

Introduction: The Opium Question in China as Seen in the Morrison Pamphlet Collection

NIIMURA Yoko

This issue of *Modern Asian Studies Review (MASR)* presents a part of the findings of the Morrison Pamphlets Research Project, which has been carried on since 2008. The Morrison Pamphlets make up an old, rare and extremely valuable collection of the Toyo Bunko library. The collector, Dr. George Ernest Morrison, amassed this trove of not only pamphlets but all clippings during his long stay in the Far East, which included a stint as a news correspondent in Peking for *The Times*, between February 1897 and August 1912. Then Dr. Morrison sold his whole library, including the pamphlets to Baron Hisaya Iwasaki 岩崎久彌 (1865-1955), who incorporated it into the Toyo Bunko (Oriental Library), which he officially established in 1924.¹ Since then, the Morrison Pamphlets has existed as one of the finest collections of the Toyo Bunko library.

There are 7200 pamphlet titles in the collection, of which 5870 are related to China, and the wide of range of subject matter they cover reflect Dr. Morrison's eclectic interests and his global vision of events happening in East Asia, while at the same time dealing with a microscopic point of view relating in East Asia current events the ways of life and thinking of the region's people. The Morrison Pamphlets is therefore a treasure trove of source materials for researchers of modern East Asian studies who must take on the task of understanding the tremendous diversity that characterizes the region's culture and history.

The Morrison Pamphlets Research Project began in September 2008 with funding from the Mitsubishi Foundation, and from that time

¹ Kazuo Enoki, *Dr. G. E. Morrison and the Toyo Bunko*, Toyo Bunko, 1967, p.1.

it has been concerned with discerning the actual content of each pamphlet and publishing research utilizing the collection. Beginning in April 2011, the project turned to the subject of “A New Vision of Modern East Asia” based on the collection and has been financially assisted by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

The Project’s members, Shiba Yoshinobu, Yabuki Susumu, Nimura Yoko, Motono Eiichi, Matsushige Mitsuhiro, Okamoto Takashi, Shiroyama Tomoko, Yoshizawa Seiichiro and Murakami Ei are all historians of modern East Asian History, but all representing different fields of research and methodologies. In sum, the Project’s objective is to generate the widest possible diversity in its members matching the tremendous diversity of the Morrison Pamphlets, with the intent of compiling a detailed catalog of the collection, while publishing stimulating research based on it. This issue of *Modern Asian Studies Review* will include part of that catalog, in addition to three articles by Project members, Motono, Murakami and Shiroyama. The rest of this short introduction will discuss what motivated Dr. Morrison to begin collecting pamphlets, by taking up the specific topic of the “opium question” found among the pamphlets.

To approach the very complicated opium question in China, it is necessary to examine it from many aspects, and the Morrison Pamphlets with its dual global and microcosmic perspective is a very good place to begin. There are about 200 titles in the collection that touch upon the question offering many very important related documents of the day.² As to the principle on which Dr. Morrison would extract essays or articles and add them to his pamphlet collection, the result shows clearly that he was interested in gathering the widest variety and range of events and artifacts, totally free of bias.³ However, the pamphlets related to the opium question also reveal his personal values, which will be the focus of section two of this essay. First, let us see what Dr. Morrison actually collected on the topic.

² *A Classified Catalog of Pamphlets in Foreign Languages in the Toyo Bunko*, Toyo Bunko, 1972, pp. 185-194.

³ *Ibid.*, p.1.

1. Titles in the Morrison Pamphlets Related to Opium

The collection's approximately 200 items related to opium may be classified under four different subjects: the 1st and 2nd Opium Wars (1830s~1850s), the opium controversy in Great Britain (1880s), the Royal Commission on Opium (1890s), and the Anti-Opium movement in early 20th century China. Of course, there are a considerable number of opium-related pamphlets that do not come under these four subjects, but roughly speaking, the greatest portion are relevance to this classification.

(1) The 1st and 2nd Opium Wars (1830s~1850s)

There are 14 items in the collection related to this subject; for example, an article from the *Quarterly Review* (1809~1967) published in London, three articles from the *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine* (1839~1848) published in New York, an article from the *National Magazine* (1852~1858) also published in New York, and an article from *Leeds Mercury* (1738~1939) published in Yorkshire. There are also some war-related pamphlets published in London and Boston.

