

1979

Midwest China Oral History Interviews

Robert Brank Fulton

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.luthersem.edu/china_histories

Recommended Citation

Fulton, Robert Brank, "Midwest China Oral History Interviews" (1979). *China Oral Histories*. Book 44.
http://digitalcommons.luthersem.edu/china_histories/44

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Archives & Special Collections at Digital Commons @ Luther Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in China Oral Histories by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Luther Seminary. For more information, please contact akeck001@luthersem.edu.

ROBERT BRANK FULTON
ORAL HISTORY ABSTRACT

BORN: July 6, 1911, in Clinton, Illinois.

EARLY LIFE: family background; education; accepts teaching position from Yale-in-China program.

CHINA EXPERIENCES: teaching English at Changsha; response to extra-territoriality; description of the foreign community in Changsha; description of students' goals, political activity and attitudes toward Christianity; impressions of Sherwood Eddy; awareness of Japanese build-up in northern China; teaching at Yencheng University and working with the Yenta Christian Fellowship; impressions of John Leighton Stuart; Christianity and the needs of a modernizing China; awareness of the Chinese Communists; trip to Free China, 1940; accepts position as representative of Yale-in-China Board of Trustees, 1943; trip to Changsha after V-J Day; reconstruction activity in Changsha; accepts teaching position at Huachung University, Wuchang, 1947; inflation in China; tensions at Huachung University and the Communist takeover of Wuchang; U.S.-China relations after WWII; experiences leaving China, 1950; impact of China experiences.

INTERVIEWER: Jane Baker Koons

DATES: 1-23-79; 1-24-79

PLACE: Fairfield, Iowa

NUMBER OF PAGES: 120

+Complementary archival and museum material from Robert Fulton is also housed in the Midwest China Oral History, Archives, and Museum Collection.



INTERVIEW

INTERVIEWER: Dr. Fulton, could we begin by your telling when and where you were born?

FULTON: That was in Clinton, Illinois, in 1911, on July 6th.

I: Would you give us a little of your family background please?

FULTON: My father was a Presbyterian minister, and I always think of my mother as actually being in the ministry as well because they were a real team. Although she didn't have formal theological training, they worked very much together. Father came from a long line of Presbyterian ministers, his home being originally in the Pennsylvania area. Mother came from Kentucky and a church-oriented home, but with a largely medical and legal, rather than ministerial, background. Her father was a judge in Kentucky and her brother a doctor. They met out in Yellowstone Park quite by happenstance and decided that they ought to form a life partnership. At some point, if I live long enough, I want to write something on Father and Mother, not just because they were my parents, but because I think they were not the usual ministerial couple.

Father had started out with the dream of being a professional baseball player. Then he started in the preparation for the law as an apprentice in a lawyer's office. But going to Chautauqua one summer, he was tremendously impressed with Dwight L. Moody and eventually decided to enter the ministry. He brought all his other interests with him. We have much of his library at our camp in Michigan, and that indicates that interest in many other areas besides the formal theological areas, including poetry, science, history and literature. And Mother's interests were very wide, too.

The reason that I mention this is that the more I think about it, the more I realize how lucky I was to have parents like that. Not only did they love each other and make a wonderful home, but their interests were so broad. I never had to struggle, as some people have, with the question of how to relate your faith to science or history. For Father, there was only one truth and that was from God, but there could be differences in regard to how people interpreted the truth. There might be differences within the church's orientation as well as between a spokesman for science and religion. Ultimately, there was no area of study that he feared, about which he would have to say, in effect, "That doesn't correspond to my faith." His whole approach was, "Know the truth and the truth shall make you free," if I may quote the Bible at this point.

I have had contact with many students who have wrestled with the problem, "How do I relate science and religion," or "How do I put together what I am studying and what I have learned in church?" I am lucky that I never had that kind of problem. I am grateful, very grateful to my parents that they felt one could pursue the truth wherever it led and not fear that one was somehow or other being untrue to one's faith. Sometimes it meant broadening a concept and wrestling with problems, but it was nothing that you had to fear as long as you were seeking truth.

As regards my formal education, I went to the public schools in Rockford, Illinois. Father and Mother moved to Rockford when I was two, so I don't recall anything of the actual birth town-- Clinton, Illinois. But Rockford

I recall very vividly, and we go back at least once a year to visit friends there. There weren't many kindergartens in those days, but I went to grade school, junior high and senior high and then on to college. The reason for going to Yale College, basically, was I got a scholarship which helped very greatly. Father and Mother were never what you might call poverty-stricken, but you had to watch expenses very carefully. You never left anything uneaten on your plate, for example, and you didn't waste money. When an opportunity to obtain a college scholarship came, it was a real help. So I did attend Yale.

After college I had an interim period in China. When I came back, I had decided to go into the ministry. Father and Mother never put any pressure at all on me in this regard. Father used to say, as a matter of fact, that you should never enter the ministry if you can avoid it. He meant the clergy aspect of the ministry. He and Mother always regarded all discipleship as ministry, that one could be a minister as a doctor, or concerned businessman, or preacher or a teacher. The clergy side was not something that was in any sense of different spiritual value or with any hierarchical significance in the church. So there was never any pressure.

When I did decide that I wanted to at least go to seminary, I told Father about it and asked his judgment as to where I should go. He said that was up to me; but he added that for himself there was really only one place that he would be interested in and that was Union Seminary in New York City. The reason was that he so greatly admired people like Henry Sloane Coffin, who was president at that time, and Harry Emerson Fosdick, who

was a teacher of homiletics and Reinhold Niebuhr and some of the others. It was a great period for Union. Many have said that Union has never had quite the collection of genuine "stars" that they did at that time. Amazingly, all of them retired within a matter of 10 years of that particular period and I think Union has never really been the same since.

Father came out of a very conservative theological background--the United Presbyterian Church, which he always respected, but which he felt had too many restrictions. For example, you couldn't have any instrumental music. All that was allowed was someone with a pitch pipe to be sure you started off on the right key. And they didn't sing anything but Psalms. He liked to sing Psalms, but he loved the great other hymns of the church and there were many things that seemed to him too narrow and unnecessary. So he did move on into the larger fellowship of the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. and he was delighted when the two denominations later united to form the present United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

I mentioned his interest in Union as an indication of how his mind was growing and broadening. That was a time when there was a great deal of controversy. Dr. Fosdick, for example, was regarded by many as a heretic. Now, of course, nearly all but the most conservative look back with great respect on the contributions he had made, whether or not they disagree or agree with this or that interpretation. It was the spirit of the man as well as his ideas that appealed to Father. I am very grateful for that lead because Union to me was the most exciting educational experience I ever had. How fortunate I was to be able to study with Niebuhr and Tillich and Fosdick and Coffin, Eugene and Mary Lyman and--well, I could go on and on.

I: What in your childhood or youth led you to a China interest?

FULTON: I think I can look back and put a precise date on the beginning-- January 24, 1924. That was the day we left New York City on a world cruise, my mother and father and I. It was an unusual situation. Through a friend, Father had been invited to become chaplain of the cruise--an annual affair. Normally, the company did not want family members to go along with the staff members; but if you will recall your history, in 1923 there was a terrible Japanese earthquake that devastated Yokohama and Tokyo, particularly. Many of those who had signed up for the cruise were literally afraid to go because Japan was one of the places to be visited and they cancelled their reservations even though they lost rather substantial deposits. So the company, about a month in advance of departing, sent out word to the staff members, stating that in view of the many unexpectedly empty rooms, they were going to experiment. "If any of you would like to bring members of your family, you may do so."

The cost was just about what you normally would pay for food. You didn't have to pay for the cruise itself. Neither of my brothers was able to leave at that time, but I didn't find too much difficulty in breaking away from eighth grade! And the teachers were very cooperative, giving assignments to take along so that I was able to keep up with my class. You can imagine what it was like for a 13-year-old boy, who had never been anywhere but in Illinois and Michigan, to suddenly get exposed to the kind of things that happened.

We went to several of the Mediterranean countries, down to India and on out to Hong Kong. Our family didn't get into Mainland China, as we chose the alternative of spending some time in Japan. Then we went down to the South Sea Islands and back through the Panama Canal and home. It was a tremendous experience!

At the end of the trip I don't think I came away with any special interest in China itself, although I greatly enjoyed the three or four days we had in Hong Kong, but it was the excitement of getting to know people in different parts of the world. I suppose, although I don't remember any consciously formed intention, that I probably decided, deep down inside, that that wasn't the only time I would try to get abroad. When the opportunity did come to go to China, it wasn't quite as startling an idea as it might have otherwise been. I guess that is where it began. That was the first contact with people in other countries that I had had, and it certainly made a very great impression on me.

I: Will you then relate how you happened to go to China?

FULTON: At Yale College part of the whole experience was related to the Yale Christian Association which was called "Dwight Hall;" and this meant a great deal to me. One of the things that was possible through Dwight Hall was contact with people who had come to visit us; and among them were people who had been to China. Also, we had on the Yale faculty at that point, one whom I think most people regard as one of the greatest early authorities on China-- Kenneth Scott Latourette. He was an incredible scholar! Way back in his early, scholarly work, he gave himself the assignment of writing five pages a day, which he did for the rest of his life. But he never let that interfere with his personal contacts; he was very closely related to Dwight Hall and very willing to meet the students.

One of the things that we stressed was out-of-class contact with concerned professors, and he was one of those whom we relied on most. He had gone out to Yale-in-China right after his educational experience and planned to be a

long-term missionary. (I'm using missionary now in the sense I wish it were always used. It wasn't just for church building; it involved educational and medical and various other service-focused work.) Latourette was in educational work in Changsha, but he quite soon had an attack of amoebic dysentery. It was so serious that the doctor not only sent him back to the States for special treatment, but said that it was something he would probably never get over (and he never did).

The doctors couldn't promise more than a few months or years in China but said he might be able to keep it much longer in check if he stayed in the States. His decision was that he could serve China more effectively by a longer life in this country devoted to Chinese studies. As you know, he surveyed the whole mission movement, including the history of the church in China, and his book on the history of Chinese missions is still the most important one that is available. And, of course, the books on the general history of China and of the Far East as a whole are of great value.

Somewhere along the line I took all the courses Latourette had to offer and would also go on walks with him. He loved to get out on Saturday afternoons to hike in the country and students were welcome to go along with him. I suppose that is as early as any direct China contact I had.

Since I mentioned Yale-in-China, Dwight Hall was very closely associated with the Yale-in-China enterprise, which had its American office right in the same building. The Yale-in-China program was the first of the college co-institutional relationship enterprises. The whole enterprise was founded in 1902 in the home of Anson Phelps Stokes, who was then the secretary of the university. He

and others had been very deeply influenced by the Student Volunteer Movement which stressed foreign mission work. Yale-in-China used to be called the Yale Foreign Mission Society. So I knew about the China program and I was interested in a general way.

After graduating in 1932, I stayed on as secretary of Dwight Hall for a year, working primarily with freshmen. In the spring of that year I was still thinking of going to a theological seminary, but I hadn't made any definite plans. One afternoon, into the place where I was staying in Dwight Hall came Frances Maynard Hutchins. Frank was the younger brother of Robert Maynard Hutchins, who was the president of University of Chicago, their father having been president of Berea College in Kentucky for many years.

Frank had been out in China as the Yale-in-China's Representative of the Trustees for several years. The pattern that had developed was for Yale-in-China each year to send two or three people who just graduated to teach in the middle school in Changsha. The responsibility involved primarily teaching English, but also helping in other ways such as athletics at Yali--the Chinese equivalent of Yale. You might also help with speaking or music or draw on other aptitudes you might have. Then they had one person who was the Trustees' representative who would keep in touch not only with the middle school, but also with the medical and collegiate work.

Yale-in-China had by degrees, starting in 1906, developed a middle school and a college--Yali College--and a medical school, nursing school and a hospital--all there in Changsha in Hunan province. Later, after the '26-'27 events interrupted the work, it was decided to merge the college department with the other collegiate enterprises in the Wuhan areas and form the Huachung University in Wuchang. Frank had been out for several years and was back on furlough when I had heard him speak at the Dwight Hall meeting; so I knew who he was.

He came, as indicated, to my room and said in his characteristic forthright fashion, "How would you like to go to China next year?" I think it took me only three or four minutes to respond OK. I said, though, that I was not quite sure whether, as uncertain as I was about what I wanted to do professionally, I ought to take two years (the normal arrangement) at this time. I asked whether I could possibly go for one year. Frank said that was possible if I could get myself back "on my own" financially. They would take care of all expenses if I served for two years. I felt that was fair enough and that is how it happened. I am pretty sure that the background contact with Dr. Latourette and others connected with Yale-in-China and the boyhood interest in getting out of the country to other parts of the world, may have prepared the way for this rather quick decision.

I: Can you recall specially some of the things Latourette told you about China?

FULTON: In his course on the "History of China," he went into the amazing cultural background as well as the formal history.*

It was not the idea that we knew all the truth and we had to go out to save the "heathen." He believed in sharing, but he had a deep respect for what was meaningful in the culture of others. We certainly got strong urgings from Latourette to read the Four Books and other classics--to really come to grips with the thought of Confucius and Mencius and Mo Tzu and the other great philosophers as well as to become aware of the total cultural background. Latourette made the whole thing, in terms of both context and events, come alive in a way that I am very grateful for.

*He believed profoundly in the mission movement, but was never in the slightest degree narrow.

I recently read a pamphlet by Douglas Steere, a Quaker philosophy professor, who has spent a lot of time in holding dialogues between himself and other Christians and also people of different faiths. This little pamphlet is called "Mutual Irradiation." It is a phrase I very greatly admire. Steere maintains, as did Latourette, that "God has not left himself without witness among any people" (to quote the Bible). We ought to be open to insights and truth from any source. It was that kind of approach for which I am very grateful and which I wish would be more widely accepted.

As we are willing to share, we ought to be willing to listen. Possibly, I am convinced, we will find that there is much that we can put together in terms of a larger concept of truth if we are open to ideas from other sources. Upon our wall, there is a Chinese couplet from the writings of Mo Tzu. Translated, it means "Universal mutual love brings mutual benefit." Now that fits beautifully, it seems to me, with the Judeo-Christian teaching: "Love God with all your heart, soul, mind, and strength and love your neighbor as yourself." There is nothing incompatible between them. There is an enrichment there, at least in my experience, for which I am very grateful. Long before the time of Jesus, Mo Tzu said that the best way to understand Shangti, or God, was love. Love was the heart of the universe; therefore, in terms of our relationship with others, we should seek to express that love.

Mo Tzu, though historically treated as a rival of Confucius, never thought of himself as anti-Confucian. For him the problem was that Confucius limited the concept of love, or "jen" to just the "five relationships." But, asked Mo Tzu, in effect, what about people who aren't related either as friend or child or spouse or teacher or government

superior or subordinate? What about others? Mo Tzu wanted to extend "love" to all these relationships. We can expand the concept of love to include all, and many are trying to do that now in 1979. Most of us still find it difficult, even when we think of love in the "agape" sense, to really include people when they differ very profoundly from us. What I'm getting at is that I'm convinced that we need not be afraid of enrichment from other sources; and actually if there is a sharing process--this has, I think, been discovered again and again--you probably are going to have to dig down deeper into your own faith, in order to be able to communicate effectively.

That's what I think of in terms of my debt to Latourette. There were others, too; but Latourette helped very greatly and encouraged all of his students to approach Chinese culture, and approach culture generally, with that kind of an openness and keen interest.

I: Before you went out, what did you see as the purpose of Yale-in-China?

