

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO



3 1761 01246882 3

LETTERS TO
A CHINESE OFFICIAL
BEING A WESTERN VIEW OF
EASTERN CIVILIZATION

BY
WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN



NEW YORK
McCLURE, PHILLIPS & CO.
MCMVII

PREFACE

Three years ago a little volume entitled "Letters from a Chinese Official, being an eastern view of western civilization," was published by McClure, Phillips and Company and at once had a large sale.

The author discussed Christian civilization as he found it in England, but in the introduction to the American edition he explained that the arguments presented by him applied with equal force to the United States. His indictment of the inconsistencies of Christians contains so much of truth and his arraignment of the conduct of Christian nations at home and abroad is in some respects so just that his words were received not only with appreciation but with gratitude. I recall how deeply I was myself impressed and how many Americans commented favorably upon his letters. It struck me at the time as a favorable omen that so frank an arraignment of our national sins of omission and commission by a foreigner should be so kindly welcomed, for a willingness to admit

[v]

PREFACE

faults is the first step toward improvement. To desire "to see ourselves as others see us" indicates an humble ambition for self-betterment, and in holding the mirror up to us, this nameless Chinese official has not only rendered a real service but has also given our people a chance to prove their good intentions.

Never having visited China and never having acquainted myself with Chinese philosophy, the absurdity of his contrast between Chinese life and Western life was not apparent. Now that I have had an opportunity to test his description by personal observation, I feel that a reply is due to him as well as required from us, for the hostility manifested in China toward American ideals is evidently founded upon the same misconception of our purpose which he betrays, and upon a self-sufficiency which his little book, if it has been translated into Chinese, would naturally encourage.

He rightfully estimates the importance of the struggle between Eastern and Western civilization although he does not always comprehend the principles which underlie it. It is, as he says, a conflict between ideals, but he misrepresents the Christian nations, exaggerates Chinese virtues and shows

himself ignorant of the spirit of our religion. He defends the policy of national seclusion, finds fault with labor-saving machinery, belittles our governmental methods, and speaks of both the Christian and the Christian home in a way that proves that he has never become acquainted with either.

While he has clothed his opinions in language which is for the most part considerate and polite, he can see nothing outside of China worthy of imitation or respect, and his conclusions are calculated to mislead his own people. It may not be out of place for an American to supplement his work by pointing out the errors into which he has unconsciously fallen. This is undertaken in the hope that those of my own countrymen who read these letters may have their interest quickened in the spread of Christian ideals and that the Chinese into whose hands they may fall may contemplate more calmly the inevitable transition through which their nation must pass from the dead stagnation of years gone by to the living future upon which it is even now entering.

In the same friendly spirit with which I credit him, I desire to point out some of the advantages of our civilization which he overlooks and some of

the defects of his own to which his eyes have been closed, and I shall be content if these lines receive from his people the generous consideration shown his letters in our country.

William Jennings Bryan

P. S.—The letters were written on ship-board and the preface in quarantine at Suez, Egypt; they were sent to my home at Lincoln, Nebraska, with instructions to have them published. Just as they are about to appear I learn that instead of being written by a Chinaman, the original Chinese letters were written by an Englishman from material furnished him by a Chinaman. Had I known this earlier, I might have changed the language of some of the paragraphs, but as it is not an individual but an argument that I am combating, I leave the letters as they were written.

W. J. B.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. CHINESE CIVILIZATION OVERRATED . . .	3
II. WESTERN CIVILIZATION UNDERRATED . . .	13
III. THE FOLLY OF ISOLATION	26
IV. LABOR-SAVING MACHINERY	38
V. GOVERNMENT	49
VI. THE HOME	59
VII. WITHOUT A MISSION	70
VIII. CHRISTIANITY VERSUS CONFUCIANISM . . .	80

CHAPTER I

CHINESE CIVILIZATION OVERRATED

To the Author of "Letters from a Chinese Official":

You have laid my country under obligations to you by your very candid, if not always fair, criticism of her ideals and institutions. The fact that you exaggerate her faults is not without its advantages, for it is not only complimentary to her that you must enlarge her defects in order to find a basis for attack, but a magnifying glass helps us to understand objects which otherwise might escape attention. While your observations are founded upon your experience in Europe, you apply your conclusions to the United States as well.

I can safely leave Europeans to defend their several countries from such indictments as are made specifically against them, but as you deal with fundamental principles, I can, as an American, discuss these principles as they apply to civilization in general.

You, not unnaturally, overrate the virtues of your people, the advantages of your country and the merits of the civilization with which you are best acquainted. There is in all an attachment for family, kindred, community and nation, and it is as much expected that we shall prefer the institutions under which we have grown as it is that we should wear the style of dress that our parents have worn and be partial to the kind of food that they ate. It is the exception, not the rule, that anyone changes materially from those among whom he was reared, and in China the influence of environment is very much increased by ancestor worship and by the reverence in which the sages are held. In your case I fear that distance has lent enchantment and that your absence from your native land has made your heart grow fonder of early scenes, while an active imagination has enabled you to draw pictures which cannot fairly be said to be from life. Take, for instance, that beautiful passage in your third letter in which you portray your early home:

“Far away in the East, under sunshine such as you never saw (for even such light as you have you stain and infect with sooty smoke), on the shore of a broad river stands the house where I was born.

It is one among thousands, but everyone stands in its own garden, simply painted in white or gray, modest, cheerful and clean. For many miles along the valley, one after the other, they lift their blue or red-tiled roofs out of a sea of green, while here and there glitters out over a clump of trees the gold enamel of some tall pagoda. The river, crossed by frequent bridges and crowded with barges and junks, bears on its clear stream the traffic of thriving village-markets. For prosperous peasants people all the district, owning and tilling the fields their fathers owned and tilled before them. The soil on which they work, they may say, they and their ancestors have made. For see! almost to the summit what once were barren hills are waving green with cotton and rice, sugar, oranges and tea. Water drawn from the river bed girdles the slope with silver; and falling from channel to channel in a thousand bright cascades, plashing in cisterns, chuckling in pipes, soaking and oozing in the soil, distributes freely to all alike fertility, verdure and life. . . . The senses respond to their objects; they grow exquisite to a degree you cannot well perceive in your northern climate; and beauty pressing in from without moulds the spirit and mind insensibly

to harmony with herself. If in China we have manners, if we have art, if we have morals, the reason, to those who can see, is not far to seek. Nature has taught us; and so far, we are only more fortunate than you. But, also, we have had the grace to learn her lesson; and that, we think, we may ascribe to our intelligence. For, consider, here in this lovely valley live thousands of souls without any law save that of custom, without any rule save that of their own hearths. Industrious they are, as you hardly know industry in Europe; but it is the industry of free men working for their kith and kin, on the lands they received from their fathers, to transmit, enriched by their labors, to their sons. They have no other ambition; they do not care to amass wealth; and if in each generation some must needs go out into the world, it is with the hope, not commonly frustrated, to return to the place of their birth and spend their declining years among the scenes and faces that were dear to their youth. Among such people there is no room for fierce, indecent rivalries. None is master, none servant; but equality, concrete and real, regulates and sustains their intercourse. Healthy toil, sufficient leisure, frank hospitality, a content born of habit and undisturbed by

chimerical ambitions, a sense of beauty fostered by the loveliest Nature in the world, and finding expression in gracious and dignified manners where it is not embodied in exquisite works of art—such are the characteristics of the people among whom I was born. Does my memory flatter me? Do I idealize the scenes of my youth? It may be so. But this I know: that some such life as I have described, reared on the basis of labor on the soil, of equality and justice, does exist and flourish throughout the length and breadth of China.”

If from this passage we strike out all that can be said with equal truth of other countries and then eliminate that which cannot truthfully be said of China, but little remains. Every nation has its pastoral scenes and its quiet spots where one can live close to Nature; every country has its rivers—some broader than others, some clearer than others, but all interesting—and most interesting to those who know their every bend and shallow.

Not only in China but in India and along the Nile has irrigation ministered to the needs of man and added beauty to the landscape; in Java, too, where the Mohammedan dwells and in Japan where Confucius is not worshipped, the rice fields are as

skillfully carved out of the valleys' sloping walls and the hills are as artistically decorated with the tea plant as in China. In every part of the world can be found the points "where man succumbs and Nature has her way," heights where crags seem to pierce the sky and where wild flowers grow. The Creator scattered broadcast those restful and secluded nooks where silence soothes the troubled spirit and where the call of conscience and the promptings of the inner man are not drowned by the babel of a busy world. Even the northern climate, which you regard as inhospitable to the exquisite and the beautiful, does not congeal the heart or chill the enthusiasm, as history abundantly teaches, and it is a lesson yet to be learned if either reason or morals require the stimulus of a southern sun. In so far as your picture deals with the beauties of Nature, what you say might be said as appropriately of thousands of spots, thousands of miles away from your native land. Every nation of importance has had its loveliness immortalized by its poets and its patriots, and their subjects have been as inspiring as yours. I am satisfied that I did not pass your home, for I saw little in fifteen hundred miles of travel to justify your description. A large

percentage of your people live on the lowlands, and millions of them have never seen a mountain or a clear stream. Even those who have come into contact with the beauties of Nature have not shown themselves superior in philosophy, art or morality to the people of other lands.

As for their living "without any law save that of custom, without any rule save that of their own hearth," this is a pleasant piece of imagination which would indicate that you have never read the barbarous criminal laws of your own country which are even now being modified under the influence of Western ideas—the slicing of the prisoner into a thousand pieces, the exposing of the trunks of the beheaded and the extraction of evidence by torture having only recently been abandoned. It would seem that the Chinese custom of punishing the whole family for the guilt of one might possibly have had some influence in preventing a violation of law, but the injustice done by it was so much greater than the crime prevented that it, too, has just been given up—the man at the head of the revision committee having received his inspiration from contact with European and American civilization during his residence in the West. I have no

thought of assailing the general character of the Chinese, but your extravagant praise is in sharp contrast with the facts that one gleans in passing through the country—the fact, for instance, that each one has to protect his ripening crop from his neighbors.

Not only are property rights obscured in the minds of a considerable proportion of the masses, but the officials are notoriously corrupt. Confucius and Mencius complained of the degeneracy of the times in which they lived, and the times do not seem to have improved. Not all Chinese in authority are dishonest, and not all of the subjects disregard the law, but there are enough to disprove any claim that may be made to superiority.

