

in number and were granted from the end of April to that of September in the same year of 1918. Their actual amount is a matter of conjecture, but the Chinese government places it at Yen 152,000,000. This gigantic sum was loaned within a brief period of five months for purposes which cannot stand close scrutiny.

Of the total amount Y.32,000,000 was appropriated for the purchase of arms and ammunition. It was used, without the slightest pretence to anything laudable, for the prosecution of civil strife in this country. It represented a deliberate attempt on Japan's part to keep China divided, and an act which, morally wrong in itself, cannot be recognised by the people who were the ultimate ones to suffer its evil consequences.

Another sum of Y.20,000,000 was allocated to China's participation in the European War. The Peking government was then, as the Chinese government has always been, financially incapable of bearing the burden of any military campaign of a non-domestic brand. If the funds had been properly used for the war to "make the world safe for democracy," there might have been adequate ground for Japan to insist upon their repayment. The fact is that this particular loan was not concluded till September 28, 1918, or less than a fortnight before the Armistice! This important factor should suffice to reveal the real purpose to which the proceeds were to be devoted, and that purpose was nothing other than the continuance of internal warfare.

A sum of Y.30,000,000 was earmarked for the development of gold mines and forestry in Heilungkiang and Kirin, and another sum of Y.50,000,000 for that of railway projects in Manchuria and Mongolia. It was no secret that the money so honorably loaned to China was most dishonorably misused for the time-honored purpose of financing the warlords in power.

Even if no irregularities were committed, Japan could by no means demand the redemption of these two loans. If any benefits accrued from them, they are now being enjoyed by the Japanese themselves. By occupying Manchuria and Jehol and practically controlling Mongolia, Japan has not only collected the principle and interest but has also taken possession of the very resources for whose development the two loans were presumably intended. China has paid more than is required by these so-called obligations.

The balance of Y.20,000,000 was contracted for in order to extend the telegraph lines in North China. It

is doubtful whether the cash was ever expended for that purpose, and if so, whether the extension was not undertaken purely to facilitate communications among the self-seeking warlords themselves.

Though we may grant them the benefit of the doubt, yet the small amount of Y.20,000,000 could hardly be sufficient to justify an expedition for its collection. It will cost Japan more to enforce payment than the loan is worth.

It is therefore obvious that Japan is not actually interested in these loans from the financial standpoint. She is only trying to call them as an excuse to invade North China. That her design has been of long standing can be easily established from the peculiar procedure in which the Nishihara loans were extended to China.

Firstly, contrary to her usual practices, Japan did not prescribe the manner in which each of the loans was to be expended. She or rather her agents gave certain officials of the Anfu clique blank authority to do what they pleased with the proceeds, and invariably they went into private pockets or were used for private ends.

Secondly, the total of eight loans within five months aggregating Y.152,000,000 was certainly a huge amount that under normal conditions would have been negotiated through the good office of Tokyo's official representative at Peking and its fiscal agent, the Yokohama Specie Bank. In the present case the customary procedure was abandoned. A single agent named Nishihara was the prime motivating force, with the support of several minor banks. This unique step was followed because Japan, as a signatory to the reorganisation loan agreement, was prevented from pursuing an independent financial policy in China. She had to resort to the employment of a private agent in order to evade her solemn undertaking to the other powers.

It may be assumed that Japan did not risk incurring the censure of the other nations, in order to extend to China a series of loans, without hoping to reap substantial benefit for herself. More than ten years have passed, and now she may soon be ready to demand the pound of flesh. What the Chinese government may do in such an event is decidedly uncertain. The probability is that she can neither pay nor refuse to pay. The new development from these nefarious loans will be as unthinkable as their original conclusion.

Sterilization in Germany

A LAW governing the reproduction of the insane, the epileptic, the feeble-minded, and others who are by heredity physically seriously defective was promulgated on July 25 by the German Government, to be effective the first of next January. Evidently it is a so-called sterilization law under which the individual, of any of the types just enumerated, shall undergo an operation, which, while leaving the sexual instinct quite intact, will make reproduction forever impossible. In the case of the male, this

operation is known as vasectomy, consisting in the severing of the tubes through which the male reproductive cells pass to the outside. In the case of the female, it is known as salpingectomy which severs the Fallopian tubes, thus preventing the normal process of ovulation from completing its course. Both these operations are now well-known and easily done, though salpingectomy is still regarded as a major operation.