FULTON: We had been told by people who had been back that the purpose was to share not only our faith, and that was certainly there; but also to share what we could as representatives of the type of thing that Yale University stood for in terms of studies and cultural development, which would include not only one's own culture but other cultures as well. Also, the medical aspect was very strong; the first president of Yale-in-China being an M.D.--Dr. Edward H. Hume.

In the middle school (like junior and senior high school here) we were called "bachelors," meaning that we had just gotten our B.A. degrees. They didn't feel that we were ready to work in the medical school or the college, but they thought we could go out to teach--primarily to teach English--in a junior and senior middle school.

Broadening it a bit, it was our purpose to go out and help with the educational enterprise as a whole, in the context of inter-cultural, international sharing. I am sure that Frank Hutchins wouldn't have asked me, or anyone else, to go if he thought I was going to go out there to "Americanize" people. There was no desire to "Americanize," but to share whatever we could of our own cultural knowledge and experience, but, again, in the framework of real respect for others.

When I said I would go, Frank Hutchins said to me, in effect, "Don't spend too much time with Americans. You'll see other Americans and you will want to meet them, but you can talk with Americans here. Really get to know the Chinese. This may be your only chance to do that, so get acquainted with your Chinese colleagues on the faculty. Really get to know your students; don't just keep it to the classrooms. Go off on hikes with them. Open yourself up--this is an enriching responsibility."

Then Frank went on to say that there were two Americans who were then in China who probably knew more about China in a scholarly sense than many Chinese. "There may be others, but these two are the ones I think are outstanding. If you possibly can, get to know them and 'pick their brains.' You will learn more about China and the Chinese people from them than from a lot of just plain reading." One, he said, was John Leighton Stuart, whom I had heard about--he was president of Yenching University--and the other one was Dwight Edwards.

Dwight Edwards was with the YMCA doing relief work and also helping with Yenching.

When I got out to China, I realized how valuable much of his advice had been. My first Christmas vacation I got up to Peking and worked it out somehow that I was able to meet Dr. Stuart and talk with him. Later on I was able to enrich that experience by going to Yenching. Also, I called on Dwight Edwards and talked with him, and he courteously introduced me to his wife. It was eight years later than that that I met his daughter Anne. I came to know Dwight Edwards as father-in-law and appreciated that relationship, but I never really thought of him fundamentally as a relative. I thought of him as a teacher in the classic sense--one from whom one sought to learn all that he could; and I did learn a great deal.

He had an incredibly rich experience, service in China from 1906 to 1950. He knew Sun Yat-sen and his wife very well and many of the others who were involved in that period. Later, he knew Mao Tse-tung and Chiang Kai-shek and other people on both sides of the civil war. Somehow he maintained an independent integrity which made it possible for him to keep his friendships with people on both sides of many serious conflicts.

I: How effective was the Bachelor program at Yale-in-China since you were out there for such a limited time?

FULTON: Actually, I stayed for two years. I went out for one year and within about six weeks, I knew that I couldn't possibly leave at the end of the year. I think it was a very valuable experience. Incidentally, the program is still continuing; even though from 1950 on it has not been possible for Americans to work on the Mainland, there is a Yale-in-China (now "Yale-China")--a relationship with the Chinese University in Hong Kong.

Now we send out "bachelor" women as well as men because of Yale's having become co-educational. The bachelors now have more careful preparation before they go, especially the study of Chinese language and they help at the college level. I think it has been very useful. By that I don't mean that we were all tremendous teachers, but I feel sure we helped somewhat. And it was certainly a very broadening experience for us.

The main thrust was to help the Chinese; but Yale-in-China always thought it of some value to have a fairly extensive number of Americans who would not only help support Yale-in-China, but who would permeate their communities with a respect for international cooperation. There were three of us who went out together and, of course, we cooperated with those who had gone the year before and then later with those who came the year after.

Then later when I went back during the war period as representative of the Trustees, I got to know the bachelors that were there at that time. I don't think I ever ran into anyone who didn't find it a deepening experience. Most of them, in one way or another, have carried on their international interests and responsibilities. I think it was worthwhile; I really do. Of course, Yale-in-China also sent out medical personnel and trained doctors and nurses, but I think this "bachelor" cooperation was meaningful for all concerned. Certainly it was for me.

I: After you decided to go, would you describe your preparations and then your journey en route to China?

FULTON: There wasn't any special training program at that time, as there is now. They recommended some books, especially Latourette's. Two of us decided to drive across

country in an old Model A Ford and there were many interesting experiences en route which I won't burden you with. This was in 1933 that we were leaving. We had a brief time in Honolulu; then still more meaningful to me, we had about two weeks in Japan. We went up the Yangtze River by river boat from Shanghai to Wuchang and then down to Changsha by train.

When we got there, it was almost time to start teaching, so we had to prepare as quickly as we could. We lived in what was called the "Bachelors' Mess," which was a very good name for it, technically it was the mess hall, but it meant "mess" in another sense, too. Several of us lived there and Frank stayed there when he came back. He wasn't married at that time. We were fed by a very lovely cook who humored us as far as reasonable, but made us be sure we were on time for meals. We were given a very generous and cordial welcome by the faculty people led by C.C. Lao and K.S. Ying and H.H. Chao.

Dwight Rugh was at that time a more permanent appointee. He and his wife and daughter were there and they were very helpful American colleagues. Dwight and his wife, Winifred, and I have kept in touch by mail through the years, they being still active in a retirement home in Waverly, Ohio, at this point.

It was a bit of a shock to go into a class, not knowing more than a smattering of Chinese and having to make a go from there; and, of course, we had some classes of students who hadn't had any English to speak of. We had some good texts with teacher guidance material, telling of some of the work that had been done before and encouraging the maximum use of demonstrations such as "I am walking to the door; I am opening the door," etc. Although there wasn't a regular Chinese language school there at that time, it was possible to have contact with a tutor and we all did that, spending as much time as could learning the language.

Then we would go off occasionally, chiefly on Saturday afternoons, for hikes crossing the Hsiang River and going up Yo Lo Shan and so on. I don't think I've ever found it easier to make friends anywhere than at Yali, and not only with colleagues but with students and other people that I met. Anne and I have been personally pained by these years of "pretend" with China--that cut the U.S. off from what actually is the government of China--because we have been out of touch with our friends. We had quite a good library about the Chinese people and their history that had been built up there for use of the "bachelors" and others; this helped us understand our experiences.

This isn't anything that I discovered, but one of the things that struck me was what you might call "interest in being practical"--the utilitarianism in the best sense. I found Chinese interested in really making things work. It wasn't just that you start with ideas; you tried to relate them to actual problems and experiences. Then, also, there was their sense of humor. I think the Americans and Chinese are rather alike in those respects. There was a joy in living that I sensed in the Chinese and it was lots of fun to get out and play with the students. I wasn't much of an athlete, but you could be absorbed very quickly in soccer, basketball, going out on hikes, etc. It was a very, very rich experience. Although I came back to the U.S. after two years with no firm intention of going back to China, when the opportunity came to do so, I just jumped at it.

Let me say one other thing at this point: That in the past Americans were as cooperative with the Chinese as they were with citizens of any other country; I think that is one of the reasons there is so much hope now. It wasn't that Americans didn't make some mistakes; but America never got involved in anything like the Opium wars that Britain was involved in or

the seizing of property as were Japan and Russia and France and some other countries. It did profit from the "Most Favored Nation Clause" by some of the unfair advantages that war produced for others; but I think it used this policy, at least sometimes, with the intent of trying to keep in touch with other foreign powers so as to prevent them from going too far. By being involved in some kind of a partnership, we were able to be in on the decision-making. I think at least you can say that America tempered, or restrained, imperialism.

One of the things that disturbed me was that there were American gun boats, right there in the Changsha Harbor with their guns trained on downtown Changsha.* The guns were usually covered and nothing happened in the period I was there, but I absolutely loathed the whole policy. Every time we went across to Yo Lo Shan, we would pass those gun boats. I made it very clear to the students that I utterly disapproved of their being there; and I refused invitations to tea on these boats. Some of the Yale-in-China people and others felt I was very strange, but I absolutely refused to set foot on any gun boat.

If gun boat personnel came to Yali, up to the Bachelors' Mess, I wouldn't refuse to speak to them, for, of course, they were persons. But to me, it was important not to have any association with gun boat diplomacy and to make it clear to the students why I felt that way. I think that may have helped a bit. I didn't do it, I hope, to get any advantage from it; but I think that if one is willing to express disapproval of somethings connected with one's own country, that opens the door to a deeper level of communication. Anyway, I found the whole relationship very, very meaningful. As I say, I have never found it possible to make friends more easily than in China--then and later on when I went back.

*There were American gunboats, as well as Japanese and British gunboats.

I: How would your students respond when you would make this comment about the gunboats?

FULTON: They would listen and watch you pretty closely to be sure you weren't just "making a speech," but rather expressing your real view. At least, that is the impression I had. Then they would say, "We agree," and go on from there. It wasn't that we would get into long political discussions. After all, I was 22 and they were junior and high school students; but I think the communication was genuine.

Later on, at Huachung College, when Anne and I got back to China, similar disavowals of certain things we felt were wrong did lead to some real discussions with students. I think they appreciated it just as you or I would appreciate it if somebody from another country would speak critically of something in their heritage that we thought was wrong; it would pave the way for a deeper level of communication. When I was at Yenching, I got to know a British chap who was the editor of the Peking Chronicle--a wonderful guy. He and I belonged to a group that met from time to time to have discussions on current events. We would take turns leading. When it was his turn, he simply went over the whole history of Britain's relationship to China with appreciation where he felt it and vigorous criticism of what he considered wrong--the Opium War and later things that the British Army had done, the destruction of the old Summer Palace and so on, and the whole imperialist attitude.

I thanked him and sent him a letter later on. It made it much easier for him and me to talk frankly. Also I talked to some of the Chinese that were there, and how they appreciated his frankness, being willing to criticize his own country! But he told me later that the Britishers present really "took him to pieces." "What in the world would you do a thing like that for? You shouldn't say anything like that

to anybody but British people. You should never criticize Britain before Americans or Chinese."

That is the reverse of what I am talking about and that I think, unfortunately, is too often what happens. Americans as well as British and others are apt, if they are not careful, to cling together when abroad. But if you show your capacity to think in larger terms, if you are willing to relate as persons, not fundamentally as Chinese or British or American, in saying what you feel ought to be said regardless of nationality, I think that is an asset in terms of opening up opportunities for people to have real discussion and cooperation.

I: Would you comment further on what the foreign community's response in Changsha was to extraterritoriality?

FULTON: I wish I could answer that in a meaningful way. I was fairly quickly typed as odd by the more traditionally "patriotic" individuals. By that I mean those who could say: "My country right or wrong; but right or wrong, my country." (I'd agree with the one who said, "My country right or wrong; when it's right, support it; when it's wrong, correct it.") There were a few teachers and the gunboat people themselves, who were like that--fortunately, not too many missionaries.

I think there has been an unfair generalization that has gotten around recently among some groups about missionaries being usually pretty closely tied-in with imperialist actions. Three or four weeks ago, I went to a local church when there was a guest minister from the School of Religion in Iowa City who had just been over to China with the U.S.-China People's Friendship Association. 85 percent of what he said I felt was just superb, in his analysis of some of the achievements of the present government. Then he went on to

generalize about the past in a way that made me writhe, implying that most missionaries had been very close to the whole imperialist structure. That led members of the congregation, if they believed him, to accept the stereotype of missionaries as "running dogs of the imperialists." I went up afterwards and tried to get him to broaden his views, but he would hardly listen.

What he said may have been true of some. But I'm convinced that in the main, this was not the case. I think many people were much more concerned with real inter-cultural cooperation. And they didn't want the kind of special privilege that "extraterritoriality" claimed.

I: What was the make-up of the foreign community in Changsha?

FULTON: Most of the Americans there were church-oriented in church missions. There was quite a variety. The Presbyterian Church had quite a number and the Methodists and the Evangelical Association and the Dutch Reform, etc. We were the only college-oriented group--the Yale-in-China group. There was another middle school--a Presbyterian Girls' School; Yali was only for boys. The girls' middle school there had some American staff women under the Presbyterian Church. There was one person recently arrived, Marjorie Tooker, whom we saw quite often and had a lot in common with. She had just graduated from Wellesley. At any rate, except for the Yale-in-China staff, they were all church-oriented groups. Then we had a lot of experiences in common with people from other cities, for Changsha was right on the north-south railway line so that the people would come through for vacation trips or after conferences, etc.

It was an interesting community, but there again, I took Frank Hutchins's advice very seriously to focus on getting to know Chinese people. Obviously those of us who worked

together in the Bachelors' Mess saw a good bit of each other. And across the road was a very lovely family, an American family, Dr. and Mrs. Phillips Greene and their three children. Ruth Greene was another graduate of Wellesley, a classmate of Madame Chiang Kai-shek's and was a good friend of hers. They took special interest in trying to help us who had just come out, because they were long-term appointees. Phil was a top-flight surgeon and Ruth was a marvelous person who took us "under her wing," so to speak. She would invite us in for various meetings she thought we might be interested in, as well as frequently having us over for meals.

We also had a very meaningful Sunday afternoon opportunity--an inter-denominational vespers service at the Hunan Bible Institute which was led by a very conservative theological group. But they were not separatists. This was an English vespers which was attended, incidentally, by a considerable number of Chinese who had studied in this country and liked to go to sing some English hymns, etc. The general agreement was that the participants agreed to disagree theologically, but to respect one another. Usually the ministers in the group would take turns leading the service and stay afterwards for discussion.

I'd like to tell one funny story about these services, if I may. The head of the Hunan Bible Institute was about as open as you can imagine an extremely theologically conservative person could be, but on one occasion he couldn't contain himself. A Swedish missionary had read from a modern translation of the Bible. Normally, we used the authorized "King James Version" for the scriptures; but the Swedish missionary had done what everybody does now occasionally--he had brought and read from the 20th Century English translation, because he liked the way a particular idea of St. Paul's was expressed in there.

Afterwards, this lovely person from the Bible institute got up and said, "We must be open, but please can't we all stick to the same text of the Bible? After all what was good enough for St. Paul should be good enough for us." I can remember how some of us looked around and almost guffawed--to think about Paul's using the Authorized King James English version of the Bible!

On the whole, it was a pretty open, cooperative community. Incidentally, you know that the ecumenical movement began about 1910 at the Stockholm Conference but basically it was started by those who had gotten to know each other on the mission field. It didn't make sense, obviously, to take too seriously that one is a "Northern Presbyterian" or "Southern Presbyterian" in Central China! But, again, I spent much more time with the Chinese. I look back with special gratitude to working with the dean, who was a marvelous person.

I also got to know a good many of the Chinese doctors and nurses. It was partly the result of the earlier contacts that made it possible to work together as easily as we did in the reconstruction period. After the end of the war, one of the doctors I had gotten to know in the earlier period and one of the middle school people and I made our way back to Changsha. I was the second American to get back a bit after Win Pettus. We started off not knowing what was going to happen and traveled together, first by bus and boat and then the last 100 miles we hiked. That wouldn't have been so easy to do except for a foundation of equal respect and affection and trust in this earlier period.

I: What difficulties, if any, did you have in your teaching responsibilities?

FULTON: Oh, nothing more than just the situation of having to learn as you went along. Although I majored in English, I hadn't taken any courses in teaching English and certainly not teaching the language to people of a different culture. Although they gave us whatever teaching material was available, you couldn't just stick to the text; and it was the sheer challenge of adjusting to a situation I'd never faced before that was so exciting. I hope I did better the second year than the first!

