In the face of radicalism, some idealism also survived. Mushanokoji Saneatsu (1885–1976) and Arishima Takeo (1878-1923) established their farm communes and cooperative farms in the same humanistic spirit that influenced Leo Tolstoy (18 17-75). There was also a movement toward women's liberation.

Politically, it was the formation of a Cabinet headed by a prime minister without nobility rank. Hara Takashi (1856–1921), nicknamed a *heimin saishō* (commoner prime minister), that gave a sense of progress toward democracy. It also ushered in a brief period of party government.

In foreign relations, Japan experienced participation in World War I and the Siberian expedition. There was also an imperialistic misadventure in China represented in her twenty-one demands to Yuan Shikai's government. Inclusion of the twenty-one demands in this chapter celebrating various phases of Taisho democracy may appear an oddity. However, chronologically it was part of the Taishō legacy, and the demands to China remained one of the major problems that the intellectuals had to face. Advocates of democracy at home, including Yoshino Sakuzo, did not find it inconsistent to support military expansion overseas. This intellectual ambivalence may explain why military fascism could so easily take hold in the next decade, as detailed in Chapter XIV.

The Taisho era ended with some sad notes, the infirmity of the Emperor and the catastrophe of the great Kantō earthquake of 1923. It was a brief era lasting only a little over fourteen years. It is sometimes likened to a valley between the great peaks of Meiji (1868–1912) and Shōwa (1926-89). Yet it was a period that showed significant progress toward the direction of democracy, from which post–World War II Japan continues to seek inspiration.

YOSHINO SAKUZŌ'S MINPON SHUGI

In attempting to articulate the nature of democracy for Taisho Japan, Yoshino Sakuzō (1878–1933) had to face the problem of seemingly irreconcilable concepts of the sovereignty of the emperor, as enunciated in the Meiji constitution, and the sovereignty *of the people. Yoshino resolved this problem by stating that democracy in the sense of sovereignty residing in the people* (minshu shugi) *could not apply to Japan. On the other hand, whether a country be a monarchy or a democracy, that country should have a government organized for the people, serving their welfare, and decisions reached by it should reflect the will of the people. This he called* minpon shugi, *which means an ideology having people as the base. or loosely translated, "democracy" in a more narrow and confined sense.*

After his graduation from Tokyo University, Yoshino studied in England, Germany and the United States. Upon his return he became professor of political science at Tokyo University and began contributing to the Chūo Kōron, *the prestigious journal of opinion. He organized Reimeikai. a study group, to promote the cause of democracy and later joined the* Asahi *newspapers. The following article first appeared in 1914, justifying antigovernment demonstrations and advocating openness in the conduct of government affairs. It signaled a fit beginning for Taishb democracy.*

1 On Demonstration, 1914' Following a set pattern, there was a demonstration in Hibiya [a centrally located district of Tokyo facing the Imperial Palace] in February of this year. The demonstration was held against the Siemens affair in which high-ranking naval officers were alleged to have received bribes for warship construction. A subsidiary issue was the question of tax reduction. A similar demonstration took place during the month of February in 1913. It was a more militant one than this year's and resulted in the ouster of Prince Katsura from his premiership. . . . Both of these demonstrations shared one thing in comrnon. They were staged for the purpose of effecting changes in our political system. . . .

It is a source of concern to us to see the masses assembling and creating disturbances. On the other hand, however, some people argue that demonstrations arc beneficial to the development of constitutional rule in Japan. I, for one, welcome demonstrations if they can make the judgment of the people become the final arbitrator in interpreting political issues or in conferring or accepting political powers. If the will of the people can become a preponderant influence in our politics, then demonstrations can be justified.

