

THE FUTURE OF CHINA AND OF THE MISSIONARIES.

It is evident that the books which have been written on China will, for the most part, have to be revised. They describe a condition which is passing away. Out of the existing riots and disturbances will come a new system. It cannot be possible that such great events should pass and leave no results behind. The position of China will be fixed and determined. Her relations with the foreign powers will be defined. Whether she shall be effaced as a nation, as other countries have been, and her territory shall be occupied as their own by the European powers, or whether she shall remain the self-poised, long-lived, enduring "Middle Kingdom" that she has been for centuries, with a greater freedom and new rights, will be registered by the fiat of the Western powers in the volume that is called international law.

Meantime, the ground and basis of the arguments of current political writers will have dropped from under them. The theory of their theses was that China was the ward, or the tributary, of the Western people. She was the world's oyster — to be opened, if need be, by the sword. Not in remote contingencies were her rights to be considered, but ponderous essays, and even volumes, were written to show that some countries were getting more power than they ought to have, and that other countries should assert themselves, and seize larger strips of territory. All these countries had partisans, but, like ancient Rome, China had none. New phrases were coined, and the veiled larceny of "spheres of influence" became pregnant with indefinite but portentous meaning. The "open door" became a phrase to swear by, though few men ever knew what it meant, and in its discussion the owner of the land was ignored.

Treaties — the embodiments of international concessions, and the measures of international rights — were as worthless as last year's almanac. The old enthroned exemplar of equal rights, the "favored nation" clause, under which the treaty powers were each to have all the rights that any one nation enjoyed, was as worthless as the right of a colored man to vote in some of our Southern States. Abso-

lutely, there was no check or rein on unbridled lust for territory. Each nation took what it pleased. One of them, in order to save something for the future, stipulated that the Yangtze valley should not be ceded to any other power, while another claimed a mortgage on a southern province. In the public mind, according to the books, there was a well-defined notion that no country in which dark-complexioned men lived had the right to keep out modern civilization. By this civilization were meant commerce, inventions, railroads, and machinery. It was contended that the advanced nations of the world, whose people were white, had the undoubted right to enter in and upon the dark nations, and force them to introduce modern methods, including the etiquette of palaces. Some writers went further, even, and asserted that it was a providential duty of the cultivated nations to compel the others to adopt improved methods of government.

At the bottom of all this cant lay the thirst for gold. When commercial regulations were satisfactory the spread of civilization was secure. Commerce was king. To it mankind was tributary. Its bales and boxes were to go up every river, and circumnavigate every lake. The internal and customs systems of taxation were to be dictated by the foreigners. If the foreign powers in their treatment of the peoples of the Far East had rested on this purely commercial view of the situation, and had refrained from the seizure of territory, their conduct might have been condoned. But every now and then a country was swallowed up, sometimes by a forced protectorate, sometimes by simple deglutition. Thus went Burmah, Cochin China, Madagascar, Annam, Tonquin, Africa, Formosa, and certain parts of China; thus have now gone the Boer Republics, and thus will possibly go the whole of China. Every now and then the yellow giants, bound in chains, writhed in their agony, and desperate deeds were done under the semblance of revenge.

There is another class of thinkers who have repudiated force, relying on slow and peaceful methods of civilization. Some of them have been diplomats, notably in China. The early diplomatic corps — from 1863 to 1895 — at Peking did not violently interfere with Chinese methods. They recognized China's autonomy. They realized that Western methods were not adapted to the Orientals, and they were not insisted on. A coöperative policy existed, and all the foreign representatives acted together. The diplomatic body took up all the questions which affected foreigners generally, and pressed their consideration on the Tsungli Yamen. The era of demanding vast con-

cessions for railroads and mines had not supervened. Promoters there were who wanted jobs; but the schemes were originated by the Chinese, and were not forced upon them.

There existed then in Peking the distinct idea that it was not desirable to assimilate China to the West. It was understood that the outer world would benefit most by refraining from introducing into her borders such modern improvements as would make her independent of the great manufacturing countries. We were selling to her immense quantities of cotton cloth; and it was not deemed desirable to introduce machinery for its manufacture, because we should then lose our market; and so with other things. Her statesmen were ignorant of international law, and did not know their power. They had made treaties by which the tariff dues were fixed at five per cent. It was best not to teach them that any nation has the right, as our Supreme Court holds, to set aside treaties by legislative acts.