You pick up techniques and so on. A lot has been done since then and more is available in terms of text materials. Two or three years ago, I was trying to help some Vietnam refugees learn English and the material I used in that course would have been most helpful if we had had it in China. A lot has been done in terms of speed-up courses in language, especially since World War II, as you know, and I think this is really a valuable addition. I don't recall any massive problems that developed. It was a lot of fun; and the young people certainly seemed to learn something in the process.

I: Would you discuss more about your students at this time-- their interests, concerns and goals?

FULTON: I haven't discussed one of the big factors of the background. If you will recall, '33-'35 was the period when Chiang Kai-shek was trying to wipe out Mao Tse-tung "and company." He had pushed the Communists up into the mountains in Kiangsi Province and was building roads and trying to encircle them. He hoped to either exterminate them or force them to surrender.

It became increasingly obvious the Communists weren't going to give in. What they would do was very much in people's minds, both students and faculty. One very real possibility was that they would break out of their hideaway

up in the Kiangsi Mountains and come right down to Changsha and then make a stand there. Mao Tse-tung's family was in the Changsha area. He'd gone to school there and this was something that everybody knew. What the Communists actually did later was to go south and clear on around Hunan before heading north. You know the route of the Long March. But coming through Changsha was a very real possibility. That was pretty much the political situation and there was a lot of talk about it. Of course, at that point, the Nationalist Government was in charge, so there wasn't any open sympathy expressed for the Communists. I don't remember any vivid discussions, but simply an awareness that the Communists were there and that they might come to Changsha.

I: Along this line did you have periods of student strikes and days of humiliation parades and things like this?

FULTON: I don't recall anything like that. Every Monday morning we had a patriotic assembly which was required, with Sun Yat-sen's picture displayed prominently. Everyone was supposed to be there, Americans as well. That was the way in which patriotic concern was regularly expressed; Sun Yat-sen's will was read and then we would sing the stirring "San Min Chu-I" anthem. Then there would be a patriotic statement, usually given by a school official and, of course, supportive of the Chiang government.

I suspect they may have been under some pressure because this was an international institution, and it was well to be known publicly as supportive of Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang. So, Chiang and his party were the ones who were praised as in the tradition of Sun Yat-sen and they were supposed to be the legitimate heirs of Dr. Sun. I can't remember any student strikes at all. I think that was pretty much in the past.

It is jumping ahead again, but one of the things that hit me when I got down to Changsha during the period before the turnover in 1949 was the change in the way in which the same school leaders spoke of the government. They now spoke of "they," not "our" government. The Nationalists were "they" and the Communists were "they." I had a feeling at that point the educated people felt very much as though they couldn't support either. They were almost in a league by themselves; they couldn't say "our" government because they felt that the government had let them down so badly with the double inflation, etc. They weren't ready to say "our" government in terms of the Communists, but the shift from first person pronoun to the third person pronoun was very noticeable.

I: Would you comment on vocationally what the students were most interested in at this point? How did they view their future involvements?

FULTON: I don't have any statistics to be sure, but I think most of the students were hoping very much to go on to college or medical or nursing school. That was pretty much all I remember in terms of ambition. I don't have any vivid recollections of specific vocational interests, other than these. It was a rather privileged "crew" that we had. We had people who paid certain fees, more than they would have paid if they had gone to a public school, because I think most of them wanted very much to get a real grasp on the language; and it wasn't possible in any place in Changsha but the Presbyterian Girls' School or Yali to have teachers who used English as their native language. It was known that that was very helpful if you were going on to college.

I suppose many of them hoped to go on into professional or government work. I don't recall any particular conversations or a group of meetings that focused on professions, but there was a deep interest in language. They really worked at it. Of course, this was a terrific help to us because we weren't trying to force English down their throats. They wanted to learn. Oh, there were some who goofed off, but that is just natural. Most of the students were very cooperative. I suppose all this helped a little bit to encourage them to invite you to go out for Saturday afternoon walks, to talk naturally, and so on.

I: Was Yale-in-China criticized because they were training too much of an elite?

FULTON: I don't recall any such criticism, partly because Yale-in-China was one of the founders of the indigenous leadership movement in mission institutions. I am not sure which was the pioneer--I may be wrong in narrowing it down to two--but as far as I have been able to find out, it was either the YMCA under Dwight Edward's leadership or Yale-in-China. Let's say they were both pioneers in as quickly as possible turning over positions of leadership to the Chinese; they had no desire to perpetuate American control.

Dr. Hume was president of the total Yale-in-China enterprise not more than five or six years--just to get the enterprise started. He stayed on for many years, but as a colleague. As quickly as possible there was a Chinese head of the medical school; a Chinese head of the college; also one of the high schools. The Americans assumed their role was that of cooperators and they came only when invited. You arrived with an awareness that there was an open door and a desire for you to be there. They were usually asking for more rather than fewer Americans. That was a real asset in my judgment.

There was nothing that I sensed in any Yale-in-China person of cultural imperialism. The doctor was there because he had more experience with surgical techniques; he was deeply Christian in his orientation and shared his views, but he wasn't trying to force anything on anybody. We "bachelors" were there to give what was wanted because the Chinese realized that China needed modern medical facilities and English and contact with the outside world.

I: How about instruction for the students in their history and culture?

FULTON: About 70-80 percent of their time studying was led by Chinese and they had good courses on Chinese history and culture. I don't think there was any opposition from students concerning the multi-cultural heritage that was being transmitted. This two-year period was for me an eye-opening experience in terms of the exciting possibilities of living with Chinese people. This, incidentally, is one of the things that prevented any implication of imperialism. All of the permanent faculty were housed in identical housing on the same campus. The Americans didn't live any better than the Chinese. They shifted houses from time to time; therefore, there was no gap between the two groups.

Foreigners in the general mission enterprise sometimes lived above the standards of their colleagues, but I think this occurred more in India and in Africa. At any rate, everybody at Yale-in-China was on a par and our salaries were just enough to get along on. I am sure that the doctor and his wife got a higher salary than I but nobody was making money. (When I got back home after two years I had 67 cents in my pocket!) The houses were largely western-style, not elaborate, but they had running water and all of that. Again, the Chinese and the Americans lived on the same scale.

I certainly recall the antagonism--sometimes spoken and sometimes you could just feel it--with regard to the gun boats. As I think back on it, it still makes me mad. How would you feel if you went up the Hudson River or the Mississippi and found some Russian or British gun boats with guns directed right at the city hall so that if things went wrong, they could be fired? Now I suspect, again, that the American gun boats were there--at least I hope this is the case--in order not to seem to be antagonistic to the other western powers, thereby helping to temper the whole situation. But I think it was a mistaken policy.

I: How open were the students at this point in their response to Christianity?

FULTON: We had a quite active Christian fellowship which was entirely voluntary. We had chapel services which were quite well--but voluntarily--attended. I remember the Christian fellowship met in the evening and the leaders were members of the Chinese faculty. We never had any Americans, as leaders, only occasionally as speakers. I was asked to come and speak at one time with regard to Dwight Hall and what that Christian association was all about. I thought it was quite open and I liked the voluntary aspect of it, though perhaps some students may have come because they thought it was a good thing to be seen there by Chinese and westerners.

All of our middle school officials, the "three big heads," were Christians. But that was not true of all the faculty. Many of the medical faculty were not professing Christians. There were no anti-Christian people that I ran

into in the Yale-in-China enterprise; but Yenching University, where I taught later on, had a number of very articulate non-Christians and actually that led to very interesting discussions. I think in Changsha, there was openness and very real interest and no sense of compulsion that I sensed at all.

As you know, the church has lost in numbers in this interim period since 1949, but there is evidence that I trust that Christianity has not died out. I think the church has become largely like the New Testament Churches--with house-worship type meetings. I suspect that the ones who have continued are far more deeply oriented in terms of their Christian commitment than otherwise would have been the case. It is easy to be a member of the church if it is "the thing to do;" but it isn't easy if that is not the case.

One of the things I am looking forward to is getting back to China and contacting some of these friends. I wouldn't be at all surprised if things keep going the way they are now that, there could be renewal of dialogue between Christians of China and others in the West. I don't expect there will be a renewal of the founding of high schools and medical schools and college, etc. I hope there will be some real dialogue and among those things we can possibly talk about will be church experiences and Christian commitment. I wouldn't be at all surprised to find Chinese fellow Christians who might come and do more to re-invigorate churches here than we may be able to help them out over there.

I: How did you decide to return to the United States via U.S.S.R. after your two years were up?

FULTON: I had always been interested in that country, in that area. As you know, there was a "make believe period" in regard to Russia as there has been with regard to China. You know of the long period between the Russian Revolution and recognition of the Soviet Union in which we ignored them. This had changed when Roosevelt came to office in 1932. The new situation had real interest for me, as for many others. But more directly, the person who had done more than any other person I had known, to prepare the way in an effort to better understand the Soviet Union and its people, was Sherwood Eddy. He had visited Russia again and again and then had come back and spoken and written about it; and I had heard him speak and read his articles and books.

Sherwood Eddy was out on one of his four or five evangelistic tours in China and stayed with us in the Bachelors' Mess when he was in Changsha. We had real conversations there at Yali and I also attended meetings downtown in one of the larger churches. Are you a great admirer of Billy Graham? You don't have to answer that. I am not and I don't go in for these current evangelistic programs on T.V. I am not opposed, but I just cringe a little bit. But Sherwood was not like that. His was a tremendous witness of Christian faith, but it was always related to social responsibility. This was one of the things that I think is so lacking in our current evangelistic movement. The Christian commitment had been virtually reduced to saying, "I accept the Lord Jesus and now I am saved and isn't it wonderful." Well, but then what? Sherwood went on with "then what." If we are ready to commit ourselves to Christian discipleship, then what does it mean in terms of real service to other people, in our own country and other areas?

There was never anything imperialistic about Eddy's approach, and also he was very, very insistent on follow-through. He didn't ask you to come up and be baptized or "be saved," but he always asked at the end of the meeting if any of those present would like to continue their concern. "Come up and let me chat with you and get your names and introduce you to others with whom you may talk." Then each name would be referred to a local pastor. If he would find no church orientation, then the referral would have to be arbitrary; but if there already was a church affiliation, then he would follow-through in terms of contact with the appropriate people. Eddy really took this part seriously.

When he told us he was having another of his trips to Russia that next summer, I asked if I could be included and he said I could if I could get there at the right time. He was bringing others, teachers and students, from the West. I was able to coordinate my trip north to Manchuria and across Siberia so that we arrived in Moscow on the same day. What an experience that was: It lasted approximately 19 days. We shared his leadership and, of course, he had made contact with many people there. Incidentally, that was right after the Kirov Incident, and almost nobody could get into the Kremlin that summer. I had a letter from the New York Times editor, Adolph Ochs, to Walter Duranty, in Moscow. I called on Mr. Duranty and he said during our conversation, "I am so sorry that you can't get into the Kremlin because of this whole situation." I couldn't tell him that I was going the next day--permission having been granted to the Eddy group.

Then we got clear off the main line. Sherwood Eddy had a contact with a group down on a cooperative farm in the southern part of the Soviet Union. It was made up entirely of Russians who had lived in America, who left under the Czars and then returned after the Revolution. The chief advantage was that nearly all of them spoke English and they had been in New Haven and New York (in the U.S.), and other places so we could talk very freely. I remember going off for a long bicycle ride with a young chap about my age and we just chatted as freely as I can imagine two young fellows chatting anywhere. It was a--again--great experience.

I: How was your group received by the Russians?

FULTON: Very openly, particularly down on the farm. The rest of the visit had been pretty much arranged. We went to the usual places, the great museums, famous churches, etc. You might think Sherwood Eddy was one who toadied to get these privileges, but he wasn't. We had meetings every evening while in Moscow with Sherwood chairing and inviting persons from different units of the government to come in and speak. On one occasion, when some questions were asked, the one Communist party official did not answer openly and a couple of times said, "I don't know." I remember Sherwood's saying, in effect, "Do you mean to tell me that you don't know that? Why don't you have the guts to say that you just won't share it with us? Don't pull that stuff on us." This was to a man from the Polit-Bureau. Sherwood was absolutely fearless. What a person he was!

Later when I was at Lake Forest College, he came out and spoke and stayed in our home for some time, and I got to know him even better. I also went on one of his summer trips to Washington, D.C. There were people from Washington on the seminar who said they learned more about what was really going on during that week, than from years of living there.

I: Was Sherwood Eddy able to preach in Russia?

FULTON: He didn't have anything like an evangelistic service. But, again, he'd say whatever he wanted to say. (This is not related to your question, but it comes to mind as what happened just after the Eddy seminar. As you know, things were getting very rough in Germany. I had been very active in the World Student Christian Federation in college and had some contacts there which meant a great deal to me. I was able to see something of the "confessing church" in Germany--the group who didn't get along with the Nazi Christians. I was at one great conference in a church where Niemoeller got up and spoke. There were Nazi uniformed agents around. Niemoeller was put in jail the next morning. He ended up by expressing his own commitments and finished with Luther's "Here I stand. I can do no other. God help me!" This was in German, of course. And then they sang Luther's great hymn, "A Mighty Fortress is Our God." It was one of the most tremendous experiences I've ever had. I was next to a member of the confessing church who said, "He speaks for all of us." But most people weren't willing to speak out because it was dangerous.

Then I went to the World Student Christian Federation Conference in Switzerland before returning to New York City to study at Union Seminary.)

I: Before you went to Manchuria, how much did you know about the Japanese build-up in the North?

FULTON: It was well-known and this was one of the reasons why there was the tremendous patriotic loyalty to the Kuomintang as defenders in those Monday services. We were all really aware of it. As far as our faculty were concerned and students, the Kuomintang was the one hope of the government. I think that whatever history says about Chiang Kai-shek, it's got to include that he played a magnificent role in terms of "holding on," perhaps because he was so stubborn and just wouldn't give in. He was courageous to the nth degree.

While I was in Changsha, there was a movement that was almost separatist in the province just south of Hunan, Kweichow. There were two very strong leaders there, one civilian and one military, who were threatening to pull out of the Kuomintang government. Chiang flew there alone, except for the pilot. He went without any guns, not even a revolver, and confronted those persons and demanded their loyalty. The sheer courage of the man impressed them so much that they gave in to what he insisted on--united effort.

Whatever his mistakes or lack of successes, later, certainly I think he played a tremendous historic role, and I am personally convinced that he was a man of integrity. I think, however, he was blind to some of the shenanigans that some of his relatives and associates were guilty of; but I have never run into anything that convinced me that Chiang himself was not an honest and true patriot. His stubbornness, which was so valuable at this period, was not an asset later on, and he became a tragic figure.

ADDENDUM

Four years later I was able to attend a conference in Japan put on by the National Conference of Churches of Japan. It was very quietly arranged to take advantage of the presence that summer of missionaries from China. One man who was there was M. Searle Bates. He was over chiefly because he had been right in Nanking and he had gone through that terrible Nanking Incident. Bates was there and Luther Tucker. Luther was a World Christian Federation man and he had invited me. We had first-hand awareness to all of this of what was going on because Searle Bates in his quiet, almost restrained manner laid the whole thing open as to what had happened. The Japanese Christians, at first, tried not to face the thing. But as he went on they all faced it. There was a time of deep repentance, but even that was dangerous because the meeting was probably spied on.

We were well-aware of the danger of the Japanese and the possibility of defeat was there all the time. It was very shortly afterwards that the campuses moved inland. When I got back there during the war, it was my privilege of having contact with these same people, though they were located at three different places at that time. The middle school and nursing school were in Yuanling, up in the mountains of Hunan. The college was way up in Hsichow beyond Kunming in Yunan and the Hsiang-ya Medical School was in the Kweiyang area. My job at that time was serving as representative of the trustees--what Frank had done before. I was to move around to keep in touch with the Yale-in-China institutions in order to be able to write back to New Haven to keep them up-to-date on what was going on and also to give encouragement and that sort of thing. The Japanese thought they had come to the point of virtual conquest; but they were again thwarted by the great courage of Chiang and his colleagues.