In these 14 items relating to the Opium Wars, we notice the writers of these items criticize the Opium Wars from a moral and philanthropic point of view. Here are a few examples. The item from *National Magazine*, also critical of the opium trade, is titled "The Opium Trade in the East. England's Shame," (P-III-a1557)⁴, which was clipped from the September, October and November 1854 issue. The very title shows the moral indignation of the writer to the opium trade. As to the *Leeds Mercury* article, the newspaper itself was edited by Edward Baines,⁵ an ardent Methodist and supporter of the such activist groups as the moral reform movement, the anti-slavery movement and the anti-opium movement. "British Opium Trade with China. From the *Leeds Mercury*, 1840," (P-III-a-1657), which was clipped from *Leeds Mercury*, of September 7th 1839 issue, strongly condemned British Opium Trade, and

⁴ The code in parenthesis is the Morrison Pamphlet call number listed in the Toyo Bunko Library catalogue.

⁵ Edwards Baines, *The Life of Edward Baines, Late M.P. for the Borough*, Longmans, 1851.

admired “true patriotism (p. 7)” of the Chinese authorities. Another example is the “Opium Crisis: A Letter addressed to Charles Elliot, ESQ., chief superintendent of the British trade with China,” (P-III-a-1698), which is a piece of correspondence sent in 1839 to Elliot, the residing chief superintendent at Canton, by C.W. King, an American merchant residing in Canton, and then published in London. King was employed at Olyphant & Co. during the Opium Wars and was known for refusing to sell opium to the Chinese, because it was morally indefensible.⁶ This item is very valuable for its first hand information about the tense situation in Canton on the eve of the First Opium War. The conscientious King reveals his grave misgivings about the fearless attitude shown by foreign merchants towards transporting opium, the equally bold opium importing practices of Chinese merchants, and the corruption of Qing Dynasty officials allowing opium to be transported inland. King states, “We believe that the opium trade with China is fraught with evils, commercial, political, social, and moral,” and tells of his decision not to take part in the purchase, transportation or sale of the drug.

King appreciates the political decision of the Chinese government to severely punish opium importers and mentions that on 12 December 1838, a Chinese opium seller, Ho-ban-kin, was strangled on the Public Square in front of the foreign factories, where his (King’s) workplace was located.⁷ It was very symbolic of the government’s policy at that time, as King refers to “the threatened executions,” but he also states, “it was for the opium-importer to look on, until his heart sickened, and his hands refused to continue the deadly importations.” King expresses sympathy for Imperial Commissioner Lin Zexu 林則徐 (1785~1850), who had ordered all the opium the foreign merchants possessed to be transferred. King also argues that the opium trade was hampering the development of normal trade, an argument similar to the opinions in the above-mentioned three articles clipped from *Hunt’s Merchants’ Magazine*.

As mentioned above, a large number of the items related to the Opium Wars were documents published in the United States, in general

⁶ Eto Shinkichi, *Kindai Chugoku Seijishi Kenkyu*, Tokyo Univ. Press, 1968, p. 101. In *Chinese Repository*, Vol.VIII, pp. 637-638, there is a letter dated 25 March 1839 written to Commissioner Lin from C.W. King, requesting permission to trade.

⁷ Ho-ban-kin seems to be 何老金 (*Yapian Zhanzheng Dangan Shiliao*, Vol. 1, p. 366).

expressing the opinions of American merchants or dissenters in Britain critical to the opium trade. In general, they criticize opium transport to China from moral and philanthropic points of view.

(2) The Opium Controversy in Great Britain (1870s, 1880s)

The controversy that arose over opium in Great Britain was initially led by the influential Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade (SSOT), which was established in 1874, was very active in the cause, and thus influential on British public opinion. Summarizing the research already published by this author,⁸ the people associated with SSOT, were almost all middle class males, aiming their message at both the House of Commons and public opinion. Members of Parliament who were SSOT members raised motion after motion insisting that “Opium traffic is morally indefensible.” Most of them were nonconformist, Quakers or Evangelicals. As SSOT became more and more influential, criticism of the movement also increased, resulting in a controversy that swept the nation. There were two main points of debate. The first was whether or not China needed opium. It was purchasing a large amount of Indian opium and also cultivating a large amount domestically. If China was demanding opium, it was not Britain’s shame to supply it. The other was the question of whether or not opium was a harmful drug. Should Great Britain be exporting poison?

