

service. Every such man is doing his part to justify the welcome that France has given to General Pershing and to our troops in France.

CHINA

The week ending July 11 was important in China's history. During that week the monarchist forces made a supreme effort to re-establish the throne. They were resisted by the forces of the Republic. These forces consisted of the Parliamentary party and the Cabinet party. The conflicting elements in the recent revolution had represented a triangular fight—the monarchists, the Parliamentarians, and the so-called Cabinet party; but now the monarchist group made the two other groups temporarily allies.

At first the monarchists, led by Chang Hsun, had a show of success, occupying Peking, the capital, and a wide district about it, and imprisoning President Li Yuan-hung. But Chang Hsun overplayed his hand. A fatal mistake was his execution of Prince Pu Lun, closely related to the Manchu Imperial family, the representative of China at the St. Louis Exposition, and, despite his Imperial connections, President of the first Chinese Republican Parliament. Ever since the establishment of the Republic Prince Pu Lun has been loyal to it, and when approached by Chang Hsun with a proposal to aid in restoring the monarchy advised against it. For this he was put to death. The act alienated many military chieftains more or less in sympathy with the monarchists.

The week began with fighting at Langfang, some thirty-five miles south of Peking. Meanwhile, foreigners and Chinese fled to the city of Tientsin, fearing loot and murder at the capital. The legations armed themselves for defense, and to keep access to the capital open the diplomatic representatives warned those in control that the international protocol of 1901 between China and the Powers requires freedom of railway communication.

The fighting resulted in Chang's defeat. He withdrew his forces to the capital, and now is reported to have further retreated into that part of it known as the Imperial City, which contains the so-called Temple of Heaven. This "Temple" is really a large inclosed space dotted with blue-domed temples, and was the scene of the most sacred rites under the old régime. The Imperial City is filled with irreplaceable relics of old China, and Chang's withdrawal into it as a place of refuge indicates his intention to hold China's priceless edifices as a pawn for his personal safety.

On Chang's approach to Peking, the Republican Government was removed to Nanking, the old Chinese capital, where Feng Kuo-chang, the Vice-President of the Republic, has declared that he has assumed the temporary Presidency. He has so informed Tuan Chi-jui, formerly Minister of War, and the leader of the Cabinet party, who had been deposed by the President on the suspicion that he had "sold out" China to Japan.

The Cabinet party aspires to conduct the Government without responsibility to Parliament. This would mean really a dictatorship. Chang was clever enough to see his opportunity, and had stepped in between the Cabinet party and the Parliamentary party by making a compromise proposal, namely, that there should be constitutionalism and a parliament, but that the executive should be an emperor.

With the collapse of the Manchu movement, the question now is, which of the other two elements will control the situation? The Parliamentary party appeals to a far wider sympathy throughout the world than does the Cabinet party; but, as China's supreme need is solidarity and centralization of control, the Cabinet party may for a time be successful.

Whether, however, one or the other gains the ascendancy, another feature should not be overlooked. We find it reflected in a just-published appeal to the military governors of China from President Li shortly before the attempted overthrow of the Republic. Matters were already in such a condition of unrest that he said: "In this present disturbed state, China, like Korea, may be brought to the condition of a protectorate, in which there will be neither republic nor any restoration of the Manchu dynasty." This was the Chinese President's warning

against dissensions which might bring China to a state of dependency upon Japan.

THE ARIZONA COPPER STRIKE

Arizona produces a third of the copper output of the United States. At present there is an entire suspension of work in the Arizona copper mines. Why is this? The workers demand better conditions as to time and wages. Perhaps they should have them. If so, one would think that the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers would be responsible for the situation. But its President, Charles H. Moyer, disclaims any authority or responsibility for the strike. He charges that the trouble is due to the activity of the Industrial Workers of the World. The operators add that when this fact is coupled with the fact that the most violent agitators and Industrial Workers of the World are Austrians, no further evidence should be necessary to show the ultimate influence responsible for the situation.

