

Historical Survey of AFSC Efforts in China
1917 – 2005

Researched and Written

by

Jacqueline Bruzio

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

Introduction

I. Outreach

| | |
|--|----|
| The Beginning..... | 4 |
| Lloyd Balderston Trip..... | 5 |
| Rufus Jones Visits China | 8 |
| 1 st Joint Deputation | 10 |
| 2 nd Joint Deputation | 14 |
| Friends International Center Shanghai..... | 15 |

II. Relief Work

| | |
|------------------------------|----|
| Friends Ambulance Unit | 18 |
| Friends Service Unit | 21 |

III. Exercises in Diplomacy

| | |
|---|----|
| Relief Efforts Continue | 27 |
| UN Recognition | 30 |
| Missed Opportunity | 31 |
| Youth Seminar Initiative | 32 |
| Famine Relief..... | 33 |
| China Coordinator..... | 35 |
| East Asia QIAR | 38 |
| National Committee on US/China Relations | 39 |
| Building Towards New Relations | 41 |
| Initiative from Prince Norodom Sihanouk..... | 43 |
| UN Recognition Received | 44 |
| AFSC Delegation 1972 | 45 |
| 1976 National Leadership Conference on US/China Relations | 47 |
| Medical Delegations | 49 |
| Pacemaker Donations..... | 50 |
| Peace Exchanges | 51 |
| Tianamen Square | 54 |
| Dialogues & Exchanges | 56 |

Bibliography

Abbreviations

| | |
|--------|--|
| AFSC | American Friends Service Committee (1) |
| CAC | China Approach Committee (36) |
| CAFIU | Chinese Association for International Understanding (49) |
| CASS | Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (59) |
| CCAS | Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars (46)] |
| CET | China Education Tours (51) |
| CFSC | Canadian Friends Service Committee (45) |
| CITS | China International Travel Service (46) |
| CO | Conscientious Objector (1) |
| CLARA | China Liberated Areas Relief Associations (25) |
| CNCP | Committee for a New China Policy (41) |
| CPS | Civilian Public Service (20) |
| CPWP | China Policy Working Party (37) |
| FAU | Friends Ambulance Unit (2) |
| FCCCA | Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America (4) |
| FCNL | Friends Committee on National Legislation |
| FSC | Friends Service Council (3) |
| FSEC | Foreign Service Executive Committee (28) |
| FSS | Foreign Service Section (4) |
| FSU | Friends Service Unit (17) |
| IAD | International Affairs Division (41) |
| IASW | International Affairs Seminars of Washington |
| ICW | International Conference on Women (56) |
| IPH | International Peace Hospital (23) |
| KMT | Kwomintang (25) |
| MC | Manchester Conference (2) |
| NCC | National Christian Council (15) |
| PRAC | Peoples Relief Association of China (16) |
| PRC | Peoples Republic of China (27) |
| QIAR | Quaker International Affairs Representative |
| QUNO | Quaker United National Office (43) |
| QUNP | Quaker United Nations Program (35) |
| RCRE | Research Center for the Rural Economy |
| RHC | Receiving Home for Children (16) |
| UCR | United China Relief (18) |
| UNICEF | United Nations Childrens Fund (27) |
| WCUU | West China Union University (11) |
| YMCA | Young Christians Men's Association (9) |
| YWCA | Young Christians Women's Association (1) |

Introduction

Although established in 1917, the history of the American Friends Service Committee's (AFSC) efforts to serve in China began in 1925. Before embarking on a more detailed history of the efforts and initiatives undertaken by the AFSC in China, however, a brief historical summary is necessary to provide background and context.

Quaker involvement in China dates back to the missionary period of the late 19th century with the establishment of American and British Quaker missions. American Evangelical Quakers from Damascus Monthly Meeting in Ohio established missions in Nanking (1887) and Luho (1898); medical work was a large component of the program at these missions. These missions remained operative until 1941, with the Quaker churches that had also been established still functioning with Chinese personnel as late as 1955. The British missionary presence dates from 1886 with the arrival in China of Robert John Davidson. In March 1890, Davidson would open the first Friends' Mission Hall in West China (Chungking). Davidson's three brothers – William, Adam, and Alfred – would later join him. In addition to evangelistic work, the Davidsons would be instrumental in establishing hospitals and would also cooperate in the establishment and management of West China Union University in Chengtu.

There was also an informal missionary presence. In the early part of the 20th century, many individual American Quakers felt called to serve in China. Among these were Robert Simkin, who established the first link between Friends' colleges in China (first in Chungking and then Chengtu) and Pennsylvania (Haverford College), Dr. William W. Cadbury, who served at Canton Hospital where Sun Yat-sen began his medical career; Lucy Burt, who taught at Yenching University, and Agatha Harrison, who worked with the YWCA in Shanghai (1921-1924) as a member of the Child Labour Commission. All served with distinction and without direct sponsorship of the Society of Friends.

To a great extent, these missionaries (formal and informal) paved the way for AFSC involvement in China. In the course of their work, they established a network of relationships that allowed Quakers, and more specifically the AFSC, more of an influence than their otherwise small numbers would suggest was possible. The way was paved, but AFSC efforts to establish a presence in China would not be easy and would occur only after the organization had transitioned from its original reason for being.

When established in 1917, the AFSC was a temporary organization formed in response to US involvement in WWI to fill a very specific need. The need was to provide an alternate means of service, or more specifically to provide a vehicle for pacifist Quakers, conscientious objectors (COs), to participate in the war effort in a way that was consistent with their beliefs. It was a successful effort, and the AFSC soon became known for its "humanitarian work with no

strings attached” (Frost, 47). It must be noted here that the work in Europe was undertaken in association with British Friends, especially the British Friends Ambulance Unit (hereafter FAU).

The members of the AFSC soon realized that their work had “some degree of permanency”. The ensuing years of post war work in Europe brought increasing hopes that the organization would continue on a more permanent basis. To determine what the future of the organization might be, conferences were held in 1920 and 1924 where discussions centered on the “relevance of Quaker pacifism in opposing the war-producing tendencies in racism, capitalism, class differentiation, and arms races” (Frost, 48). As a result, in 1925 the AFSC changed from a temporary to a permanent organization with a broader mission.

In a February 1925 letter to “Dear Friends,” Rufus Jones articulated the revised mission:

We conceive it now to be our business to do what we can to prevent another war and to bring about a better understanding between nations and groups of people who are affected by a clash of interests and who are antagonistic to each other ... [and that represents] the finest type of spiritual service.

Jones believed that the need for service at this time was greater than it had been in 1917. And although future service may be “less physical” than it had been initially, it was considered more necessary. This newly articulated mission was grand, and brought with it a proposal for establishing Quaker Centers in France, Germany, Austria Poland, Russia and Mexico to promote international goodwill.¹ It was in fact the emphasis on promoting international goodwill that distinguished the newly expanded mission. While China or for that matter the Orient in general was not specifically mentioned, it was recognized that organizations such as the AFSC must give more attention to inter-racial questions.

This expansive mission, with its strong focus on the larger social issues, seems to have been percolating since the Manchester Conference [MC]. Held in England in 1895, the Manchester Conference was a gathering of liberal Quakers for the purpose of discussing the social questions and issues of the day. The mandate established at the MC “demanded of Friends that they become involved in the work of the world ... and [that they] deal with social questions and social needs.” The new mission of the AFSC as articulated by Rufus Jones in 1925 clearly echoes this earlier mandate, and is perhaps why some suggest that the seed of the AFSC was planted at the MC.

Indeed, the move away from directing the work of COs to the prevention of war and to establishing better understanding between nations set the stage for AFSC involvement in China. But how would the AFSC serve in China? Except for the proposed establishment of Quaker Centers, the newly reorganized AFSC had no predetermined agenda. With the need for COs gone, and such a broad mission to fulfill, how could the organization provide the kind of concrete

service that had become associated with its involvement in Europe? Given the AFSC's original purpose, the choice of how to serve in Europe was evident. There were numerous challenges that had to be met of course, and they are another story. But in Quaker parlance, way opened, and by the mid-1920's service in Europe was considered "an ordinary thing" (MHJones, 134).

The situation in China was far from ordinary. While Quaker evangelical missionaries as well as individual Quakers had established a Quaker presence in China, it was still, from a US perspective, "a remote and relatively mysterious place" (MHJones, 135). Individual Quakers in the US interested in the welfare of the Chinese were sending monetary contributions to AFSC. These contributions would in turn be sent to various relief organizations already established in China, e.g. the American Red Cross. In 1922, the AFSC sent contributions in the amount of \$76 earmarked for China to help victims of a devastating typhoon in Swatow. This was, however, the extent of the manifest concern for China until shortly after the AFSC reorganized and issued the "Dear Friends" letter (see pg. 2).

Given this background, it is no surprise that much of the work in China would be a joint effort of American and British Quakers. Referring to the joint efforts during WWI, Rufus Jones wrote: "Our work together in this time of agony has inaugurated a new era of relationship between English and American Friends which is prophetic of much for the future" (p. xii). And indeed it was prophetic. The collaboration of the AFSC and the Friends Service Council (FSC) of England in Europe and in China contributed significantly to the recognition of Quaker ideals when in 1947, the Society of Friends² was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. As then chairman of the Nobel Committee, Gunnar Jahn so aptly put it in his presentation speech at the award ceremony:

The Quakers have shown us that it is possible to carry into action something which is deeply rooted in the minds of many: sympathy with others; the desire to help others; that significant expression of sympathy between men without regard to nationality or race; feelings which, when carried into deeds, must provide the foundation of a lasting peace. For this reason they are today worthy of receiving Nobel's Peace Prize.

Both organizations accepted the Nobel Prize on behalf of the Society of Friends.

This document attempts to convey a history of AFSC efforts and service in China from the years 1925 through 2000. It is by no means comprehensive or exhaustive. Rather, it is a survey that highlights the major efforts undertaken by AFSC to fulfill its mission which includes: "building interracial harmony, coordinating activities with English Friends and other relief organizations, reconstruction programs abroad, peace education and social welfare work at home" (Frost, 43). Except as noted, the information in this document was obtained from the AFSC archives.

¹ Centers had been established in Paris and Berlin during WWI as administrative centers to support the war relief effort.

² In Chinese the Society of Friends is known as Kung I Hue

I. OUTREACH (1925-1939)

The Beginning

While a history of Quaker presence in and concern for China had already been established, 1925 marks the “official” beginning of AFSC efforts to serve in China. Three seemingly unrelated situations arose that prompted AFSC’s turn toward a more active role in China:

1. The Shanghai Incident of May 31st 1925
2. Swarthmore Summer School³ effectively encouraged AFSC to advance better relations between the East and West.
3. Dr. Henry of Canton Christian College during a meeting with Wilbur Thomas urged Friends to appeal for funds to support Canton Hospital. Discussions regarding this request ultimately resulted in the decision to send a representative to China to investigate ways in which AFSC could serve.

Shanghai Incident

On May 31st, 1925, police fired forty-four shots into an angry crowd of Chinese demanding “the release of six Chinese students who had been arrested by the British and [protesting] against militarism and foreign imperialism” (Spence, 340) Eleven were killed and twenty wounded.

Mary Hoxie Jones (MHJ) wrote that China “was brought suddenly to the attention of concerned people by the reports of the terrifying incidents of [shootings of communists] in Shanghai, Hankow and Canton in May and June, 1925.” (MHJ, 134).

According to Lloyd Balderston, Jr., these were “shootings by the foreign concession police of unarmed students and others demonstrating for their rights.” In response, the Chinese “organized a spontaneous and effective boycott of British imports” which would have a serious negative effect on trade. Balderston, Jr. suggests that the climate of Chinese opinion engendered by this incident was the “principal reason for the AFSC sending Lloyd [Sr. to China].” It was AFSC’s attempt “to discover what reconciliation the Quaker Body might undertake” (Balderston, Jr., 35)

Swarthmore Summer School

In June 1925, Swarthmore Summer School sent a request to the AFSC. The group asked the AFSC to contact the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America (FCCCA) to communicate with the Christian leaders of China to determine what the American Churches could do to foster a better understanding between the East and West. The Foreign Service Section (FSS) of AFSC considered the request at its June 1925 meeting, and approved this course of

³ Quaker summer schools were a direct outgrowth of the Manchester Conference.

action. In December, it was reported that through its earlier enquiry, the FCCCA had discovered that the Chinese Christian leaders thought it neither timely nor wise to establish ties to the Christian Churches in America. Meanwhile, another request and possible opportunity for service occurred.

Canton Hospital

Dr. Henry, president of Canton Christian College, urged Friends to make an appeal for funds to support the hospital. The AFSC, however, did not view this as a way to render the kind of service that they deemed worthy of separate action since individual Friends were already contributing to the hospital, and other major religious organizations were contributing as well. At the meeting of the FSS on October 7, 1925, the decision was made not to make an appropriation to the Canton Hospital. The thinking was that funds "can be better used by following Jones' counsel to send someone to China to study the situation and recommend how Friends can render ... service to China along lines that are distinctly Christian but not sectarian." Thus, it was decided to send a delegate to China.

Jones suggested Lloyd Balderston as the best person to undertake the mission to China. It is unclear precisely why Balderston was chosen for this assignment; but his position as General Secretary of the Philadelphia Friends Mission Board no doubt uniquely qualified him for the task. He had also spent considerable time in what was then referred to as the Orient, Japan in particular. Balderston had reservations about undertaking this responsibility, in part because he was concerned for his family's wellbeing while he was away. His immediate personal concerns were handled, and although the enormity of the task would plague him, he agreed to go.

Lloyd Balderston Trip

Balderston set sail for China on November 12, 1925 from San Francisco on the Taiyo Maru. His trip was the first major initiative undertaken by AFSC in China. The following is an excerpt from the epistle written by Rufus Jones on behalf of the AFSC introducing Balderston and describing the spirit in which he was sent; it also serves as another iteration of the AFSC mission:

He is going out to cultivate friendship, goodwill, international understanding and the spirit of reconciliation. He carries a message of sympathetic interest from Friends in America and he embodies their faith and hope in a wider fellowship and brotherhood of life among men in all lands. He is asked to find out from his intercourse in China what ways Friends in America can help to promote the best interests and the ideals of the Chinese people at this important epoch in their history.

Balderston arrived in Shanghai on December 9, 1925 and for the next three months traveled to many parts of China to discern how AFSC might serve there. From Shanghai, Balderston traveled to Foochow, Hong Kong, Canton, Hangchow, Nanking, Hankow, Changsha, Tsingtao, Dairen, Tientsin and Peking.

Shanghai was then the largest city in China as well as the epicenter of “anti-foreign and anti-Christian agitation.” But Balderston was most amazed at the degree of hostility towards Americans by the British. He wrote, “They [the British] say we [Americans] are cultivating the favor of Chinese for the express purpose of supplanting the British in trade!”

Balderston wrote numerous, detailed reports of his travels and activities. He found many opportunities for service in areas such as: engineering and building, religious and social work, journalism and education to name a few. The AFSC directed the attention of young Friends to some of these opportunities by publishing a pamphlet (sub headed “An Invitation to Further the Cause of World Peace”) briefly detailing these “openings for service.” Balderston would ultimately submit 42 recommendations, eleven of which were seriously considered by the FSS.

The first viable opportunity was presented to Balderston shortly after he arrived in Shanghai when he met with Mr. Thomas C. Tchou, the architect of what would become known as Friendship Village (Village). Tchou was a mill worker in Shanghai and had developed the Village plan to alleviate the deplorable conditions in which he and his fellow mill workers in China lived. Rents were so high that several families had to share one two-room house; people also had no place to bury their dead. Tchou’s outline of the proposed Village cited his two aims for the project:

1. To improve the housing and social conditions of the ordinary working people as well as foremen and other groups of the working population;
2. Through this means to usher in a movement to promote a new social order based on the principles of brotherhood, mutual service, goodwill, cleanliness, economy, temperance and purity.

Balderston visited the site where the workers lived and did indeed find conditions so deplorable that he thought a vividly told story of the visitation would bring tears to the eyes. He immediately wrote to the Committee in support of this project. He argued that AFSC funding of the Village would be instrumental in eliciting funds from Chinese sources.

The AFSC determined that the Village was the kind of project they wanted to support; the project was appealing for two reasons. First, it would allow for direct cooperation with the Chinese people and it would render practical service; thus it would demonstrate the ideals considered important by the AFSC. Second, it was a distinct project and did not duplicate the work of the mission boards.

AFSC agreed to cable the \$1,000 requested by Balderston, and Chinese contributors did donate the remaining \$3,750 needed to build the Village. Balderston also suggested that additional funds be provided (\$600/yr.) to support “a Chinese woman social worker ... to direct the work and to take charge of collecting the rentals from the different families.” (FSS Minutes 4.22.26). The AFSC was sympathetic to this idea and apparently discussed it with members of the FSC who, a month later, agreed to recommend that the money be appropriated to hire a social worker. Balderston thought that the “success of this first Friendship Village ... would open

up tremendous opportunities for international service for further development of such villages." In fact, several years later another village project to be built in Chungking was considered but never materialized.

Getting the Shanghai Village project started was in a sense relatively easy but conditions in China soon threatened its completion. Early in 1927 the AFSC determined that it could no longer continue to subsidize the project, which had met with difficulties as a result of the North/South war. The internal revolution raging throughout China did not, in the end, seriously affect the work and the difficulties were surmounted. The houses were occupied and a well that provided clean water was completed in May 1927. The flow of information regarding the Shanghai Model Village effectively ceased at this point. Reference to the Model Village work surfaced in 1929 in connection with another proposed project in Chungking. At the time, AFSC could not support the project financially, but did extend its "moral" support.⁴

The Village project was the first concrete opportunity for service suggested by Balderston and the first to receive AFSC support. When he returned, a special meeting of the FSS was held in April 1926 to hear his report and consider his proposed recommendations for service. At that meeting, eleven of his "more important proposals" were considered. The Model Village headed the list. Some of the other suggestions included: 1) financing the visit of Kagawa⁵ to China; 2) providing personnel to the Friends' International Institute at Chungking; 3) re-organization of Canton Hospital; 4) releasing Henry Hodgkin so he could devote all of his time to international service; and 5) support for the Peking Leader "to make it a much stronger factor in promoting the understanding and fellowship which it is at present doing." A sub-committee was appointed to summarize the proceedings and to report to the AFSC later that month. Of the suggestions reviewed at the meeting, the FSS specifically directed the newly formed sub-committee "to include the appropriation for Kagawa's trip to China."

Balderston considered the establishment of a social settlement at Shanghai or Hankow the second most important thing that AFSC could undertake. Essentially, the idea was that the project would begin as an exchange program. For two years, a number of young Americans would live in China to learn the language and make preliminary studies. Similarly, a group of Chinese would spend time in the US. After two years, the two groups "would be ready to come together in a Chinese city and start something." (Balderston, Jr., 221-222) Members of the FSS considered it an "unworked field in [China], and the Friends could make a very tremendous contribution toward bettering social conditions" by developing such work. It would be many years before anything approaching this type of exchange would occur.

