



Chinese Exclusion

Author(s): WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON

Source: *The Advocate of Peace (1894-1920)*, Vol. 64, No. 2 (FEBRUARY 1902), pp. 35-39

Published by: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25751909>

Accessed: 16-09-2017 00:22 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Sage Publications, Inc. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Advocate of Peace (1894-1920)*

"Joy to the world, the Lord has come!"

"Glory to God, to men goodwill!"

Now hush the bugle and the drum,
And bid the haughty strife be still.

What lips were loudest in the fray
Of wrathful words, what hands would smite
With fist or sword, be still to-day,
And learn the law of peace and right.

Such wisdom as from self proceeds,
The sapient lore of worldly lust,
Forget, with all those ruthless deeds
That, from the dust, return to dust.

Oh, not with boastful threat and blow
Doth man achieve his true estate,
But loving, trusting, toiling, so
God's gentleness doth make him great.

Ye leaders of the multitude,
With their up-reaching hands in yours,
Lead to the one eternal Good,
The Love that ransomed, heals, endures.

Yea, all ye stewards of the Lord
Make haste to do His perfect will;
Obey the voice: "Put up thy sword!"
Obey the voice: "Thou shalt not kill!"

And ye who stretch your limbs at ease,
Forgetful of a brother's claim, —
Down from your couches to your knees!
Thence rise to work in Jesus' name!

White is the harvest, large the yield;
Lift up your eyes and see the glow
Of fair wheat shining in God's field:
The call is sounding, rise and go.

Chinese Exclusion.

BY WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

From an address before the Henry George Club, Philadelphia, January 12.

"Unsettled questions have no mercy for the peace of nations," said Garfield, and the wrong perpetrated upon one of the oldest and most wonderful races of history thrusts itself once more before the public tribunal for a fresh decision. If the old judgment is repeated, we bequeath the case to future days and men, with added difficulties which always accompany the postponement of the ethical solution.

To justify Chinese exclusion from the United States, it must be demonstrated that these immigrants trench upon the rights of American citizens. And this is attempted. The method used is to magnify defects of character, to decry national habits, and to draw up a bill of indictment against an entire race — a race that was venerable before this baby republic was a distant dream, and before the land which it controls had been discovered by Columbus. A very old and a very stubborn nation are we insulting and defying. Our stability, who can predict? China's seems like the earth's foundation.

China, looked at through impartial spectacles as a study, is a subject of wonder and respect; contemplated through the political glasses of hustling American "sov-

ereigns," swollen with Anglo-Saxon pride and conceit, it is a "yellow peril" full of menace. This bogey was pictorially displayed in the yellowest of New York journals and reproduced approvingly in the pages of Mr. Bryan's *Commoner* — incongruous to one fresh from reading the editor's praise of the Declaration of Independence. Let me recall briefly the story of Chinese immigration in the United States, a chapter of disgrace which should bring a blush to every American cheek.

It is a matter of history how the Chinese were invited to the United States on equal terms with immigrants of other nations. Invited is a mild word; they were entreated to come and help build up the Pacific railroads, and something more than simple persuasion was used to entice the necessary number. In the early days of their coming they were treated with distinction and honor. In the public pageants of San Francisco they held positions of favor and prominence. All was well until race prejudice and jealousy, instigated by sand-lot demagogues, enlisted the more ignorant laboring men against the quiet and industrious Asiatics, who shunned intoxicating liquor and were outside of labor unions.

POLITICS THE DICTATOR.

The clamor increasing and spreading, the question soon became a political one. California was an evenly balanced state, and its electoral vote in a Presidential election might turn the party scales. Blaine, with his eye on the Presidency, and eager to score every point on the road to success, adopted the war-cry of the lazy, discontented enemies of the Chinese, gilding his arguments with a plausible rhetoric that Dennis Kearney could not attain. The Democrats, not to be beaten at this game, vied with the Republicans in bidding for the labor vote of the coast. It was not the Chinese *per se* to which the leaders of either party objected; but Chinese proscription was the price willingly offered by both for the labor suffrage.