“They (the Chinese) do not care to amass wealth.” This does not accord with one’s observation either in China or in the countries to which the Chinese have gone. They not only amass wealth where they have a chance to do so, but they show as much avarice as can be found among any other people. As usurers they need fear no rivals among the white races as anyone can testify who has visited the Malay states.

That they are industrious is unquestionably true

—that is, those who do not feel themselves above labor—but to say that they are contented is to ignore the fact that they have left their fatherland and swarmed to other countries in order to better their condition, and when the coolies have been excluded (as they have been from America) retaliation is threatened in the form of a boycott.

The picture which you draw is not true to life; you hold up the best that you can find in your country (or even better than you can find), and comparing it with the worst that you can find in Christian countries, you boast, in a holier-than-thou spirit, of superiority. It would not be fair to judge China by her coolie class, although that class constitutes a large element of her population; neither is it fair to judge her by her refined and polished diplomats who, while sneering at Western civilization, have liberally borrowed from it; we must judge by the average man which Chinese environment has produced, and this average man does not approach in mental strength, moral stamina or high conception of life the product of Christian civilization.

“None is master, none is servant, but equality, concrete and real, regulates and sustains their in-

tercourse," you say, and yet nowhere except in India are the social strata more distinctly marked; nowhere is the thin upper crust more indifferent to the welfare of the mass beneath.

We are told that the Chinese are peaceable, and it is certain that they have not shown much disposition to risk bodily harm in defense of country, of compatriots or posterity, but the hundreds of walled cities scattered throughout the country and the protected villages in which the country people are huddled together would indicate that they are more afraid of each other than are the inhabitants of Europe or America.

While you refer to the crowded cities and slums of the Western world, you have nothing to say of the narrow, filthy streets of the cities of China, where the people are crowded together in squalor and live without sanitation amid noisome smells. This would be a sombre background against which to paint the green fields and the purling brooks of a rural landscape. But long residence abroad has doubtless removed all unpleasant lines from the picture and left only the delightful memories with which a kind Heavenly Father clothes the scenes of childhood.

CHAPTER II

WESTERN CIVILIZATION UNDERRATED

The Chinaman who remains at home would obtain a very erroneous impression of Western civilization if he relied entirely upon your letters. In speaking of Chinese civilization you exhausted poetic license in glorifying your people and their institutions; but when you surveyed Western civilization, you recorded mainly that which the inhabitants of Europe and America themselves condemn and are trying to remedy. Here is a specimen:

“ Your legislation for the past hundred years is a perpetual and fruitless effort to regulate the disorders of your economic system. Your poor, your drunk, your incompetent, your sick, your aged, ride you like a nightmare. You have dissolved all human and personal ties, and you endeavor, in vain, to replace them by the impersonal activity of the State. The salient characteristic of your civilization is its irresponsibility. You have liberated forces which you cannot control; you have caught yourselves in

your own levers and cogs. In every department of business you are substituting for the individual the company, for the workman the tool. The making of dividends is the universal preoccupation; the well-being of the laborer is no one's concern but the State's. And this concern even the State is incompetent to undertake, for the factors by which it is determined are beyond its control. You depend on variations of supply and demand which you can neither determine nor anticipate. The failure of a harvest, the modification of a tariff in some remote country, dislocates the industry of millions, thousands of miles away. You are at the mercy of a prospector's luck, an inventor's genius, a woman's caprice—nay, you are at the mercy of your own instruments. Your capital is alive, and cries for food; starve it, and it turns and throttles you. You produce, not because you will, but because you must; you consume, not what you choose, but what is forced upon you. Never was any trade so bound as this which you call free; but it is bound, not by a reasonable will, but by the accumulated irrationality of caprice."

⌋ In a progressive civilization there are constant changes in legislation; the running stream is seldom

straight, but its waters are far more pure than the waters of the pool hemmed in by changeless boundaries. We have our poor, and an increasing part of the energy of society is being directed toward both prevention and alleviation, and yet we are not so poor but what there is so much room beneath the lowest strata that Chinese workmen will cross an ocean to occupy it. We have our drunkards, but we also have our temperance societies and laws permitting each community to regulate or prohibit the sale of liquor. We have our incompetents, our aged and our sick, and while they do not ride us "like a nightmare," they so appeal to our sympathies that our land is dotted with hospitals, homes and retreats where these receive care and attention. Is it possible that you have never visited these institutions, some of them supported by the State, some of them by religious societies, and others by private philanthropy? Or, having seen them, did they make no impression upon you? Have you never visited the asylums for the insane, to be found in every State and in all the Western countries, the schools for the blind, the schools for the deaf, and the homes for the friendless? Have you never compared our prisons with your own and noted our more

humane methods of treatment and the greater efforts for the reform of the criminal?

And can you find no word of praise for the colleges, public and private, to be found throughout the Western world? You have charged our country with leading the world in the mad pursuit of material wealth, but I will be pardoned if I remind you that you apparently fail to appreciate the educational advantages which are open to all of our people. There is no child so poor that it may not enter school, supported by public taxation, and continue its studies until it has completed a course that includes not only the rudiments of instruction but the sciences, the languages and technical knowledge. To these have been added industrial schools where the mechanic arts are taught, and agricultural colleges which present the results of experiments in agriculture, horticulture and stock-raising. These not only train those who labor with their hands, but teach the dignity of toil and combine the mind with the muscle in productive employment. Besides the public school, reaching from kindergarten to university, your attention has doubtless been called to the colleges and academies established by secular or religious societies which bring

higher education within the reach of those who prefer private instruction. Compare the school system of our country with the lack of such systems in your own. Our schools are open to both boys and girls; yours, such as you have had in the past, are open to comparatively few of the boys; our schools have brought their students into contact with all nations, all ages and all climes through the teaching of history, geography and literature; yours have been narrow, shallow and provincial in their courses. Our schools have led their students into all the storehouses of knowledge and have put them in possession of the intellectual wealth bequeathed by all the great minds of all the world; yours have been content to teach the sayings of a few sages and a few poems that have received the imperial sanction. I need not speak of the superiority of our scientific courses, for you admit this, although you apparently underestimate the wide-spread influence of scientific studies.

I am surprised that after so long a residence abroad you should eulogize a feature of your civilization that to a Western mind seems so indefensible. You say:

“ And there is another point which weighs with

me, one less obvious, perhaps, but not less important. In any society it must always be the case that the mass of men are absorbed in mechanical labors. It is so in ours no less, though certainly no more, than in yours; and, so far, this condition does not appear to have been affected by the introduction of machinery. But, on the other hand, in every society there are, or should be, men who are relieved from this servitude to matter and free to devote themselves to higher ends. In China, for many centuries past, there has been a class of men set apart from the first to the pursuit of liberal arts, and destined to the functions of government. These men form no close hereditary caste; it is open to anyone to join them who possesses the requisite talent and inclination; and in this respect our society has long been the most democratic in the world. The education to which we subject this official class is a matter of frequent and adverse comment among you, and it is not my intention here to undertake its defense. What I wish to point out is the fact that, by virtue of this institution, we have inculcated and we maintain among our people of all classes a respect for the things of the mind and of the spirit, to which it would be hard to find a parallel in

Europe, and of which, in particular, there is no trace in England. In China letters are respected, not merely to a degree, but in a sense which must seem, I think, to you unintelligible and overstrained."

You follow Confucius and Mencius in assuming that society should be permanently divided into two parts, one part to be beasts of burden, the other part to be "relieved from the servitude to matter and free to devote themselves to higher ends." Scarcely at any other point do Eastern and American civilization clash more sharply than at this point. An intellectual aristocracy to which but few can possibly attain, with the rest condemned to ignorance, is not worthy to be praised, even though the road to it leads through a private school and is open to such as can afford it. It is a false democracy that would substitute an official monopoly of learning for a system that instructs the ruled as well as the rulers. When only those "destined to the functions of government" enjoy the "pursuit of the liberal arts," it is not strange that, having reached their destination, the educated should look down upon those below, but it would be strange if in China letters were respected to an extraordinary degree.

The wide and almost impassable gulf between the educated and uneducated in China accounts largely for the centuries of misrule from which the people have suffered. One of the noticeable features of Japan's awakening has been the interest taken by the educated classes in the uplifting of the masses, while in China those at the top of the ladder have seemed not only willing to stay there alone, but unwilling that any considerable number should climb to their level.

In America no man could remain long in public life who showed any inclination to withdraw from others the enjoyment of all the educational advantages which he himself had had, or to limit to the official classes the pursuit of the liberal arts. If it had been intended that only a few should enjoy leisure for the contemplation of "higher ends," and that the rest should be "absorbed in mechanical labors," surely some physical mark would enable us to distinguish the two classes; as it is, any arbitrary attempt to so divide the people of any country is sure to leave millions with longings unsatisfied and to elevate thousands who are undeserving. And nowhere has this system of selection failed more signally than in China, where but a small

percentage of those who aspire to official position can possibly reach it, and where men have spent their lives in examinations, lured on by the hope of finally escaping from the despised classes, conscious always that the stereotyped course which they have pursued does not fit them for anything else.

Already this antiquated and effete system of education, if system it can be called, is slinking away from competition with the broader learning of the West, and a few of the Chinese officials are boldly advocating a system of public instruction patterned after America, Europe and Japan. Several thousand new schools have been established since the Boxer uprising, and who will say that this is not a desirable change?

Even the daily newspaper comes under the ban and you see in it only a "stream of solemn fatuity, anecdotes, puzzles, puns and police court scandal," and this you are pleased to describe as our literature. Granted, that our newspapers are not perfect; how can we expect them to be perfect so long as they are published by imperfect human beings? But there are different kinds of newspapers, and you have been unfortunate in the selection of your

reading matter if you have found only puns, puzzles and police court scandals. There is not a capital in Europe nor a State in America in which you will not find daily and weekly papers, not to speak of magazines, which are far above the particular sheets which you describe. However guilty some of our newspapers may be of publishing sensational news and of pandering to low taste, it is eminently unfair to disregard the vast good which they do, or to underestimate the influence which they exert in behalf of social progress and governmental reform. They call attention to the misconduct of officials, to abuses that need a remedy and to conditions which can be improved. No great wrong can long resist the attacks of a free press, and China sorely needs the newspaper—aye, more, China is beginning to experiment with the newspaper, and it is bound to exert a powerful influence upon the China of the future.