I: After returning from Changsha, what was your next educational involvement and how did that relate to your China experiences?

FULTON: You can imagine that coming back to the U.S. in '35, when Mao Tse-tung and the whole group that went on the Long March, were on their way, and having had the experience of some contacts under Sherwood Eddy's leadership with some very interesting people in the Soviet Union, I was interested, among other things, in becoming less uninformed as to what the whole Marxist movement was all about. I had gone to college with relatively little exposure to anything but the most superficial treatment of Communism. I had read some of Sherwood Eddy's books which were very helpful and others by Harry Ward, a Union professor, but I needed more.

I had already decided to go to Union because of Father's suggestion that Union had such interesting people on the faculty. I suppose the most famous were Reinhold Niebuhr and Paul Tillich; Tillich came over from Germany the first year I was there, or the summer before, and I was very excited about both of them. I took every course they offered.

But not only were these more newsworthy people there, but President Henry Sloane Coffin brought rich experience and his own keen mind to his work as both teacher and president. Henry Pitt Van Dusen was there and was a very able student and teacher of systematic theology. Then we had people in the Biblical field who were very excellent. Bewer, a German scholar, taught by carefully structuring the thought of the Old Testament, as did Scott with regard to New Testament. Both the Lymans, Eugene and Mary were on the faculty as was William Adams.

Harry F. Ward was the professor whom some critics accused of being Communist-oriented, but he really wasn't. He was world-oriented and thought it absurd, as did Sherwood Eddy, to pretend that Soviet Russia didn't exist; I am sure that a lot of his writing had quite a bit to do with what became the change in policy. Incidentally, I think in terms of educational techniques, Ward was the best teacher I ever met.

Niebuhr, though, was the one who was most challenging to me. One of the things that hit me was his question to the class during the first week: "How many of you have ever read anything that Karl Marx ever wrote?" I hadn't even read the Communist Manifesto, let alone Das Kapital. I wasn't even sure who Engels was. It seemed absurd that nearly all of us in class were in that predicament. Niebuhr argued, in effect, "You just can't come to grips as would-be church servants in our day without at least knowing

something of that important movement." So it was at his insistence that I read some key Marxist writings; and I found myself with a very different impression than I had expected. As a result of that, and because I was sure I would be keeping in touch with China and learning more news about the development of the Eighth Route Army and the Communist movement, I decided to major in Ethics with Niebuhr, and my graduation thesis was A Christian Critique of the Marxist Approach to the Problem of Social Change.

When I came back after the Yenching experience and decided I was probably going to go into the teaching area, I decided I had to get a "teacher's union card," a Ph.D. I went back to New Haven this time to the graduate school which worked in cooperation with the divinity school in the area of religious studies. It was my advisor in Social Ethics, Leston Pope, who said I could use the material from my Union thesis but that I should compare Marx with some other figure; and he suggested one who is usually thought of as the antithesis of Marx--Adam Smith. I had never read anything of his writing but a chapter or two of the Wealth of Nations and knew he was connected with laissez faire economics, and that was about it. The resulting study that led to a dissertation was focused on the effort to get down to what was the metaphysical base of their underlying philosophies--The Problem of Religious Assumptions in the Systems of Adam Smith and Karl Marx. I discovered much that I had never known about Smith as well as about Marx and Engels. He was only partially concerned with the subject of economics. Basically he was an ethics teacher, a professor of "moral philosophy" in Scotland.

I think it is a mistake to speak of Marx and Engels as atheists. It depends on how you define "atheist." If it is anyone who has a different concept of God than I have, or than you have, a lot of other people are "atheists." But if you should take Elton Trueblood's suggestion that "atheism" involves fundamentally the idea that there is no meaning in the universe, that what you and I think of as purpose and the capacity to reason are just found in persons, and that this is a happenstance development, this is something quite different. This would mean that there is nothing for you and me to relate to in the universe! It is merely atoms in motion.

Now if that is "atheism," then Marx and Engels are not atheists. We can go on to deal with "theism" as that which every Christian, Jew, Muslim, and other "religionist" affirms, that however inadequate our knowledge, there is meaning in the universe; and we can relate our lives to the source of that meaning. It may be called God; it may be called Shangti or Yahweh; or it may be called the ultimate principle of being. Whatever the varying titles, and I am not saying that the difference in approach in the different religions is insignificant, there is an underlying affirmation of meaning.

As so understood, I would say that Marx and Engels stand with those who affirm the theistic rather than atheistic approach. Marx and Engels were extremely critical of organized religion in their time, primarily because of what they thought was its insensitivity to the sufferings of people. Marx was going to be a professor of philosophy, but expressed some views that were somewhat variant from

those of the leaders of the religion-educational establishment of his time. His career was abruptly ended as a result. As an alternative he went into newspaper work and was assigned to study the labor movement and was simply appalled at what he found. In that area, mining was actually done by women and children, little children. Their lives were often cut short, and Marx was indignant.

I was looking awhile back at a comment I wrote on the last page of my copy of Das Kapital after just finishing it--which says, "one of the prophets." By that I don't meant a predictor, but rather one who is "speaking" for another -- in the Bible, for God. If you didn't know where they came from, you might think that certain passages from Das Kapital were 19th Century versions of some of the things Amos and Isaiah and Micah wrote--passionate denunciations of oppression.

I became convinced that there are at least three basic religious presuppositions in the Marxist system. One is that the universe has meaning, however inadequately understood. Another is the "worthfulness" of people--everybody, not just the elite, and that any injustice must be fought. Then there is the possibility of progress--that we are not caught in an endless trap. This is why I call Marxism, in its original sense, a semi-religious movement. It doesn't have the theological development of a full religion--and I am not talking about its goodness or "badness." I am simply saying it is not something to be categorized as atheism. It is much more profound than that. Certainly you know that there is a Marxist-Christian dialogue that has recently been going on in Europe and in the United States, and I think with the "opening" of China there will be some significant developments in this area.

I: After you finished Union, how did you get a position at Yenching?

FULTON: I didn't go right after seminary to Yenching. I had an interest in sociology and related this to a social settlement venture--a lot of very valuable experience on the lower East Side of New York in relation to the Henry Street and other settlements. It was a church venture--an Episcopal Church venture. I was trying to relate young people, volunteers, to social settlement activity. I also took some work at the New York School for Social Research--the history of economic thought, primarily. I was not sure what the next professional step was going to be. I assumed I was headed towards the pastoral ministry; but I didn't want to get into the whole approach that involves seeking to go step by step up the "professional ladder."

Also, I felt the need for further experience before I could be an effective pastor. So I just thought I would take a few years more, either in settlement house activity or something else of that nature in order to get more experience.

Then one day I got a call from Dean Van Dusen, asking me to come to his office. He said that word had come from Yenching University of an opportunity there. (Van Dusen was, incidentally, a Princeton graduate and was active in the support of "Princeton-in-Yenching," which Anne's father had helped to found.) He said that the man who taught ethics on the School of Religion faculty was going to have a sabbatical--Dr. T.C. Chao. Yenching needed someone to teach ethics but that was only part-time. They thought it would be useful to have someone help with the Yenta Christian Fellowship.

Yenta had 200 or 300 members who were meeting in small groups. They wanted someone to help with the preparation of English study materials. I was asked if I would like to go; and with no hesitancy I was able to reply, "Yes, I would." So I went back to China and that gave me opportunities to renew some acquaintanceships and to make many new ones. I was able to get better acquainted with Dr. Stuart and also to get to know both the Edwards better, and that ultimately led to my meeting and marrying their daughter Anne. It was in 1939 that I went back to China.

I: What concern, if any, did you have with the war situation as it had progressed?

FULTON: I was well aware of the crisis and by that time, of course, it was different from when I was there before. Most of the universities and middle schools had moved into what was called Free China. The geographic base of Yale-in-China institutions had been shifted, as I said before; our middle school and nursing school were in the little town of Yuanling up in western Hunan; the medical school was in the Chungking area and the college out in Yunnan. The only significant representative of the Christian colleges that I was aware of that was trying to carry on in the occupied territory was Yenching. The Peking area was occupied by the Japanese. That was a pretty exciting prospect, working in a very controlled situation, but Dr. Stuart and his colleagues felt it was useful.

This was not the total Yenching enterprise as they had also established a refugee branch in the Chengtu area in West China, but a portion carried on in Peking. Those

responsible thought there ought to be at least an effort to continue in the cultural capital of China, as long as academic freedom was not interfered with. So Dr. Stuart and a very much reduced staff were carrying on; and they continued right up until Pearl Harbor.

I: Did you have difficulties getting to Peking at this time?

FULTON: The only problem I ran into was a typhoon. I went to Shanghai and couldn't get direct passage to Tientsin which would be the normal way to go. The indirect routing gave me a better chance to know Dwight Edwards better, as he and I happened to get on the same boat. While we were going on this little coastal steamer from Shanghai to Ts'ing Wang Tao, we hit the typhoon. The trip took twice as long as it was supposed to, and we were the only passengers who didn't get terribly sick.

I made use of the experience to get to know him very much better than I had in the brief interview before. When we finally landed, he was kind enough to invite me to their summer home in Peitaiho; and he and his wife were very hospitable indeed. That is where I first met Dr. Randolph Sailer, as it was the place where most Yenching faculty and many Y personnel gathered. Going on to Peking we were questioned by Japanese guards and you had to have your proper papers and all that sort of thing; but there was no other difficulty.

I: What arrangements did Dr. Stuart make so that a skeleton of Yenching was able to operate?

FULTON: He was one incredible "guy," with apparently a complete absence of fears and a real devotion to human beings. I have some real questions about what happens to people, some people, who became college presidents. It can very easily go to their heads and they come to think of themselves as special emissaries of the Almighty, although they may not use theological language. Dr. Stuart was one of two college presidents whom I have personally known who was unaffected by that sort of thing; the other was the black president of Miles College in Birmingham, Alabama-- Dr. Lucius Pitts. Both of them were able to function as leaders and yet be humble and open--and very courageous. Anybody could get to see Dr. Stuart. You sometimes had to wait a day or two for an appointment; but when you were in his office, you had the impression that you were the most important person in the world and that what you had to say was what he was most interested in. It was a marvelous capacity.

Later, I had the privilege of living in a guest room in his home for about six months and got to know him better than I otherwise would have. I have never idealized anybody-- I think that is very dangerous for all concerned--but these two people (Dr. Stuart and Dr. Pitts) have made strong impressions upon me as to what an educational leader ought to be.

Later, as you know, Dr. Stuart became the U.S. Ambassador at the suggestion of General Marshall. Truman had already tentatively appointed another ambassador, another military person (General Wedemeyer); but Marshall got him to hold off, saying that they needed someone whom people in China knew and trusted; Marshall said he would find out who was the most qualified. Marshall decided Dr. Stuart was that person and asked that he be appointed. Dr. Stuart reluctantly accepted with the hope that maybe he could help.

He knew that he would get tied in with government affairs and be called all kinds of things if the effort failed-- 'running dog of the imperialists,' etc.

Really, looking back, I almost wish he hadn't done it, but still I guess he "had to" because there was a chance of success. This is a long-winded answer to your question, but Dr. Stuart had quite a capacity for inspiring confidence and respect and also the capacity to stand up for things he believed in. He had contacts with people who had been at Yenching and were back in Japan. Also he was in touch with people who were with the Nationalists and with others who were with the Communists. Everybody trusted him! He made it completely clear that he would close Yenching at any point if there was any interference with academic freedom. The Japanese military would march by the gates from time to time. Their major headquarters was about three miles away and they could have technically taken over the campus at any point; but they knew what would happen if they did. So the university carried on for a number of years under extremely difficult conditions.

I: What differences did you note between Yenching and the work that was carried on by Yale-in-China?

FULTON: The chief difference was that Yenching was a university in the real sense of the word, with more than college level work; and it was a top-flight university--it really was. I think it is fair to say that Yenching had the greatest respect in this country and elsewhere. The Princeton connection helped, I think. Princeton was responsible for supporting the Social and Political Science Department. Harvard had established a relationship--the Harvard-Yenching Institute. Yenching was a very, very fine institution.

I hadn't at that time been in touch with Huachung University, which included the former Yali College. I knew about it, but I had had no real contact with it until Anne and I went there together at a later period. My work in 1933-'35 was with the junior and senior middle schools. It was most interesting, but it was a different atmosphere.

One of the things that was so impressive to me about Dr. Stuart was that though he was a missionary of the Southern Presbyterian Church, which is usually thought of as more conservative, he was utterly open to insights from other heritages, not only other Christian branches, but from the Confucian and Taoist heritage as well. He had done more reading, probably, of the Chinese classics than any other Westerners in China, with Dwight Edwards as his chief rival at that time.

He had on the faculty a number of people who were not members of a Christian church. They were basically Confucianist or Taoist or Buddhist--that is, related to some branch of the classic heritage. You could take courses in different areas under different people. It was a real university, a stimulating experience that I appreciated.

Also I enjoyed the teaching. Dr. Chao came back my second year; but with some shifts in responsibility, I stayed on until the summer of 1941; so I got to know him when he came back.

I: What were your impressions of T.C. Chao?

FULTON: My first contact with him was indirect--through impressions gained by talks with his School of Religion colleagues and students; for as already indicated, I went out the first year to help with one of his courses while he was on a study-leave in this country. All spoke

of him with respect though some--especially some students--felt that he was somewhat hard to approach; and when he came back, I understood both attitudes. He wasn't an "intellectual snob" but one so absorbed in deep-level study and writing that he found "small talk" a bit difficult. Faculty meetings, under his leadership, were likely to become exciting theological-philosophic discussions, after required business had been taken care of.

Underneath was a deep spiritual commitment which is apparent in his writings and in his poetry--much of the latter being set to music by his colleague, the late Dr. Bliss Wiant.

Of course, I got to know other members of the faculty as well--Chinese and Western--while teaching in both the School of Religion and the college, where I had been asked to teach a course in the English department.

Then there was the contact with the college students of the Yenta Christian Fellowship. This meant a great deal to me in the area of out-of-class relations. I suspect that at least twice a month, maybe more often, I would go out on Saturday afternoons to the Western Hills and hike with the smaller groups within the Yenta Fellowship. I also worked with Wei Yang-ch'ing, the general secretary, to help develop study materials.

Yenching was built on an old prince's palace grounds--a beautiful location. The buildings were consciously structured to be in the Chinese architectural traditions, but they had modern plumbing and heating. Some people didn't think that was sincere, arguing that if you are going to have the old Chinese style, you shouldn't have modern plumbing; but I didn't run into any Chinese students or faculty who objected to the plumbing or heating and certainly I didn't!

The first year, I spent six months in a dorm and then six months in Dr. Stuart's home. The second year I was assigned to an old gateman's house. It had a useable Chinese kitchen, but I could still eat in the dorm when I wanted. What worked out so well was that I invited all the Yenta Christian Fellowship groups to come to my home if they wanted to cook their own meal and have a meeting, but with one proviso: I didn't have to be in on the meeting, but I had at least the privilege of sampling their dishes--just for the fun of it! The students were over there a great deal and it was a very rich experience. If Anne and I are able to go back, one of the things I am going to try to do is to look up some of the students I knew particularly well; I hope we can contact at least a few of them. Yenching was my first contact with a college level program--something I look back on with the greatest appreciation.

I: When you were discussing with the members of the Yenta Christian Fellowship, what were some of their ideas as to how Christianity could meet the needs of a modernizing China?