The Morrison Pamphlets contain 15 items relating to this controversy during the 1870’s and 80’s. Among them five items were published by SSOT, including a series of anti-opium tracts. One of these entitled “Medical testimonies as to the effect of opium smoking,” (P-III-a-1673) was an 1882 collection of opinions by medical experts who had resided in China. The opinions conflicted, based on in which province the expert had resided or the class of people whom he had treated. While this pamphlet was clearly attempting to prove the harmful character of opium, it merely showed that medically speaking, the second point of the debate was still open to argument.

There are 4 items written by missionaries, including a pamphlet by the secretary of the China Inland Mission, Benjamin Broomhall, en-

⁸ Yoko Niimura, “Igirisu ni okeru ahen boeki hantai undo to chugoku,” in *Ahen boeki ronsou*, Kyuko Shoin, 2000.

titled “A revenue of India out of the blood of Chinamen. A few pages from the Truth about opium-smoking,” (P-III-a-1667). This illustrated pamphlet describes the way in which opium was produced in British India and imported to China. There is no date on the pamphlet, but we know it was extracted from Broomhall’s *The Truth about Opium Smoking, with illustrations of the manufacture of Opium, etc* (London, 1882), so the pamphlet may have been also published that year.

As to the pro-opium argument, we find an article written by East Asian diplomat Rutherford Alcock entitled, “Opium and common sense,” (P-III-b-197) in *The Nineteenth Century* (December 1881). In this article, Alcock offers his candid opinion that the opium question is not as simple as SSOT was insisting. He states that China may need foreign opium as well as native opium, because of the revenue it generated, and adds that Great Britain has the obligation to care for the people of India suffering from poverty. The ending of opium export would accompany many types of economic losses to Indian Government and people. Counterarguments in response to Alcock appeared in *The Nineteenth Century* and *The Contemporary Review*. The former (February 1882) published an essay by F.S. Turner, the president of SSOT, entitled “Opium and England’s Duty,” (P-III-a-1627). Turner argues that despite the fact China had been protesting the opium trade, Great Britain had forced it upon China with the use of arms. It is clear that Alcock and Turner were arguing on different planes.

There is also A.J. Arbuthnot’s “The Opium controversy,” (P-III-b-196), which appeared in *The Nineteenth Century* in March 1882 and comments on the arguments of both Alcock and Turner, favoring the pro-opium views. Interestingly, B. Fossett Lock’s “The Opium trade and Sir Rutherford Alcock” (P-III-a-2267) in *Contemporary Review* (April 1882) points out that Alcock had changed his mind on the opium question from his condemnation of opium consumption in testimony before the Select Committee on East India Finance in 1871 and asks why he had become pro-opium just one year later.

As outlined above, the Morrison Pamphlets relating to the opium controversy in Britain during the 1870’s and 1880’s include both the arguments of the anti-opium SSOT and missionary organizations, and pro-opium arguments, which appeared in such high quality magazines as *The Nineteenth Century* and *Contemporary Review*. However, we do

not find George Birdwood's articles in Morrison's own *The Times*,⁹ or Dr. W. Moore's pamphlet,¹⁰ both arguing for the harmlessness of opium. Both of these writers were the most critical opponents of the anti-opium movement.¹¹ Birdwood was a former professor of pharmacology and then curator of the Government Central Economic Museum in Bombay, while Moore was a former deputy surgeon general in Bombay. We can only speculate why Morrison did not include their arguments in his pamphlet collection.

(3) The Royal Commission on Opium (1890s)

The Royal Commission on Opium (RCO) was set up on 30 June 1893 and held deliberations until 16 April 1895. The RCO was convened in the House of Commons under pressure from SSOT. It examined the questions of whether opium consumption was detrimental to human health and whether the Indian government and its citizens could subsist without opium, concluding that opium is not all that harmful and that India could not subsist without opium production, export and its own internal market.¹²

There are 13 items in the Morrison Pamphlets related to the RCO, eight were published by SSOT and four by pro-opium advocate and orientalist Robert Needham Cust, G.W. Des Voeux, former governor of Hongkong, H.N. Lay, former inspector general in Beijing, and G. H. M. Batten, a former official of the Bengal government, respectively, all arguing that the anti-opium argument was shortsighted. The remaining item is a clipping from *The Sentinel*, a Christian magazine taking a position against opium trafficking.

Two of these items in particular would greatly influence the research that would be done later on the RCO. The first is entitled "Min-

⁹ "The Morality of Opium", *The Times*, 6 December 1881; "*The Opium Question*", *ibid.*, 20 January 1882.