But why say our literature is the daily press? You cannot be ignorant of the volume of books constantly flowing from the presses of Europe and America. These works cover every conceivable subject—history, science, religion, ethics, economics, poetry, travels, essays, fiction, etc. What have

you in China to match them in quantity or quality? You say that we have "dissolved all human and personal ties" and "endeavor, in vain, to replace them by the impersonal activity of the state." While it is true that the sphere of state activity is much larger in the Western than in the Eastern world, it is not true that human or personal ties have been dissolved; on the contrary, humanity is nowhere more potential or humane sentiments more controlling. Without loosening the family ties, we have strengthened the ties of brotherhood indefinitely beyond anything known in China.

Not only do our churches teach the doctrine of brotherhood, but it is the basis of the numerous fraternities which are constantly widening our sympathies and cementing together those who differ in creed, in political opinion and in occupation.

I need not reply to your strictures on our architecture further than to suggest that neither in your public nor in your private buildings do you make any approach to the beauty of Western models, and that the skill displayed in the construction of your ancient monuments and temples has few duplicates in your work of today.

You have condemned, I think justly, the opium

war waged against you by England, but your protest would have more weight if you did not devote so much of the soil of China to the cultivation of the poppy and if your countrymen did not carry the vice into every country into which they go. You also condemn with reason the "land-grabbing policy" which some European nations have pursued toward your country. The exchanging of murdered missionaries for naval bases and open ports is not endorsed by the Christian conscience, however cruel the methods employed by your people, or however savage their attacks upon those who enter China for peaceful purposes. I will go farther and say that I have observed in China conduct on the part of foreigners entirely indefensible, though not more coarse or brutal than the conduct of the Chinese government toward its subjects. These are exceptional cases, however, and are no more sufficient for the arraignment of Christians than are the recent cases of bomb-throwing in China for the condemnation of the whole population.

Your people ought to know that in all that makes life valuable, that in all that promotes the welfare of the whole people, that in all that justifies the existence of a state, that in all that advances a genu-

ine civilization, the countries which you condemn are so vastly superior to China that it is difficult to make a comparison between them. This superiority is recognized by a growing band of Chinese reformers whose zeal for the uplifting of their country emboldens them to speak out against the old system at the risk of their lives.

CHAPTER III

THE FOLLY OF ISOLATION

You are an exponent of the doctrine of national isolation, and you state your position with a frankness that leaves no ground for misunderstanding.

You say:

“Left to ourselves we should never have sought intercourse with the West. We have no motive to do so, for we desire neither to proselytize nor to trade.”

And again:

“And as we are not led to interfere with you by the desire to convert you, so are we not driven to do so by the necessities of trade. Economically, as well as politically, we are sufficient to ourselves. What we consume we produce, and what we produce we consume. We do not require, and we have not sought, the products of other nations; and we hold it no less imprudent than unjust to make war on strangers in order to open their markets. A society, we conceive, that is to be politically stable must be

economically independent; and we regard an extensive foreign trade as necessarily a source of social demoralization."

I will go as far as you can in the condemnation of wars waged for trade, but I cannot agree with you that either national necessity or national welfare requires non-intercourse between nations. There is inexpressible egotism in the declaration that your nation or any other nation is so complete in its possessions and so perfect in its ideals and development as to need nothing from without. Neither is it a sound doctrine that a society, "to be politically stable, must be economically independent," or that an extensive foreign trade is necessarily a source of social demoralization. No one nation produces everything that it can profitably use, and if a nation were large enough to do so, there would be an economic waste in attempting to compel commerce between extreme sections that might more advantageously be carried on with neighboring nations. While there are few areas of any considerable size upon which people cannot, if necessary, exist independently of the rest of the world (just as each individual can if need be raise his own food, do his own cooking and make his own clothes), still

a hermit policy is almost as foolish for a nation as for an individual. Experience has shown that it is wiser for the individual to do that which he can do best and exchange his surplus for that which others can produce better than he, and the logic of this policy is as strong when applied to intercourse between nations. The highest type of man is not the most independent man; he is rather the most dependent man, for his interests are inextricably interwoven with the interests of his fellows. The savage is far more independent than the civilized man, for, living without continuous labor upon the herbs which he may gather or upon the game which his arrow may kill, he can entirely avoid the "demoralization" of foreign trade. There are several means by which human progress can be measured, and one of the surest is that of mutual exchange and interdependence, and is this not also true of nations?

Japan has amazed the world by her marvelous strides during the last half century. You used to look down upon this little nation with ill-concealed disdain; neither the geographical proximity of her people nor their race resemblance to your own could lift them to the range of your vision, and yet today

you treat the plenipotentiaries of Japan with distinguished consideration and employ her sons as school teachers in your budding schools and as drill masters in your growing army. When did this change take place? When did the new era begin? Was it not when she abandoned the very policy of seclusion which you hug to your breast? For two and a half centuries she locked her ports against the outer world, kept her soil sacred from the tread of the stranger and forbade her people to travel abroad; for two and a half centuries she produced what she consumed and consumed what she produced, even prohibiting the building of large sea-going craft lest she might suffer contamination. And then — behold the result — she altered her policy, sent her sons like winged messengers to Europe and America, opened her harbors to the sails of every nation, invited tutors to bring the learning of all the colleges to her students, and now with increasing influence and growing commerce she stands the colossal figure of the Orient.

You pay a flattering tribute to the greater wisdom of Japan when you send, as you do, thousands of your young men annually to her universities.

Did any foreign nation ever send students to China's schools?

You seem depressed by the fear that foreign commerce will disturb the world's peace, and your forebodings of evil find expression in the following words:

“Such is the internal economy of your state, as it presents itself to a Chinaman; and not more encouraging is the spectacle of your foreign relations. Commercial intercourse between nations, it was supposed some fifty years ago, would inaugurate an era of peace; and there appear to be many among you who still cling to this belief. But never was belief more plainly contradicted by the facts. The competition for markets bids fair to be a more fruitful cause of war than was ever in the past the ambition of princes or the bigotry of priests. The people of Europe fling themselves, like hungry beasts of prey, on every yet unexploited quarter of the globe. Hitherto they have confined their acts of spoliation to those whom they regard as outside their own pale. But always, while they divide the spoil, they watch each other with a jealous eye; and sooner or later, when there is nothing left to divide, they will fall upon one another. That is the real meaning of your

armaments; you must devour or be devoured. And it is precisely those trade relations, which it was thought would knit you in the bonds of peace, which, by making everyone of you cut-throat rivals of the others, have brought you within reasonable distance of a general war of extermination."

I shall not attempt to defend the maintaining of large standing armies with a view to conquest nor shall I excuse the forcible extension of either territory or trade, but you will pardon me if I insist that commerce is a pacific, not a disturbing factor in the world.

While it is true that wars have been waged for commerce, it is also true that commerce has prevented more wars than it has caused. Recurring to the savage, you will not deny that among the roving tribes which have no commerce at all there is constant warfare. Not a certain percentage of the able-bodied men, but all of them, are warriors. Commerce is not the only force that has been responsible for the gradual knitting of the world together, but it has been a potent one. The business portion of a country exerts a strong influence upon its policy and business men are preeminently disposed to peace—so much so, in fact, that they have often

been accused of putting their financial interests above their patriotism. In proportion as nations trade with each other they are slow to engage in a war, for business is a sort of hostage which each nation gives to the other.

While we have recently witnessed bloody wars in different parts of the world, they do not contradict the statement that the world is growing toward peace. It is a common error to form a rule from an instance, but it is none the less a mistake. The Hague Peace Congress was suggested by Russia and was quickly endorsed by the United States, England and Japan. All of these nations have since that time been engaged in wars of considerable magnitude, and yet the Hague Tribunal grows in importance and the peace movement spreads. The next fifty years are more apt to see a decrease than an increase in preparations for bloodshed, and while commerce will not be credited with accomplishing this great result unaided, she cannot be denied her share of the glory.

But intercourse between nations can be defended upon other grounds. People need to know each other and this is as true of groups as of individuals. As "no one liveth unto himself or dieth unto him-

self," so no nation can entirely separate itself from the rest of the world, nor should it desire to do so. Wisdom has no pent-up habitation. Truth is many-sided, and no one individual or one nation has made a complete survey of it. As individuals grow in breadth of mind, depth of thought and clearness of vision by a comparison of views, so nations are enlarged, strengthened and developed by intercourse. It is out of combat between opposing doctrines, conflicting opinions and differing ideals that the best emerges, "purified as by fire."

Sometimes freedom of speech is denied to the subjects of a king, but censorship is ruinous to the ruler as well as to his people—more ruinous, in fact, for the people ultimately secure the freedom for which they contend while the ruler suffers in proportion as he has delayed in the recognition of the right of free speech. A policy of national seclusion is simply the suppression, on a large scale, of freedom of thought. The Chinese government undertook to prohibit its citizens from imparting any information to or receiving any information from those living beyond its borders. It was a gigantic policy of coercion—an attempt to chain the people to thoughts, conditions and customs

against which with greater light they might rebel.

Trade is voluntary; like a contract, it involves the meeting of two minds. We cannot sell a pound of flour, a bale of cotton, a bolt of cloth, a gallon of oil or a piece of machinery in China unless some one desires to buy it. All this talk of "forcing trade" upon unwilling people is playing with words. China did not say that her people did not want to trade with the world, but that they should not trade whether they wanted to or not. And you are authority for the statement that a distinction must be drawn between your government and your people, for you say, "we are not to be judged by the acts of our mobs, nor even, I may add, by those of our government, for the government in China does not represent the nation." If the mob which assaults strangers or boycotts foreign goods does not represent the nation, and if the government which puts an embargo upon foreign intercourse has no authority to speak for the people, who, pray, is in a position to declare the will of the nation? What better plan than to allow each individual to decide the question for himself? While a nation may, for fiscal reasons, impose a tax upon imports or exports, it is

nothing short of tyranny to deny the right of a people to trade as they please and where they please. And you have so exalted the intelligence and morality of your people that you are estopped to deny that they would trade with discrimination and be governed by ethical considerations in their foreign intercourse. If your encomiums are at all deserved, your people are the last to need recourse to commercial seclusion as a protection from social demoralization.

Aside from being a means of making people better acquainted, intercourse between nations creates sympathy, and sympathy is absolutely essential to the solidarity of the world. Acquaintance, as a rule, precedes sympathy, and intercourse is necessary to acquaintance. The principles that affect international affairs are none other than the principles which regulate individual life; it is, therefore, logical to reason from the unit to the collection of units.

