever outwitted the fools. Weak and stupid people in fear of their oppressors submitted and became slaves. It was a period of anarchy, without institutions. Eventually people grew tired of fighting and longed for peace. Then either a virtuous and talented man would win the hearts of the people and become the ruler, or a strong, wily man would dupe the people and seize power. In either case the man who became ruler would make laws and devise a temporary peace. This is what is known as a despotism of ruler and ministers; it is the first step in the evolution of government.

"This kind of despotism is a step beyond the earlier relationship between master and slave based on concrete physical force. Ruler and people under a despotism are tied together by a kind of immaterial bond which stems from feelings of affection and gratitude rather than from any formal arrangement. The ruler shows affection and compassion toward the people, and they in turn are grateful to him. So long as this immaterial bond continues to grow strong, the righteousness of the ruler and ministers also increases and the relationship of ruler and ruled becomes more and more firm. This was

the case when the great dynasties of the Hsia, Shang, Chou and T'ang were founded.

"There is, however, one dangerous source of disruption inherent in this system. The gratitude which the people feel for those above is only a reflection of the compassion which the ruler shows for them. If the ruler's compassion is lessened even a little, the people's gratitude decreases accordingly like an echo reflecting sound. The extent of the ruler's compassion depends for the most part on the temperament of the individual ruler. If by ill fortune the ruler is mediocre, it makes no difference how much his ministers try to guide and enlighten him. If the relationship between ruler and ruled is severed, violence will result. This is precisely what happened at the end of the Hsia, Shang, Chou and T'ang dynasties. If by good fortune, generations of successive rulers have excellent qualities and show increasing compassion for the people, the gratitude of the people will be correspondingly greater with each generation, and for thousands of years there may be peaceful and prosperous government.

"Yet even if the rulers are good there still remains an even more frightening source of disruption. People work to keep themselves alive and then must give some portion of their harvest to the government. Consequently, they feel as if the burden of supporting the entire country has been placed wholly upon their shoulders, and they cease to care about anything. People of all occupations immerse themselves in their own work to the exclusion of everything else. Their minds decay and their bodies become blobs of flesh fit for nothing except the ingestion of food. As I said earlier in connection with the art of despotic countries, all art and writing, agriculture and commerce are like sediment at the bottom of a vat. There is neither vitality nor variety.

"Our ancestors, because they were ignorant and could not govern themselves, temporarily relinquished their rights in a desire

for peace. They entrusted all responsibilities to a ruler and obeyed his laws. It was their hope that at some later time their descendants would achieve greater wisdom and would regain the right of self-rule. Although there was no formal covenant between ruler and people to this effect, the meaning was there. But in spite of that, the rulers by longstanding convention hold on to the rights which they received from our ancestors and will not under any circumstances return them to us. They insist that the right to rule has belonged to them from the beginning. That is why I said earlier that a despotism of ruler and ministers is a stupid thing unaware of its own faults.

"Since countries were first formed this process of evolution from anarchy to despotism of ruler and ministers has characterized political development throughout the world with the exception of the barbarian peoples of Africa. The peoples of Asia, once they had achieved a despotism of ruler and ministers, stood still and were unable to progress further. In Europe, however, the more progressive states from the seventeenth century and the slower ones from the eighteenth emerged from despotism to the next stage of political evolution, that of a constitutional monarchy. That is the reason East and West are at different stages of civilization now.

"It is the nature of the god of Evolution to march on untiringly. Evolution impelled its children to leave the plains of anarchy and enter the valley of despotism where for a while they rested and gathered strength. Then it drove them up to the fine hills of constitutionalism. When they became more and more aware of their surroundings, they looked up and saw the splendid and peerless peak of democracy with its tall green trees, floating clouds and birds singing everywhere. I shall describe this splendid peak in greater detail.

"When Greece and Rome flourished, it looked as if Evolution

had caused those countries to achieve a high degree of preparation for the liberal system, but because the system of slavery still existed Evolution did not yet dare to let the light of freedom shine very brightly. In the modern age of all countries Evolution has the greatest respect for England and looks with favor on the Anglo-Saxon race. After Evolution descended upon Great Britain the British people competed with each other to carry out the wishes of Evolution by cheering and waving the standard of freedom. The blood of Charles I spurted out on the execution ground and the great words of their brilliant constitution radiated its light across the world.

"Evolution is basically a gentle god by nature and does not like to kill people, but when human emotions are roused, there is nothing it can do to avoid bloodshed. It is human nature to cling to the past and fear anything new. When Evolution cannot stop people from stubbornly blocking the way, it has no choice but to knock down the obstructions. I am not finding fault with Evolution."

Highbrow filled another glass and drank. Then he looked at Nankai sensei, "No doubt my long-winded speech bores you."

"On the contrary," answered the sensei, "In European countries such things may be stale, whereas in all of the countries of Asia it still sounds fresh. Please continue."

Highbrow went on, "The second stage of political evolution is the constitutional monarchy. Under this system as under a despotism the chief ruler is called an emperor or a king, and he keeps strict control over the people generation after generation. There is also a nobility made up of dukes, marquises, viscounts and barons and, just as under a despotism, the nobility pays homage to the ruler and upholds the ruling house. But in constitutional monarchies the five ranks often indicate no more than an honor given a certain person or family and the only advantage that comes with

it is a seat in the upper house of the Diet. The nobles get their extensive lands and large fortunes through their own efforts so that any farmer, artisan or merchant may by his own efforts amass a huge fortune for himself and be no different from the nobility. This is not the situation in despotic countries where nobles just sit around in idleness sucking the sweat and blood of the people to enrich their families. For this reason a constitutional monarchy is superior to a despotism.

"After emerging from a despotism to a constitutional system, the people for the first time become independent human beings. They have the right to participate in government and enjoy freedom of press and assembly--the basic human rights of free men. Just as a man with a head but no hands or hands but no feet is a physical cripple, a man who does not have all of his constitutional rights is a spiritual cripple. Under a constitutional monarch people have the right to elect outstanding men as representatives to the Diet. Needless to say, all of the rights which the people have under a constitutional system are the natural rights of man.

"Hence the contrast between the first two stages of political evolution is obvious. Under a despotism only the royalty and nobility live like human beings while the rest of the people remain mere spiritual cripples. Even if the people accumulate wealth by hard work, it is taken away from them in taxes as soon as the government becomes impoverished, and the people have no say in the matter whatsoever. They are shackled by troublesome regulations and have no freedom of movement. Despotic ministers destroy any incipient freedom of religion, press or assembly just as they might trample new grass on the side of a road.

"In a despotic country officialdom is all important and the people are dirt. The people, no matter what their occupation, must get protection from official families if they want to expand their operations in any way. If a man has vast fields, large shops

or factories, or numerous servants, it always means that he has succeeded in winning favor from some official. You find this true even for artists if you look closely enough. The artist is at times himself an official or, if not, he must use bribery and flattery to win his way into official audiences. Unless his work is officially recognized, it is considered worthless.

"Official support from above is all the more essential for the office holders themselves. It has been said that, 'One receives offices at court and favors in private; one begs for pity at night and in the daytime is arrogant to others.'¹¹ This is a good description of the sycophant who holds official posts. Isn't it real humility to keep one's self-esteem by refusing to grovel? What self-respect can the official have; does he act like a great man? If he did keep his self-respect, he would not survive in government for a single day. If he were to criticize the government in the morning, by evening he would receive notice of his dismissal. Without his salary he and his family would starve. Rather than that isn't it only reasonable that he keeps his mouth shut and enjoys life in comfort with his family? But is it necessary to make fun of those people who spoke out in the past just because at the present time it is no longer in fashion to do so? Why should a person be so stupid and immature just because he has managed to stay afloat in official circles for a long period of time?

"Any person under a despotism is insincere and skilled at flattery, unashamed to debase himself. He is polite to those he does not know only if they are on an equal level with himself, but when he deals with a person below him in rank, he is extremely arrogant. The inferior does not dare look him directly in the face and after every ten words, stops while the superior grunts an acknowledgement. If the inferior laughs, the superior merely smiles a little. There is not a grain of frankness in his bearing. He intends to make a show of solemnity and severity. How different he is from that

cringing form before him. Some people say that he acts as he does because he enjoys his proud pose, but I disagree. It is a part of man's nature to speak and act just as he pleases, but he early learns to control his feelings and after painful self-discipline he no longer gives vent to them easily. Although in time, flattery becomes unconscious to him, within himself his original nature remains unchanged. Yet even when he has an opportunity to express himself freely without fear of harm, he does not. He assumes an arrogant attitude. In so doing he is simply recompensing himself for all the cringing obeisance he ordinarily has to practice. It is only a natural psychological tendency.

"When Westerners observe this sort of thing, they conclude that men in free countries are gentle and refined and do not offend others, whereas men of despotic countries are overbearing and arrogant. They are quite right. From this point of view, the democratic system has advantages for the human spirit as well as for more concrete matters. Alas, why did man abandon freedom for despotism?

