of the CHINESE
PEOPLE



辜鸿铭 著

外语教学与研究出版社 FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS

(京)新登字 155 号

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

中国人的精神: 英文/辜鸿铭著. - 北京:外语教学与研究出版社, 1998.4 ISBN 7-5600-1449-6

I.中··· Ⅱ.辜··· Ⅲ. 散文 - 中国 - 英语 - 语言读物 Ⅳ. H319.4: I

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(98)第 10964 号

中国人的精神 奉鴻铭

外语教学与研究出版社出版发行 (北京西三环北路19号 100089)

http: //www.fltrp.∞m.cn 北京外国语大学印刷厂印刷 开本 850×1168 1/32 5.5 印张

1998年5月第1版 2000年6月第4次印刷

印数: 30001--40000 册

<u>ISBN 7 - 5600 - 1449 - 6</u> H•817

定价: 6.90元

如有印刷、装订质量问题出版社负责调换

出版说明

我们现在将英语作为一种"世界英语"(WORLD ENGLISH)来看待;于是,英语不再只是单纯的一门异族语言,它同时融合着不同民族的表达方式并折射其多姿的文化。一个世纪以来,有过这样的一位位中国人,他们以各自令人惊叹的完美英语,对世界解说着中国,对祖国表达着赤忱。如今,我们相信,还有更多的中国人胸怀一样的向往,因为,跨越世纪的开放中国需要引进,也需要输出。

我们出版中国人的英语著述,正是为有志于此的英语学习者树一个榜样,为下个世纪的中国再添一份自信,还为世界英语的推广呐一声喊。

选择辜鸿铭(1857—1928)的作品重排出版,当然不是宣扬他那不免乖张偏颇的行为思想,而是感动于他对中国传统文化的奋力捍卫;惊叹于他那登峰造极、令人仰止的英语造诣。辜鸿铭通英法德俄等多种外语,但他的著述多用英文,而其中尤以《中国人的精神》为著。《中国人的精神》原载 1914 年的《中国评论》,1915 年更名《春秋大义》在京出版,并很快被译成德文,一时轰动西方。本书力阐中国传统文化对于西方文明的价值,在当时中国文化面临歧视、中华民族遭受欺凌的境况下,其影响尤为特殊。当然,对于我们现在的读者,这首先该是一本极为宝贵的英语读物。

罗家伦

在清末民初一位以外国文字名满海内外,而又以怪诞见称的,那便是辜鸿铭先生了。辜先生号汤生,福建人,因为家属侨居海外,所以他很小就到英国去读书,在一个著名的中学毕业,受过很严格的英国文学训练。这种学校对于拉丁文、希腊文,以及英国古典文学,都很认真而彻底地教授。这乃是英国当时的传统。毕业以后,他考进伯明罕大学学工程(有人误以为他在大学学的是文学,那是错的)。

回国以后,他的工程知识竟然没有发挥的余地。当时张之洞做两湖总督,请他做英文文案。张之洞当年提倡工业建设,办理汉冶萍煤铁等项工程,以"中学为体,西学为用"相号召,为好谈时务之人。他幕府里也有外国顾问,大概不是高明的外国人士,辜先生不曾把他们放在眼里。有一天,一个外国顾问为起草文件,来向辜先生请问一个英文字用法。辜默然不语,走到书架上抱了一本又大又重的英文字典,碰然一声丢在那外国顾问的桌上说:"你自己去查去!"这件小故事是蔡孑民先生告诉我的,这可以看出辜先生牢骚抑郁和看不起庸俗外国顾问的情形。

民国四年,我在上海愚园游玩,看见愚园走廊的壁上嵌了几块石头,刻着拉丁文的诗,说是辜鸿铭先生做的。我虽然看不懂,可是心里有种佩服的情绪,认为中国人会做拉丁文的诗,大概是一件了不得的事。后来我到北京大学读书,蔡先生站在学术的立场上网罗了许多很奇怪的人物。辜先生虽然是老复辟派的人物,因为他外国文学的特长,也被聘在北大讲授英国文学。因此我接连上

