“It was pointed out that the Greyhound Racing Club which operates Luna Park and the Shanghai International Greyhounds operating the Stadium, are registered as Clubs and the Shanghai Municipal Council have no jurisdiction over them. No licences are issued to these Clubs by the Council with the result that the Council cannot directly control this racing and other activities.”

These two Clubs are registered under the British law, as we understand, and are, therefore, beyond the control of the Council. In this case as in the case of the “Wheel” the power of the Council is contingent upon the willingness of the consuls concerned to co-operate with it. In other words, the Council has no direct control over citizens enjoying extraterritorial rights in China, and has to contend itself with watching such citizens abuse such rights. Extraterritoriality has been mother to many evils that are demoralising rather than protecting the foreigners in China. The sooner it is abolished, that sooner will they learn self-respect and behave themselves as citizens of civilized states.

Moral Dictatorship: the Way of Revolution

To the Memory of Him Who is Now Enshrined

By A Chinese Contributor

(Although we agree perfectly with the writer that Dr. Sun’s influence over the whole nation—and also the world, unless other nations understand his ideals in moral and not political, the publication of this article does not necessarily mean that we agree with him also in the form of dictatorship that he proposes towards the end of the article—Ed.)

There is no other way to attain the object of our New China Movement except the Way of Revolution; and there is no way to succeed in the Revolution as conceived and so consecrated by Dr. Sun Yat-sen except Moral Dictatorship.*

One who is sharing this view must feel much concerned if he reads over the China Critic editorial of May 16, 1929, on “China at the Cross-Roads.” “The leaders of the present Government,” it says in conclusion, “are facing a golden opportunity. If they choose the road leading to peace and prosperity, they will be remembered as true statesmen and saviors of the country. If some of them should seek self-aggrandizement and self-enrichment, posterity would regard them as no better than the militarists and politicians that have gone before them.” In other words, liu fang bei shi or yi chiu wan nien 道高万年—which will they rather choose?

Do they believe that the people now living and those coming to live can be somehow deceived, or that honesty is rather the best policy of any man even in this age of chaos? Do they believe that “achievement” can cover a crime and therefore they themselves should live after the patent of Yuan Shih-kai, or that no matter under any circumstance, national interests must precede personal interests and therefore self-sacrifice for public good is the supreme obligation of any one especially connected with the Revolutionary Government? One way or the other, they must choose. There can be no compromise.

To be honest as a man or not to be; to be patriotic as a citizen or not to be; to be loyal and brave as a soldier or not to be; to be true to Sunyatsenism as a Kuomintang member or not to be; there is no neutrality. A middle ground without the meaning of “Yes” or “No” in the crisis through which we Chinese are now going, is unsafe; it is dangerous as it is poisonous. Pretension can never last, however cleverly. it may be posted.

Leaders of present-day China are all under a microscopic scrutiny. Whether they are conscious of it or not, its result will be recorded in stories better than history. They cannot escape.

“At least,” as the China Critic observes, “they are now in a position to lay the foundations for a great republic, and they can ill afford to miss the opportunity.” It is they “who are exercising tremendous powers, and it behooves them to realize at the same time what heavy responsibilities they are shouldering. Upon their wisdom and far-sightedness,” indeed, “depends China’s future.” But how, one may venture to insist, are their wisdom and far-sightedness to be directed? To the realization of Sunyatsenism—to the fulfilment of the Chinese hope, or to the satisfaction of their own vanity—to the pleasure of their respective beloved family? Clearly there are the Cross-roads! Into which will they tread?

At the Cross-roads there are three questions for those to answer who are actually or nominally in power. First, what is the broad scope of our Revolution, or what is the true mission of every Sunian Revolutionist? Second, what is the supreme qualification of a social or political leadership? Third, what is to be the structural essence of the foundations for a great new China that they are asked to lay? Alone or otherwise there must be some one standing by the Cross-roads who will watch how, under the reflection of circumstances, these questions are to be considered.

There can be no denying now that as our Tsungli predicted when he was passing away, all the Kuomintang leaders are under acid test more and more as time comes.

Naturally the men in power would deny that they control the destiny of China, that they have any design of their own, that they favor any longer a military dictatorship—or even party dictatorship. They would only admit that they are servants of the people, "do as
told," that their ideas and plans are those of Sun Yat-sen as already widely published, that what they want is a chance to work out his constructive program. The unification of China, they say, is now accomplished and reconstruction must begin.

