

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.

... I tell you that I know of no outrages that have been perpetrated in the South that surpass the conditions I found in East St. Louis, in our own beloved State.

Mr. Roosevelt, during a reception to the Russian Commission in New York, courageously faced the issue raised by the East St. Louis riots. In Carnegie Hall, from the same platform on which sat the Russian Commission, Mr. Roosevelt said:

Before I extend my greetings to these envoys I want to say a word to you, a word I should not leave unsaid. Before I speak of justice and liberty to Russia we should do justice within our own household. There has been an appalling outbreak of savagery in the race riots in East St. Louis—race riots which, as far as we can see, had no real provocation, and, whether there was provocation or not, waged with such appalling brutality as to leave a stain on the name of America.

It behooves us to express our deep condemnation of acts that give the lie to our words. It is our duty to demand that the governmental representatives whose business it is shall use with ruthless sternness every instrumentality at their command to punish murder, whether committed by whites against blacks or blacks against whites.

This statement of Mr. Roosevelt's called forth at the time the emphatic protest of Mr. Gompers, who declared that the race riots, detestable though they were, had been caused by the unfair importation of Negro labor from the South. This indirect apology for the rioters called forth a second energetic protest from Mr. Roosevelt, and for a little while it seemed as though the reception to the Russian envoys would be forced to take second place to the discussion of what many might consider solely an American domestic problem. But it is not merely a domestic problem. That riot was an attempt to terrorize a community into submission; and "frightfulness" is a menace to all mankind, whether we call it *Schrecklichkeit* when practiced by the Prussians in Belgium or France, or call it a race riot when practiced by a mob of whites in an American city.

Naturally enough, many Southern newspapers have seized upon the East St. Louis riots as an opportunity to point the accusing finger at those Northern critics who have been most vehement in denouncing the South for its attitude toward the Negro. A typical editorial of this kind appears in the "Courier-Journal" of Louisville, Kentucky. The "Courier-Journal" says:

It would be indeed a strange *dénouement* and a kind of poetic justice if, after the ungenerous treatment bestowed upon the South by the public opinion of the North in the matter of this Negro question, the chalice of race poison should be put to the North's own lips. . . . If East St. Louis were in Kentucky, the newspapers north of us would be on their hind legs howling for dear life.

It can be said in fairness to such Northern papers as the New York "Evening Post" and the Chicago "Tribune," which have been the bitterest critics of Southern lynching, that they have been, in the present instance, equally bitter in their condemnation of this Northern atrocity. Despite this fact, there is more than enough truth in the arraignment by the Atlanta "Constitution" to make the reproach of that journal unpleasant reading for Northern eyes:

Disdainful of law or decency, disregardful of police or military authority, all day long and for half the night the blood-crazed mobs howled and fought and destroyed—employing stones, bludgeons, knives, firearms, and the torch! The number of dead Negroes as a result of the day's rioting cannot be approximately estimated until a search of the charred ruins can be made.

And this all happened in the home State of Abraham Lincoln, who guaranteed the black man freedom from bondage and equality before the law!

Here is the concluding advice of the Atlanta "Constitution":

As to those colored folk who have escaped with their lives, they had better come back home, where they were well off. And those who have not gone North can thank their lucky stars that they have stuck by the South, where every man is safeguarded in the right to work—and to live in peace and security if he works and leads the life of a decent, self-respecting citizen!

Not all Southern papers, however, are as certain as the Atlanta "Constitution" that the exodus of Negroes to the

North followed solely as a result of the blandishment of Northern labor agents. Any one who has recently traveled through the South knows that there are many Southern men and women who ascribe the exodus of Negroes from the South in part to the unsanitary conditions in which the average Negro is forced to dwell, to a lack of school facilities for the colored race, and to the uneconomic system of tenant farming which still hampers the agricultural efforts of a large part of the South.

The New York "Tribune" quotes two editorials from Southern papers which have looked upon the East St. Louis riots with their eyes open. The first is from the Houston (Texas) "Post":

In the towns and cities the Negroes are dissatisfied with their living conditions. They are not disturbed about politics or social equality, but the insanitary surroundings amid which circumstances compel them to exist are unsatisfactory, and the white people owe it to their own welfare to improve those conditions.

Even worse conditions obtain on many of the plantations, and added to all of the drawbacks common to the towns and cities is the other fact that the rural schools for Negro children, where they exist at all, are a joke.

Another cause of Negro discontent lies in the widely prevalent and largely justified belief among the Negroes that there is one law for the white man and another for the Negro. The instances in the court records of the State which prove this to be true are too numerous to be recited here.

The Savannah "Morning News" does not believe that the solution of the problem caused by the emigration of Negro labor from the South is to be found in the application of coercive measures to prevent the Negro departing from the location which has so long been his home. This Georgia paper says:

Would it not be the part of reason to look about us and find out why the Negro is so fixed in his determination to go elsewhere, instead of arbitrarily seeking to stay his departure or to frighten him into staying by picturing to him the disadvantages of the life he will have to live in the North? If the Negro is discontented in the South, there is undoubtedly a reason for his discontentment. This reason may be partly fancied, but it cannot be wholly so; a race of people does not break every natural tie and go into strange lands because of an entirely fancied grievance.

Consider the matter selfishly or altruistically, as you please, there is no escape from the conclusion that the obligation to understand the Negro's view-point is resting upon the best white people of the South heavily, or that this obligation is of the most pressing immediacy.

If the North and South can get together on such a basis for action as has been outlined by the Savannah "Morning News," we shall have gone a long way towards eradicating many of the contributing causes to such a disaster as has occurred in East St. Louis.

In view of the fact that such occurrences as the East St. Louis riots and the recent ghastly lynching in the neighborhood of Memphis, Tennessee, have caused the growth of a tremendous feeling of discouragement and fear among the Negroes both North and South, it is gratifying to record the fact that in the South, at least, the number of recorded lynchings during the first six months of 1917 has been very much less than during the same periods in 1915 and in 1916. According to statistics compiled by the head of the Division of Records and Research of Tuskegee Institute, Professor Monroe N. Work, there were thirty-four lynchings during this period in 1915, twenty-five lynchings in 1916, and only fourteen lynchings in 1917. Professor Work states that in ten instances by the bravery of officers of the law mobs were thwarted and lynching prevented. Of those lynched thirteen were Negroes and one was a white man. Four of those put to death—one white man and three Negroes—were charged with the crime of rape. One of those lynched was a Negro woman, reported to have been of unsound mind, who in resisting arrest wounded an officer of the law.

The decrease in the number of lynchings is a happy augury for the future; but so long as a single man, black or white, is put to death by mob violence within the confines of the United States without due process of law, America cannot hold itself free from shame.