We all recognize the fact that the affairs of those whom we know interest us more than the affairs of strangers. We read in the paper that a person unknown to us has died or met with a misfortune, and we pass on to the next item; but if it is a person

whom we know, we lay down the paper and give voice to our sorrow and sympathy, and that sympathy is deep in proportion as the acquaintance has been close. Even a chance meeting on an ocean steamer or during a long railroad journey (or, I may add, at a quarantine station) suffices to give a person a larger hold upon our active sympathies than a large number of persons whom we have never seen and of whom as individuals we have never heard. How often have we known misunderstandings to be removed by intimacy and friendship to take the place of distrust and prejudice.

It is even so with nations. Travelling between them ought to be encouraged and commerce is a sure promoter of travel. No nation can afford to adopt a policy which is not defensible upon principles of general application. If one great nation can justify itself in a course of political, economic, social and religious isolation, why is not that the policy for all? And if such should be the policy of all nations, how shall we know that the present national boundaries are the proper ones? Is this the policy for Belgium and Holland and Switzerland as well as the policy for a great nation like China? If it is only good for large nations, how

large should a nation be before it can properly wall out the rest of the world? And if the policy is good for a small nation as well as for a large one, why should not China be dissolved into a number of smaller nations and these be further subdivided into communities? If it is well for individuals to become acquainted and to be drawn together by ties of sympathy, at what point shall a barrier be raised and on it inscribed, "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther"?

What the world needs more than anything else is sympathy—sympathy between man and man, sympathy between class and class, sympathy between community and community, sympathy between nation and nation; and commerce, faulty in vision, full of frailties, permeated with selfishness and prone to error—commerce still possesses enough of saving salt to make it a unifying force. With all its weaknesses, it has strength enough to form a part of the web of human brotherhood.

CHAPTER IV

LABOR-SAVING MACHINERY

The text for this letter I find in your ingenious attack upon labor-saving machinery.

“The truth is that a study of your history during the past century and a closer acquaintance with the structure of your society has considerably modified my original point of view. I have learned that the most brilliant discoveries, the most fruitful applications of inventive genius, do not of themselves suffice for the well-being of society; and that an intelligence which is concentrated exclusively on the production of labor-saving machines may easily work more harm by the dislocation of industry than it can accomplish good by the increase of wealth. For the increase of wealth—that is, of the means to comfort—is not, in my mind, necessarily good in itself; everything depends upon the way in which the wealth is distributed and on its effect on the moral character of the nation. And it is from that point of view that I look with some dismay upon

the prospect of the introduction of Western methods into China."

You then proceed to explain how your government quieted some boatmen who tore up a railroad by guaranteeing that "the traffic by water should not seriously suffer." But even the ability of the government to compensate the people who suffer from the "dislocation of labor" caused by a new machine does not relieve your apprehension, and you are appalled by the pictured disorder which you say must inevitably ensue among your people if Western methods of industry are introduced. You argue against the introduction of improved methods and raise a question of great importance, viz., Is the labor-saving machine a blessing or a curse? Does it help or hinder the development of the individual and of society?

To agree upon an answer we must first agree upon a definition of civilization, for if we cannot agree as to the end to be desired, we can hardly hope to agree as to the best means of reaching that end. Even if we could agree as to the means without agreeing as to the end, we should be as far apart as ever.

I can frame no better definition of civilization

than that it is the harmonious development of the human race, physically, mentally and morally—not the development of all along one line or the development of a few along all lines, but the full and well-rounded development of all in body, mind and heart. If this is the legitimate aim of life and of life's activity, we can judge all proposed policies, whether they be economic, political, social or religious, by the effect which they have in aiding or retarding this development.

Does the labor-saving machine contribute toward the physical, mental and moral improvement of the race? I will not deny that the machine, like all things else, may be turned to evil account, nor will I affirm that it can be introduced without accompanying temptations to new forms of evil. But I do assert that the good brought far outweighs the harm done and that our efforts should be directed to the lessening of the latter rather than to the abolition of labor-saving processes. I once heard a man defend his failure to learn to write by saying that he knew a man who was sent to the penitentiary for forging a note and that he thought it was safer to avoid the use of the pen. To argue against the use of machinery because it introduces

new dangers, even if those dangers are difficult to avoid, would be scarcely less absurd than to discourage writing as a cure for forgery.

If the invention of a labor-saving machine is hurtful, then China has not only sinned but has boasted of her sins, for she has plumed herself upon having been in advance of the West in several important inventions, chief among which may be mentioned the printing press. What an army of men might have been employed copying the books published each year and the magazines published each month and the newspapers published each day, but for the invention of movable type! The only flaw in the argument is that the books, magazines and papers would not have existed to any great extent but for the printing press. Hundreds, yes, thousands of times as many persons are employed on publications today as would have been employed upon them if the old method of copying were still the only one employed, not to speak of the infinite advantage that has come to the human race through the bringing of learning and general information within the reach of the masses. Take the use of steam as another illustration; what a multitude of men might have been employed on

sailing ships but for the ocean steamers, and how many more in carting and hauling on land but for the railway trains—only there would have been no such commerce, foreign or domestic, as we have now. The number of men engaged in transportation has been increased rather than diminished by the utilization of steam. But why should the owner of a sail boat object to the vessel propelled by steam? The sail itself is a labor-saving machine, probably one of the first. Who gave the sailors permission to dispense with a multitude of oarsmen and turn their work over to the strong arms of Boreas? Why should the teamster find fault with the locomotive? What moral right had he to enforce idleness upon a dozen men by substituting a cunningly wrought wagon for their strong backs? Even the wheelbarrow, which is omnipresent in China, is a petty thief, stealing opportunity to work from those who but for the inventor might be bearing its burdens. And what shall we say of the pole, employed everywhere in the Orient, which enables a workman to carry several buckets or baskets when he might otherwise be making several trips with lighter burdens? If to minimize the labor necessary for a given task is a sin, how can your people hope to escape

censure? I saw them digging up the ground with implements of iron which had been fashioned for the express purpose of supplementing the muscles of the farmer; I saw them cutting grain with sickles when more labor might have been employed by breaking the straws by hand; and, that the blame may not rest entirely upon those who toil outdoors, let me remind you that I saw looms at work, relentlessly robbing those who might have made cloth by slower processes. By what logic do you prove that inventions were good in so far as they have been employed in China and bad when they go a step farther? Or do you censure all inventions alike and counsel a return to the most primitive form of life where men and women live like animals, wearing the garb that Nature gave them and scorning the use of tools?

I prefer to believe that God intended man for a higher life when he gave him dominion over earth and air and sea; I prefer to believe that progress is a part of the divine plan and that it is as innocent to harness the lightning as it is to harness the horse; as righteous to use the energy of the wind and the waterfall as to borrow the strength of the ox.

If man is to be more than a perfect beast there must be employment for the mind as well as for the body, and while we cannot go back into antiquity far enough to find a people entirely devoid of inventive genius, we do know that intellectual advancement has been greatest among those who have taken advantage of the forces of Nature and thus increased their own strength. Buckle, the English historian, even goes so far as to measure civilization by the mastery of the human mind over the forces of Nature. While he errs in entirely ignoring the moral element, he is right in placing a high estimate upon the labor-saving machine.

In the patent office at Washington is a model of the first sewing machine and on it is a card upon which is the following:

“ Mine are sinews superhuman,
 Ribs of brass and nerves of steel;
 I'm the IRON NEEDLE WOMAN,
 Born to toil but not to feel.”

A similar inscription might be placed upon every important invention. The more mind can be united with muscle in the work of life, the greater will be the advancement and the easier will it be to re-

move from physical toil the odium which it has so often borne. If the advantages of machinery are properly distributed every new invention will bring us nearer to the time when all can share equitably in the wealth annually produced and all move forward together toward life's higher planes.

You have pointed out with great force the chief defect in our industrial system. The fault does not lie in the "brilliant discoveries" or in the "fruitful application of inventive genius," but in the failure to secure for all of society the accruing benefits. We have permitted the heritage of the whole family to be monopolized by comparatively few; we have allowed capital to absorb more than its share of the products of human toil. This is the crying evil of the Western world, and I am not surprised that a stranger should be deeply impressed by it. But the remedy is not to be found in the contraction of the volume of production, but in the establishment of equity in the distribution of reward. Even under the present conditions the lot of the average man in America is far better than that of the average man in China, and I venture to say that by any standard—physical, material, intellectual, æsthetic, moral or spiritual—the average

American is far superior to the average Chinaman; and I say this in spite of the fact that you question whether we have either intelligence, taste, morals or religion. But superior as our civilization is, it is not what it should be and not what we desire to have it. We do not imitate you in regarding our condition as incapable of improvement and we do not, like you, refuse instruction or suggestion from without. We regard the work of society as an ever continuing one and always unfinished. While each generation is in duty bound to advance it as far as possible, it does not hope to complete it. There is an increasing study of the problems to be solved and a constant elimination of things found to be bad and encouragement of things promising good. As production must come before distribution and as experience is the teacher from whom we all learn, it necessarily follows that the evils come before the remedy. No one is wise enough to measure in advance the influence of an invention or to estimate its far-reaching effects, but we cannot doubt the disposition and the ability of the people, when free to act, to find a remedy for every evil. We walk by faith and that faith is justified by history and by the present.

To so enlarge the wealth produced by man as to satisfy all legitimate wants with a reasonable day's work is the first object, and the second is to so adjust the compensation as to give each member of society a reward commensurate with his contribution to the welfare of society. To do this it may be necessary for us to go farther than we have yet gone in compelling society as a whole to share the temporary burden imposed upon particular classes or industries by new inventions. A perfect realization of these two objects has not yet been reached; to realize them should be the purpose of all who have the welfare of their fellows at heart.

You complain that the spirit has been lost in an unseemly scramble for wealth. In this I am constrained to believe you grievously err. I would deny it if asserted of any of the European nations, but I most earnestly dispute it in regard to my own country. At no time during a century have moral forces been more potent than they are in America today; at no time has the conscience been more sensitive; at no time has a larger percentage of the people been engaged in altruistic work. We have, it is true, gross illustration of unbounded avarice and inhuman greed, and we have still more numer-

ous illustrations of complete absorption in money making. At the other extreme we have the destitute and the desperate, some the victims of unjust legislation or unfair conditions, some the victims of their own appetites and lusts. But between these classes there is a large middle class—God fearing and God worshipping; a class composed of both men and women in whom the spiritual element predominates and who, though often discouraged by failure and often putting forth misdirected effort, yearn to be of real service to mankind.