With all due respect to the leaders, there should be no question as to their sincerity. Still there arises one question; that is, how can it be assured that all the ideas and plans of Sun Yat-sen will be carried out in spirit, as in letter?

There is quite a legitimate reason why one may entertain a little doubt as to the outcome of the operation of the present Government. Is it not true, one may ask, that the persons by tens, hundreds and thousands, who are now in government and politics are the same as they were since the last eight or ten years? What has been their respective record of loyalty or of character? And how could it be considered? Are we as Social Revolutionaries, in truth, satisfied with it all?

Since human nature can never be changed impersonally, one may well assume that the persons, as they are, will be what they have been. If they are supposed to be so excusable according to their record of service, not to say desirable according to the criterion of our Revolution, as immune from criticism or censorship, of course there is nothing that can be discussed any further and there is no use of reminding any one of the social and political tendency of today. If they are not, then for the sake of China and in the name of Kuomintang, the men in power must face them squarely to ascertain exactly what and where is their trouble that could have undermined our national life. And the men in power must sit down to consider the serious problem of employment to its full extent.

Civil and military service examination, censorship and control, if adequate and efficient, all may work to lessen the seriousness of the problem, but can never serve as its solution.

A proper and possible solution of the problem cannot arrive unless it comes after a careful consideration of the standard of service and that of living and a common understanding of the standard of life. Besides, as a matter of course, for the promotion of our New China Movement, such standards are inevitably necessary to the people. The question as to the standard of living is primarily economic and social and that as to the standard of service and of life is primarily moral or pro-social. Of course there should be inquiries and studies on these questions, but at present, as history shows in our own country, it is obvious enough that nothing short of a moral dictatorship can establish a standard of life, of service or of living and make them applicable throughout all provinces.

We in China cannot follow the American, or European, or Russian footsteps to rebuild a society unless we misunderstand the Revolution peculiar to ourselves, forgetting Sunyatsenism, and abandon the common cause for which our late Leader stood so firmly in his last fifteen years. We must adopt a method of our own and that, I believe, must be of a moral dictatorship. There is another—more important reason why we should advocate for a moral dictatorship:

However one may think of the Will of our Tsungli, few will repudiate it or dispute over its essentials and the leading Kuomintang members would be the last to ignore it. Today, as it stands, it is the social as well as the political command throughout China. There can be no question as to its value. What still remains as a vital question of the nation is, how the Will is to be executed or observed.

That all are working on the principles, ideas and plans of Dr. Sun Yat-sen is one thing; but how we loyally work for them is another. It may be permitted to ask as one comrade by another: Have we the heart and soul, the mind and vision that the Father of our New China Movement had when he worked out those principles, ideas and plans? And yet, it may be further permitted to ask, do we truly understand those ideas and principles as he worked out?

For almost twenty years I knew our Leader and at times observed him at work by his side. He was marvelous as he was sympathetic. He was masterly as he was industrious. He was analytical as he was observant. He was Commander-in-Chief and common soldier, teacher and student, father and child at the same time. However imperfect he was, as our opponents might say, his mind, his vision, his heart, his soul were already greater than those of any one else that ever lived or still lives in our land. Through hardship, suffering, self-denial, and serious studies, he worked for the salvation of China with all his heart and soul and he had an immeasurably broad mind and vision while looking at the world in which he very heartily believed that there should be a Brotherhood of Man as Confucius and Jesus had prophesied. It is the mind, the soul, the heart, the vision of the man—all immaterial—that we first need to understand before we can ever understand his ideas and principles.

The Three Social Principles, or Principles of the People, did not come to us through a dictaphone, but through the united operation of his mind, his vision, his heart and soul. Unless we have a heart like his, let out our soul as he did, comprehend his vision and follow the working of his mind, we cannot measure the depth and breadth of all his principles. Nay, we cannot understand his ideas; we cannot conceive his plans. Indeed we have no conviction at all however able we may be to memorize and recite all his sayings. Without conviction, then, how can we be revolutionists as he was, not to say he would be today? Without a soul, a heart, a vision and mind like his, how can we have a will as he had unto his death? Unless our whole inner life be converted to be like his best, it is more than doubtful that we can truly execute his Will according to its spirit and letter.

Why is it, let us pause for a moment and think aloud, that turmoil and anarchy still seem to continue all over China? Is it not because the Kuomintang is
not so well organised as it could be and the Central Government is not so powerful as it should be? Then why is it that the Central Government or the Kuomintang itself should be what it is? Is it not that there must be something wrong which can be called the cause of it? Is it not because Sunyatsanism after all does not prevail even with the highest authority of the day?