From the eugenic point of view, the value and advis-

ability of the law is now no longer questioned. The student of eugenics is of the conviction that much of the unfitness that we see around us in any community is hereditary or at least has a hereditary basis, and that unless those that are hereditarily unfit are prevented from reproducing their like, many of the social problems will forever remain and will become worse as generations go by, particularly as there is a tendency for such elements in a community to multiply at a faster rate than the more normal types. For this purpose numerous methods are now on record. Primitive peoples, more or less conscious of the importance of racial health, of course dealt with the problem summarily and drastically. Death, ostracism, and castration were often resorted to.

But under civilisation, humane sentiments, and finally the systematic knowledge of eugenics or race hygiene, three newer methods have emerged. The first is segregation which proposes to keep apart for life the two sexes in well managed institutions. The second is contraception which proposes to induce the defectives to make use of birth control methods. The third is sterilization such as the present German law provides for. There are three criteria for judging the comparative merits of these three methods, namely, effectiveness, humaneness, and economy. Segregation is doubtless effective as far as it goes, but it is not quite humane and, what is most objectionable, is awfully expensive. Defectives are usually not defective as far as their sexual desire is concerned; with some it is indeed abnormally developed; while the lack of inhibition often results in crimes and other forms of outrages, a continuous repression for life is not only inhumane but may so affect their personality as to turn them into more sulky, unapproachable or even deadly individuals. The question of economy is still more formidable. In 1915, the United States, for instance, spent a sum of \$81,048,990.93 for the maintenance of 394,991 defectives, dependents, and delinquents in 576 institutions. Now if it is observed that most of the inmates in the different institutions were there only for a period of time; and that those three d's who were undergoing segregation for life constituted only a very small fraction of the whole number of their kind who deserve the same treatment but were as yet at large, it becomes evident that should life segregation become more general (and it has become more general in the United States since that date) the sum would be even more staggering.

Contraception is certainly the most humane of all methods; it is perhaps also the most economical, but it is the least effective. Those who are hereditarily unfit, by their very unfitness, simply cannot be induced to make use of birth preventive methods. Birth control presupposes foresight and a sense of responsibility, and it is these very traits that are often found wanting in such unfit individuals. It is for this reason that birth control, while still rapidly gaining in favour as a weapon for keeping down the birth-rate and for preventing many of the ills of a large family, has in late years enlisted but few supporters among the more strict of eugenics students.

But sterilization seems to meet the three criteria equally well. It is certainly the most effective. It is economical; the operation is simple, particularly in the case of the male. Individuals operated on may be safely left at large; no supervision is necessary as far as the mischance on procreation is concerned. The very thought of operation to annihilate an important function may make some people feel uneasy; but when it is remembered that it does little or no harm to sexual desire and often results in improved health equivalent of rejuvenation, it will be seen that the method is certainly not less humane than segregation.

The only considerable objection to sterilization has come from the side of politicians. The politician thinks it is interfering too much with individual rights. To him our answer is very simple. While we may hesitate to go so far as to declare with the late Professor William Bateson that "of (individual) rights we know little and of equal rights we know nothing," it is evident that society has its rights to look after, particularly that society which has learned to include future generations in its purview.

The present German law has therefore much to commend itself. As a piece of legislation people may think it to be a bit too rash; a government that is not Fascist would perhaps never have promulgated it. But this is again mistaken. The movement for sterilization has its own history, and is quite independent of and very much older than Hitlerism. Germany, of all countries, was indeed the very first to be thinking about questions of racial health. Johann Peter Frank, a physician and a philosopher, as early as 1779, urged that the mentally diseased and mentally deficient be castrated to prevent the deterioration of the race. Popenoe and Gosney write in *Sterilization for Human Betterment* (1929): "The war, with its tremendous damage to racial stocks and its succeeding misery, brought eugenic prospects very much to the fore in European countries, with the resulting increase in interest in sterilization... In Germany the discussion has been more active (than all other European countries), and as the German law seems not to interfere with sterilizations made with the consent of the patient or of his near relatives or guardian, scattered sterilizations have been performed in many places and more systematically, as part of a eugenic campaign, in the Saxon community of Zwickau, where more than one hundred operations are recorded." Needless to say, in the United States, sterilization and sterilization law have received a growing interest during the last four or five decades and have already accomplished much, particularly in California where more than six thousand persons had been operated on up to 1929 with satisfactory results. And it will be remembered that the United States has been far from going Fascist, the present attempts of President Roosevelt at centralization notwithstanding.

