

## ENGLISH DIPLOMACY AND THE FUTURE OF THE "HUNS."

BY THE EDITOR.

THE main question of the present war in the beginning was whether the Slav or the Teuton is to be the leader in Europe. The Teuton holds the most dangerous position in the middle of the continent. He was the guardian of civilization and Christianity during the Middle Ages ever since Charlemagne was crowned emperor at Rome in 800, and for a full thousand years down to modern times, when Napoleon I broke to pieces the German-Roman empire (*das heilige römische Reich deutscher Nation*) and established a new order of things by crowning himself Emperor of the French.

If Napoleon had but understood the needs of the times and had founded a European empire, if he had not trodden underfoot the rights of the conquered but had raised them to the equality of a free and humane alliance, he might have succeeded and his empire might still be standing. He could have counted on the support of the Germans (for they have always been cosmopolitan) to join him in founding an empire of the United States of Europe which would finally expand into a confederacy of all mankind. But his egotism was boundless, his genius was very onesided, and his greatness was limited to an extraordinary talent for strategical cleverness while he regarded broad humanitarian ideals as farcical. This and this alone is the reason for his final doom. He forced Germany to resist, and she asserted herself, rose against his tyranny and abandoned her cosmopolitan tendencies. He was defeated and England reaped the benefit, remaining in undisturbed possession of the seas and of the most valuable territories of the world.

Russia is truly England's most dangerous enemy. Russia is a menace to China, Tibet, Persia and also India. She is moving slowly but surely, and England set Japan against the growling bear. Japan was victorious and England felt relieved; she ceased to fear

Russia. But in the meantime her former ally of Waterloo has grown. Germany has become united, and her expansion not only in the peaceful arts and sciences but also in commerce and in military efficiency has developed in an unparalleled degree. England has come to believe that Germany is a much more dangerous rival than Russia, and so in the struggle between Slav and Teuton she steps in and throws her influence against Germany on the side of Russia.

This move of England's may have been smart from the standpoint of the ruling oligarchy of England; but from the standpoint of progress and of the future of mankind it was not wise to side with the most reactionary power of the world, with Muscovite autocracy, against the most advanced and most progressive nation of the world. It was a shrewd enough plan to attempt to crush the most progressive people so as to remain in the lead, but it was a wrong policy to profit by ruining a rival instead of outstripping him by doing better than he, by excelling his virtues, by learning from him and advancing beyond him. That is what England ought to have done to win a real and effective victory. But that would have meant labor, and education, and it would have meant an advance of the English people by means which would not have suited the English oligarchy. It would have necessitated the spreading of knowledge among the middle classes and enabling them to take a share in the administration of affairs.

The English middle classes, the yeomen as they are called, are a sturdy race; they are still the backbone of the country but they are kept in ignorance. They are not given a due chance to develop their abilities to the utmost; they are meant to be, and to be kept, subservient and to sacrifice themselves for their country, but not to share in the advantages of the aristocracy. At present the yeomen are satisfied with believing that they are the freest people in the world. So long as they have this conviction and can be kept in ignorance they are easy to rule, and the English oligarchy can be maintained to the disadvantage of the yeomanry.

The British empire resembles the constitution of Russia much more than is generally believed. Dean Burgess<sup>1</sup> contrasts the sham liberty of the former to the real liberty of the German empire speaking of Great Britain as "the system of the colonial empire, with its upper ten thousand rolling in wealth, splendor and luxury, and its hundreds of thousands, nay millions, groveling in ignorance, want, misery and crime; with its grip upon a quarter of the earth's land surface and a quarter of mankind of all races and colors as

<sup>1</sup> In his recent book *The European War*, p. 110.

its subjects; with its continual territorial expansion through intrigue, war and bloodshed; with its sovereignty over the high seas and a vast naval power to sustain it."