In that refinement which is a matter of manners rather than of heart; in that estheticism which prefers the form to the substance; in that learning which breeds vanity instead of breadth of vision—in these we may be inferior to those who have slumbered in the cold embrace of Eastern civilization, but in all that tends to enlarge life, infuse into it a throbbing earnestness and direct it in noble paths, I dare to believe America foremost, not only among the nations of today, but among the nations past as well.

CHAPTER V

GOVERNMENT

And even your government is defended by your facile pen. Just when its foundations are crumbling and its moss-grown methods are about to be abandoned, you proclaim it superior to the governments which your nation is preparing to imitate. With all your eulogy of it, you take a pride in the fact that its sphere is very limited—that it does not represent the nation and that the people could easily do without it. No wonder you desire to reduce its influence to a minimum! No wonder the masses seem indifferent to its fate!

You almost deny that the government has any existence when you say: "Neither the acts nor the omissions of the authorities at Peking have any real or permanent effect upon the life of our masses except so far as they register the movements of popular sentiment and demand. Otherwise, as you foreigners know to your cost, they remain a dead letter. The government may make conventions and

treaties, but it cannot put them into effect, except in so far as they are endorsed by public opinion." And then you add the threat: "The passive resistance of so vast a people, rooted in a tradition so immemorial, will defeat in the future as it has done in the past the attempts of the Western powers to impose their will on the nation through the agency of the government. No force will ever suffice to stir that huge inertia."

And this is the law-abiding people whose virtues you so indiscriminately extol! They permit an absolute monarch to occupy the throne and invest him, or allow him to invest himself, with power to behead at his will any one of his admiring subjects, and then they show their contempt of the government by refusing to obey any decree that displeases them. They tolerate a judicial system in which the decisions are sold to the highest bidder and then parade, as an evidence of merit, the fact that they settle their differences in private courts. They have no way of ascertaining public opinion except through the mob, and this represents no one but those who take part in it.

You are audacious enough to contrast your method of selecting your officials by competitive examina-

tions with the Western methods of election. While your government has recently abandoned the centuries-old system of examinations and allowed the pretentious examination halls to fall into decay, it still maintains a modified scheme of selection from among the graduates of the modern schools which are springing up. While this is a long step in advance, it is still so far inferior to the methods which you condemn that it is worth while to point out some of its defects.

Your old system tested only the memory. The aspirants for public place prepared themselves by reading what was written two thousand years ago and by imitating the style of poets whose lines had been approved by royal edict, adding a smattering of censored history. The successful candidates gave no evidence of their knowledge of present-day problems, no proof of their interest in public affairs (for a desire to hold public office might indicate a desire to escape from association with the laborers rather than a sincere interest in good government). They were not required to show proficiency in anything directly connected with the work which they might be called upon to perform. Having obtained official rank, the candidates waited

for an appointment, always conscious that those who had more money could cheat them out of the coveted place. The rank was sometimes made a matter of auction and a person of wealth could buy a position without passing any examination at all.

The new plan of selecting from those who have completed the course of study prescribed in the schools is a marked improvement over the old, and yet this plan depends largely for its merits upon the breadth and thoroughness of the collegiate course. And even though a system of examinations, perfect in its plan and details, did result in the selection of those with the best intellectual qualifications, it could not secure the selection of those best fitted for office, because fitness for office means more than knowledge. A disposition to serve the public rather than to exploit it is more essential than mere mental attainments, and no system of examinations can test this quality. One who has no sympathy with the people whom he is supposed to serve may be the worse rather than the better for an education, for he may the more cunningly contrive to take advantage of those who pay his salary.

Your system of government, instead of being the best the world has ever seen, is about the worst that

could be conceived. The head of the government is a usurper who seized the throne (or rather, inherited it from those who took it by force); he lives in the "forbidden city" surrounded by walls to protect him from his subjects; and he administers government through a body of officials responsible neither to him nor to the people. The sovereign has no way of ascertaining the will of the people, and the people have no interest in him. The officials live entirely apart from those whom they rule, and the masses obey when they please to do so. To the Western mind such a government would seem the very breeding ground of disorder. Such a thing can only be called a government by a violent wrenching of definitions. We have, it is true, a civil-service system, but the selection by examinations of subordinate officials to do routine work under the supervision of elective officials is, as you can readily see, quite different from your plan of intrusting the entire machinery of government to men thus chosen.

You compare your system with our system of elections, and declare the former to be much more reasonable. You argue that our system means representation not of the people but of different inter-

ests. I will leave others to defend European politics, suggesting only that all the European governments are better than your government and to a greater or less extent responsive to the popular will. If Russia is an exception, her ruler is paying the penalty for his unwillingness to take the people into partnership with him in the exercise of authority, and even here a legislative body has recently been created.

But of the United States I am better prepared to speak, and I dispute your proposition. I admit that wealth sometimes controls elections and that at all times it exercises more influence than it should, but there is no proposition which the people cannot carry through, no principle which they cannot crystallize into law, when they really undertake it. We have one body, the United States Senate, in which the corporations exert the most noticeable influence, but this is the branch of Congress which is not elected by a direct vote. The fact that it is more subservient than the House of Representatives to the money power is a strong argument in favor of popular elections. In the cities we have had many instances of corrupt government, but in these very cities the people have shown how quickly and how

thoroughly they can purge their government when aroused by a knowledge of official misconduct. If our newspapers have more to say than yours about the misdeeds of public servants, it is partly due to the fact that we have more freedom of the press than you, and partly because with us malfeasance in office is an unpardonable sin, while with you it is a common occurrence and the thing expected.

With us the government derives "its just powers from the consent of the governed"; the people choose their representatives, retain them in office as long as they like and depose them when they please. We have none who rule by right divine, transmitting office from sire to son; neither have we a permanent official class monopolizing the emoluments of the public service and independent of those in the supposed interests of whom they occupy their positions. The head of our nation is chosen by the voters, and they include all the adult males, except in a few Southern States where many of the blacks are excluded by suffrage qualifications. (In a few Western States women vote upon the same terms with the men.) Our Congress is composed of two bodies both elective for a term of years, the senators by State legislatures, the repre-

sentatives by direct vote. Our States and cities have governments modelled upon the same plan. Not only are our legislative and executive officials responsible to the people for the authority which they temporarily exercise, but our judicial officers are largely selected by ballot, and those who are appointed are appointed by officials who hold by election.

The people make and unmake, regulated in their forms of procedure by constitutions framed and adopted by themselves. If there are faults in the government, there are means of correcting those faults; if abuses appear, they can be remedied; if those in authority go astray, they can be disciplined or discharged. Our government can be made as good as the people desire it to be, for it reflects their vigilance, their intelligence and their virtue.

This system of self-government has not only developed in a century and a third more great men than China has known in all the centuries of her existence, but it has produced a still larger number of competent and conscientious, if less conspicuous, officials and has educated the masses of the people in public affairs to a degree scarcely conceivable by the Eastern mind. Confucius taught that the administration of government was a thing about

which no one need concern himself unless he was himself an official. Our government, on the contrary, rests upon the theory that the public affairs of the nation are the private concern of all the people, and that the voters, being the real sovereigns, are in duty bound to study thoroughly not only the permanent principles of government but the transient problems which affect the nation's welfare. If there be those who are indifferent, it is the business of the alert to arouse them; if mistakes are made, it is the business of all to correct them; if the few attempt to use the instrumentalities of government for private ends, it is within the power of the many, to dispossess them and to restore the government to its legitimate functions.

Since a few brave men flung these doctrines into the face of a king, the theory of self-government has spread; since our constitution was adopted, others have been adopted, and the principles of representative government have been transplanted upon the soil of every continent. Everywhere the power of the people has spread, everywhere arbitrary power is waning. Even in the Orient the day has dawned; Japan's emperor, without waiting for revolution, announced a constitution curtailing his own prerogatives and deposited in the hands of

an elective body the legislative power which he had formerly exercised without restraint. In Russia, the last European citadel of despotism is being stormed, and the Czar, who could once consign a suspect without trial to Siberia's inhospitable plains, now negotiates with the populace, and, more wonderful still, while I write your own Dowager Empress summons her wisest councilors and sends them as envoys to the barbarous West to investigate their constitutions with a view to the promulgation of a constitution in China! The world does move; those who love darkness rather than light may glory in the night, but they cannot stay the coming of the morning. The "huge inertia" upon which you so confidently rely will prove impotent to prevent the change. The masses, "the still and brooding soul" of China, as you are pleased to describe them, will join in the demand for reform. Just as the Daimios of Choshu vainly tried to obstruct the progress of Japan, so some of your people may throw themselves in the path of progress, but when Western ideals have been planted in the place of those which you now cherish, your people will be as grateful as are the people of Japan for the example set them by Europe and America.

CHAPTER VI

THE HOME

In your letters special stress is laid upon the home, and you are justified in regarding it as a strategic point of the highest importance. If you could show that the home, as it is found in China, is better than the Western home and more calculated to give to the individual, the community and the nation that development which may be regarded as ideal, your case would be won, for the home is the center of all civilizing influence. As in ancient times two armies sometimes selected individual champions to decide the issue while the rest looked on, so the champions of Eastern and Western civilization could well afford to commit the decision to the issue between the ideals which these two homes represent.

You emphasize reverence for parents and I make no answer. "Honor thy father and thy mother" is a commandment binding the world around, from the dawn of creation to the last generation of the sons of men. If in the Chinese home there is more

reverence for parents than in the homes of Europe and America, let that fact be put down to the credit of your people and to the shame of ours, but the superiority which you claim is not conceded. Reverence may take upon itself numerous forms, and it is not safe to judge by outward appearance alone or by the observance of prescribed forms. As in religion the spirit is sometimes lost in devotion to the ritual, so true filial respect may be absent when there is a profusion of obeisance and lip service.

I specifically deny that the American home is lacking in love of child for parent or that those tender ministrations which affection prompts are less common in the American than in the Chinese home. That we have instances of ingratitude, neglect and even cruelty in a population of eighty millions, I freely concede; that you have them in China as well, your court records will prove; but that they are more common with us or that our conception of a home naturally or logically weakens the domestic tie cannot be established. Not only is reverence for the parent presumed, but care for the parent is compelled, and so wide-spread is the respect for age and consideration for the aged that homes are established by fraternities, by private

philanthropy and by the State wherein those find refuge who have lost their relatives.

