



TRINITY COLLEGE
LIBRARY

MOORE
COLLECTION
RELATING
TO THE
FAR EAST

CLASS NO. _____
BOOK NO. _____
VOLUME _____
ACCESSION NO.

PROTECTION *of* AMERICAN
LIVES *and* PROPERTIES
in CHINA

"AMERICA IS COMMITTED BY EVERY CONCEPTION
OF HONOR AND GOOD FAITH TO COOPERATE
WITH GREAT BRITAIN AND JAPAN IN THE DEFENSE
OF FOREIGN LIVES AND PROPERTIES IN CHINA"



Speech Delivered Before The National Trade Convention

Detroit, May 27, 1927



By GEORGE BRONSON REA

Publisher of THE FAR EASTERN REVIEW

Delegate of the American Chamber of Commerce of China

Protection of American Lives and Properties in China

America is Committed by Every Conception of Honor and Good
Faith to Support Great Britain and Japan in the Defense
of Treaty Rights in China.

By GEORGE BRONSON REA.

Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I come before you as the Delegate of the American Chamber of Commerce of China. I have lived in China for 25 years as the publisher and editor of *The Far Eastern Review*, the only American trade and industrial magazine in that part of the world. At one time I was intimately associated with Dr. Sun Yat-sen as adviser in charge of his railway program. I held his power of attorney to finance his new national railway scheme. I loved him and respected him and have loyally defended him on all occasions against the attacks of his enemies. I sympathize with his cause. I would like to see the Nationalists win out in their struggle to implant his ideals, but as long as they are allied with the Soviet; as long as I am certain that the Soviet is carrying on a fight against the so-called capitalist powers behind the screen of the Nationalist armies; as long as their object is to drive the foreign business men from China, despoil them of their properties, oust them from the treaty ports and make Shanghai the Far Eastern center of world Revolution, my first duty is to my fellow countrymen.

In painting the picture of conditions in the Far East, I do not wish to be understood as condemning the policy of our Government. The point I wish to make and emphasize is that whenever a crisis arises in China calling for firm action on the part of our Government for the defense of its basic trade rights, it is the Uplift element in this country which monopolizes the public platforms and floods Washington with resolutions recommending acceptance of the Chinese viewpoint. They are always articulate; always on the job. The business men of this country are not articulate. If Americans in China are now being adequately protected by our armed forces, it is because the President has declined to be guided by the recommendations of the Uplift element urging him to withdraw all American warships and troops and sur-

render immediately to the demands of the Nationalists. The President has done all he could under the circumstances. He has to be guided largely by public sentiment. Public opinion in this country demands that we play a lone hand. We hesitate to cooperate with the other powers for the protection of foreign lives and properties. We believe we can win out alone and retain the friendship of the Chinese. We may, but if we do we will lose the friendship of others.

In every instance where the subject of China has been discussed from a public forum in this country for the past six months, the speaker has been either a missionary, an educator, a Y. M. C. A. secretary, or a propagandist in the pay of the Nationalist Government. Not once do the newspapers record an instance where a banker, a merchant or a Chamber of Commerce has spoken in defense of their trading rights. Only two American firms have approached the State Department asking for protection.

Perhaps the reason why American firms interested in China have refrained from asking the State Department for protection, is because they have been intimidated by Nationalist agents. I have seen one of their confidential statements describing the birth and development of the Nationalist movement which frankly admits the alliance with the Soviet and winds up with the following threat:

“Persons and organizations in China today suspected by the people of blocking the free development of the Nationalist movement will have their usefulness seriously affected and even their continued existence threatened. The same would be true of Governments and nations.”

Mind you, this is not a public statement that might be reprinted in the newspapers. It is a secret and confidential warning to an American firm doing business in China. From this one instance you will readily understand how difficult it has been for any American firm holding property in China to openly approach his own Government for the protection he is legally entitled to. The resolution of the American Chamber of Commerce of China calling upon our Government for international armed intervention for the preservation of foreign lives and properties is the only instance where our business men have gone on record in defense of their own interests.

Perhaps the American Chamber of Commerce of China worded its resolution too strongly, but there were good

reasons for it. If it came out fairly and squarely for armed international intervention, it is because it had reached the limit of human endurance and felt compelled to make some effort to counteract the campaign of scuttle advocated in this country by sentimentalists and Chinese propagandists.

