

situation in China would slip out of hand. Something was to be done, and done immediately, to remove foreign control over China. He had seen two situations like this: in the first days of the Russian Revolution and in the Moslem world in 1919. I could not help contrasting the spirit of Europe and of China in his parallel, and get a bit of comfort out of it, for to the Chinese present the frantic, hysterical haste which most speakers urged must have seemed like the impetuosity of squabbling children. I know the Americans present were sincere, and I know that the situation in China is very grave. But in contrast to the manner of Dr. Kuo, I could not help asking myself whether the question was really as vital to us as we declared. The cue must be taken from China herself. As Dr. Kuo said, seeing history in prospect, fifty years or a hundred years of struggle in China—what is that to a four-thousand-year-old child?

### *New "Pep" in Ancient Problems*

THE Chinese are as determined as we—infinitely more so. But they have suffered for nearly a century—too long to take offense at new slights. The clouds of world strife are gathering in the Far East. Ours was the sound of thunder in the heavens; but China's feelings were the electricity. We rushed out with lightning-rods in our hands, hoping to avert disaster. China may lie down in the lowest level between the hills. But which of us is likely to come out alive?

The Americans present plunged into these troubled seas without sail or compass. The goal set was the removal of extra-territoriality. In the manner of Americans, full of pep and too busy to waste time, everybody at once began to disembowel this long term by removing "territori." Speed! Let's call it "extrality." Wuxtry! American pep is going to solve this Chinese problem and make recommendations so that all the Powers will have to get out of China. Never mind going back into the history or origin of it, was the burden of the first speaker from the floor. In this tremendous hurry, every one, trying to adjust himself to the use of "extrality" instead of extra-territoriality, used up enough time in stumbling and halting to have solved the problem itself. For two days this impediment in speech was prominent, until it was forgotten. This is a trifle, but it is significant of this first attempt at a really democratic solution of a grave international problem. Speed was the god of the Conference, and it turned out to be a clay idol.

Speed again fooled the Conference when, after a morning's session that was

really worth while, the Steering Committee decided to rush things by breaking the body up into four groups. The result was that group one alone brought in any finding worth while. In group two sarcasm nullified the results; group four petered out; group three made little impression on the rest of the Conference. And for two sessions after the Conference resolved itself into the complete wrangler on whether the report of group one should be embodied in the records, or whether some resolution committing the Conference to action should be promulgated. This in essence was that America should urge at the coming conferences in Peking the removal of extra-territoriality and the granting of customs autonomy to China.

### *Altruism and Cash*

NEVERTHELESS it was striking to see how liberal and altruistic the business men present were. The impression made was that they really didn't want to remain in China, anyway. Business didn't pay much under foreign protection, they claimed. All would be better off without extra-territoriality. The missionaries declared that, while they had more actual business interests in China, they did not wish protection, that they felt freer without it, and that if any missionary was afraid to remain in China under such circumstances he had better come home.

The only hitch seemed to come from those who were concerned with China's own welfare. If the foreign Powers evacuate China, said these practical people, the Chinese who have come under the protection of foreigners to escape the depredations of their militarists would be thrown back upon their mercy. No one seemed to argue that no nation will attempt to solve its problems if it can escape them. But I am not expressing opinions. I am concerned with the spirit of the whole Conference, and the spirit was against extra-territoriality.

I shall probably fare no better in now trying to give my impressions than did the Steering Committee in its efforts to formulate a resolution which might summarize the spirit of the Conference. It is poor policy to admit one's failure. But it seems to have been the motive of all the guiding spirits who were guided to Johns Hopkins University last week that there should be nothing in the end which might be summarized. Not that there was any hostility between the various groups; quite the contrary. It was delightful to see the perfect accord that existed between men who the moment any one of them rose to a definite resolve rose to defeat it. It was not that the

conferees disagreed. It was simply that they couldn't agree upon a basis for agreement. The objection to framing a resolution with which the inarticulate might go forth and confuse the world's money-changers was not because resolutions were distasteful to them, but because the dough of democratic discussion had not been leavened with the yeast of scientific or artistic management. They could not agree to a resolution, not because they were not resolute enough, but because they had been too much so. Had each man resolved less to differ in his agreements, had there been a more clear-cut regard for the past, the present, and the future of the problems of China, a resolution would have crystallized itself out of the very substance of the discussions; but as there was no beginning to the middle of the discussion raised, how could there possibly be an end? The Conference did not fail, because it seems to have pledged itself not to succeed. The substance of the debates having been helter-skelter, if some resolution committing the Conference to a definite action before the word had been passed, then indeed would the Conference have defeated its dearest desires. As it is, out of nothing there at least came simplicity.

### *The Faith Survived*

IT would be manifestly unjust to minimize the effects of this gathering, as it would be deceitful to deny its importance. The results are not to be measured in recommendations and resolutions. Two hundred people came with an abiding faith in China. After three days of discussion and failure to co-ordinate their views they left with an enduring—one might say, a militant—faith in China. On the floor of the Conference I told a little story that illustrates the process of the discussions. There was a captain of a China clipper once who was given to daily readings from the Bible. A mischievous young supercargo thought he'd play a trick on the captain, and every day set back the bookmark. After this occurred two or three times, the captain, suspicious of the joke, rose, and before he began to read remarked: "We seem to be having head winds through the book of Daniel." So was it at the Conference. We may have got nowhere, but there is no uncertainty at all as to the basic feeling of faith in China, her past and her future. That faith in China will grow because it is in the nature of China to win the world to her. From a super-liberal regard for China, this collection of Americans of almost every walk of life came away with respect fortified and reassured to the point of conviction.