But in speaking of the home, it must not be forgotten that it includes something more than the devotion of child to parent. There is a duty of parent to child, and in addition to this, there is an obligation existing between brothers and sisters. The Chinese home is built upon a philosophy which to us seems one-sided, much being said about the child's duty to the parent and the younger brothers' duty to the eldest, but less about the mutuality of domestic relations. Do not the parents owe something to the child? The child enters life without his own volition; when he becomes conscious of existence, he finds himself environed by others and certain relations fastened upon him. He is taught to address one person as father, another person as mother, a third as brother and a fourth as sister. As he does not select the parent whom he is to revere, neither does he determine whether he shall be the elder brother or the younger, or even how many brothers and sisters are to surround him. Can it be that thus brought into the world, he is under greater obligation to his parents than his parents are to him? With them his birth was a conscious

act, and they are responsible for the race marks that he bears through life and for the national frame into which his existence is fitted. By what process of reasoning does one reach the conclusion that the child must burn incense at the grave of his ancestor though that ancestor may have neglected his body, his mind and his soul? I assert that in the American home the conception of a parent's duty is higher than in a Chinese home and point for proof to the fact that the parents of America tax themselves by laws made by themselves in order that every child, others as well as their own, may have an opportunity for intellectual development.

Not only do the parents of America build school-houses, but they build churches also in which, as they believe, the spiritual nature of the children is nurtured. There is a reciprocity between parent and child, and in the American home the mutual obligations between them are, as a rule, considered sacred.

While your observations, according to your letters, have been confined to Europe, you have by implication included the American home, and of this I feel that I can speak with some intelligence, for my opportunity to become acquainted with the home life of my country has been ample. In every

section of the United States I have been privileged to enter the family circle, and I know whereof I speak when I say that there is no institution of which our people have more reason to be proud than the American home. And I believe, further, that no home, ancient or modern, in the Orient or in the Occident, surpasses it in all that goes to make a home beautiful, wholesome and improving to those who share its blessings.

But as regards brothers and sisters, will you measure your home against ours? Will you argue that among brothers a precedence based upon the accident of birth is as just or as promotive of the good of all as equality of rights, privileges and opportunities? Do we find any guarantee in nature that a brother, because he happens to be the oldest, will administer with equity the estate which his father left? Your system is patriarchal and only tolerable in the country and in the village, and that, too, when education has not been carried far enough to disclose differing capacities for usefulness. Even where it is at its best, it cannot lend itself to the fullest development or secure fairness or impartiality between the different members of the household. Harmony is inconsistent with injustice, and

I venture to assert that the American home, because built upon principles more in accord with justice, is more harmonious. The Chinese home may show a deference in the younger children toward the oldest brother, but it does not show the mutual regard, the mutual help and the mutual sacrifice between brothers and sisters which may be found in the American home, where all share and share alike in the advantages and in the burdens of the household.

There is another test. What is the condition of woman in the Chinese home? What is the condition of the daughter or the daughter-in-law? Does she stand, as in America, by the side of the son and entitled to all the consideration shown to him? Is her birth an hour of joy, her childhood a delight, her young womanhood a crown of glory and her happiness an object of solicitude to brothers as well as to parents? Is she regarded equally entitled to strength of body, vigor of mind and independence of purpose? In the American home woman's place is firmly established; she is not merely a flower, although she is an ornament; she is not a slave, although she has a work as important as man's. She is full partner in all that belongs to the family, and in the interest of future generations claims

attention for her every faculty. It is not unusual in America to see a brother denying himself that his sister may be educated, and the sister, in turn, out of her increased earning power, assisting the one who educated her or educating a younger brother. The permanent affection between the different members of one family is as great in our country as in yours, and I am sure there is no better way of showing love for a dead parent than by care for brothers and sisters and offspring. In America less depends upon the eldest son, for all the sons, and the daughters as well, can honor the parents by making their lives a blessing to the world.

In considering the home, I have only touched upon the natural relations between parent and child, and between brothers and sisters; but since you have seen fit to claim so much for the Chinese home, permit me to say that from our standpoint the whole theory of the home as it is found in your country is inconsistent with true happiness, as well as with broad and just development. With us the union, on a basis of love, of one man with one woman in the bonds of holy wedlock is essential to the formation of a family. It is not reasonable to suppose that an ideal home can be built upon

a marriage arranged by parents between two children before the contracting parties are old enough to know their own minds, to make their own selection or to enter upon the responsibilities of husband and wife. And as if this were not enough to jeopardize the happiness of the home, the husband is allowed to select other wives from time to time and to bring them into the family; a practice that I have heard justified on the ground that he has no voice in the selection of the first wife. To make the confusion worse, he can add concubines if he prefers them to wives. To us it is inconceivable that such a system should contribute toward, or even permit, a model home life. I do not mean to assert that all Chinamen have plural wives or that all of them practice concubinage, but these things are not only permitted by law but tolerated by public opinion, and from the royal family down these practices are generally recognized as proper. I doubt not that your country has a multitude of homes in which there is happiness, where there is a tie of indissoluble affection—homes into which the suspicion of infidelity has never entered and where each is satisfied with the society of the other; but I am constrained to believe that in all these

homes the happiness increases in proportion as they approximate the American ideal and diverge from the Chinese.

Aside from the faults which we see in your marriage relations, there seems to us to be an insuperable objection to the community family. It is difficult enough to rear several groups of children, the offspring of different mothers, under one roof (especially if room has to be made for an occasional illegitimate) and preserve harmony between them, but the difficulty must be much greater where each of several sons brings several wives into the same compound and their sons do the same. Each wife has her relationships, not to speak of her special interest in her own brood, and the influence of the several wives upon their husbands, even when all have the best of intentions, cannot but complicate family life. It does not require any stretch of the imagination to picture discord as a natural result of such enforced joining of diverse interests, and such a relationship could not stand the strain at all if the different contributors to the family fund differed materially in industry, capacity and attention to business.

While in America the relatives do not all live to-

gether or throw their earnings into a common fund, it does not follow that there is antagonism between them or a lack of friendship one for the other. With each child's rights recognized and each individual's talents developed, the foundation is laid for an amicable relationship. When the child is grown, he builds a home for himself, unless it is mutually agreeable that he should bring his wife to the family home and take the burden of the household from the shoulders of the parents. The homes established by the children, while separate from the parental hive and from each other, are not hedged in by frowning walls. Visiting back and forth is constant, and family reunions are numerous, and these are not less delightful because the families have been independent of each other and each home regulated by rules agreeable to its occupants.

You have been unfortunate in the families which you have visited, if your comment on the Western family is founded upon your own observation. You describe the family as "merely a means for nourishing and protecting a child until he is of age to look after himself"; in the public school you see only a place where boys "quickly emancipate themselves from the influence of their home"; and you picture

the boy as sent out to make his fortune as soon as he is of age and ceasing to recognize his obligations toward his parents as soon as he ceases to be dependent upon them. How superficial has been your survey of the home that lies at the root of Western civilization!

Come to America and acquaint yourself with the American home as it really is, and you will find that it is not necessary that a child should be dependent upon its parents in order to love them and care for them; you will find that there is a deeper reverence than that which shows itself in pilgrimages to a grave and a more lasting affection than can be expressed by a few cast-iron forms, transmitted from generation to generation. I commend you to the American home, which has its beginning in the love-encircled union of a congenial pair, its flower in children, loved, loving and each equal to the others in rights and privileges, and its mature fruit in the prosperity and progress of the community.

CHAPTER VII

WITHOUT A MISSION

“We do not conceive that we have a mission to redeem or civilize the world, still less that that mission is to be accomplished by the methods of fire and sword; and we are thankful enough if we can solve our own problems without burdening ourselves with those of others.”

You might have omitted the phrase, “still less that that mission is to be accomplished by the methods of fire and sword,” without changing the meaning of the sentence. I shall be the last to defend the forcing of ideals or ideas upon others, and shall vie with you in the condemnation of such practices no matter who resorts to them. If, however, you mean by this language to assert that any Christian nation is at this time attempting to civilize by force, you will find difficulty in substantiating the proposition, and in the case of my own country you will find no proof at all. I have already referred to the matter of trade, and as for the matter of religion,

what attempt is being made to compel the adoption of any form of belief? Our missionaries go to your shores, it is true, but they have neither the disposition nor the power to coerce your people into the acceptance of any creed. They present a gospel of peace and a conception of life. If there has been violence, it has been because your people have attempted to put them to death, and the murderous attacks made upon them have reflected upon the Chinese rather than upon the Americans. You do not have to kill a missionary in order to reject Christianity, and the acts of violence have been committed, not by those who listened to the missionaries, but by brutal and fanatical followers of Confucius who were unwilling to have their countrymen voluntarily choose Christianity.

All that Americans ask is that those Chinamen who desire to hear shall be permitted to hear and that those to whom Christianity commends itself shall be permitted to accept it. This is not accomplishing a mission "by the methods of fire and sword." You dodge the question when you attempt to place upon foreigners the blame for the use of force when that force is used in the punishing of outrages against treaty rights, outrages

against international rights and outrages against human rights. If your language is intended as a defence of assaults upon missionaries or as a condemnation of the punishment visited for such assaults, you should state your position more clearly and say boldly that our nation should not punish a Chinaman for interfering with the right of an American to hold communication with Chinamen.

I have quoted what you say in regard to your nation having no mission because it is the most important statement that you make in your letter. It is said lightly, as if you yourself did not recognize its significance. "We do not conceive that we have a mission to redeem or to civilize the world," you say, and then with smug self-satisfaction you add: "We are thankful enough if we can solve our own problems without burdening ourselves with those of other people."

Many criticisms have been made of the Chinese, some in a friendly spirit, some in an unfriendly spirit, but no foreigner has ever brought against your people a graver accusation than is couched in the language above quoted. You charge your people with being dead, for such a sentiment is inconsistent with life and health; you charge them with being

so engrossed in their own affairs that they have neither thought nor care for the rest of the world. You have unconsciously revealed the secret of the dry rot that has been consuming your nation. You have exposed the cause of the stagnation that has characterized your country. Naturally the indifference with which your people look upon the people of other nations manifests itself in indifference to the welfare of each other. While, unfortunately, every country presents instances of "man's inhumanity to man," no nation present or past furnishes a clearer illustration of man's indifference to man. Selfishness, ingrowing, outcropping, deep-rooted and wide-spreading is the dominant note in your social discord.