了3年辜先生主讲的英国诗这门课程。我记得第一天他老先生拖了一条大辫子,是用红丝线夹在头发里辫起来的,戴了一顶红帽结黑缎子平顶的瓜皮帽,大摇大摆地上汉花园北大文学院的红楼,颇是一景。到了教室之后,他首先对学生宣告:"我有三章约法,你们受得了的就来上我的课,受不了的就早退出:第一章,我进来的时候你们要站起来,上完课要我先出去你们才能出去;第二章,我问你们话和你们问我话时都得站起来;第三章,我指定你们要背的书,你们都要背,背不出不能坐下。"我们全班的同学都认为第一第二都容易办到,第三却有点困难,可是大家都慑于辜先生的大名,也就不敢提出异议。

3年之间,我们课堂里有趣的故事多极了。我曾开玩笑地告诉同学们说:"有没有人想要立刻出名,若要出名,只要在辜先生上楼梯时,把他那条大辫子剪掉,那明天中外报纸一定都会竟相刊载。"当然,这个名并没有人敢出的。辜先生对我们讲英国诗的时候,有时候对我们说:"我今天教你们外国大雅。"有时候说:"我今天教你们外国小雅。"有时候说:"我今天教你们学离骚。"这"洋离骚"是什么呢?原来是密尔顿(John Milton)的一首长诗 Lycidas。为什么Lycidas 会变"洋离骚"呢?这大概因为此诗是密尔顿吊他一位在爱尔兰海附近淹死亡友而写成的。

在辜先生的班上,我前后背熟过几十首英文长短的诗篇。在那时候叫我背书倒不是难事,最难的是翻译。他要我们翻什么呢?要我们翻千字文,把"天地玄黄,宇宙洪荒"翻成英文,这个真比孙悟空戴紧箍咒还要痛苦。我们翻过之后,他自己再翻。他翻的文字我早已记不清了,我现在想来,那一定也是很牵强的。还有一天把他自己一首英文诗要我们翻成中文,当然我们班上有几种译文,最后他把自己的译文写出来了,这个译文是:"上马复上马,同我伙伴儿,男儿重意气,从此赴戎机,剑柄执在手,别泪不沾衣,寄语越溪女,喁喁复何为!"英文可能是很好,但译文并不很高明,因为辜先生的中国文学是他回国后再用功研究的,虽然也有相当的造诣,却不自然。这也同他在黑板上写中国字一样,他写中国字常常会

缺一笔多一笔,而他自己毫不觉得。

我们在教室里对辜先生是很尊重的,可是有一次,我把他气坏 了。这是正当"五四"运动的时候, 辜先生在一个日本人办的(华北 正报》(North China Standard)里写了一篇文章,大骂学生运动,说 我们这班学生是暴徒,是野蛮。我看报之后受不住了,把这张报纸 带进教室, 质问辜先生道: "辜先生, 你从前著的〈春秋大义〉(The Spirit of the Chinese People)我们读了都很佩服, 你既然讲春秋大 义,你就应该知道春秋的主张是'内中国而外夷狄'的,你现在在夷 狄的报纸上发表文章骂我们中国学生,是何道理?"这一下把辜先 生气得脸色发青,他很大的眼睛突出来了,一两分钟说不出话,最 后站起来拿手敲着讲台说道:"我当年连袁世凯都不怕,我还怕 你?"这件故事,现在想起来还觉很有趣味。辜先生有一次谈到在 袁世凯时代他不得已担任了袁世凯为准备帝制而设立的参政院的 议员(辜先生虽是帝制派,但他主张的帝制是满清的帝制,不是袁 世凯的帝制)。有一天他从会场上出来,收到300银元的出席费, 他立刻拿了这大包现款到八大胡同去逛窑子。北平当时妓院的规 矩,是唱名使妓女鱼贯而过,任狎妓者挑选其所看上的。辜先生到 每个妓院点一次名,每个妓女给一块大洋,到300块大洋花完了, 乃哈哈大笑, 扬长而夫。