⁴ Additional information on the Shanghai and Chungking Village projects beyond this point could not be found.

Rufus Jones Visits China - 1926

While Balderston was in China, Rufus Jones was invited by the YMCA to lecture in China at the Quadrennial Convention of the National Christian Council in August 1926. The visit of Rufus Jones was another opportunity for service that Balderston considered of utmost importance. Even though Jones was not invited to speak in China in his capacity as Chairman of the AFSC, "the members of the Service Committee were unanimous in feeling that this call opened up the way for one of the largest pieces of service that any Friends could be called upon to give" (AFSC General Meeting Minutes 3/25/26).

Jones was invited by F. S. Brockman of the YMCA in China. The decision to invite him was apparently based on the anti-foreign and anti-Christian sentiments then prevalent in China. Anti-foreign sentiment made it impossible to reach a unanimous decision on a particular representative from England, and anti-Christian sentiment made it "unwise" to ask an ordained Christian minister from the West. T. Z. Koo, a YMCA representative, indicated that the Chinese considered their greatest threat was no longer external but internal, and that it was indeed "great and ominous" (Balderston, 144). Jones was not inclined to accept the invitation, but letters from Balderston as well as encouragement from others convinced him that it was the thing to do.

Jones sailed for China in July 1926; he would visit Peking, Wu-Chang, Hankow, Nanking, Wuchow, Shanghai and Canton and would attend 92 meetings and conferences. These travels provided Jones the opportunity to meet with many in leadership positions not just in relation to the Christian Church in China but also in the areas of education and government. He had the opportunity to meet Wellington Koo, Finance Minister, ex-premier W. W. Yen and nearly all the members of the Chinese Cabinet. He also met with J. Leighton Stuart (Stuart), president of Yenching University.⁶ At the request of the AFSC, Jones met with Mr. Tchou, the architect of the Friendship Village project, to ascertain what progress was being made. The project, it seemed, was making great strides and Jones was given the honor of laying the cornerstone.

His speaking engagement for the YMCA was a great success, with 500 Chinese Christian leaders and thinkers in attendance. His diaries from that trip contain comments on topics ranging from "politics and government, corruption, religion, to transportation, Chinese and American character, society and fear of Japan."⁷ Jones believed that at that time four great revolutions were proceeding in China:

⁵ Toyohiko Kagawa of Japan had renounced his rights as a member of a prominent, wealthy family and took up residence in the slums of Kobe as a social worker. At the time, he was probably the leading authority in Japan on labor union problems.

⁶ Stuart became US Ambassador to China (1946-1949) and helped facilitate several matters for the FAU/FSU.

⁷ Diana Franzusoff Peterson, "Haverford College, Quakers and China Missionaries," paper presented at Wesleyan University, September 20, 2002.

1. Political – the transition from rule by emperors to a democracy
2. Intellectual – the unanalyzed religious attitude of mind was being confronted by the modern, scientific temperament
3. Industrial – the transition from an agricultural to an industrial society with its attendant labor problems
4. Social – the ancient system of familial and parental authority was vanishing

And he warned that the “psychological attitude of a people cannot be conquered by guns; it must be understood and appreciated before it can be altered.”⁸ Shortly after Jones’ visit, the Chinese Nationalist Government led by Chiang Kai-Shek succeeded in achieving control of most of China.

Jones thought that the trip was a great success; he complained only of the extreme heat, and in spite of “all the upsets, military battles, floods, bandits, strikes and other obstacles,” was able to travel with relative ease. The trip to Hankow was the only leg of the journey that had to be canceled due to fighting. Jones would travel to China in 1932 and again in 1938, the latter trip being the only one undertaken at the request of the AFSC. The goodwill established and the contacts made during all of his visits proved invaluable to AFSC endeavors.

The trips by Balderston and Jones were important. There were “smaller” efforts and actions however that also helped to advance the AFSC mission. Agatha Harrison, an American Quaker who had been sent to China by the YMCA to survey their factories attended the May 1926 meeting of the FSS to express her concern about the real lack of understanding between the British and the Americans in China. As a result of her presentation, and also no doubt based on Lloyd Balderston’s first-hand experience of the hostility between the British and Americans, AFSC decided that cooperative work between English and Americans be considered by 1) strengthening the *Peking Leader*, a forum for English and Americans in China, 2) establishing an international exchange periodical, and 3) initiating staff exchanges. Several years later, in 1929, the first joint deputation would go to China.

In the meantime, the AFSC would lend its support to various efforts. For example, it endorsed the Association for the Welfare of Children in China and gave it permission to use the AFSC name. It coordinated and administered the publicity for an appeal for funds to help the victims of famine in Shantung Province. Also in 1928, W.K. Thomas met with T.L. Chang, General Secretary of the YMCA in Chungking, to discuss the possibility of future cooperation in connection with another Friendship Village project in Chungking. Although the project in Chungking would not be built, the meeting was indicative of the exchanges that began to occur and that would continue throughout the years.

⁸ RMJ Papers, Collection 1130, Box 108, Haverford College Library, Haverford, PA.

1st Joint Deputation to China

In March 1929, a letter was received from Harry T. Silcock requesting that AFSC appoint someone to accompany the British delegation to China. William Eves, chair of the FSS, set in motion a chain of correspondence alerting various Friends' organizations of this request. The proposed deputation was another attempt to explore opportunities for service in China. The deputation's charge was to "make a thorough survey of the situation in China and the whole opportunity for Friends in the Far East." Although the initial thinking was that the AFSC Board would agree to the appointment of a corresponding committee to keep in touch with the deputation, it was unlikely, given the recent trips by Balderston and Jones, that another trip would be approved. The AFSC, however, did agree to participate, and Gilbert Bowles and Carolina Wood were chosen by the FSS to accompany British Friends, Philip Burt, Florence G. Burt, Edith M. Brittle, Harry T. Silcock, and J. Cuthbert Wigham to China. The deputation departed for China in December 1929 and, in part or as a whole, visited Ichang, Hankow, Changsha, Nanking, Hangchow, Tientsin, and Peking⁹.

Upon returning, the deputation prepared a report outlining the proposed policies for service in China. First on the list was the recommendation that "there should be—as a minimum—Friends' Centers in Peking, Shanghai, Nanking, Canton, Hankow and similar places." The deputation also recommended that service be undertaken in the areas of education and medicine. While these policies and/or recommendations highlight what were deemed important areas of service, the belief that infused the desire to serve is no less important. In the words of the deputation, "we ought to work in the true spirit of Christ to realize China's ideal of peace, and ... bring the world to a new harmony and a deeper peace."¹⁰ The proposal to establish Friends Centers in China echoes that of Balderston. It was an idea that created interest and discussions and conferences, but it would not become a reality until 1939.

At the May 1930 FSS meeting, Carolina Wood presented the recommendations of the deputation. Among them was the more specific recommendation that a high school English teacher be sent to replace Alfred Davidson at the Friends School in Chungking so he could take a much needed sabbatical. The China Sub-Committee recommended that the request for a substitute teacher be referred to the Personnel Committee of the FSS. Some months later, English Friends requested that the FSS "formally approve" Arnold and Lois Vaught for the teaching position in Chungking.

In January 1931, the China Sub-Committee recommended financing the Vaughts trip to Chungking, and to appoint a committee in Chicago where the Vaughts lived, to ensure that their

⁹ The city of Peking has been known in the past as Peiping and is currently known as Beijing.

¹⁰ ---, Report of the Joint Deputation sent to China and Japan in the Winter of 1929-1930, (London, FSC, Philadelphia, AFSC, April, 1930).

concerns were known to Friends in their community, paving the way for personal assistance. AFSC did help underwrite the Vaughts mission to China. The couple spent several months in England at Kingsmead for language instruction, and set sail for China in September 1931. A letter to "Dear Friends" dated December 1st places the Vaughts in Chungking and is filled with details of their trip. Both Vaughts wrote prolifically and their many letters helped keep the AFSC abreast of events in China. They stayed in West China for five years, left and returned a year later. Some thought they were well-suited to head the Friends Center in Shanghai, but it was not to be.

Establishing a Friends Center in China was an idea that seemed to permeate the atmosphere. In 1931, the AFSC would also receive a request from Edith Brittle of Peking and A. Warburton Davidson of Hankow for a Quaker Centre in Shanghai. This was now the second time such an undertaking was proposed. At its August 1931 meeting, the China Sub-committee decided that the matter be discussed with English Friends and that the plan be contingent on their financial support. Apparently, the AFSC and FSC were not yet ready for an undertaking of this magnitude and the matter was dropped. While mention should be made of individual Quakers, for example the Dye's, going to teach at West China Union University (WCUU) in 1932, nothing else of note was happening at this time. WCUU had opened in 1910 and FSC "missionary" work continued there until 1949, when the PRC was established. British Quakers were one of four Protestant denominations who came together to establish the university. Also, one of the FAU teams worked at WCUU during the war. In 1951, WCUU became a fully Chinese institution and was later renamed the Szechwan Medical College and is today called West China Medical University.

In February 1933, Clarence Pickett raised the possibility of another joint deputation to China (and Japan) in a letter to Eugene Barnett of the YMCA in Shanghai, but nothing came of it. It wouldn't be until 1936 that the issue of cooperation between English and American Friends in the Far East was raised again.

J. Passmore Elkington suggested another joint collaboration at a meeting of the China Committee in May 1936. The "ideas of the wider service of Friends in the East" suggested by Elkington elicited a positive response from Paul Sturge (FSC) who subsequently proposed that a week-end conference be held to discuss the possibilities. The conference in England was held at Jordans from October 30 to November 1, 1936. The issues discussed at this meeting included what method of service, training for service, medical work, educational work and the proposed Quaker Center in Shanghai. The FSC was sympathetic to the idea and thought that "our work in West China and ... of all groups of Friends ... would benefit ... from the establishment of such a Centre."

In the meantime, a meeting of representatives from various American Friends' groups¹¹ interested in China was held in Philadelphia on September 23, 1936 to discuss their concerns related to work in China. This was the first meeting of the Committee on the Orient. Discussions were informed by reports from Howard H. Brinton, William W. Cadbury and D. Robert Yarnall as to conditions in China and how AFSC work in China might proceed. The idea of a retreat in the Orient was raised by Rufus Jones who, on his earlier trip to China in 1926, had been privy to a ten day retreat of ten leading foreigners and ten leading Chinese the influences of which were still reverberating. He thought this experience should be repeated not so much with a view towards working on or solving a specific problem but to deepen the spiritual well. The issue of the establishment of a Friends' Center was not addressed specifically. In fact, a number of those present seemed to favor the indirect rather than the direct method of spreading the Quaker message. That is, they thought that sending someone who had a concern to do a specific piece of work in China was the more effective way to proceed. No direct action resulted from this meeting but it was agreed that further discussions would take place at the Friends World Conference in 1937 between Chinese and Japanese participants and British and American Friends to consider the work of Friends in the Far East.

The AFSC revisited the issue of a Friends Center in China again in May 1937 at a meeting of the Committee on the Orient. To aid their deliberations, the Committee reviewed the report of the special China Committee held at Jordans. Several determinations issued from this review. To gain influence with persons of authority and power, it would be necessary to establish permanent centers in cities such as Nanking and Canton, and a traveling ambassador would also be a crucial element of this plan. It was also determined that any future service must be undertaken "in the light of the counsel and desire of nationals."

Meanwhile, full-scale war between China and Japan erupted in the summer of 1937. The AFSC received word from Robert Simkin, then in Chengtu, that China was "at war in fact if not in name." This of course led to many more requests for help one of which came from Madame Chiang Kai-shek. In a letter to Margaret E. Jones¹² dated March 20, 1938, Madame Chiang requested financial help from the Society of Friends. She had organized a Women's Committee to provide relief for the children orphaned as a result of the war: a child could be fed, clothed, educated and sheltered for \$20 a year. She was beginning a campaign to solicit help from organizations in other countries who might underwrite the program of relief services for a certain number of children per year. Would AFSC be able to help with this plan? George Shepherd (Shepherd) also met with a small group of friends on March 28th to discuss the matter.

¹¹ Representatives were from the following groups: American Friends Board of Mission of 5 Years Meeting; Wm. W. Cadbury Committee; Mission Board of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting; Robert Simkin Committee; Mission Board of New York Yearly Meeting; Lucy Burt Committee; Friends General Conference and the FSS.

Shepherd had worked closely with Madame Chiang through the churches and the New Life Movement in China. Madame Chiang had taken responsibility for 20,000 children with the expectation that a way would be found for America to care for them. It had been determined that \$400,000 per year would be needed to feed and clothe the children. It fell to Shepherd to sell this program throughout the US. The AFSC was one of many organizations and groups that he approached; he requested that each take responsibility for 2,000 children. At the April 1938 meeting, the AFSC Board of Directors determined that this was not the type of unique service that AFSC should render in China at that time. Even though this specific request was denied, AFSC did exert its considerable influence and helped Shepherd make the contacts that would enable him to raise and administer the necessary funds.

Shortly after the Friends World Conference in September 1937, the FSS invited the Committee on the Orient to its next meeting to discuss in greater detail establishing a Center in Shanghai. At the October FSS meeting, it was noted that the English were very keen to establish a Shanghai Center and that Harry Silcock, on behalf of the China Universities group, would go to China in the spring of 1938. At the same meeting, Harold Fey, of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, "encouraged Friends to consider a mission of reconciliation to both countries and perhaps a reconstruction project in China." Apparently there was a sense that it might be worthwhile to send a small reconstruction unit to do a small and specific project. It was thought that out of such a project would grow concern among interested people in many countries for the work of a center in Shanghai. A small group was formed to work on this concern but it did not come to fruition. Several months later, the Committee on the Orient decided to organize itself officially as a subcommittee of the FSS and thus became the Sub-Committee on the Orient.

As the Sino-Japanese war escalated, the AFSC and the FSC continued to deliberate about future service in China. Whatever was done would be done jointly, that had been established. And although way had not opened, it was becoming clearer. Correspondence from individual Quakers and others residing in China told of deteriorating conditions and stressed the need for help in a variety of ways. In a 1937 report, Lois Vaught described Shanghai as a "modern tower of Babel" highlighting the tensions among its inhabitants—English and Chinese, Chinese and Japanese—and the need for "truly international work." Her report ended on the note that peace in the Orient seemed a "far-off dream." Robert Simkin wrote of the heavy migration of refugees into Szechwan and the need for organized relief work to aid the needier ones (the first wave of refugees was wealthy). Amy Wu, Secretary of the Chinese Women's Club in Shanghai and a former AFSC employee, wrote to Pickett that at that time in Shanghai there were "at least 1 ½ million civilians with no livelihood" and asked about the possibility of Friends participation in relief work. There was a definite need for service. But there was also still a need for more first-

¹² The relationship between Jones and MCK began at Wellesley College where the two were classmates.

hand intelligence to determine what kind of concrete service might be rendered. A second joint deputation would go to China: Harry Silcock, B. Ward Perkins and Rufus M. Jones.

2nd Joint Deputation

The British contingent (Silcock and Perkins) arrived in China in March 1938. Jones would travel to China from South Africa at the request of the AFSC, joining Silcock and Perkins in Shanghai. Prior to Jones' arrival, Silcock and Perkins had met with a number of prominent Chinese leaders in Shanghai, among them Dr. W.W. Yen, a Chinese diplomat and President of the Shanghai Branch of the Red Cross, and Mr. Sho-Tsu King, respected scholar and Trustee of Yenching and Peking Union Medical College. In Silcock's own words the situation was "difficult, complicated and obscure" and "any work at all aimed at making life in the occupied area possible [would be considered] treason to the cause of China" and could "result in the assassination of any who venture to share in such work." Nevertheless, he and Perkins were optimistic, believing it only a matter of time before the way opened. They were right. Shortly after his arrival, Jones met with Mrs. Y.Y. Tsu, Chair of the Committee of Management of the Shanghai Refugee Maternity Center. This meeting, followed by a letter detailing the work and the need of the Center, resulted in an invitation to do a piece of relief work. It was just the kind of constructive relief work that they had been seeking.

Upon their return, the delegation made two recommendations: 1) to establish a Center in Shanghai; and 2) to establish a Nutrition Camp in the International Settlement of Shanghai. They urged that the Center be established as quickly as possible. The AFSC Board met in July 1938 to consider the recommendations for the Center proposed by Silcock and for the Nutrition Camp proposed by Jones. It approved both. It would be a joint undertaking; English and American Friends would "cooperate in establishing a Center ... [and] would engage in a piece of relief work, to be confined chiefly ... to the feeding of children and nursing and expectant mothers – possibly along the lines of a nutrition camp in a hospital center as has already been proposed."

The Center would function in a similar fashion to those already operating in Europe. More specifically, avenues of service would depend on local circumstances and the personnel available. Functions would include the following: providing opportunities of service for Friends and others; interpreting the Far East to the West and vice versa; hospitality and special problems with the aim of "increasing the Society's flexibility for world-wide service."

The Nutrition Camp project "involved taking from the severely crowded hospitals in the Shanghai areas all of those patients, mostly children, who [were] suffering from malnutrition," with the goal of making more space available for those "who were actually suffering from disease." The Shanghai International Red Cross would provide the necessary accommodations and dietary supplements; Friends would be responsible for management and personnel. But all would not go according to plan. In the several months since the project had been suggested and approved, the situation in Shanghai had changed—the number of refugees needing aid had diminished

significantly from 375,000 to 60,000. Shortly thereafter, a cable from Dr. Harold Morris of St. Lukes Hospital in Shanghai confirmed the situation, indicating that such work had now become "inexpedient." Thus it was deemed unwise to proceed, and plans for the Camp were abandoned. Surprisingly, the demise of the project in no way adversely affected the progress of establishing the Center. Nor did it change the decision to have Dr. Herbert Hodgkin accompany Harry Silcock to open the Center, the thinking being that there was sure to be a demand for a doctor.

Friends International Center (Shanghai)

Harry Silcock and Herbert Hodgkin set sail for Shanghai on January 21, 1939 on the Empress of Russia and reached Shanghai on February 12, 1939. Before departing for Shanghai, Silcock and Hodgkin attended the January 14, 1939 meeting of the AFSC Committee on the Orient in Philadelphia. At this meeting, Silcock made emphatically clear his concern that AFSC send a representative to be present at the start of the Center. The Committee selected Walter Borton (Borton), then in Tokyo, for this assignment.

Shortly after their arrival, Borton, Silcock and Hodgkin had to address a potentially negative public relations problem. According to Borton, several Chinese papers had printed a story that Friends were going to attempt a reconciliation between Chinese and Japanese. The trio was, however, successful in counteracting any negative effect of the misprint by issuing a statement of its own.¹³

The Center opened in 1939 and the work was as diverse as anticipated. Programs at the Center included meetings for worship, library services, a traveling ministry, study groups and relief work. Relief work at the Center would develop along three main lines: Child Welfare Work, Chinese Refugee Work and European Refugee Work.