"Freedom is not the only characteristic of the democratic system. Equality is also an integral part of it, and the people want for nothing when they have both liberty and equality. In a constitutional monarchy equality is not possible because of the existence of a monarchy and a nobility. But liberty is a requisite, and men in a constitutional system hope that by setting up a constitution they have safeguarded it. They ensure freedom but they damage equality. That is why I earlier contended that the constitutional monarchy realizes its weaknesses but corrects only half of them.

"In the seventeenth century the English were the first to establish a system which guaranteed freedom. Although they won great renown for this, they did not advance any further. Instead they have retained a monarchy to the present day because it is a national characteristic to dislike making any more changes than are absolutely necessary. If we look carefully at the English system, however, we

see that although it is called a constitutional monarchy, it is not really so very different from a democracy. With the exception of two or three powers reserved by the king the position of the ruler in England differs from the presidency of a democracy only in that succession is hereditary. Western scholars frequently consider England to be a democracy and do not distinguish it from the democracies of the United States, France and Switzerland. It doesn't matter what name you give to a system; if in fact it is a democracy, we can consider it to be a democracy. If it is not a democracy, calling it a democracy does not make it so. Yet even though a country resembles a democracy in many ways, while there is still a royalty and a nobility, there cannot be perfect equality and the country cannot have a true democratic system.

"Many of the English with their great powers of reasoning want to progress a step further and adopt a fully democratic system of liberty and equality, and it's no wonder. Human beings were the first creatures to be guided by the law of political evolution, and theorists among them were the first to be aware of that law. Consequently it is only natural that English theorists should be dissatisfied with the constitutional system and want to move on to the third stage of political evolution, the democratic system.

"Ah, the glorious unfettered atmosphere of the democratic system where the heart is pure and the mind is open! It has a timeless and limitless quality about it. If all people are made of the same flesh and blood, why should there be national distinctions among them? Among democratic countries, where people rule themselves and are not mutually hostile, boundaries serve merely to indicate geographic areas. It is the democratic system which unifies the people of the world into one integral body. But if a king or a family rules a country, it makes its citizens into retainers, and it closes its borders against all the other countries. Such closed borders foster hostility among countries; they are the evil remnants of a

constitutional monarchy. . . .

"France ascended the road of freedom a little later than England, but it moved into the democratic system with a single burst of energy. Yet, unlike the steadfast English who did not swerve from the road marked out by Evolution once they had embarked upon it, the erratic French soon retrogressed. They executed Louis XVI and then went on to pour the blood of the French Revolution over all of Europe. Undaunted by enemy fire, they were determined to force the other countries to accept the principle of equality, the foremost principle of the French Revolution. In the process, however, they were dazzled by the colors of Napoleon's flag and forgot their goal. They fell prey to the fierce beast of imperialism and retreated to the conditions of a hundred years earlier. Later the French overthrew Louis Philippe, Charles X and Napoleon III and restored democracy. . . .

"But I am digressing. I have chattered on and on, wrapped up in what I was saying and have lost my train of thought. Please forgive me."

Highbrow then raised his voice and resumed his discourse.

"It is of course easy for a huge and militarily powerful country to look down on other countries, but a country with a limited amount of arable land and a small population must learn to take care of itself. It cannot rely on others for help. However, if it levies ruinous taxes for military purposes it will inevitably incur the ill will of its own people and with little productive farm land, no amount of encouragement of agriculture will bring immediate prosperity in any case. To expand its economy it may turn to industry, but where will it find markets for its products?

"England and France both invaded and occupied areas in their search for markets. England took possession of India and then made inroads into Asia, Africa and America. France snatched Algeria in

Africa and Saigon and Annam in Indo-China. They displaced the native population and left no stone unturned in their effort to enrich themselves. Both disregarded the existing governments in those areas.

"It would be insanity, however, for a small country to attempt to follow the examples of England and France. Instead of sending out its meagre army and navy it must preserve itself by adopting a system of democracy and equality, return the right of self-rule to the people, level its fortifications, and dismantle all its guns and ships. In this way a small country can show others that it has no desire to commit atrocities against them. It must transform itself into a garden of morality, virtue and scholarship in which the establishment of a Diet would ensure the prosperity of the country. To every person, so long as he is mentally competent, should be given the right to vote upon coming of age regardless of whether he is rich or poor, male or female. The people would be the ones to elect all the officials from the prefectural governors down to the town and village officials and the judiciary. Then no longer will it be necessary for anyone to flatter government officials. Numerous schools should be established enabling all the people to become men of letters without having to resort to bribery. Brutal punishments and executions would be done away with, and the abolition of protective tariffs would eliminate economic barriers. Without disturbing the mores or inciting riots a small state should concentrate on getting rid of all laws which deny freedom of speech, press and assembly.

"People yearn for such a garden of morality and virtue. They want to enjoy its fruits and are anxious for its preservation. I will discuss this in further detail; please stop me if my explanation isn't any good.

"When a scientist wants to examine something, he uses a laboratory. Why not turn the small states of Asia into a kind of laboratory

for democracy, equality, morality and learning? At times we Asians are the most noble people in the world with the greatest capacity for love. Perhaps we can discover the complex elements of world peace and happiness. Let's pretend to be experimental sociologists like Priestley or Lavoisier. Here is my scheme:

"The god of Evolution watches us from above and there's no telling when he will become angry with us. Sometimes it is once in a hundred years and sometimes only once in a thousand. If his anger is frequent it is generally not very severe, but when it erupts once in a thousand years it is invariably terrible. While the god is tranquil, we frail human creatures can lie down on the rocky road of inequality and the god will not trample us nor will he cut aside the thorns which block his path. But when the god is angry, he pushes his way through fields and across roads and unless statesmen-priests are prepared for him their rulers will suffer the fate of Charles I and Louis XVI. It will be a calamity for the king and a disaster for the people. Future generations will ridicule them. We must warn heedless statesmen, or they may pile rocks and cultivate thorns in the path of the god of Evolution. Sooner or later they will invite his disastrous wrath. Is that really what they want to happen?

"Some people say the democratic system is ideal but that it is extremely difficult to put into practice. Unless knowledge and customs already exist to prepare the way for the democratic system, its establishment will only lead to confusion. They say that under a democracy a president is chosen by popular election to head the machinery of government. Because he is elected, his power is less than that of a king, but compared with the ordinary citizen he is exalted and revered. Ambitious people in a democracy use every means to attract public attention and to succeed in becoming president. If by chance such a president is evil, the people will be torn apart and the whole country destroyed. This is the common curse of democracies.

"These same people say further that the constitutional system is different. The indisputable power of the ruler discourages inordinate ambition. Because the constitution is inviolate, even nobles and ministers dare not do as they please, and the freedom of the people is assured. Hence a constitutional monarchy combines the best features of both despotism and democracy without having the evils of either. Like in the despotic system, a ruler holds the highest position and so suppresses inordinate ambition and, as in a democracy, the people are free.

"Montesquieu in the Esprit des lois and Stuart Mill in On Liberty both discuss all three political systems and say that it doesn't matter what the political system is so long as it is suited to the entire culture of the country in which it is established."

Highbrow sighed and said, "This discussion of mine is only foolish prattle. It doesn't seem sound."

He continued, "It is true that in democratic countries such as the United States, France and Switzerland there are evil men and customs, and during presidential elections the strong and ambitious do, in fact, cause suffering. Yet the democratic system does bring peace because it throws down its arms and combines all of the nations of the world into one family. Peace rests on the principles of individual freedom and equality. In a constitutional monarchy, however, peace is not the result of equality. Instead it depends on the existence of a respected ruler. Unfortunately the ruler is only human like the rest of us. What a pity that under that political system one's life depends on such a fickle thing as the character of a human being.

"The Abbé de Saint-Pierre¹² in the eighteenth century was the first man to advocate the end of all war and the creation of a lasting peace. At the time, however, few men praised his doctrine and many called it impractical. Some were even more extreme and ridiculed Saint-Pierre. Although Voltaire had great admiration for

social progress, he did not, as one might expect, praise Saint-Pierre's doctrine but instead made himself appear intelligent by disparaging it. The only wholehearted praise came from the magnificent pen of Rousseau who termed it a great contribution to the world. Later Kant also commented favorably on Saint-Pierre's work in a book entitled Zum ewigen Frieden. In discussing the necessity of ending all war Kant said that if people cannot rid lust and vanity from their hearts, there can be no peace in this world. The only way to have peace is for people who respect righteousness to try to practice it. This is the responsibility of man.¹³

"Later scholars were perhaps dissatisfied with one feature of Saint-Pierre's doctrine--the means he advocated for ending war. In all ages there have been numerous reasons for war, but behind all of them is the desire for fame and military power on the part of ruler and ministers. Therefore, unless all countries adopt the democratic system, they can never hope to end war. Saint-Pierre did not realize this. He did not take into consideration the characteristics of the prevailing political systems of his day but accepted them as they were without advocating any innovation. His hope for a lasting peace rested exclusively on such ephemeral things as treaties and alliances, and he did not take into account the effect which the strengths or weaknesses of the various treaty nations would have on peace. Despite any alliances war is inevitable when the ruler and ministers of one country are strong and their counterparts in another country are weak. When one country is rich and militarily powerful, a thousand treaties cannot hold back the great force of war.