FULTON: Here's something I must show you which I think gives a large part of the answer to your question. It was gotten out by the National Christian Council in 1949, right after the turnover which called attention to some of the things that the Christian movement had meant to China, especially with regard to the breadth of Christian influence. The building of church groups certainly was important, but they point out, too, that the earliest education for women was under Christian auspices.

The first efforts to deal with the child labor problems, the stopping of foot-binding for girls, the first western medical research, and the development of new farming techniques were all initiated by the Christian church. I think it is so "meaty" and relevant that it should be copied; it's dated, you see, November, 1949, just a month after the founding of the new government.

"REFLECTIONS OF SOME ASPECTS OF HISTORY"

"Although the Christian Church in China has a history of a little more than 100 years, within this short period it has made a very real contribution to the early beginnings and humble struggles of this movement which has now awakened China to a new destiny. To illustrate, in recent times paramount importance has been attached to science in the reconstruction of the nation. It was the Christian Church that first brought science to China. Foundations of democracy lie in education. It was the Christian Church which promoted literature in the vernacular and used phonetics or romanization to extend popular education on a vast scale. The emancipation of women and children represents a great need in new China. It was the Christian Church which first advocated education for women and girls and ran institutions such as infant homes, doors of hope, schools for the deaf and dumb, and day nurseries. It was also the Christian church that, at the same time, did its utmost to oppose concubinage--the keeping of the girl slaves and the taking of children into the homes to be raised as future daughters-in-law and other evil customs which oppress women. The emancipation of the working man has already become national policy today. It was the Christian Church

which first promoted education of employees and workmen along with welfare projects for the workers. To raise the level of the living of this world for people is the most urgent duty of an agricultural nation. Again, it was the Christian Church which first promoted education in agriculture and forestry, tried out farmers' loans and made experiments in rural re-construction. This succession of historical facts, as far as the Christian Church is itself concerned, simply lies within the sphere of those things which the church ought to do. The purpose of mentioning various items, just listed, is to urge the church today to yet greater efforts as in positive accord with the Christian Gospel, advancing further along the path hitherto trodden, of seeking the welfare of the common people for the united world and the manifestation of God's Kingdom as its ultimate objective."

Now that was written, not by foreigners, but by Chinese Christians. I think it summarizes, more than anything I can give you, the reasons for interest on the part of concerned students.

Also at Yenching I was asked to work on some materials that were first used in the study program to deal with the Biblical heritage. The effort was to be as brief as possible and that was a challenging assignment. I was asked also to work on these subjects: "Christianity and Economics," "What is Success?," "The Relevance of the Church," and "The Life and Teachings of Jesus!" In addition to helping prepare study materials, I was asked to be the faculty advisor for a group that was studying the life of Jesus.

This was another exciting experience because I had never had any group whose members were almost without prior study of this topic. To have people come as "outsiders" was exciting because the questions they would ask were not exactly the ones those who had been brought up in a Christian environment would. That experience did a lot to make me go back to the New Testament materials and my own notes from seminary and try to come up with something accurate, as far as I knew how to make it accurate, as to the significance of the life and teachings of Jesus. That was the focus you find, also, in some of the material that Dwight Edwards wrote. He felt that the future of the church in China was very largely related to the life and teachings of Jesus and with probably less involvement in ecclesiastical developments and hierarchical concerns and all that.

The church in China needed a constant focus on the impact of this tremendous historic personality whatever one's ideas as to the theological implications. That was an exciting task for me. I perhaps have used the word "exciting" more than I should, but there is hardly any word that is more accurate. It was all so stimulating. It made me realize how we needed to go at things in a fresh way, and I appreciated that.

I: Can you recall some of the questions that your Chinese students asked that were different from what you had been asked in America?

FULTON: Basically, they were questions that people who had been brought up in a church-home would be familiar with. What was the situation in Jesus' time? What was his relationship to other Jewish people? What were the problems

he dealt with? What were the opportunities? Was he tied-in with the establishment or not? It was the kind of a question that, let's say, a person first studying the life of Confucius, who had not been steeped in that cultural heritage, would ask. Who was this person? What was his family like? Where did he get started on his teaching? It meant coming afresh to the whole study of a subject which I think we are in danger of becoming superficially too familiar with.

This may sound strange coming from one who is technically a "minister." But here's the kind of thing I have in mind. I don't think the prophets, Amos, and Isaiah, and Micah ought to be dealt with prior to at least the high school age--maybe later. If you get a superficial, childish exposure to the tremendous figure of Amos, for example, one who took on the hierarchy of his time, both political and ecclesiastical, there are things that a kid can't deal with. If he or she has had a simple exposure in Sunday School and then you try later to ask deeper questions, the answer is likely to be, "Oh, sure. We know about Amos." Yet they really don't.

At Yenching you often had adult young people coming afresh to the subject. What they wanted was not superficial knowledge; but what made Amos do what he did, and what lay behind the work of Paul, and what was the situation in Paul's time--the tremendous complexity, for example, of Paul's growing up in a largely Stoic center, etc., etc. Again, it was a stimulating challenge.

I: What did you know about the Chinese Communists at this time and what contact did you have with members of the Eighth Route Army?

FULTON: This was '39-'41, you recall, and the Communists were theoretically still out in what was called the "Eighth Route Army area;" but they were actually all over the place. I remember that one time on a trip into Peking (Yenching was about five and a half miles out toward the Western Hills from Peking), I was standing with a Yenching student in a crowded bus. Rather unwisely, I assumed that we were the only ones who could understand English, and we were talking about the rumors that there were more Eighth Route Army people in the Peking area than was realized. When I got off the bus, a Chinese man who had also been on the bus came over to me, just as I started off down the street, and said, in very good English, "May I ask who you are?" I replied, "Sure, I'm a teacher out at Yenching." Then he went on to say that he couldn't help overhearing what we were talking about and thought we just might like to know that the rumors were not incorrect and that he was related to the Eighth Route Army. Then he took off. So that's a part of the answer to your question.

Here's another part: My last house assignment area had an entrance on an alley and so could be approached from outside the campus. Students and faculty did not want to get involved with the military; but it was known that in among the Eighth Route Army personnel were many needs for medical supplies and there was concern to help in this area. I was asked by a man who was on the faculty if, because I had the house with a gate on the outside, if it would be all right to have a packet, of medical supplies left in my backyard. If I agreed, I would just unlock the gate that night. Believing in helping anyone in such need, I did agree, and the next morning the supplies were gone.

Let me focus for a bit on the question of what I would call non-atheistic presuppositions in the Marxist movement. You probably know that Mao Tse-tung had been a librarian at Tsinghua University, which was just a couple of miles from Yenching. He happened to get acquainted with Dr. Stuart at that time--a personal contact going back before his Long March days. Dr. Stuart was a lover of horseback riding and he would, whenever he got a little time off, go out to trot and gallop. Sometimes he would concentrate on conversation with a fellow rider.

On one occasion he wasn't watching too carefully and went over the horses' head when it made a quick turn and gave himself a mild concussion. He had to be under hospital care for a time and the telegrams poured in from all over China when word got out. Telegrams came from the Nationalists, missionaries, government people, friends all over the country; he was deeply loved and respected everywhere. He showed me one telegram that I wish I could show to you, from Mao Tse-tung. (Incidentally, I was so impressed with the importance of Dr. Stuart that while I was living with him, I spent a good many hours, whenever he had time, just taking notes as he talked. I was going to bring that back and at least make it available to someone who could help in writing it up. When I left China in 1941, the question was how was I to get the baggage back to the United States. I guess I had about 100 pages or so of handwritten notes, so Dr. Stuart and I both agreed that probably the safest thing was for me not to take them in my briefcase, but to put them in a trunk with some books that I very much wanted to keep and get back to the States.

I had it all set that this would go on the first British-American steamer; but somewhere or another it got transferred to a Japanese steamer and was delayed. The Japanese steamer was two days out of San Francisco on Pearl Harbor day, and so it turned back. I thought that was the last I'd ever see of that material. But two or three years after the end of the war, I got a notice from a Japanese official that they had found in a warehouse some books with my name on them and would I be interested in having them sent (at my expense). I agreed, of course, hoping that the Stuart notes especially, would be there. It turned out that only about half of the books were there, the others having disappeared; and the Stuart notes were gone.

Ultimately he wrote his own autobiography and other people have written about him; but I was very disappointed that these notes were lost.

One of the things that Dr. Stuart showed me was this telegram from Mao Tse-tung out in the Eighth Route Army area. Communications could go back and forth, even with the Japanese there. The telegram from Mao was very courteous, as a Chinese communication would be; but Dr. Stuart was especially impressed by one phrase: "I hope for your speedy recovery in order that you may carry on your important work of Christian education in China." Dr. Stuart emphasized that this was beyond what Chinese courtesy called for and he wondered as to its real significance with regard to Mao's basic approach--as do I.

Let me read one other thing that might be relevant here. This goes back to the same period--1938. A YWCA secretary, Winifred Galbraith, whom I knew in Changsha,

went out to Yen-an with Edgar Snow and others and interviewed Mao. They talked about a variety of things and then Ms. Galbraith said: "Since we can talk about those things in a friendly way, I want to ask you if you cannot change your opinion about Christianity and the Christian missionaries in China?" Mao responded, "What are you here for," looking at me straight in the face. Christ's words at the beginning of his ministry seemed the right answer here, as a statement of an aim if not an achievement--"to preach the gospel to the poor, to heal the broken-hearted and to preach deliverance to the captives and the recovery of sight to the blind." Mao was very taken with the words and had me repeat them. "It is not so unlike our own aim," he said. "Is that really what Christianity is trying to do?" I told him some of the things that the church in China would have for all men and at the end he said, "Yes. I did think you foreigners were all capitalist aggressors, but I am beginning to change my mind."

As you know, Stalin despised Mao. He called him a "Chinese radish." You've heard that phrase, meaning that he was red on the outside and white on the inside. Mao was a deep-level person, more than simply a doctrinaire Communist. I think he was very strongly influenced by the Chinese ethical heritage--Confucianism, Taoist, the teaching of Mo Tzu, etc.--he knew his classics. You can see that in some of his poems, particularly. I have long been convinced that the fears that a lot of people had that when the Communists moved into China they would erase the impact of the heritage, were unfounded.

There was a time, during the Cultural Revolution, when the tomb of Confucius was defaced and a lot of people were hurt. Of course, what is happening now is the development of a broader attitude. I think that what happened many times earlier in Chinese history will take place now, being influenced but not dominated by outside ideas.

I think Mao was more open than many people realized. If he had had more contact with people like Dr. Stuart and Winifred Galbraith and others, there might have been some significant changes in approach. We know that Chou En-lai wanted to come to this country, and I've heard that Mao Tse-tung, too, was quite ready to come in '49-'50 to make personal contacts. He was not anti-American. I don't think he was basically anti-Christian.

I: How much freedom did you have going on and off the campus at this time period?

FULTON: There was no interference at all. I made a couple of trips that meant a great deal to me. One summer I went to the Yun Kang Caves, way out in the Shansi area. It was several hundred miles to get out there. The other summer, I went over to Korea. I particularly loved North Korea. The best way to describe it would be, I think, to say it's somewhat like having the heights of the Grand Tetons right down by a Florida beach.

There was really no travel problem; but you had to be sure you had your papers with you. We would go right by the Japanese military establishment every time we went out to the Summer Palace and beyond into the Western Hills; we would sometimes get some stares, but I never had any interference at all.

I: What did you do when your two years at Yenching expired and where were you when Pearl Harbor occurred?

FULTON: To answer your last question first, I was in the dining room of the Yale Divinity School when President Roosevelt announced what had happened. I didn't anticipate Pearl Harbor when in Peking. However, I had gone out for a year, and stayed two, and it was the time to go. I had finished the work that I had been invited to do. There was some talk about my possibly coming back in a later period to teach at Yenching, but I didn't feel adequately prepared without more study. I wanted to do graduate work--doctoral work. But I wanted to get into Free China before going back to America.

TAPE THREE-SIDE TWO

So I took the very minimum essentials--a change of clothing, papers that wouldn't get you in trouble if you got searched, etc.--and then went down to Hong Kong. There I made the needed inquiries as to how you could get on a plane going to Free China. (I had been told it was easier to get to that area from Hong Kong than to go directly across the lines from Peking or from Shanghai, although you could go from almost any place.) I stayed about three weeks at the Chinese YMCA before word came that I was able to go. We flew by night in an unlighted plane. Sometimes we got shot at, but we crossed the border and landed in Shiuchow. I went from there using various conveyances, sometimes a train, sometimes a bus or a boat, primarily because I wanted to see the Yale-in-China set up, going back to my old stamping grounds.

On the Yali campus I renewed contact with a friend who really, I think you can say, gave his life for China. Win Pettus was one who was out as a doctor and doing a superb job. While I was there, there were some air attacks, not too disturbing to Win because he was one of those people who assumes that nothing was going to happen to him. I assumed we ought to head for the basement with his family when the planes started coming over. Win said, "No. Let's stay up and take some pictures." So we went up on the roof and I still have photos of the planes. They bombed the area pretty heavily, though nothing hit the campus.

Win rushed over as soon as he could to the Hsiang-Ya Hospital where he was one of the surgical staff and assisted the victims that were brought in. One in particular needed an immediate transfusion. Win said to me, "What's your blood type?" I'd never given blood before so mine had to be checked. It turned out that mine was O--a universal donor type--so they could use my blood. It is one of those moments, I am sure we have all had them, when a whole lot of things come into a special focus. I suddenly realized--

I don't want to be too dramatic about this--that this unknown Chinese worker, (he was a ricksha puller) and I were at least in one respect more closely related than I and any of the other foreigners or he and any of the other Chinese. It was one of those things that hit me--that this business of separating people racially and nationally was pretty superficial. I had the joy of being able to help that man under Win's direction.

Then I went inland, visiting Yuanling where Yali had already established a base in case they had to move everything. Then I had to get back to the States in time to start graduate school. This summer experience gave me a

feel for wartime conditions that I hadn't had up to that point. Later I did get back to that area as roving representative of the Yale-in-China Trustees.

I came back to New Haven and was just getting well started, in graduate work, when Pearl Harbor hit us. We were all affected in various ways. I have never been a supporter of the military approach to things, but I did feel that people ought to be involved in some way. I finished the year because the dean had given me a full year's credit for the work at Union and it seemed important to complete the class work. Then I made contact with the Chaplaincy Office and registered for an assignment, meanwhile working hard on my dissertation. When it was done, I traveled for the World Student Service Fund, raising money for students in China and other war areas.

It was at this point that Win Pettus came back and made clear in a very persuasive way to the Yale-in-China Trustees that someone was needed who wasn't tied-down as he was to surgical procedure and who could act as an official representative to maintain communication with the various institutions being supported. So, I was asked to go back as the Trustees' Representative, to keep in touch with our work in Yuanling, in Chungking, and in Hsichow, Yunnan. I wanted very much to do this, so I went to the Chief of Chaplains' Office in Washington and I explained the situation to one of the associates. He listened carefully and then said, in effect, "Look. I can't advise you do to this, but we can't assure you that when you are assigned you will go anywhere near China. We certainly need to have concerned friends of China in that country. You say you know something of the language. If you want, just ask us to put your papers on file and take off."

I then decided to accept the Yale-in-China offer and waited for the opportunity to go. You would get about four or five days notice of when to appear. That clearance did not come until January of 1944. I waited during the summer and fall, meanwhile working with the Student Service Fund. In the meantime, the people who were in China at the time of Pearl Harbor had been interned by the Japanese. Anne's father happened to be in Chungking in Free China, but her mother was in Shanghai and was interned in that area. When eventually released, most of them started back on a Japanese vessel and then transferred to the Gripsholm which met them in India. I went down from New Haven to New York City to see a number of friends who were being repatriated, including Mrs. Edwards and several Yenching associates. I was staying with a retired Y couple, the Heldes, whose former home in Changsha I had visited frequently.