The English oligarchy saw the danger which threatened not so much the English people as the British government. England boasts of being the freest land in the world, but it is only a few representatives of the English nobility who reap the harvests of British power. The crafty Sir Edward and his helpers saw that Germany was steadily gaining in peaceful competition, and so they came to the conclusion that Germany should be crushed by an anti-German alliance of the most powerful nations of Europe, if possible of the world. Russia is dangerous to Great Britain as a competitor in land-grabbing, but Germany *even more so* because of her superiority in education, in liberal institutions and in a general advance, all of which makes her more efficient in both peace and war.

For this reason British diplomacy sided with the Slav against Teutonic civilization, and I repeat that it was a grievous mistake in English policy, although it was a clever trick of the English oligarchy now in power. The leaders of the aristocratic portion of England, led first by King Edward VII and after his death by his clever disciple, Sir Edward Grey, took advantage of the European embroglio and supported the Slav who was deemed too slow and ignorant ever to become dangerous to England.

The Germans are the most advanced people and they are more progressive than any other nation, neither Great Britain nor the United States of America excepted. History teaches us that such a nation, a nation that represents the advance of mankind, stands under the special protection of God, the God of history, and it is not advisable to fight against the Almighty.

Persia was a remarkable nation, small but vigorous, the only one of Aryan stock among the numerous Semites of Hither Asia. She conquered Babylonia, Lydia and Egypt, and founded a world empire of unlimited possibilities extending from the Mediterranean Sea to the Indies, from the inhospitable steppes of the Scythian savages in the north to the barbaric black Abyssinians in the dreary south. But when the Persian kings decided to punish the little people of Greece for being progressive, independent, courageous, and intellectually superior, they undertook a struggle against the God of history who had chosen the Greek nation as the one in which He would reveal the eternal laws of art, of science, of humaneness and of manhood. The Persians brought against Greece

all the hordes of Asia and Africa and outnumbered the Grecian armies more than a hundred to one. Their uncounted wealth was inexhaustible compared with the simplicity of Greek life. Millions of Asiatic soldiers invaded Greece and forced their entrance at Thermopylae; they burned Athens and there was no resistance against their well-equipped hosts. But all their warfare was in vain. They fought against the chosen people of God—the elect of the God of history—and the Persian onslaught, so formidable and apparently irresistible, collapsed miserably and hopelessly. Only a few years more than a century and a half had elapsed when Alexander the Great, the representative of Hellas, made an end of the Persian empire and established a new era not only for Asia but for mankind, in which Hellenic civilization dominated the world.

We are the heirs of the Greek spirit; all civilized mankind have accepted Greek modes of thought, and the people who are the Greeks of to-day are the Germans.

There are more instances in history where the advance of mankind has been represented by minorities, where the efficient, the vigorous, the progressive, the God-inspired courageous heroes of the broad cause of mankind were confronted with designing enemies who conjured the greatest powers of the world against them; and it is as if the God of history permitted such combinations against those whom He desires to entrust with the holiest treasures of the future in order to prove them worthy of the great task.

When Frederick II of Prussia had proved his genius, his grit, and his right to existence among the powers of Europe in the first and second Silesian wars, his enemies formed an alliance consisting of Austria, France, Russia, even the Holy Roman Empire itself, and a number of smaller states to crush him. Their motto was *Borussia est delenda*. Prussia was to be wiped off the map of Europe, and Frederick's fate seemed to be sealed according to all human calculations. But the God of history had entrusted to Prussia the leadership of the German nation, and it was the presentiment that Prussia might gain this leadership which produced the venomous hate of the powers that wanted to prevent it. Yet in spite of outnumbering little Prussia with her small but very efficient army again by almost a hundred to one, the allies did not prevail. Quality proved more efficient than quantity, and after a war of seven long years they accepted the inevitable result of the survival of the fittest and allowed historians to call the victor "Frederick the Great."

