

to think) that St. Paul never gave one, nor is it a fatal objection to a church fair that the Church of Ephesus is not known to have advertised such a thing. As is the case with the ethics of many other social questions, there is room for discrimination and taste in these matters. But the church which transforms itself into a manager of "sacred negro minstrels, dances, light opera, and vaudeville" is certainly in great need of a spiritual vision and a higher sense of duty. Mr. Hale has kept a list of money-raising devices used by churches the past year. He finds the lottery in use only in some Roman Catholic fairs—in one of which he avers that barrels of beer were raffled for; but he charges Protestant churches with sensational advertising not to be distinguished from that of variety shows, with comic opera performances, with "Living Picture Shows," "Female Minstrel Shows," irreverent and vulgar jokes, and in one case with "song and dance turns, impersonation of the Bowery Girl, and a skirt dance!" We do not need to take with too great gravity much that is evidently intended as harmless humor by the purveyors of these entertainments, nor to thunder *ex cathedra* at petty absurdities; yet there is plenty of evidence that in too many cases the churches are wandering altogether too far from their true function. We join heartily in Mr. Hale's general conclusion: "The world does not need the Church as a purveyor of vaudeville. . . . The world does need, and is piteously crying out for the Church to do that for which, divided, it is hopelessly inefficient."



## What Can We Do?

It is worse than useless to read with beating hearts and blanched faces such a story of trouble and tragedy as that printed on another page, and then—do nothing. Is there anything which we can do? Any service which Christian pity in America can render to the suffering Armenians—persecuted for the crime of being Christians? Yes!

1. We can by our Government protect our own citizens. The two nurses whose story we give our readers to-day are Americans. They are pursuing a legitimate vocation in Turkey. It is as least as legitimate to carry on a hospital as a railroad, to heal the sick in Armenia as to make money among the Armenians. Perhaps our Government is doing all that can be done for their protection. But certainly they are not adequately protected. If some of the superfluous indignation over wrongs not yet inflicted on the Venezuelans were directed toward the Kurds ruthlessly massacring the Armenians, if some of the praiseworthy determination to protect American interests not yet assailed in South America were directed to protect American philanthropists in peril of their lives in Turkey, more efficient protection would be afforded than has been. Where there is a will there is a way. America is fierce where it should be patient, and forbearing where it should be fierce.

2. The President by a message and Congress by joint resolution can express the universal sympathy of Americans for the massacred Armenians and protest in the name of humanity against the indifference and the inefficiency of the Turkish Government. England is responsible for the maintenance of that Government. Half the people of England are indignant that the English Government does nothing. We can officially, by Congressional resolution, declare our sympathy with that portion of the English people, and our sense that it is England's duty to act. Would such interference in European affairs be inconsis-

ent with our traditions? No! It would be in accordance with them.

In December, 1823, Greece was fighting to deliver herself from this same Turk, and President Monroe, in his annual message, declared the sympathy of Americans with them in their struggle, and Daniel Webster, then in the House of Representatives, introduced the following resolution in response to that message:

"Resolved, That provision ought to be made by law for defraying the expense incident to the appointment of an Agent or Commissioner to Greece, whenever the President shall deem it expedient to make such appointment."

This resolution he supported in a vigorous speech, the principles of which are as applicable to the present situation as to that which then existed:

"It may be asked, What can we do? Are we to go to war? Are we to interfere in the Greek cause, or any other European cause? Are we to endanger our pacific relations? No, certainly not. What then, the question recurs, remains for us? If we will not endanger our own peace, if we will neither furnish armies nor navies to the cause which we think the just one, what is there within our power? Sir, this reasoning mistakes the age. The time has been, indeed, when fleets and armies and subsidies were the principal reliances even in the best cause. But, happily for mankind, a great change has taken place in this respect. Moral causes come into consideration in proportion as the progress of knowledge is advanced; and the public opinion of the civilized world is rapidly gaining an ascendancy over mere brutal force. It is already able to oppose the most formidable obstruction to the progress of injustice and oppression; and as it grows more intelligent and more intense, it will be more and more formidable. It may be silenced by military power, but it cannot be conquered. It is elastic, irrepressible, and invulnerable to the weapons of ordinary warfare. It is that impassable, inextinguishable enemy of mere violence and arbitrary rule, which, like Milton's angels,

"Vital in every part, . . .  
Cannot, but by annihilating, die."

The event justified and reinforced this reasoning. There are good grounds to believe that this action by the United States Government, which was the first, was also one of the most potent, influences outside of Greece in securing her independence. It is high time for the President to follow the example of President Monroe and for Congress to recognize the principles enunciated by Daniel Webster, and for both to proclaim to the world America's sympathy for the Armenians, and her protest against the further acquiescence of the Christian Powers in the massacres.

3. We can give more material expression to our sympathy. When Chicago was desolated by fire, the Atlantic States sent relief. When Charleston was desolated by earthquake, the Northern States sent relief. When Ireland was desolated by famine, the United States sent relief. But the desolations of war are worse than those of either. Fire, earthquake, famine, are not so cruel as the saber of the Kurd. David's choice was wise, "Let me not fall into the hand of man." Nothing is so cruel as the cruelty of men. Clara Barton starts in two weeks for the scene of desolation. She has the promise of protection in her ministering work. Her efficiency has been proved on American soil. Send her full-handed. Turn to page 93. Read the story there. Then send your contribution. The Outlook will receive and forward it. Be prompt. Whatever is done should be done quickly. But what she cannot carry can be sent to her. It will be better late than never.