¹⁰ I have yet to read Dr. Moore's pamphlet. Incidentally, Moore did speak before the 1893 Royal Commission on Opium (Report of the Royal Commission on Opium, *British Parliamentary Papers*, Vol. 1. p. 71).

¹¹ *The Friend of China* (Jan 1882, p.2; July 1882, pp. 208-212), an organ of SSOT, attacked Birdwood and Moore.

¹² D.E. Owen, *British Opium Policy in China and India*, Yale Univ. Press, 1934, pp. 323-324.

ute of Dissent,” (P-III-a-1700), written by H.J. Wilson and published by SSOT in 1895. Wilson, who was one of the nine RCO commissioners and had refused to sign the final Commission report, outlines his own opinion in the piece, arguing that if the investigation that was conducted in India had been pursued impartially, the conclusions of the RCO would have been quite different. The argument laid out by Wilson, a PM from the Liberal Party and a nonconformist, is still highly regarded by historians today.¹³

The other is a lengthy pamphlet entitled “The Report of the Royal Commission on Opium compared with the evidence from China that was submitted to the Commission. An Examination and an appeal”(P-III-c-385), written by Arnold Foster and published by SSOT in 1899. Foster, a missionary who had worked for the London Missionary Society at Hankow for over 25years castigated the RCO for not conducting any investigations in China proper, reexamined the actual testimony related to China in the RCO report in detail and argued that China was demanding that the opium trade be abolished and that the drug was doing a great deal of harm to the Chinese people. Foster’s critique is also highly regarded among historians today.¹⁴

In the world of the 19th Century, opium was in universal use in a diversity of cultural environments. While opium is a potentially poisonous substance, it was thought effective as a medicinal treatment in proper doses and was an indispensable article of ritual and recreational events. However, ignoring such cultural diversity and the fact that in a society without modern medical treatment, people needed opium to release them from many types of pain. SSOT, Wilson and Foster all regarded the substance solely as a form of poison.

(4) The Early 20th Century Anti-Opium Movement in China

An imperial edict was issued on 20 September 1906 expressing the intentions of the emperor to eradicate the evil effects produced by the

¹³ Bruce D. Johnson, “Righteousness before revenue: The forgotten moral crusade against the Indo-Chinese opium trade,” *Journal of Drug Issues*, 5 (1975), p. 314; Kathleen L. Lodwick, *Crusaders against Opium: Protestant Missionaries in China 1874-1917*, The University Press of Kentucky, 1995, pp. 102-103.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 101-109.

widespread use of opium.¹⁵ The edict declared that the use of opium, both foreign and native, would be abolished over the next ten years. Both the import of foreign opium into China and the cultivation of native opium would also be completely prohibited during that same time. The British government accepted the 1907 Anglo-Chinese Agreement on Opium (for a term of three years), declaring cooperation with the Chinese government, to restrict the export of Indian opium to China. The Indian government had already agreed to reduce that country's total yearly opium exports to China by 5100 chests, beginning in 1908. The conditions of the Agreement were that if during the three year trial period the Chinese Government duly carried out its promise to diminish the domestic production and consumption of opium, the British Government would agree to continue to decrease its annual exports.¹⁶

There are about 65 items related to the Anglo-Chinese Opium Agreement, in the Morrison Pamphlets, indicating that Dr. Morrison had taken a deep interest in the early 20th century anti-opium movement. While it is not possible to present here a detailed examination of all the items, a rough outline should suffice for the purpose of this introductory essay. There are many items that were published by SSOT and missionary organizations. Three were published by SSOT, five by Benjamin Broomhall, the secretary of the China Inland Mission, four by Hampden C. Du Bose, a missionary of the American Presbyterian Church, an annual report of the executive committee of the Anti-Opium League, founded by Du Bose, a report of the Church Anti-Opium Committee (London, 1911) and so on. There are many articles extracted from such periodicals as *The Times*, *The North China Daily News* and *World Today*, including an item written by Dr. Morrison himself for *The Times* (7 Aug 1906), entitled "The Chinese opium trade," (P-III-c-454). Most of these items were favorable to the reform movement in China, declaring support for Chinese Government's opium eradication program. Many items are related to the Shanghai International Opium Commission of 1909: for example, "An address of Tang Shao-yi to a large and influential deputation representing the British Anti-Opium So-

¹⁵ Correspondence respecting the Opium question in China, *British Parliamentary Papers*, 1908, p. 1.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 46-47.

cieties. A report on opium, its derivatives and preparation, for presentation to the International Opium Commission assembled at Shanghai” (P-III-a-1618). Convening the Commission was the first step taken to regulate international opium production, trafficking and consumption. In addition to opium-related events in China, the Morrison Pamphlets show clearly the strong influence of the United States on the early 20th century international anti-opium movement and also the powerful impact of moral and philanthropic efforts made by British and American Christian missionary organizations in the Far East.