To-day there is the same presentiment again which makes the Slav and the Latin races feel that Germany has a great future, that at any price her career must be checked; and England who holds the balance of power has come to the conclusion that in her own interest she must help to crush the German upstart before he grows too strong for her. So she joins her old enemies, preferring to take the risk that Russia may take India and become the mistress of Asia, and in taking this risk she plays a significant part in the history of the world. She serves the God of history as the instrument to test Germany's worthiness before the latter country assumes the great task of taking the lead of mankind.

England is misguided but the fault lies entirely with herself. God has sent prophets to announce his plans. Think of Carlyle! But the English did not listen, and Carlyle remained a voice crying in the wilderness. They have rejected their prophet and say, as an English friend of mine lately expressed himself, "Carlyle is antiquated." The English no longer read Carlyle: he should be ignored; he would be radically opposed to Sir Edward Grey, and you know Sir Edward Grey is so clever, so very clever!

There are many more warnings that have come to England, but in order to make them inefficient the Baal priests of Britain have invented a great mass of falsehood about Germany and have systematically spread misrepresentations of her advance as contrasted with the glorious conditions of England, all of which taken together bewilders the English nation and leads them to their doom.

One of the Baal priests of English diplomacy is Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. He defends the British position and denounces Germany as barbarous and iniquitous in an article contributed to the *London Chronicle* under the title: "A Policy of Murder. How Prussia has Degraded the Standard of Modern Warfare." He has been answered most decisively and his false charges against Germany have been most convincingly refuted by the American war correspondent James O'Donnell Bennett. But will the English read the other side? Probably not. They continue to repeat unvarnished news, they overlook the testimony of their own people favorable to the Germans and of impartial observers. Mr. Bennett concludes his article thus:

"My testimony is the testimony of an American who loves England and who has not a drop of German blood in his veins. What things I have seen I have here set down because I believe that what raises the man of my calling above the level of a scribbler is the telling of the truth."

One of the symptoms that England will lose in this conflict is the fact that it is the policy of her diplomats and of the defenders of her cause to suppress the truth. The victor, and the one who deserves to be victorious, never suppresses the truth and scorns to use the lie as a weapon. The British diplomats however have established a strict censorship and set great hopes on the efficacy of wrong reports and misrepresentations. There are a few men in England with backbone who speak out boldly and criticize their government, but they are unpopular at home, and the truth they have to tell is resented. We mention the best of them when speaking of Professor Conybeare of Oxford, the Hon. Bertrand Russell of Cambridge, J. Ramsay Macdonald; and we must not forget Mr. Aleister Crowley who has sent a circular to his friends in which he castigates English hypocrisy under the title "An Orgy of Cant."

Our American public is very much divided. American manufacturers believe it their inalienable right to assist Great Britain and her allies with war materials and ammunition, and in this they are supported by our present administration.

Why our administration allows the manufacture and exportation of war material is a problem. Is it done in subservience to Great Britain, or in subservience to those millionaires who profit by this iniquitous trade? Or in subservience to both? It is difficult to say. One thing is sure, that if Great Britain succeeds in crushing Germany the next rival to be crushed will be the United States of America; but our administration does not see this although the principle has been pronounced repeatedly and most unequivocally, and the policy of England toward us has always been the same—the same ill-concealed jealousy, or even contempt, the same insidious methods of weakening us or making our republic subservient to the British empire. The United States ought to recognize Germany as her best friend and not assist Great Britain in her attacks on the fatherland. A well-prepared newspaper campaign undertaken in the United States against Germany has distorted the facts regarding our own danger. It is incredible how we can be so blind to the actual state of things, but, says the French proverb, *Qui se fait brebis, le loup le mange*. Those who see deeper understand very well that the German victory in the present war means a defeat of our most dangerous enemy.

The Germans are as much kin to us as the English, and if there is a difference between our relationships with the two it is in favor of the Germans. We have never had a quarrel with Ger-

many, but have had to fight England repeatedly and owe our independence to a war with her. It is noteworthy also that the English people are not in the habit of becoming naturalized in America as readily as other nationalities.