Of course, even in the past, the judgment of the people was not completely ignored in politics. In most instances, people could not participate in the process of making binding final decisions. . . . Even after the promulgation of the constitution, changes in government were never conducted in full public view and in an aboveboard manner. For some time, it has been asserted that the Cabinet should be a transcendental one, existing above politics and above any shift in the balance of power within the Diet. . . . Around the time the constitution was promulgated, changes in the Cabinet were effected in most instances by decisions made secretly by the clan oligarchs *(hanbatsu). No* one outside the oligarchs' circle could tell why the Kuroda Cabinet had to be replaced by the Itō Cabinet. In any event, the will of the people, or the power blocks in the Diet that represented the will of the people, had nothing to do with changes in government. . . .

The development of political parties, especially the emergence of strong parties such as the Seiyūkai, was an occasion for hope that the government would have to recognize the power of the people and be influenced by it in determining changes in government. It was felt that the power of the political parties could not be ignored. Before long, however, party executives began entering into secret

---

'Yoshino Sakuzo, "*Minshuteki Shijiundō o Ronzu* (On Democratic Demonstrations)," reprinted in *Chūō Kōron,* November 1965, pp. 366-75.

deals with the government and started conferring or accepting political power in a manner lacking faimcss. . . . This is not the way constitutional rule should develop or function. We must somehow destroy this political secrecy.

To destroy it, there is no other recourse but to rely on the power of the people. When there is a blatant abuse of power. and normal means cannot destroy it, one is forced to resort to demonstration. If demonstrations become more prevalent, they can revitalize the stale undercurrent in the political world and deepen the understanding of politics by the people. In this sense, demonstrations can contribute toward the development of a constitutional government. . . .

There are many obstinate people in this world who look with disdain on acquisirion of power by the people. They somehow deem the extension of power to the people as something akin to a socialistic or subversive thought, or at times associate it with the disturbances created by the mobs in the French Revolution. . . . This type of mind set is prevalent among older people, and it is also ingrained in the so-called bureaucrats. However, when we observe the background of these people with obstinate ideas, it is not difficult to discover that they arc usually fearful of losing their own power base when the power of the people is expanded. In order to maintain their present position, they have to suppress the rise in people's power. . . .

Unfortunately these people's thoughts are clouded by a one-sided view. Everything has its positive and negative aspects, and indeed democracy has certain shortcomings. If we are to speak of shortcomings, however, we must also recognize the existence of shortcomings in oligarchy. In fact, if the two are compared, oligarchy will be found to contain more shortcomings. Oligarchy by its nature stresses secrecy, and wrongdoings may not become readily apparent. In contrast, democracy is conducted in full public view, and any wrongdoing can immediately be called to the attention of the observers. Thus people tend to name the shortcomings of democracy and forget similar shortcomings existing in oligarchy. If one happens to be a member of the clan oligarchy, no matter how 'knowledgeable he may be, he is not likely to discover the ills of oligarchy.

Politics of a nation must first of all abide by the principles of justice, unencumbered by secrecy. . . . However, if only a few professional politicians, whose power is not based on the support of the people, can make secret deals, there is bound to be some personal considentions. . . . For example, when an officer purchases certain items, if the purchase is made in full public view, there can be no wrongdoing. However, once the purchase is made only from a certain special party. wrongdoing can occur. This was evident in the bribery case of the navy. Who would have doubted the loyalty and devotion of the officers of the imperial navy? Yet a very clear case of corruption existed because their procurement was done behind the dark screen of secrecy. If the navy could be made into a glass box open to inspection from every comer, then the corruption would not have taken place. There are many other similar instances. . . .

If we subscribe to this view, then regardless of certain merits it possesses,

oligarchy cannot compare favorably with democracy. Once a person gains political power, hc wishes to monopolize it. . . . To safeguard the purity of politics, we must insist on recognizing the power of the people. In this sense, I am pro-democracy, and I also applaud the recent demonstrations.