How easy it is to find excuses when a path of wrong is once entered! Negro slavery was justified on grounds which insult intelligence at this day; but before the war such justification seemed ample to the majority of the American people. The misrepresentation and abuse then showered upon the colored race have been transferred to the Chinese. The reasons, equally false and misleading, will in a better day be recalled only with contempt. The truth is that the yellow people are persecuted in place of the black because they are disfranchised and defenseless. Their bitter opponents have the ballot. In a republic a disfranchised class is powerless to preserve its own rights. Hence the present situation.

In reply to this statement of the case, we shall be told that our view is based on sentiment; that we have become a world power, and that the Declaration of Independence is obsolete; that our first consideration is our own material prosperity, and to accomplish that the welfare of other nations is not to be considered. Instead of rising on "stepping-stones of our dead selves to higher things," we must rise on the mangled bodies of men who died for liberty. We are advised to take a practical view of the situation, and to answer if we can the objections to Chinese immigration which appeal so strongly to the American Congress.

This we are glad to do. Let me include the common

objections in a single paragraph: The Chinese cannot assimilate with Americans; they earn money here and send it back to China; they underbid American labor; their manner of living is inexpensive and they are small consumers; they huddle together in great numbers, and their dwelling places are unsanitary and dangerous; crime and unchastity abound with them; in short, their influence is corrupting and they must go.

ASSIMILATION.

For men who hold in contempt an alien race to complain that it will not assimilate with them is sheer hypocrisy. When have the Chinese been invited to accept such closeness? A bludgeon is a poor instrument with which to effect assimilation. Persecution is not cementing, except to the people persecuted. Had the Chinamen been idle and habitués of the saloon, had they obtained the ballot and made themselves a power at the polls, apparently they would have demonstrated their adaptability for American institutions. The rumseller, the labor unions and the professional politician would not now be hounding them down. Only one sure way of assimilation exists, that of mutual respect and brotherly feeling. We have no right to complain of clannishness until we have extended equal rights and cordial treatment to these quiet, industrious, patient people of the Orient.

LOVE OF FAMILY A REPROACH.

The Chinese earn and send back money to their relatives at home. If this is reprehensible, what shall we say to the Irish and Germans, who send back millions where the Chinese send thousands? What to the Swedes, the Italians and other immigrants whose leading motive has been to save and succor the dear ones left behind? The week before Christmas a single German steamer carried back over eleven hundred thousand dollars to relatives in the fatherland. Love of family and respect for parents are traits that exalt a people. To cast blame upon a race for cherishing such virtues is to dishonor the accuser. What happiness and comfort have resulted from this unending tribute of affection which flows from the United States to the old and distant homes! Whether the bounty is received on the banks of "the pleasant river Lee" or the banks of the Canton River, human nature is ennobled by the act.

COMPETITION WITH AMERICAN LABOR.

For believers in the single tax, of all men, to make labor competition a just ground for excluding Chinese is indeed strange. They profess belief in freedom of trade, and yet single tax exclusionists are demanding protection for labor. As though the exclusion of goods and the exclusion of laborers were not one and the same in principle. Well does that extreme protectionist, Robert Ellis Thompson, say in the *Irish World*: "Our first duty is toward our own people, and as it is clearly impossible to maintain the American rate of wages and standard of living in the face of an unlimited immigration of Chinese coolies, they should not be allowed to come. No protectionist can take any other view. He cannot propose the exclusion of the products of cheap labor, while admitting the labor itself." A true and logical conclusion from Thompson's standpoint, but what stultification it is from free trade lips!

The Chinese did not come to this country to com-

pete with American labor, but to perform work for which Americans could not be obtained. I remember myself the eagerness for the yellow men to construct the Northern Pacific Railroad, twenty years ago, when, in Oregon, I listened to the projectors discussing the difficulties of procuring immigrants enough. Competition! There were no white competitors. And even now, when Chinese labor is more diversified, and the uncomplaining, steady toilers are making themselves invaluable to the farmer and are succeeding in independent industries, they are not crowding out competent white workers. They are simply hated by the lazy and idle for their industry and thrift. Inferiority seeks protection against superiority. Which most benefits the country?

ECONOMY A REPROACH.