Child Welfare Work

Shortly after it opened, the National Christian Council (NCC) requested the Center's help in work with under-nourished children. The NCC had at its disposal a sum of money to accomplish this task in the occupied areas but lack of personnel to properly administer the work stymied their efforts. Friends undertook the work and a year later could show that 4,000 children in various cities received at last one meal a day. Not only were the children fed, but they also received simple instruction, physical education and medical attention. Locals were encouraged to contribute funds to pay overhead expenses for the premises and the small living allowances paid to the numerous young helpers so that the NCC funds went entirely to feed the hungry children. Child welfare work would become, according to Silcock, "the most important part" of the work of the Shanghai Center.

¹³ No record of the statement could be found.

On May 8, 1940, the Receiving Home for Children (RHC) opened at the request of the Municipal Council of Shanghai at the Friends' Center. The RHC was not part of the Friends' Center but did receive 40% of its operating funds from the Center and was in effect run by Center personnel. Additional funds were contributed by local sources. As a result of the war, many children were lost, abandoned, and orphaned. The only institution of its kind in China, it was a safe haven for children taken from the streets, for difficult children, and for those with unsuitable homes, where they received care while plans were made for their future. Not an orphanage, the children were housed temporarily until their difficulties could be investigated with a view to placing them in suitable homes, institutions or employment. During the war with Japan, conditions in Shanghai deteriorated and the Home was forced to move. The RHC moved out of Shanghai into the old Chinese city of Nantao where it was operated by a group of Chinese; it remained there until 1947. In 1947, the RHC moved to a property purchased by the AFSC which would also house the Friends Center and some FSU personnel.

Chinese Refugee Work

This work took place in Free China, close behind the fighting lines. Two representatives from the Church of the Brethren worked in cooperation with Friends to bring relief to the Chinese refugees whose cities and villages were attacked and taken. Their homes destroyed, these refugees fled to the mountains; they were bewildered, stricken with fear, and unable to find food. The \$100,000 (national currency) provided by the workers enabled them to feed the refugees both physically and spiritually, to "put heart" into them.¹⁴

European Refugee Work

The flood of European refugees into Shanghai became one of the areas of greatest need. Apparently China was the one place the German Jews could go without the need of a special passport or permit, and they were arriving in Shanghai at the rate of 700 per week. In the three years prior to Pearl Harbor, 25,000 German refugees arrived and more than twice that amount were still expected. This influx was in addition to the large numbers of white Russians and the even larger numbers of Chinese refugees also seeking sanctuary in Shanghai. It has been estimated that 3M to 5M refugees found their way to Shanghai during this time.

The Center questioned its ability to provide help with the refugee situation. The question, however, was decided for them when a refugee presented them with a note from a Quaker colleague in Berlin. As it so happened, the Center was somewhat more prepared to handle the situation than originally thought. Erna Czerwenka, a German-speaking refugee who

¹⁴ The nature of this work was considered "sensitive" and steps were taken to shield the names of the representatives as well as other details from the Japanese. Details of the work, in terms of specific places and numbers helped, are scant.

had worked with the Jewish Relief Committee, was a part-time employee at the Center and became instrumental in helping the European refugees.

Distribution of clothing was one of the major contributions to the refugee problem at the Center. The need for clothing became of paramount importance with the arrival of the Eastern European refugees who, in seeking refuge, obviously had no thought of the weather in Shanghai and arrived in a sweltering Shanghai with their heavy clothing. Hodgkin wrote to a Friend in Australia where clothing collection was already underway with no particular plan in mind. Hodgkin's letter set a plan in motion and the clothing was shipped to the Center in Shanghai and distributed.

In 1942, Silcock was "called" to West China and left the Center. Center work was continued by Herbert Hodgkin and the Lees with the help of Erna Czerwenka. In 1943, Hodgkin and the Lees were interned by the Japanese until the fall of 1945. During this time, Czerwenka carried on the work of the center which at the time included distributing clothing and teaching English. With the end of the Sino-Japanese war and the escalation of the civil war, the AFSC assumed more responsibility for the work in China. A property was purchased that would provide accommodations for the Shanghai Center, FSU (Friends Service Unit) [see page 21] personnel and the Receiving Home.

The Communist victory in early 1949 prompted concern for continuation of the Center. Because of the changes wrought as the Communists assumed power, "foreigners would find it increasingly difficult to work in China, but would be more than ever needed as emissaries of good will." The hostility towards foreigners translated into a personnel problem for the Center (and the FSU). At their July 1949 meeting, the members of the AFSC Centers Committee considered the then current situation in China "a challenge to Friends" and wanted the Center in Shanghai to continue "until we can see more clearly the lines we should follow." Several months later, it was learned that a Center staff member who had been appointed in the spring of 1947 would remain in Shanghai until the spring of 1950.

Circumstances grew less favorable during the ensuing year and it became clear to the Centers Sub-Committee "how difficult it would be for present [Center] personnel to carry on ... after the [FSU] left." It was clear that the work was valuable and should be continued. Whatever happened, however, it was recognized that Philadelphia was a long way off and that the staff in Shanghai was better equipped to make the ultimate decision. The situation in China worsened and the last western appointee to the staff of the Center, Margaret Perry, decided to leave Shanghai and China.

Based on a request from AFSC, Perry reported on the disposition of the Center at the time of her departure. As reported in the March 1951 minutes of the Sub-Committee, "the Hostel has just recently been rented to a government department college of Finance and Economics, and ... the Center office will carry on as long as possible." Six months later, the Sub-Committee

“reluctantly ... realize[d] that in the present situation there is little the Service Committee ... can do with regard to future relationship with the Center in Shanghai.” The AFSC discontinued financial assistance as well as sending literature and other Friends’ publications to the Center. It was also recorded that “always we will keep Friends in Shanghai in our hearts and prayers.”

II. Relief Work

Friends Ambulance Unit (FAU) – Kung I Chu Hu Twei

FAU medical relief and transport services are considered the major undertaking of the FSC and AFSC in China. Established in England during World War I to provide pacifists a vehicle for participating in and supporting the war effort, FAU operations began again in response to the Second World War. However, the Nazi occupation of Europe soon made operating in that arena impossible, thus precipitating the turn to China. The work of the first FAU was done in such close contact with the armies that some Friends considered it “an inadequate demonstration of pacifists’ unwillingness to participate in war and of their desire to associate with only the constructive.” (Pickett, p. 211) This ‘new’ FAU would remain true to Friends’ pacifist philosophy.

Men were eager to volunteer for duty with the FAU; funding the Unit proved more difficult. Initially supported by individual English Friends, the decision to operate in China necessitated the turn to AFSC to help with both personnel and funding. In February 1941, Christopher Sharman (Sharman), an English member of the FAU, arrived in Philadelphia to obtain AFSC assistance. Sharman successfully conveyed “the intense need,” the “voices” and the “vitality” of the Units members in such a way that, after the usual and no doubt exhaustive consultations, the path was clear—the AFSC would enter into this joint venture with the FAU. Dr. Robert B. McClure, a Canadian medical missionary who was born in China and appointed by the FAU in London to direct the Unit, also paid a visit to the AFSC offices to garner support for the venture.

Meanwhile other American social services agencies were mobilizing to help. Led by Henry R. Luce, the publishing magnate, these agencies coalesced under the banner “United China Relief [UCR].” The AFSC was invited to participate and did in fact become a member agency – once assured that it was not a “hate Japan” campaign. A certain percentage of the funds raised by UCR would be funneled through AFSC to the Unit in China. To help solicit funds for the UCR campaign, Sharman spent a great deal of time traveling throughout the US as a spokesman for the FAU leaving an indelible impression of FAU transport work. The campaign was such a success that Pickett states, “UCR funds became one of the chief sources of income for FAU in China” (p. 213). Substantial funds were also secured from British and Chinese sources that allowed expansion of the work.

In the meantime, a number of American and Chinese members joined the Unit. By October 1942, the Unit consisted of 71 British, 16 Americans, 2 Canadians and 8 Chinese. A

number of older, experienced Chinese also served as advisors to the Unit, including S.H. Fong, P.C. Hsu, Dr. C.P. Li, Chang Fu Liang, William Hsu, Dr. Y.T. Tsu and Dr. C.U. Lee. It had become a true international fellowship and in so doing, fulfilled the hopes of its sponsors that the work of the Unit might contribute to a better understanding between the Chinese and Western people.

The first FAU men (British) arrived in Rangoon in July 1941 with the aim of doing emergency service that was not being done by anyone else. They soon learned that more than a hundred hospitals in Western, Northwestern and Southeastern China were operating at half or quarter efficiency because they lacked drugs and hospital supplies. Simultaneously, drugs and supplies that had been donated by other relief organizations were sitting in supply depots in need of transportation. Transportation between the depot and the hospital was a vital service that no one seemed to be doing. Thus, the FAU started transporting medical supplies.

When the Unit became active "there was little conception of what the major undertaking" would be (Pickett, 213). But in spite of the deplorable conditions, great suffering and reigning chaos, the FAU members began to serve; their work fell roughly into three categories: 1) transportation, 2) surgical teams and 3) personnel services

The transport system covered over 7,000 kilometers of road in Free China: as far north as Suchow in Kansu Province, on the edge of the Gobi Desert, south-east into Kiangsi Province and south into Yunnan Province. Trucks were based in four depots in Kweiyang, Kutsing, Chengtu and Kukong. In addition to western mechanics, the garages and machine shops maintained by the Convoy also employed Chinese student mechanics making them valuable training schools for young Chinese. The first transportation job undertaken by the Convoy was along the famed Burma Road because, as Pickett explained:

The great seaboard gateways to China were closed by the Japanese, the most urgent need in the beginning was to get supplies to certain of the hard-pressed inland Chinese cities, such as Chungking, Changtu, Kweiyang, and Kunming. ... The only open land route into this part of China from the outside world was through Rangoon, Burma. From Rangoon supplies could be shipped by rail as far as Lashio; but from there on they must be hauled over the twisting, hazardous mountain route known as the Burma Road. (p. 213)

In March 1942, the FAU established two mobile surgical teams. With the eight doctors and the majority of its non-medical personnel having trained in connection with relief services in England during the "blitz," the Unit was uniquely qualified to provide mobile surgical assistance. One team was sent to Burma to assist in the care of wounded Chinese. Several months later, Burma fell and it was necessary for the Unit members to retreat. During the journey out of Burma, this team was the only source of medical service available.

The other team was established at Paoshan in Yunnan Province, and was attached to the medical corps of the New Life Movement and served the Chinese Army defending this border province. The team's work was both medical and surgical, with emphasis on the treatment of disease among the troops. Although the objective was to engage in field surgery, the constant threat of attack in the area made it necessary to remain stationary.

During 1942, FAU members were attached to the International Relief Committee at Kweiyang and to the Chinese Industrial Cooperatives. Their tasks were varied: at one time bringing a flock of sheep imported from New Zealand to India and from there through Tibet to China; at another, as buyers of wool for the cooperative industries.

While battles raged in China, the AFSC was also engaged in a battle of sorts with the US State Department. Conscientious Objectors (COs) serving in Civilian Public Service (CPS) Camps were prohibited from serving with the FAU in China. When pressed for an explanation, Sumner Welles (Welles), Undersecretary of State explained that "because China was cut off by the fall of Rangoon the Department did not feel it was feasible to grant [AFSC] permission to send relief units." Nonetheless, AFSC continued to expend considerable effort in an attempt to obtain permission for American COs to serve in the FAU. These efforts would also be bolstered by requests for increased service by the Chinese.

In July 1942, Hu Shih, Chinese Ambassador to the US, wrote to Pickett stressing the "crucial importance" of the service provided by the FAU and stated that additional American personnel would be a "welcome strength." Letters from several American experts on China, Lauchlin Currie and Owen Lattimore, also urged American support. Pickett presented these letters to Welles who indicated that the "letters were more hopeful than anything that had been submitted previously." But the State Department did not relent. The AFSC, however, was as relentless in their attempts to effect a change in policy.

While AFSC staff worked to get COs released for foreign service, the FSS was asked to consider appointing volunteers for FAU service in China. The FSS wanted this field of service open to COs, and decided that no other appointments to China would be made until an answer from the US government was received. Exceptions to this decision would be considered on an individual basis.

In December 1942, the new Chinese ambassador, Wei Tao-Ming, also sent a letter "warmly welcoming" American support and advising Pickett that the Chinese Government would support 70 additional American men. Pickett forwarded this letter to President Roosevelt. In January 1943, a meeting between Pickett, Jones and Secretary of War Stimson proved helpful. Stimson was familiar with Friends' work and felt "completely convinced that the men in CPS camps should be used in relief and reconstruction work." These efforts elicited a favorable response. On February 16th, Pickett received a letter from President Roosevelt approving the

release of 70 men from CPS camps for “medical relief, sanitation, and public health work in China.”

The process of choosing eight recruits from among those who had volunteered began immediately, and the men set sail for China in June 1943, which was the soonest transportation could be arranged. However, Congress would erect another obstacle that, despite efforts, could not be overcome. According to Pickett, “[Joseph Starnes] a Southern Congressman [from Alabama] introduced a rider to an army appropriations bill [that effectively prevented] CPS men’s leaving the country for any purpose.” The AFSC did not expect this legislation to pass. But as it so happened, the collective hatred and fear of war was directed at the conscientious objector and the bill passed. Because seven of the eight men were draftees, they were subject to Selective Service rules and regulations. Upon reaching South Africa, the seven men were recalled. This obstacle did not necessarily prevent Americans from serving in the FAU. Although AFSC could not send draftees to the China Convoy, by the end of 1943 seventeen (17) Americans had become members of the Unit.¹⁵

When the war with Japan ended in 1945, “it was estimated that 90% of the drugs and other medical supplies which arrived in West China for civilian use were transported by the FAU China Convoy.” (Pickett, p. 223) Relief work had shifted from behind battle lines and medical teams were sent on special missions to combat the deadly diseases of cholera, malaria, leprosy, and kala-azar. Honan Province in central China was targeted as an area for a coordinated project of rehabilitation with the Unit helping in renewed hospital services, agricultural and industrial rehabilitation, and education. Being essentially a wartime emergency organization, the FAU began preparations to dissolve but the process took longer than planned. In 1946, the AFSC became responsible for the work in China, which continued under the name Friends Service Unit (FSU). The FAU continued to help with the administration of the Unit and officially disbanded in March 1947.

Friends Service Unit (Kung I Fu Wu Hwei)

The FSU operated in China from 1947 to 1949 providing similar services (to that of the FAU) in connection with the civil war then raging in China. The Unit provided relief services to both the Nationalists and the Communists in the following areas:

- Chungmou Village Rehabilitation, Honan Province (main center of FSU activity) According to Pickett, this was the “second major service” of the FSU in China after the start of the civil war.
- Kala-Azar Campaign
- Transport of medical supplies along perilous roads of West China

¹⁵ Pickett, pp. 219, 220.

- Nanking Medical Team
- Hunchow Medical Team
- Technical Service in Hankow

With the most recent Sino-Japanese conflict over, the FSU was now faced with problems arising from the escalating civil war between Communist and Nationalist armies. The Unit, true to its Quaker roots and the desire of Friends' to be non-partisan and non-political, wanted to serve both sides of the conflict. In the words of Bronson Clark, "we became anxious that our work be on both sides engaged in the conflict ... [w]e believe in serving those who are suffering regardless of their political beliefs."¹⁶

In 1946, FAU members entered into negotiations with the Chinese Communists that continued for six months. As Clark wrote, "we negotiated with the Peace Team located in Nationalist Changte, Honan, which made arrangements by radio with the Peace Team located in Communist Hantan, Hopei." The Nationalist and Communist Peace Teams along with a US Army Officer arranged two exploratory trips behind Communist lines to assess the situation and determine what was needed. Bronson Clark joined the second exploratory trip into Communist territory in the fall of 1946. During his week-long trip, Clark met with Dr. Ma, Medical Advisor to the Yen-an Government and Dr. Ssu, Director of the Medical Program to offer the services of an FSU team and medical supplies. Clark also surveyed the existing medical facilities, talked with the Secretary of the Border Regions Medical Department, and met with Chairman Mao Tse-tung.

Disease in Yen-an was rampant; malaria, amoebic and bacillary dysentery, relapsing fever, typhoid and tuberculosis being most prevalent. To make matters worse, there were "very limited" medical facilities and virtually no drugs to combat the diseases since the Communists had effectively been cut-off from any source of drugs or medical equipment. Help was sorely needed and both Drs. Ma and Ssu were receptive to Clark's proposal. But the list of drugs and equipment that the Communists provided upon his departure indicated to Clark that they did not hold much hope for the success of the proposed project.

Upon his return to Peking, Clark proceeded to arrange meetings with US military officers and others to gain support and approval for the project. A letter of introduction paved the way for Clark to meet with Lt. General A.C. Gillem, Commander of all US troops in China. Gillem agreed to provide the necessary transport if approval for the project could be obtained from General George C. Marshall in Nanking. Undaunted, Clark asked Lewis Hoskins to accompany him to Nanking to enlist the support of US China Ambassador Stuart in approaching General Marshall. Ambassador Stuart was enthusiastic about the proposal and agreed to speak with General Marshall personally. Marshall gave his approval for the project pending confirmation from Yen-an,

¹⁶ Bronson Clark, "Behind Communist Lines in China", *Foreign Service Bulletin*, February 1947, reprint, AFSC Archives, Philadelphia, PA.

which was promptly received. Mission accomplished—Medical Team #19 would serve behind Communist lines, and desperately needed medical supplies would be provided.

Medical Team #19 -- Yen-an

On December 7, 1946, two US Army C-47 transport planes delivered 7,500 pounds of urgently needed medical supplies and the FAU Team to the 1st International Peace Hospital (IPH) in Yen-an. Medical Team #19 (MT19) included Drs. Peter Early, an Englishman and Douglas Clifford, a New Zealander; Joan Kennedy, American (from Bucks County, PA), a nurse; Jack Dodds, Canadian, a lab technician; and Eric Hughes, an Englishman, an x-ray technician. The team's goal would be to train local Chinese personnel to assist in developing more effective service. Upon arrival in Yen-an, MT19 discovered that conditions were not quite as reported by Clark. For example, the wiring system in the hospital theater area had been shoddily removed and other necessary equipment moved on threat of invasion. But on the whole, the Team thought the project worthwhile and given the circumstances, their outlook was positive.

In March 1947, another 8,000 pounds of supplies and two reinforcements, Margaret Stanley and Frank Miles, arrived. A week later, Yen-an fell to the Nationalists and regular contact with MT19 ceased. But hospital personnel had evacuated before Yen-an was captured.