The idea of the most successful corporation that the world has ever seen — the East India Company — was exactly on these lines. It did not seek to instruct or proselyte. It was a company of traders, pure and simple. *En passant*, let me say that this company had a very noted factory at Canton. Originally there were two East India companies, which were consolidated in 1600 under a charter granted by Queen Elizabeth. In 1825 the company was in its greatest glory. As a commercial body it ceased to exist in 1834. Some idea may be formed of its grandeur by the statement that the sum of £100,000 per annum was allowed for the expenses of the factory at Canton. The salary of the chief was £25,000. This corporation became too powerful, and it passed away. In 1843 five ports were opened to foreign trade, and a development of the new China began.

In this development the missionaries began to assume an important part. Here was a vast field for the exercise of religion and of charity. For two hundred and fifty years the Catholics had been in China; the Protestants were now to enter the arena. At the beginning of the new era, after the British treaty of 1843 had been made, the Protestant missionary work was quiet and unostentatious. Missionaries were settled in the open ports, and some went into the interior. France, the natural protector of the Catholic missionaries, secured the adoption of what was called the Berthemy Convention, under which the French missionary has the right to go into any province and buy land, build houses, and permanently reside. Of course, this right inured under the favored nation clause to the Pro-

testants. It was largely made use of. The Protestant missionary began to settle in every part of the Empire. Between the years 1885 and 1895 the movement assumed the character of a new crusade. Now the finger of the world points to the missionary as being the cause of the recent outbreaks in China, and one of the questions confronting us is whether his work shall be abandoned. In the accounts that have been published of the existing disturbances, I do not find that a distinct anti-missionary feeling was the impelling force of the riots. The missionary was driven out because he was a foreigner, not because of his occupation.

The rioters found a new field of operations in the province of Chihli, where since 1870 peace has prevailed. The great riot that year at Tientsin was due to a common cause of disturbance. Very young children were received in the asylum for infants, and it was charged that their eyes were used to make medicines. The alleged kidnapping of children for this purpose, ridiculous as the accusation is, has caused several great riots in China. Riots are ordinarily organized by some secret society. They do not originate in the body of the Chinese people. To them life is simply a struggle for existence, and above all they want tranquillity. To the lower classes the missionaries bring bread and education. They gather up refuse children of the street into great Sunday schools and teach them. I have seen as many as twelve hundred children gathered in the Methodist church at Peking, divided into classes, and taught exactly as is done here. Who can predicate harm to any one from such a charitable observance as this?

In any résumé of the elements that have contributed to the progress of China, it is simply just to allude to the labors of the missionaries of all nations and of all denominations. Truthful history must say of them that they preceded commerce, that their literary and educational labors have instructed foreigners as to China and China as to foreigners, and that their exalted philanthropy has begot among the poor and the rich a great measure of respect and confidence. While it is proper to give to the Imperial Maritime Customs, to the ministers and consuls, and to the great commercial houses full praise for their labors, we should not forget gratefully to remember those unobtrusive, but influential, agents of progress, whose inspiration came from a holier source than a desire for gain.

The question of the future of the missionaries is clear-cut now, and it lies outside of any consideration as to the intrinsic value of

their work. It is this: Conceding all the good that is claimed for missionary work, should it, in view of the present condition of China, be abandoned? That question is to be answered. In the beginning we must recognize the undoubted fact that the Catholic powers — the Pope, Spain, Italy, and especially France — will never consent that the Catholic missionaries shall be driven out of China. Their interests there are immense. There are twenty-eight Catholic bishops in the Empire, of whom three are in the province of Chihli. There are vast establishments over the country with schools, colleges, and asylums. Curiously, the Catholics have not gone into medical or surgical work, but they fill all other fields, covering industrial schools, carpenter and other shops, and all the forms of labor. The great cathedral at Peking was built mostly by the native Christians. The wealth of the Church is enormous. The chief religious societies, the Jesuits, Benedictines, Augustines, Christian Brothers, Lazarists, and Franciscans are found at many places. You cannot turn the dial of progress back. You cannot revoke all the treaties. You cannot undo the work of three centuries. If the Continental Catholic remains in China, his Protestant colleague will go thither. It is not in human nature to stand back and see others occupying fields of danger or of venture, and it is not in Christian nature to disregard the Divine command to go into the world and teach all nations.