With reference to this strike Mr. Moyer, in response to our inquiry, has sent the following despatch to The Outlook:

The fact that Industrial Workers of the World called strike at Butte, Montana, Jerome, Miami, Globe, Bisbee, and Humboldt, Arizona, all at same time and are active in attempt to close down copper smelter at El Paso, Texas, and copper mines and smelters in Utah, and their declaration that one will not start until all others have recognized their unreasonable demands and recognize their organization, is confirmation of my charge they are not only endeavoring to discredit our organization by calling their followers on strike in camps where we are organized, then practicing direct action and sabotage and charging it to our members, but through their lying statements and poisonous work have created such dissension among a number of our locals as entirely to destroy them.

It appears, then, that this strike is not so distinctively a conflict between labor and capital as a conflict between two rival labor organizations.

There was a picturesque occurrence at Jerome on July 10, when hundreds of miners and other citizens, some with rifles and others with pick handles, cleared the town of the agitators whom they considered undesirable. Sixty-seven of those persons were herded together, searched, loaded into cattle cars, and sent to a point some thirty miles away. At Globe, another mining center, there was some shooting, but order has been restored by the Federal troops.

The operators have asked for representatives of the Federal Government to visit the districts and investigate. The Government has appointed ex-Governor George W. P. Hunt to act as special conciliator at large. Thus the present Governor, Thomas E. Campbell, may find his position made somewhat more difficult, for a man who has fought him and is still contesting his election is appointed to a position where friendliest and frankest co-operation is essential.

THE KNEELING CHILDREN OF PARIS

WHEN our troops marched through the streets of Paris on Independence Day, they were pelted with flowers and were greeted with shouts by the crowds. So were the envoys of France hailed and applauded by the throngs in American cities. But there was one thing that happened in Paris that did not happen here. That is told in a cable despatch in a single sentence: "The Americans were greatly surprised to see a number of children kneel in the street as the flag was carried by."

For nearly three years France has been resisting invaders of unimaginable cruelty. For nearly three years cities and villages of France have been subjected to ruinous bombardment. For nearly three years men of France—fathers of families, brothers, and sons—have made of their bodies a parapet against the bullets and shells of the aggressors. For nearly three years women and children of France have been suffering unspeakable woe. Over all the land there has been darkness, and among all the people there has been pain.

And for the most part of these three years America, the sister

republic of France, kept out of war. During these months upon months the American flag was kept safely furled at home. When the heroism of the French sons, brothers, and fathers in their resistance to the forces of tyranny was recounted to us, when the desolation of the land under the invader was described, when the cry of the women and children of France reached our ears, and our instinct commanded us to rise and go to their help, we were told that we must preserve our own peace and prosperity, that we must be for America first, that war was wicked and we must have no part in it. And France never complained and never reproached us. Now, at last, we are where we ought to be—by the side of those who are fighting for the preservation of democracy and of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And as our flag is unfurled in Paris, French children kneel.

Early in the war Rostand wrote a poem about the American flag. He told of a German reaching up and cutting out the stars, hoping thereby that he might destroy the idealism for which our Nation has stood. Then Rostand told how the night wind came, and the desecrated flag, lifting its folds in the breeze, showed through its torn field the very stars in the heavens.

For some of the people of France the flag of the United States may have such symbolism; but not for the little French children that knelt in the street. For them it meant only succor and a helping hand in the dark. And the children of France, as they kneel in the presence of our flag, are nearer the heart of the truth than even the French poet; for there is no true idealism possible to those who refuse to give help to men, women, and little children suffering in the defense of ideals. There is now a new glory in the flag, and those who are bearing it and will bear it on the battlefield of Europe will find no greater tribute than that paid to them by the kneeling children of Paris. Our soldiers will have rendered their country the highest service, inasmuch as they have done it unto the least of these.

NO DISTINCTIONS AMONG LOYAL CITIZENS

The American Red Cross has been cautioned by the State Department not to include in its units for service in the countries of our allies Americans who were born in Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, or Bulgaria, or whose parents were born in those lands. The reason given for the warning is that the presence of such Americans in our Red Cross units would cause concern and anxiety to the officials of the Allied Governments.