"Recently when the French philosopher Émile Acollas¹⁴ classified all of the various kinds of laws, he ranked international law in terms of morality rather than of jurisprudence. According to Acollas, national laws are administered and enforced by officials who assure their effectiveness by punishing violators.

Morality, unlike law, is made effective only by the dictates of individual conscience. Similarly, international law has no officials to enforce it but depends instead only on the 'consciences' of the nations involved. Therefore international law operates more like morality than like jurisprudence.

"In discussing the various kinds of wars between nations Acolas said that there are four types of war: wars of succession, religion, race and commerce.¹⁵ Now of these four, at present, some occur more frequently than others. There are a great many countries today with extensive military establishments because they are at war over strategic posts, commercial markets or royal succession. But all wars, no matter what kind, are the result of the ambitions of a ruler or ministers who make some small incident into a pretext for starting them. This could not happen in democratic countries which build their whole society on the moral principles of liberty, peace and fraternity. They try to excel other countries only in such matters as science or national prosperity. While constitutional monarchies seek victory over other states by physical force, democracies use non-military methods.

"After Saint-Pierre had advanced his doctrine of world peace, Jean-Jacques Rousseau praised it, and then Kant gradually enlarged upon it recasting it in philosophical terms. In Kant's words, 'It is only possible to stop wars and make a lasting peace if all nations adopt the democratic system. Only then will the people be their own ruler and guard their own interests. What reason would they have for opening hostilities when war is against their interests? When two countries attack each other, the real sufferers are the people. They are the ones who do the actual fighting, whose houses are burned and whose fields are trampled. After defeat they shoulder the burden of a war debt which can never be completely extinguished before the residue of hatred from the first war leads immediately to the outbreak of another one.'¹⁶

"Kant further said that under a constitutional monarchy the ruler represents the interests of the state and not of the people, and so he has no feeling of sympathy with the plight of the people during war. While his army confronts the enemy and blood soaks the fields, the ruler hunts in his parks or revels in his palace just as if it were any ordinary day. Although his charge to the soldiers before the battle is impressive, he doesn't really care if they die fighting for him. He risks the lives and wealth of the people for the sake of his own selfish fame. For him the fight is ultimately no more than a kind of amusement.¹⁷

"Recently when students from all the European countries met together,¹⁸ those who advocated a lasting peace all emphasized the need for democracy and the desirability of unifying all the countries of the world into one great nation. When considered in terms of the law of political evolution this idea is not so very extravagant.

"Why doesn't Evolution move ahead rapidly to encourage growth and uproot decay? Why doesn't it bring happiness and satisfaction to all people?

"The free people of Europe have all kinds of civil and criminal laws which protect them and their property from damage. If an evil person should dare to harm them, they have no need to fight him; the law will punish him for them immediately. All they have to do is to fill out one writ of accusation and an impartial official will judge the situation according to the express provisions of the law and will force whoever is responsible for the damage to make amends. Europeans have emerged from barbarism into a just and enlightened system within their own national boundaries. Ironically, however, barbarism among powerful European nations still exists. Beyond the borders of a peaceful state a neighboring state may be preparing to attack. Although men in the peaceful state sleep undisturbed tonight,

tomorrow their enemy may kill them and lay waste their land. One can escape a smallpox epidemic faster than one can escape enemies such as these. Insurance compensates a person for loss from fire or shipwreck, but nothing will make up for the ravages of war. Aren't they afraid? Why don't they smash their own guns and burn their own gunboats to prevent this from happening?

"Nowadays in the nineteenth century it is madness for a country to base its national prestige on military power and attempt to take over the whole world by seizing land and killing people. Germany is insane enough to try this. It has wrought unwanted violence and caused great sorrow. France scorns the kind of course taken by Lü Meng of Soochow.¹⁹ Instead France submits to Germany and swears revenge. England takes great pains to protect from theft the wealth it has accumulated. Italy is in awe of the great powers and wants to become one of them like a child who envies adults their authority without realizing the anxieties which accompany adulthood. While these madmen brandish weapons in a free-for-all, Holland and Switzerland stay out of the fight safe from harm and frolic like amiable children. Meanwhile America just laughs at the boundless aspirations for land and power of the European nations and does not examine its own motives too closely. America, too, strives untiringly to acquire great wealth. . . .

"In the time of Emperor Charlemagne France and Germany were one people. Later when they were two separate countries, Louis XIV attacked Germany without provocation and defeated it. Frederick II of Prussia retaliated against France and evened the score. Napoleon I also without provocation attacked Germany and defeated it. Today Prussia's Kaiser Wilhelm has attacked France in reprisal. Generation after generation these attacks and counterattacks go on. When will it all end? Wilhelm's Prussia and Napoleon's France are bound up by the desire for revenge on each other. It is the rulers, however, and not the people of France and Prussia who lust for

revenge. The people themselves are civilized human beings, not wild soldiers. France already belongs to the French people. If Prussia one day is ruled by the people, France and Prussia will be united into one friendly nation which combines the shrewdness of the French and the steadiness of the Prussians.

"Now Russia is like a wild boar. Will Alexander's Russia ever belong to the Russian people? I know how significant the violent tactics of enraged anarchists can be! The English are an enlightened and educated people who enjoy accumulating wealth. Perhaps the outrages they committed in Africa and Asia stem from their fear of Russian aggression and their desire to quash it.

"The rulers of England, France, Russia and Germany had all better take care that no great democratic leaders rise up from among their people. If such leaders should arise, the rulers had better not listen to them unless they are willing to give up their possessions in the name of democracy.

"Finally, the great countries of the world are all foolish to uphold monarchies. They only invite disaster by building up armies and navies to protect themselves from other countries. All of the smaller and less powerful countries should learn from this. Why don't they insure the peace and happiness of the people and of the ruler by adopting the democratic system and destroying their weapons and ships?"

Swashbuckler leaned forward and said, "Highbrow's words are indeed those of a scholar. A scholar's words can be written in a book but cannot be put into practice. Suppose you go to London, Paris, Berlin and St. Petersburg and make every effort to advocate your exalted doctrine. The newspapers would laugh at you. Politicians would probably--"

Highbrow interrupted, "Politicians would certainly consider it mad, and I am proud of it! You belittle me by calling me a scholar,

but don't you know that today's politicians are the most inept men in the whole world when it comes to political affairs? Since time immemorial men had said that unless philosophers deal with political questions, lasting peace and tranquility will never be achieved."

Swashbuckler answered, "Your main argument is perfectly clear to me, Highbrow. You recommend that all small states adopt the democratic system immediately and abolish their military preparations. Is it your real intention that democracies like America and France will be sufficiently impressed by the superiority and spirit of such an action to come to our aid?"

"No, no," Highbrow replied. "Men who seize upon the opportunities of the moment and consider only what is important to their own country are likely to make mistakes. My own concern is with reason and justice. If we aim at the attainment of reason and justice, then all countries will be our allies. Perhaps America and France will be impressed by our great determination and initiative; Germany and her allies may back us in order to maintain the balance of power. What's wrong with that?"

"But suppose one aggressive country remains in the world and it attacks us in our defenseless state. What then?" asked Swashbuckler.

"I don't think such a country exists," replied Highbrow, "but if there should happen to be such a country, every country would deal with it in its own way. I would wish that if attacked, we would not expend a single soldier or bullet but would calmly say to the aggressive state, 'We have never been rude to you, and you have nothing against us. Our government rules the country, and we never fight among ourselves. We don't want you to come and disturb us. Please go home immediately.' But if instead of listening to us, they were to load their guns and take aim, we should shout, 'Why do you lack propriety and righteousness?' and then we would die

from their bullets. I have no clever scheme for defense."

Swashbuckler laughed, "That is really going too far. It is nonsensical! You have glibly discussed the world situation for many hours now and have dwelled on politics at great length. Your conclusion is that the people of a country under attack should not defend themselves. They should just die under a rain of enemy bullets. How easy it is to talk! Are these the miracles of your famous god of Evolution? Fortunately I don't think anyone but you relies on his benevolence."

Highbrow replied, "All pacifists in the West say that although it is immoral to attack others, it is morally justifiable to defend oneself against attack. They apply this to states and claim that just as with the individual, the state too has a moral right to defend its own possessions. I think that is wrong. Killing a human being is evil under any circumstances; it is destructive of the living order. Even if a man would kill me, I must not kill him. He is obviously a thief and a scoundrel, but I would be as bad as he if I were to use that as a justification to kill him. It is like saying that evil justifies evil. People say that all life is precious. How then can the life of a thief be less precious than any other? It is not a question of whether or not he is a thief. If I am in need of defense, I must wait for the police. It is contrary to all principles to go ahead and kill the thief before the police arrive. Probably for the time being, however, it will not be possible to deny people the right to defend themselves.

"It is even more immoral for a country to claim the right of self-defense. If in defending itself a country counterattacks, it is just as wicked as the aggressor. Swashbuckler, if the enemy comes, I want our country to set a moral example for posterity. We must perish at the hands of the enemy without lifting a finger in our own defense. You, on the contrary, would have us meet evil

with evil. How very ignoble of you!"