Word of the Team eventually reached the Shanghai Headquarters in October, 1947 when Jack Dodds, the lab technician, left the Team and returned to FSU headquarters after an arduous two month journey. The Team was "somewhere in North Shensi", one of the poorest parts of China. Conditions there were apparently more deplorable than in Yen-an. The patient wards, operating theater and labs were located in caves and the need for the Team's services seemed even more critical. It took about a month before they were able to establish a running hospital. The unsettled military conditions made it necessary for personnel to move on a moments notice taking only those possessions that could fit into a backpack. IPH #1 became essentially a "mobile rear hospital moving to be near the source of casualties," the majority of its patients. (In the midst of this turmoil, a baby boy, David, was born to the Hughes'.) Several months later, military conditions apparently stabilized. From late August 1947 to February 1948, the IPH was located at Hsia Pei T'a, a small town near the Yellow River in northern Shansi province.

The hospital was housed in caves and conditions in general were deplorable. "The OR cave usually had whitewashed walls and a sheet fastened to the ceiling to prevent particles of clay from falling." Because lines of communication and supplies into Communist territory were effectively non-existent, supplies and equipment were desperately low; should they be available, the delivery system between locations—pack animal train—left much to be desired. Nevertheless, the hospital continued to operate. In mid-February 1948, Margaret Stanley and Frank Miles left the Team and the 1st IPH after a year of service. The three remaining members of the Team, Dr. Douglas Clifford (New Zealand), and Mr. and Mrs. Eric Hughes (London), planned to stay until early autumn. MT19 had rendered yeoman's service under extremely difficult conditions. And

their service yielded results, both short and long-term. The short-term, tangible results of their efforts occurred in the field – many lives were helped and saved. But Clifford, in a report to headquarters, described what may be considered the long-term results

We have had an excellent opportunity for adding a little to the reciprocal understanding and appreciation of the groups of people of greatly differing backgrounds, education and development, but with very similar ultimate ideals, and the development of such understanding is essential if our mutual ideals are ever to become reality.

In the meantime, the FSU had been successful in promoting its concern with influencing reconciliation in China. Although some Chinese did not understand or agree with pacifism, it was precisely this principle that became associated with the Quaker name in general and the FAU/FSU in particular. Its international membership, with Chinese included on an equal basis, helped to remove suspicions and promote confidence. The unit's attitude of impartial service to the common people regardless of political considerations had been tested and proven effective by its years of positive relief work on both sides of the political divide. It placed the Unit in a key position and a series of meetings to discuss the idea further were underway.

Meanwhile, in May 1947 Spencer Coxe wrote to Clarence Pickett raising the possibility of Friends' service in the reconciliation of China's warring factions. The letter prompted meetings and talks with China expert Professor Burr of Cornell who had recently returned from China. The discussions led Collin Bell to write a memo stating that Burr was pessimistic as to the likelihood of success of mediation efforts. On the other hand, Burr emphatically stated that "if any reasonable sort of chance of adding our reconciling influences to the situation were discovered, Friends ought to go in and make the attempt." On January 4, 1948, Lewis Hoskins wrote to Colin Bell, et al (AFSC) and David Johnstone et al (FSC) about the discussion that he and John Wilks had with Dr. J. Leighton Stuart, American Ambassador to China. The Ambassador was sympathetic and lent his support to the proposal. In light of this support, two weekend retreats were held (January and February 1948) in Shanghai with corresponding meetings in Philadelphia and London to consider the issue of reconciliation. Members of the FSU made several "highly confidential" attempts at reconciliation but they were, of course, unsuccessful. Other negotiations with the warring factions, however, proved worthwhile.

As an outgrowth of the Shanghai retreats, a concern developed within the Unit to expand its medical work in Honan by sending medical teams to hospitals in a chain of towns extending from stable Nationalist territory, through the disputed areas, and into stable Communist territory. Dr. Ssu, Chief of the Medical Services of the Border Regions had approved this plan in principle at an earlier conference in January, and permission for the new program was obtained from the Ministry of Defense of the Nationalist government in Nanking. It was thought that the "Hoskins Negotiating Team" would meet with Dr. Ssu and finalize arrangements with the Communists.

Another round of negotiations with the Communists was undertaken in April, May and June, 1948 by Spencer Coxe, Lewis Hoskins, Mark Shaw, Charles Cadbury and Henry Yu. As reported by Hoskins, the negotiations were undertaken in order "to reach understandings with Communist authorities regarding our future work; and the occupation of Chungmou during the recent campaigns of the Communist army which resulted in the capture of Kaifeng."

The FSU, in 1946, had sought and obtained documentary recognition from the National Government for its impartial status in serving in Honan province. The document gave approval for ambulance work across fighting lines and within 50 miles of its three hospitals at Changte, Weihwei, and Chengchow. But in 1948, the FSU faced actual involvement in the increasing hostilities in the Honan area and a new document, to include the areas of Kaifeng, Kweiteh and Loho was needed. Another appeal to Nationalist General Pai Chung-hsi was made and granted. The corresponding negotiations with Communist authorities would prove more difficult to effect due to transportation and communication problems.

From May 28 through June 6, 1948, the negotiating team met with officials of the China Liberated Areas Relief Associations (CLARA) i.e. Communist controlled areas and with the Public Health Department of the Liberated Areas to discuss the future of the FSU in the areas that would potentially become involved in the conflict. They spoke with Tung Pi-Wu, head of CLARA, and a member of the Communists' Peoples' Political Council. Other officials at these meetings were General Wu Yin Fu, executive director of CLARA who was familiar with the Unit in Shanghai, and Dr. Ssu Chin-Kuan, the most important man in medical work in the liberated areas and Dr. Ma Hai-teh (George Hatem). Bronson Clark had met with Drs. Ssu and Ma during his negotiations, and Medical Team 19 had been under the direct care of Dr. Kuan and had won his confidence. Consequently, relations with Dr. Kuan were excellent, and facilitated the conversations. It was determined that:

During the next six to eight months the FSU [would] send in three medical teams to assist the medical work of the Liberated Areas. An anti-Kala-azar team [would] be based on HwaiKing (Ch'inyang) beginning in August. MT 19 [would] leave the area this summer. MT 22 [would] be sent to assist the work of the International Peace Hospital at Kwant'au (Chin Chi Lu Yu) Border Region in October. The FSU MT 24 [would] open a hospital under its own direction and sponsorship at Hantan or Singtai at the beginning of 1949.

With regard to the future work of the Unit, it was felt that the Communists "exhibited an understanding" of the need for impartiality, that is, to work on the side of the Nationalists as well. The Communists also "recognized that nearby work in KMT territory might facilitate the movement of supplies into their area." Although both sides realized that there would be difficulties in executing the plan for a Unit hospital in Communist territory, Dr. Ssu was nevertheless more than willing to work out the details as fairly and equitably as possible. The

Negotiating Team was to understand that an exception was not being made in their case but that the Communists were “applying their regular policy.”

The FSU continued to operate as the civil war continued and intensified. Little more than six months after the negotiations, the Communists were victorious. Communist anti-foreign sentiment apparently extended to the FSU; in the words of Spencer Coxe, “the Unit’s relations with the local Communists have not been good; ... the authorities were suspicious of the Unit as foreign and ... they did not approve of the Unit’s educational and industrial activities.” Nevertheless, the Unit continued to function and made valiant attempts to find ways to be of service. Conditions under the new regime eventually made future service impossible although the FSU operated in a reduced capacity until 1951.¹⁷

In September 1950, the FSU informed the Peoples Relief Association of China (PRAC) by letter that “without permission for personnel replacements” the Unit could not continue its program and would “close down the clinic in Chungking and devolve the Chungmou hospital to the provincial health authorities by the end of the year.” PRAC’s response was friendly and appreciative of the Unit’s work and ongoing desire for service, but negative in terms of future work. The FSU officially disbanded in 1951. Some of its members would continue to play key roles in AFSC’s efforts to bridge the divide between China and the United States, among them, Bronson Clark, Rhoads Murphey, Lewis Hoskins, and Spencer Coxe.

Even though the political situation in China caused the AFSC to leave China, there was still a need for relief work. At the April 1950 meeting of the Foreign Service Executive Committee, reports of a severe famine in China and how the AFSC might provide relief were discussed. It was determined that it would be difficult to get any food for even a token shipment without paying for it. Madame Sun Yat Sen had been contacted and expressed interest in helping but indicated that a public appeal for funds would be unwelcome since the (communist) Chinese government did not wish to appear incapable of handling the situation. It was also felt that the Chinese government would refuse aid from America unless there were no strings attached. Would China want to buy food? UNICEF funds already earmarked for China were still available but blocked because of an inability of the organization and China to come to acceptable terms. A decision was made to explore the matter further even though Coxe as well as others seemed pessimistic about the outcome.

The explorations regarding famine relief to China took two paths:

¹⁷ According to Spencer Coxe, the demise of Friends’ programs in China was due largely to the US stance against the new Communist regime. While the PRC probably had nothing in particular against Friends, it did not suit their strategy to permit any American group to appear in a good light. And so the PRC refused to issue visas to AFSC recruits for work in China. The PRC then forced the Chinese members and employees of the FSU to denounce and calumniate American Unit members in Chungking. Finally in Honan Province they arrested three FSU members, Hazel and James Lovett and John Rue, along with Miss Sayre, an Anglican missionary. All were subsequently expelled via train to Shanghai (a step perhaps hastened when John Rue had an epileptic seizure).

1. finding out what, if any, government surpluses might be made available to private agencies and also govt. money to cover shipping costs, and
2. what private resources would be found to send a token shipment

The red tape involved in sending any large shipments (5,000 tons or more) was onerous in terms of government regulation (Chinese). Smaller shipments, 1,000 tons or less, could be handled locally and without central government involvement. Private agencies pressured the US government, resulting in the State Department unearthing a Discretionary Fund under control of the President that could be used to purchase government stocks of grain and for shipping costs. This approach would make a private effort unnecessary.

Circumstances within the organization were such that the AFSC Finance Committee and Board approved a \$50,000 expenditure for emergency relief aid to China (and India) with the requirement that concrete plans for China be submitted to the Foreign Service Executive Committee (FSEC) for its approval before being implemented. This decision was reached in May, and Coxe alerted the FSU; more specifically, the Unit and the AFSC Board agreed to offer approximately 500 tons of food to China to be underwritten by AFSC. Henry Yu, the only FSU member in the Peking area at the time, presented the offer to the Peoples' Relief Association of China (PRAC).

PRAC thankfully accepted the offer, but they changed the terms, preferring drugs to food, kala-azar drugs in particular. The AFSC accepted the change "in principle" and set the plan in motion. The issue of how the drugs would be procured and how much money the AFSC was to actually spend would cause a misunderstanding between it and the FSU. The AFSC thought that a large portion of the drugs could be procured as gifts-in-kind, resulting in an actual cash expenditure of \$20,000. The FSU considered that they were committed to an expenditure of \$50,000 worth of drugs in addition to what might be procured as gifts. The AFSC did realize that this misunderstanding was potentially embarrassing to the Unit. The details were of course worked out; the drug shipment to China would consist of \$31,000 worth of drugs with the balance of the shipment (up to \$50,000) to consist of ancillary kala-azar supplies. To help resolve the misunderstanding, a letter of explanation was sent to China. The drug shipment left England for Hong Kong and subsequent transfer to China in May 1951.

III. Exercises in Diplomacy

Following the assumption of power by the Communist regime in 1949 and fueled by anti-communist sentiments during the McCarthy era, the US refused to recognize the new government. US policy towards the Peoples Republic of China (PRC) was intensely hostile and communication between the two countries effectively ceased. AFSC now turned its efforts towards the normalization of relations between the US and the PRC. During its years of service in

China, AFSC had formed valuable relationships and established itself as a trusted and impartial friend. Consequently, AFSC was in a unique position to help. Initially, help meant actively influencing American policy in China through public education.

Although the PRC had assumed power on the mainland of China in 1949, the US Administration and Congress were seriously considering reactivating military aid to the Nationalists who had retreated to the island of Taiwan (Formosa) which they still controlled. In response to these impending government actions, the China Subcommittee (CS) decided to take a proactive stance: AFSC would share its experiences and point-of-view with the public and with Washington officials. The CS urged that all within AFSC be alerted to the crucial importance of relations between China and America. To begin the process of normalizing relations, AFSC field people were encouraged to arrange talks and discussions on China, and the China Desk was encouraged to help by providing lists of speakers, etc. The campaign to reconcile the two countries via educating the public and government officials was underway.

To assist in the goal of effectively influencing American policy in China, the AFSC enlisted the cooperation of the Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL), especially in challenging the "interventionists," who supported direct U.S. military intervention on behalf of the Nationalists, and whom the AFSC considered dangerous. In his January 1950 letter to E. Raymond Wilson (Wilson) of the FCNL, Spencer Coxe requested that information provided by AFSC be channeled by FCNL to those members of Congress that the FCNL felt were sympathetic to the AFSC position.

At the request of the China Sub-Committee, Spencer Coxe wrote a formal statement defining the AFSC point-of-view regarding American policy in China. In January 1950, the statement was forwarded to Senator Robert A. Taft by Lewis Hoskins and to President Truman by Clarence Pickett. Copies of the open letter to President Truman were also sent to numerous individuals, organizations, AFSC regional offices and the wire services.

Dr. Ernest Osborne, presiding chair of the informal group of American Friends of China, appointed a Special Committee (SC) which met on February 17, 1950. This committee was instructed "to draw up recommendations for possible activities designed to further better American-Chinese relations." The SC determined that the most important priority was to promote recognition of the PRC by the US government. Normalization of relations between China and the US could not be achieved without such recognition. The AFSC agreed with this view; advancing the normalization of relations became one of its top priorities.

It would not be easy. In February 1951, FCNL's Wilson enlisted Rhoads Murphy (a former FAU/FSU member) to talk to members of Congress in an effort to influence opinion. But the FCNL met with "a more adamant attitude" in this endeavor to influence policy than anything on which they had previously worked. Like initial efforts to find ways of serving in China, efforts to

influence American policy in China would continue for years before the desired results were achieved.

Relief Diplomacy

Another opportunity to provide relief occurred several years later in 1954 when floods once again devastated the Chinese mainland in the Yangtze and Yellow River valleys. This event prompted the concern of several local groups of Friends as well as Friends from the Southwest Regional Office, Richmond Regional Office and Southeast Regional Office – that the AFSC seek aid from the US government on behalf of the Chinese government.

The highly complex nature of the political situation made it difficult to know whom to consult. Not only that, but two offers of aid to China by the League of Red Cross Societies had already been refused, a fact which the State Department used to justify its own position. It was also reported that the Chinese Government had taken steps to allocate funds estimated at \$150,000,000 to meet the disaster. Friends' concern was conveyed to the Department of State and other possibilities explored. The political situation would not allow much else, and efforts to find ways of providing relief for those suffering in China continued.

In early 1955 Lewis Hoskins and Earle Edwards, proposed that AFSC explore the possibility of a goodwill relief project. The proposed project was motivated by Friends' deep and abiding concern for the flood victims in mainland China as well as by the heightened political tensions. The House of Representatives had recently approved (409-3) a joint resolution "authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories of that area..." The political situation made it necessary for Friends to alert US government officials of the depth of their concern and desire to be of service. On January 27, 1955 Hoskins and Leslie Heath met with the Deputy Undersecretary of State, Robert Murphy, to discuss concern for the flood victims and the mounting political tensions, and to suggest the idea that an offer of goodwill be made, if not by the government then perhaps by private agencies.

The AFSC Executive Board was enthusiastic about the proposal. It felt that every effort should be made to have one or two Americans accompany a gift to China. Doing so would signal their deep concern for the Chinese people, and serve as evidence that the US government was willing to send a few Americans to China despite then current policy related to imprisoned American fliers.

Several concerns needed to be addressed before AFSC could go public with the project. Given the hostility between the two countries, any gesture would first need Chinese approval. American Friends might have to rely on British Friends, who were intent on sending a mission to Peking, to accompany any gesture that might be approved by the Chinese. During an interview with Huan Hsiang, Charge d'Affaires of the Peking Government in London, Gerald Bailey and Lewis Hoskins discussed what form a gift might take. Eventually it was decided that AFSC would

offer China \$10,000 worth of Kala-azar or leprosy drugs and that a small American Quaker team would take the medical gift to China during the month of May.

Regarding the subject of a gift, Lewis Hoskins discussed the idea with Ting-li Cho, a former Chinese member of the FAU, who thought that "it would be delicate and difficult to combine a gift with a mission. It would be much better to send a mission first and then on return send a gift which must be small enough so that it could not in any sense be considered a bribe." Based on this information, it was decided that sending a mission to China would be pursued, sans a gift.

In a letter dated July 5, 1955, Hoskins wrote to John Foster Dulles, US Secretary of State, renewing the request for a Quaker visit to China. Previous requests had been unsuccessful. The government did not want to set a precedent. Hoskins continued to argue the merits of such a visit but the State Department denied the request again citing precedent and the fact that American civilians were still being detained on trumped-up charges. The perceived danger of being in the power of the Communist regime was too great a risk. The US government would not permit Americans to travel to China.

Hoskins responded to the State Department in a letter dated July 30, 1955 saying "neither of these reasons appeals to us as convincing." He argued that no precedent would be set since it was a request from an organization and not from an individual, and that the Geneva talks "had opened the way among other things to the encouragement of private contacts such as we are suggesting." But the arguments were to no avail. The State Department would not yield its position.

UN Recognition

Americans were not permitted by the State Department to travel to China, but AFSC continued to advance its goal of normalization of relations with China through the written word. In April 1955, in an attempt "to explore the China dispute and to stimulate thinking on the matter, the Labor-International Affairs Program of the AFSC published a pamphlet titled "Crisis over China." By providing the history of China's role in the UN as well as information on the current situation re China and Formosa, and by interpreting the position of other democracies on the issue, the pamphlet carefully outlined the argument for recognizing the PRC as the official government of China. In July 1959, more information was prepared and distributed by the AFSC Peace Literature Service. Titled "China and the UN: A Question of Representation," this fact sheet provided background information for those with a general interest in American policy in China and with a specific interest in the question of China's representation in the UN.

Meanwhile, Six British Quakers, invited by the China Peace Committee made a three-week visit to China in October 1955 that included a meeting with Prime Minister Chou En-lai. During this two-hour meeting the group discussed issues relating to the relaxation of tensions, Formosa, Geneva and the strengthening of East-West contacts, with the Prime Minister

acknowledging that this was greatly desired and that “China herself had issued invitations widely.” The conversation also turned to the issue of American prisoners in China. The delegation’s report, “Quakers Visit China,” speaks to this issue providing a glimpse of the Chinese point-of-view:

The Chinese government seems likely to release all these people in due course provided there is no challenge to its sovereign right to try and to sentence foreigners in China for alleged infringements of its own laws and in accordance with its own procedures. Its insistence on this right is easier to understand if it is remembered that for many years it was deprived of it by provisions for “extra-territoriality.”