The subject transcends the scope of human laws. It is the same "higher law" which was preached by Seward and his associates prior to 1861. No American law forbids the going of any citizens abroad; and if China should admit them into her territory, no administration in this country would dare to order them not to go thither, even if it had the power to do so. From a governmental point of view the suggestion of exclusion is impracticable of execution. If the merchant may sell his wares in China, the missionary may sell his tracts and Bibles. Happily we do not recognize any religion in our Constitution. Fortunately the religious wars which have devastated the earth are unknown here. It would not be wise to precipitate one. Let assumed truth go forth to meet assumed error. Let the peaceful battle of the ages go on. Let modern arts, commerce, and inventions follow in the wake of self-devoted religious teaching. It cannot be that the serious disturbances we have witnessed were caused by antagonism to men and women whose lives are devoted mainly to charity. The hurly-burly of the riot overtook the mis-

sionary because he was a foreigner, not because he was a religious teacher. It was racial feeling, such as exists in this country against the negro — the feeling which raged so recently in New Orleans, New York, and Akron.

Whether or not missionary work should be circumscribed in its extent must be left to the great societies which have it in charge. From my experience I would advise that care and prudence be exercised in selecting locations for missionaries. In many localities there would not, probably, for a generation to come be any danger of destruction. In others the danger is patent. It is impossible for our Government to station soldiers all over China to protect its people. It can only demand redress when wrongs are perpetrated, and that it has always faithfully done. The spirit of adventure, which takes no account except of the letter of the Scriptural injunction, should be restrained. In some cases missionaries have defied the advice of consuls, and have gone into the most dangerous localities. There should be reason in all things. Riots occur and pass like summer clouds, and all races are eminently recuperative. A few years will obliterate the marks of the recent outrages; but let not the patient, gentle, persistent labors of decades be brought to naught.

If in the treatment of China now by the powers the grievous wrongs which have threatened to produce her effacement could be repaired, a new and peaceful era would be inaugurated. While probably the nations cannot do this efficaciously, they may, at least, call a halt. They may, at least, bind themselves to the effect that no further seizures of territory shall be permitted. It is certain that this great, calm, majestic Republic will not lend itself to any scheme of aggression, and it is to be hoped that other nations will coöperate with it in the crisis which is impending.

CHARLES DENBY.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF FRIEDRICH FROEBEL.

It is with the kindergarten that the name of Froebel is most intimately associated; and it is this institution that has spread his fame throughout the world. Froebel himself, however, regarded the kindergarten as but a fragmentary part of educational reform. His pedagogy rests upon a distinct philosophical system, the comprehension of which is requisite to an adequate appreciation of his theories.

The philosophy of Froebel is characteristic of the time in which he lived. At the dawn of the nineteenth century the Germans were a race of poets and thinkers, and regarded all questions of material existence as secondary to the great problem of moral culture. Politically weak, the nation was yet sufficiently strong to delve into the depths of the universe and to develop the spiritual life; and thus the grandeur and dignity of man became the predominant idea of that epoch. Upon this basis there arose a multitude of conceptions as to world and life; and Froebel, although not an adherent of any particular school, was most closely associated with the movement designated as "romanticism," which was most perfectly personified in Schelling. It was for Krause, however, that Froebel seemed to have the greatest affinity, and from him the great educational reformer borrowed much of his technical phraseology.

According to Froebel's conviction, the world is the creation and revelation of a Supreme Being, operating not from without, but from within, as the essence of all things. Briefly formulated, "The divine agency, operating in every form and object of creation, constitutes the nature of that particular form or object." Thus founded in God, the infinite complexity of the universe becomes an organic whole; the same laws everywhere become operative; and, most important of all, nature and the intellectual life become one and inseparable. Therefore, whatever at first glance may seem an evil loses this signification so soon as it is considered in relation to the universe.

Nevertheless, the unit, by becoming part of the whole, does not sacrifice its independence; for God, being life, infinite and inexhaust-