It is true we speak English and most of us speak and read no other language; but that is our disadvantage. We are limited to English reports and the English diplomats find our people gullible enough to credit English reports and imbibe the prejudice which they have against the Germans. Are we so ignorant and feeble-minded that our opinions can be made in England and we adopt them ready-made without critique as if we were still an English dependency?

The great predecessor of the present Kaiser, the hero of the three Silesian wars, unexcelled as a leader in battle and also as a ruler in peace, sent to George Washington a sword of honor to show his sympathy with the new republic and his recognition of its successful founder. When we had a serious difference with England with reference to the Alabama case, in consequence of her sympathies with the southern states, we found an impartial umpire in William I, the first German emperor. Moreover, we are closely related to the German people by ties of blood through many millions of our citizens of German birth and ancestry. But what weighs heavier still is the intellectual connection with the German fatherland whose schools and other institutions we have imitated and at whose universities tens and tens of thousands of spirited Americans have drunk from the fountain of science and philosophy. We owe to England mainly our political institutions and our language, but to Germany we owe at least as much and perhaps considerably more through the influence upon us of German science and industry and humanitarian ideals.

We Americans are sometimes distinguished by a narrowness which in its insularity is otherwise only met with in England and the English colonies; perhaps it is an inheritance which we preserve with reverence for the English nucleus from which we have grown. Such narrowness was evidenced in our objection to allowing a statue of Frederick the Great, a present offered by Emperor William II in remembrance of Frederick's admiration for the great republic in the west, to be set up at Washington simply and solely on the ground that he was a king!

The people who raised this objection forgot that Frederick was a real king and also a great man—a noble man born on the throne as a legitimate heir to a crown, a man who was a better

ruler than many presidents elected into leadership by political art and political artifices. Frederick was among kings what Lincoln was among presidents—a rare exception, and he bears his cognomen "the Great" not merely because he was a great general but because he was noble as a man and efficient as a prince of peace.

Well known is the story of the miller of Potsdam who would not sell his mill, fearlessly relying on the king's sense of justice. He knew the king would not confiscate private property but would submit to the law, for even above the king there was justice and against the king the miller could appeal to the courts, knowing that no Prussian judge would break the law or render an unjust decision merely to curry favor with the king.

We Americans ought to be proud of Frederick's sympathy with us and should remember that he was the king who conceived of kingship not as the right and privilege of ruling his country but as the duty of serving its interests—a principle which he expressed in the sentence, "I am the first servant of the state."

If the kings of England had been like Frederick the Great there would have been no need of an American revolt against the yoke of England, and we would still be an English colony. Why then this objection on our part to erecting a statue of Frederick the Great? Whether or not it is proper to have the statue of a king in Washington depends on our reason for erecting it, and when we refuse to place the effigy of a great man in our capital because he was a king, we forget that he was a king who sympathized with the establishment of a great republic, himself a republican on a throne. We are unwilling to see his statue in a prominent place among those of other great men, because we are too small, too puny, to recognize greatness in a king, in a royal hero, in a crowned sage, who used to eat with his friends at a round table because he desired to be an equal among his guests. Are we afraid that if a man like him lived among us he would robe himself in purple? We need have no fear.

We had a man like Frederick among us, born in the most unpretentious hut; it was Lincoln, our great and noble martyr president, who when confronted with a great crisis had only the one thought—to do his duty, and proposed to resign and surrender his high office if there were any one more capable than himself to assume the responsibility.

We Americans ought to be proud of having had the friendship and esteem of a king like Frederick the Great; we ought to bear in mind that kings who have a lofty conception of kingship like



that proposed by Frederick hailed the birth of our republic at a time when republican institutions on a large scale were still generally regarded as impossible, as positively Utopian, or at best a questionable experiment.