"We have no mission." If your nation were not destined to be reclaimed by those who have a mission; if your people were not to be aroused by those whose hearts are large enough to share the burdens of others, your words spoken in eulogy would form a fitting epitaph for your native land. What a spectacle a country presents, crowded with missionless men and women, each one intent upon his own problems but unconcerned about the problems with which his fellows are struggling--the coolie look-

ing out for himself, satisfied if he can escape starvation; the merchant looking out for himself, satisfied if he can settle his bills before New Year's day; the official looking out for himself, content if he can make enough on the side to support himself in style and care for his leech-like kin folks that swarm about, and over and above all the Emperor looking out for himself, happy in his harem.

This is the picture which you have in the past presented to the outside world, and yet, looking upon it, you exclaim, behold our greater intelligence, our higher morality, our purer religion!

I will be more just to your people than you are and deny that all of them deserve to be characterized as you characterize them. You have had brave spirits who have from time to time called your people from the low levels to higher grounds, but their voices have been lost—and in some cases their lives as well. Brave spirits are calling again, for they have a mission, and they will call until their call is heeded.

Western civilization has spread because Western nations have had a mission, and their peoples have journeyed over every sea and throughout every land, because they have conceived themselves to

have missions. There is an old saying, "Beware of the man with a mission," and why beware? Because the man with a mission is in earnest; he has a purpose and he accomplishes it. He may in his zeal be led into error—he may even do injustice, but he acts. The man without a mission—well, if he has no mission at all, he is not a man. Without a mission man is simply an animal, content to eat and drink and die. Missions are infinite in variety. One's ambition may be to show to what perfection physical development can be carried, and with patient labor, constant exercise and daily sacrifice he trains each muscle; another may choose an intellectual object and seek to perfect himself in language, in literary style or in the art of speech. A third may seek to exemplify the triumph of the spiritual forces over the flesh and teach the possibility of a high ethical standard. Still another may devote himself to some domestic task, the care of a home, the nursing of a parent, the training of children or the assistance of some relative who is in need or who shows fitness for some special work.

A fifth may choose a still larger field and dedicate himself to charitable or philanthropic work, to the development of a community, to the advance-

ment of a state or to the welfare of a nation. And what is true of man is equally true of woman, for in the complex and varied activities of life woman's place is as dignified as man's and her influence matches his. While the number of directions in which a mission may lead one is infinite, the motive power is the same—the feeling that something ought to be done and that the one to whom the feeling comes should do it.

I do not know that I can better describe the having of a mission than to compare it with life as we see it in the fields. The grain of corn is planted in the earth; the rain moistens the ground about it; the rays of the sun, warming the soil as they pass through it, touch the heart of this grain of corn and seem to say: "Awake! Awake! Bestir yourself! The people are hungry and you must feed them." The spark of life within it responds and, swelling with its great purpose, it bursts its walls. It sends its roots down into the ground, even though the ground may be at first unyielding; it sends its tiny shoots up toward the light, even though it must push aside the clods to do so. The air may sometimes be too cool to be pleasant, the wind may be too rude to be enjoyable, and the sun that bade it rise may

become too warm to be comfortable, but amid all these trials and vicissitudes it grows until, in the autumn, the stalk turns its withered face to the orb of day and holds out the full-grown ears of corn as if to say, "Here is the food for which you asked; my work is done; now let me sleep."

Man, like the seed, may for a time seem dead, but amid the cares and crying needs of the world, he must feel not only that there is work to be done but that there is work which he above all others must perform, and just in proportion as he responds to the call and expends himself in making some contribution to the world, he justifies his presence in it.

Not only is there that in man which compels him to recognize, even if he does not respond to, a call to duty, but this consciousness that he is under obligation to be helpful to the world forces him to impart to others that which he believes will be of use to them.

If he feels that he has discovered something of transcendent worth, he has no choice; he must give it to the world. Nothing else approaches in value an idea, and the ideas that have blessed the world have, as a rule, seemed so priceless to those who first ad-

vanced them that they have devoted their lives to their propagation and often died in testimony of their faith in them.

No more accurate distinction can be drawn between China and the Western world than you have drawn when you suggest that our nations conceive that they have a mission "to redeem and to civilize the world," while your nation has no mission and is satisfied to solve its own problems without burdening itself with the problems of other people. Europe and America feel that they have a mission, and this explains their growth and the expansion of their influence. They are so certain that they have something good to bestow upon the world that they are willing to encourage education everywhere, and then risk the world's verdict on their definition of civilization and on their conception of human life. Can they give better proof of their sincerity or of their faith in the ideals that inspire them?

In their attempt to accomplish their mission they have shown the frailties that are inherent in man; the light within them has had to shine through clouded glass, but with all their imperfections, with all their sins, aye, with all their crimes—if you insist upon so harsh a word—they have not only made

progress themselves but they have imparted blessings unspeakable. Better, a thousand times better, is the man with high purpose and good impulses who in his large life reveals some evil mingled with his benevolence, than the colorless, passionless, useless man who by a negative existence leaves the world no better than he found it. Better the nation that, aspiring high and laying out for itself a gigantic task, goes forward in a civilizing work, even though its virtues are not unmixed with base alloy, than a nation which, wrapped in the contemplation of its own immaculateness, sleeps the precious years away, indifferent to the world's welfare and unmindful of misery that might be relieved.

CHAPTER VIII

CHRISTIANITY VERSUS CONFUCIANISM

Nowhere do we grow more eloquent than in contrasting the religion and morals of China with those of the Western world. In the very beginning of your letters you boldly assert the superiority of your nation in this respect. You say:

“ But not only is our civilization stable, it also embodies, as we think, a moral order; while in yours we detect only an economic chaos.”

Again:

“ He (the Chinaman) has both the instinct and the opportunity to appreciate the gifts of Nature, to cultivate manners, and to enter into humane and disinterested relations with his fellows. The result is a type which we cannot but regard as superior, both morally and esthetically, to the great bulk of your own citizens in Europe.”

And still again:

“ We believe, it is true, that our religion is more rational than yours, our morality higher and our

institutions more perfect; but we recognize that what is suited to us may be ill adapted to others."

Speaking of Confucianism you answer the suggestion that it is merely a code of ethics, by saying:

"This, too, is true in so far as its whole aim and purpose is to direct and inspire right conduct. But, on the other hand—and this is the point I wish to make—it is not merely a teaching, but a life. The principles it enjoins are those which are actually embodied in the structure of our society, so that they are inculcated not merely by written and spoken word, but by the whole habit of every-day experience. The unity of the family and the state, as expressed in the worship of ancestors, is the basis not merely of the professed creed, but of the actual practice of a Chinaman."

In another place you say that Confucianism "is the exponent of the ideal of work" and add:

"I claim for us that the life of our masses is so ordered and disposed as to accord with the postulates of our creed; that they practice, if they do not profess, the tenets of our sages; and that the two cardinal ideas on which every society should rest,

brotherhood and the dignity of labor, are brought home to them in direct and unmistakable form by the structure of our secular institutions."

As for Christianity, you can scarcely conceal your contempt for it and its founder. You say of the principles of our religion that they were "enun-
ciated centuries ago, by a mild, Oriental enthusiast,
unlettered, untravelled, inexperienced," and that
"they are remarkable not more for their tender
and touching appeal to brotherly love than for their
aversion or indifference to all other elements of hu-
man excellence."

You observe:

"I cannot see that your society is based upon religion at all; nor does that surprise me, if I have rightly apprehended the character of Christianity. For the ideal which I seem to find enshrined in your Gospels and embodied in the discussions of your divines, is one not of labor on earth, but of con-
templation in heaven; not of the unity of the human race, but of the communion of saints."

You refer to "that extraordinary epoch in West-
ern history when the Christian conception made a
bid to embody itself in fact," and you characterize
it as "the life and death struggle of a grandiose

ideal against all the facts of the material and moral universe."

Of the influence of Christianity you remark that, "while it is strong enough to make him (the European) a chronic hypocrite, it is not so strong as to show him the hypocrite he is"; that "deprived on the one hand of the support of a true ethical standard, embodied in the life of society of which he is a member, he is duped, on the other, by lip-worship of an impotent ideal."

And this is the picture which you draw of the average Englishman (and in your preface you include the American with the European):

"I see one divorced from Nature, but unreclaimed by art; instructed, but not educated; assimilative, but incapable of thought. Trained in the tenets of a religion in which he does not really believe—for he sees it flatly contradicted in every relation of life—he dimly feels that it is prudent to conceal under a mask of piety the atheism he is hardly intelligent enough to avow. His religion is conventional and, what is more important, his morals are as conventional as his creed."

I have quoted enough to show you that you not only regard Confucianism as superior to Christian-

ity, but that you claim for the Chinaman that he lives up to the Confucian ideal, while you charge the Christian with falling below an ideal which you characterize as impracticable and impotent.

Let me admit, without qualification, that the Christian ideal is not lived up to anywhere in the world; let me admit that the best of Christians everywhere fall below the conception of life presented by the life and teachings of the Man of Galilee, and still I will contend that one who follows Christ afar off, even with limping step and many a fall, may live a nobler life than the perfect disciple of Confucius. No ideal is high that is fully realized. The man who claims for his ideal that instead of being above him, it is perfectly embodied in his life, confesses that he has no aspirations for improvement. It is the glory of the Christian ideal that while it is within sight of the weakest and the lowliest, it is still high enough to keep the best and the purest with their faces turned ever upward.

If my purpose were to combat each erroneous proposition submitted by you, I might question your right to credit Confucius with having emphasized either human brotherhood or the dignity of labor. The three relations which he most dwelt upon

were the relation between father and son, the relation between the elder brother and his younger brothers and the relation between the king on the one hand and the people on the other.

Of the relationship between the individual and his fellows, he said far less than of the particular relations above referred to, and of the relations between his own countrymen and the rest of the world he said nothing. To the broad relationships of life he seemed to give no attention, and man's indissoluble connection with all other members of the human race was a subject which he entirely ignored.

On the subject of labor, his advice was not comprehensive, and he seemed to assume that the superior man was to live by the labor of others. The gulf between the educated classes and the masses which has existed in China for centuries must be due to his teachings, if, as you say, Chinese society is modelled according to his precepts.