2. Dr. Morrison’s Involvement in the Anti-Opium Movement

The genuine concern of Dr. Morrison about the opium question in China, which is clearly shown by the large amount of pamphlets he collected on the subject centered around the SSOT and the Anglo-China Opium Agreement of 1907, is no doubt related to his position as Beijing foreign correspondent for *The Times* during a time when the anti-opium movement was progressing in China.¹⁷ Here let us look at the article that Dr. Morrison himself wrote on that movement for *The Times*, in addition to his correspondence with Valentine Chirol, head of the Foreign News Department at *The Times*.

In the article which appeared in the 6 August 1906 edition,¹⁸ we find, Although the text of the opium resolution passed in the House of Commons on May 30 and the full report of Mr. Morley’s sympathetic speech have been in the hands of the Chinese for some time, no steps have yet been taken by China to respond to the Challenge therein given. The fact is that the resolution causes considerable embarrassment to China, for she is dependent to the extent of £830,000 a year on the duties paid on imported opium, and she cannot, with the present state of the national finances, without concern the disappearance of such an important branch of revenues... He reiterates that same thought in a letter addressed to Chirol on 8 Sep-

¹⁷ He left Beijing for his long journey on 15 January 1910 and returned Beijing in the middle of March.

¹⁸ “The Opium Trade (from our own Correspondent),” *The Times*, 6 August 1906.

tember 1906.¹⁹

The Opium question has made no advance at all. Morley's admirable speech and the equally admirable leader in *The Times* have been translated by Yang²⁰ of Wai Wu Pu (I had given them to Tang Shao-yi) and are now fairly well known to the Chinese. But the Chinese are much embarrassed by the challenge given them; they have no desire to restrict at the present time their opium revenue.

These two quotes are describing the state of affairs at the time an anti-opium resolution had passed in the House of Commons and notice of it was given to the Chinese government. "Morley's admirable speech" refers to the speech given by John Morley, Secretary of the State for India, in the debate held in the House on 30 May 1906. During the debate, Theodore C. Taylor M.P. put forth a motion that, "the Indo-Chinese opium trade was morally indefensible and requested His Majesty's Government to take such steps as might be necessary for bringing it to a speedy close." To this motion, Morley replied "this new House would approve of that."²¹

The Times of 31 May had introduced the debate at length in an article entitled "Parliament House of Commons, Wednesday May 30," and the following day in its lead article "The Opium Question," *The Times* editors praised the Morley's speech highly, calling it "a wholly sincere and commendable moral feeling." After Morrison then passed these two articles on to an important person in the Chinese government and detected no particular reaction to the British proposal, he was lead to assume that the Government was afraid of losing its huge revenue from the opium trade. At the same time, Morrison also seems to have been informed about the Emperor's forthcoming anti-opium decree that would be issued a month and a half later. In his article of 6 August he wrote,

My belief is that China will ask India to consent to an annual reduction in the import to China, which would have the effect of extinguishing the trade in ten years, and as an evidence of good

¹⁹"To V. Chirol Peking 8 September 1906," in Lo Huimin, *The Correspondence of G.E. Morrison*, Volume 1 (1895-1912), New York, 1978, p. 382.

²⁰Yang Shu 楊樞 (1844-1917) was an official in the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Wai Wu Pu).

²¹"The Opium Traffic," *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, 30 May 1906.

faith will issue an Imperial Edict condemning the use of opium and forbidding the employment in the Government service of any opium eater and ordering an annual reduction in opium cultivation, leading to its extinction in ten years.

Dr. Morrison recorded in his diary on 18 December 1905 that in an interview with Mr. Morley, he suggested the gradual abolition of the opium trade.²² Margaret Lim wrote as follows.

Morley had discussed the opium trade with G.E.Morrison, correspondent in Peking for *The Times*, in Desember 1905. Morrison had suggested the trade's gradual abolition, pointing out among other things that at the time India had large surplus revenues, and that people like Sir Ernest Satow, then British minister at Peking, as well as church opinion in England and America, and an immense body of public opinion favored suppression of the trade.²³

After the interview with Mr.Morley, Morrison returned to China, and may have then interviewed Tang Shao-yi 唐紹儀 (1860~1938), suggesting to him the gradual abolition of the opium.²⁴

It was on 20 September 1906 that the Qing Dynasty issued its Anti-Opium Edict, followed in November, by related regulations issued by the Council of State Affairs, which outlined the gradual abolition plan in practice. Morrison commented on these regulations in his article in the *The Times* of 23 November 1906 as follows.