When will China be affected by movements of this nature can only be a matter of conjecture at present. It seems that while we have been rather fast in accepting

abstract doctrines of government and social organization and even call them our own after a change of names, we have been unusually slow in accepting anything that will materially raise our status as to health and ability to cope with the present difficult situation. The authorities of our judiciary are just now considering the problem of releasing the sex tension of long-termed criminals by allowing them to be visited by their spouses at stated intervals. This is of course a quite humane thing to do as far as

these criminals and their consorts are concerned. But the authorities seem to have utterly overlooked that in the absence of proper precautions, a release in sex tension may mean the release of a new individual over whose sex tension they may yet have to be solicitous twenty years hence. We do not propose that these criminals are in need of sterilization, but we do insist that our authorities, judicial or otherwise, stoop down and learn what sterilization may yet mean to the uplift of the race.

Japan, America And Russia

By P. C. KUO (郭斌佳)

THE long awaited Disarmament Conference and World Economic Conference had been held respectively at Geneva and in London, and both had finished their sessions. We remember distinctly that before they were convened, the situation in the Far East filled many people with apprehension, lest aggression or violations of treaties seal the doom of these Conferences. It is obvious now that while this apprehension was not fully justified, yet no tangible accomplishment resulted from either of the two parleys. People in the Far East, as those in the rest of the world, have allowed themselves during the past three months to overlook problems of sectional interest, only to realize to-day that their troubles cannot be removed overnight. It is time for us to resume our study of the Far Eastern situation, and to understand its logic which, having not been adequately met by the Conferences, contributed to their failure.

During the past three months nothing of a vital nature happened to alter the situation in the Far East, except the completion of Japanese conquests of Jehol and Manchuria, the Tangku truce between China and Japan, and the proposed sale of the Chinese Eastern Railway to Japan by Soviet Russia. The period is marked by relative inaction on all sides, by a decline of attention toward the Sino-Japanese issues, and by an obscurantism pervading a large section of the public. But the Far East to-day presents the same problems as those of three or four months ago, the problems are of long standing, and they demand our urgent attention. A proper analysis, therefore, of the present situation in the Far East should go back to its origins in the last spring.

It will be remembered that in April last the Sino-Japanese conflict entered upon a new phase as Japan formally signified her decision to withdraw from the League of Nations. According to the Covenant of the League, any member may withdraw from the League after two years' notification of its intention to do so, "provided that all its international obligations and all its obligations under this Covenant shall have been fulfilled at the time of its withdrawal." Japan had fulfilled none of these obligations. Her invasions of Manchuria and Jehol violated not only the League Covenant but also the Nine-Power Treaty and the Anti-

War Pact. Before Japan's withdrawal from the League could be effective, therefore, she has to rectify all her delinquencies under these international obligations. In other words, Japan is still subject to the jurisdiction of the League and she cannot escape the authority of the latter at a mere signal of secession.

Not a few of the thinking public believe that had there not been the League, the dispute between China and Japan would have been settled long ago. Such scepticism toward the League is, however, both unnecessary and unwarranted by facts. The truth is that Japan has a policy of her own which she means to carry out at any cost. Her whole attitude is best epitomized in the saying that she quit the League because she could not have her way. Therefore, we need not criticize the efficacy of the League. On the contrary, the League Covenant explicitly provides (Article XVI) that should any recalcitrant member of the League resort to war, it is tantamount to declaring war against all other members of the League, who should thereupon sever all trade or diplomatic relations with the Covenant-breaking member. Applied to the present situation in the Far East, it becomes clear that unless other members of the League could afford an act of self-denial, they have the duty to punish Japan by means of an economic boycott. The League should get to work, and give Japan to understand that she is the aggressor and that her aggressions will be opposed by every effective means in its power. It would not be for the sake of China alone; but it would be vindication of the League itself.

Such are the "legalities" in the present international relations of Japan. But the actual situation in the Far East has long passed the stage when legalistic scruples could have a restraining force upon Japan. Since her withdrawal from the League, Japan had added Jehol to the list of her conquered provinces; and to insure her ill-gotten gains, she came out of the struggle with the Tangku truce concluded with China. Japan has frankly declared before the world that other members of the League are addicted to cut-and-dried rules and are too concerned with the sanctity of the League. In her own words, "Japan and the League entertain diametrically opposed views, Japan being for a policy of realism and the League continuing to view things from an academic