There is scarcely any sacrifice that we ought not to be willing to make for the cause in which we are engaged; but we ought not to offer or consent to sacrifice the very thing that is at stake in this war. We are not fighting a territorial battle, but a battle of ideals. All who believe in democracy and liberty and the right of men to be civilized and humane and the obligation of governments to be moral are on our side. To reject them because of their birth or parentage is to deny the very thing that we are fighting for.

There must be some way found, and found speedily, to correct the gross blunder by which our Government has consented to

the branding of those loyal Americans who happen to be natives of Germany or born of natives of Germany with the mark of suspicion. The United States has a right to demand that its citizens be loyal to it; but also the loyal citizen has a right to expect that his country shall be loyal to him.

If it were not for Americans of British birth or descent who fought against British tyranny, there would never have been an America to fight for to-day. Our Government must see to it that Americans of German birth or German descent who are willing to spend their lives in service to this country against German tyranny shall be accorded, not only by our own officials, but by the officials of our allies, the same honor and trust that are accorded to other Americans.

TO AN AGNOSTIC

In the article entitled "If God Reigns" in your issue of June 13, 1917, the following statements occur: "Jesus is called King of Kings and Lord of Lords. How did he exercise his authority? Only over those who accepted it. His subjects were all voluntary subjects. . . . Jesus would exercise no authority except over those who yielded to this authority," etc., etc.

I should be greatly interested in hearing how you reconcile such statements as the above with the following texts from the Gospels:

1. "He that believeth not shall be damned."
2. "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire."

AGNOSTIC.

Jesus never said, "He that believeth not shall be damned." The last twelve verses of the Gospel of Mark (9-20) are a supplement or appendix, or probably two supplements, added by some unknown copyist to complete a book which had been left incomplete. See the "Twentieth Century New Testament" or any modern-school commentary.

The other saying you quote is found in Christ's dramatic picture of the Last Judgment, in which he welcomes to celestial companionship with himself and his Father those who befriended the sick, the sorrowful, the friendless, and condemns to eternal punishment those who have never done so. And he declares that neither class knew him; therefore the one class could not have accepted nor the other class have rejected his authority.

In the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus Christ sends to hell the rich man for leaving the beggar at his door uncared for. When Christ cries out to the Pharisees, "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" it is not because of their opinions, but because they devour "widows' houses, and for a pretense make long prayers."

The Church has often condemned men for their theological opinions; Jesus never. He condemns them for inhumanity to man.

If you want to know what Jesus Christ taught, do not go to the creeds and theologies; go to the original documents. They are quite accessible. Read the first three Gospels. Read them not critically, to pick flaws in Christ's character, conduct, or teaching. Read them appreciatively, to find out what there is in his character, conduct, and teaching which has made him the admiration of such agnostics as the English John Stuart Mill and the French Ernest Renan.

WHAT SOME AMERICANS THINK OF EAST ST. LOUIS

EAST ST. LOUIS has recently occupied an unenviable but a well-merited place in the forum of public opinion.

As the home of the most destructive race riot of recent years this Northern city has brought upon itself the castigation of editors and public men both North and South. The immediate cause of this riot (which broke out on July 1, and raged for the larger part of two days) is still shrouded in doubt, but it is painfully evident that during the progress of the riot Negro men were hunted to death and their wives and children burned within the walls of their homes. Whether or not the spirit of riot will flare up again in East St. Louis seems at present to depend

more upon the strong arm of military force than upon the self-restraint of her citizens.

The opinion of Governor Lowden, of Illinois, is the opinion of the whole country. After a visit on July 3 to East St. Louis he said:

I have been weighted down since I visited those hospitals last night, since I saw those charred ruins of homes, since I saw the havoc this riot wrought. . . . A stain rests upon Illinois—a stain that will remain. We cannot erase it if we would. . . .

We in the North have been in the habit frequently of criticising our Southern friends for their treatment of the Negro.