

ment now is to protect the lives, and so far as possible the property, of Americans in China. Missionaries and traders are in full flight from the Yangtze Valley and other parts of central China to Shanghai. The great international port of commerce has become a port of refuge, a haven from the rising storm of Chinese antipathy. We must now co-operate with other Governments in throwing a safe bulwark of armed protection around the foreign settlement there.

This does not imply—as some radical critics will charge—armed intervention in China. It means simply the elemental obligation of providing secure shelter for our compatriots exposed to the perils of riot and looting. How this situation might have been prevented it is too late to consider. We have first to deal with the situation that exists.

What happened when the Cantonese Nationalist troops, in pursuit of the retreating Northerners, entered Nanking, on the Yangtze River—how they attacked the American, British, and Japanese Consulates; fired on the Standard Oil compound at Socony Hill when it was used as a place of safety; killed Dr. J. E. Williams, Vice-President of Nanking University, and Dr. Smith, an Englishman; wounded Miss Anna Moffett and two more Americans, the British Consul, and various other foreigners; how they were stopped in the attack on Socony Hill only by a barrage of shells from American war-ships in the river; how a rescue was effected by a landing force and how the safe-conduct of foreigners from other parts of the city to the war-ships, for transport to Shanghai, was secured only by a threat to shell all military points—all these deplorable facts are now common knowledge. The whole incident is evidence either that the Nationalist leaders have less control over their excitable followers than they have professed, or that the attacks represented a concerted policy. The conviction of the Americans who were at Nanking evidently is that the latter was the case, and that the hand of Soviet Russia pushed on the unruly soldiers.

The American Consul had urged American residents to leave for Shanghai, but the missionaries had stayed—denying danger and minimizing the menace from the radical wing of the Nationalist movement. They have paid a tragic price for their faith in the Chinese they have striven to serve. One of the best leaders of the missionary education movement is dead; the rest are evacuating the whole Yangtze Valley. Dr. Williams, the murdered teacher, is reported to have faced his killers with a

benevolent smile. Such an attitude is a glorious triumph of the individual spirit, but it could not justify the responsible authorities if they neglected the hundreds who must be brought out alive. Much as the courage of those who stuck by their duties as they saw them may be admired, the question arises whether they did not owe a higher duty to their country in heeding the requests of its representatives in the interest of the whole United States, if not of humanity. If the American residents had followed official advice to leave earlier, complications which may injure the whole future of American relations with China might have been avoided. But that is not the point now. The United States, Great Britain, and Japan are rushing reinforcements to Shanghai, and that is the only course to take.

In the midst of all this turmoil Secretary Kellogg has announced quietly that the Department of State is prepared to negotiate with the Cantonese Nationalists regarding the future of Shanghai. It is also rather late to advance that policy. A few months—even weeks—ago a clear move to establish relations with the Nationalists might have been effective. It is highly doubtful whether it can be so now. Then they had just reached Hankow, where their capital now is, and they doubtless would have been open to a frank approach. No such approach was made, although it was urged by the most competent observers of Chinese affairs. Now they are the dominant force in China, apparently on a victorious march to Peking to drive out the militarists from the Northern capital. Parallel with this purpose they now place the purpose of driving out all foreigners. Feelings have been so aroused that there is little hope of a conciliatory treatment of the situation.

The powers of democracy have allowed the agents of Bolshevism to put them on the defensive, and so to inflame Chinese hatred by the necessary measures of protecting their citizens. That is the great failure in the handling of the crisis in China, and for it the Western nations are likely to pay the price for years in the loss of leadership in the Far East.

## II—Nicaragua for the Nicaraguans

THE letter from Nicaragua which we publish in this issue reveals one aspect of the situation there of which most Americans are probably ignorant. We hear much of the relative merits of Diaz and Sacasa. We hear little of the hardships and suffering of the

common people, to whom neither Sacasa nor Diaz really means anything. What our marines there are doing is, as this letter shows, not merely to protect American lives and property, but also incidentally to alleviate the miseries of the Nicaraguans themselves. The United States, it has just been made public, has sold munitions to the Diaz Government, which it has recognized, as it sold munitions to Obregon in Mexico. It does not make our task of establishing order for the Nicaraguan people any easier that the guns which went out of Mexico to Sacasa appear to be the identical guns that went out of the United States to Obregon to enable him to put down the Huerta rebellion and have put and maintained Calles in power.

## III—Mystery and Plots in Mexico

NO writer of international secret service stories could have imagined more surprises and thrills than the actual relations of the United States and Mexico have lately furnished. Diplomacy is supposed to be a formal and rather dull affair, but our dealings with our neighbor to the south have been both unconventional and enlivening. And it appears that some progress toward a better understanding is being made.

First we had the despatch of the much-discussed "mystery notes" from the Department of State to the Government of Mexico. These were the first communications sent by our authorities to Mexico City since the termination of the correspondence about the new Mexican land and oil laws last October. No official in Washington or Mexico City would say anything about the contents of these secret notes.

At the same time we witnessed the sudden departure of Ambassador Téllez for Mexico City. It was at once rumored that he had been practically sent home because of "propaganda." But he conferred with President Calles, and returned to Washington bringing, evidently, reassurances regarding the application of the oil and land laws to properties held by foreigners in Mexico and expressions of good will. From the Mexican capital it was reported that the Cabinet was inclined to favor a modification of the laws to meet the objections of the United States that they are retroactive and confiscatory, as affecting property rights of oil producers and other investors in Mexico. Further, it was said that the Mexican Supreme Court was likely to hand down an opinion adverse to the legality of the regula-

April 6, 1927

tions in question and the articles of the Constitution of 1917 on which they are based. So far neither of these things has become a reality.