While listening to this discussion Nankai sensei helped himself to more liquor and offered some to his guests. Then he said, "I have heard what Highbrow has to say for himself. Now I would like to hear from you, Swashbuckler."

"However much I may dislike speaking of war in the philosophical terms used by scholars," Swashbuckler began, "I will try. I believe that ultimately war cannot be avoided. It is a natural instinct to want to win rather than lose. All living things from worms to wolves live by the kill. The more intelligent the animal, the fiercer it is; the more stupid, the more cowardly. There is no more stupid bird than the wild duck and no more stupid animal than the pig, and it is because of their stupidity rather than of any docility on their part that the pig and wild duck are less willing to fight than any other creature. Whenever a young child barely able to crawl sees a dog or a cat, he will beat it with a stick or grab it by the tail. His little, round, childish face beams with delight. Such behavior is instinctive to every living thing, not only to children. Anger is an expression of heroism. If everyone were heroic, everyone would be angry. Catching mice is a cat's form of heroism. Who but a human being would consider the cat heartless?"

"Highbrow values philosophy and despises war, but even he cannot help preferring victory to defeat. When any two scholars exchange opinions, they end in loud and violent argument. Each yells at the other without listening to what is said. These scholars would be sure to insist that they seek only the victory of the principles they uphold. What a rationalization! If principles are their main concern, why don't they argue dispassionately?"

"Man gives vent to anger by fighting and a country by waging war. It is a weak man who will not fight and a weak country which

will not make war. People may argue that fighting is evil and war unnecessary, but there is nothing they can do to prevent it. Within a country strict laws stop savage fights among men, but there is nothing to prevent strong and prosperous states from fighting each other. Barbarian peoples had leisure time for war and always fought with each other, and according to history, civilized people in the past waged war just as civilized countries do today.

"Russia with over a million troops is determined to swallow up Turkey and Korea. Germany with a comparable army has trampled France and wants to extend its power into Asia. France intends to use its million or so troops to avenge itself on Germany and also to make incursions in Annam. England has hundreds of strong ships with which it has established colonies all over the world. All four of these great European powers are like powder kegs ready to explode at any minute and destroy everything in sight. Then millions of soldiers will trample the fields of Europe while as many gunboats will churn up the seas of Asia. Only the greatest of optimists²⁰ would speak of liberty and equality and say that all the men of the world are brothers.

"Let's suppose that a person sits at a table some sultry summer day sometimes looking at his open book and sometimes closing his eyes and thinking. Sweat pours down his face and back, but he isn't conscious of the heat. Or imagine a dimly lit room on a winter afternoon. The stove is cold and the ink in the inkstone has frozen. This same person is still at his table with his book in front of him. He alternately reads and meditates. His whole body is cold, but he isn't aware of it. His brain rises above all adversity and by means of his reasoning power he destroys his greatest enemies, falsity and perversity, and storms the citadel of truth.

"Similarly a merchant seeks victory over his enemy, economic decline, and takes pleasure in winning great rewards from the battle.

Farmers struggle with the elements. No matter what a man's occupation, he takes pleasure in achieving some form of victory. The same is true of countries. Every country has some policy the fulfillment of which affords it great satisfaction such as the realization of the policies of its prime minister or the success of the tactics of its generals. If its policies are effective, it fights for ascendancy over the other countries and having succeeded in this, it then forms alliances with them. If its strategy is superior, it will defeat the enemy in a single battle. Such are the victories which bring pleasure to a country.

"Highbrow considers war to be wholly detestable. He does not realize that the discomforts of exposure to the elements or the physical pain of a wound do not cause any real suffering to a soldier. Spirit and bravery are the essential elements of battle. Before the battle the martial spirit of the soldiers is akin to madness, and courage consumes them. It is another world. What is mere suffering and pain to them? The commander-in-chief of their army sends his scouts out to reconnoiter the enemy position. His army surrounds the enemy and launches a surprise attack. Through the cover of smoke from the booming cannons it charges with the wind at its back and breaks the enemy with one assault. The soldiers in the front line brace themselves prepared to die with bravery and zeal. If they are killed, their names will be celebrated for generations to come. That is the soldier's greatest reward. If the scholar does not suffer from bitter cold or scorching heat, why should death or injury cause agony for the soldier?

"Let's imagine ourselves in an army encamped in a vast and desolate field without a house in sight and only small hills to break the monotony. It is late fall or early winter and the enemy army camping nearby must number around a million. Their officers are famed for their skill in leadership, and their soldiers are

exceedingly strong and well armed. Our army has only a hundred thousand men, but we are brave and we stand behind our officers. If we are victorious, we will return to our capital driving our captives before us. We will demand spoils in land and money. When peace is established, the military prowess of our country will dazzle our neighbors. If, however, we are defeated, we will glory in death. That is the greatest satisfaction a commander has. You, Highbrow, take pleasure in scholarship and I in war."

Nankai sensei laughed at that. "You are young and spirited," he declared, "You each seek what gives you pleasure. Only this brandy pleases me." He drank two or three more shots and tapped his chest, "Ah, now that is pleasure!"

Highbrow said, "I discussed far-reaching national policy with you, Swashbuckler. I did not discuss individual pleasure. I'm not the only one to stray from the main course of discussion."

"Swashbuckler, you have skillfully penetrated the human heart and exposed human pleasures quite cleverly," said Nankai sensei, "You seem to be well versed in psychology."

Swashbuckler replied, "My apologies to Highbrow. To return to the main point, all nations throughout the world are fighting with each other. They revere military power, and they marshal all of the ingenious findings of science to prepare more efficiently for war. They make use of physics and mathematics to construct superior guns and fortifications and rely on manufacturing and commerce to provide the expenses of military equipment and provisions. People of every occupation support the war effort. Entire armies and navies upon receiving their orders rush to meet the enemy; there is no danger of their being late for the encounter or of refusing to fight. What can a nation's rulers do in the face of the enemy but set up a military establishment? The enemy army is greater than ours by several thousands, and it has thousands of warships to our few. So

we drill day after day to become skilled, but it is no more than child's play. It is madness to think that a country can avoid the contempt of other countries in this way. Only by good fortune have our harbors not been destroyed and our forts burned and levelled. Other countries do not fear us. They do not invade because there is some reason why they cannot. Just as soon as they are able to invade us they will, and our harbors and fortifications will be demolished, our countryside torn apart and our main cities. . . . What a pity all small states are in such danger today!

"Even if a small state wants to expand and grow rich in a hurry, it cannot. Its army is small and it cannot afford to increase it. Its ships are few and it cannot buy more. Yet the small state may one day be annihilated unless it increases the size of its army and navy and becomes richer. That is the reason it devises plans for the future. Look at the sad fate of Poland and Burma! Today Japan has a policy of enriching the country and strengthening its army and navy. We must carry out this policy as fast as we possibly can.

"Somewhere in Asia or Africa, I forget which, there is a big state; I can't remember its name. Its resources are great, but it is unable to exploit them effectively and so remains extremely weak. Its large army is disorganized and undisciplined and useless in an emergency. The country might as well have no government at all for all the good it does. This big state is just like a fatted calf intended by Heaven as food for the bellies of many small states. Why not dash over and carve off a half or a third of it? Japan could then have an army of at least four or five hundred thousand. We could recruit stout lads throughout Japan upon the emperor's issuance of an edict for the draft, and we could buy several hundred ships. We would be able to send men of all occupations to work in the conquered territory to make it into a great country. Its rich natural and human resources would enable us to arm and fortify ourselves, to mobilize a million troops and launch a hundred thousand

ships. We would become another Russia or another England. Our ruler will command the army himself and will follow behind the generals who in turn will protect him. He will cross the sea on the stoutest of battleships and take advantage of the great victory of the advance columns to select a site for his capital. He will build a grand and beautiful palace with high towers reaching for into the clouds, and his imperial guard will stand watch around the imposing structure. The emperor will rule the great new state and leave the islands of Japan to be taken over by foreign powers. Should Russia be ahead of us in carving up the big state, we will appease it with our former territory. If England comes first, we will give it to them. . . . Come to think of it there may be a better policy than that. In Japan, there are advocates of democracy and popular rights. Many of them oppose monarchy and the military. The emperor and the army will all move to the big state and leave the former territory to those people who will then be able to realize their ambitions. That is the best policy.

"What would become of the ancient imperial tombs? Despite their obstinacy, their extreme views, and their dislike of the imperial institution, the advocates of popular rights still revere the emperors of the past. They would not be disrespectful of the imperial tombs and would probably perform services in memory of our ancestors sending envoys year after year to make offerings to them.

"We would be a vast and populous country with a strong army and navy and would work to promote agriculture, commerce and industry. Our officials would use our newly found riches to buy the products of American and European civilizations. How then could England, France, Russia and Germany be contemptuous of us?

"Those four European powers did not become strong in a day. It was an extremely complicated and lengthy process sometimes involving the establishment of a virtuous government by a wise ruler

or the formation of an apparatus for the control of internal and external affairs. Sometimes these states achieved greatness when a famous general distinguished himself in war, or a great scientist developed a profound theory, or a well-known artisan made superior instruments. During peacetime these four European powers marshaled their strength to use in time of war. After many decades and much difficulty these powers have arrived at their present level of civilization.

