

hibition Act. The jury disagreed on the guilt of two of the defendants and acquitted several others on the ground of insufficient evidence. The four guilty conspirators—a garage-owner, a café proprietor, a real estate man, and a roofer—were sentenced to terms of from one to two years. As this issue is going to press, I am informed that Judge Clark has just reduced each sentence by four months because of an agreement between counsel that no appeals would be entered. Those who plead guilty were given sentences of nine months.

In a letter dated December 13, 1926, to United States Attorney Walter Winne, A. Bruce Bielaski (chief of the prohibition enforcement under-cover agents) writes in part: "The sentences which have been imposed and the pleas of guilty have made a profound impression, I think, upon the principal law violators in your district, and I believe will be productive of very great good. Already, as you know, new leads have been opened up, and I am confident that there will soon be presented to you evidence on which you can successfully prosecute men perhaps higher up in the

conspiracy than those convicted, as well as numbers of new defendants of importance."

To Americans, who have cherished their pride in the Coast Guard, this story is humiliating. Should it not be humiliating to every inhabitant of New Jersey who has had any pride in his State? Or have the people of New Jersey become so calloused by this form of lawbreaking that they have ceased to care whether their State is the stamping-ground of smugglers and their lawless allies?

Student Crusaders

By WALTER W. VAN KIRK

ON the last day of the old year there was heard from the platform and on the floor of the National Student Conference that met in Milwaukee during the Christmas holidays, under the auspices of the Council of Christian Associations, a vast amount of criticism of the social order that had been created for these students by their elder comrades. Much of this barking at the present order was only what might be expected from a group of young people whose idealism had so far outdistanced their intelligence as to make the futility of their criticisms a foregone conclusion; but much of this criticism of the existing order, with its slums, its industrial and international sore spots, its profiteering, its materialistic reach, its thirst for power, its lust for gold, battleships, and marching armies, its appetite for exploitation, its selfishness, its worship of things as they are, was well merited.

The following day, the first of the new year, these same students covenanted among themselves to fashion a society fit for men, women, and children to live in. The work of several generations was laid out in the findings of the Conference—the silencing of guns; the humbling of the world's pride; the lifting up of the masses; the unifying of the churches, of the nations, of the races; the subordination of things and the exaltation of personality; and, finally, international friendship. These are ideals that cannot be woven into the fabric of civilization overnight. The National Student Conference was, however, not to be deterred by the far-off consummation of them.

What these young people said, interpreted as an isolated and disconnected utterance, and entirely out of context with the thinking processes of youth the world over, may indeed have had the

appearance of being hopelessly radical. I talked with many of the business and professional men who sat on the "sidelines" of the Conference, and many of them were frankly concerned about what they felt to be the mistaken idealism and the foolish, legendary aspirations of these inexperienced and misguided youth. They deplored the radicalism of these self-appointed Arthurian knights. But there is no cause for alarm. These young people are not "Red." Their pockets are not being lined with Communistic shekels. They are determined, however, in so far as it is humanly possible within the brief compass of a single life, to push the race forward and upward.

To be concrete, these young people are internationally minded to a remarkable degree. That does not mean, necessarily, that they love America less. It means that they love humanity more. They believe that fidelity to one's country receives its finest expression in a co-operative service, political and otherwise, to all mankind. That is why these young people are on speaking terms with the World Court and the League of Nations.

High above the speaker's platform of the Conference auditorium there had been suspended against a velvet-curtained background two huge hemispheres. Written on one were the words "UT OMNES," and on the other "UNUM SINT." Then still higher, but on a line between these hemispheres, there hung in quiet splendor the Stars and Stripes. There you have the basic social and political philosophy of these undergraduates. They do not believe in isolation. They do not believe that America can permanently detour around Geneva. If they oppose war, and they do, it is because they see in this practice

the negation of the principle of unity. If they protest against the lynching of Negroes, or against racial discrimination in whatever form it may take, it is because they believe racial equality to be essential to the attainment of world brotherhood.

Compulsory military training in our schools and colleges, the landing of Marines in Nicaragua, the "bullying" of Mexico, the parceling out of China and Africa among the strong Powers, and the threatened renewal of competition in naval armaments were opposed by the Conference, because these gestures, separately and together, jeopardize the achievement of the world ideal to which these young people are committed.

Then, again, the youth at Milwaukee let it be known that the chasm that has lately widened between the college administration and the student body can only be bridged by the granting of a larger measure of responsibility and autonomy to student groups. These young people want a voice in the handling of campus problems. They protest against what they deem to be the unwarranted interference of college authorities in matters of social conduct. One student told of being severely disciplined by a college president because he insisted on walking across the campus each day with his Negro classmates. Another student said that she had been threatened with expulsion because she insisted on living on a basis of social equality with a Japanese girl comrade of hers. When one of the platform speakers, himself a Negro, was asked what a student should do under such circumstances, he replied: "Try to change the administration's point of view; but if you can't do that, then experiment with another school—for the one you are in is giving you a very poor education indeed."