After supper, George Helde, with his characteristic bluntness said, "How old are you?" I replied that I was 32. "Aren't you going to get married?" I said, "Well, I certainly haven't any opposition to the idea; I guess I haven't met the right potential partner yet." Then I continued, "You know about Chinese arrangements in marriage. Why don't you set the things up for me?" George replied O.K. and then he described a young lady whom he had sat next to the evening before at a dinner for the Gripsholm people. He spoke of her intelligence and attractiveness, and I said, "O.K., give me her name and telephone number and I'll contact her." "It's Anne Edwards, daughter of Dwight and Mary Edwards." I replied that I knew her parents and that I was going to see her mother the next day.

So I called Mrs. Edwards the next morning and said that I was hoping to see her at the afternoon meeting and that I hoped she would give me the pleasure of having dinner with me afterwards in a North China Restaurant on 47th Street. She said she would. Then I added that I had heard from a friend that Anne was with her and that if she were free, I hoped she would come, too. Anne happened not to have any conflicting engagement, so we met at that Chinese restaurant (which has since been torn down, to my regret). We were interested in each other right from the beginning; but we decided that it wasn't the time to get married, since I was on call to go out to China at any time. But we kept in touch and when I came back in 1946, we were married. After a year together in New Haven we went back to China in the summer of '47 and stayed on until 1950.

I: How did you actually get back to China in 1943?

FULTON: I got word in January to show up not later than five days later in New Orleans. They gave me an address. I went down and located the right people and was told that a convoy was leaving at such and such a time. It was all very hush-hush. The convoy was taking a lot of things--military supplies, food and so on--but they had room for a few civilians on board. I found there were about 40 civilians going--some to China, some to India and some to Africa. We discovered that we were going first to Cape Town and there those of us who wanted to go farther would cross to Durban and some go to North Africa; some others on to China. It was a very interesting and varied group. There were six black Air Force officers, who were on assignment to go to Ethiopia to help modernize the air force. Then we had missionaries and business people and a few returning students.

Nothing drastic happened on the way, the convoy traveling slowly and without lights at night. Since it was four or five weeks before we reached Cape Town, we had plenty of time to get acquainted. We set up a program for exchanging personal experiences and ideas and holding a few debates, etc. I thought it was a group that would have a sense of "stick-togetherness," but I turned out to be mistaken.

A day before reaching Cape Town, the captain came and said that he supposed we all realized that we were entering a segregated society and we ought to make our decisions as to what to do with that in mind. To my dismay, the group divided. People who had been talking and acting in the most inter-racial fashion became rather distant. There were only two of us in the non-black group who said this didn't make sense. Mr. Manley, an American missionary who was going back to India, and the Air Force people and I decided that we should travel across South Africa together. The rest of the group, as soon as we docked, took off.

The six black officers were put in a segregated railroad car, so the India chap and I went with them, getting some funny looks. We never lied, but we didn't tell the whole truth. I mean we didn't go out and say, "We are whites riding with blacks." The South African society is pretty complex, as you know, with different treatment for whites, blacks, and the "colored." I think people thought that Manley and I were blacks with pale skins.

When we got to Durban, the Air Force chaps had a place to which they had been assigned. Mr. Manley and I went to a hotel but were able to keep in touch with them. Because of that, word got around that we were interested in inter-racial communication, and we had some very interesting

experiences as a result. (Some of those who had separated from us in Cape Town came to us and asked if they could attend the inter-racial meetings that had been arranged, but the India friend and I decided that wouldn't be advisable.) One inter-racial event was held within a stone's throw of the City Hall, set up by some liberal whites, and we discussed the whole situation openly.

Another experience was really quite dramatic. I doubt if that would be possible now. The Air Force men said to me, "We would like to go to church together before we go our separate ways." I said, "Sure. That would be fine. Let's go down to the British cathedral." I went alone to the early service because I didn't want our relationship to end in a bad experience. I went, after the service, to the vicar and told him about the situation, saying we would all like to come together at 11:00. Would that be all right? He said, "Why, of course. You will be most welcome," and he went on, "I'll be in touch with the ushers and you won't be segregated. If you aren't treated with courtesy, you let me know who acts in such a way and I'll break him if I have to go to the Archbishop of Canterbury!" I didn't tell the others about having gone in advance, not feeling they had to know; but we just went together at 11:00 and were ushered into a place on the main aisle with other people. The vicar went out of the way to welcome the group.

Then we went on to India. I expected to just go across from Bombay to Delhi to Calcutta and right into China, but that wasn't the way it worked out! I had been warned that there was danger of losing baggage on the way, in stations, if you weren't careful; so I took special care of my briefcase in which I had my passport and camera and travelers checks and special letters I was taking out from the Trustees.

At night I normally used the briefcase as a pillow with my coat on top, so it couldn't be taken without disturbing me. But the last night, going from Benares to Calcutta, I figured that if we locked the door we'd be safe from thieves--the windows in this third class compartment being very small; so I put the briefcase by my feet. In the morning it was gone! Probably what happened was that someone lifted it out with a long cane designed for this purpose. I hoped it would appear at the next stop where I informed the police, but it never did show up.

In Calcutta I immediately went to the American Consulate to apply for a new passport, but I got the biggest run-around. I couldn't even get in to see the head consular official. The person at the desk took my message and then told me that they would wire Washington. About 10 days later I got this message, through a subordinate, that the Washington passport people urged that I seek to find my old passport! I had been, of course, in touch with the police since my arrival and they had contacted others along the way, so this message struck me as pretty stupid!

Week after week went by. Then a friend I met there said, "Why don't you go to the Chinese Consulate? They might help." So I went right away and explained to the lady at the outer desk what the problem was. She almost immediately ushered me into the office of the head consular official who was really friendly. He asked me to tell him the whole story. When I had finished he said, "There is no reason why you shouldn't be able to get to China.

The only thing is that we have to have some travel paper that we can put a permit on." I was almost sure the American consulate wouldn't cooperate, as they had refused to give me a temporary passport. But the Chinese Consul was more hopeful and he got on the phone to the American Consulate and went over the situation. He said that as far as he was concerned there was no reason why I couldn't go on, but that he had to have something from the American office. He was told they were not authorized to issue any travel papers without direct word from Washington. He replied, "Suppose I write you a letter. Will you reply?" They said that there was nothing in the regulations against that. (The whole American approach seemed to me to be that any action they initiated had to be authorized or they couldn't do it. The Chinese view appeared to be that if a desirable action wasn't specifically forbidden, they could go ahead.)

After a few minutes I took the letter from the Chinese Consular which said that he had heard this morning from Mr. Fulton about the situation, which he then described and he added, "Is this, as far as you know, an accurate statement of the happening?" The American official, rather annoyed, gave me a reply saying, "Your letter, insofar as we know, is correct." I took it back to the Chinese Consul and they stamped it with a travel permit and I was off the next day! This indicated something about the difference between what I would call stiff, bureaucratic procedure on the one hand and open sensibility, on the other--willingness to adapt and get the job done.

I: Did you fly over the Hump?

FULTON: Yes. There was no particular problem, but it was very exciting, with spectacular beauty. I did some work in Kunming, visiting various offices there, as it was pretty much of the center for all kinds of mission activities in Free China. Then I went up to Hsichow where Huachung University was refugeeing and then up to Chungking, to contact Hsiang-Ya Medical School. Also, while in Chungking I was able to see Anne's father and talk with him about our changed relationship.

I found that most of the Chinese buses were incapacitated, so the best way to get around was to "bum" a ride from the American military. (I usually wore one of those brown Indian shirts one associates with the British military in the Far East, and this probably made the process easier.) One of the times I made this circuit, I asked an American military officer if there was a truck going to Kweiyang? His reply was that he'd appreciate my driving a jeep down for them, which I was glad to do. After V-J Day, I went back to Changsha as soon as possible, walking a good bit of the way.

I: Would you describe how you heard about the end of the war and your walk back to Changsha?

FULTON: Win Pettus and I were both in Yuanling, Hunan, the refugee site of the Yali middle schools, junior and senior, and of the Hsiang-Ya Nursing School. When the V-J Day news arrived by radio, Win and I agreed with other Chinese colleagues that we had better get to Changsha as quickly as possible. The question was how to make the trip. The reason we needed to get back immediately was that we thought there could be looting and that sort of thing. Also, we knew that the hospital had been bombed and we wanted to go back to try to help with reconstruction.

The Yali campus was never bombed, just the hospital. We got back and we found that all of the faculty houses were still there and the chapel, and the Yali campus was actually being used as the Japanese military headquarters. It was a nice compound in which to live and so they apparently had ordered that it not be bombed.

At any rate, Win and I decided that we would try different methods to reach Changsha. He had become an amateur pilot, as he thought that it would be useful to be able to fly to get things that were needed. Win got more supplies from the departing American military group by his "uninhibited openness," than most of us thought possible. After V-J Day, the American military were under orders to sell equipment and they were not supposed to turn it over to Chinese colleagues. (Later there was a real arrangement where they could turn things over to the Chinese military, but not at first.)

They had only two approved options--to give what they weren't taking with them to American citizens or destroy it. Most Americans, at least those I knew, were not very gifted in "begging." You would willingly "thumb" a ride in a plane, and you might get up enough "gumption" to ask for maybe a pound of coffee or a pair of shoes. But Win would go in to the top officer's office and ask for an airplane, a hospital unit and two jeeps or something like that. They were so delighted to be able to get so much off their hands at once that they usually agreed.

Since he knew so many Air Force people, he thought he could "bum" a ride to Changsha, but I said that I would rather stick to the usual means of travel. He went off on his own to try to fly in and one of the Hsiang-Ya doctors and one of the middle school officials and I just started off by the land and water route.

It took us about five days, as I recall. We went on a bus part way and then on a boat. The boat went pretty carefully because as you got down to the Hsiang River area, the water had been mined. The mines hadn't been taken out--you could see them! You didn't travel at night, naturally. The boatmen were pretty skillful; but you were still a little more than casually aware that if they didn't do their job well, that was it! We got down then to the last place we could reach by boat, with about 100 miles left. So the three of us started out walking. I had never walked quite that far before, but we did it in three days and it was really fun. We kept walking and talking and singing and then at night stopping in Chinese inns on the way.

When we got there, we found that Win had arrived within a matter of almost hours. He had persuaded an American pilot, stationed at Chih Kiang to take him in a small plane to the Changsha airport. As they came over the field, there was obvious interest on the part of the Japanese military, with soldiers coming out to meet them. Win said they just landed and the plane took off again immediately, leaving him on the field. Win was in a used fatigue uniform, which he had acquired at the American air base. He didn't tell any lies, but he didn't tell the whole truth. The Japanese apparently thought he was an advanced agent of the American military. They knew the war was over, but there had been no official turn-overs of authority. They still had their guns and other military hardware.

Win walked in and let them think what they thought. He said he would like the use of a truck saying he needed to go around town. So he went not only to the Yali and Hsiang-Ya campuses, but also to the Hunan Bible Institute and to every other mission organization.

Win had been brought up in China, his father being the head of the Chinese Language School in Peking. He spoke and wrote Chinese with great ease. He put up notices in English and Chinese, requesting that everybody help to preserve the institutions until those who had been away got back. As a result, nothing further was lost in any of the mission compounds. He did a superb job! When we arrived, the Japanese military were still there, but by that time there had been one or two advance American military representatives with some Chinese. But before the American or Chinese authorities, there was Win Pettus!

Within a short time the Japanese had moved on up the river and so the campus became available. Then some of Win's spade work began to show up when the American units started coming up. They would come to the Yali campus and say they had orders to deposit this, that, and the other thing. I remember the basement of the house that we used as storage. I am sure it was dangerous from the standpoint of fire hazard, but we soon had about 50 big tanks of gasoline and oil. Then they started dropping off big 20-pound cans of coffee, and in the medical area, Win had gotten enough penicillin to last Changsha for, oh, a couple of years. We received a mobile American first aid unit. We got a captured Japanese truck and an American truck and two jeeps, and the promise of two airplanes!

Win was soon flying in and out of Changsha bringing in more supplies--and then the tragedy. First his plane didn't come when we thought. Apparently he'd gotten too eager to take off one day and the weather conditions were such that he flew into a mountain. His body was later found by a search party with the wrecked plane, but it was in such condition that they finally brought it back in a fuel tank--all sealed.

The memorial ceremony, is, I think, worth taking a little time with. Win was just as deeply loved by his colleagues as Dr. Stuart was by his, or Dwight Edwards. Younger, he had not fully established his reputation, but I had never known more genuine grief than that of his Changsha associates. The service was a tremendous tribute. They decided to bury the body right on the Hsiang-Ya Medical campus, which was quite unusual. I am not sure that in normal times the city authorities would have approved; but his Chinese colleagues said, in effect, "This is where his body belongs." And I hope the grave is still there. They asked me to put something in English and so this was engraved on the marker: "He gave his best with courage, zest and skill and we, his grateful colleagues, students and friends, will not forget." He was a tremendous personification of the courageous desire to serve. If you haven't already done so, you ought to read Dauntless Adventurer, which includes some of his letters and gives the whole story of his life by one who knew him well-- the Dr. Hume already referred to.

I: Will you continue with your efforts in the rehabilitation of Changsha? First of all, how were you received by the citizenry of Changsha?

FULTON: With great friendliness. We thought that more people with whom we'd had contact had either gone west or been killed. In fact, a lot had quietly gone underground. When Win showed up, the people were there to greet him. Some I already knew and some he introduced me to. Of course, the Chinese colleagues that I came with found that doors were just wide open and they started right in immediately with the rehabilitation process. Nothing was needed except minor repairs on the Yali campus-- that was intact.

But the hospital was in bad shape. Some of the foundations were there, but the buildings had to be restored and, of course, all the equipment replaced. So what? Everybody plowed in and the job got done. So much depends on morale. There wasn't any question of the "director" or "dean" sitting somewhere and giving orders and other people doing the work--everybody worked together.

TAPE FOUR-SIDE ONE

I saw what can happen if people, whatever their various skills, work together, as these did. This was another real learning experience for me! Because I am not in anyway gifted in terms of architectural reconstruction and knew nothing about medicine, my chief job was to drive one of the trucks which Win had acquired to locate and pick up bricks from the bombed hospital, which were easily identifiable, and which had, as it were, been "borrowed." I think that's a better word to use than "looted," for nobody during the war was sure that Hsiang-Ya would be rebuilt. I did a lot of that. Then there were various meetings to attend and keeping in touch with the New Haven office, etc. I wasn't there very long because I was asked by the trustees to come back and attend the annual meeting, which was held in late June.

To go back to the States, I had to "bum" a ride with the American military again going down the river because all of the Chinese traffic had been disrupted. In Shanghai I needed to get the first boat back, as there wasn't any available air transportation. The only boat leaving was taking troops back. A civilian could get a place, but you

had to have clearance from Washington through the Consulate. Here is another example of something I wish I hadn't been exposed to, of how some Americans can get pretty bureaucratic and, in my judgment, corrupt.

I went into the office but couldn't get in to see the person who could arrange for the document which I needed to get passage on the ship, which was leaving in about 48 hours. So I sat down to wait, inquiring every so often, and meanwhile reading some magazines that were there. Finally, a Chinese person near me said, "You've been there quite awhile." I replied, "Yes, I hope to get in soon." He said there was only one way to do it. When I asked what that was, he said one had "to pass some green stuff to the person at the desk." I expressed amazement, but he said that was what was happening.