"If we want to attain a comparable level of civilization, we must have the money with which to buy it. Yet the cost is very high, and it would take all of the resources a small state has to pay for it. If we bought a little at a time, it would be ages before we had what we needed, and in the meantime our enemies would have swallowed us up. Even if they spared us out of pity, our small state would be absorbed by bigger and stronger states like a drop of water evaporating into the air. This is the way it is between strong and weak, great and small.

"Even if a small state cannot buy the advances of civilization, it can seize land from big states to enrich itself. What greater good fortune is there than to find a great land with fertile soil and a weak army? If that large country became prosperous and powerful, it would no longer be of any use to us. Now, while it is sluggish and easy to handle, we should take advantage of it. Far better for us to make it rich and strong than to let it destroy itself."

Swashbuckler downed another glass and then went on, "We must continue to make plans for future foreign invasions even if at present we concentrate on internal reform. I will elaborate.

"When a backward country becomes advanced, all aspects of its earlier civilization--literature, customs, practices, etc.--change, and this change naturally engenders a conflict between conservative

people who are attached to things of the past and progressive people who have a fascination for anything new. To conservatives new customs and attitudes are abhorrent. Progressives are just the opposite. To them anything old reeks of decay, and in fear of becoming outmoded they devote themselves to seeking out any innovation. Even those who do not go to such extremes belong somewhere within one of these categories. One can usually tell by a person's age and place of origin whether he will be progressive or conservative. People over thirty are generally attached to the past, and those under thirty are usually attracted by innovation. When a person over thirty does make an effort to adopt new things, he still retains a subconscious attachment to the past. People under thirty are exposed to the kind of education their fathers had and to their fathers' fondness for the past, but their own beliefs naturally reflect an enthusiasm for anything new and they tend to be antagonistic toward old ways. It is not at all surprising!

"When people who are now over thirty were twelve or thirteen, they spent many long days reciting the Odes and Documents and reading the works of Confucius and Mencius. The past is indelibly imprinted on the minds of those who have devoted all their energies day after day to the classics or the ancient military skills. People under thirty have not yet been prejudiced by the past so that they quickly respond to novelty. This explains the difference in thinking between the two generations.

"There are those who say that many people over thirty have studied books in English and French or have read books in translation and so are in tune with the major events of the times. They argue that these people study such concepts as freedom, peace, rights and responsibilities with the same interest that younger people do, and that it is not always possible to categorize them as conservatives or progressives from their age alone. I agree. Naturally educated and talented people are able to discuss theories

with profound understanding, but when it comes to putting them into practice most of what they do is conditioned by their age.

"This is apparent from the way such people behave towards their families. A father who is over thirty rears his children as he was reared. If he sees them carrying silk parasols as protection from the summer sun or wearing wool clothes to keep out the winter cold, he takes them to task for coddling themselves. If he hears his wife discussing learning, art or contemporary problems, he scolds her harshly saying, 'You are a wife; your place is in the kitchen. People will laugh at you if you talk that way.' He admonishes her not because he fears she will take control of the family, but because when he was young, he never heard a wife discuss such things. His wife and children laugh behind his back. The children agree among themselves that their father is old-fashioned and knows nothing about hygiene. The wife cries, 'How stupid my husband is; he is not in step with the times!' That is why I believe it is possible to distinguish between conservative and progressive people by their age.

"A man's place of origin also has a great deal to do with determining whether he will be conservative or progressive. In feudal times, men who received large grants of land of over two hundred thousand koku generally enclosed their land and forbade people of other areas to enter. Such people saw and heard only what went on within their own territory and had no contact with the world outside. Naturally their modes of thought, custom, dress and speech became stereotyped. Military arts became their greatest concern. People who lived in smaller territories valued at under two hundred koku and who were similarly limited in their travel also became provincial, narrow-minded, and self-righteous. Isolation conditioned them to the old and practiced ways and hindered their ability to accept new ideas.

"In territories which were not sealed off from the world, however, the people came in contact with men from other parts of the country, and their lives were filled with new ideas and influences. Their customs were colorful and varied, and civil matters were more important to them than military arts. As a result of outside stimulation many of these people were alert and well-informed and able to take advantage of their opportunities. They were quick to cast aside old ways and accept new ones. Although we cannot discuss people of great talent and understanding in the same terms as ordinary people, I would be surprised if they too were not influenced by their place of origin.

"This conflict between conservatism and progress is common to any advancing nation which has instituted a program of enlightenment and reform. It penetrates even to the human heart. It causes dissension within the cabinet and the bureaucracy and between ordinary citizens, and it affects everything from court policy to such everyday matters as eating, drinking and forms of entertainment. In one country it split all of the people into two opposing parties. It is a disease! Suppose a certain prime minister and general come from some large and remote region where there is no contact with the outside and where customs are simple, the people rough, stolid and narrow-minded and where great emphasis is placed on military arts. Compare them with another prime minister and a general who come from a region which is smaller but is in frequent contact with the rest of the world. Its customs are elaborate, and civil matters take precedence over military arts. We have little difficulty in guessing which prime minister and general will be receptive to change and which will resist it.

"If on the other hand one prime minister and general are forty or fifty years old and the other two are twenty or thirty, we can still predict which are the wiser.

"This conflict manifests itself even among those who advocate

freedom and reform. For example, progressive people respect principles and disapprove of the use of force. They put industrial development ahead of military preparation, and they study morality, law and economics. As men of letters they have contempt for military and aggressive policies and despise militant nationalism. They long for a Thiers or a Gladstone, not a Napoleon or a Bismarck. Now people who are attached to the past initially look upon freedom and equality as destructive forces. They believe in militaristic nationalism and dislike the intricacy and bookishness of legal studies and the subtleties of economic theory. Yet when they read about the French Revolution, for the first time they come to favor the construction of a constitutional society, a national assembly and the creation of a modern nineteenth-century world. They are not, however, able to become true progressives. It is not surprising that they are attracted by the atrocities committed arbitrarily by Robespierre and Danton. Twenty or thirty years ago they waved swords and spears and glorified death in battle as the highest of all honors. They inherited their warlike traits from their forefathers and cherished the long swords which had been the pride of those ancestors and the symbol of their ideals. When sword-wearing was abolished, every one of them cried bitterly and put his sword away in a box. In their hearts some still long to take out the swords and use them again.

"When the doctrines of popular rights and freedom were introduced from abroad, these people praised them loudly. They formed associations and flew party banners. The samurai of old became enlightened politicians. But are they really the enlightened politicians they appear to be? The old militarism is stored up in their hearts and when they hear the theories of popular rights and freedom, they find in them a kind of force and violence which to them seems to resemble the old military ethic. How foolish to use the foreign principle of popular rights as a new way to express the old feudal

ethic. They approve the idea of a Diet because they see it as a place to shout and fight. Although they advocate change, they do not really want to exchange old ways for new ones. All change--good or bad--appeals to them only because it provides an excuse for destruction and destruction seems courageous while constructive measures seem timid.

"What if they do not have the right to vote and are ineligible for election to the Diet? In a certain street somewhere in a southern or northern town there is a dilapidated temple which serves as a club house for these fellows. They devote all of their energies to attacking journalists and members of the cabinet and of the Diet whether the attack is justified or not. They frequently use loaded words in their editorials for emotional effect. After all, remember that Marat and St. Juste, too, were reactionaries three or four years before the French Revolution.

"History gives us ample proof that when the conflict between reaction and progress spreads to the court it inevitably affects national policy. It is enough to make a person sick! Conservatives are generally stern-faced, humorless and aggressive. They make ruthless decisions and act without thinking of the consequences. They do not fear public opinion. In ordinary times when nothing is happening, they are silent and inactive. They never bother with matters which require intricate thinking and skillful management; they consider such everyday affairs as mere trifles unworthy of their attention. They plead incompetence and pass the matter along to someone else whom they insist is better equipped to handle it. However, when a crucial problem arises, they spring to life with surging emotions and cry, 'We will do what we think right and consider it cowardly to compromise.'

"None of this is true of progressive people. They are persevering and methodical and will not make a decision until they are certain that no harm will come of it. Their facial expressions

are composed and their wills strong. Whereas conservatives strive to be stalwart and unbending, progressives want to be safe. When both progressive and conservative men are involved in court affairs, it is hardly to be wondered at that the people often do not understand what is going on. Official pronouncements bear the imprint of whichever group is dominant at any period. Pronouncements are decisive when conservatives are in power and meticulous when progressives have the upper hand. The selection of officials similarly is determined by whichever group has the greater influence at court since each naturally appoints officials sympathetic to themselves. Progressives value ability while conservatives stress constancy. That of course accords with human psychology. All men in government from petty functionaries to department heads attach themselves to one group or the other, and further their careers by forming cliques from which ministers will choose appointees. History shows that the whole government evolves about the two resulting cliques, one conservative and the other progressive.

"Highbrow, in one country these two groups compete both within government and outside it, and when they clash, a crisis results. It is against their intrinsic natures for these two groups to co-exist harmoniously for very long so that such a crisis is always imminent. One group must be eliminated before national enterprises can be carried out successfully, and if one of the two cannot be eliminated, Highbrow, your revered god of Evolution will not be able to perform his miracles."