However, several rebuttals are put forward against this view. The first one states that the view just expressed is not consistent with the national polity of Japan and is contrary to the Japanese constitution. . . . The national polity of Japan does not permit the will of the people to become the final arbitrator. However, we must consider this: When the Emperor exercises his power, he invariably consults someone. He does not exercise his power alone and has an option of consulting a small number of people or a large number of people. The fact that the Emperor consults the opinion of the people in exercising his power does not go counter to the national polity. If one maintains that democracy is contrary to the national polity, then oligarchy is also contrary to the national polity. As we have indicated, the difference lies merely in the number of people the Emperor consults. . . , The Charter Oath of Emperor Meiji states that "a deliberative assembly shall be convoked on a broad basis, and all matters of state shall bc decided by open discussion." If anyone denies that democracy is consistent with the national polity of Japan, it must be remembered that this thought comes from an archaic notion that the nobility must be placed between the Emperor and the people to defend the former from the latter. . . .

The notion that democracy is contrary to the constitution stems from a confusion between legality and politics. . . . The function of law is to show a certain direction, but in its application it must be entirely flexible. Thus within the framework of law, political precedents have their rightful place. For example, one of the constitutional principles states that the Emperor has the power to appoint or dismiss his ministers. However, within the framework of this principle, a precedent can be established that can permit formation of a party Cabinet. It is true that in the final analysis, the Emperor possesses the power to appoint his ministers. But in practice, the Emperor has never appointed his ministers by solely relying on his own judgment. The Emperor normally acts on the recommendations of several persons. If consultation is to be made with a certain group, then a precedent can also be established to make the political parties perform that function. .

The second objection to democracy stems from a notion that participation in the political process by ignorant people is too dangerous a step to take. . . . Some people maintain that participation in the political process requires understanding of the nature of that participation and adequate knowledge of politics. There is no doubt that democracy can grow only among the people who are sufficiently advanced. However, democracy in the final analysis does not require advance in political knowledge as the necessary prcrcquisite. Politics is often incomprehensible not only to the common people but also to those who have received higher education. . . . For example, lately we have been debating the desirability of

abolishing the business tax, or the desirability of reducing the land tax. We must judge these issues from the perspectives of our overall national interest, but I wonder how many college students or even representatives will not be baffled by the complexity of these issues. If we insist on allowing participation in politics only to those people who can determine the pros and cons of these technical questions, we have to subscribe to the idealism of Plato in which only philosophers can govern.

Under a democratic form of government, people select as their representatives those persons in whose qualifications they have confidence. The candidates for office state their views and appeal to the people for their support. . . . It does not follow that people can always pass judgment on the views expressed by the candidates. . . . The minimum requirement that democracy makes of the people is to pass judgment on the personality of the candidates, determining which one of the candidates is a better person, more dependable, or can be entrusted with the affairs of state. . . . The ability to discern the personality of the candidates does not require special training in politics, law, or economics. I am sure this is not an excessive requirement.

. . . Often those people who are closer to certain basic issues are not necessarily the best judges of the problems involved. They may not be able to transcend immediate issues and render impartial judgment. Thus occasionally it may be better to have educated guesses of outsiders. For example, many strategic decisions are made by staff officers far removed from the battle scene and not by those who are in actual command. The analogy permits us to stress from a different perspective the importance of having a representative government. . . .

The third objection to the democratic form of government comes from those people who insist that democracy brings forth many incidences of corruption and other ills. What are they referring to? Lately in Japan, some people say that the United States is suffering from mob rule and presents a sorry example of the ills of democracy. This type of argument either stems from an emotional outburst against the United States because of her recent Japanese exclusion act or from a complete ignorance of the political development of the United States in recent years. It is true that the United States shows all the ills of democracy in their extremes. But on the other hand, she is also an outstanding showcase of democracy. Oftentimes, the good points are replaced by bad ones, and vice versa. But in general the ills are few and the country benefits from the advantages given by a democratic form of government. One can look at the condition of the federal government with envy. Not a single one of its Cabinet secretaries has been under suspicion of corruption.

In short, democracy is not something to be disdained, as some people fretfully insist, but it must be welcomed. Setting aside the question of advantages and disadvantages, we must not forget that democracy is one of the rising forces in the world today. Whatever constitutional lawyers or defenders of the clan oligarchy may say, the power of the people is on the rise day after day. There is nothing one can do except to help nurture it. Assuming that democracy is not

desirable, still one cannot suppress it totally. We must recognize this fact in planning the future of our nation.