The Chinese are accused of living cheaply. Once such a course was considered a New England virtue. Our historians are fond of recurring to those early days when with scanty means there existed noble characteristics. From such conditions our great men sprung. On this count against the Chinese Abraham Lincoln might have been deported. Yet, in the time to come, I think he will still be rated as a greater benefactor to his native land than the lavish magnates of the Standard Oil Company and the great steel combination. But proscription is a poor way to encourage generous expenditure on the part of the persecuted. With decent treatment and equality before the law there would come freer investment and more expensive living on the part of the Chinese. Transient people rarely spend freely; the Forbeses, Russells and Cunninghams, who made their fortunes in China, were ungrateful enough to come home to invest it. Do we berate them for it? Give the Chinese justice, and there will be an inducement for them to anchor here and bring their families. Now we complain that they will not abide, and in the same breath assert that we shall be overwhelmed by them: statements that devour each other.

THEY HUDDLE TOGETHER.

The Chinese huddle together in unhealthy quarters, and form plague spots, it is asserted. Who is responsible for the aggregation? Persecuted people naturally combine and are forced to be clannish. Custom and language decree such a result. Other nationalities do the same for a while and then melt and mingle under the sunlight of freedom. The sun of democratic America is veiled to the Chinese. They swarm in contracted and unsanitary precincts because prejudice closes the door of better situations. It was once the same way in Boston with the colored people. They were confined to the north side of Beacon Hill. Since emancipation they have found homes at the South End, Roxbury and adjoining suburbs, and centrifugal forces are working. Chinatown in San Francisco is subject to the health laws of the city, which are not enforced. The repellent features of the place are a source of profit to Americans who exploit the field. Vicious features are carefully guarded, that they may be shown by policemen for a price to curious visitors. And the landlords reap extravagant rents from this mass of sure-paying tenants, whose very crowding enhances white revenues. The remedy is, and always has been, in the hands of the city government of San Francisco.

UNCHASTITY.

Unchastity exists. Yes. Where race hostility prohibits men from bringing with them wives and daughters with a view to permanent family life, what else is possible? Is it not rather a wonder that under the circumstances the offense is not more flagrant? Group together fifteen or twenty thousand Anglo-Saxons with the feminine element excluded, and Chinatown would be in comparison a model city. Compare with these alien people the American citizens that make up our army of conquest. In camp and barrack can be shown a code of morals and a practice of corruption more appalling than can be seen in the Chinese quarters of any city, with brutality of drink, from which our Chinese population are free, superadded.

I feel almost ashamed to answer seriously these trumped-up objections to our Asiatic brethren. They are manufactured solely to excuse our unchristian action, and obscure the real motive of restrictive legislation, which, first, last, and all the time, is political and selfish. Justice and fair play are the only solvents of the problem. If the issue were not a political one, how quickly would the public mind open to the situation and ordinarily humane views obtain. But when forced into party entanglements, affecting political ambitions and successes, no question can apparently be impartially considered, especially if the sufferers are themselves debarred from voting. When the Chinese get the ballot, as in time they surely will, unless imperialism prevails, and American citizens lose their own political rights, we shall see aspirants for high office "kowtowing" to the influential Chinamen, praising the virtues of the Flowery Kingdom, and "swiping" for the yellow vote. And the day will be welcome, because political subserviency is a decided advance upon race proscription and persecution.

EXCLUSION LAWS BREED AMERICAN CORRUPTION.

The question of civic corruption is too large to consider in this connection. It is notorious that United States officials find heavy revenues in their connivance at smuggling Chinese immigrants across the border. The higher the bars are put up the greater the price of assistance. My own conviction is that few Chinamen are really kept out by our stringent laws, and that this home-loving people would increase very little under absolute freedom of entry. Their migration keeps pace with their incoming. The greater question is the abandonment of our former standards of human liberty and the denial of our declaration in the Burlingame treaty, wherein the United States and China mutually recognized "the inherent and inalienable right of man to change his home and allegiance, and also the mutual advantage of free migration and emigration of their citizens and subjects respectively, from one country to the other, for the purpose of curiosity, of trade, or as permanent residents." Inalienable rights do not change in a third of a century nor in ten thousand centuries.

THE SMALLNESS OF THE YELLOW PERIL.