当时在他们旧式社会里,逛妓院与娶姨太太并不认为是不正当的事,所以辜先生还有一个日本籍的姨太太。他是公开主张多妻主义的,他一个最出名的笑话就是:"人家家里只有一个茶壶配上几个茶杯,哪有一个茶杯配上几个茶壶的道理?"这个譬喻早已传诵一时,但其本质确是一种诡辩。不料以后还有因此而连带发生的一个引伸的譬喻。陆小曼同徐志摩结婚以后,她怕徐志摩再同别人谈恋爱,所以对志摩说:"志摩!你不能拿辜先生茶壶的譬喻来作借口,你要知道,你不是我的茶壶,乃是我的牙刷,茶壶可以公开用的,牙刷是不能公开用的!"作文和说理用譬喻在逻辑上是犯大忌的,因为譬喻常常用性质不同的事物作比,并在这里面隐藏着许多遁词。

辜先生英文写作的特长,就是作深刻的讽刺。我在国外时,看 见一本英文杂志里有他的一篇文章, 所采的体裁是欧洲中世纪基 督教常用的问答传习体(Catechism)。其中有几条我至今还记得很 清楚,如:"什么是天堂?天堂是在上海静安寺路最舒适的洋房里! 谁是傻瓜?傻瓜是任何外国人在上海不能发财的! 什么是侮辱上 帝? 侮辱上帝是说赫德(Sir Robert Hart)总税务司为中国定下的海 关制度并非至善至美。"诸如此类的问题有二三十个,用字和造句 的深刻和巧妙,真是可以令人拍案叫绝。大约是在1920年美国 (纽约时报)的星期杂志上有一篇辜先生的论文,占满第一页全面。 中间插入一个辜先生的漫画像,穿着前清的顶戴朝服,后面拖了一 根大辫子。这篇文章的题目是"没有文化的美国"(The Uncivilized United States)。他批评美国文学的时候说美国除了 Edgar Allan Poe 所著的 Annabelle Lee 之外,没有一首好诗。诸如此类的议论 很多,可是美国这个权威的大报,却有这种幽默感把他全文登出。 美国人倒是有种雅量,欢喜人家骂他,愈骂得痛快,他愈觉得舒服, 只要你骂的技术够巧妙。像英国的王尔德、萧伯纳都是用这一套 方法得到美国人的崇拜。在庚子八国联军的时候, 辜先生曾用拉 丁文在欧洲发表一篇替中国说话的文章, 使欧洲人士大为惊奇。 善于运用中国的观点来批评西洋的社会和文化,能够搔着人家的 痒处,这是辜先生能够得到西洋文艺界赞美佩服的一个理由。

无疑义的,辜先生是一个有天才的文学家,常常自己觉得怀才不遇,所以搞到恃才傲物。他因为生长在华侨社会之中,而华侨常饱受着外国人的歧视,所以他对外国人自不免取嬉笑怒骂的态度以发泄此种不平之气。他又生在中国混乱的社会里,更不免愤世嫉俗。他走到旧复辟派这条路上去,亦是不免故意好奇立异,表示与众不同。他曾经在教室里对我们说过:"现在中国只有两个好人,一个是蔡元培先生,一个是我。因为蔡先生点了翰林之后不肯做官就去革命,到现在还是革命。我呢?自从跟张文襄(之洞)做了前清的官以后,到现在还是保皇。"这可能亦是他自己的解嘲和答客难吧!