There are, however, some phenomena that give us great concern. Democratic movement is a great asset to politics when it is conducted spontaneously and positively. It is not desirable if the masses congregate and indulge in demonstrations without having any concrete proposals. The demonstration against the conclusion of the Treaty of Portsmouth in September 1905 cannot be considered fully spontaneous. However, there was a definite demand among the people. There were many instances of deplorable violence, but they had certain meanings. However, most of the recent demonstrations cannot be considered positive or spontaneous. 1 suspect some men who witnessed the strength of the people who were united for a cause in 1905 are now organizing demonstrations to utilize that strength for other self-serving purposes. These recent demonstrations appear to have agitators behind them. . . .

If we are committed to democracy as our ultimate goal [and eliminate causes for the recurrence of demonstrations], we must remove existing inequities and work toward betterment of our constitutional government. . .

Among the two major approaches, the first is to institute certain reforms in the implementation of our constitutional government. Disturbances occur when the constitutional government is not smoothly functioning. . . . There are several ways in which we can bring about that smooth functioning of our government. The first is expansion of the right to vote to a larger segment of our population and equitable redistribution of electoral districts. . . The second is the establishment of party government. . . which in turn may require rivalry by two major political parties. Only future events can determine if political parties can be organized into two groups. It cannot be legislated as in the case of suffrage. What we must do at the present time is to eliminate those existing conditions that are detrimental to the development of party government. . . .

The second approach concerns the development of people themselves. This can again be divided into two main topics. The first is, of course, economic development. If life is difficult, people tend to give in to agitation and can be taken advantage of by demagogues. In the olden days we spoke of "those who have permanent treasure have steady hearts." To stabilize the strength of our people in a healthy manner, we must enact certain social legislations in order to secure livelihood for the lower class of people. . . .

Another point we must consider is the nurturing of people's intellectual and spiritual development. The first thing that comes to mind is encouragement of political education which is not done at all today. In the Western world, political parties are organized in such a way that they must continuously appeal to the people for their support. They do not neglect to reach the people by all available means. They may not make political education one of their major goals, but they conduct speeches, publish newspapers, and issue tracts and pamphlets on current problems. How poorly our political parties compare with them.

deals with the government and started conferring or accepting political power in a manner lacking fairness. . This is not the way constitutional rule should develop or function. We must somehow destroy this political secrecy.

To destroy it, there is no other recourse but to rely on the power of the people. When there is a blatant abuse of power. and normal means cannot destroy it, one is Forced to resort to demonstration. If demonstrations become more prevalent, they can revitalize the stale undercurrent in the political world and dccpcn the understanding of politics by the people. In this sense, demonstrations can contribute toward the development of a constitutional government. . . .

There are many obstinate people in this world who look with disdain on acquisition of power by the people. They somehow deem the extension of power to the people as something akin to a socialistic or subversive thought, or at times associate it with the disturbances created by the mobs in the French Revolution. . . . This type of mind set is prevalent among older people, and it is also ingrained in the so-called bureaucrats. However, when we observe the background of these people with obstinate ideas, it is not difficult to discover that they are usually fearful of losing their own power base when the power of the people is expanded. In order to maintain their present position, they have to suppress the rise in people's power. . . .

Unfortunately these people's thoughts arc clouded by a one-sided view. Everything has its positive and negative aspects, and indeed democracy has certain shortcomings. If we are to speak of shortcomings, however, we must also recognize the existence of shortcomings in oligarchy. In fact, if the two arc compared, oligarchy will be found to contain more shortcomings. Oligarchy by its nature stresses secrecy, and wrongdoings may not become readily apparent. In contrast, democracy is conducted in full public view, and any wrongdoing can immediately be called to the attention of the observers. Thus people tend to name the shortcomings of democracy and forget similar shortcomings existing in oligarchy. If one happens to be a member of the clan oligarchy, no matter how knowledgeable he may be, he is not likely to discover the ills of oligarchy.