The present Government’s feeling that it has still to establish recognition of itself as a sovereign power, by insistence on such points as these, is naturally not diminished by its non-representation in the United Nations. (p. 52)

The Chinese were willing to be patient; the prevailing attitude was that “it will be the UN and not the People’s Republic that has ‘missed the boat’” if recognition is too long delayed.¹⁸ Such visits to China would not take place again for quite a few years, though it would not be for lack of effort. In the ensuing years, members of the AFSC as well as others with a concern for normal relations with China would try to enlist Prime Minister Chou En-Lai’s help in their endeavors.

Missed Opportunity

Meanwhile, the AFSC tried another route on the path to normalization of relations with China through the Conferences for Diplomats program. AFSC hoped that the PRC would permit members of their diplomatic service to join in the Friends’ sponsored Conferences for Diplomats. This program was a direct outgrowth of the Clarens Conference held in Switzerland in August 1952 to provide a venue for the ministries of foreign affairs to meet “in an atmosphere of confidence where friendly, frank discussions could develop.” As later described by Paul B. Johnson, Director of the Conferences for Diplomats in 1961 in a letter to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Peoples Republic of China:

These meetings are a direct and important part of the Quaker effort – admittedly a very small effort indeed – to bridge international chasms and to help to bring about international understanding. We undertake this effort not aside from, but indeed as a direct result of our continuing international programs in the fields of refugee and relief work, ambulance and medical programs and more recent endeavors in the fields of social and technical assistance.

In 1957, the Chinese made an unexpected move when they invited Lloyd Bailey to the Chinese Consulate in Geneva to discuss the Conferences for Diplomats program. Word of the Conferences had reached the Chinese via the Russians, who had just started participating. Chinese participation in the Conferences, however, was not to be. As Duncan Wood later wrote

“we were not prepared for this approach.” Wood cited logistical and administrative problems that arose from the expansion of the program to include Eastern European representatives, and the belief that Chinese participation would negatively impact participation of the US and its allies. Wood further explained that the interview with Bailey ended cordially “since the Chinese obviously understood our predicament and did not press their claims” – a cordial ending to a meeting, yes, but a lost opportunity – a fact that would slowly become evident. In 1959, the AFSC began issuing invitations to the Chinese to participate in the Conferences. Efforts to secure Chinese participation would continue—unsuccessfully—for more than ten years.

Public Education

It was also during 1959 that the AFSC Peace Education Program issued two publications in its campaign to educate the public and policymakers. The first, titled “What’s Going on in China?” was a reprint of the following four articles: 1) *China May Soon Be The World Power*, 2) *Red China’s Hidden Capital of Science*, 3) *Chinese Agriculture* and 4) *Our China Policy Reaches Dead End*. All four of the articles were written “by an observer of some competence;” three articles were written from recent personal observation. The articles were offered “not because we [AFSC] can vouch for their accuracy or agree with their observations, but because we, along with the rest of America, are so much exposed to negative and often second-hand information that we need to weigh other points of view.”

The second publication, “China—1959,” was issued approximately six months later. The response to the first publication was so great that the initial printing was quickly exhausted. A second printing was considered out of the question because “[t]ime does not stand still in China,” and because of the perception that Americans wanted current information on the changes taking place in China. Americans, of course, were not traveling to China and could not provide this kind of information. Canadians, however, were and could. A series of articles written by Walter Gordon appeared in *The Toronto Star* and were reprinted under the title “China—1959.” Gordon had visited China for 3 ½ weeks in April 1959 during which time he “visited six big cities, inspected factories, workers’ living quarters, kindergartens, schools, universities, hospitals, theatres and several Communes.” The pamphlet was “offered in a spirit of inquiry in the belief that open and full discussion of this complex subject will help us and our government to reach peaceful solutions to problems troubling the world today.”

The following year brought another reiteration from the FSC of the desire to develop work in China, and also saw the beginning of another initiative to engage policymakers – the International Affairs Seminars of Washington (IASW) program. The aim of the IASW program was not so much to educate government officials as it was to engage them in a joint search for truth.

¹⁸ See “Quakers Visit China” a report prepared by the British delegation and published by the Society of Friends East-West Relations Committee and Peace Committee, London, 1955.

In April 1960, a seminar, "Main Trends in the Chinese Communist Party: Implications for the non-Communist World of Communist China's Internal Policies and Foreign Outlook," was held.

Youth Seminar Initiative

Given the decidedly hostile relations between China and the United States, continuing efforts to effect positive, healing relations were also undertaken by the Friends community at large, mainly the Quaker United Nations Office in Geneva and British Friends. In November 1960, British Friend Irene Jacoby wrote to Wang Chao-hua of the All China Youth Federation offering to arrange a seminar/conference to be held during the summer of 1961/62 in England to be attended by young Chinese and Americans. The purpose would be to allow the participants to get to know one another and to discuss matters of mutual interest.

Several months later Wang Chao-hua responded, explaining that the Chinese do cherish goodwill of American youth and that they have been proactive in furthering friendship between the youth of China and America. He discussed the delegation of American youth that were invited by the All-China Youth Federation in 1957 and the ongoing contact provided by attendance at other international youth conferences. In closing, Wang offered to send their publication EVERGREEN to promote understanding and friendship.

Several more letters were exchanged, but agreement to attend the proposed conference in England was still not forthcoming. At a meeting of the World Youth Forum (Moscow) in August 1961, Wang asserted that the greatest impediment to participation in the proposed conference was "the two China plot" of the USA. Wang expressed willingness to talk whenever possible and to maintain correspondence and exchange literature. He also held out the possibility of Chinese acceptance and participation in future seminars if they found the place and terms acceptable.

In the meantime, since September 1961 the East-West Contacts Subcommittee of the Young Friends Committee of North America had begun working toward dialogue with mainland Chinese, searching for contacts and the best means for studying the history and contemporary developments in China, and exploring channels and roadblocks facing US citizens in this endeavor. Their first project was a workshop held in Ann Arbor Michigan in June 1962. The week-long conference focused primarily on historical developments in China that led to the present impasse and touched briefly on possible approaches.

Famine Relief

In 1961 reports of another food shortage in China set yet another flurry of activity in motion to respond to the problem. Colin Bell wrote to Stella Alexander at the FSC on January 3, 1961 to tell her of the pressure being placed on AFSC by its constituents in favor of sending US food to Peking, and to ask those in London how they viewed the "food shortage" in China. What evidence was there that there's a famine in China? A memo dated January 10, 1961 to Colin Bell from Cecil Evans mentioned an article that appeared in The New York Times December 30, 1960, on the subject of crop failures in China. Colin Bell talked about the growing concern of the

AFSC constituency concerning this problem, which prompted inquiries to determine what the reality of the situation was, and whether and how AFSC might help. What kind of offer would be politically acceptable to China and to the USA as well? As Bell wrote:

One possible line of action for the AFSC would be to encourage the US Government to make a purely humanitarian gesture, emphasizing the natural calamity aspect of the present situation and the desire to alleviate human suffering. Such a gesture might be the more acceptable by being channeled through the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN, with the suggestion that China might herself make a similar gesture in future years when she is blessed with a particularly good harvest. All indications are that, in addition to the present gulf between the US and China, special attention must be given to the very great sensitivity of the Chinese authorities at this time, which makes selection of the right approach crucial.

Opinions varied as to the extent of the food crisis. Some reports referred to pockets of famine which although affecting vast numbers could be met through improvement of transport within the country. Others wrote of a famine of unprecedented proportions. Inquiries were made through sources in Washington and London, UN delegations, the UN and the Food and Agriculture Organization, as well as students of the China scene.

AFSC contacts in Washington, DC regarding Food for China included: George McGovern and Stuart Symington, Jr. of the Food for Peace Program, as well as three members of the White House Staff, Arthur Schelsinger, Jr., Mr. Kaysen, asst. to McGeorge Bundy, Special Assistant to the President, and Mr. Raskin. The intense interest in getting food to China was rooted in the political and reconciling background of Quakers' concern. (As explained in a conversation between Stella Alexander, Sydney Bailey and Dr. Werner Klatt, of the Research Department of the Foreign Office in response to his questions as to why China and not India, for example.) In June 1961 the AFSC received an invitation from George McGovern, Director of the American Food for Peace Council, to nominate a representative to the Council. The International Service and Affairs Committee agreed to accept the invitation and charged the chairman, in conjunction with the nominating committee, to make a suitable nomination.

In a memo dated January 25, 1961, Cecil Evans wrote to Colin Bell of his meeting with U Thant, Burmese Ambassador to UN, regarding the food situation in China. U Thant suggested that a letter be written stating all aspects of AFSC concern for the present food situation in China which he would present to his government upon his return to Burma. As requested, Colin Bell wrote a letter addressed to U Thant outlining AFSC concerns about the food shortage, how the issue of food aid be broached in Peking to ensure acceptance, and of course the desire for better relations with the Chinese.

Meanwhile, normalization of relations with China continued to be the driving force of most activities and every opportunity to advance this goal was seized:

On April 7, 1961, Stella Alexander, Gerald Bailey, Sydney Bailey and Duncan Wood met with Mr. Huan Hsiang, Chinese Charge d'Affaires in London to "express [their] concern at the difficult relations between the U.S. and China, and to say that [they] believed that the time had come for Quakers to make a further effort to help to bridge this gulf." – excerpt from account of meeting written by Stella Alexander on April 12, 1961.

A letter dated July 6, 1962 was sent to Chou En-Lai under the signature of the six British Quakers who visited China in 1955 and met with him asking for a "renewal of the contacts" initiated during that visit.

On November 2, 1961, Duncan Wood and his wife dined at the Chinese villa at Versoix with Chiao Kuan-Hua, his wife, Madame Kung Peng and Huan Hsiang; also present: Mr. Wu-Chin-Shih, Consul General in Geneva, his wife, Mr. and Mrs. Yeh, also of the Consulate, and a Mr. Chi (an interpreter whose expertise was not actually needed more than once or twice). Subsequent to this dinner, invitations were extended to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Peoples Republic of China in Peking to participate in a Conference for Diplomats.

Colin Bell, George Loft, Ed Snyder and Barry Hollister met with U. Alexis Johnson (Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs) on March 15, 1962 to discuss (1) the possibility of an international Quaker mission to Mainland China, to include two Americans, (2) AFSC invitations to Communist Officials for Quaker Diplomats Conferences, and (3) Food to China. With regard to the food issues, it was reported in a letter written by Colin Bell that Johnson made two points during their meeting (1) there was no sign of reliable evidence that official Chinese representatives had opened or were intending to open negotiations for the purchase of American grain, and (2) that the two applications for a license came from the same company, that the firm in question was a very small and that the license was a "hunting license" applied for before any quarry was in sight. Bell consulted with Rhoads Murphy on these points and was told that everything about the applicant for a license was true.

In October 1962 another meeting with Hsiung Hsiang-hui, the new Chinese Charge D'Affaires, occurred in London to put forth again the desire to send an international delegation to mainland China. Citing the occupation of Chinese territory by US troops, Hsiung said that American participation in a delegation would not be possible. Regarding invitations to the Conferences for Diplomats, Hsiung strongly suggested that it would be best to approach the Chinese ambassador in Berne.

The food shortage in China was discussed again at the March 1962 International Service and Affairs Committee (ISAC) meeting. Colin Bell reported on his discussions with those working on the issue: Quaker United Nations Program (QUNP) staff, FCNL and the staff of the International Affairs and International Services divisions of the AFSC. FCNL had been doing

yeoman's service in bringing and interpreting Quaker views to government officials. But all efforts at this point had yielded little in the way of results. The committee determined that someone was needed who could provide a more sustained effort and pursue and establish the necessary relationships. Although initially connected to the food shortage, this thinking would become more holistic in terms of opening communications with China and eventually lead to the decision to establish the role of a China Coordinator.

China Coordinator

The need for a Coordinator was recognized and much discussed among those interested in restoring relations with China on both sides of the Atlantic. In April 1963, the AFSC "advisory Committee on International Issues recommended and the Board approved the release of some able Friend, highly experienced regarding China," to study, consult and recommend what steps Friends should take to relate more effectively to the PRC. The Coordinator's primary area of focus would be the problem of the relationship between the US and China. Another step to advance this goal was also taken at this time by the AFSC ISAC with the formation of the ad hoc China Approach Committee (CAC). Barrett Hollister, Secretary of the AFSC International Affairs Division, would present this plan to the members of the FSC in London. Duncan Wood was chosen as the most desirable candidate for the full-time, temporary position. Wood declined; Cecil Evans (Evans) assumed the position effective January 1, 1964.

A month later, Evans interviewed Friends and China experts in England (Owen Lattimore and Evan Luard). It was pointed out that emphasis should be placed on what the Society of Friends had to offer the Chinese in the field of ideas. It was further pointed out that rather than trying to mold the Chinese into Quaker programs, it should be asked "What is it that the Chinese want to do with us?" Evans then spent three days in Geneva with Duncan Wood during which they met with the Chinese Consul-General.

From March through May 1964, Evans traveled throughout the US and Canada to confer with China specialists. His travels took him to Philadelphia, New York, Washington, Boston, San Francisco, Pasadena, Seattle, Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa (and several other cities) where he met with university professors, government officials and individual Quakers to gather opinions and insights. There was also a stop in Yellow Springs, Ohio where a seminar was held at Antioch College on Friends' China concerns. His brief report outlines the prevailing thoughts and opinions on issues of foreign policy as well as on what steps Friends should take to better relations between the US and China, which "should essentially be in the human dimension."

As a result of his meetings with representatives from around the country, Evans recommended four main areas as next steps in an overall strategy:

- 1 education of the American public;
- 2 sending of an exploratory mission to China;
- 3 efforts to make contacts with Chinese government offices all around the world;

4 invitations to Chinese to participate in AFSC programs.

The CAC supported the recommendation to send a small exploratory Quaker delegation to China and agreed to seek Board approval. In more specific terms, the mission would explore Chinese reactions to the idea of visits from Friends, especially American Friends with expertise in some technical field, such as population problems, water resources and agriculture. As a result of the Peace Secretaries' Roundup held in January 1964, China was suggested as an area for National program emphasis. The CAC also welcomed the Peace Education Division effort to formulate a working party to consider a Quaker view on US-Mainland China relations and perhaps prepare a pamphlet similar to the US-Soviet Union publication of 1949.

National Conference on US/China Relations

Later in 1964 Senator Fullbright made a well publicized speech saying that it might be time to re-think US policy towards China, an idea that had previously brought very sharp criticism from people in the government and the public. However, public reaction to what he said was relatively mild. Friends decided to test the waters of public opinion further, as to whether or not an open discussion of the question was now possible. Cecil Evans organized a series of invitational meetings of prominent business, academic and political people on the west coast. He found that serious discussion of this issue was not only possible, many people were for it. The time seemed ripe for a high profile, well publicized gathering to talk about US relations with China.

As a result, a national conference, *The United States and China*, was held on April 29-30, 1965 in Washington, D.C. The conference was presented by Georgetown University and The School of International Service of the American University in cooperation with the AFSC. As reported in the Washington Post (May 5, 1965) this was the "first significant national conference on American-Chinese relations since the Communists came to power on the mainland." The purpose of the conference was "to focus nationwide attention upon the problem of USA-China relations. Its aim [was] to provide information on the subject and to stimulate thought so as to prepare the public for a more intelligent grasp of the problems that divide[d] the two nations. It [did] not intend to promote any particular viewpoint or give support to any given policy."

Participation in and enthusiasm for the conference exceeded expectations. It was widely promoted by all sponsors. Senators Dominic and McGovern invited all members of the Senate to a breakfast with some of the speakers. More than 65 Senators and Representatives, or members of their staffs, responded. The conference featured 30 speakers, including high state department officials, the Nationalist Chinese Ambassador, Senators, a US Chamber of Commerce Official and leading scholars from around the country. There were more than 800 in attendance. Media representatives included: Tass, Reuters, Washington Post, ABC, NBC, CBS, UPI, Japanese press, Swedish press, English press, EKO network, among other. The conference was a success. And the AFSC approach to China was once again being reconsidered.

At this time, the AFSC continued to promote discussion of US/China relations in various parts of the country. As part of this process, AFSC published "Let's Talk about China Today", and "A New China Policy: Some Quaker Proposals" in 1965. The former publication included a series of articles that appeared in the July-September 1964 issue of *The Political Quarterly*. Written by acknowledged experts, the articles "describe[ed], analyz[ed], interpret[ed] and apprais[ed] the principal political, economic, and social aspects of Chinese Communism" (editorial, p. 5). The latter publication was the product of the "China Policy Working Party" (CPWP) established by the Peace Education Division in 1964 and was also published in connection with the National Conference on US/China Relations. The CPWP included Far Eastern scholars, persons with expertise on China, businessmen and professors. All were members of the Society of Friends, among them, Hugh Borton, president of Haverford College; Lewis Hoskins, professor of history at Earlham College; Rhoads Murphey, editor of The Journal of Asian Studies; and Kenneth Boulding, professor of economics at the University of Michigan.

Mention should be made here that the CPWP and the China Approach Project (under the auspices of the China Approach Committee) were two distinct efforts. The former was "for the purpose of drawing up a statement of policy approved by concerned and informed Friends for consideration in the United States with a view toward improving relations" between the two countries. The latter was "working toward the possibility of getting a small mission of Quakers into China for the purpose of opening up communications with the Chinese."

East Asia QIAR

In March 1965, Cecil Evan's assignment as Coordinator of the China concern came to an end. The thinking of the CAC regarding the Coordinator position had also changed. While the CAC saw the value of having someone give full-time attention to China, it now agreed that it was not justified due to timing and the amount of progress possible.¹⁹ To ensure that the coordinated effort to make direct contacts with China continued, "it was recommended that a staff and non-staff group representing the China interest in different parts of the world, such as Tokyo, Geneva, Hong Kong, Australia, and Canada, remain in correspondence and continue to share ideas, and that the Secretary of the International Affairs Division in Philadelphia join with the appropriate staff person in London in coordinating this. It was further agreed to recommend to the appointing body that the ad-hoc China Approach Committee be laid down at this time, but that members remain as a panel of advisors to ISAC on China approaches." DeWitt Barnett, newly appointed (1965) Quaker International Affairs Representative (QIAR)²⁰ for East Asia, based in Tokyo, would "carry a major concern for contacts with China, so that the whole effort [continues]."

¹⁹ A little less than a year later, circumstances changed and this need was once again revisited.