PREFACE

THE object of this book is an attempt to interpret the spirit and show the value of the Chinese civilisation. Now in order to estimate the value of a civilisation, it seems to me, the question we must finally ask is not what great cities, what magnificent houses, what fine roads it has built and is able to build; what beautiful and comfortable furniture, what clever and useful implements, tools and instruments it has made and is able to make; no, not even what institutions, what arts and sciences it has invented: the question we must ask, in order to estimate the value of a civilisation, -is, what type of humanity, what kind of men and women it has been able to produce. In fact, the man and woman, -the type of human beingswhich a civilisation produces, it is this which shows the essence, the personality, so to speak, the soul of that civilisation. Now if the men and women of a civilisation show the essence, the personality and soul of that civilisation, the language which a man and woman speak, shows the essence, the personality, the soul of the man and woman. The French say of literary composition, "Le style, c'est l'homme." I have therefore taken these three things, the Real Chinaman, the Chinese woman and the Chinese language, -as the subjects of the first three essays in this volume to illustrate the spirit and show the value of the Chinese civilisation.

I have added to these, two essays in which I have tried to show how and why men, foreigners who are looked upon as authorities on the subject, do not really understand the real Chinaman and the Chinese language. The Rev. Arthur Smith, who wrote the Chinese

Characteristics, I have tried to show, does not understand the real Chinaman, because, being an American, -he is not deep enough to understand the real Chinaman. Dr. Giles again, who is considered a great sinologue, I have tried to show, does not really understand the Chinese language, because, being an Englishman, he is not broad enough, -he has not the philosophic insight and the broadness which that insight gives, I have wanted to include in this volume and essay I wrote on J. B. Bland and Backhouse's book on the famous late Empress Dowager, but unfortunately I have not been able to find a copy of that essay which was published in the "National Review" in Shanghai some four years ago. In that essay, I have tried to show that, such men as J. B. Bland and Backhouse do not and cannot understand the real Chinese woman, —the highest type of woman produced by the Chinese civilisation viz the late Empress Dowager, because such men as J. B. Bland and Backhouse are not simple, -have not the simplicity of mind, being too clever and having, like all modern men, a distorted intellect. * In fact, in order to understand the real Chinaman and the Chinese civilisation, a man must be deep, broad and simple, for the three characteristics of the Chinese character and the Chinese civilisation are: depth, broadness and simplicity.

The American people, I may be permitted to say here, find it difficult to understand the real Chinaman and the Chinese civilisation, because the American people, as a rule, are broad, simple, but not deep. The English cannot understand the real Chinaman and Chinese civilisation because the English, as a rule, are deep, simple, but not broad. The Germans again cannot understand the real Chinaman and the Chinese civilisation because the Germans, espe-

^{*} Mencius says, "What I hate in your clever men is that they always distort things. 所恶于智者为其凿也" Bk IV. Part II. 26.

cially the educated Germans, as a rule, are deep, broad, but not simple. The French, —well the French are the people, it seems to me, who can understand and has understood the real Chinaman and the Chinese civilisation best. * The French, it is true, have not the depth of nature of the Germans nor the broadness of mind of the Americans nor the simplicity of mind of the English, —but the French, the French people have to a preeminent degree a quality of mind such as all the people I have mentioned above as a rule, have not, —a quality of mind which, above all things, is necessary in order to understand the real Chinaman and the Chinese civilisation; a quality of mind viz: delicacy, For, in addition to the three characteristics of the real Chinaman and Chinese civilisation which I have already mentioned, I must here add one more, and that the chief characteristic, namely delicacy; delicacy to a preeminent degree such as you will find nowhere else except perhaps among the ancient Greeks and their civilisation.