Contrast Frederick's views with the opinion of English noblemen as characterized in the behavior of the English when they robbed and burned the city of Washington in 1814. When they entered the Hall of Representatives in the capitol they proposed to kindle "this democratic rathole" and used the books of the Library of Congress for lighting the flames!

Democracy is a good thing. It means that the people shall govern themselves. But they cannot all be rulers, they cannot all be kings. They must entrust leadership to one, and they call him their president. In a democracy every one has a chance to become president, while in a kingdom the ruler of the people is born and educated for the office of kingship. It remains to be seen which of the two systems is better. There are advantages on both sides. If a democratic president has been elected because he has given evidence that he is fit to rule, a man like Lincoln, he will be the right man in the right place, while a king like Louis XIV whose sole aim was the aggrandizement of his own person is a curse to his country. The main point is that the man who has been entrusted with the leadership of his people—whether by birth and good fortune or by political conditions or ability—should prove both efficient and conscientious in the administration of his high office; and since the Great Elector of Brandenburg it has been a deeply-rooted conviction in the Hohenzollern family that duty comes first and all the privileges of rulership exist merely in order to make a thorough performance of duty possible.

The ascent of the Hohenzollern family from the time when they are first mentioned in history as counts, to prince-electors, then to kings and finally to emperors, is not accidental but is based upon the serious spirit of the men themselves and their noble traditions faithfully preserved from generation to generation.

Frederick the Great was the most distinguished among them, but even such weak and narrow-minded monarchs as Kings Frederick William II and III had their redeeming features and though lacking in judgment and guilty of many blunders, they at least were anxious to do their duty.

It is not the titles that are essential, but the actualities of life. Republics are not preferable to monarchies because they have no kings, but only if they give democratic advantages to the people

so as to enable them to make their influence felt upon the government, to secure liberty to all and equal rights before the law and equal chances to all according to their capabilities. A republic where the president imposes his will upon the people in a dictatorial fashion is certainly worse than even a bad kingdom.

Scholars who have made a special study of historical and social institutions and have compared the actual conditions of the different nations, both republics and monarchies, almost unanimously agree that Germany is the most democratic country in the world and that its institutions deserve imitation everywhere. It is remarkable how even the Socialist party of Germany stood up for the defense of the country and endorsed the policy of the imperial government.

We have always had democratomania with us who would even abrogate the office of the presidency, and it will be remembered that they opposed the proposal to make the eagle the emblem of our nation. They might have been endorsed by a democratic majority, had not their childish narrowness been brought to ridicule by a sarcastic wit who, granting that the eagle was a bird of prey and as the emblem of royal power might be objectionable, suggested that we might choose the goose for our emblem instead since this good and honest household bird was certainly more democratic than a bird of prey and would otherwise prove a convenience, for while a goose would mark our dollars, the gosling would be appropriate on our dimes.

If it is the aim of this country to bring all down to the level of the lowest standard of incompetence we had better publicly justify the method of suppressing recognition of royal genius in our very school-books and praise the goose in preference to the eagle. Was it perhaps in unconscious recognition of this principle that our Populist party is symbolized in its ultra-democratic simple-mindedness by the goose, as the Republicans are pictured as the pompous elephant and the Democrats as the braying donkey?

We Americans with our democratic ideals are pretty simple-minded in our comprehension of the essential significance of our aim, and we have been most easily duped by cunning methods of misleading our judgment.

English diplomacy is the craftiest of all. The English understand how to pit other powers against each other and thereby to hold the balance of power in their own hands. They gained control of India mainly by making Indian rajas fight among themselves, finally to submit to British rule as an acceptable yoke of leisure

and security, preferable to those who love pleasure more than independence. English diplomacy has succeeded in building up an enormous empire and in gaining unlimited wealth which, however, remains in the hands of the few, while the large masses of the English people are kept under the illusion that in spite of the abject poverty and ignorance of London's East End and the poor all over the country, they are the freest people on the face of the earth.