If you only claimed for Confucius superiority over those about him, the claim would not be disputed; if you only credited him with unusual wisdom and an earnest desire to raise the moral standard of his country, the position would be granted. His life was devoted to contemplation and

instruction, and he has left enough in the way of sound admonition and advanced thought to give him a place among the world's great men; but when you compare him with the founder of the Christian religion and impute to him a better or more practical code of morals, you must expect to be challenged.

Aside from what may be called the religious side of Christianity, there is an ethical side; Christ presented a system of moral philosophy which can be judged upon its merits. To this code of morality—to this conception of life—I beg to call your attention.

If you think that Christ occupied the time of His disciples in discussing the beauties of heaven to the neglect of things connected with the present life, you should re-read the Scriptures; you will discover that the Master seldom referred to the future life but continually emphasized the relations which exist between man and man. He pointed out the dangers which beset life and the temptations to which all are liable, and He fortified the individual at every point for his combat with the evil in the world. No other teacher has evinced such a perfect knowledge of human nature or so analyzed it. He

showed His disciples how to be tender without being weak, how to be strong without being proud or arrogant, and He proved how much more potent love is than force. He built a moral structure upon solid rock, and experience has shown how wisely He adapted it to man's every need.

Confucius dealt with rules and formulas; Christ dealt with substance and with unchanging truth. Confucius spoke frequently of manners and ceremonies; Christ purified the heart, out of which are the issues of life. Proprieties formed a conspicuous theme in the conversations of Confucius—how to behave toward the father, how to act toward the elder brother, how to approach the king and his ministers—these subjects are minutely treated; the purpose weighed with Christ, and the uprightness of intention more than outward form. Confucius sought to show kings how they could become popular with their ministers and subjects, and individuals how they might become “superior men”; Christ made service the measure of greatness and established a standard which can be adapted with profit by prince and peasant alike. For the noisy scramble for gain and selfish advantage, he substituted a peaceful rivalry in doing good, estimating

life, not by its accumulations, but by its contribution to the sum of human happiness.

There are two points at which the teachings of Confucius and Christ conflict—not that these are the only points, but here the conflict is especially noticeable and the difference vital.

Tsze-Kung asked, "Is there one word which may serve as a rule of practice for all one's life?" Confucius replied: "Is not reciprocity such a word? What you do not want done to yourself, do not do to others." Christ taught, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." These two precepts have sometimes been confused, and Confucius has even been credited with forestalling the Golden Rule. But there is a world of difference between the two doctrines. "Do not" states the negative side and is good as far as it goes. The man who obeys Confucius will do no harm, and that is something; the harmless man stands upon a higher plane than the man who injures others. But "Do" is the positive form of the rule, and the man who does good is vastly superior to the merely harmless man. One can stand on the bank of a stream and watch another drown without lifting a hand to aid and yet not violate the "do not" of

Confucius, but he will violate the "do" of Christ. Life in China illustrates this very difference. There is apparently lacking that cohesion which sympathy produces, that active interest in others which our Gospels enjoin; verily, one can live up to the Confucian ideal and yet be almost as useless to his neighborhood and his nation as the insensate stone.

Reciprocity is a balancing of favors and implies a careful calculation of benefits received and bestowed. The man who has no higher rule will spend time adding, subtracting and multiplying which he could spend in acting. How much larger the doctrine of Christ, who bids us measure the gift by the need and not by what we have previously received. The overflowing spring, pouring forth constantly and asking not where or how far away the waters flow, is the Christian symbol of an ideal life. Of what use would a reciprocal spring be, which only gave forth as much water as was poured into it?

And this is a practical doctrine, for it has been exemplified in millions of lives, as your own land will testify. While your people (are they living up to the ideal of Confucius?) are stoning missionaries and organizing mobs to drive out the foreigner,

Americans and Europeans are risking their lives to bring light and religious liberty to the Chinese. Throughout the Christian world hundreds of thousands, yes, thousands of thousands, have contributed of their money that your children might have an education—thus showing more interest in the masses of China than many of the educated Chinese and “superior men” have shown in their own countrymen. This unselfish interest in the people of other lands—this willing sacrifice that others may be made happier—is the fruit of Christ’s gospel of positive helpfulness; has Confucianism borne such fruit?

But there is a second conflict and a difference even greater, if possible, in its consequences. Some one asked Confucius, “What do you say concerning the principle that injury should be recompensed with kindness?” He replied: “With what then will you recompense kindness? Recompense injury with justice, and recompense kindness with kindness.” Christ dealt with that identical question, and in that most wonderful of all discourses, the Sermon on the Mount, said: “Ye have heard that it has been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thy enemy, but I say unto you, love your enemies, bless

them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you.”

Do you discern any difference between these two doctrines? And can you be so blind as not to recognize the infinite superiority of the Christian creed? Recompense evil with justice? Who can correctly define the word justice when his heart is full of hatred and his bosom swells with angry passions? Man's eyesight is poor enough at best; it cannot be relied upon when he looks through a mist of resentment. Christ goes to the root of the matter; He would remove the retaliatory spirit which blurs the vision. How this philosophy transcends the codes and creeds of earth's sages! How it stretches forth in its world-wide reach! How it glows with life and vigor!

If I were asked to name the sentence in Christ's gospel which gives most inherent and conclusive proof of His knowledge of man, I would point to the Beatitude, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God"; if I were asked to point out words which more clearly than any other differentiate the teachings of Christ from the utterances that have fallen from uninspired lips, I would quote

from his simple but incomparable prayer, "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us." Difficult ideal to realize? Yes. And so is it difficult to climb the mountain, but how else can one extend his view? Is it an impracticable doctrine? On the contrary, it has not only been successfully tried by tens of thousands but it commends itself to the reason. Nothing, except being forgiven, so relieves the heart as forgiving; no burden is heavier to carry than revenge. Longing to get even may be natural, but forgiveness is a moral triumph of the first magnitude. The desire for revenge poisons the life of the one who cherishes it; the taking of revenge embitters the one upon whom it is visited. Revenge begets revenge, as like breeds like, while forgiveness melts the stony heart and brings reconciliation. Difficult as it may be to cultivate this spirit of forgiveness, its worth cannot be doubted, neither can we doubt its efficacy as a compelling force. The heart can resist any other weapon, but before this one it is defenseless.

Centuries before the birth of Christ the Hebrew prophet Isaiah foretold His coming and styled Him the Prince of Peace; and the commandment given by this Prince of Peace, "Thou shalt love thy

neighbor as thyself," furnishes the only basis upon which lasting peace can be built. This doctrine, however, is not only not found in the teachings of Confucius but is directly combated by Mencius, who, according to Chinese opinion, stands next to Confucius as a philosopher.

Not only is the Christian ideal a high one and a practical one, but it is a universal one. You abandon your case when you say of Confucianism that it "may be ill adapted to others." Men may differ in the color of the skin and in features; they may differ in intelligence and in methods of thought; they may differ in race characteristics and in theories of government, but they are alike in all that pertains to the heart and its development. The law of love is as universal as the law of gravitation, and its influence is as omnipresent. As the influence of gravitation would, but for obstructions, draw all particles on the surface of the earth toward the center, so, but for the obstructions interposed by selfishness, love would draw all hearts together; and as obstructions only suspend, but do not destroy the law of gravitation, so selfishness cannot destroy, though it may temporarily suspend, the constant operation of the law of love.

Experience is the test of truth, and experience shows that there is no corner of the earth where the truth of Christianity has not been recognized and its principles applied. The story of Him to whom you refer as "a mild Oriental enthusiast, unlettered, untravelled and inexperienced," has been translated into every tongue, and that simple story has kindled everywhere an enthusiasm that dimly, at least, reflects the earnestness of Him who "spake as never man spake." In your own country there is abundant evidence of the gradual substitution of the Christian for the Confucian code, and during the Boxer trouble thousands of Chinamen suffered death rather than surrender the faith which the life and teachings of Christ had implanted in them, and there were among your people examples of courage and consecration that recalled the martyrdom of the early days of the Christian church.

As a fountain of water issuing from a hillside clothes a barren plain with verdure, so Christianity has scattered oases throughout China and is today exerting an influence far greater than the actual church membership would indicate. Schools have followed the Christian teachers, and hospitals have

sprung up in the wake of the medical missionary. The light from the Cross has fallen upon the Chinese home, and already its quickening influence has been shown in schools for girls and societies for the discouragement of foot-binding, child marriage and other evils. Your students, even if they do not confess the source, are appropriating the results of Christianity, and your statesmen are finding it necessary to copy the institutions which Christianity has planted.

The growth of Christianity from its beginning on the banks of the Jordan, until today, when its converts are baptized in all the rivers of the earth, is so graphically described by Rev. Charles Edward Jefferson, of New York, in his book entitled, "Things Fundamental," that I take the liberty of concluding this chapter and these letters with his words:

"Christ in history! There is a fact—face it. According to the New Testament, Jesus walked along the shores of a little sea known as the Sea of Galilee. And there he called Peter and Andrew and James and John and several others to be his followers, and they left all and followed him. After they had followed him they revered him, and later

on adored and worshipped him. He left them on their faces, each man saying, 'My Lord and my God!' All that is in the New Testament.

"But put the New Testament away. Time passes; history widens; an unseen Presence walks up and down the shores of a larger sea—the sea called the Mediterranean—and this unseen Presence calls men to follow him. Tertullian, Augustine, Anselm, Aquinas, Francis of Assisi, Thomas à Kempis, Savonarola, John Huss, Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, Uhlric Zwingli, John Calvin—another twelve—and these all followed him and cast themselves at his feet, saying, in the words of the earlier twelve, 'My Lord and my God!'

"Time passes; history advances; humanity lives its life around the circle of a larger sea—the Atlantic Ocean. An unseen Presence walks up and down the shores calling men to follow him. He calls John Knox, John Wesley, George Whitefield, Charles Spurgeon, Henry Parry Liddon, Joseph Parker, Jonathan Edwards, Horace Bushnell, Henry Ward Beecher, Richard Saltus Storrs, Phillips Brooks, Dwight L. Moody—another twelve—and these leave all and follow him. We find them on their faces, each one saying, 'My Lord and my God!'

“Time passes; history is widening; humanity is building its civilization round a still wider sea—we call it the Pacific Ocean. An unknown Presence moves up and down the shores calling men to follow him, and they are doing it. Another company of twelve is forming. And what took place in Palestine nineteen centuries ago is taking place again in our own day and under our own eyes.”

THE END