Some students wanted an opportunity to co-operate with the faculty and university authorities in the making of chapel programs, while others protested against the outworn social inhibitions that were still imposed upon them by their Victorian superiors. Many lamented the absence on their campuses of student government, while others objected to the giving of Phi Beta Kappa keys for doing no more than reproducing with painful exactness the mind of the professor. It was felt that scholarship awards should be given for intellectual initiative and originality; not for mental conformity. What college administrators are disposed to do about these matters is more than I am able to predict. I am only trying to pass on to others what I discovered in the thinking of these Milwaukee dissenters.

And, finally, there was a voice raised at Milwaukee that church leaders would do well to hearken to. I refer to the oft-repeated declaration that only in

church co-operation and in Christian unity can the problems of the world be met and solved. I have been attending student conferences now for the past several years, and I go away from every such gathering with a more firmly embedded conviction that these young people have parted company with the sectarianism that to-day so hopelessly divides the Church.

How can the Church rid the world of war? How can the Church democratize industry? How can the Church right race relations? How can the Church create that international mindedness without which the swords of the world can never be sheathed? There is no stumbling for words in the answer that these young people give to such inquiries.

The answer invariably is this: Let the churches bury their denominational rivalries in one great, supreme act of loyalty to their common Christ, and in the strength of union go forth to con-

quer the world for peace and righteousness. Unless the leaders of the Church make an effort seriously and constructively to face this student protest against sectarianism, they will have no one but themselves to blame if in the future these young people are found hostilely arrayed against them.

These students simply do not live in the denominational world of their fathers. They have no interest whatever in Modernism, nor in Fundamentalism, as such. They will not devote their lives to a continuance of any form of institutionalized sectarianism.

These Milwaukee crusaders have much to learn. They are long on idealism and short on experience. They are but dimly conscious of the mass strength of the vested interests against which they have thrown themselves with such eager abandon. But they are out to win, and the world will some day be their debtor because they have dared to dream.

Canton, China, and the Powers

By JOHN McC. ROOTS

JUST what and where is the Government of China? The final adjustment of this delicate detail, which for several years now has kept the Peking diplomats in a mild quandary, is precisely what the Canton Nationalist Government had in mind when it started the recent campaign against General Wu Pei-fu and the three sister cities of Wuchang, Hanyang, and Hankow. The dramatic and complete success of the southern forces in Central China last October, and their present control over more than half the country, make it altogether fit and proper to inquire briefly into the political philosophy of these people who denounce the Peking Government as a mockery and foreign treaty rights as an anachronism.

For eight years now the Cantonese have claimed to be the only legitimate rulers in China. The final break came in 1918, when the southern representatives at Peking withdrew in protest against the restoration of the boy Emperor and the seizure of power by northern militarists; and actually the country has been split in two since that date. But no one at the time took Canton seriously; so for all diplomatic and historical purposes China continued to be a modern republic whose capital was Peking. The upstart "Nationalist" Government remained a good joke.

Last summer I was in Canton, and

saw Eugene Chen, Minister for Foreign Affairs, a man who was born a British subject and who knows English better than he does Chinese. We came to the subject of Canton's claim to power as the only legitimate heir of the old Parliament and the 1913 Constitution—a claim which had a certain amount of validity. He brushed it aside. "That idea," he asserted, quietly, "is no longer necessary to prove our right to the leadership of China. We are political realists. We submit that we have proved ours to be the best Government in the country, and that this alone justifies the title 'Nationalist.'"

OF course, ultimate recognition by foreign nations is necessary if the new Government (dating only from July, 1925) is to realize its ambition of representing China before the world. This, needless to say, has not been granted. But there are signs that it may not be long in coming.

It is already past argument that Peking does not represent the country.

And Canton might be regarded somewhat as Peking's twin star, which brightens as the other wanes. Foreign Powers have already had occasion to deal separately with the local authorities in Mukden, where Chang Tso-lin holds sway, and in Greater Shanghai, ruled by Sun

Chuang-fang. Last summer the British at Hongkong, ignoring Peking, negotiated directly with the Nationalist Government for a settlement of the strike and boycott. And the climax came early last month, when the new British Minister to China conferred with "Nationalist" officials at Hankow before proceeding to his legation in Peking.

The implication contained in these instances is clear—namely, that foreign diplomats are groping towards some method of dealing with China on a basis of reality. From conversations I had in August with various members of the diplomatic body at Peking, it appeared that the American and British representatives were considering the idea of formally abandoning the absurd fiction of a Chinese Central Government, and of recognizing, what is the undoubted fact, that China is at present simply a collection of regional loyalties whose temper and territory are subject to change without notice. This would involve the negotiation of current issues with the *de facto* authorities in any particular locality, instead of addressing hollow protests to a phantom Government which no longer even pretends to control the nation.

Such a step would enormously enhance the prestige of the Canton Nationalists, for it would mean recognition of theirs as the Government of China in