

and difficult task of administering the affairs of educational institutions.

One thing was conclusively settled at the annual football game between Yale and Harvard, played last Saturday at Springfield—namely, that the intercollegiate game, as it is now indulged in, must be either radically reformed or resolutely suppressed by college authorities. This is not the opinion of enemies of the game, but of football enthusiasts and experts. The Outlook has never joined in indiscriminating condemnation of football, but we believe that it is impossible for any fair-minded and reasonable man who saw the contest at Springfield, or who reads the report of it given elsewhere in this issue by a staff correspondent of The Outlook, to deny that it was brutal in its results to the players and brutalizing in its effects on the spectators. We believe the game as it was played Saturday is open to the most serious indictment on the latter count; the rancor, malice, heartburnings, and wild, intemperate excitement which every spectator was conscious of on Saturday, even if they are aroused only for an afternoon, are not to be lightly passed over. This is not a question of pouring contempt on physical prowess; physical prowess is something to be cultivated and admired, as it has been admired from the days of Achilles and Odysseus, of Samson and David, down to the present day. It is a question of savagery versus civilization, and the real friends of sane and healthful athletic sports and contests, among whom The Outlook wishes to be counted, will welcome the prompt and rigorous action which it is to be hoped the faculties of the small colleges as well as of the great universities will take to suppress what has become the National evil of football. It must be said that, if college authority does not assert itself in suppressing this football evil, it will be justly subjected to the condemnation which is now visited upon the “coaches,” rule-committees, and undergraduate players who, in spite of promises of reform, have given us this year the most violent exhibition of football that has ever been seen in an American intercollegiate game.

Now that the Czar is at length buried, the interest of Europe centers on the policy of his successor, and there are some indications that that policy, while perhaps not less peaceful, will vary in important directions from that which, in a general way, allied Russia in terms of unformulated but genuine friendship with France. A noticeable hostility, expressed through the newspapers, has suddenly sprung up between Germany and England, and in Germany articles in some newspapers have weight because they are supposed to be unofficial expressions of official opinion, or attempts on the part of the Government to sound public sentiment in advance of action. England is told by some of the German newspapers that she has been interfering of late with the colonial policy of the Empire, and that she must desist; to which some of the English newspapers have very properly replied that of late England has yielded everything in colonial matters to the wishes of Germany. But the feature of the situation which is attracting most attention is the apparent approach of a very cordial relationship between Russia and England, leaving Germany out of account on one side and France out of account on the other. The marked attentions of the Czar to the Prince of Wales during the recent funeral ceremonies attracted attention, taken in connection with the negotiations which are pending between Great Britain and Russia. The questions in discussion are said to include the matter of concerted action with regard to Korea, the granting of a free

hand to Russia in Persia, and the opening of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus to Russian vessels of war. The opening of the Dardanelles is the most important of all, because it would involve an entire change of English policy, and either a consultation with the other Great Powers or combined agreement on the part of Russia and England to disregard them. If such an agreement should be made between the two countries, it would mean an alliance between them which would compel a reconstruction of international relations between the other Great Powers. The step is so radical, and so directly reverses everything that England has been trying to do for years in her attitude toward Russia, that the report is discredited by many influential people. It is certain, however, that an attempt is being made to bring the two countries together by a more cordial understanding. It looks very much as if the young Czar were being drawn toward England rather than toward Germany or France.

The cable reports of the recent exciting school election in London represent the Clericals as still in majority in the London School Board, though that majority has been decreased. The nature of the issue involved in this election has not been fully understood by the secular press in this country. In England, public education is carried on by parochial schools which receive Government grants of money and are under ecclesiastical or denominational control, chiefly of the Church of England, and by School Board schools which are wholly undenominational, but are not wholly secular. Even Professor Huxley has urged the retention of moral instruction and the systematic use of the Bible in these schools, and for the last twenty-three years the Bible has been systematically taught in these schools in London, by Biblical lessons appointed for the purpose by the Board. But the Clerical party in England, as everywhere else, has desired to break up the uneclesiastical schools. For this purpose it has recently insisted on certain catechetical instruction involving belief in the Trinity and the Sacrificial Atonement. Whether this catechetical instruction shall be added to the previous Biblical instruction was the question nominally at issue in the late election, but underneath this was the real question, whether the School Board schools should be efficiently maintained, for the Clericals have so cut down appropriations for them as to impair their efficiency. We quote from an article in the November number of the “Nineteenth Century” by the Rev. J. Guinness Rogers:

“There is a deficiency of schools, and those which exist are insanitary, often to the point of danger. The teaching staff is kept down to so low a point that classes are overcrowded and their work imperfectly done. The same cheese-paring policy prevents the introduction of appliances which would increase the refining influence of the schools and give to the education more completeness. It is a sorry record from first to last. But what else was to be expected from men who have the most antiquated ideas of what education ought to be, and who are really administering Board Schools in the interest of rival institutions?”

This economy has appealed to penurious ratepayers and won a temporary victory for the Clericals; but we judge that the indications are that this will be their last victory.