Recitation, and gramophone may be quite effective as entertaining instruments, but neither can ever make Sunyatsenism work. The spirit rather than the letter of Sunyatsanism can give life—power and function—to the Party and the Government.

This implies that we can approach our problems and apply solutions only through moral experience. It was through moral experiences that Sun Yat-sen, the Revolutionist, himself had resolutely founded our Republic and reorganised the Kuomintang. If there is no morality but politics, or, as some one has said, to argue for moral determination is in effect nonsense, then, I dare say, there cannot be anything in our country that is to be pro-social.

Why Sun Yat-sen himself, and no others, was able to live and die for the Chinese nation as he did, led the Revolution onward and upward for forty years while others deserted it, and lay down the principles and plans enough for us to apply in ages to come, is because he was above all a very exceptionally strong moral being. If this simple opinion of mine is wrong, I beg to ask, as I am sure you will permit me: Have you ever thought of what, in the last analysis, made Sun Yat-sen great?

He was so patriotic and magnanimous as to be superman for all ages because there was deep in his heart the Idea of Good. He had faith in the people, he had hope for the people, he had love of the people. To him love was strength, hope, resource, faith and power. Of all the Revolutionaries, he was the most honest, because always he was faithful; he was unselfish because always he was hopeful; he was hard-working because always he was a loving man. The older he was, the better he became. His love, his faith, his hope, all became greater, deeper and higher. We say "he is dead, but his spirit lives." But why does his spirit live? Is it not because his love, his faith, his hope permeate over the world and penetrate into our heart?

We belittled him because we misunderstood him. We misunderstood him because we did not understand him. The best we thought of him was to be an agitator of modern age, a founder of dynasty, a hero of the old time, a revolutionary leader like those whom we read in history. We did not understand him to be the man in whom the hope of the Chinese nation lay and from whom the spirit of New China was born. We did not understand him as the son of man destined to labor for our salvation in our land. We did not behold the social aspect of him. We misinterpreted him even today because we do not earnestly endeavor to understand what he said and did. To most of us, what he meant by Revolution still remains like a mystery though we all pay our homage to him. Very happily, since the last ten years or so, many have come to know him better through various severe struggles for our Movement. Many have begun to revere him in a new light. What moves us the youth has not been the President or Generalissimo, but he the man? What inspires the new generation has not been he the Leader, but he the moral endeavorer?

Men in power: Uphold Sun Yat-sen, the moral endeavorer and Kuomintang will survive any crisis. Uphold Sun Yat-sen the man and the Chinese as a nation will rise. Try to succeed Sun Yat-sen the President and turmoil cannot cease. One attempt leads to a military dictatorship of some kind if it ever succeed at all. The other leads to a moral dictatorship and it must succeed. Moral dictatorship leads to a new, secure, orderly prosperous and progressive society. Military dictatorship leads to absolutism, reactionarism, stagnation, social poverty and waste—hence, the collapse of Kuomintang, the fall of the Republic and the degeneration of the Chinese race. Walking into one road, your conscience will be clear, your mind at peace and your everlasting happiness assured. Walking into the other, you may possess wealth and power, and your family, your vanity, your selfishness may be satisfied, but you will be eternally condemned. Which will you rather choose?

Through the history of man one may take revolutions as a study. Many though there were, a revolution may be military, political, social or religious. Each has its own ideas and ideals. Each has its own method and management. How the ideals may be attained or whether the ideas may be realized, each depends upon the method and management that the revolution ensures. How the management and method may work, all depend upon the men in power that the revolution may install. How the men in power may become all depend upon their respective moral make-up. The success or failure, the precedence or consequence of a revolution is commensurate with the moral fiber of those who make it go. As far as history has shown, that is a certainty.

Without moral aspirations, the Taiping Rebellion and the Confederate Rebellion, for instance, utterly failed. With moral force and fire, the Russian and the Turkish Revolution succeeded. Reviewing further: the American and the French Revolution also succeeded; and however incomplete a success each was, its influence extended all over the world and has so prevailed unto this day. Out of these two most familiar revolutions has arisen a great socio-political force in every land on the world map, merely because each had its own moral exponents who were great both in mind and in heart. To go further back: it was because from Christ on, for hundreds of years, there were many moral generators, moral defenders and moral endeavorers that the Christian Revolution at first suffered an instant defeat, but then inherited an everlasting victory. At a moral pre-
mium, too, it had insured the success of every religious revolution that subsequently occurred everywhere.