²⁰ Summary of purpose of QIAR: A QIAR lives in an area in which int'l problems or concerns have come to a focus. Representing Friends' concern for that of God in every person no matter what his/her political orientation may be, the QIAR assumes a unique function in int'l affairs. S/he seeks to find the truth in a

According to a Program Evaluation report written in January 1965, the overall responsibility of the East-Asia QIAR was “to find channels of communication for large segments of the human family between whom little or no communication exist[ed]. The most important task in East Asia [at this time] was re-opening communication with Mainland China. As long as a barrier existed between China and the West, especially the US, the work of the QIAR here was considered highly important.” It would become more so within several months.

The attitude of the governments of the two countries toward one another was entrenched. But, the Quakers felt, movement was inevitable because popular attitudes were changing – it was a matter of time. So the QIAR, “by cultivating contact with knowledgeable persons, by facilitating interest in and study of China and its problems, and by group discussions, etc, laid the groundwork for the time when the awaited breakthrough would come.” In November 1965, Barnett and his family began exploring the possibility of a visit to mainland China. Both DeWitt and his wife were born in China and used this as the reason for their proposed trip – a visit to their homeland. The AFSC did not think their attempt would prove successful, but a policy change was imminent.

In 1966, changes at the US State Department brought corresponding policy changes. In March of that year, Congressman Weston E. Vivian (D. Ann Arbor, Michigan) addressed the House of Representatives and urged: a relaxation of travel restrictions, a relaxation of the embargo and extending trade conditions, support for PRC entry to UN and that Taiwan relinquish its seat on the Council. He further stated: “our policies toward China, with its three quarters of a billion people, the most populous nation on this planet, cannot stay sterile. We must look toward the future, rather than being entrapped in the past.” The note attached to a copy of the address states that the Congressman attributed his change of viewpoint toward China directly to his participation in a Quaker weekend conference at Airlie House. Shortly thereafter, travel restrictions were lifted.

As a result of this policy shift, certain American professionals (scholars and scientists) were granted permission to travel to China. Relaxation of the restrictions, however, did not guarantee entrance into China by the Chinese. To gain access to China, an invitation from an official person or group for purposes of obtaining a visa was necessary. Many Quaker doctors contacted the AFSC about possible action and expressed a deep interest in going to China. By July, the following medical professionals expressed their interest in going to China and to

difficult situation and tries humbly to convey to those directly involved and to Friends at Large the relevance of religious insights to current political, social, and economic problems. S/he makes personal contact with those caught up in tensions and does what s/he can to bring together those who are separated by an intolerant outlook or by legacies of bitterness. S/he arranges meetings which may range from simple conversation to diplomats’ discussions. An important feature of the QIAR’s work is the opportunity for informal, off-the-record meetings in a home-like atmosphere, whether it be in the QIAR’s own home or a Friends’ Center.

receiving a Chinese counterpart in the US: Dr. John Barlow—Neurology at Mass General, Dr. Robert Leopold—Community Mental Health, Warner Kloepfer—Human Genetics at Tulane University, Dr. David Bassett—Cardiology, Hawaii Cardiovascular Study, The Queen’s Hospital, Honolulu, William L. Brown—Plant Genetics, VP Pioneer Hi-Bred Corn Company, Dr. George A. Perera—Medical Education and Hypertension at Columbia University.

Bassett applied for permission to travel to mainland China and received a favorable reply in a letter dated August 10, 1966. He was not able to obtain the requisite visa, possibly due to political developments within China with regard to the outbreak of “The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution” with its Red Guards, and the rise of Lin Biao, Chinese Defense Minister. Bassett (in a letter dated 9/11/66) seemed to think that the events may suggest that doors to China would “close even tighter.” Although the political obstacles were still present, the AFSC Board decided to take advantage of this opportunity and considered the appointment of someone to work intensively for six months on arranging appropriate interchanges with the Chinese.

National Committee on US/China Relations

The formation of the National Committee began as an initiative of the (AFSC) Northern California Regional Office in conjunction with the Peace Education Division. Cecil Thomas, associate peace education secretary in San Francisco, contacted and consulted with businessmen, professionals, academics and at times with AFSC staff in attempts to form a citizens committee on US/China policy. Based on these discussions, the proposed citizens committee would embody the following characteristics: 1) it would not advocate any policy proposals or take positions on issues; 2) it would be composed of people of widely varying opinions who largely agree on one point: *present policy toward China should be publicly studied and discussed*; 3) it would stimulate dialogue as to whether modifications in existing policy are desirable; 4) it would carry out an educational program that would include studies, conferences, public discussions, and consultation with non-governmental organizations; and 5) its program would be developed by paid staff and a small executive committee elected by the members of the National Committee. Through Cecil Thomas, the AFSC assisted and initiated activity to help bring the National Committee into being, but AFSC would have no financial or administrative responsibilities. An AFSC member could be a member of the National Committee, and an AFSC member could serve on its executive committee, but not as a representative of the AFSC.

The National Committee was officially formed on June 9, 1966 and was well-received by the highest government officials. Cecil Thomas was named Executive Secretary and Robert A. Scalapino, professor of political science at University of California, named Acting Chairman. The four functions of the Committee were: 1) Conferences and Seminars, 2) Exchanges and International Contacts, 3) Information Gathering, and 4) Information Distribution. By October 21, 1966, the National Committee had become officially recognized at the UN as an NGO with an ambitious program including a nationwide China Seminar Program, developing TV and radio

programs on China, publishing a series of bibliographies on China to name a few. The First National Convocation, titled "The United States and China: The Next Decade" was held in March 1969 in New York City.

Building Toward New Relations

Additional efforts on behalf of US/China relations were underway in various parts of the country and the world:

1. Colin Bell lunched with Pu Chao Minh and his interpreter, Yao Jen-Liu in January 1966. Minh was representative of the Hsin Hua News Agency in Canada concerned with distribution of Chinese literature throughout North America. Bell was able to meet with this Chinese representative because the AFSC Peace Secretaries held their Round-Up near Toronto that year.

2. Conference on Mainland China was held February 8-12, 1966. The China Conference was sponsored by AFSC, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, Northwestern University, and University of Chicago.

3. Bronson Clark, National AFSC Board Member, testified before the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Representing AFSC in an attempt to bring about change in US policy towards China, Clark concluded his testimony by quoting the conclusion from "A New China Policy;"

4. Dr. Robert E. Reuman (a former member of the FSU), in a confidential memo dated June 1966, reported on his meeting with two Chinese officials at the embassy in Berlin. He described how the invitation to the AFSC's Sinaia (Rumania) conference for Diplomats was adamantly rebuffed. Reuman used the terms failure and dismal to describe his attempt to encourage Chinese participation.

The AFSC International Affairs Division (IAD) began to reconsider the general approach to China. The question of how best to approach the PRC was explored again at the AFSC Consultative Conference at Singapore held in 1968. Experts on China, Professor Shinkichi Eto of Tokyo University and Anugerah Pekerti, an Indonesian of Chinese ancestry assisted the group discussion. The following proposals were made:

1. No more letters to be written inviting Chinese participation in diplomat or other conferences until a different decision is made – merely sending and accumulating written invitations "is a typically Western mode of operating, as opposed to the more personal Chinese way through 'connections.'"

2. To ask DeWitt Barnett to see if, via Japanese connections, a personal word might be lodged in Peking concerning AFSC desire to include representatives in conferences.

3. To think carefully about the person who AFSC would like to get into China and who would be most likely to achieve this.

4. That AFSC attempt personal contacts at available and judiciously chosen points around the world.

Immediately following the First National Convocation on China (March 1969) where Senator Edward Kennedy delivered a speech²¹ that received “widespread and largely (2-1) favorable reaction in the press” nationwide, there apparently were indications from “reliable sources” that the “Administration was willing to move on the China Question – maybe even ready to move!” To capitalize on this development, a group of individuals met in New York City – Ed Doty, AFSC Peace Education Secretary and Cecil A. Thomas among them²² – to explore the formation of a committee “concerned with effecting changes in US policy, moving toward normal relations with a major world power [China].”

The Committee for a New China Policy (CNCP) as it came be called would be a limited-term action organization with programs designed to educate the public, to work with government officials, and to initiate further contacts with China through individuals and groups with connections therein. The committee included businessmen, educators and church officials and was chaired by Professor Hans Morgenthau, a leading American political scientist and critic of US policy in Asia. Other members of note were: Professor Noam Chomsky of MIT, and Professor Rhoads Murphey, Director of the Center for Chinese Studies at the University of Michigan and former FAU member. Although not an AFSC committee, Cecil Thomas was recognized as having laid the groundwork for the formation of the Committee. It should be noted too that the Committee was neither in direct competition with nor an outgrowth of the National Committee on US/China Relations. Stewart Meacham was a member of the Committee in its early stages and attended the September 1969 meeting held in New York City to discuss in greater detail the proposed work of the Committee. An article on the formation of the committee soon appeared in the newsletter of the AFSC Understanding China Program and seems to be the last bit of information contained in the AFSC files.

Through 1969, no successful contact with the PRC had as yet been established. But the deep and abiding concern for China fueled continuing efforts to reconnect. In a paper titled “China Contacts,” DeWitt Barnett, wrote: “Our consultants are generally pessimistic about AFSC making China contacts primarily on our own terms, or primarily as a Quaker organization. Initiatives by Quakers, however, are something else again. These do not always require an institutional label.” In mid-1970, a major policy change towards China appeared imminent.

²¹ The full text of the speech is in the 1969 AFSC Peace Education Division File, Administration: China: Correspondence folder.

²² Other attendees included Thomas B. Manton, Director of International Relations, CCSA, United Church of Christ; Homer Jack, Director, Division of Social Responsibility, Unitarian-Universalist Association; Donald MacInnis, Director of China Program, National Council of Churches; Carl Soule, Methodist Board of Social Concerns; Carly Wade, UN Quaker Program; Richard Riseling, Department of International Affairs, American Baptist Convention and Mia Adjali, Board of Christian Social Concerns.

At a White House dinner on July 10, 1970, President Nixon stated: "The problem is China. It is dangerous to have eight hundred million people alienated, hostile, and cut off from the world community." This statement prompted Louise Bennett, a member of the Understanding China Committee in AFSC's Pacific Southwest Region, to write Bronson Clark in an attempt to encourage reexamination of AFSC work on China. Clark responded that the period of inactivity was a choice made as the result of so many refusals and "piled up negative responses." Clark, however, agreed that new initiatives may be warranted based on the changing situation.

Nixon's statement and subsequent review of US policy towards China was the long awaited breakthrough. Colin Bell, Director of the AFSC Public Affairs Program in Washington, DC, proposed that the AFSC and closely related organizations might benefit from a day spent in consultation and discussions to: 1) face the substantive issues dividing the West from the Chinese and to discover to what extent we are in agreement concerning the issues (e.g. Taiwan issue), 2) share what [was then being done] in China, 3) agree on desirable actions for the future (e.g. seeking visitations to China, attempting to influence public and legislative opinion, preparing for moment of China UN entry), 4) coordinate actions among the AFSC as well as with others of like mind both home and in the world.

On February 26, 1971, a conference was convened at Pendle Hill to discuss and plan activities regarding relations with China for the next one to two years. With regard to policy towards China, it was agreed by those attending the meeting that 1) the PRC should be regarded as the sole representative government of the Chinese people; 2) that AFSC urge the US government to issue a statement withdrawing all US support for Taiwan and recognize the future of Taiwan as being an internal question and 3) that priority be given to the seating of Peking as the representative of China at the UN.

The role of the Quaker United National Office (QUNO) was discussed at Pendle Hill with high priority on work toward the seating of Peking as the representative of China at the UN. Several months later, QUNO hosted the Mohonk Conference in May 1971, titled "Presentation of China in the United Nations." Twenty diplomats, all of whom were UN delegates, plus the chairman and four staff participated in the conference. The two days of frank discussions of seating Peking at the UN were viewed as extremely successful in terms of achieving its goals. It may even be said that convening these diplomats significantly influenced the outcome of the UN vote later that year.

Participants at the Pendle Hill conference also agreed to issue a white paper setting forth Quaker policy. The publication would briefly update information from the 1965 publication "A New China Policy: Some Quaker Proposals" and be the official policy statement of the AFSC Board of Directors. Work on the paper began and in August, the AFSC issued a news release describing the upcoming Quaker report: "The study [took] a strong stand against the recently announced Nixon administration policy of dual representative for China in the U.N. ...[and] argue[d] that

China's seat in the U.S. should be transferred from the Nationalist government on Taiwan to the Communist government in Peking ... the de facto ruler of mainland China's 750 million people;" it also urged the withdrawal of all American troops from the island as steps necessary for the normalization of U.S.-China relations. In September 1971, the AFSC published "US China Policy: A Fresh Start".

Initiative from Prince Norodom Sihanouk

The report was delivered to the Chinese Foreign Ministry in Beijing in person by AFSC representatives Bronson P. Clark, AFSC national executive secretary, and Russell Johnson, peace education secretary for the New England office of AFSC. They had traveled to Peking at the invitation of Prince Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia, then in exile in Peking. According to Johnson, the invitation and resulting visit "came about unexpectedly." Johnson had a six-year relationship with the Prince established in the 1960s as a result of seminars in Cambodia which Johnson had organized as the QIAR in New Delhi and later in Singapore. He had also been in touch with the Prince during the time when visas to China were not forthcoming to Americans. A note to Johnson from a Philadelphia colleague prompted a new round of correspondence; Johnson wrote to the Prince and three weeks later the invitation was received.

Clark, Johnson and their wives arrived in China on Wednesday August 18. The purpose of the trip was threefold:

1. to respond to the invitation of Prince Sihanouk, the exiled head of the Cambodian government currently living in Peking
2. a) to visit friends known during the '45-'46 (FAU) period, b) to learn more about the Chinese Revolution and c) to compare the China of yesterday with the China of today.
3. to meet with officials in the Chinese Foreign Ministry to discuss the possibility of Chinese officials joining in participation in Quaker Conferences and Seminars program held with diplomats and young leaders in Asia, Europe and Africa.

The visit included discussion with officials of the Chinese foreign ministry and a three hour meeting with Prince Sihanouk. It was the first visit by AFSC representatives to China in 20 years.

Clark wrote three reports upon his return. The first report "People's Republic of China and AFSC Programs" concluded:

While we did not accomplish Chinese participation in Conference and Seminar Programs or even move forward any possibility of exchanges, still we felt that we had renewed acquaintances at a number of levels in and out of the Chinese government and that on the whole the reaction to the [AFSC] and to Friends' service as an international effort was positive. There is considerable interest about the work of Medical Team 19 and ... we need to search the archives and prepare a special report which can be taken by the next group. The Chinese regard the war against the KMT

as having happened “yesterday” and Yenan is regarded as the cradle of the revolution. Our relationship to it in the past is therefore of considerable interest to them.

The 2nd and 3rd reports focused on the specifics of the visit, including the discussions with Prince Sihanouk and observations about Chinese life resulting from their travels. A press release issued by the AFSC at the conclusion of the trip addressed the prevailing attitude of the Chinese, as interpreted by Clark, regarding the political impasse:

The Chinese welcome Nixon’s visit as the 137th meeting in 16 years with US representatives, but in their eyes the solution to the problems of Southeast Asia remains obvious—the US should get out of Asia. We remain in their eyes as a military power trying to adjudicate with force issues that are essentially internal to the nations of Asia.

The AFSC had a significant “China program” in place, albeit uncoordinated. The major themes of the existing China Program were: 1) China and the UN; 2) interpreting the New China in the US; 3) visits to China; and 4) proposals for Chinese participation in programs arranged by AFSC. The recent change in US policy toward China, however, brought with it a perceived need to reevaluate the situation and the possible need for a Coordinator. A Coordinator would “give focus and continuing momentum to the purposes and program objectives.” The matter would be discussed with Bronson Clark upon his return from China. Within six months two long awaited significant events occurred.

UN Recognition Received

On October 25, 1971, the PRC received the necessary votes and was seated at the UN. Barrett Hollister, Director of QUNO, on behalf of International Quakers, sent a cable to Premier Chou En-lai recognizing and welcoming PRC participation in the UN. Several months later, in February 1972, President Nixon visited the PRC.

The seating of the PRC at the UN and Nixon’s visit to China were groundbreaking events and signaled that the long-awaited mending of fences had begun in earnest. It did not however mean that full normalization of relations with China had been reached, nor did it mean that AFSC efforts toward that goal would cease. In fact an AFSC delegation would visit China in 1972, and in 1976 the AFSC would sponsor a conference on the subject.

AFSC Delegation – 1972

The AFSC was always looking for opportunities to visit China, and the idea for this particular delegation surfaced in July 1971. At that time, the AFSC formed the Special Board Committee on China Approach, a Special Committee to investigate and consider the best way to approach the PRC and reestablish ties. At this time, the AFSC and the Canadian Friends Service Committee (CFSC) were working together to help American Friends gain entree. Mike Yarrow reported to the Committee on the suggestion of the Canadian Chairman, Edward Bell, that the Canadian agency act as intermediary and seek an appointment with Huang Hua, Chinese Ambassador to Canada. The purpose of the meeting would be to “lay the groundwork” and to see

how Hua felt about meeting with a group of American Quakers. Meanwhile, the “unexpected” invitation to visit the PRC arrived from Prince Sihanouk and the Clark/Johnson visit materialized. While there, Clark proposed a visit by a larger AFSC delegation; when he returned, Clark said he was hopeful that the Chinese would grant the request the following spring. Clark’s hope became reality.

In January 1972, Clark, Lois Schneider and John Sullivan met with Kao Liang (Liang), First Secretary of the PRC Mission to the U.N. As it happened, Liang knew of the FSU and could recall the names of several individuals who had served in the Unit. Talk turned to the war in Indochina, with Clark outlining the AFSC’s opposition to the war and to US involvement, as well as the general work of the AFSC. Liang was particularly interested in the AFSCs anti-war activities and in their community relations work. Subsequent to this January meeting, there was a flurry of correspondence and on February 23, 1972, John Sullivan and Barrett Hollister met again with Kao Liang. Liang formally advised Sullivan and Hollister that the AFSC delegation was welcomed. He strongly suggested that the delegation consist of individuals who had worked in the liberated areas with the Friends Unit since they would be able to “compare the New China with the old.”

In May 1972, eleven AFSC representatives visited the PRC for a three week goodwill mission. The members of the mission included: Wallace Collett, Margaret H. Bacon, Harold Hochschild, Kenneth Kirkpatrick, Marilyn McNabb, Rhoads Murphy, John Sullivan, Margaret Stanley Tesdell, Stephen Thiermann, Hulen Watson and Gilbert White. They visited six cities: Canton, Wuhan, Shanghai, Sian, Yen-an and Peking and during their travels had the opportunity to observe various aspects of life inside the PRC. They visited the urban and rural communes, factories, schools, and historical sites; they attended a number of popular entertainment events and met with government officials in Peking to discuss domestic and foreign affairs. Details of the visit are described in their report, “Experiment Without Precedent,” published by the AFSC later that year.