For a great nation of seventy-five millions of people to be frightened by the advent of seventy-five thousand is surely one of the marvels of history. In twenty years there has been no apparent Chinese increase, the numbers departing exceeding the entrances. Every China-

man in the country could be hidden in a single ward of Philadelphia, and yet such is the fear of these imperturbable, unobtrusive, persistent men that it is necessary to reverse the traditions and habits of the republic. It recalls the Scripture parallel, where one can chase a thousand, and two can put ten thousand to flight. To this it is answered that it is not the number here which is so startling, but the future possibilities, if the national doors are not closed to the inroad.

No proof is offered that the restrictive legislation is to be credited with this result. I commend to our dissenting friends the Dingley report of 1890, written by a student of European immigration, and published by the government. In it occurs the obvious truth that these imposing movements of population "are as irrepressible as they are irreversible. The stream may be dammed or diverted, but cannot be stopped. . . . Legislation falls flat. To stop emigration or to reduce emigration European nations must remove the causes which are behind emigration—land monopoly, landlordism, and militarism,"—words of golden truth. The poor people of other lands have come to us because we have been freer from these curses than the despotisms from which they fled. Now that we are cultivating the same causes, permitting a land monopoly almost unparalleled, safeguarding landlords with the federal power, and building up a wasteful and destructive militarism, the temptation to immigration must lessen. To flee from tyranny to tyranny is unnatural. More potent than congressional legislation to close our doors is the decrease of opportunity which we are assiduously trying to accomplish.

RACE PROSCRIPTION EPIDEMIC.

Exclusion cannot pause at the Chinese. It must spread not only to other Oriental peoples, but to the less favored of the Occidentals. My friend, Henry George, Jr., would discriminate and open the doors to the Japanese because they would assimilate with us. "A Japanese man in the United States," he says, "is a man who has an extreme eagerness to learn all that can be learned of our ways, of our fund of knowledge. He makes himself as nearly as possible one of us." On the other hand, Mr. Bryan would shut the Japanese out. He wishes our government to ask the Japanese government to place restriction on emigration and save us the trouble of putting up the bars ourselves. He says, "The matter should at once be brought to the attention of the Japanese authorities, and unless sufficient and satisfactory action is taken by the home government, the Chinese exclusion act should be made broad enough to extend to Japanese of the same class." And this is the leader of Democracy talking of "classes to be excluded" which another Democrat assures us are easily assimilated and are eager to learn of our ways and of our fund of knowledge. If that is Democracy, I am not a Democrat. As Mr. Lincoln said, "If this is coffee, give me tea; if it is tea, give me coffee."

THE TRUE REASON FOR CHINESE EXCLUSION.

After all these attempted excuses and unreal arguments, we look for the true cause of this antipathy to the Chinese. It does not require a microscope to discern that the entire question is a political one. The game is played for votes. The determining factor is organized labor, which is solid against competitors in the

labor market. The labor unions do not confine their opposition to Mongolians. The growing movement for more stringent laws to keep out European immigrants originates with them. Ambitious politicians of both parties fear to stem the tide and rush to get into line. Each party has its disgraceful exclusion plank. In spite of Blaine's success in first capturing the issue for the Republican party, Mr. Bryan is laboring to show that "many of the Republican leaders are in favor of the policy that will flood the country with cheap Chinese labor," and that exclusion is really Democratic thunder. He gilds his partisanship with this high-sounding flourish: "The question is whether we are going to build up a strong, independent, upright, and patriotic people, and develop a helpful influence on all the world, or whether we are going to be a greedy, grasping nation, forgetful of high ideals and concerned only in making money." High ideals, indeed! It is a sentiment reminiscent of utterances which linger in public memory about "criminal aggression" and "plain duty." The question of the "yellow peril" resolves itself into the question of capturing the labor vote of the United States.

CONCERNING LABOR UNIONS.

However necessary the counter combinations of skilled labor may be to offset the combinations of capital, the fact remains that their existence is an indication of evil social conditions. Nobody knows better than the single taxer how absolutely they fail to help the general wage earner. Labor unions include but a small fraction of the workers of the country, and are banded together for their own advantage. No altruistic motive enters into their scheme. They are, first, last, and all the time, for the organization and its members. Their ground is narrow and selfish, and in that respect they stand upon the same plane with capitalists.