The English aristocracy is so entrenched in traditional rights as to be quite secure in their possessions, and their well-devised plans anticipate any dangers that might threaten to arise. The British empire was menaced by France under Napoleon I, and in more recent times by French enterprise in building the Suez Canal and soon afterward again by the French advance in the interior of Africa up to Fashoda, but English diplomacy overcame these obstacles. At the same time Russia's power was growing and it seemed probable that Russia would become master of Asia by taking Constantinople at the western end of this large continent and by invading Japan at its farthest eastern extremity. It seemed as if the conquest of Tibet, of Persia, of Afghanistan and finally of India was inevitable and merely a question of time to be delayed but unavoidable.

A third danger, however, loomed up on the horizon, and that was the unparalleled growth of Germany. Were the English diplomats right in deeming this danger the greatest of all? Whether they were right or not, they acted on the principle that in comparison to the dangers implied by the growth of Germany the dangers of France and Russia were insignificant, and that it would therefore be wiser to crush Germany first and deal with the other rivals afterwards.

It seems true that the German danger was indeed more threatening than all others. The German empire has become a new factor in history. The Germans have become leaders in the sciences and arts, and their industry in times of peace has slowly but with systematic certainty overtaken England. Against such a nation there is only one remedy: it must be crushed. Here is a people among whom education has reached the highest level hitherto attained, and liberty has become the dominant feature of its political institutions. The increasing wealth of Germany is more evenly and justly distributed through all the classes than anywhere else, the republican commonwealths of Switzerland (the freest of all), France and the United States not excepted, and a peaceful competition with Germany could be successful only if England would

adopt German methods by spreading the benefits of education and giving the poor an opportunity to rise higher, to assert themselves in a legitimate and orderly way, and to improve their conditions without resorting to revolution—at any rate to insure them against the dire fate of wretched poverty or destitution.

This method was not acceptable to the English oligarchy and so there was only one way of competing with Germany successfully—war. Germany has taken a step forward in the development of mankind by becoming democratic not in name but in fact, by raising science to its proper place in social arrangements and by encouraging all to join in the general advance and share in its benefits. Our English diplomats shirked a step which would rob the aristocracy of some of their privileges and democratize the British empire. They preferred therefore the other course which aimed at the elimination of this unwelcome rival. To obviate the danger of German competition in peace was impossible; in peaceful pursuits the Germans were winning, and every peaceful year of further development showed them farther and farther ahead of English industry and commerce.

But how destroy Germany's industry and her power with the least risk before they could outgrow Great Britain? English diplomacy makes other nations fight for Great Britain. So Russia and France were engaged to attack Germany and do the work. This is the meaning of the Triple Entente, and British diplomacy was successful in hypnotizing both the Gallic republic and the autocracy of the Czar.

The principle that Germany must be crushed was first pronounced in the much discussed articles of the London *Saturday Review*, "*Germania est delenda.*" Russia and France could be pushed aside and duped by diplomatic tricks; they were dangerous, but not to be feared since they could be manipulated. But Germany's advance appeared somehow and in a mysterious way uncanny even to England's keenest diplomat, and the danger could only be averted if Germany were crushed.

The result of this logic was the Triple Entente, and thus Germany came to be surrounded by enemies strong enough to break her power forever. There is only one flaw in the logic of the Triple Entente. It overlooks the fact that although quantity is an important item in calculation, quality should not be forgotten. Quantity, which means superiority in numbers, is on the side of the Allies, but quality is in favor of the Germans; and it would not

be for the first time in history if quality proved more important than quantity.

