EDITORIAL

CHINA IN REVOLUTION?

By DANIEL DE LEON

THE oft-repeated opinion from the British essayist P.J. Dunning—“Capital is said by a Quarterly Reviewer to fly turbulence and strife, and to be timid, which is very true; but this is very incompletely stating the question. Capital eschews no profit, or very small profit, just as Nature was formerly said to abhor a vacuum. With adequate profit, capital is very bold. A certain 10 per cent. will ensure its employment any where; 20 per cent. certain will produce eagerness; 50 per cent. positive audacity; 100 per cent. will make it ready to trample on all human laws; 300 per cent. and there is not a crime at which it will scruple, nor a risk it will not run, even to the chance of its owner being hanged. If turbulence and strife will bring a profit, it will freely encourage both”—this opinion, tho’ often before quoted in these columns can be quoted none too often. It gains with quoting. By its light present despatches from and about China may be read to advantage.

That the Chinese Empire was a conundrum, promising any number of solutions, some of them possibly quite startling, was generally understood. There is, therefore, nothing that can strictly come under the head of “unexpected” in the tidings of a revolt in China, of stupendous proportions, aiming at nothing short of the overthrow of the Manchu dynasty, and with aspirations so radical that one of the notes emitted by the turmoil is the note of a cry for a republic. And yet—

The question naturally leaps forth, What does Capital say to that? British, French, German, to say nothing of our own American bankers, have long had their fingers deep in the Chinese pie. They have before this brought about “interventions.” May not they “intervene” again? Moreover, while some kind of popular explosion might not disturb their bookkeeping, some other kind of explosion might decidedly do so. Is not “revolution against the Manchu dynasty” of the latter category? Does that not imply the overthrow of the oppressor and the rule of the oppressed? Is
not that a sort of encouragement to the “Hydra Head” against “Law, Order,” Etc. That may all be; but Sun Yat Sen has dropped hints that allow peeps into secrets, and the secrets are re-assuring for the Chinese dynastic Revolution.

Sun Yat Sen has been on secret missions to America and Europe. His missions were not diplomatic. Diplomacy follows Cash. His mission was to Cash. The reservoirs of Cash being the Banks, and the keepers of the reservoirs being the Bankers, it is these Sun Yat Sen has been “seeing.” It seems he has “seen” them to a purpose. If this be so the anti-Manchu revolution will prosper.

What matters it tho’ the revolution sets a bad example to Subordination? With 300 per cent. in prospect as the returns on an investment in Revolution in China “there is not a risk Capital will not run, even to the chance of its owner breaking his neck.”