"Which should be eliminated?" demanded Highbrow.

"The conservative group. Conservatism is a cancer in the flesh of progress."

Highbrow said, "Earlier you called my words foolish, the simplistic argument of a scholar. Now when you discuss conservatism and progress in connection with reform, you want to keep progress

and get rid of conservatism which you compare to a cancer. Your conclusion is incompatible with your original statements. They cannot both be right."

Swashbuckler laughed, "True enough! You are a pure progressive and want to adopt the democratic system and abolish military preparations. I, of course, am a conservative and want to resort to military methods alone to save Japan. You only know how to fatten flesh. I, on the other hand, seek to cut out the cancer in order to make the nation healthy. We must rid ourselves of the cancer before we can grow fat."

"How can we get rid of a cancer?" asked Highbrow.

"Just cut it out," replied Swashbuckler.

"Stop joking. You can of course cut out a cancer, but conservatives are human beings. You cannot simply eliminate them."

Swashbuckler said, "We will kill off the conservatives just as easily as we could get rid of a cancer."

"Now how can you do that?"

"We must force them to fight. No matter where they are, all conservatives hate peace and are dissatisfied when the times are uneventful. They don't know what to make of progressives. If the nation issues an order to open hostilities, we can get two or three hundred conservatives together under one command. Even I am a thorn. By getting rid of myself I hope to avoid damaging the living flesh of Japan. The best place to get rid of the cancer is in that big country somewhere in Asia or Africa. I will go to that country with two or three hundred thousand people who, like myself, are thorns. If successful, we will seize and occupy part of the big state and will set up a separate conservative society. If we lose, our corpses will litter the battlefield. In any case the thorn of conservatism will no longer trouble Japan. Either way we stand

to gain. It is my cherished ambition to round up brave men and proceed to the big state to transform ourselves into a powerful and wealthy state. We will send gold to the West to buy the fruits of civilization and in one jump will achieve a position of strength comparable to that of the countries in the West. Within Japan we will institute political reform and reform of customs in preparation for the civilized state of the future. That is my policy.

"All conventional people who prefer expediency to decisive action will be terrified and will have nothing but contempt for my policy, but I know I am right. Throughout history people like me have devised extraordinary plans and have achieved great results. Our stalwart resolution scares away every demon.

"Policies differ according to time and place, and it would be madness for statesmen in the West to adopt the policy I have devised for Japan. Men like Prime Minister Bismarck and General Moltke worked out a policy suitable for Prussia. My policies would suit the situation in Asia and Africa exactly, and if the remarkable leaders of the West were in the place of our Asian leaders, they would adopt my policies and would not hesitate to strengthen our weak state by ridding it of conservative elements."

Highbrow said, "Of course people like Napoleon and Tamerlane did follow policies such as yours, but they were monsters who greatly disrupted the progress of social development and put an end to all possibility of putting into actual practice morality, economics and such ideas as freedom and equality. They created a society of brute force. If such monsters had not lurked in the mountains and forests of Europe after the eighteenth century, democracy and scholarship would undoubtedly have triumphed.

"Asian countries have only a few great heroes to compare with those in the West. Liu Pang, Kublai, and Hideyoshi are certainly Asian counterparts of Alexander, Caesar and Napoleon, but where in the East are men like Newton, Lavoisier, Adam Smith and Kant? Anyone

who meets an immediate crisis with violence destroys all possible alternatives for the future."

Swashbuckler answered, "Everything in the world can be divided into theory and practice. Theory is effective in debate, but practice produces results in real life. This is true of medicine. Medical theories include speculation on cells and bacilli. Medical practice involves the administering of quinine for a fever or the use of mercury to treat syphilis. In government too there is political theory which concerns principles of equality and economy, and there is political practice by which weak states are strengthened and orderly government is wrought out of confusion. You discuss theory, Highbrow, and I will discuss practice."

"Before the powerful states of Europe we are like a torch in a hurricane. Our patriots must act quickly before it is too late.

"Recently all of the newspapers at home and abroad have been diligent in reporting the situation between Germany and France. At one time the papers say the two countries are directing their energies toward military preparation, and another time they say there are signs of peace. They cite Bismarck or Boulanger²¹ and recount their activities. In light of the hostility between Germany and France, I believe that war is imminent. As Highbrow has said, Napoleon's France and Wilhelm's Prussia both seek revenge simply because they bear a grudge against each other. All countries since ancient times have harbored grudges, and France and Germany are no more extreme than the rest. The grounds for war are laid over a long period of time long before states come into actual confrontation with each other. Fortunately for Bismarck, he is alive in a time of strife and can give full reign to his vigorous ability. Gambetta did not appear at such a time and so could not plan bold strategies. Napoleon in his last years of power gradually went against the will of the people, and although there was a large opposition party in the French parliament, all of the members unanimously approved his declaration of war on Prussia. Thiers as a

man of experience spoke out against the war before a hostile assembly, and with feelings at such a high pitch he was ambushed, stoned and insulted by villainous commoners on his way home from the assembly.

"This proves that the French people did bear a grudge against Prussia. However, in my opinion, France and Prussia did not always harbor resentment toward each other. From the eighteenth century theirs were the two strongest armies in the world. Whenever they went to war with each other, the neighboring countries tried to predict the outcome from the sidelines and cheered them on, thus encouraging the two armies to fight to the finish. They fought on like two strong men in a wrestling ring who at first seek only one match. The spectators yell and cheer first for one man and then the other, and when the outcome is apparent, the voices of the crowd shake heaven and earth. This sort of thing encourages each contestant to consider it his duty to win, and he becomes jealous of his opponent. This is precisely the feeling of France and Prussia and the reason I contend that their resentment of each other did not arise overnight. It is not the way Highbrow explained it at all.

"Now what Highbrow said of Russia and England is certainly true. England from the beginning has grasped the importance of economics. Its colonies circle the globe. No other country could hope to equal its wealth. To this day England's main object is to hold on to what it has while extending its empire. But what can England do when Russia acts like a wild hawk? Russia holds fast to the traditional schemes of its former kings by relying on military power to increase its territory. It resents the wealth of England and aims at overturning England's Indian base because England formerly allied with Napoleon and fought against Russia at Sebastopol.

"France and Prussia compete for military supremacy and fame and not for territory. England concentrates on protecting its

wealth and possessions and fears military threats. Russia, on the other hand, remembers ancient Rome and wants to increase its wealth by use of arms. It intends to use the resources of a growing prosperity to build up military power. Out of this Russian arsenal will come disaster in Europe. Only its fear of France, England, and Prussia keeps Russia from sending its armies to India immediately. I am afraid Russia will catch the East unawares and will sneak up on us. The Russians were delighted by the Franco-Prussian war. They violated their Crimean alliance immediately by sending ships into the Black Sea. I think that one day while French and Prussian armies are confronting each other on the battlefields of Europe, Russia will leave a trail of dust behind in its mad rush into Asia. Then the disasters and ravages of war will no longer be confined to the European continent but will leave Japan devastated for many years to come. There is no doubt that British ships will not stop with the seizure of Komundo from the Russians.²² Today Prussia and France compete in Europe, and Russia and England vie for supremacy in Asia.

"The gunsmoke of the French and Prussian armies will billow out over Europe. The dust from the battle of the English and Russian armies will swirl around the Asian continent. When their navies churn great waves in the Asian seas, international law will not stop their outrages. How can small states protect themselves? There is only one policy--to get out quickly, abandon the sinking ship and climb on another bigger ship which is steady and will not roll. This is the only solution. Peacetime does not give rise to great strategy, but now while ominous clouds hang over Europe and Asia the time is right for Japan to turn disaster to advantage and weakness to strength. This opportunity comes only once in a thousand years. If instead of devising an effective policy, we are timid like an old woman, there is no hope for us."

Nankai sensei tossed down another shot of brandy and said,

"The gist of Highbrow's argument is that the system of democracy and equality is the best of all systems and all countries should adopt it immediately. Since a small weak state like Japan cannot hope to find a policy by which to enrich itself and strengthen its military, Highbrow wants to adopt a wholly democratic system. Japan is to abandon military preparations on land and sea and give up any thought of resorting to a physical force unequal to that of the great powers. Japan is to adhere to abstract morality and promote learning extensively, thus transforming itself into a superior state which all great powers will admire and respect. They will then have no desire to invade us.

"Swashbuckler's main points in brief are that all of the European countries stress military competition, and as soon as war breaks out disaster will spread to Asia. When that happens small and weak states in Asia must make a great decision: they must call up able-bodied men throughout the country, arm them for attack on a big country in Asia or Africa and conquer vast territory. Otherwise, the small state will not have the resources with which to resist European aggressors. Reform of internal government as a means of strengthening the country will fail because conservative elements within the country will obstruct change. Highbrow's argument is sublime and exhilarating while Swashbuckler's is forthright and forceful.

"I am an old man. My feeble brain does not assimilate your arguments very well. You should both try to carry out what you advocate and afterward evaluate what you have done. Meanwhile I'll sit back and watch."