Politics of a nation must first of all abide by the principles of justice, unencumbered by secrecy. . . . However, if only a few professional politicians, whose power is not based on the support of the people, can make secret deals, there is bound to be some personal considerations. . . . For example, when an officer purchases certain items, if the purchase is made in full public view, there can be no wrongdoing. However, once the purchase is made only from a certain special party. wrongdoing can occur. This was evident in the bribery case of the navy. Who would have doubted the loyalty and devotion of the officers of the imperial navy? Yet a very clear case of corruption existed because their procurement was done behind the dark screen of secrecy. If the navy could be made into a glass box open to inspection from every comer, then the corruption would not have taken place. There are many other similar instances. . . .

If we subscribe to this view, then regardless of certain merits it possesses,

oligarchy cannot compare favorably with democracy. Once a person gains political power, he wishes to monopolize it. . . . To safeguard the purity of politics, we must insist on recognizing the power of the people. In this sense, I am pro-democracy, and I also applaud the recent demonstrations.

However, several rebuttals are put forward against this view. The first one states that the view just expressed is not consistent with the national polity of Japan and is contrary to the Japanese constitution. . . . The national polity of Japan does not permit the will of the people to become the final arbitrator. However, we must consider this: When the Emperor exercises his power, he invariably consults someone. He does not exercise his power alone and has an option of consulting a small number of people or a large number of people. The fact that the Emperor consults the opinion of the people in exercising his power does not go counter to the national polity. If one maintains that democracy is contrary to the national polity, then oligarchy is also contrary to the national polity. As we have indicated, the difference lies merely in the number of people the Emperor consults. . . The Charter Oath of Emperor Meiji states that "a deliberative assembly shall be convoked on a broad basis, and all matters of state shall be decided by open discussion." If anyone denies that democracy is consistent with the national polity of Japan, it must be remembered that this thought comes from an archaic notion that the nobility must be placed between the Emperor and the people to defend the former from the latter. . . .

The notion that democracy is contrary to the constitution stems from a confusion between legality and politics. . . . The function of law is to show a certain direction, but in its application it must be entirely flexible. Thus within the framework of law, political precedents have their rightful place. For example, one of the constitutional principles states that the Emperor has the power to appoint or dismiss his ministers. However, within the framework of this principle, a precedent can be established that can permit formation of a party Cabinet. It is true that in the final analysis, the Emperor possesses the power to appoint his ministers. But in practice, the Emperor has never appointed his ministers by solely relying on his own judgment. The Emperor normally acts on the recommendations of several persons. If consultation is to be made with a certain group, then a precedent can also be established to make the political parties perform that function. . . .

The second objection to democracy stems from a notion that participation in the political process by ignorant people is too dangerous a step to take. . . . Some people maintain that participation in the political process requires understanding of the nature of that participation and adequate knowledge of politics. There is no doubt that democracy can grow only among the people who are sufficiently advanced. However, democracy in the final analysis does not require advance in political knowledge as the necessary prerequisite. Politics is often incomprehensible not only to the common people but also to those who have received higher education. . . For example, lately we have been debating the desirability of

abolishing the business tax, or the desirability of reducing the land tax. We must judge these issues from the perspectives of our overall national interest, but I wonder how many college students or even representatives will not be baffled by the complexity of these issues. If we insist on allowing participation in politics only to those people who can determine the pros and cons of these technical questions, we have to subscribe to the idealism of Plato in which only philosophers can govern.

Under a democratic form of government, people select as their representatives those persons in whose qualifications they have confidcncc. The candidates for office state their views and appeal to the people for their support. . . . It does not follow that people can always pass judgment on the views expressed by the candidates. . . . The minimum requirement that democracy makes of the people is to pass judgment on the personality of the candidates, determining which one of the candidates is a better person, more dependable, or can be entrusted with the affairs of state. . . . The ability to discern the personality of the candidates does not require special training in politics, law, or economics. I am sure this is not an cscccssive requirement.