Upon their return, the delegates were met by several members of the press and briefly commented on their visit. They felt the need to express their “shock and indignation” at the escalation of the war in Indochina, and to inform the press that the Chinese, too, were very concerned; they stated:

[The Chinese] recalled that Nixon in his statements had said: judge us by our actions, rather than our words. That is precisely what the Chinese are doing. Although the Chinese clearly wish to improve relations with the USA they were emphatic that there will be no normalizing of US-China relations and no discussion of the Taiwan issue – on the resolution of which such normalization depends – until the USA completely withdraws its forces and assistance from Indochina.

Notwithstanding the concern about events in Indochina, the delegates were successful in getting the Chinese to accept invitations to participate in two exchange programs, one jointly sponsored

by the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars (CCAS) and the AFSC for 5-7 young Chinese to spend four weeks in the US, and the other solely sponsored by the AFSC for 11-15 Chinese persons of any age and vocation to visit the US for a similar amount of time. According to the members of the delegation, the Chinese were particularly interested receiving a delegation of Americans with third-world origins.

AFSC, in cooperation with the CCAS, began to explore the possibilities of increased visits by Chinese to the US. The AFSC as well as Chinese officials viewed increased contact as a crucial step to normalizing relations. In May 1972, the AFSC delegation had broached the subject of an exchange program with Yueh Tai-heng of the China International Travel Service (CITS).²³ In a letter to Tai-heng dated July 12, 1972, Bronson Clark stated that the "visit[s] will add very significant dimensions to the development of friendship between the Chinese and American peoples." The US/China exchange program was also the topic of a Roundtable discussion titled "The Prospects for Exchanges with China" held at the office of the National Committee in March 1973. John Sullivan, AFSC Associate Executive Director, attended the meeting to speak on recent developments and the recent AFSC trip to China. The proposed visits between the countries however would not quite go as planned.

The invitations extended by the AFSC delegation in 1972 had been accepted but had not yet been realized. The one year limitation on the invitations expired in May 1973. For a number of reasons, the AFSC did not renew its unilateral invitation but did renew the invitation jointly extended with the CCAS. A flurry of activity ensued to realize the agreed upon exchange: Sharon Pixton wrote to Dave Elder in Hong Kong requesting that he and the CCAS people there "make contact with those known to sympathize with or have contacts in Peking", and Steve Thiermann met with Charles Freeman of the State Department in June 1973.

With regard to pursuing contacts with the Chinese, Freeman suggested that AFSC "proceed under its own name and under its own initiative" since the CCAS was not an organization currently in good standing with the Chinese; the organization was "persona non grata" due to its "withdrawal of a previously accepted invitation ... over the issue of China policy vis-à-vis US and Indochina." Several months later, Clark wrote to Yueh Tai-hang of the CITS reminding him of the invitation extended in 1972 and essentially reissued the invitation. The letter made no mention of the CCAS, but it would appear this did not matter. In December, Clark received a response from the Liaison Department of the CITS informing him that "owing to the busy work, it is difficult for us at present to send this group for a visit to your country."

In 1974, the Chinese initiated another campaign in the Cultural Revolution that resulted in a slowdown of relations between the countries. Only trade relations were unaffected, with exchanges between the two countries continuing on an ad hoc basis.

The AFSC held a meeting at Pendle Hill on April 21, 1974 titled "China Consultation" to discuss the current state of relations with China. After much discussion about what was and was not happening, and the shift in tempo of relations, it was concluded that

China has neither time, personnel nor resources for casual or inconsequential concerns . . . We look for the time when Americans and Chinese can freely visit each other, living and studying together, searching for new solutions to the common problems of global life today.

In July 1976, a devastating earthquake hit Hopeh Province in northern China and elicited concern and an offer of help from Wallace Collett on behalf of AFSC. There is no evidence of a response to this outreach; apparently China was quite determined to stand on its policy of national self-reliance. Several months later, on September 15, 1976, Chairman Mao Tse Tung died. Louis W. Schneider, Executive Secretary of the AFSC, cabled condolences. Meanwhile, the AFSC was hard at work preparing for another conference on China.

1976 National Leadership Conference on US/China Relations

The AFSC was one of twenty national organizations that co-sponsored the National Leadership Conference on US-China Relations held in Washington DC in December 1976.²⁴ The conference was convened to promote normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China and was appropriately titled "The Time Has Come." Approximately 380 people attended the conference.

The AFSC and other participating organizations took their lead from the Shanghai Communiqué jointly issued in 1972 by President Nixon and Chou En-Lai, in which both men declared that normalization of relations between their respective countries would benefit the world. More specifically, the Communiqué affirmed "its interest in a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question by the Chinese themselves" and also "the ultimate objective of the withdrawal of all U.S. forces and military installations from Taiwan." In the ensuing years, steps had been taken to further the goals of the Communiqué: trade relations had developed, and restrictions against official exchange visits and tourist travel had been lifted. But the AFSC and other co-sponsors of the conference believed that the full intent of the Communiqué was still to be realized. For that to happen, the following "important" steps needed to be taken:

- US forces and military installations must be withdrawn from Taiwan
- The military security pact between Taiwan and the United States must be abrogated

²³ The subject of exchanges was also discussed with Premier Chou En-lai in 1971 and also earlier in 1972 with Yang Gung-su during the recent visit of the CCAS.

²⁴ Some of the other sponsoring organizations: Church of the Brethren; Friends Committee on National Legislation, Americans for Democratic Action; Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars and Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Individual supporters included Julian Bond, Georgia State Senator; George Wald, Nobel Laureate from Harvard; Linus Pauling, Nobel price-winning scientist; and Corliss Lamont, Chairperson, National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

- The US must withdraw its recognition of Taiwan as the Republic of China and sever all diplomatic relations with the Taipei government.
- The US must formally recognize the PRC and establish full diplomatic relations with the Peking Government
- Trade between the two countries should be facilitated through the extension of “more favored nation” status to the PRC

The conference was convened to advance these issues, and the topics presented included: 1) a review of the history and current status of US-China relations, including the Communiqué and the remaining obstacles to normalization of relations also to include the history of Taiwan and the questions of independence and self-determination, 2) views on normalization from Capital Hill, and 3) benefits of normalization. A Statement advancing the above-stated issues was adopted at the conference with the subsequent suggestion that it be sent to President-elect Carter and other government officials. It was also determined that organizers of the conference would continue widespread educational efforts to achieve the stated goal of the conference and that the leaders of the co-sponsoring organizations meet with Cyrus Vance (President-elect Carter’s nominee for Secretary of State) “to press [their] concern.” A Continuation Committee had been formed to coordinate efforts.

The Continuation Committee met in January 1977 as scheduled to begin the process of organizing and implementing the numerous steps necessary to advance their goal. The members of the Committee determined that their first effort should be a visit to Cyrus Vance. Other suggestions included working through Congress, bringing other organizations in and organizing local and regional conferences, as well as more focused actions such as letter writing campaigns, holding press conferences, circulating petitions, a media campaign. It was decided, however, to postpone the visit to Cyrus Vance for two reasons. First, “he would be swamped [with visits from many other] organizations trying to express their opinions and views.” Second, “the Committee felt it would be more effective to approach Vance at a time when world events provided more leverage.” The Committee also decided that it would meet quarterly but evidence – or rather lack of it – suggests that this did not occur.

Medical Delegations

The following year, the Bureau of Foreign Affairs of the Ministry of Health in China extended an invitation to Lewis Hoskins, his wife Lois, and 14 other former members/associates of the FAU to visit China for three weeks in August 1978. The delegation was international in scope, with members from the US, Canada, New Zealand, the Philippines, England, Rhodesia, and Jordan. In addition to visiting the places where the FAU/FSU had operated, rekindling old friendships and establishing new ones, the delegation had the opportunity to explore the possibility of exchange visits, especially of medical personnel, in some depth. The Chinese were “keen to arrange medical visits to the United States hospitals and universities,” and the informal “negotiations” proved fruitful. In October, Dr. Chen Ke-ju, Deputy Director of the Ministry of Public Health wrote to Lewis Hoskins indicating that “an invitation for a Chinese medical delegation to

visit the United States under Quaker auspices would receive 'positive consideration.'" In the spring of 1979, a Chinese organ (heart, kidney and eye) transplant team from Shanghai visited the US as guests of the AFSC for a six week study tour.

The doctors, all transplant specialists from the newly formed organ transplant team at the Shanghai Second Medical College, arrived in San Francisco on October 8, 1979. They visited prestigious hospitals and university medical centers in Denver, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, and New York, among others. The trip culminated back in San Francisco, where the doctors enjoyed a traditional Thanksgiving Dinner and a relaxing weekend before their departure on November 25, 1979. The visit had given the doctors "the chance to have a birds-eye view of all the major transplantation centers and to be able to learn new technology in transplantation related basic sciences." The trip was a success and would eventually lead to other exchanges and opportunities.

The next two decades saw the beginning of numerous cooperative ventures between AFSC and various organizations in China. There were donations to the medical community in China, exchange visits of peace activists between AFSC and the Chinese Association for International Understanding (CAFIU), a visit to China by the AFSC Executive Secretary and several conferences related to health care, women's issues and peace building. Also, the work of the FAU/FSU had left an indelible impression on the Chinese, and was the basis for yet another invitation for former members to visit in 1981.

The official invitation was dated September 30, 1980 and signed by Dr. Cheng Keru of the Bureau of Foreign Affairs Ministry of Public Health PRC. The following quote, taken from the full report of this visit, gives some brief background regarding the invitation: "As a consequence of friendship and mutual trust built during [FAU/FSU] years, the Chinese ministry of Health in 1978 invited members of the Friends Medical Team-19 to return to places they had worked earlier. Later, Margaret Stanley, nurse in the FAU/FSU, and member of both the 1972 and 1978 delegations, sought and received an invitation to organize another tour to China in 1981 as a continuation of contact between Friends and the Chinese Health Ministry." The eleven member delegation visited China from May 23 – June 5, 1981; they spent time in Kwangchow, Beijing, Xian, Yanan and Nanjing.

Pacemaker Donation

In the meantime, Edwards Laboratories, Irving, California, a division of American Hospital Supply Corporation, offered a donation of several thousand pacemakers to AFSC. Apparently, the company had discontinued making pacemakers. AFSC alerted Dr. Fong-Chung Tong, head of the visiting Chinese delegation to the US and Professor and Chairman of the Department of Surgery at the Rui Jin Hospital. He cabled back: "having informed our hospital authority, other affiliated hospitals of ours and the city health department ... please send as many as possible, even thousands." Dr. Tong had also provided the names of nine Shanghai hospitals where the

pacemakers would be used. The AFSC requested that “a substantial portion” of the pacemakers also be provided to hospitals in Beijing and wrote to Dr. Huang Chia-Ssu, President of the Chinese Academy of Medical Science in that regard. In June 1981, the 3,220 donated pacemakes and accessories worth \$7.6 million were shipped to China for use in Shanghai and Beijing hospitals under the conditions “that all patients shall receive them at no charge” and “that the Chinese airline provide free air freight.” Several months later, Dr. Chia-Ssu forwarded a list of the hospitals in Shanghai and Beijing that had received the equipment.

A sequel to the shipment of Edwards pacemakers to China was the donation of heart valves by Extracorporeal, Inc. which were sent to China (and Vietnam). The donation was formally presented to the AFSC by Bart Harrison, former AFSC Board member and then President of Extracorporeal, Inc. The donation included valves, valve conduits and other related items and was valued at \$1.5 million. Shipped to China in July, the equipment was distributed to hospitals in Beijing and Shanghai and a list of the hospitals was again provided by Dr. Chia-Ssu.

David and Betty Elder, and Will and Leila Patterson received an invitation from Dr. Huang Chia-Ssu in February 1982 to visit China in mid-April. During their stay (April 10-28), they visited ten hospitals in Beijing (4) and Shanghai (3) and one each in Sian, Hangchow and Changsha and interviewed 34 of the pacemaker patients. Overall, everyone who had received the pacemakers – doctors and patients – was pleased. The delegation found that distribution of the pacemakers was widespread and the system for distribution was well designed; the delegation also made the necessary arrangements for the shipment of heart valves donated by Extracorporeal, Inc.

While on this trip, Dave Elder also explored the possibility of carrying out rural development work in China. On April 15th, he met with Madame Xu Jing, head of the Foreign Affairs Bureau of the Ministry of Agriculture, to discuss the idea of AFSC conducting a small rural development assistance project. Later that month, the PRC was to adopt “a new constitution that included many significant reforms and gave special attention to matters of rural development” including an end to the commune system. Timing couldn’t have been more disadvantageous to pursue a program linked to communes. David Elder and Mr. Tao (Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences interpreter) along with two local Bureau of Agriculture staff, spent several hours on April 26th at the Liang Tzu People’s Commune, a ¾ hour drive from Hangchow.

As Dave Elder reported, “time for discussion of a possible AFSC project with the Agriculture Bureau staff was limited to the ride in the car back to the city.” The concept of a “wealthy” foreigner living on a commune was difficult for the Chinese to absorb. The possibility was not rejected outright but such a drastic idea would need approval from Peking. A cable from M. Xu Jing received in June read: “if your visit to China only concerning cooperation program with Peoples Commune we find present condition not proper suggesting you cancel visit.” Dave Elder followed-up with a letter to Madame Jing dated June 14th that restated the argument and pressed for reconsideration and a future meeting. No further response was forthcoming and the matter

was not pursued. In the interim, the AFSC determined that while work in China was interesting their attention and resources were needed for more immediate humanitarian needs in other parts of Asia, Indochina especially. Consequently, program development related to China became “responsive” in nature.

Peace Exchanges

The reciprocal peace exchanges were initiated in June 1983, when a letter from Zhu shan-Qing, Acting Secretary-General China Association for International Understanding of China (CAFIU), was received by Max Hess and Dick Mason of China Education Tours (CET).²⁵ Hess and Mason arranged cultural tours to China with a goal to promote some fairly serious political dialogue between American and Chinese. While in China, Hess and Mason had “raised the possibility of two sets of exchanges between the US and China, one to discuss Sino-US relations, and the other with a broader, ‘world peace’ theme.” The Chinese requested specifically that the delegation to China consist of leaders from US peace organizations. Hess and Mason first approached Helen Caldicott as a potential leader for the delegation but she was not interested in that role. Later that month, Hess and Mason visited Russell Johnson, head of the NE Regional Office of AFSC, to discuss the possibility of AFSC being the host organization of the exchanges, based on its “history of contacts in China and because of its long standing peace activism.” AFSC co-sponsorship would also “be very helpful in the financial arrangements” being considered by CET. During the next several months, the matter was discussed and in the fall of 1983, the plan received the approval of the AFSC Board.

The US delegation visited China from January 1-16, 1984 and traveled to Beijing, Hangchow and Shanghai. Lewis Hoskins led the delegation which also included Joe Volk, who represented the AFSC Peace Education Division. Other members of the delegation were: Ann Bastion, consultant in social policy to the New World Foundation; Jane V. Belwett, researcher and analyst assistant at the Center of Concern; Elise Boulding, chairperson Sociology Department, Dartmouth College; Susana Cepeda, Central America Coordinator, SANE; Laurence Harris, Treasurer, New Jewish Agenda, San Francisco; Richard P. Mason, CET; Bernice Reagon, Smithsonian Institute and “Sweet Honey in the Rock”; and Barbara Roche, Deputy National Coordinator, Nuclear Weapons Freeze Campaign.

According to the internal report written by Volk upon his return, the delegation “went to China especially to exchange views on foreign policy: the Middle East, Euro-missiles, the East-West Conflict, the Central American wars, the North-South dialogue and the United Nations.” These topics, as well as several others including US-China relations and Taiwan, were in fact discussed and a brief summary of each topic is included in the report. Overall, the trip was viewed as a step in developing better communication between China and the US peace movement. But

²⁵ Hess and Mason were formerly with the U.S.-China People’s Friendship Association.

the members of the delegation cautioned the Chinese that a ten person delegation could not be considered representative of the entire US peace movement. The trip was a success and the Chinese looked forward to sending their delegation to the US later that year (June 28th through July 16th). Plans to receive the reciprocal delegation began as soon as the American delegation returned.

Planning proceeded on the basis that the reason for the reciprocal visit was based on the desire of the Chinese “to meet more peace movement people and to discuss some issues.” And the AFSC wanted “an opportunity to discuss possible future program relations.” Possible subtopics related to the nature of the US peace movement to further Chinese understanding included: traditional peace/disarmament groups; the growing movement of anti-Intervention people; and the relation to social and economic justice issues.

The Chinese delegation arrived in Boston on June 27, 1984 and would travel from Boston to Philadelphia, Washington, DC, New York and San Francisco. The members included: He Xiquan, Secretary General CAFIU, delegation leader; Shi Ruquan, council member CAFIU, member Chinese People’s Political Consultative Conference, member executive council All China Women’s Federation, associate general secretary YWCA, vice delegation leader; Zheng Shenyu, Council member CAFIU, member CPPCC, advisor to World Affairs, advisor to delegation; Li Pei, council member CAFIU, associate professor of foreign languages at the graduate school of the Academy of Sciences; Lao Yuan, council member of the translators association of China; Wu Keliang, director CAFIU office; Fei Chen, program organizer for CAFIU; Chen Bolin, lecturer Beijing Sparetime Workers College; and Ma Ying, interpreter for CAFIU. It was not lost upon AFSC staff that the delegates were a “generalist” group, “not necessarily uninformed on the [peace] issues ... but not directly involved in debating the issues or formulating policies at home.” This development led to some rethinking and slight adjustments in the way scheduled talks were presented. It appears that this was the only wrinkle in what was a very successful exchange.

There was a “significant by-product” of this exchange that brought the importance of the FAU/FSU work in China to the fore. On their last day in Washington DC, the Chinese Ambassador to the US, Zhang Wenjin, arrived at Davis House to say goodbye. During the course of conversation, Wenjin began to recall the Quaker teams at work in China during the 1940’s when he served as a top aide to Chou En-Lai. He lamented that records and documents from that period had not been well-preserved, and asked “quite specifically if the AFSC could gather relevant materials ... letters, reports, files, photographs and clippings ... that would help to document that period in China’s history and the contribution of the foreign volunteers.” Margaret Stanley who was a “font of information ... historic documentation and enthusiasm” was contacted and would travel to Washington to meet with the Ambassador. Other former FAU/FSU members were contacted as well. Helping with this archival project would no doubt be a critical step in building a relationship with Ambassador Zhang.

The members of the US delegation to China returned with “several, quite different, but not necessarily mutually exclusive ideas” about future involvement. This prompted the Asia program staff to think more seriously of major involvement in China. Four major ideas were raised: 1) formation of an advisory committee on US-China peace exchanges; 2) AFSC, perhaps with CET, should continue to sponsor “specialized” peace exchanges; 3) AFSC should establish an International Affairs presence in Beijing; and 4) continue with material and technical assistance in the healthcare arena. Although it was the least thought out, establishing a presence in Beijing was the most exciting idea from the AFSC point of view. The possibilities of the nature of AFSC work in China continued to be explored.