It will be seen from what I have said above that the American people if they will study the Chinese civilisation, will get depth; the English, broadness; and the Germans, simplicity; and all of them, Americans, English and Germans by the study of the Chinese civilisation, of Chinese books and literature, will get a quality of mind which, I take the liberty of saying here that it seems to me, they all of them, as a rule, have not to a preeminent degree, namely, delicacy. The French people finally, by the study of the Chinese civilisation, will get all,—depth, broadness, simplicity and a still finer delicacy than the delicacy which they now have. Thus the study of the Chinese civilisation, of Chinese books and literature will, I believe, be of

[•] The best book written in any European Language on the spirit of the Chinese civilisation is a book called "La Cité Chinoise" by G.—Eug. Simon who was once French Consul in China. It was from this book that Prof. Lowes Dickinson of Cambridge, as he himself told me, drew his inspiration in writing his famous "Letters from John Chinaman."

benefit to all the people of Europe and America. I have therefore added to this volume an essay on Chinese scholarship,—the sketch of a programme how to study Chinese, which I made for myself when I made up my mind and began, after my return from Europe, to study the civilisation of my own country, exactly now thirty years ago; this sketch of a programme how to study Chinese which I hope will be of help to those who want to study Chinese and the Chinese civilisation.

Last of all, I have included as an appendix an essay on practical politics,—an essay on "The War and the Way out." Knowing full well the danger of entering into the arena of practical politics, I nevertheless do it, because in order to prove the value of the Chinese civilisation, I want to show how the study of the Chinese civilisation can help to solve the problem facing the world to-day,—the problem of saving the civilisation of Europe from bankruptcy, In fact I want to show that the study of Chinese, of Chinese books and Chinese literature is not only a hobby for sinologues.

In this essay, I have tried to show the moral causes which have brought on this war; for until the true moral causes of this war are understood and remedied, there can be no hope of finding a way out of it. The moral causes of this war, I have tried in my essay to show, are the worship of the mob in Great Britain and the worship of might in Germany. I have, in my essay, laid emphasis more upon the worship of the mob in Great Britain, than the worship of might in Germany, because looking impartially upon the question, it seems to me that it is the worship of the mob in Great Britain, which is responsible for the worship of might in Germany; in fact, the worship of the mob in all European countries and especially in Great Britain, it was this which has created the enormous German Millitarism which everybody now hates and denounces.

Now let me first of all say here that it is the *moral fibre* in the 8

German nation, their intense love of righteousness and, as a consequence, their equally intense hatred of unrighteousness, hatred of all untidiness and disorder (Unzucht und Unordnung), which makes the German people believe in and worship might. All men who intensely love righteousness, who intensely hate unrighteousness are inclined to believe in and worship might. The Scotch Carlyle, for instance, believed in and worshipped might. Why? Because Carlyle with the German moral fibre in him intensely hated unrighteousness. Now the reason why I say that it is the worship of the mob in Great Britain which is responsible for the worship of might in Germany, is because, the moral fibre—the intense hatred of unrighteousness, of untidiness and disorder in the German nation makes them hate the mob, the worship of the mob and the mob worshippers in Great Britain. After the German nation saw how the mob and the mob-worshipping politicians of Great Britain made the Boer War in Africa, their instinctive intense hatred * for the mob, the mob-worship and the mob-worshippers in Great Britain made the German nation willing to make heavy sacrifices, made the whole German nation ready to starve themselves to create a Navy with the hope to put down the mob, the mob-worship and the mob-worshippers in Great Britain. In fact, the German nation, I may say, found themselves surrounded on all sides by the mob, mob-worship and mobworshippers encouraged by Great Britain in all Europe and this made the German nation believe more and more in might, made the German nation worship might as the only salvation for mankind. This worship of might in Germany created by the hatred for the Religion of mob worship in Great Britain, thus created the enormous monstrous German Militarism which everybody now

The famous telegram of the German Emperor to President Kruger was an instinctive outsburst of indignation of the true Gernamic soul with its moral fibre against Joseph Chamberlain and his Cockney class in England, who manipulated the Boer War.

hates and denounces.