To speak plainly, the fundamental American Open Door doctrine for the protection and advancement of our trade interests in China has become subordinated to our national Uplift activities. American investments in China are now revealed as totalling \$150,000,000, of which \$80,000,000 represents missionary and uplift properties. Of the balance, \$40,000,000 represents loans and frozen credits to the Chinese Government. This leaves \$30,000,000 as our commercial stake in the country.*

Our exports to China over a period of three years averages \$100,000,000 a year. If we assume a fair five per cent profit on this, the increase to the national economy is about \$5,000,000. On the other hand, the missionary boards spend \$10,000,000 a year in missions alone. Add to this the expenditures for the maintenance of colleges, hospitals, Y. M. C. A.'s, the Rockefeller Institute and other benevolent institutions and the total will approximate \$15,000,000. The balance sheet shows that for every dollar of profit we take out in trade, we hand back to China two dollars for charity. The distribution of this charity requires two uplifters for every American engaged in trade. They outnumber and outvote us two to one.

The Uplift movement in this country has become one of our most highly organized and efficiently directed activities, deriving its support from the contributions of the church-going public and endowments from business men. Like a snowball rolling down hill it grows with its own momentum. Each year calls for an increasing expenditure. Naturally, anything that might diminish the flow of these contributions strikes at the very life of the movement and the usefulness of its agents. In any crisis where our Government is called upon to support its basic trade doctrine in China by force or firm diplomacy, the interests of our traders are invariably subordinated to sentiment by the pressure exerted upon the administration by missionary boards and Uplift bodies. Any action on the part of our Government that might create an anti-Chinese sentiment in the United States and cut off the

* This official estimate does not include outstanding American banking credits, loans and bills, nor the value of cargoes in bonded warehouses or stocks of merchandise. Nor does it provide for present day replacement costs of properties. Our total stake in China can be roughly estimated at \$250,000,000.

contributions for Uplift work in China is vigorously opposed. Any move that might create an anti-American sentiment in China that would undermine the position and usefulness of the Uplifters is equally inimical to their interests. The influence of this element is so powerful that no President, Secretary of State, or politician can afford to ignore it, and although I would not care to say that the pressure is openly applied, the subconscious reaction on the officials in Washington is one of deference.

It is only necessary to read Mr. Henry Morgenthau's book, "All in a Lifetime", and Colonel House's "Memoirs", to realize that our missionary and educational interests dictate the selection and appointment of the American minister to China. The present incumbent is the exception to the rule.

Now the only legal right Americans have in China is the right to trade. To this basic privilege we have added the right to propagate our ideals, our religion and our culture through the medium of missions, schools and colleges under the treaties originally designed to protect our trade. If our major interest in China is to expend millions of dollars yearly in propagating our ideals, then we cannot deny the same right to the Bolshevists for using the same means to achieve similar ends. The underlying principle is the same in both cases. If these propaganda rights have received the sanction of the Chinese Government, they are merely secondary rights, to be surrendered when China's full sovereignty over her educational and religious institutions is recognized by a revision of the treaties. Our trade comes first, and in any controversy with the Chinese over treaty rights the Uplift element should take a back seat and let our commercial interests have their say. It is the American business men who are doing the Nation's constructive work in China and it is to the business men that the missionaries, educators and Uplifters must look for their endowments. If it comes to an issue as to who shall withdraw from China we cannot ask our traders who are building up the foreign trade of the nation to get out in order that our charities may have a free field. We cannot mix trade with sentiment. The sooner the American people realize this the better it will be for their future prosperity.

American traders in China have every right to expect that in any issue where their lives are imperiled, our Government will come to their protection and enforce respect for the

treaties. They sympathize with the aims and aspirations of the Nationalist party and are willing to surrender their extra-territorial privileges just as soon as a unified Government is evolved out of the present chaos and can guarantee them protection and some measure of justice and security.

American business men in China have been encouraged to go there by their own Government. For several years, the Department of Commerce conducted a campaign to induce American manufacturers to open offices in China. Congress passed a law known as the China Trade Act, exempting from federal taxation American corporations operating in China. On the surface, the China Trade Act was designed for the purpose of placing American firms in China on the same footing as the British, but the real object was to facilitate the cooperation of American and Chinese capital in creating new joint enterprises in that country. For many years, British registered companies in China had been exempt from income and other taxation and as a result Chinese capital flowed into their enterprises. Americans were handicapped in this competition for Chinese capital in establishing new factories and industrial plants, so they started the campaign which finally resulted in the passage of the China Trade Act, which, among other things, exempted them from taxation and placed them on an equal basis with the British. You will recall that there was great rejoicing in this country when that bill was enacted into law. The whole country approved of it. The Chinese Government cordially endorsed this program, and conducted a propaganda campaign of its own to bring Americans into China. As a result, many American firms answered the call and established themselves in Shanghai and other treaty ports. Our Government followed them and appointed officials from every department except the interior to supervise their activities.