# The Worm in the Rose

An editorial from the Chicago "Tribune" and a reply

A RECENT number of The Outlook, a weekly magazine, contains an article by its contributing editor, Lawrence F. Abbott, which he calls "Impressions of Chicago." Mr. Abbott places our new building first among his impressions. He speaks of it as "towering on the lake front, a creation of Gothic beauty, a monument to the genius which has enabled American architecture to make out of the skyscraper an original contribution to the progress of mankind." Having said all that, he wonders how it can be that so sinister an institution as the Chicago "Tribune" can clothe itself in a robe so resplendent. Such a building, you can almost hear him say, is one worthy of The Outlook herself in the days when my father ran it. There she could pass her declining years in tranquillity.

Mr. Abbott is not the first to say we are a well-dressed villain and we suppose he will not be the last. A newly arrived rector of a north side congregation made the same observation from his pulpit recently. Mr. Abbott says we print too much news about murders and that we use on our front page "screaming headlines in black-face, stud-horse type." But he—and perhaps the clergyman, too—dislike us for a deeper reason. They think we are beastly because we are opposed to the Volstead Law and the Prohibition Amendment and don't care who knows it. Mr. Abbott thinks the Prohibition Amendment is a great experiment in social and political progress and ought to be supported without protest.

There are a good many people who share that opinion. They call us the world's wettest newspaper, though we never have advised any one to take a drink and we never have said that liquor is good for men even in small quantities. What we have said is that temperance will never be won by Constitutional amendment and we have repeatedly taken occasion to point out the political and social evils arising from the attempt to enforce an unenforceable law. We said these things out loud, sometimes with "black-face, stud-horse type," in Mr. Abbott's elegant expression. He may find it possible to whisper to his circulation, but our auditorium is somewhat more ample. We have to raise our voice if those in the back seats are to hear. We expect to go right on raising it in the interest of personal liberty.

Nowadays you seldom see the phrase "personal liberty" without quotation marks around it. The quotation marks are put there by the Abbotts. The quo-

tation marks are intended to convey the thought that the people who talk about personal liberty aren't in the least interested in any such abstraction; and that what they really want is a chance to do some uninterrupted guzzling.

However, we are for personal liberty and we make no apologies for it. We do not want our morality wrapped in cotton wool and kept in the vault for fear something will happen to it. We believe this world contains good and evil and that men and women must choose the one or the other for themselves. That is what morals are for. We have heard clergymen say the same thing from the pulpit and quote appropriate Scripture in confirmation, though it is true they were not speaking of prohibition at the moment.

We do not believe that the prohibition of liquor is the sort of thing that belongs in the Constitution of the country. The Constitution is the outline of our governmental system and of the rights and duties of citizenship. Prohibition doesn't belong there. We have been accused of inconsistency because we do not actively oppose laws controlling the sale of habit-

forming drugs. We reply that we should oppose prohibition of drugs by Constitutional amendment if that were proposed. It is not proposed simply because the vast majority of the people are agreed upon the evil inherent in the free traffic in opiates and no great body of citizens has to be coerced into obeying the narcotic laws.

In regard to liquor, on the contrary, a majority of the population in the great urban centers of the country, as referendums have shown, opposes prohibition. They will drink despite the Constitution because they see no moral wrong in it. We have said and we repeat that Constitutional prohibition will fail as it has failed. We see no reason to change our opinion, even though Federal prohibition enforcers are shifted about and replaced, and the Constitutional guaranties of jury trial and immunity from unwarranted search are beaten down as if drinking were a more serious crime than murder.

That is the sinister spirit some good people think we are hiding under our bright robes. We are glad, at any rate, that they like our taste in clothes.

September 18, 1925.

DEAR SIR:

Aren't you barking up the wrong tree?

I can find no reference in Mr. Abbott's editorial to the Chicago "Tribune's" policy in regard to prohibition. I do not think that he had it in mind. It is conceivable that he may not even have been aware of it.

Possibly a few facts in regard to The Outlook's own editorial policy may be of interest to you.

The Outlook believes that the Prohibition Amendment, still on trial, should be given an honest trial. It believes in law enforcement.

It has never questioned and never will question the right of any man or any journal to work for the modification or repeal of any law or any part of our National Constitution, providing only that it is sought to bring about modification or repeal by strictly Constitutional methods. The Chicago "Tribune" can work for the abolition of the Eighteenth Amendment or the establishment of a Soviet government or an hereditary monarchy within the confines of the United States if it so chooses. The Outlook would under such circumstances condemn the judgment of the "Tribune," and with equal vigor defend the "Tribune's" right to put forward such pleas.

The Outlook is not afraid of the truth.

It does not wish the Prohibition Amendment or any other measure passed by Congress or the Legislatures of our several States to stand upon a false basis.

During the past year The Outlook's own correspondent, Ernest W. Mandeville, gave in a series of articles a summary of the evils which have come upon the country as a result of the Prohibition Amendment. If I remember correctly, in his articles he quoted and indorsed certain statistics gathered by the Chicago "Tribune." Mr. Mandeville's and The Outlook's conclusions have been fully corroborated by the exhaustive investigation conducted under the auspices of the Federal Council of Churches. The Outlook, by the way, was the first journal in America to put before the public the courageous findings of that survey.

I may add that Mr. Lawrence Abbott, our Contributing Editor, is free to express his own opinions without regard to the editorial policy of The Outlook. If he were here at the office, I am certain, however, that he would indorse our statement in regard to our editorial policy on prohibition. We can likewise, as scores of our readers have done, indorse his statements concerning the Chicago "Tribune." Sincerely yours,

HAROLD T. PULSIFER,  
President.

Editor of the Chicago "Tribune,"  
Chicago, Illinois.