Thus, I say again, it is the worship of the mob, the Religion of the worship of the mob in all European countries, especially in Great Britain, which is responsible for the worship of might in Germany; which has created the abnormous enormity and monstrosity of German Militarism in Europe to-day. If therefore the people in Great Britain and the people in all European countries and America want to put down German Militarism, -they must try first to put down the mob, the mob-worshippers and the Religion of mob-worship in their own countries. * To the people of Europe and America, and in Japan and China too, to-day who speak of and want liberty, I will venture here to say that the only way, it seems to me, to get liberty, true liberty is to behave themselves; to learn to behave themselves properly. Look at China before this Revolution. There was more liberty among the Chinese people, -no priest, no policeman, no Municipal tax, no income tax to bother them-more liberty among the Chinese than among any other people in the world; and why? Because the Chinese people before this Revolution behaved themselves; knew how to behave themselves; knew how to behave themselves as good citizens. But now after this Revolution—there is less liberty in China, and why? Because the modern queueless, up-to-date Chinamen, the returned students have learnt from the people of Europe and America, -learnt from the European mob in Shanghai how to misbehave themselves; to behave themselves not as good citizens, but as a mob-a mob encouraged, coddled and worshipped by the British

[•] Confucius said to a disciple "when outside nations are dissatisfied with you, you should cultivate *civil* or *Civic* virtues (远人不服则修文德)." The British aristocracy, however, like the Manchu aristocracy in China, are now helpless against the mob and mob worshippers in England. But it is, I must say, a great credit to the British aristocracy that not one of them as far as I know, has joined the mob in England in their shout, howl and yell in this war.

diplomats and the British Inspector General of Customs in Peking.* In fact, what I want to say here is, that if the people in Europe, the people in Great Britain want to put down German Militarism, Prussian Militarism, they must keep the mob in their own countries in order; they must make the mob in their own countries behave themselves properly; in fact they must put down the Religion of mob-worship, and the mob-worshippers in their own countries.

But now while I say that the British people with their mob worship and encouragement of mob-worship are responsible for the worship of might in Germany, for German Militarism, I must at the same time say here that, looking again impartially upon the question, it seems to me that the *direct* responsibility for this war rests more heavily upon the German people, upon the German nation, than upon anybody else.

In order to understand this, let me first of all here give the history of German Militarism in Europe. After the Reformation and the Thirty Years War, the Germanic nations, the people of the Germanic race with their moral fibre, with their intense love of righteousness and their intense hatred of unrighteousness, hatred of all untidiness and disorder, the German people, with Militarism as a sword in their hand, became the rightful guardian of civilisation in Europe. In other words, the responsibility for putting order and tidiness (Zucht und Ordnung) in Europe; in fact, the moral hegemony so to speak of Europe came into the hands of the German people. After the Reformation, Frederick the Great, like Cromwell in England, had to take

[•] To show what a mob the Chinese returned students have become, I may mention here that some of these students in Peking last year actually wrote letters to the "Peking Gazette," a newspaper conducted by a clever Chinese "Babu" by the name of Eugene Chen, openly threatening to organise and carry out a public assault upon me for criticising the new Chinese woman in my essay on "the Chinese woman." This clever Chinese "Babu" Eugene Chen the instigator of the contemplated piece of rowdyism now is a respected member of the Committee of the Anglo-Chinese Friendship Bureau under the patronage of the British Minister and the I. G. of the Chinese Customs!

up and use the sword of German Militarism to put order and tidiness in Europe and he succeeded in putting order and tidiness at any rate in the Northern part of Europe. Now see what happened after Frederick the Great's death. His successor did not know how to use the sword of German Militarism in order to guard and protect the civilisation of Europe; in fact, he was unfit to hold the moral hegemony of Europe. The result was, the whole of Europe, even the courts in Germany became a bottomless pit of abominations covered up only with the veneer of civilisation; so much so that at last the suffering population, the plain men and women in France rose up with pikes to protest against the abominations. The plain men and women in France who rose up to protest against the abominations very soon became a mob, and this mob finally found a great and able leader, Napoleon Bonaparte, * who led them to rob, murder, kill and ravage all Europe until the nations in Europe rallying round the small nucleus of sound German Militarism left in Europe, put an end to the career of the great leader of the mob at Waterloo. After this the moral hegemony of Europe should have returned to the people of the Germanic race, to the Prussians, the back bone of the German nations. But the jealousy of the other races which formed the Austrian Empire prevented this. The result was that without the German nation with its moral fibre and the sword of German Militarism to keep down the mob, the mob in 1848 again rose up furiously to break the civilisation, of Europe. Then again the German nation—the backbone of the Germanic nations, the Prussians with their moral fibre and the sword of German Militarism, saved Europe, --saved Kingship, (Bismarck called it the dynasty), saved civilisation in Europe from the mob.