I decided I wasn't going to do it, but to contact New Haven instead. It so happened that the son of the president of the Trustees of Yale-in-China, Dick Weigle, who had been out as a bachelor, was helping in the Passport Division of the State Department during the war. I wired Dean Weigle, and explained the situation--a pretty expensive wire--saying one of the bachelors, also asked to return, and I were caught and unable to get passport clearance. I went back the next morning and the whole atmosphere had changed. "Yes, Mr. Fulton and Mr. Morland, come right in." We went into the key official's office and everything was worked out without further delay. We later learned that what happened was that Dean Weigle had called his son, Dick, in Washington. Dick went next door to the lady in charge of passports and explained the thing. She got in direct touch with the Shanghai office. It still annoys me because

if I hadn't had that personal influence, I could have been stuck there for days unless I would have been willing to bribe people. Incidentally, that Shanghai Consular Office was later cleared out and everybody fired because word got around that they were acting "irregularly."

Back in New Haven, I made my report to the Trustees, a copy of which I'll give you. Ken Morland became executive secretary and I was asked to stay on for a year to help with the raising of funds for reconstruction. Anne and I renewed our relationship and were married that summer. She was completing her master's degree in Public Health at the Yale Medical School, so she wanted to wind that up. Then a year later, we went back to China; but this time to Wuchang where I served on the faculty of Huachung University, as well as being a representative of the Trustees there, the Changsha post being filled by Dwight Rugh.

We had a department of religion at Huachung and I helped in the areas of ethics and church history and was also asked to give a course in the history of economic thought in the college department. So Anne and I were there in Wuchang in the period from '47 to '50.

I: Before we go on to Wuchang, let me ask you what contact you had with the Chinese Communists from '44-'46?

FULTON: When I was in Chungking I contacted, among other people, Dwight Edwards (as already indicated) and asked him about the whole situation at that point during the war period. He pointed out that the former antagonists were theoretically cooperating so that actually the Kuomintang headquarters and the Communist headquarters were about a block apart in a very crowded section of Chungking. There were several air raid attacks while I was there and I got acquainted with some of the air raid shelters. People took it in stride.

I remember I was talking with Mr. Edwards when the sirens started and he said, quietly, "I guess we'd better go down into the shelter"--there was one quite near. Nobody knew, of course, what would happen, but everyone jammed in. I didn't make any personal contacts with any leaders.

You remember prior to the theoretical cooperation there had been the capture of Chiang Kai-shek. Chiang had been keeping up his adamant antagonism to the Communists who were beginning to spread out from the Yen-an area and actually focusing on the combatting of the Japanese. The Japanese were trying to wind-up the whole China venture and really get control. Chiang was really under pressure but was holding out in his adamant way.

The Communists were ready to cooperate, but he didn't want to. Remember Chang Hsueh-liang? I don't believe anybody thinks he was a Communist, but he was more open than Chiang Kai-shek to the possibilities of cooperation. Chiang was up in Sian on some kind of mission and again without any military escort. He was captured and given the option of cooperating with the Communists or being held indefinitely. I don't think Chiang's life was actually threatened, but he finally decided to change his approach and agreed to cooperate.

After his release technical cooperation began and later the setting up of nearby headquarters in Chungking. At least the two forces stopped having major confrontations although there were reports of skirmishes that came in from outlying areas and they certainly didn't work together easily. As I recall, the Communists agreed to carry on the work of resistance where they felt it was needed in the areas where they were in the largest numbers and the Kuomintang in other areas. I stopped in at both headquarters to pick up materials that were available; anybody could do that, that was the limit of my contact.

I: What was the situation when you arrived in Shanghai in 1947 and what were your perceptions of the current situation?

FULTON: First, Anne's parents were back in Shanghai and we stayed with them. We had the fun of bringing out a replacement for their worn out car, so all could get around a little better. We spent some time with them. Her brother, Dwight, Jr., was also there; so it was something of an Edwards family reunion. John Leighton Stuart was also there, having by this time become the U.S. Ambassador. Because I had gotten to know him quite well at Yenching, I was able to get to see him. I wish I had a taped recording of our conversation; but let me give you my impressions. He was, of course, thoroughly aware of the problems. The impression I came away with was that he thought there was perhaps a bit more than a 50-50 chance that General Marshall and he would succeed in their mediation efforts. If they didn't then it was renewed civil war.

What Stuart had wanted was to continue as an educator, an American devoted to serving the Chinese, who thought of him as one of them. The mediation effort failed, as you know, but that wasn't clear until a little later.

I think the inflation business comes in here very naturally. The day we arrived, the exchange rate was 20,000 Chinese dollars to one American dollar. Before the war it had been two to one, and incidentally, it continued two to one as far as Chinese silver was concerned. That is, a Chinese silver piece continued to have the same value in terms of foreign exchange or the buying of rice.

That is why so many people got hold of silver and kept it. The money had gone from two to one to 20,000 to one which sounds pretty awful, but that was during the war period. People had somehow lived with it.

The next day after we arrived, it was 37,000 to one. By the next summer it was 12,000,000 to one. I have a five million dollar bill downstairs in case you've never seen one. Jumping ahead a bit, this was the second inflation and then came a third one; and with it came the change I spoke of in the attitude of people I had known earlier. The change was from "our" leaders and "our" government into the two "theys." They didn't affiliate with the Communists, but they seemed to increasingly look on the Kuomintang with suspicion.

Their last savings were wiped out and the whole country was economically collapsing! They had wide suspicions that this wasn't something that had to be, that some people were manipulating the exchange and sending money abroad. And a lot of that did happen. I don't have all the data; but there are still people, I gather, who are living in estates on the Hudson with money they sent out at that time to Swiss banks and so on. There was one revealing episode involving Madame Chiang's nephew, David Kung.

H. H. Kung was the Finance Minister and Kung, in the opinion of a good many people, got involved in all kinds of chicanery. A little later, after we were in Wuhan, we read of people in Shanghai being executed for black market exchange activities, and then David Kung was accused of being involved. Would he, too, be executed? It was at this point that Madame Chiang, out of loyalty to her sister and family, sent a government plane down and took David Kung out of Shanghai.

Anne's father said to us later that this action put the anti-inflation efforts way back. It was clear to people in the government's program to stop the black market and the inflation, that it depended on who was involved. Then things went absolutely hay-wire.

I remember the next summer, when we were up in Kuling, having to spend \$3,000,000.00 to send an airmail letter to the United States. Later that summer (in 1948) the Chiang government came out with a pledge to reform the currency and to stop all black market activity and urged people to turn in their silver dollars, and any American currency or other foreign currency, for an exchange of four to one. The roll-back was almost to the pre-war period. A lot of people did this. We turned in some. Of course, we were in a better situation because we had American checks sent out every so often. But I can remember we bought some of that currency along with others.

In six months it was back to 12,000,000 to one! That was the final blow! At that point, the people that I was working with in the college felt the government was near collapse. When the morale began to break down, the Communists were able to take over much more speedily than would have otherwise been likely. I think the break down of the whole financial situation was at least, a big part of it.

Getting back to '47, after our visit to Shanghai, we went up the Yangtze River to the Wuhan area. We went to the Huachung campus in Wuchang and found it in pretty good shape. Before long, it became increasingly obvious that there was going to be a Communist take-over in the North. They (the Communists) were pretty well consolidated in Manchuria and

soon Peking was captured and not long after that the whole northern area was under their control. By early '49, the Wuhan area was their next objective in Central China; and the Nationalists announced that there would be a "last stand" at Wuchang, on the south side of the Yangtze River. All there were supposed to help prepare for the defense, including the Huachung faculty and students--building trenches and bomb shelters, etc. It was announced that if they got to Hankow, the ferries would be destroyed and the power system as part of the last stand.

Soon, however, it became increasingly clear from what was happening to the Kuomintang troops that they had lost their morale. Some of the troops just abandoned their equipment and ran away. More and more American equipment fell into Communist hands. Mao Tse-tung reportedly made the statement that America was his arsenal and Chiang Kai-shek his supply marshall.

As the Communists approached, the merchants in the Wuhan area became increasingly skeptical that there was going to be a last stand; and there was a widely accepted report that the merchants made a pretty large financial offer to the government troops to persuade them to leave things intact if they retreated south. The retreat did take place and the only thing destroyed was a little bridge over a creek which was within sight of our home outside the campus.

We heard that explosion and we could see what happened. That was simply a last little bit of defiance and then the last train, carrying national troops went south. The Communist Army simply walked in. The ferry was running, the lights were on, the power system was intact; and not only that but there was a big American Army motor pool that had been left a couple of years before with a lot of oil and gas. It, too, was just appropriated.

I remember staying up all night along with Chinese colleagues, walking around with the thought that possibly we could discourage any looting. Actually, there wasn't any. Then the next morning Communist soldiers came in, and they were under very strict orders to be courteous to both Chinese and American personnel. One of the things they did first was to stabilize the monetary situation. As far as I know, the currency that began circulating never went into an inflationary period--quite a change from the previous situation.

I: When you arrived in Wuchang in 1947, what was the mood of the students and what kind of political discussion were prevalent?

FULTON: In any meeting with students or others, you were extremely careful not to say anything that could be possibly interpreted as even showing interest in the Communist movement. People who did were likely to "disappear." It was a dangerous situation so that there was very little overt discussion. But by early 1949 we became aware that there was one person on the faculty, a competent teacher, who seemed to be tied-in with the Communists. There had been a vacancy and this man had applied and been appointed.

To most of the rest of us, he seemed likely to be a contact person. As for student interest, I think what follows will be relevant: In my course on the history of economic thought, about 12-15 students enrolled. Huachung was quite small, and that was about a normal size class. When we were dealing with the earlier backgrounds, Smith and Ricardo and all the rest, there was just the usual attendance; but when we got to the Marx and Engels period, the class suddenly expanded until you could hardly get the people who were attending into the room.

The extras were from a government university nearby and had obviously heard that Marxism was going to be discussed. I was freer to discuss it, as an American citizen dealing with a history course, than a Chinese person was. When I got beyond that to a later period, the "guests" disappeared. I think that is reasonably indicative of the concern that you would obviously expect.

Soon after this, the situation began to get more and more tense. But there was one subject we and our associates could joke about, in view of Anne's being expectant--who would get there first--our child or the Communist Army. But the Communists "won" by almost exactly a week. They took over on May 17th and Mary Anne was born on May 23rd, so everybody called her "the liberation baby."

The take-over, as I have already indicated, was utterly peaceful except for blowing up the little bridge, which was easily fixed in a few hours. Prior to that, the American government had gotten word to every American citizen that it was obviously going to be a situation with some risk and that American planes would be available for take-off at certain places, on certain dates. It was simply the usual instruction from the American military and consular authority. If we wanted to go, we could. This went to all the Americans on the campus as it did to others in the area.

Dr. Francis Wei, the Chinese president of Huachung, was aware of this. He got all of us together and said, in effect, "Please feel free to go if you wish. Nobody is going to be critical." There was increasing uneasiness about some of the American government's actions; but Dr. Wei continued, in effect, "Whatever the political situation that develops, since Huachung is a private institution and church-related, I think you can stay on. You are very welcome to stay if you wish to, but feel free to go."

Anne and I discussed that pretty seriously because she was expecting Mary Anne and we had a small son Bill. We decided that we'd stay and I think that all but one of the American faculty members did likewise. As it worked out, we had no unpleasant experiences. I don't doubt that some Americans had some bad experiences in various parts of the country; but it seems to have been more common in places away from the big cities, where perhaps some of the previous officials were trying to show how loyal they were to the new government. But this wasn't so in Wuchang.

There were some changes. For example, if you wanted to go on the train to some other city, you had to get a permit; but you could travel anywhere within walking or bicycling distance without one. Also, foreigners were no longer invited to go to the head of the line in railroad stations or elsewhere, but I never liked that anyway. Now you stood in line like everyone else, without any special privilege.

Then strange things began to happen in the area of U.S.-China relations--a series of them. During the early period, the American Consulate in Hankow was able to continue without any change, except their members also had to get permission to travel between cities; but they had a two-way radio which they continued to use. They printed information that came in and whoever wanted to could see it.

There was one young fellow from the consulate who came over to Huachung fairly frequently and we'd chat a bit as he was in and out. Then came the "Peking Episode." It

had to do with some buildings there that were just outside the embassy area, a foreign enclave which had long been an affront to any self-respecting Chinese citizen. It was much easier for a foreigner to get into that area than for a citizen. I could simply walk in while a Chinese colleague had to go through lots of "red-tape." These buildings were claimed by western powers as under their jurisdiction, but both the earlier government and the present one rejected this.

TAPE FOUR-SIDE TWO

The Nationalists had tried to get them back, but had failed. When the Communists took over, they said, in effect, "These are our buildings and we want them vacated by such and such a date." The British and French Consular officials were instructed to refuse to agree that these were not under their control, but to say that the question could be adjudicated in later consultation. But the Americans were instructed, we learned, to say that if the buildings were taken over, America would pull out all its consulates, 17 of them. The day came, and an armed unit took over the buildings. The British and French put the issue "on the agenda" for future discussion, as already indicated, but the Americans started closing all consulates! This was, in my judgment, a big mistake, as the consulates had been effective listening posts and communication centers. So--our consular friends took off from Hankow.

As you know, on October 1st the new government was formally organized. (Chiang "and company" by that time had all gone to Taiwan.) It came out in the papers the next day that Chou En-lai had immediately sent word to all governments, including the Americans, inviting them to move toward the establishment of diplomatic relations.

A friend and I agreed that something ought to be done. So the two of us worked up a telegram which we took around to every American in Wuchang. There were 26 people in all and 24 signed the telegram. Only two of them didn't, but they made clear that they agreed but that their mission forbade them to do anything political.

We sent the telegram to Dean Atcheson in the State Department. We know that it got through because we got an inquiry from the State Department as to who Ruth Earnshaw Lo was. Every other person was easily identifiable as an American citizen, but here was this Chinese name. (Mrs. Lo has recently come back to the United States after being the only American who was able to carry on her teaching up until a year or two ago. She had married a Chinese dean and later assumed Chinese citizenship. Her son is an American citizen, born here, and she's now been able to join him here. Her daughter and their family are still there.) I replied that she was an American citizen married to a Chinese dean.

I think this could have been duplicated in every other city where Americans were living. All the American citizens wanted to have a favorable response to the Chinese invitation. That didn't mean an immediate exchange of ambassadors, but readiness to consider it--not to just ignore it. The last thing you ever did in China was to ignore any communication. Sheer politeness made it necessary to respond with courtesy. Here is the telegraph we sent:

October 2, 1949. "We, the undersigned, as private American citizens in Wuchang, strongly recommend the acceptance of the Peking government's invitation to enter negotiations looking toward establishing diplomatic relations."

If there had been a courteous response, what might have been different? Perhaps the Korean War could have been avoided, perhaps the Vietnam War. I am not a great admirer of Mr. Nixon, to put it mildly; but I think that history is going to treat respectfully the action, whatever the motivation, that Mr. Nixon and Mr. Kissinger took in finally breaking through the impasse. Of course, Mr. Fulbright had started the process of rethinking, years before, saying that we should start thinking some "un-thinkable" thoughts. I personally feel that whatever the motivation or whether all the processes were right in the recent "normalization" action (personally, I would have liked more consultation with Congress), at any rate, it's good to stop playing "make-believe."

When we got back to the United States, I did try to follow through with a letter to the State Department and spoke to the person in charge of affairs, indicating our reasons for thinking this movement toward diplomatic relations made sense; and I tried to get an article published in a church magazine, but failed. I know of others who tried to get the U.S. to move at that point; but that was, getting way ahead now, in '50-'51, at the height of the McCarthy period, when people were having their reputations destroyed. Many who had shown interest in keeping the door open were called Communist sympathizers and all that sort of thing, as you know. It was very sad. Looking back, it's tragic that we missed some big opportunities, as I see it.