It is true, perhaps, that the United States has no concessions in China, but our citizens reside and conduct business in the concessions held by other powers and enjoy all their privileges. If the other powers should decide to preserve their concessions for the exclusive use of their nationals, where, pray, would the Americans reside? Do you know the story of Shanghai? When the Chinese Government handed over the mud flats outside the old native city to France and Britain, it set aside what is known as the Hongkew district as an American concession. Our Government, however, declined to accept it and in time incorporated Hongkew in

what is now the International Settlement, in which we hold equal rights with all the other Powers, except the French. On our own initiative we internationalized the concession that China willingly presented us with and so became equally responsible with the other Powers for its protection. After all these years of participating in the municipal government of Shanghai, how can we now stand aside and refuse to cooperate with the other Powers in defending the International Settlement? How can we defend American lives and properties in Shanghai without fighting shoulder to shoulder with the British, the Japanese, the Italians and others? Americans in Shanghai have their offices in the International Settlement, but the majority reside in the French Concession. The American school and community church are located in the French Concession. Over \$30,000,000 worth of property is registered in the American consulate at Shanghai. American trade in Central China and the upper Yangtze region has been built up by American firms whose headquarters are located in the British concession at Hankow. How can our Government protect the properties of its citizens in this port without cooperating fully with the British? How can we protect our homes, our school and our church in the French concession of Shanghai without cooperating with the French? Is it playing the game to denounce the other fellow and refuse to cooperate with him when the Chinese, urged by the Soviet, turn on all foreigners and by force of arms demand immediate return of the concessions? The American business man in China recognizes his debt to the British, to the French, to the Japanese, and other nations whose hospitality and police protection he has been forced to seek because his own Government, after inviting him to come to China, has consistently refused to accept a treaty port concession that the Chinese Government in the past was always willing to set apart for him. American business men in China have been compelled to live within those foreign concessions controlled by other powers. The American missionary on the other hand has enjoyed special residential and property privileges outside the treaty ports not available to his commercial brother. It makes little difference to the Uplifter if the foreign treaty port concessions are surrendered to the Chinese. His work goes on under the same old conditions. He can afford to lead the campaign in this country for the immediate recognition of China's sovereign rights. He loses nothing by the change. The trader pays the price of the Uplifter's altruism.

Is it any wonder that the American Chamber of Commerce of China, faced with a possible looting of Shanghai and a repetition of the horrors of Hankow, Nanking and Kiukiang, pleaded with their countrymen at home to support them fully by armed international intervention? To have done otherwise, would have stamped them as weaklings, as hypocrites and as ingrates. Had they deserted the British by following the lead of the Uplift element in demanding the immediate withdrawal of American warships and marines, never again could they have held up their heads in China. Had our Government in Washington acted on the advice of those who clamored for the immediate withdrawal of our armed forces in China, the lives of every American in Nanking would have been sacrificed. Americans in Shanghai thank God that the British troops arrived there before the Nationalist army; they are proud they had an Admiral of the Yangtze patrol who lived up to the highest traditions of the American Navy and had the courage to cut red tape and come to the rescue of his imperilled countrymen.

Americans in China have not forgotten that in every instance for the past two decades where the affairs of China have claimed the attention of their Government we have insisted with the full force of our diplomacy and finance on complete international unity of action. Only once during the Wilson administration did we depart from this principle and then had to return to it when it was found that unless we did cooperate with the other Powers, American capital could not participate in the development of China. In fact, it has been a settled policy of the American Government to do nothing in China unless it could rely on full international cooperation. We followed this doctrine in our railway negotiations and turned over to an international banking group the currency loan that the Chinese hoped we would finance alone. The whole consortium principle from the American banker's standpoint is based on the fact that it is impossible to sell a Chinese bond to the American investor on the support of the State Department alone. Only the guarantee that lies behind the support of the four great Powers can make a Chinese bond salable on the American market.