In late December 1984, Li Yimang, President of CAFIU, invited one person from AFSC to attend the Beijing Forum on Safeguarding World Peace to be held from June 4 to June 6, 1985. Corinne B. Johnson (Johnson), Secretary of the AFSC International Division attended. Johnson had an opportunity to talk to Qi Xiyu, CAFIU council member, which brought about a greater understanding of the Chinese organization’s origins, nature and purpose and a clearer understanding of how the AFSC and CAFIU might work together. Although the Forum lasted only two days, Johnson stayed in China until June 17th and thus this visit was considered a reciprocal exchange.

The relationship between AFSC and CAFIU flourished. The recommendation of the first American peace delegation to China to continue the exchanges was adopted. While the exchanges continued, however, the nature of the exchanges changed; in addition to peace discussions, “continued exploration between AFSC and CAFIU about the Asia Quaker International Affairs Program (QIAP) to be located in Hong Kong” occurred. CAFIU was extremely interested in being the point of contact in China for the AFSC staff based in Hong Kong. The QIAP program did expand and the office in Hong Kong opened in 1986. The first visit to China occurred the following year.

In March 1986, a Chinese delegation representing the Chinese People’s Association for Peace and Disarmament visited Philadelphia under the auspices of CAFIU to attend the meeting of Physician’s for Social Responsibility. The delegates:

- Wu Weiran – Head of Delegation, President of Peking Medical School, Honorary President of Peking Hospital
- Yu Wen – Member of the Council of CAFIU
- Qi Xiyu – Political Scientist, Member of CAFIU
- Fu Tieshan – Bishop, Patriotic Catholic Association
- Xu YuanChao – Deputy Director of Chinese Peoples’ Association for Peace and Disarmament
- Niu Qiang – Interpreter

AFSC personnel met with the delegates for the purpose strengthening contacts and to learn more about peace and disarmament concerns in China. The Chinese delegation went on to spend a week in Boston.

Sandra Sturdevant, QIAR East Asia, Hong Kong, visited Beijing in August 1987. She met with He Xiquan of CAFIU to become acquainted with the organization and to discuss ways in which the two organizations might cooperate. It was one of the QIAR's responsibilities to visit China and develop relations with CAFIU and other organizations. Sturdevant established that CAFIU was particularly interested in economic development, and especially interested in situations from which China could learn about successful experiences elsewhere, i.e. success stories of industrialization arising in Southeast Asia and East Asia. Xiquan cited Singapore and Southern Korea as examples and wanted to know how AFSC might help in this regard. It was clear that CAFIU was indeed interested in possible AFSC projects in China. Sturdevant, however, found it necessary to explain that there was an organizational divide between AFSC projects and the work of the QIAR.

Tiananmen Square

In 1988 new QIARS, Catherine Shaw and Evans Young, were appointed to Hong Kong, The spring of 1989, a year that had "promised to be an anniversary year of special significance for China," was permeated by an "uneasy atmosphere," charged with pressure on the Chinese government from leading intellectuals for reforms. Some intellectuals urged "the rights of freedom of expression" while others wanted "a return to the kind of pragmatism" attributed to Deng Xiaoping. According to Spence, the call for reforms was publicly ignored by the Chinese leaders; the proverbial buck had been passed to their subordinates and the ensuing response was "harshly dismissive." The mounting unrest was exacerbated by the death of Hu Yaobong who had been "made the scapegoat for allowing the 1986-1987 student demonstrations to spread. Students in Peking took the death of Hu Yaobong as a call to action and "a means of pressuring the government to move more vigorously with economic and democratic reforms." The student demonstrations began on April 17, 1989 and culminated on June 3, 1989 when the army converged on the Square "crushing those who fell in front of them or tried to halt their progress." (Spence, 738-743)

During the demonstrations, the AFSC wrote a letter to CAFIU, expressing the hope for a nonviolent resolution of the situation. And on June 5, 1989, Asia Bennett, General Secretary of AFSC, issued a statement on the events in Tiananmen Square and extending sympathy to the Chinese people on behalf of AFSC.

The QIARS wrote a report on the climate in China since Deng Xiaoping reversed Mao's policies. The Tiananmen Square killings prompted Young and Shaw to question whether Friends had been too optimistic regarding the Cultural Revolution and its aftermath. Although the standard of living for the Chinese improved after Deng Xiaoping's reforms, they claim that more

seasoned Friends sensed that serious problems were on the horizon. Underlying the analysis was of course the main question: how should Friends proceed? The present approach to choosing seminar themes was unlikely to elicit a helpful response since the QIAP program relied on potential seminar participants to make known their needs and interests. The highly charged political climate in China at this time made it too dangerous for Chinese to speak out. A China study project was proposed, possibly to include some of the members of the 1972 trip to China as well as some from the 1984 trip.

The Tiananmen Square incident spurred concerns about the future of the relationship between China and the US. AFSC was asked to sign two letters drafted by the Foreign Policy and Military Spending Task Force of the Church of the Brethren, one to the Chinese Ambassador in DC, Han Xu, and one addressed to President Bush. Although different, generally speaking, each of the letters expressed concern for the victims of the tragedy and concern for maintaining normal relations between China and the US. Roberta Foss circulated the letters sent by Leland Wilson to the AFSC General Secretary and ID personnel for comment; the decision had to be made within 24 hours. Based on the feedback, Foss advised Jim Matlack that on behalf of AFSC he could sign the letter to the Chinese Ambassador but not the letter to President Bush—"Bush letter not good"—the reason for this judgment was not stated.

In October 1989, a Chinese delegation under the auspices of the National Committee on US-China Relations visited the AFSC in Philadelphia. According to Sidney L. Greenblatt, the delegation escort, "the central focus of the group's mission [was] moral and ethical education in the United States, its historical and cultural roots, its manifestation in present day religious and secular values, and embodiment in institutions, particularly in education." Greenblatt speculated that the delegates wanted to determine what features in the American value system, if any, might be applicable to China's modernization. There were 24 people in the delegation; all but three were researchers in moral education at various Chinese universities working through the China State Education Division. From June 10th through July 7th, the delegation visited Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, DC, Salt Lake City and San Francisco. While in Philadelphia the delegates met with AFSC representatives to learn about the organization's work.

Dialogues and Exchanges

During the 1990's, the AFSC sponsored several seminars and study tours involving Chinese participants. The first seminar titled "Networking on Issues of Violence Against Women in Rapidly Changing Economies" was convened by the AFSC Asia QIARs, Barbara Bird and Donna Anderton at Harmony House, a women's shelter and hotline, in Hong Kong from August 7-14, 1993. Women's issues had gained some ground during this time to the degree that in September 1992, the first women's hotline in China was established. Two manuals on rape and

violence against women, produced as the result of a QIAP workshop help in 1989, were used to train the volunteers for the hotline.²⁶

This seminar was a direct outgrowth of the need to educate the hotline counselors “[so they] could receive more training and that they could have a better understanding of how hotlines, shelters and women’s organizations functioned in other countries.” It brought together not only the four participants from the Beijing Women’s hotline and the representatives from Harmony House, but also a representative from the All Women’s Action Society (AWAM) in Malaysia, an agency experienced “with counseling and issues related to women of Chinese ethnicity.” This “exposure” trip to Hong Kong was considered the first of a two part exchange to be followed by another exposure and training in Beijing. The advanced seminar titled “China Strengthens Social Services” took place in Beijing from May 13-21, 1994 and again, was convened by the AFSC Asia QIAP.

AFSC, through its Dialogues and Exchanges program, partially funded a symposium on “Women’s Groups and Social Support” initiated by the Women’s Research Institute. Held in March 1995, it was an extension of the seminars previously held in Hong Kong and Beijing with the aim of presenting “information about the situation of women in China in an international gathering and to prepare Chinese women’s groups for their participation in the NGO Forum” at the International Conference on Women (ICW) in Beijing, China in September 1995. The symposium was originally scheduled to take place in conjunction with the NGO Forum but China’s internal politics and the perceived need for image control caused a change in plans.

The ICW was a landmark event in the worldwide feminist movement attended by approximately 180 government delegations and 2,500 NGOs. The Conference “presented an extraordinary opportunity to advance AFSC work on Korea” in particular as well as other parts of the Asia Pacific region. In 1994, with the appointment of Ed and Teresita Reed the AFSC began a new Korea Regional QIAR program based in Japan, with the goal of increasing dialogue and exchange in Northeast Asia and involving North Korea.

The AFSC efforts in connection with the Conference were twofold. First, in June 1995, the AFSC undertook to send delegates, more specifically women activists, from Vietnam, the Sudan, Morocco, Algeria, Jordan, Hungary (Gypsy), Laos, Korea, and Mexico to attend the NGO Forum at the ICW.

The second effort was the project “Program Linkages for Korean Women” to be held during the period of the ICW. The project “was aimed at opening new channels of communication; encouraging sharing of views, information and experiences; and creating potential for

²⁶ Wang Xing Jian, founder and president of the Women’s Research Institute (WRI), had the manuals translated into Mandarin. The WRI was recognized as China’s first NGO and the force behind the Beijing Hotline.

cooperation” among all Korean delegates, and those of the US, China, Korea, Mexico and Vietnam with whom AFSC was working and had two components:

1) “an offer of financial support to enable representative of the (North) Korean Democratic Women’s Union to attend, was not accepted;

2) “meetings and linking activities [that] would introduce Korean women of north and south (separately) to AFSC staff and Quaker delegates, AFSC program partners and contacts, and their counterparts in the region.”

The latter component met with more success with several meetings held during the conference that did in fact succeed in advancing the stated goals of the project.

The event had “provided impetus” for the AFSC’s new regional program in East Asia. The AFSC report “Supporting Women’s Dialogue in East Asia” issued as a follow-up to the Beijing Conference addressed the many openings for continued dialogue and laid out a plan of action for the following year.

On the heels of the ICW, Greg Victor and Rekha Shukla, AFSC’s Southeast Asia QIARs co-sponsored²⁷ five HIV/AIDS professionals and two senior journalists from Yunnan and Beijing to the Third International AIDS Conference in Asia and the Pacific in Chiang Mai, Thailand from September 17-21, 1995. According to the QIAP Summary Report, “the essence of the project was to link key activists and journalists at the Yunnan provincial level and the national level to each other and to the Asia-Pacific HIV/AIDS network to help raise awareness in China of the gravity” of the pandemic. The Conference was attended by “more than 3,000 government, NGO, UN and bilateral agency representatives from throughout Asia and the world.” Chinese participants included Dr. Zhu Qi, Miao Hong, Dr. Zheng Lingcai, Dr. Sha Lijun, Ma Yuwai, Dr. Li Wen and Dr. Wang Shiyi.²⁸ The AFSC and its co-sponsor “organized a day-long tour of HIV/AIDS projects in the Chiang Mai area, various individual contacts, and two major gatherings of conference participants...One gathering brought together people working in Laos, China, and Vietnam with the top official of UNAIDS responsible for coordinating UN country programs. The other brought together people working in China from Beijing, Yunnan, and Anhui.” The experience succeeded in helping the participants gain “a new understanding of HIV/AIDS, new ideas about how to deal with it, and a new appreciation of the need...to make the system address the issue [in China] before [the country] is overwhelmed with disease and despair.”

In 1996, two seminars were held that flowed directly from the efforts undertaken at the ICW. In May, June and September 1996, “AFSC, together with the Ford Foundation-China Office, sponsored a trilateral exchange project...on the theme “Woman and Rapid Industrialization” in South Korea, China and Vietnam.” Local partners in the exchange were the Korea Women’s Associations United (KWAU), hold of the first leg in South Korea; the Research Center for the

²⁷ Save the Children Fund UK also co-sponsored.

Rural Economy (RCRE), Ministry of Agriculture, official host for the second leg in China; and the Vietnam National Women's Union, official host of the final study tour. In brief, this "exchange project emerged out of a side activity organized by AFSC to take advantage of the presence [at the ICW] ... of many people from different countries who [were] working on the same issues and [were] interested in sharing experiences." The overall goal of the project was "to engage a range of actors and researchers in a dialogue on the social impact of rapid industrial development" in the participating countries. For AFSC, three specific program goals were addressed by the exchange: 1) promoting women's dialogue in East Asia, 2) promoting reconciliation among people from societies that have histories of conflict and lingering suspicion, resentment or antagonism, and 3) influencing policy in the three countries toward giving more attention to the social implications of development programs, including impact on women and vulnerable groups.

Participants spent ten days of intensive study tours in each country and attended seminars or conferences to discuss "aspects of industrial development and its social consequences, responses to issues and roles of women in the process." The project was viewed as successful in large measure based on the "expressed determination to continue having exchanges." In the words of Tan Shen, who spoke on behalf of the Chinese team:

This study tour is very helpful for understanding among the three countries. This is also a breakthrough. Whether in Korea or in China, the important part is not the tour itself – it is impossible to completely understand the three countries in a short time; ... So what is important is that we continue the connections that have been made between our three countries.

From July 26-28, 1996, another seminar titled "Dialogue on the Role of Education in Peacebuilding in Northeast Asia" was held in Beijing, China; it was co-sponsored by the Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies, the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) and the AFSC. Although other factors ultimately contributed, the seminar grew out of dialogues during the prior two years between regional representatives of AFSC and staff and Scholars of CASS. The purpose of the seminar was "to initiate a dialogue among a group of educators in the region who are involved or interested in the challenge of promoting international understanding through education." Twenty participants, senior educators and scholars from China, South Korea and Japan, "shared their perspectives and discussed a broad range of issues related to incorporating concepts of peace and cross-cultural understanding in all forms of formal and popular education. There was general agreement on the central role of education in inculcating tolerance and respect for cultural and political differences ... Above all, it was agreed that education should empower people to desire and work for peace at the individual level where each one can make a difference."

²⁸ See Summary Report dated October 6, 1995 their respective titles, affiliations and then current projects.

The educators had hoped to share their concerns and hopes for promoting a more peaceful international community. As a “modest” first step toward this goal, the seminar produced a “shared set of basic principles related to the role of education in peacebuilding” that created a framework, contacts and channels, and the focus and content for the continuing dialogue. Following the seminar the U.S. delegates visited North Korea.

Another exchange took place in 1999. It was in part an outgrowth of the earlier dialogues and exchanges among China, Korea and Vietnam examining the effects of rapid industrialization on women, coupled with the Asian financial crisis of 1997. According to the East Asia QIARS report, “women and work issues [were] still very important ... with the press of the financial crisis the most immediate concern.” The disappearance of the middle class with their disposable income caused certain types of jobs generally performed by women to evaporate. At the same time, there was a backlash against advances made by women in the past ten years: “hard-won rights such as maternity leave disappeared, and women were forced to take early retirement” to name a few. In short, the economic restructuring taking place was wreaking havoc, especially in the lives of women.

These concerns were first expressed to the new QIARS, Karin Lee and John Feffer, by KWAU staff during their first visit to KWAU in the summer of 1998. It became clear that women from China, Korea and Hong Kong were interested in meeting with each other to discuss their mutual concerns and how the difficulties were being addressed in their respective countries/regions. The QIARS then met with the AFSC’s partners in the earlier exchanges, the Ford Foundation and the Research Center for Rural Economy, who indeed were interested in another exchange.

The Korea and Chinese Women’s Exchange in Hong Kong took place the following year and was co-sponsored by the AFSC, the Ford Foundation and Oxfam Hong Kong. The goal of this Exchange was “to increase genuine dialogue among women working on women’s issues in China, Hong Kong, and the Republic of Korea.” More specifically, there were three objectives:

1. to exchange information and opinions on women and work issues, and women and society issues in China, South Korea, and Hong Kong.
2. to expose women from China and South Korea to a range of NGOs and civil society organizations in Hong Kong.
3. to provide space in which women from the three difference countries and regions can explore and evaluate their similarities and differences.

Thirty-five women participated in the conference. While the women were clear that they wanted to meet with each other, there were nevertheless tensions and prejudices to be overcome not just with each others perceived differing ways but also with the meeting structure itself. Ultimately, these women left the Exchange with a better understanding of each other. In the

words of the QIAR, “the exchange went a long way toward addressing the stereotyped images Chinese and Koreans have of one another.”²⁹

AFSC undertook agricultural development work in North Korea beginning in 1997. This work involved sourcing materials in China. In 2001, new AFSC East Asia QIARS James Reilly and Wu Na became the first AFSC QIARS to establish a base in China. During that same year, they started the AFSC China Summer Workcamp program that brings together young people from China and the US to help promote mutual understanding and goodwill. But the scope and impact of their presence and work in China is much broader. Their 2004 year-end report gives a glimpse of their efforts: “in Northeast China we are developing an exciting exchange and training program with North Korea. In Southeast China, we are working with Chinese partners on both social service provision and policy advocacy on cutting-edge social issue around migration of young women. We continue to facilitate exchanges between the US and North Korea, and cooperate with South Korean partners.”

Amidst all of the upheaval and changes in China in the past and in the present, AFSC continues its work to this very day, putting Quaker values into action.

²⁹ See the detailed report for more information on this Exchange.

Primary Sources

AFSC Archives
Quaker Special Collections, Haverford College Library

Works Cited

- Balderston, Lloyd Jr., *Lloyd Balderston's Visit to China 1925-1926*. Bethesda, MD: Poolside Publications, 1988. p. 35
- Clark, Bronson. Behind Communist Lines in China, *Foreign Service Bulletin*, February 1947. AFSC, Philadelphia, PA.
- Davie, A. Tegla. *Friends Ambulance Unit*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1947.
- Evans, Cecil. "The Role of Friends in Improving Relations between China and the West." 1965, IAD: China: CAC: Report
- Frost, J. William. *Our Deeds Carry Our Message: The Early History of the American Friends Service Committee*, *Quaker History Journal*, V. 81, No. 1, Friends Historical Association, Haverford, PA.
- Jones, Mary Hoxie. *Swords Into Ploughshares*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1937.
- Jones, Rufus, M.. *A Service of Love in War Time*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920.
- Peterson, Diana Franzusoff, "Haverford College, Quakers and China Missionaries," paper presented at Wesleyan University, September 20, 2002.
- Pickett, Clarence E., *For More Than Bread*, Boston: Little Brown & Company, 1953
- Silcock, Harry T. "China and the Quakers: A Century of Sino-British Team Work" (p. 11) IAD: China: Reports: 1965
- Spence, Jonathan D., *The Search for Modern China*. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1990
- , *Quakers Visit China*. London: Society of Friends East-West Relations Committee and Peace Committee, 1955.
- , Report of the Joint Deputation sent to China and Japan in the Winter of 1929-1930, (London, FSC, Philadelphia, AFSC, April, 1930).