In the light of history, therefore, there should be no doubt as to the outcome of our Revolution. The moral make-up of its Leader was so strong that even our enemies were astonished and could not help expressing admiration and respect, and that even our worst traitors could not murder him. His great mind and spirit that have been embodied in Sun Yat-senism and imbued in the new generation can never be suppressed, but will remain with the Chinese people as a twin of awakening forces. Even if our revolution should fail for the present, it must succeed some other day. Liberty, Equality and Fraternity never die. So Mingshu 民主, Mincheun 民權, Minsheng 民生 will forever live. Surely our Revolution can rise high, spread wide, and be a grand success when there arise moral fighters as its offspring. What it needs as a self-starter once more, is the moral dictatorship that will promote moral energy.

This moral dictatorship, we propose, is to be a civil dictatorship. Its foundations shall be ethical and all its arch structures, social. It shall have no use of any immoral or non-moral personnel, however able. Whatever its rule may be, the rule shall be of moral nature. Accordingly, the civil authority shall be supreme over any military authority throughout the country and there shall be no place in the center of the dictatorship for a nominal or actual militarist or commander.

The dictator of our dictatorship is the spirit of our Tsungli. Its ministers, daily responsible to the dictator through the medium of prayer and so likewise inspired by him, shall be those who swear allegiance to his Revolutionary cause, pledge themselves to the execution of his Will, confess their own sins, give up their property, leave their families to live a pure and simple life for at least three years, and work together under one roof without any business secrecy from each other until dismissed by the dictator or voluntarily retiring from Government and politics on a word of honor.

The principle of the dictatorship is the root of Sun Yat-senism. Its code shall be made out of the spirit and letter of Sun Yat-senism as conceived and consecrated by its ministers. The code, then, shall bind all the Kuomintang members alike.

The dictatorship is to take over all the powers and duties of the Central Executive Committee of Kuomintang. The Central Supervisory Committee, on the other hand, shall remain independent and separate de facto as well as de jure and hence, the members thereof shall not hold any military or any other civil office.

The dictatorship is to limit its own duration to five years or extend it longer, as may be necessary, in the fifth year. It shall install a new management and adopt new methods for the carrying on of our Revolution. It shall reorganise the Nationalist Government, abolishing the State Council in order to conform closely to the principles of the Five-power Constitution. It shall entrust and direct one man to readjust and reorganise all the military forces of the nation. This man shall not hold any other office whatsoever. He shall act only by its explicit order. He shall be called the Military Administrator. Having a standing in the Government next to the Minister of Military Affairs, who shall be a civilian.

The dictatorship is to be the supreme authority of the Republic of China. There shall be no party convention, nor people convention above or under it unless it calls one at its own discretion; but there shall be mass movements encouraged and directed as it deems fit. The dictator shall be responsible for all it does, only to Heaven.

As we are marching through the Revolution, Mingshu-Mincheun-Minsheng shall be its watch-words and it shall give all the signals that we may follow on.

To conclude: What the moral dictatorship shall dictate is but Sun Yat-senism for which some of us have died and for which we will live. Hence, the dictatorship that we advocate is in reality a dictatorship of our common will expressed through certain selected representatives and guided by our own conscience which is in response to the call and touch of Sun Yat-sen the moral being. May it ever come into existence?

League of Nations and Disarmament

(Continued From Last Issue)

By P. T. Chen (陳炳章)

The majority then turned to Article 8 of the Covenant as the best standard for limitation. It was argued that not all nations could be compared on the basis of their status quo at a certain year and that therefore limitation should be made only with direct reference to their particular requirements and special conditions. This principle seemed true especially in the case of young countries which could not yet determine their defensive needs and of older countries which feared an attack. But it proved just as unsatisfactory in definitely fixing a standard or a ratio for limitation. The special conditions and requirements of different States were so numerous and varied that no mathematical proportion could be supposed to exist between them. Moreover, if the principle were enforced, the logical corollary would be that each State had the right to determine its own tonnage figure, which no other States could question. The result was obvious: the delegates could do nothing but advance their own figures, vote on them—a vote which had no force—and then depart. Spain, Brazil, Russia, Greece, Chile, etc., each and all of them advanced figures which they themselves believed necessary for