We insisted on international cooperation in financing China, and, in doing so, broke down the barriers which kept Russia out of China. We forced the Japanese to surrender to the consortium the Taonan-Jehol concession, which they were holding as the one defense of China and Japan against

“the menace from the direction of Urga.” As self-appointed trustee for the Russian people, our Government pressed Japan to evacuate her armies from Siberia and Northern Manchuria thus opening the door for the Bolsheviks to recover their lost positions in those regions. Supported by the British Dominions, we broke down the Anglo-Japanese alliance at the Washington Conference when we labored under the hallucination that we were in danger of going to war with Japan. This alliance stood for twenty years as the one guarantee of peace in Eastern Asia; the one check to Russia’s designs on China. We deliberately ignored the part that China had played through her secret alliance with Russia in 1906 which forced Japan and Great Britain to come together in defense of their menaced interests. Even after China’s tardy confession at the Washington Conference when a telegraphic summary of the secret Sino-Russian alliance was read before the delegates by Dr. Wellington Koo, not one American writer on Far Eastern affairs, not one public speaker had the courage to accept the evidence that gives an entirely new angle to Far Eastern history, and fully justified Great Britain and Japan in maintaining their alliance. We closed our eyes to the facts and superseded an alliance with teeth in it for a Four-Power Pact safeguarding our insular possessions in the Pacific. We purchased peace in the Pacific at the expense of Great Britain and Japan in Asia and as a direct result the Russians again swarmed into Mongolia and Manchuria and now dominate the Canton Government, carrying on their war against Great Britain behind the screen of the Kuomintang armies.

When we induced the other powers to join the consortium in 1921, Mr. Lamont proudly announced that the new lineup was, in effect, a Far Eastern League of Nations. Mr. Lamont was right. The present consortium for financing China was created on our own initiative. It was the American Secretary of State who issued the invitations to Great Britain, France and Japan to join us in this undertaking and in order to make the plan acceptable we even offered to finance the French and British groups until such time as they could take over their share of the loans. Although the consortium has not functioned, that agreement is still in force. In plain words, in order to obtain the cooperation of Great Britain and France to forward our own policies in China, we were willing to carry the full load of financing them. We are committed to play the game with them, but the other

members of this Far Eastern League of Nations now learn that when our cooperation becomes essential to uphold or defend their interests placed in jeopardy as a result of their acceptance of our ideas, we decide to play a lone hand. As many American newspapers put it, "America will not rake the chestnuts out of the fire in China for Europe." These Americans, however, overlook that we did not scruple to use Great Britain to rake our chestnuts out of the fire when it looked as though we might have to fight Japan. Great Britain gave up her alliance with Japan to please us and as a result now finds herself up against it in China with the Soviet determined to destroy her investments and her commerce and drive her out of Asia. There may be excellent reasons why America should pursue a lone hand in China at this time, but there are equally good reasons why we should stand shoulder to shoulder with Great Britain and Japan. Whether we like to admit it or not, we are committed by every conception of honor, of loyalty, of good faith and common decency to cooperate fully with these nations for the preservation of foreign lives and properties in China. China is entitled to a square deal. Every American is with Canton in its present struggle, but our friendship for the Chinese should not blind us to our obligations to the others. If the British and Japanese are driven from China, we will follow.

The British stake in China, exclusive of Hongkong, is \$1,750,000,000. British and French capital has, in the main, built the railways and developed the mines and industries throughout China proper, which, in turn, has made possible the trade expansion Americans are now participating in. Outside of our \$7,500,000 share in the Hukwang loan, America has not contributed one dollar towards the construction of China's railways, and even in this loan we have not a mile of railway equipped with American materials to show for our investment.

The Japanese stake in China is estimated at two billion and a half dollars. In Manchuria alone, Japan has \$1,500,000,000 invested, half of it in a railway built to American standards and specifications. In this alone, Japan has done for us something we have never been able to do for ourselves in China. Since the South Manchuria Railway came into the possession of Japan as a result of her war with Russia, the Japanese have purchased nearly \$100,000,000 in American materials for this line and its allied industrial enterprises. The exact figure stood at \$75,000,000 five years ago. Let me

tell you what this means. In order to finance all the other loan-built railways in China, the European nations advanced to the Chinese Government approximately \$150,000,000. Out of this sum they received in exchange about 50 per cent for materials required in the construction and equipment of the lines, or \$75,000,000. In other words, American manufacturers received from Japan without lending her one cent, orders for materials to the same extent as though we had financed all the Chinese Government railways. Even when the Japanese controlled the operation of the Shantung Railway during the war, out of a total of \$10,000,000 spent in new materials, some \$6,000,000 came to the United States. They transformed the old German line into a modern American railway.