. Often those people who are closer to certain basic issues are not necessarily the best judges of the problems involved. They may not be able to transcend immediate issues and render impartial judgment. Thus occasionally it may be better to have educated guesses of outsiders. For example, many strategic decisions are made by staff officers far removed from the battle scene and not by those who are in actual command. The analogy permits us to stress from a different perspective the importance of having a representative govcmmcnt. . . .

The third objection to the democratic form of government comes from those people who insist that democracy brings forth many incidences of corruption and other ills. What are they referring to? Lately in Japan, some people say that the United States is suffering from mob rule and presents a sorry example of the ills of democracy. This type of argument either stems from an emotional outburst against the United States because of her recent Japanese exclusion act or from a complete ignorance of the political development of the United States in recent years. It is true that the United States shows all the ills of democracy in their extremes. But on the other hand, she is also an outstanding showcase of democracy. Oftentimes, the good points are replaced by bad ones, and vice versa. But in general the ills are few and the country benefits from the advantages given by a democratic form of government. One can look at the condition of the federal government with envy. Not a single one of its Cabinet secretaries has been under suspicion of corruption.

In short. democracy is not something to be disdained, as some people fretfully insist, but it must be welcomed. Setting aside the question of advantages and disadvantages, we must not forget that democracy is one of the rising forces in the world today. Whatever constitutional lawyers or defenders of the clan oligarchy may say, the power of the people is on the rise day after day. There is nothing one can do except to help nurture it. Assuming that democracy is not

desirable, still one cannot suppress it totally. We must recognize this fact in planning the future of our nation.

There are, however, some phenomena that give us great concern. Democratic movement is a great asset to politics when it is conducted spontaneously and positively. It is not desirable if the masses congregate and indulge in demonstrations without having any concrete proposals. The demonstration against the conclusion of the Treaty of Portsmouth in September 190.5 cannot be considered fully spontaneous. However, there was a definite demand among the people. There were many instances of deplorable violence, but they had certain meanings. However, most of the recent demonstrations cannot be considered positive or spontaneous. I suspect some men who witnessed the strength of the people who were united for a cause in 1905 are now organizing demonstrations to utilize that strength for other self-serving purposes. These recent demonstrations appear to have agitators behind them. . . .

If we are committed to democracy as our ultimate goal [and eliminate causes for the recurrence of demonstrations], we must remove existing inequities and work toward betterment of our constitutional government. . . .

Among the two major approaches, the first is to institute certain reforms in the implementation of our constitutional government. Disturbances occur when the constitutional government is not smoothly functioning. . . There are several ways in which we can bring about that smooth functioning of our government. The first is expansion of the right to vote to a larger segment of our population and equitable redistribution of electoral districts. . . . The second is the establishment of party government. . . which in turn may require rivalry by two major political parties. Only future events can determine if political parties can be organized into two groups. It cannot be legislated as in the case of suffrage. What wc must do at the present rime is to eliminate those existing conditions that are detrimental to the development of party government. . . .

The second approach concerns the development of people themselves. This can again be divided into two main topics. The first is, of course, economic development. If life is difficult, people tend to give in to agitation and can be taken advantage of by demagogues. In the olden days we spoke of "those who have permanent treasure have steady hearts." To stabilize the strength of our people in a healthy manner, we must enact certain social legislations in order to secure livelihood for the lower class of people. . . .

Another point we must consider is the nurturing of people's intellectual and spiritual development. The first thing that comes to mind is encouragement of political education which is not done at ail today. In the Western world, political parties are organized in such a way that they must continuously appeal to the people for their support. They do not neglect to reach the people by all available means. They may not make political education one of their major goals, but they conduct speeches, publish newspapers, and issue tracts and pamphlets on current problems. How poorly our political parties compare with them.