The two visitors drank some more and then said to Nankai sensei, "We have already poured out our innermost feelings to you and there is nothing left to say. We would very much appreciate your criticism and instruction."

The sensei answered, "The ideas of the European scholars ferment in Highbrow's brain and are expressed in his writing and speech, but his argument is nonetheless an airy cloud of resplendent ideals yet to be realized in this world. With respect to Swashbucker's argument, it is true that in the past once every couple of hundred years a great man would win fame by leading large armies into battle, but at present this too is impractical. Highbrow's cloud is the hope of the future while Swashbuckler's political scheme represents a splendid and thrilling view of the past. Neither argument is appropriate to the present time. Highbrow's ideal cannot be carried out unless the people of the whole country want exactly the same things, and Swashbuckler's scheme is impossible without arbitrary action by the emperor and his ministers. They are most likely nothing but empty words. Highbrow has the greatest faith in the divine power of the god of Evolution, but the progress of that god is slow and meandering. You cannot always tell whether he is coming or going. Although Highbrow never develops his ideas according to any logical organizational framework, he seems to be saying that if we humans have a reckless desire to obstruct the god of Evolution, there is no telling how disastrous the results will be, and that we must follow along wherever the god goes.

"According to the law of evolution, everything in this world treads in the footsteps of the god of Evolution and invokes his name. When the world was first created, it was Evolution which determined that people on earth would fight with each other. It was in accordance with this law that men came under the rule of a monarch and then progressed to the constitutional system. All the steps by which people of the world advanced are along the path of this god. Some countries in Europe have abolished capital punishment and this is naturally a part of their evolutionary process. When African tribes eat human flesh, this is similarly one phase in their evolution. The god likes the widest possible of political systems.

"Highbrow, when you say that the god of Evolution likes the constitutional or democratic systems but does not like the despotic

system, haven't you considered that the god of Evolution is also at work in Turkey and Persia? If as you say this god likes development and abhors violence, where was he when Hsiang Yü had 400,000 Chao troops buried alive?²³

"In feudal times the god of Evolution likes feudalism, and in a period of centralized government he likes that system. He likes the policy of seclusion or of open ports depending on which one is in effect at the time. All variety of things come under his approval, from a vegetarian diet to meat, from traditional Chinese painting like the water-and-ink drawings of Shen Shih-t'ien²⁴ to Western art like Rembrandt's works. This god has more affinities than any other creature in the world.

"There is one thing, however, which the god of Evolution does not like, and everyone but especially statesmen must know what that is or else there will be unforeseen disaster. Suppose a student like me were to write a book without knowing what the god of Evolution likes; the book would not sell and I would be the only one to suffer. Even if I were to perpetrate some evil plot, only I would be punished for it. However, when a statesman governs without knowing what the god of Evolution hates, thousands of people will suffer. It really is frightening! What is it that the god of Evolution condemns? It is speaking or acting without regard for time or place . . . no, that's not quite it. Even though a statesman executes policy without taking the time or place into consideration and myriads of people suffer, scholars will undoubtedly say that there is a reason that this had to happen, and if there is such a reason, then what occurred had the approbation of the god of Evolution. Thus when scholars discuss the political reforms of Wang An-shih, they will argue that these reforms had to be carried out. If we understand Evolution in these terms, then all that has been done up to the present has been done with the approval of the god of Evolution. If so, then what does the god really condemn? He condemns any

attempt to carry out the wrong thing in the wrong place at the wrong time.

"Highbrow, I believe that the things you have talked about cannot be carried out at the present time. You have great respect for the god of Evolution. You did ask me to listen to what you had to say and criticize it on the basis of the laws of the god of Evolution. Please do not take offense.

"You advocate a system of equality and consider that the god of Evolution dislikes the establishment of the five ranks, and you compare them to obstacles in the path of Evolution. This is your greatest mistake. If the god of Evolution in Asia hated the establishment of the five ranks, why did he allow the creation of new nobility in addition to the old system of five courtly ranks? The god of Evolution in Asia has always approved of the system of ranks. Consequently both the old and new nobilities are thriving. In the summer heat fever epidemics are rampant. Even though people pour disinfectant around their houses and around the village gates, they cannot stop epidemics and piles of corpses wait to be cremated. The epidemic does not, however, effect either the old or the new nobility. Both remain healthy while the poor are crowded into carts and sent to quarantine hospitals. Even when a long string of carts proceeds to the crematorium, the old and new nobility remain untouched and aloof. Their concubines and women servants fan them with cool breezes. I think that the god of Evolution likes the nobility very well in Asia and despises the common people. It seems to be very much the opposite of what Highbrow said--"

Nankai sensei suddenly sat up straight, breaking his train of thought, "My words are foolish. Please excuse me, both of you."

The sensei drank another glass and said, "Highbrow advocates a system of democracy exclusively, but it looks as if he has not yet grasped the main purpose of government. That purpose is to follow

the inclinations of the people, to be appropriate to their intellectual level and in this way to maintain peace and happiness and bring prosperity to the people. If a government suddenly ceases to follow the people's inclinations and adopts a system which is not suited to their intellectual level, how can the people enjoy peaceful pleasures and the benefits of prosperity? Recently the Turkish and Persian governments tried to set up democratic systems to the surprise and horror of the people. The people rioted and blood flowed throughout the country. The question was settled immediately. Even if we consider it in the light of what Highbrow calls evolution, the sequence of political and social progress is a movement from despotism to a constitutional monarchy and from a constitutional monarchy to a democracy. It is never a single leap from despotism to the democratic system because the idea of monarchy and nobility is strongly imprinted on men's minds. Although not immediately apparent, this idea rules people like the god Shimei which according to popular tradition presides over a person throughout his entire life.²⁵ If a government should suddenly set up a democratic system, the minds of common men would be thrown into confusion. This is a natural psychological phenomenon. A few people are favorably attracted to the tenets of democracy, but the majority remain in ignorance and confusion.

"There are two kinds of people's rights. In England and France the people forcibly recovered their rights from the ruler. This is an example of recovered rights. There is also the kind of right which is bestowed upon the people as a gift from the ruler. The people's own self-seeking inspired them to recover their rights from the ruler, but rights which the ruler bestows upon the people come from above and so are not the result of the people's self-seeking. If the king has already willingly given the people their rights, why should they attack the government in order to seize those rights?

"Unfortunately, the king and his ministers depend upon power and fear to lose it if they return the people's right of freedom to them. The king and ministers are afraid because they have seen what happened in France and England when the people rose up and seized their rights. If this were not the case, the king and his ministers would take time and events into account and would respond to the inclination of the people and try to act in accordance with the people's intellectual level. They would grant sufficient sovereignty to maintain the happiness of the people. The people rather than risk death to take back their rights by force will be satisfied with fewer rights given to them peacefully.

"The rights that are bestowed upon the people no matter how few are essentially the same as those seized by revolt, and if those rights are carefully guarded and nurtured with morality and learning, progress will go on. In time the people's backs will become broad enough to support the responsibility of their rights. This is the law of Evolution.

"At the present time the idea of an emperor and a nobility is deeply rooted in the minds of men, and only in your mind, Highbrow, do the seeds of democracy grow. If you are truly devoted to democratic thought, speak out, write books and sow the seeds of democracy in the minds of the people. After a hundred years or so they will probably germinate throughout the land. Be sure to do this right away if you hope to reap the rich harvest of democracy.

"The minds of the people are reservoirs of the ideas of the past, and these ideas shape present society. Consequently, if you want to remodel society, you must first change the thinking of the people. Look at history, Highbrow. The history of any country reflects the predominant modes of thought and the society that stems from them. Thought shapes society and society in turn reacts upon thought. This is the way of the god of Evolution. That god is not enshrined mystically above the heads of society, nor does he

lie concealed beneath it. He dwells within the minds of men and is an integral part of their thoughts. Highbrow, you worship your own ideas and would like to make the people accept them as their own before they are ready for them. That is intellectual despotism. As a scholar you should take heed of the dislikes of the god of Evolution. Like an artist who must mix his pigments and lay out his paper before he begins to paint, you must set up your democratic ideas now before you can color the minds of men and create the democratic society of the future. Only then will your society become a work of art as dazzling and highly valued as a Rubens or a Poussin.

"You two continue your discussion of the merits and weaknesses of your respective arguments and watch out for those ideas which you have not fully developed. Take a look at the antiquated ideas of the past while you're at it. Your doctrines are as incompatible as oil and water, but as I understand them, they are both rooted in the same fear of the strong countries of Europe. Your anxiety is excessive. You both think that because the European powers maintain millions of troops and battleships to fight each other, they will extend their fighting into Asia and will one day attack Japan. Because of this fear you have come up with your proposals.

"Highbrow, you want to adopt the democratic system and abolish the military preparations which you believe engender hostility. By anticipating the future you hope to avoid its sharp edge. Swash-buckler, you want to raise a great army and go abroad to extend our territory by conquering foreign lands. You think that we can profit from the present disturbances in Europe. You advocate this because of your immoderate concern for the situation in Europe.