The edict abolishing the use of opium which was issued on September 20 commanded the Council of State Affairs to draft regulations giving effect to the Imperial decree. These regulations, which were drafted by Tang Shao-yi and approved by the Council of State, received yesterday the Imperial sanction and will be promulgated immediately. They are more drastic than any regulations ever before issued in China and do honor to the enlightened official whose patriotism, supported by the influence of the Viceroy Yuan Shih-kai, prompted the issue of the Imperial edict referred to.²⁵

²² *George Morrison Diaries* (1905-1906), MSS. kept in the Mitchell Library.

²³ Margaret Julia Beng Chu Lim, *Britain and the Termination of the India-China Opium Trade 1905-1913* (unpublished Ph. D. thesis, London University), p. 61.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 98.

²⁵ "The Chinese Opium Edict (from our own correspondent)," *The Times*, 23 Nov 1906.

After the Edict was issued, the anti-opium movement in China took off like a whirlwind. In correspondence dated 14 May 1907, Morrison wrote,

The development of the movement is more than satisfactory. The greatest opponent or passive resistant is Chang Chi-tung who preaches against opium (it is chapter IX of his famous book) yet himself seeks solace or rather sexual stimulus in the opium pipe. The use of opium is becoming unfashionable and the growth of that feeling is extraordinary. In this province the change is very great. No opium is permitted in the restaurants, or brothels, where before it was universal. Beginning from next Friday all opium dens will be closed. I enclose you a copy of the proclamation. It is written in simple colloquial intelligible to the meanest coolie. In Paoting-fu and Tientsin the purging has been greater than the most ardent opponent of the use of opium could have hoped for.²⁶

The Chinese government had made no response to the anti-opium resolution passed in the British House of Commons (30 May), but it had acted quickly after the release of the anti-opium edict (20 September). Morrison was pleased with China's reaction.

In sum, Dr. Morrison played an essential role in the anti-opium movement in turn of the century China, by proposing the gradual abolition plan to Secretary of the State for India, politicians in London and Tang Shao-yi, a Minister of Wai Wu Pu (Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Beijing), a program that would bring the import of British opium into China to an end.

Conclusion

Of the Morrison Pamphlets related to the Opium Wars (1830s~1850s), most of them were arguments critical of the conflicts. Most of those related to the opium controversy in Britain (1870s,1880s) were published by SSOT. Of those related to the Royal Commission on Opium (1890s),

²⁶“To V. Chirol, Peking 14 May 1907,” Lo Hui-Min, *op.cit.*, p.409.

9 out of 13 were pamphlets published also by SSOT or missionary bodies critical of the RCO. Those related to the anti-opium movement of the early 20 century number as many as 65 items, reflecting Morrison's deep concern about the importance of the movement and active involvement in it as an intermediary between the Chinese and British governments. He even proposed the plan of gradual abolition of opium production, trafficking and consumption to both governments. The Imperial Anti-Opium Edict of 1906 and the Anglo-China Opium Agreement of 1907 also followed the scenario he first set down.

As to why, Dr. Morrison lent his support to the movement, some have accused him as being an imperialist pursuing the economic interests of the British Empire; however, the abolition of opium exports from India to China can also be interpreted as harmful to those same interests. The answers may lie elsewhere, beginning with his Scottish emigrant ancestry and probably Presbyterian upbringing, which may have fostered sympathy with the values held by philanthropic activists of 19th century and the nonconformist church, both of which took humanitarian and moral stands on current issues. Dr. Morrison was enthusiastic about the moral reform movement in 19th Century Britain, missionary work in China, as well as the civilization of the Far East.

Secondly, he believed in new form of economic interest or presence of the British Empire in the world consisting of lending capital to countries like China, instead of disgracing them with supplies of foreign opium, resulting in both physical and fiscal addiction to the drug. Tang Shao-yi and Yuan Shi-kai 袁世凱 (1859~1916) became his partners in establishing a new type of Anglo-Chinese relations, and the Morrison Pamphlets contain many items describing the prospects that they held for a new diplomacy and British presence in the Far East.