Japan has gone into China, not to exploit the country, but to build up industries in a legitimate manner. Far from exploiting the Chinese, the shoe is on the other foot. The Japanese have been exploited. Outside of the South Manchuria Railway, not one of her enterprises in Manchuria have returned a fair rate of interest on the investment. The money in nearly every case has gone into the pockets of the Chinese. Japan owns outright forty per cent of the total cotton spindles in China and through her loans to private Chinese cotton mills, now controls over fifty per cent of China's cotton industry. She has Yen 45,000,000 invested in the shape of loans in the Han-Yeh-Ping Company, which operates the great Chinese steel mill at Hanyang, the iron mines at Tayeh and the coal mines at Pinghsiang, all located in the heart of the Hankow region. Japan has \$15,000,000 in the Kiangsi Railway, tied up for years, on which she has received neither interest nor principal. Japan has gone into China in the same way that Americans were invited to go there under the China Trade Act, cooperating fully with the Chinese for the development of their country.

Look at the position of Japan. Here you have the picture of a country with a rapidly increasing population denied the right of emigration into the White Man's countries, fighting desperately and honorably to solve its problems in a peaceful manner. Japan's only hope of a peaceful solution lies in keeping her children at home and finding employment for them through industrialization. Even this is no solution unless markets are available for the sale of their manufactured products. Japan's eyes are turned towards China as the main source of her food supply and raw materials and

as a market for her manufactured products. If China collapses, Japan faces ruin. Japan is now passing through a severe financial crisis, traceable in large part to the long drawn out civil warfare in China. Our loans and investments in Japan total about \$500,000,000. If Japan's investments in China are wiped out, how can she pay her debts to us? So, aside altogether from the political and sentimental aspects of the China situation, the economic phase has a direct bearing on the ability of Great Britain and Japan to pay their debts to the United States.

American exports to China total \$100,000,000. Do you realize that thirty to forty per cent of these exports are sold through Japanese firms having offices in this country? Another ten to fifteen per cent passes through British hands. Japan buys from us Y360,000,000 worth of cotton. The textile industry is the basis of her export trade. If her trade with China collapses, our cotton growers will lose a valuable market. If Japanese and British investments in China are ruined and American firms are forced to leave the country, our trade with China will drop at least fifty per cent and our market in Japan will dwindle to an alarming extent.

Another financial crisis in England or Japan will shake the very foundation of world credit, dislocate world trade and compel America to finance these nations in order to protect her own interests. Once more we will hold the bag. Every crisis of this nature is one more victory for Moscow, one more step forward towards the Soviet goal of world revolution.

This, gentlemen, is the real aim of the Soviet leaders allied with the Nationalist movement in China. On the surface, the Kuomintang party, inspired by the highest patriotic motives, are waging a worthy fight to implant their ideals of popular government and overthrow the militarists, but their Soviet allies are openly fighting the so-called capitalist nations in a determined attempt to oust the foreigner and hold Shanghai as their Far Eastern center of world revolution. Soviet commercial agents come before you in this convention urging you to extend them trade credits, yet their political agents in China are destroying the trade and investments you have built up in that country at so much labor. For every dollar we will gain by financing the Soviet from this end, we will lose three in China. For not only is our own trade affected, but the trade of England and Japan; our best customers.

Lest We Forget! Once before China and Russia entered into a secret alliance for the purpose of crushing Japan and giving Russia a warm water port on the Pacific from which her fleets, acting in conjunction with their French ally, could wrest from Britain her empire in India. This was the sole reason for the Anglo-Japanese alliance. The moves of Russia compelled Great Britain to demand compensatory concessions from China in order to protect herself. The scramble for concessions in 1898, the partition of China into spheres of influence came as a direct result of China's secret treaty with Russia. With this alliance in full force, the American Secretary of State, John Hay, in complete ignorance of its terms, promulgated his now famous Open Door Doctrine, which, among other things, guaranteed the integrity of China's territory at a time when she had surrendered her sovereignty in Manchuria to Russia. Japan, also maintained in ignorance of the terms of the secret alliance, gladly accepted the American doctrine, thus tying her own hands, while Russia and China were secretly preparing to crush out her national existence. That war was fought. Japan sacrificed 200,000 men and nearly bankrupted herself. China, the full ally of Russia, emerged from the struggle as the innocent and injured victim. Had the text of the secret alliance been known at Portsmouth, China would have been compelled to pay her full share of the indemnity, by ceding Manchuria to Japan. She escaped scot free. Not until the Washington Conference, twenty-five years later, did China officially admit the existence of this secret pact, which brought upon the world one of the bloodiest wars of modern times. Ponder over it, gentlemen. For twenty-five years the world was maintained in complete ignorance of the most cynical and disastrous piece of secret diplomacy recorded in history.