"I do not believe that the current increasingly large-scale military preparations of France and Prussia are the result of tension arising from the immediate situation. If the expansion of military preparations were on a small scale, then perhaps there

would be something to worry about, but because it is on a large scale, war is impossible. Have the two of you ever seen children making a large snowball in winter? In the beginning it is not very big and the children can push it wherever they please, but when little by little they make a great big snowball, they can no longer move it no matter how hard they try. Prussia and France are like children each competing constantly to make bigger snowballs. If Prussia increases its snowball, France will add the same amount to its snowball. If Prussia doubles this, France will too. Year after year their snowballs become bigger. Russia and England looking on wait for the two snowballs to collide, but as long as there is still snow in their gardens, France and Prussia like children will concentrate on making their snowballs even bigger before they push them outside their own gates. When the snow in their gardens melts, the two snowballs will fall apart without ever having collided at all.

"Although the idea of world peace cannot yet be realized in international relations, moral doctrines will gradually come to be widely accepted, and the doctrine of brute force will in time be less influential. This is a natural tendency or, as Highbrow would say, the path of the god of Evolution. Thus a country like Russia is finding it difficult to expand its power in Asia, desiring as it does to annex intermediate territory in order to confront England in India. Even though such countries in their international relations respect force alone and not morality, it is still not so bad as people imagine. If any one of the four great European powers, Prussia, France, England and Russia, were to grow sufficiently powerful to lord it over the other three, it might then rely entirely upon brute force, turn savage, and be in a position to flout international law. Yet as it is now, those four states are nearly equal in strength, and so they have no recourse but to observe international law at least in some respects. Thanks to this, the various

small states have a chance to escape the horrors of annexation.

"A nation is an aggregate of the wills of many people--king, officials, Diet members and commoners. Because its structure is highly complex, determining the nation's form and direction is not as simple as it is for a single individual. If a nation's course were as easily directed as that of the individual, it could be as highhanded as it liked, and a weak state would always suffer. Fortunately, that is not the case. When a country wants to send out a large army and navy, the king and officials study the scheme, and it becomes the subject of debate in the Diet and the press. It is not as if an individual were to gather up his kimono and of his own accord go off to battle on foot grasping a stick. Because they did not wait for the deliberation of the various institutions at home, General Gordon died in the sands of Arabia,²⁶ and Admiral Courbet died in the heat of Annam.²⁷ The Diets and press curb the power of the armies of all European countries, and the balance of power and the agreements of international law tie the hands of the military leaders. That is why I believe that Highbrow's democratic system and Swashbuckler's doctrine of aggression both show an exaggerated concern for the situation in Europe."

The two visitors then said in unison, "Suppose someday the European powers do attack us, how would you cope with them?"

"If they attack us without fear of criticism from the rest of the world and in complete disregard for international law and for the arguments of their own Diets," replied Nankai sensei, "we should resist them with all our strength. All of us would become soldiers alternating between defensive fighting and offensive surprise attack. We would thus keep the enemy off balance. They will be at our mercy. The moral argument will be in our favor, so that if they arouse the hostility of our officers and soldiers, they will not be able to defend themselves against our wrath. Our military officers hold their commissions because they have extraordinary planning ability.

"If our Asian armies are not strong enough to defeat European armies, I think neither Highbrow's democratic country nor Swashbuckler's new large state would survive. I have no plan in particular, but I am not alone in this; even though England and France attack each other, they too lack clever schemes. If our Asian armies were to invade Europe, we would be defeated, but our armies are strong enough to withstand an attack at home. If we train diligently in peacetime and nurture a martial spirit, what need is there to worry about whether we can defend ourselves? Why should we follow Highbrow's theory and wait to be killed without trying to resist at all? Why should we incur the hatred of our neighbors by following Swashbuckler's plan?

"I, of course, do not know to what great country in Africa or Asia Swashbuckler is alluding, but if it is in Asia, I for one cannot agree. We should ally ourselves with the other Asian countries and become brother nations and rescue each other in times of emergency. It is a very bad policy to provoke our neighbors unnecessarily and make enemies of them by unnecessary belligerence. We will only cause innocent people to die in massive numbers on the battlefield.

"Let's suppose the country is China. Because of our common bond of customs, conventions, civilization and geography, Japan and China should always be friendly allies, and Japan should try not to incur the ill will of China. China with its vast territory and large population will be the most important market for any further increase we may make in our special products and abundant commodities. It is a gushing spring of profit which we must not dry up. It would be the height of folly if, without taking this factor into consideration, we were to pursue the idea of increasing our national prestige by waging war recklessly under the pretext of some trivial misunderstanding.

"People who favor the sort of thing Swashbuckler advocates say that China has long tried to bring about our downfall. They say

that although we have deep feelings of friendship for China and try to form alliances with it, the Chinese always respond with anger and spurn our friendship. Meanwhile the Chinese take every opportunity to intrigue with strong European powers and ally with them. These people say too that we do not yet know whether China will offer us to the great powers for its own profit.

"In my opinion, the Chinese are not necessarily thinking of that sort of thing. Generally the source of ill will between countries arises not from actual circumstances but rather from baseless rumors. When we look at the actual situation, we find that there is no need for suspicion, but if we are guided by false rumors, we become very much afraid. Our suspicions take on the proportion of neuroses. A man's view of any situation is colored by his own preconceptions. I wish that the people of any one country would look at any other country with clear and untinted vision.

"Two countries open hostilities not because they want to fight each other but precisely because they are afraid of fighting. If we rapidly make military preparations because we fear another country, that country too will build up its troops as fast as it can because it fears us, and day by day, month by month the neurosis on both sides will grow. Newspapers mix fact and rumor together without distinguishing between the two. They often print stories that are distorted by their own neuroses, thus aggravating the tension. Each country then in anticipation of attack organizes its people and sends them out to attack the other first rather than waiting on the defensive at home. Suddenly the fear of war is magnified, and fighting naturally erupts. This is the way wars have always begun. So long as one country is not obsessed with fear, generally there will be no fighting, and even if there is a war, the strategy of that one country will emphasize defense. It will have the moral advantage, and so will be favorably judged by history.

"Those who favor Swashbuckler's argument say that although China is vast, it is in a period of decline and is headed for revolution. If one hegemon rises up to seize power, no one will be able to prevent the state from collapsing. This seems to me to be mere conjecture based upon historical precedent. It is not justified by the circumstances surrounding the Manchu ruling house today. In terms of Chinese dynastic history, Manchu rule is now infected with decay and is deteriorating. Fortunately, however, the winds of European culture have blown from the West, and the old and withering tree has suddenly leafed out and spread its shade in all directions once again. The men now in power at the Manchu court are all very clever. Their aim is military preparation, and they are using China's abundant resources to buy up the fruits of European civilization. Day after day they increase the number of their battleships, and every month they construct new fortresses. By completely overhauling their military system they hope to utilize the methods of the great European powers. Is this an adversary to inspire contempt?

"In short, from the standpoint of foreign relations it is good policy to promote peace and friendship with all countries and, whenever necessary, to maintain a defensive strategy. That way we will avoid the hardship and expense of sending an army over great distances and will also lighten the financial burdens of the people. As long as we don't arouse unnecessary fears among other countries, why should China look on us as her enemy?"

Highbrow said, "Sensei, your speech is full of flowery phrases and adjectives. I really am enjoying it very much, but your main point eludes me. Would you please make it plain to us?"

Swashbuckler then remarked, "In the course of your discussion, sensei, you have overlooked one thing which both of us mentioned. Would you please tell us what you think the best policy for the future of Japan would be?"

"My proposals are brief," answered Nankai sensei. "I think that Japan should frame a constitution, strengthen the honor and glory of the emperor and increase the well-being and security of the people. We should set up a Diet with an upper and lower house. Membership in the upper house is to be hereditary in the noble families, and membership in the lower house should be determined by election. For detailed regulations we should take what we can from the present constitutions of Europe and America. Restrictions on discussion and publication ought to be made more lenient, and education, commerce and industry must be encouraged. In the realm of foreign policy, we should emphasize friendship and peace, and in order to protect the nation's prestige we should avoid flaunting our military power in an overbearing way."

The two visitors laughed at that, "We had heard that your theories were extraordinary, sensei, but what you have just outlined is not strange in the least; even a child could understand it."

Nankai sensei sat bolt upright, "In random discussions people sometimes carry on weird conversations and try to be more outrageous than anyone else. It is naturally very amusing, but when it comes to a discussion of farsighted national policy, how could I court novelty for my own amusement? I am obstinate and dissolute and out of touch with the times. Much of what I say is irrelevant and probably will not satisfy you."

Once again the three men exchanged glasses. They had already finished the brandy and so sent out for a few bottles of beer to quench their thirst. Just as they were about to return to their discussion, a neighboring rooster announced the dawn.

The sensei chortled, "Haven't you heard that before? While you have been here, the cock has crowed twice. When you return to your homes you will find that two or three years have passed. Such is the calendar of my hut!"

The two guests burst out laughing and went home at last. Ten days later this book, Discourse on Government, was completed. The two guests did not come again. I have heard that Highbrow has since gone to America and Swashbuckler to Shanghai. Nankai sensei just keeps on drinking.