The official declaration of the Turkish Government (as sent out to the press on Monday by the Turkish Legation at Washington) that it regards the offering of relief to its suffering subjects as an insult, and that it will not permit the relief to be given, is no reason for withholding nor for delay. Whether we have a right as Americans to give succor to suffering Americans; whether, on the larger ground

of humanity, we have a right to extend succor to suffering Armenians, and whether we will insist on this right—all this will be time enough to determine when the benevolence is met at the door of the Turkish Empire and refused admission. Meanwhile, the larger the contributions, and the wider their sources, the greater will be the pressure of Turkey to withdraw its refusal to allow them to be bestowed on the hungry, the wounded, the dying. Moreover, the authorities in charge of the Armenian Relief Fund in this country inform us that there are sufficient avenues for the distribution of relief without antagonizing the Turkish Government.



## The Way Out

In a time of moral perplexity and peril like that into which the Venezuela dispute has plunged this Nation, a first thing is to unite the moral forces of the Nation. And this cannot be done if one party assumes that it possesses them all. It cannot be done by charges and counter-charges, by accusations of Jingoism on the one side and of commercial cowardice and lack of patriotism on the other. Classes, like individuals, act from mixed motives, and to find the true solution of a perplexing moral problem a first condition is to disentangle these mixed motives and to mass those that are righteous against those that are unrighteous.

It is very certain that in the passionate outburst against England there was much that was base: there was an emergence of the brutal love of war for its own sake, a repetition of the ambition for "glory" which cost France so dear in the Napoleonic wars, a passion for conquest, a measurement of national greatness by the bigness of its territory, an Anglophobia which is at least no more rational than the deservedly satirized Anglomania. But there were other and nobler elements. The Monroe Doctrine, as proposed by Canning and approved by Monroe, is past history, but underneath it and really embodied in it is a doctrine which is a present fact and which will influence, if it does not control, future history on this continent. It is a sentiment rather than an opinion, but it is a chivalric and a not unworthy sentiment. The United States feels a sense of responsibility for affairs in the American hemisphere. This is no more a part of international law than England's responsibility for India; but it is as serious a fact, and one that must be reckoned with in all international dealings. And it has lately been quickened and vivified by the Armenian outrages. The American people have read the tales of horror from Turkey; they have thought themselves powerless to interfere; they have believed that the responsibility for such outrages rested on the European Powers, and especially on England; they have felt indignant that this responsibility has been apparently so lightly regarded; and when a rumor of aggression in our own hemisphere reached their ears they were impulsively eager, too impulsively eager, to assume the responsibility which in some measure does belong to them. The passion over Venezuela is in part an outlet for the pent-up indignation over Armenia. Not only Americans who believe in peace and will pursue it, but Englishmen who are perplexed by the sudden war-fever which has swept over this country, must reckon with a serious determination of Americans, which is probably the only permanent element in this sudden and strange excitement, to hold themselves responsible that no aggressions are permitted, no great national wrongs suffered, on either the North American or the South American continent. We hold ourselves guardians for this hemisphere as the

Christian Powers do for Europe, only with a far stricter accountability.

On the other hand, it must be confessed that the desire for peace is not wholly praiseworthy. Commerce is timid; and commercial timidity has enforced the call for peace. But it is a great mistake to charge the demand for peace to any such motive. When Mr. Roosevelt, writing in the "Harvard Crimson" in criticism of the utterances of Harvard professors, speaks of "stock-jobbing timidity, the Baboo kind of statesmanship, which is clamored for at this moment by the men who put monetary gain before national honor, or who are still intellectually in a state of colonial dependence on England," he dishonors himself in trying to dishonor his peers. In truth, it requires a very high degree of courage to resist an outbreak of irrational prejudice in a democracy, and none whatever to fall in with and endeavor to inflame it. The fact that with substantial unanimity—with only such exceptions as emphasize that unanimity—the Christian churches in all localities and of all denominations have condemned as needless the talk of war and as wicked the spirit which desires it, should suffice to convince all fair-minded men that in the demand for a peaceable adjustment of this and all kindred differences there is a very earnest and a very determined, though not vociferous, conscience.

In England, too, the conscience is not all on one side. We ought to be able to understand, even if we do not approve, the Tory position that England will not arbitrate the question whether she will protect her citizens, residing on what she has always claimed as her colonial territory. On the other hand, it is certain that the Christian conscience of England and Scotland agrees with the Christian conscience of the United States, not only that it would be a crime to permit war between the two countries, but that it is a crime ever to entertain the idea of such a war.

Men who recognize each other's righteous spirit can always find a way to agree in a righteous purpose; and if the righteous elements in both nations unite, it is certain that the unrighteous elements cannot compel a wholly unrighteous war. And the method by which the universal conscience can be satisfied, and peace not only now maintained but reasonably well assured for all future time, has already been suggested by wise statesmen on both sides of the Atlantic. This is by something better than arbitration—namely, the constitution of a permanent court to which all matters at issue between the United States and Great Britain should be referred for settlement, as now all matters at issue between the several States of this Union are referred to the Supreme Court of the United States for settlement. This is not a new proposition. Not to go further back, it was suggested by Sir George Clarke, the Governor of Malta, in an article in the "North American Review" in March, 1894. It was again urged on the Peace Conference at Lake Mohonk last June by Edward Everett Hale. It was received with applause by the American Bar Association last August when recommended by Mr. Justice Brewer in his address. According to the press, it has been more definitely formulated by Sir Frederick Pollock in England and Mr. Justice Harlan in this country. Professor Thayer, of Harvard Law School, in a recent issue of the "University Law Review," argues its practicability. Diplomacy should be able to adjust a basis between the two countries on which such an international court could be organized. Since England originally proposed the Monroe Doctrine, England could hardly object to a rationally defined doctrine of our responsibility for the peace of the American hemisphere. American law is so far borrowed from English law as to give legal homogeneity to a tribunal