More than any previous conflict in the history of the world this great conflagration is a war of diplomacy, or, to state the fact more boldly, a war of intrigues; and the question for us neutrals is and will be whether or not we shall be sufficiently sagacious to understand the situation at the critical moment which will turn up in the progress of events. There was the terrible disaster of the *Lusitania* with its terrific loss of lives, among them one hundred and odd Americans; there is the protest of the Washington administration against Germany's submarine warfare; there is a disturbance of neutral traffic on the seas by the English policy of cutting off Germany's trade with the world; and I am sorry to add, America finds it profitable to furnish enormous quantities of war material to the Allies. Our witty orator (who happened at the time to be our Secretary of State) declared that if we did not furnish England and her allies with war material we would be guilty of a breach of neutrality.

There were two boys wrangling and a third boy stood by and handed one of them a knife, and then he said in excuse of his action, "It would have been unfair (or unneutral) if I had not handed that boy a knife for he just needed it in order to stab the other."

The Germans—it must be said to their honor—are poor diplomats. They have proved even unwisely outspoken and act on the principle that honest truthfulness is the best policy. Will they win in the long run in spite of their lack of diplomacy? It almost seems so.

English diplomacy has utilized the circumstances of the Servian conflict by promising Russia her assistance against Austria-Hungary and Germany. The Russians would not have dared to begin the war alone or merely with the assistance of France, and so England prompted the war. And in this war the Russians imagine that Great Britain is fighting for Russia, and the English believe that the Russians are fighting for the English cause and trust to their successful diplomacy for protection against Russia.

France has suffered severely by English diplomacy, but English diplomacy has succeeded in enlisting her interest with Great Britain against Germany only by utilizing the French cry of revenge for Alsace and Lorraine.

It would have been in Italy's own interest to remain a faithful member of the Triple Alliance, but English diplomacy has

succeeded by hook or crook in persuading the Italian ministers to join the allies in support of England, France and Russia. Rumania will probably follow suit, and the question is whether the United States will continue to support the Triple Entente by continuing its manufacture of war material, or will even declare war against Germany. English diplomacy is certainly artful, and what will be the result among us? Let us hope that we cannot be so easily lured as Italy.

And what will be the end of the war?

It is not advisable to indulge in prophecy, but I shall venture to express my opinion freely. If we read history in the light of the truth that the development of mankind follows eternal laws, we see in the present struggle the oft-repeated attempt of reactionary powers to crush the rising progress and to prevent the growth of mankind. The same kind of intrigue as often before has once more arrayed a world against a people who are the most advanced and therefore the most dangerous community in the world, most efficient in peace and in war. Before they can enter upon their inheritance they must be destroyed, lest the future be theirs and Great Britain be dislodged from her snug position where she rules the seas and exercises her profitable benevolent dominion over the world.

I will prophecy without hesitation that England will meet her Waterloo. She has been declining for some time under the domination of a very narrow-minded egotistical oligarchy, and if she is defeated the result may after all be beneficial to the English people.

There is enough strength left in the English commoners, but it remains to be seen whether they will assert themselves when their clever masters are overthrown. It is to be hoped that in the future men like Sir Edward Grey will find it impossible to drag England into a disastrous war simply because it seemed the best means to preserve the oligarchy and its privileges.

What will become of Germany?

The Allies will not succeed in conquering her; and even if she should be defeated she will rise again and again from her humiliation, until finally she will be triumphant, not to dominate over the rest of mankind, but to lead the other nations on the paths of progress onward and upward.

At the end of the war Germany will, if at all possible, restore Poland and make of it an allied kingdom with a common tariff, and also a military confederate. She may restore Belgium, give part of it to Luxemburg and let the northern and western portions be rehabilitated as the duchy of Flanders with her own old Flemish;

speech. It is to be hoped that the Baltic provinces and also Finland will become independent and that in a more distant future all the states of central Europe may see fit to form an alliance for the purpose of a common tariff system and as a confederation in arms. This would embrace the northern states, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, also Holland and Switzerland. Austria-Hungary will probably join, and the result would be a condition of well-assured peace establishing also the principles of the freedom of the seas.