Every strike bears evidence of this fact. No pity is shown to the unorganized laborers who rush of necessity to fill the vacant places. During the recent San Francisco strike there were said to have been over two thousand brutal assaults upon non-union men by the strikers. Who can forget the murderous attack upon the negro laborers in Illinois under Governor Tanner's administration? Such conduct is inspired by the same ignorant blindness that once destroyed labor-saving machinery, of which there was a revival in Northamptonshire, England, last month, when an instalment of new shoe machinery was made.

However one may view the lack of economic intelligence shown by these militant organizations, no one questions their vast political power. For their support politicians humble themselves, and for their votes high bids are made. Association with them is often a path to political preferment.

The union of labor for self-protection against the oppression of wealth cannot reasonably be decried, but when it in turn becomes an aggressor upon less fortunate workers, it is time to raise a voice of protest. Especially now, when organized labor is at the bottom, not only of Chinese persecution and exclusion, but is responsible for the increasingly stringent anti-immigration laws against Europeans, as well as Asiatics. It is another phase of the protection policy, cruel, selfish and futile; but if you condense all the exclusion arguments with

their sweeping indictments against whole races, there will remain a single, definite, all-explanatory residue, a desire to command the labor votes for personal schemes and party ends. In this light, humane considerations become irrelevant and impertinent.

FALSE ANALOGIES.

A San Francisco single tax paper asserts that "we have a right to exclude any objectionable character from our home or from membership in our family, and so has a nation, a family on a large scale, the right to prohibit the immigration of the people of any undesirable race, particularly when self-preservation makes such a course necessary."

Are family and country analogous? A man's home is the product of labor, and to it privacy attaches by right. It is for the owners to decide who shall or shall not be admitted. Hence the recognized justice of the English law that a man's house is his castle. This is based on property grounds, and I need not waste time in explaining to single taxers the distinction between property and natural opportunity. A man may build a dwelling and make it as exclusive as he wishes. This does not, however, give him a right to exclude people from the territory where he happens to live. He did not make the territory. Consequently the parallel between exclusive house ownership and exclusive land control does not hold. The contrast is impressive.

Once grant that a nation has a right to shut out other people seeking it without hostile intentions, and a state, city, yes, even the ward of a city, may equally decree proscription. When a land is invaded for the purpose of injury and theft, as are South Africa and the Philippines, the law of nations justifies resistance of the extreme kind; but personal dislike of foreign and strange immigrants is no excuse for maltreatment or barring out.

If the earth is the Lord's, and not the landlord's, the only valid prohibition must be a divine one. The present chance inhabitants of the United States, immigrants themselves or descendants of immigrants, are usurping the prerogatives of a higher power when they forbid entrance to the Chinese. We who oppose restrictive laws deny, with the San Francisco paper, the right of immigrants to invade the personal property of a single human being; but we ask by what right the almost boundless domain of this country is forcibly closed to them? How does the fact of getting here first confer the right of shutting others out? And what right have labor unions or politicians to deny to those who prefer the services of the Chinese the privilege of employing them at will? The Geary law infringes American as well as foreign rights.

A MUDDLED CHRISTIANITY.

How strange it is that the country most bitterly opposed to Oriental immigration should profess to worship an Oriental Christ and to hold an Oriental religion. The truth is that, although formally adopted, Christianity has never been naturalized by Western peoples. Our very treatment of the Chinese shows that our religion is simply one of profession. This nation's practice contravenes the fundamental principles of Jesus; and, while from its pulpits inculcations of peace and brotherly love are preached, it fosters great armies and navies for slaughtering fellow-men whom Christ bade his disciples

to love and serve. Mock followers of the Oriental Messiah, we are in reality worshipers of a rapacious and bloody god of force, to whom our chaplains pray before their regiments enter battle.

OTHER PEOPLE'S RIGHTS.

I speak of Christianity because the belief that this earth was created for all the children of men, and not for a favored few, is an embodiment of the teachings of Jesus and the foundation stone of our single tax reform. To advocate race exclusion is to discredit our own sacred principle. Conceding, for argument's sake, that discomfort and privation might for a time result from an American application of the Golden Rule, how about the gain and benefit to the foreigners whom we shelter? When and where in the discussion of immigration do we hear from exclusionists one word of concern for these hated people or a word of rejoicing in their improved well-being?