Once more we see the outward working of a secret agreement between Russia and China. It is plain that such an agreement exists. What are the terms of this secret understanding? We know no more today than we did in 1898. The same conditions exist today as existed thirty years ago, with Moscow and Canton linked up in an understanding to oust Britain and Japan from their positions in Asia. As long as this understanding remains in force, as long as the Nationalist party in China is openly allied with Moscow, the rest of the world must expect that Great Britain and Japan will make every effort to defend their rights. Once before the American Government unwittingly and with the best of intentions

intervened in a situation which strengthened the hands of Russia. With the clear evidence before us of another secret pact between China and Russia, we are being urged by Chinese propagandists and American sentimentalists to again strengthen the hands of Russia by acceding to the Cantonese demands. It is true, perhaps, that our interests in China are not altogether identical with those of the other Powers, and if the issue was one solely identified with Chinese Nationalist aims, there would be some justification in holding ourselves completely aloof from the other Powers. But the fight is clearly one between the Soviet and the so-called imperialist or capitalist nations, in which they are using the Chinese Nationalist movement to conceal their real purpose. We cannot defend American lives and properties in China without sending our troops into the concessions held by the other Powers. Only through full and loyal cooperation with Great Britain, France and Japan can our Government carry out its program to protect American interests in China along the lines laid down by the President in his speech. That, gentlemen, is the reason why the American Chamber of Commerce of China sent out its appeal for armed international intervention, and that is the reason why I, its representative, appeal to you to stand by your own agents and make your voices heard in Washington in opposition to the propaganda of those who are urging our Government to withhold its troops and warships and evacuate all Americans from China. We owe a debt to the other Powers. We cannot withdraw and leave them to fight our battles for us. We cannot desert those whose sacrifices for peace in 1921 brought security to us and retain our self-respect.

One word more. The slogan of this convention is "**Greater National Prosperity Through Greater Foreign Trade.**" What will it profit you if you increase your trade in one part of the world and lose it in another? What will you gain by a few more exportations to Latin America or Soviet Russia, if you lose out in China; if the purchasing power of Great Britain and Japan, your best customers, is curtailed? If this convention means anything at all, if your objects are to be realized, you must insist upon full cooperation with the other Powers in China for the protection of mutual interests. If they go under, in some way or other you will pay the bill. These Americans in China who are pleading for full cooperation with the other Powers are doing the work of the American manufacturers represented in this audience. They are your men,

your agents, fighting your battles for foreign trade. Stand by them! When you leave this convention, sit down and write to the President and back him up in his policy. Remember that powerful influences are at work to persuade him to withdraw our warships and troops, surrender immediately under threats our treaty rights, and evacuate all Americans from China. Remember that concessions wrung from us under pressure will cheapen American lives in China. The President has stood by our commercial interests in the face of the most powerful campaign to surrender our treaty rights and abandon our citizens to the tender mercies of a hastily improvised military Government, incapable as yet of preserving law and order and guaranteeing the lives and properties of its own people against the hordes of bandits who overrun the countryside, looting and burning homes and villages, ruthlessly killing old men, women and children and carrying off to their lairs the younger women for the satisfaction of their bestial desires.

It is not for me to originate any resolution at this convention. If I could I would ask the foreign trade organizations represented here to draw up and pass a resolution expressing their appreciation of the President's firm stand in defense of American lives and properties in China. It was said that he would sacrifice his political future if he sent American warships and troops to China. He declined to be guided by this advice and ordered our warships and troops to the places where they were most needed. Public sentiment now applauds what he has done. The danger is not over. Other Powers are strengthening their forces in China in order to more adequately protect their nationals when dangers again threaten. Before the end of the chapter is reached, America will again be called upon to take the same stand. Are we to cooperate with the other Powers, or are we to stand alone? Can we dissociate ourselves from the others and preserve our self-respect, while they are guarding concessions which shelter American lives and properties? Let the President understand that in any such crisis, which calls for complete unity of action between the United States and the other Powers, that you are with him. Strengthen his hand! The American commercial community in China expect you to stand by them in their appeal for international cooperation. There is no other honorable way out.