Next we read the announcement of the termination of the anti-smuggling convention between Mexico and the United States. This convention has been in force for a year, which ended on March 28. Under its provisions, it was abrogated by a declaration of desire on the part of the United States. Alarmists immediately began to shout that the next step would be the lifting of the arms embargo by our Government and the shipping of arms to revolutionists in Mexico. But there is no sign that this is the purpose. The convention was put in force primarily in the endeavor to stop rum-running and the entry of undesirable immigrants. It has not worked well, by all accounts; and the number of agents required to watch the border was as large as before. This is probably a main reason for its termination. Further, the action may serve as notice to the Calles Government that we are ready to raise the arms embargo if the land and oil laws are applied in a manner which we think unjust to the interests of citizens of the United States. The anti-smuggling convention bound both Governments to give notification of all shipments by land, sea, or air—an effective bar to supplying arms to Mexican rebels. Its termination opens the way to the lifting of the embargo at any moment. But the best-informed observers think that neither our Administration nor the property-owners whose rights it is urging in Mexico want to see a revolution now, which might render these rights even less secure. Our conviction is that an uprising in Mexico would be against all the best interests of the people of both countries.

The key to the puzzle presented by the summary abrogation of the anti-smuggling arrangement may be found in the fact—unknown to most Americans—that we have no general commercial treaty with Mexico. That is an object which our Government has desired for some years to achieve, and which the Mexican Government always has found reasons to postpone. Under such a treaty, the property interests of Americans in Mexico would be most effectively protected.

Finally, "forged documents" are alleged to have figured in the development of the critical situation between the two countries. These documents, purporting to have been signed by Secretary Kellogg and other Washington authorities, were addressed to President Calles, Ambassador Sheffield, and other officials in

Mexico City. They seemed to indicate an intention to make war in Mexico. As a consequence of an interview between President Calles and George Barr Baker, a former correspondent and American Relief Administration officer, they are now reported to have been proved spurious. It is said that they represented a conspiracy to foment trouble between Mexico and the United States—by whom and to what end is not stated. To these "forged documents"—it is now believed—the notorious "mystery notes" referred. The airing of the whole affair seems to have cleared the way for a new understanding between the Governments.

In the midst of all these confusing events, the average citizen has one duty—as we have urged before—to keep a calm mind and wait for the facts, and so help to form a public opinion in favor of an amicable settlement.

## Evolution and the Bible in Schools

**R**AILLERY may be an effective weapon in debate if it is used with restraint and skill; but it may be as dangerous to the user as to his opponent, and may easily degenerate into ridicule and derision. It may be effective in winning a local or temporary advantage, or in turning a flank by surprise, or in securing a breathing spell in a long conflict; but it is no substitute for reason in winning an opponent's consent. Against deliberate sham it may win a campaign; but against honest convictions, however erroneous, its effect is not lasting.

For the purpose of killing a bill in the Missouri House of Representatives under circumstances that might have allowed the bill to go through by default such raillery as is described by Mr. Fraser in this issue probably served. Even in that case, however, the sober and reasonable statement by 180 members of the Faculty of Washington University in St. Louis was probably quite as effective. At best what was accomplished was simply the postponement of a discussion that must be settled fundamentally if anti-evolution bills are not to crop up in legislatures indefinitely.

That discussion must take into account certain facts which have been too generally ignored by those who deplore and resist the campaign to suppress the study of evolution in the schools.

Foremost in this discussion must be put the consideration of what constitutes good teaching. It is often assumed in all this discussion that the business

of the teacher is to supply the pupil with a body of ready-prepared facts and to insist that the pupil accept from the teacher certain definite conclusions and opinions. It is assumed, for instance, that teaching evolution means that the teacher should require his pupils to accept certain theories on his say. That there is this misconception of teaching on the part of so-called evolutionists as well as on the part of so-called anti-evolutionists is evident from what appears in books that are used as textbooks in some schools. The real purpose of a teacher should be to establish in his pupils the habit of learning facts for themselves and building up their own conclusions and opinions. Dogmatism in teaching is one of the roots of this controversy; and it cannot be got rid of on the one side until it is got rid of on the other. Those who come into court against the anti-evolution bills as the products of dogma must come with clean hands.

Then, too, in this discussion it would be well to remember that the effort to suppress the teaching of evolution in the schools has not been the first effort against the freedom of teaching. For years there has been carried on a campaign against the teaching of the Bible in the schools. Several States have laws which prevent the use of the Bible in schools supported by public money. By such laws unnumbered children have been barred from acquaintance with one of the great literatures of mankind. They have been permitted to get acquainted with every literature except that of the ancient Hebrew people. More than that, they have been shut out from a study of what is generally regarded as the greatest of English classics. "Consider the great historical fact," says T. H. Huxley, who certainly had no prejudices in favor of ecclesiasticism, "that, for three centuries, this Book has been woven into the life of all that is best and noblest in English history; . . . that it is written in the noblest and purest English and abounds in exquisite beauties of mere literary form; and, finally, that it forbids the veriest hind, who never left his village, to be ignorant of the existence of other countries and other civilizations and of a great past, stretching back to the furthest limits of the oldest nations of the world. By the study of what other book could children be so much humanized?" Those who, in the face of the so-called anti-evolutionists, are urging the freedom of teaching in the interest of science cannot afford to make exceptions of literature and history if they are going to win their own cause.