So far from considering the immigrant's gain an offset to our possible loss, all arguments for their prohibition are baldly selfish. The welfare of the poorest Chinaman, whether in San Francisco or in Canton, is, in a Christian and humane point of view, deserving of equal consideration with that of the proudest Anglo-Saxon that exists. As Wendell Phillips said in his memorable address on Harper's Ferry, "I am talking of that absolute essence of things which lives in the sight of the Eternal and the Infinite; not as men judge it in the rotten morals of the nineteenth century, among a herd of states that calls itself an empire, because it raises cotton and sells slaves."

FEDERAL EXCLUSION THE PRELUDE TO IMPERIALISM.

It is a satisfaction that there is no dissension among single taxers on the question of imperialism. They are united in opposition to this undemocratic conquest and murder of weaker races. But the exercise of Federal power to stop immigration was clearly a link in the chain of imperial aggrandizement. In 1893 David Dudley Field saw the dangerous tendency and sounded the alarm. These are his prophetic words: "In our own history we see unmistakable proofs of a strong flood tide settling in towards federal sovereignty. To go no further than the Chinese deportation act of the last session, enacted and upheld on the plea of federal sovereignty, it needs no prophet to foretell that, if the foundation of that enactment be not dashed in pieces, the incoming century will see this nation either broken into fragments or converted into a consolidated republic, another name for despotism, which would be but a prelude to anarchy, and that but a prelude to an empire, and that but another name for an emperor and military dominion."

THE ETHICAL VERDICT.

It is a comfort, when public opinion is overwhelmingly in favor of racial injustice, to turn to the testimony of unselfish men.

In 1879, less than three months before his death, William Lloyd Garrison thus wrote to James G. Blaine: "Against this hateful spirit of caste I have earnestly protested for the last fifty years, wherever it has developed itself, especially in the case of another class, for many generations still more contemned, degraded and oppressed; and the time has fully come to deal with it as

an offense to God, and a curse to the world wherever it seeks to bear sway. The Chinese are our fellowmen, and are entitled to every consideration that our common humanity may justly claim."

In 1892 Phillips Brooks wrote: "The legislation on the Chinese Restriction Act is most humiliating, and demands the indignation and remonstrance of every citizen who cares for justice and his country and humanity. Surely all good men must desire its repeal."

In 1882 James Freeman Clark declared that "The whole spirit of this crusade is opposed to the spirit of humanity," and after describing the Chinese, asked, "Are we then ready to exclude such a people as this?" adding, "Lowell in his Commemoration Ode makes our country say that she has 'room about her hearth for all mankind.' Shall we who profess to be in advance of other nations go back to a poor mediæval system of exclusion? . . . The politician calls this sentimentalism; but the true statesman knows that such sentiments of justice, brotherhood and honor are the foundation rocks which support the republic. Let these be taken away to satisfy the cry of partisans, and all that is strong and good in the nation goes down into ruin."

Senator Hoar also bore this testimony: "These measures not only violate our treaty engagements with a friendly nation, but they violate the principles upon which the American republic rests, striking not at crime or even pauperism, but striking at human beings because of their race, and at laboring men because they are laborers."

The Powers and the Missionaries.

BY MARY S. ROBINSON.

In view of the deplorable transforming of missionaries into soldiers during the late and not yet concluded warfare between the Chinese and the Occidentals; in view of the widespread hatred now manifest, evoked by the policy of the European powers toward peoples and governments weaker than their own; in view, also, of the abduction of Miss Stone and of the likelihood of a repetition of such abduction in the future,—it seems to many that the time has come—nay, that it came long ago—for the representatives of the foreign missionary societies to protest against a secular policy diametrically opposed to the teaching for which those societies stand: a policy which has compromised foreign missions and missionaries in the estimation of the civilized world. The chief obstacle to the diffusion of the Christian teaching in non-Christian countries to-day proceeds not from the people of those countries, but from European thrones and cabinets and arsenals. The European sovereign, with his lieutenants, is the exponent of the war power, the feeder of land hunger, the procurer for the greed of domination. The first provocation leading up to the late outbreak in China was the Opium War of 1839, the initial of a series of compulsions, appropriations, creations of "spheres of influence," and of other outrages innumerable, such as no people worthy of the name ought to endure for one hour. That outbreak was the occasion for the collision of the theoretical Christian and the secular un-Christian policies. In the collision the theoretical Christian suc-