Going back to the change-over period in Wuchang, we carried on with our classes with not even a day or two of "interlude." The stores opened up again after the first couple of days. Foreigners could walk down the street or

ride their bicycles with no questions asked. We were occasionally called on by officials who asked for certain data about us and we responded. Incidentally, sometimes they were officials we had known before. They were smaller fry who hadn't been able financially to leave; but the Communists had taken over so rapidly that they had to ask former officials to continue as they didn't have the personnel. They had planned on a much later take-over, but South China collapsed. I remember a particular chap whom we had gotten to know quite well when he contacted us once a year for the census. When he came back one day with Communist soldiers, you would never have thought he had ever known us. He wasn't unfriendly, but very stiff. Then for some reason the Communist soldiers went off and he relaxed and said, in effect, "I hope you realize I'm working in a somewhat strange situation, but I am glad to see you again."

We had planned to carry on and see what happened. Unfortunately, I slipped while getting off a ferry. Anne and I had been over in Hankow; and she was carrying Mary Anne and I was carrying Bill. This was before the bridge across the Han River was built and it was a very rough day. The ferry was going up and down. You had to get onto a dock which was also going up and down before getting onto the steps leading up to the embankment. Since I was carrying Bill, I couldn't break the fall with my hands and hit my back, very hard. I hit the edge of a part of the dock or something and it knocked the wind out of me.

I was able to get up, after a bit, with the help of a Communist soldier. (When we came back and I was making my report, one very anti-Communist member of the Board of Trustees said, when I was telling this: "Did a Communist push you?" "No, sir. As a matter of fact the person who helped me up was a Communist soldier." I don't think that was much appreciated.)

We went back home and the next morning, suddenly, I was hit with a splitting headache and it wouldn't go away. After a time it did get a little better but the doctors kept me in bed. I couldn't teach and I wasn't even supposed to think. I wasn't supposed to read anything that required any concentration. I read poetry and wrote some letters. This went on until it was obvious I wasn't of much use. Eventually the Yale-in-China people said--this was in the spring of '50--that I had better get back and go to the Mayo Clinic and see what the story was.

So we left, not forced out at all, prior to the time that most of the other Americans left. I did get a clean bill of health at Mayo's, as it turned out to be fundamentally a psychosomatic problem. (A doctor in China had asked me if I had ever had a brain tumor, if the fall was the result of a brain tumor. I had reported that to the Mayo neurologist questioning me. He said later that tests then showed that nothing was physically wrong; but that idea of a tumor, he thought, was in my subconscious and that the headaches were a result of that. "If you accept my analysis, you can go back to work.") The headache I had lasted a little longer but then disappeared. I haven't had a serious headache since. It was an example, if you will, of "faith healing"--I had faith in the soundness of their diagnosis!

We hoped to go back to China after I got a clean bill of health. Then in late December of 1950, there were two or three things that happened--parts of the series of events referred to before--that ultimately made it wise for all Americans to come back. One was when the United Nations had invited a representative of the new government to come to report on developments--a preliminary, China hoped, to membership in the United Nations. Our representative to the U.N. criticized the emissary for his assertion that America had been acting imperialistically. This, of course, was after America's involvement in the civil war by putting the U.S. fleet between the Mainland and Taiwan.

Our representative said, in effect, "Here you criticize us as being imperialistic; yet look at these 13 Christian colleges and what they did for China,"--thus, associating them with the government. And that hit the press both in this country and in China. In China, the comments were, in substance, "Aha! These colleges that have been claiming to be non-governmental basically, they have all the time been emissaries of the political regime!" This greatly weakened Dr. Wei's and the other presidents' credibility in respect to their being able to say, "Look. This is a people-to-people program." It was a stupid thing.

Then about the same time there was a sudden freezing of all American funds to China, including all the mission grants to mission institutions. The mission boards immediately got in touch with the authorities and they were able to get that partially reinstated but only after considerable delay. In the meantime, there was the stoppage of all American funds. Although the American funds to Huachung and other colleges were not vast, they were crucially important, and to have them cut off was very upsetting.

At that point, we learned the Communist government authorities came to the college leaders and said something to this effect: "We regret your financial situation. If you would like it, we will fill the gap left by the withholding of United States funds." Dr. Wei accepted it; otherwise he would probably have had to close the college. It was that important. And the other college presidents did likewise. Having done that, the Communists became involved with the administration and the situation changed. As far as we can tell, they later simply absorbed the institutions into the total educational picture. There was never any formal take-over.

The third thing that happened at that time was this: the one who was representing the Associated Boards at that time wanted to contact all of the presidents of the 13 Christian colleges. Instead of going out on his own, which would have cost the board a considerable amount of money, he accepted a U.S. government responsibility which meant that he was traveling on government funds. This was publicly known. Then this representative sent a letter out to all the presidents saying that he would like to confer with them, but requesting that they come to Hong Kong to confer with him instead of his calling on them in China. You put this together with the government's withholding funds, the U.N. representative's claiming that there was government support for the college and it absolutely wiped-out the whole contention of Dr. Wei and others that all this was purely a people-to-people program.

Then the situation, we were told, got very, very tense. It was increasingly difficult and potentially dangerous for Chinese students or colleagues to show too much friendship for Americans. Dr. Wei called a meeting and said, in effect, "We are not asking you to leave, but

we think that probably the greatest service you can render now would be to let us carry on and face the future on our own." So I think leaving was pretty generally regarded as the best thing to do. There were a few that were there a little longer; but I think that in a matter of months, virtually every American did come back--not because they were forced out, but because they felt that, given the situation, with the increasing political tension, it was best to leave. Ruth Lo was about the only exception I know who stayed on for years. I think it was chiefly because of her being married to a Chinese dean who continued his work and because she decided to become a Chinese citizen.

Before leaving, we had to apply to Peking to get authorization. The only pressure I was under was that I had gotten word very late, after we decided to come back, that my mother was dying of cancer. (She passed away before we got back--actually before we left.) Our authorization came in about three weeks. We were able to take everything we wanted to bring back--books and clothes for the children, etc. We went down to Canton by train, walked across the international bridge, and stayed in Hong Kong for a period. I was asked to confer with the consular authorities there, which I did. I had never wanted to have too close relations with the State Department as a missionary--I thought these spheres of activity ought to be kept separate--but when I received an invitation to confer, I thought I should answer their questions.

I: Earlier you mentioned that one of the professors was a Communist contact. How did you know that?

FULTON: "Scuttle-butt" plus "a feeling." People would say, "We think he has some connections." It was one of those things that came to be accepted; and it tended to make people more careful in expressing their views. This was before the turn-over. Afterwards, there were open contacts between Communist representatives and sympathizers and others, particularly among students.

One student who was very close to us would sometimes come after meetings, in the post turn-over period, and tell us sometimes about the pressures that were put on the members of the Christian Fellowship which was the most active student organization. We (there were faculty advisors, of which I was one) had all worked especially hard at the social service aspect of the program. It had been very effective, we thought, and the students in the fellowship were often down helping people in the city who needed help.

The pressure was to get the Christian association to join forces with the new government-oriented group. They responded in the way many other Christians did. The general approach was, in effect, "We will cooperate where we can; we will agree to disagree in terms of theological orientation, but we certainly do not want to hold ourselves off from the need for on-going community improvement."

There was one particularly crucial church leader, Y.T. Wu, whom I had met at Union Seminary years ago, who with some others set-up a conference in our area after the turn-over; and he and Kiang Wen-han, the leader of the National Christian Student Movement, were guests in our home in Wuchang. They made it clear that they were not members of the Communist party and were not planning to join, but felt that they needed to open their minds to whatever possibilities of cooperation there were. That

has been the general pattern in the ensuing years according to what we have picked up from people who have gone back and forth and as set forth in the U.S. National Council of Churches' China Notes.

Dr. T.C. Chao, Dean of the School of Religion at Yenching, later had some accusations made against him, was tried and given an "assignment" to go through a period of re-education. He accepted that, and has continued to be willing to talk with people who have called on him. Recently, there has been a series of articles by Bishop K.H. Ting, head of the Nanking Theological Seminary, which has been carrying on for years, though with small numbers of students. Ting was at Union Seminary for a time and then with the World's Student Christian Federation in Europe. He went back on his own after the turn-over against the advice of some people, but he felt he ought to be with the Chinese, his fellow citizens. He is now among those who are meeting and talking with visitors.

There is a smaller number of practicing Christians, meeting largely in homes, but they have carried on. I personally hope that before too long, there will be fairly free contacts between church people of China and America. I think we ought to be wide open to fresh thinking, involving a repudiation of anything we believe is true, but a willingness to listen and then find areas where cooperation is feasible. At least, that is my approach. The older I've gotten the less I believe in stereotyping people, politically or religiously or in any other way. So often it reduces opportunities for cooperation that could be very meaningful.

I: When you were at Wuchang did you have any experiences with anti-Christian sentiment?

FULTON: I can't recall any. The closest was when the Communists, in effect, said: "Look. What you have been doing as a Christian group is all right, but it really is not the real thing. Join us!" Some did. We knew some who went over completely and left the Christian Fellowship and joined the newly Communist-oriented youth group on the campus, but others decided to be selective. They were not going to give up what they thought was important in terms of our own Christian orientation. No, I don't recall any anti-Christian movement or attacks on the Huachung campus. I know, though, that there were such developments elsewhere from what I've read and heard.

For example, my friend Dwight Rugh, who was down in Changsha, stayed on until a later period. He had some experiences which were very difficult. He and one of his colleagues were accused of being American agents. He was paraded through the streets and some people attacked not his Christianity, but his independence from "American imperialism." But he said afterwards that some of those who shouted said to him later, "Please forgive us; we were under pressure." Again, this was later, after we returned, when the tension was getting greater and greater.

The Korean War was beginning in 1950 and there was growing tension with the threat to China's independence. One beautiful thing about Dwight Rugh was that his experience didn't embitter him at all. His daughter and her husband have been involved in work of the American Friends' Service Committee and have been in China recently and have seen

many old friends. Dwight and Winifred were delighted they went back. If Dwight had been in better health, I think he would have gone with them. He is a very wonderful person. It was just "one of those things." He realized that he was experiencing the kind of thing-- though "in reverse," so to speak--that some people suffered in the McCarthy Period in the U.S., being accused of this, that or the other orientation when it wasn't so. I imagine that if Dwight would go back now he would receive a very warm welcome, because he never did anything that could possibly support the charge of his being an agent.

Of course, we all had to keep in contact with the consulate to be sure our passports were up-to-date. When our children were born, we had to take them over within a limited period to be registered. Otherwise they would lose their citizenship; you couldn't avoid contacts. Anne and I simply felt that we should keep it to a bare minimum. It didn't mean refusing to talk with persons, but rather not being too "buddy-buddy" with officials.

Later when the closing of the consulates came, you had to keep it clear that you were on your own rather than acting as an agent of the American government.

I: Would you describe in greater detail the kinds of social action the Christian Fellowship was involved in?

FULTON: It was remarkably like what we used to do at Dwight Hall in New Haven. The students first found out what people were in need. Sometimes we helped the people who were having sickness in the family to be sure they were getting medical

attention. We contacted nurses and helped them to make appropriate contacts. We raised funds and got some food and clothes, having periodic clothing drives. Later we established a little office nearer the center of Wuchang that was open during off-school hours where people could come in and talk.

The Fellowship members also met for worship purposes and to study the Bible and church history, but there was a strong emphasis on social service--the kind of thing that the NCC document I read, referred to. It was limited in scope, of course, as they were volunteers, not professionals. I thought it was a very healthy program and it was respected, also, by those who then later became Communists. Their work was not disparaged. The Communists simply said, in effect: "Join us so you can do a better job."

I: During the turn-over what communication were you sending and receiving? How did you let people know of Mary Anne's birth?

FULTON: It was difficult. We got out word of the birth of Mary Anne through a ham radio friend, so our folks heard about it within a few days. It was a period when the mails weren't going through. There was an extremely tragic situation that occurred in the immediate post-turn-over period because of lack of communication: Dean Ying of the Yali Middle School had a son at Hwachung--a brilliant young fellow who was studying education. He was an athlete and a good student, a lovely person, but like so many young people apt to be a little careless about his health. He didn't bother to get inoculated against typhoid, though this was strongly urged by our college health department.

He came down with a bad case, which destroyed his intestines despite everything the hospital, a good hospital, could do. He had blood transfusions, one right after another. People lined up to give blood. Nurses stayed up over night and gave constant attention. Everything was done that could be done, but we didn't save his life. This was during the period of weeks when we couldn't even communicate with Changsha because the Nationalists went south and were in Changsha after Wuchang had been taken over. Eventually, the father got the earlier word that his son was ill, but he didn't know he had died. When he arrived in Wuchang, by a round-about route, he found that his son was gone--a very tragic, tragic situation.

I don't want to get into a theological discussion about this, but I remember that some people tried to help him by saying, in effect: "You have to accept this as the will of God." He said to me, "How can God have willed this?" I said, "I don't accept that. I believe in God and His will but to say that God wanted your son to be careless, as he was, and wanted the efforts to save him to fail--I just can't accept that." I later read in one of Sherwood Eddy's writings of a study by Leslie Weatherhead, pastor of the City Temple in London, on the will of God. It developed the idea that we ought to think of the will of God as in three categories: the "intentional will of God," the "circumstantial will of God," and the "ultimate will of God."

The "intentional" aspect would certainly be that every life should be lived to its fulfillment; the "circumstantial" would involve dealing with problems as they arose, and this would include medical activity where needed. Finally, the "ultimate" form of the divine will would be that we deal creatively with tragedy that you would have liked to have prevented.

I: As you look back on your China involvement, what has been the impact on your perspectives from this association?

FULTON: In general, it has been the sense of being a part of a community of persons who don't fit into the usual stereotype. I have said before that I think it is a mistake to pretend that it really matters in terms of ethical or moral concerns, whether one is Chinese or American or black or white.

TAPE FIVE-SIDE ONE

It's the sense of belonging, and being happy about belonging, to an international, interracial, inter-denominational, inter-class community. Basically to use the theological language, we are all God's children and we can and should think in those terms. I think the astronauts, some of them, have helped us in seeing from "way up there" that the earth is pretty small and the differences between living in Canada or in the United States or other places are really pretty trivial in terms of the universe. I think that we can and must get more people to really think of themselves as fundamentally members of an international community.

Personally, I believe that unless we do this in the "post '45" atomic era, the obvious danger is that we'll ruin the whole human process. So these international experiences have added a lot of zest to my thinking and teaching since then. Since coming back, I've been working in a number of colleges; and among the courses I have most enjoyed, has been the history of religions.

Here the stress has been on seeking to understand what is meaningful to people, whether one agrees or disagrees. For example, why is such and such an idea meaningful to Gandhi and to others like him--or some other concept to Muslims? And I've sought to deal with Communist ideas in the same way; I regard Communism as a kind of "semi-religion," especially, in its influence.

I guess it's the sense of belonging, of really deeply feeling that I belong, to a community that has no limits. Living for 10 years in China helped to push my roots down deep in such a community-feeling and I am deeply grateful for that. I was later able to spend about six months in India and Pakistan and that helped to encourage this sense of "belonging."

I'm hoping that somehow, before too long, Anne and I will be able to get back to China and renew some contacts and then help, when we return, with more adequate interpretation.

I: Dr. Fulton, thank you for your time and perceptions you have given us of your varied China involvement.