^{*} Emerson with great insight, says, "What sent Napoleon to St. Helena, was not loss of battles, but the *parvenu*, the vulgar ambition in him—the vulgar ambition to marry a real Princess, to found a dynasty."

But now the Austrians, —the other races forming the Austrian Empire again became jealous and would not allow the German nation, -the backbone of the Germanic nations, Prussia to take over the moral hegemony of Europe until 1866 when the Prussian King Wilhelm with Bismarck and Moltke had to put down the Austrian jealousy by force and took over the hegemony into their hands. After this, Louis Napoleon, not like his great uncle a leader, but a swindler of the mob or, as Emerson calls him, a successful thief, tried with the mob of Paris behind him, to dispute and wrest the moral hegemony of Europe from the German nation. The result was that the Emperor Wilhelm with the sharp sword of German militarism in his hand had to march to Sedan and put down the poor successful thief and swindler of the mob. The plain men and women of Paris who put their trust in the mob and the swindler of the mob had their houses sacked and burnt not by the German Militarism, not by the Germans and Prussians, but by the very mob in whom they put their trust. After 1872, -not only the moral, but the actual political hegemony of Europe passed finally into the hands of the German nation with the moral fibre of the Germanic race in their soul and the sword of German Militarism in their hand, to hold down the mob and keep the peace in Europe and thanks to the moral fibre in the German nation and the sword of German Militarism, Europe since 1872 has now enjoyed peace for 43 years. Thus people who abuse and denounce German Militarism and Prussian Militarism should remember how much Europe owes to this very German, this Prussian Militarism which they now abuse and denounce.

I have in the above taken the trouble to give this rough short sketch of the German Militarism in Europe in order to make the German people see that I am not prejudiced against them in saying what I am going to say to show that the actual *direct* responsibility for this war rests more heavily upon them, upon the German people and German nation than upon anybody else. I say that the actual *direct* responsibility for this war rests more heavily upon the German people and German nation than upon anybody else; and why? —Because power means responsibility. *

I say that it is the intense love of righteousness, the intense hatred of unrighteousness, intense hatred of all untidiness and disorder (Unzucht und Unordnung) in the German people which makes them believe in and worship might. Now I want to say here that this hatred of unrighteousness, hatred of untidiness and disorder, when it becomes over-intense, when it is carried to excess becomes also an unrighteousness, becomes a frightful and terrible unrighteousness, something more sinful and wrong even than untidiness and disorder. It was this over intense hatred of unrighteousness which came from their intense love of righteousness, the intense, narrow, hard, rigid hatred of unrighteousness carried to excess in the old Hebrew people—the Hebrew people to whom the people of Europe owe their knowledge and love of righteousness, it was this which destroyed the Jewish nation. It was from this over-intense narrow, hard, rigid hatred of unrighteousness that Jesus Christ came to save His people. Christ, with what Matthew Arnold calls his unspeakable sweet reasonableness said to his own people: "Learn of me, that I am mild and lowly and yet shall have peace in your souls." But the Jews-his own people would not listen to him; they, instead of listening to him, crucified him and the consequence was-the Jewish nation perished. To the Romans who were then the guardians of civilisation in Europe, Christ said, "All

[•] Confucius says, "Possession of power without leniency and generosity is a thing which I never can bear to see. (居上不宽吾何以观之) Shakespeare says: "Oh, it is glorious to have a giant's strength: but it is tyrannous to use it like a giant."