The news that Port Arthur has fallen has been confirmed by dispatches to the State Department at Washington, and it is said that China is so alarmed as to be forced to do what she should have done some time since—sue for peace directly from Japan, instead of inviting intervention, arbitration, or mediation from any of the Great Powers. It seems that the decisive work at Port Arthur was done by a concerted rush upon the entrance of the harbor by twenty-three Japanese torpedo-boats, while at the same time the

land forces attacked the place from the rear. This victory does not seem to alarm that foreign power most interested in China as much as was anticipated; indeed, the greatest of journals, the London "Times," says: "Perhaps Japan's policy will continue until the arrogance of the Chinese be beaten down. Although the capture of Port Arthur is of the highest strategic importance, it is no reason why the Powers should depart from their neutrality." It is reported that after the victory Field-Marshal Oyama detached some of his troops from those at Port Arthur, and is leading them northward through the Regent's Sword promontory in the direction of Niuchwang. Meanwhile Field-Marshal Yamagata has gained another brilliant victory on the outskirts of Mukden. The third Japanese army has now sailed from home, its destination not being known. The Mongol and Chinese soldiers at Jehho have raised the standard of rebellion. This place is about one hundred and fifty miles north of Peking. The Emperor has a country seat there. Another dire event has been the loss of China's largest war-ship, the Chen-Yuen—the most recently constructed armorclad in her service. There is great consternation at Tientsin, Peking, and Shanghai. The foreign Ministers and Consuls are taking proper measures looking to the safety of merchants and missionaries. Japan's Minister of Finance has announced a further loan, making four-fifths of the amount authorized by Parliament to be raised for war purposes.

Our Government's offer to mediate between China and Japan has been met by the latter country with a courteous refusal to receive proposals for ending the war from any source but China itself. Japan, however, expresses her willingness to receive such proposals from China through the United States Ministers to the two countries, as China has, of course, no representative at Yokohama. The United States' offer to mediate is defended on the ground that it is called for by a clause in the treaty between China and the United States providing that "if any other nation should act unjustly or oppressively, the United States will exert their good offices, on being informed of the case, to bring about an amicable arrangement of the question, thus showing their friendly feelings." If it is really under this clause of the treaty that our country has proposed mediation between China and Japan, that mediation assumes that Japan has been acting "unjustly or oppressively"—an assumption which Japan would be justified in resenting, and which, in our judgment, would be utterly groundless. It is, indeed, clear that this clause has no application to the present condition of affairs. There is, however, a well-remembered clause in Washington's farewell address which it would be well for those to recall who have lately been endeavoring to mix us up now in Samoan, now in Hawaiian, and now in Chinese affairs: "The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is to have with them as little political connection as possible. Why entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?" America has all that it can do to attend to its own concerns, and it will be quite time enough for us to intervene with friendly offices of mediation between foreign warring nations when such offices are directly and officially requested. China has seen fit to engage in war with Japan. She has been badly beaten. She should sue Japan for peace, and it will be time enough for other countries to mediate when she has so sued and her suit is not treated in accordance with the laws of civilized nations.

An event of prime importance to Japan has taken place in Washington, where Secretary Gresham and Min-

ister Kurino have signed the new treaty, which will be submitted to the Senate for consideration directly Congress convenes. It is anticipated that there will not be any opposition in that body, unless it be upon the tariff and immigration provisions. By this treaty, which is similar to the one recently negotiated between Great Britain and Japan, the latter country's foreign settlements become incorporated with the general municipal system, and the foreign consular authorities, who have hitherto exercised judicial rights in all cases affecting aliens, are replaced by Japanese judges. Thus are swept away the extra-territoriality clauses of the existing treaties, which have been justly so repugnant to Japan, and that country now enjoys not only tariff but also judicial autonomy. In return for this, our citizens may travel or reside wherever they please in Japan, and enjoy full protection under the Mikado's Government.

The Armenian atrocities may yet be followed by as grave consequences as attended those in Crete and in Bulgaria. It is quite possible that the first reports received have exaggerated the facts of the case, and it may be, as Mavroyeni Bey has stated, that some at least of the trouble at Sassoun was created by Armenian brigands. However, we know that the greater part of the Armenian population is not composed of brigands, while so far as their being armed is concerned, the Turkish law prohibits Armenians from possessing arms of any kind; they may not even carry a penknife. The cause of the trouble goes back to the famous Berlin Congress of 1878, which so greatly altered the map of Europe. In exchange for the Dobrudja the Czar recovered Bessarabia, but, on the other hand, in Asia Minor not only was he prohibited from retaining all his conquests, but quite a section of Armenia was actually returned to the Ottoman Government. About two millions of Armenian Christians must needs abide under Turkish rule. The fifty-first article of the Berlin Congress provides for a Christian Governor and Christian police in Turkish provinces when the majority of the population consists of Christians; and the Porte has complied with these requirements. By the treaty the Porte was also bound to realize, without delay, "those ameliorations and reforms which local needs require in the provinces inhabited by the Armenians, and it guarantees their security against the Circassians and the Kurds." It is just this security which has been lacking, and the repeated raids of the predatory Kurd tribes have so impoverished the Armenians that tax-gathering has become impossible. It seems probable that the tyranny of the Turkish tax-gatherers has induced a revolt, and that its suppression has (if one-tenth part of the recent reports are true) been characterized by atrocious barbarities, practiced upon women and children as well as men. All of the Powers represented in the Treaty of Berlin are directly challenged by this catastrophe, and their moral obligation in the matter is patent to any one. Perhaps the Power most especially implicated is Great Britain, since upon the cession of Cyprus the Sultan promised additional reform in Armenia. At all events, if Great Britain finds it convenient, as hitherto, to befriend the Porte, Nicholas II. has been furnished with a strong moral reason for an invasion of Asia Minor. We learn from the officers of the American Board that the meager reports received from its missionaries indicate that "1876 has been repeated." The officers of the Board will urge on our Government the importance of having an official report upon what has taken place. Great Britain has already ordered such a report. Whatever may be said of the political aspects of the Armenian question, it is certain that the