Another aspect deals with moral education of the people. We must enlighten the people, make them understand the voice of justice, and make their minds receptive to justice. Without this, democracy may not be able to rise above the abyss of corruption. On this point I am most impressed with an example set by the United States. In New York, there is a political organization called Tammany Hall, making a mockery of the municipal government. Abuses were rampant, but when some reformers began decrying against such evils, people responded by showing their determination to eradicate once for all the atmosphere of corruption. Indeed, the voice of justice should find a harmonious chord in the moral fiber of the nation. A young man in his early thirties was elected mayor after he hoisted the banner of reform.[2] His reforms are unorthodox but heartwarming. When I hear that he is succeeding in eradicating many existing ills, my heart is filled with envy. We must guide our people to attain this level of understanding. True, this can influence politics only indirectly, but I think it is the most essential condition in the development of democracy. On this point, I beseech the help and collaboration of educators and religious leaders with great expectation.

THE TWENTY-ONE DEMANDS

In 1915, England, France, Germany, and Russia were fighting in Europe and the United States was being drawn closer to the conflict. China remained neutral, but during the preceding year. Japanese troops moved freely across Chinese soil to occupy the German-leased territory of Jiaozhou. Internally, Yuan Shikai's government was being challenged by the revolutionary movement of Sun Yat-sen, and Yuan's aspiration to establish a monarchy further weakened his position. This was the setting under which the Japanese attempted to extend their influence in China.

The twenty-one demands were presented to Yuan Shikai on January 18, 1915, by the Japanese minister to Beijing. These demands were divided into five groups: three concerned with the extension of Japanese rights in Shandong, Manchuria, Fujian and one with the control of Han-yeh-ping Company, which was the chief supplier of iron ore in China. The fifth group, if accepted, would have made China virtually a protectorate of Japan.

Japan's military threat, combined with the inability of the Western powers to intervene on behalf of China, finally resulted in the acceptance of the first four groups by Yuan's government on May 9. The public, including leading intellectuals, strongly supported this unequivocal expression of continental expansion. Yoshino Sakuzō published a book, Nisshi Kōshō Ron (On Negotiations between Japan and China), *the same year to render his expert opinion and support. This political scientist and advocate of democracy was also a student of Chinese affairs with a number of books on China to his credit. In this book Yoshino claimed that the demands represented Japan's minimum conditions, and he "deeply regretted the elimination of Group V." He, however, urged the Japanese government to explain to the Chinese that Japan was forced to take this stand because of international competition and suggested that in future dealings with China emputhy and respect should become part of Japan's posture. He had a foreboding that the cycle of revolution in China was not over and that the younger generation would turn that into an even uglier struggle. As Yoshino feared, the twenty-one demands became the symbol offoreign aggression for the Chinese and provided a rallying point for student nationalism which later culminated in the May Fourth Movement of 1919.*

Document 2 below contains the English version of the twenty-one demands as subsequently published by the Japanese government. (The English version published by the Chinese government differed in some minor points.) To grasp the extent of Japanese demands, please consult a map of China. Place names are given first in the manner they appeared in the official version and then in pinyin *in brackets.*

[2] The thirty-four-year-old Fusion candidate, John Purroy Mitchell, was elected mayor of New York in November 1913.

2 The Twenty-one Demands Presented by Japan to China, January 18, 1915[3]

GROUP I

The Japanese Government and the Chinese Government, being desirous to maintain the general peace in the Far East and to strengthen the relations of amity and good neighborhood existing between the two countries, agree to the following articles:

ARTICLE I. The Chinese Government engage to give full assent to all matters that the Japanese Government may hereafter agree with the German Government respecting the disposition of all the rights, interests, and concessions, which, in virtue of treaties or otherwise, Germany possesses vis-à-vis China in relation to the Province of Shantung [Shandong].

ARTICLE II. The Chinese Government engage that, within the Province of Shantung or along its coast, no territory or island will be ceded or leased to any other Power, under any pretext whatever.

ARTICLE III. The Chinese Government agree to Japan's building a railway connecting Chefoo or Lungkow [Longkou] with the Kiaochou-Tsinfu [i.e., Qingdao-Jinan] Railway.

ARTICLE IV. The Chinese Government engage to open of their own accord,

[3] From John V. A. MacMurray, *Treaties and Agreements with and Concerning China, 1894–1919* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1921), vol. 2, pp. 1231–33.