

The Open Court

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science, and the
Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea

Founded by EDWARD C. HEGLER.

VOL. XXXI (No. 2)

FEBRUARY, 1917

NO. 729

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
<i>Frontispiece. The Flying Dutchman. Painted by MARY BASSETT.</i>	
<i>The Beiliss-Trial Government: The Russian Autocracy and Its Dupes.</i>	
ARMINIUS	65
<i>An American Judgment of Germany's Cause. JOSEPH W. PENNYPACKER . . .</i>	89
<i>From Zamboanga to Singapore (Illustrated). A. M. REESE</i>	97
<i>German Contributions to Our National Achievement. ALBERT GEHRING . . .</i>	109
<i>Anglo-Saxon and Teuton. PAUL CARUS</i>	117
<i>The Strife Between Nations and Its Morality. S. HONAGA</i>	119
<i>Straws in the Wind. PAUL CARUS</i>	122
<i>"British Failure." PAUL CARUS</i>	124
<i>Disposing of the Hyphenates. MEDICUS</i>	126
<i>Book Reviews and Notes</i>	128

The Open Court Publishing Company

CHICAGO

Per copy, 10 cents (sixpence). *Yearly, \$1.00 (in the U.P.U., 5s. 6d.).

Entered as Second-Class Matter March 26, 1897, at the Post Office at Chicago, Ill., under Act of March 3, 1879
Copyright by The Open Court Publishing Company, 1917

England's legalized piracy in the present war is well set forth in a pamphlet entitled—

AMERICAN RIGHTS AND BRITISH PRETENSIONS ON THE SEAS

The Facts and Documents, Official and Other, bearing upon the Present Attitude of Great Britain toward the Commerce of the United States. Compiled with introductory memoranda, by William Bayard Hale. Price, \$1.00.

"The Government of Great Britain has virtually set up in the midst of the busy seas an arbitrary court, claiming unheard-of powers and exercising the most tyrannous police functions; seizing and haling into the dock as suspects all travelers upon the ocean highways, and visiting many of them with heavy penalties for unproven, and indeed unprovable, offenses. This lawless assizes of the seas, contemptuous alike of its own precedents and of the rights of others, scarcely stoops to the pretense of citing authority for its actions, which are determined solely by its brutal will, and enforced, though indeed largely through intimidation, by the gigantic power of its naval police. The extent of the earth's surface over which this extraordinary court is permitted to wield its self-arrogated jurisdiction, the magnitude of the interests which its actions vitally affect, and the supineness with which sovereign states submit to the erection, upon the ruins of their self-respect and the debacle of their highest commercial and political interests, of an island's municipal statutes into international formulas, unite to render this one of the spectacles of history."—*Preface.*

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY

122 South Michigan Ave., Chicago, Ill.

THE NORTH SEA

By Howard Mumford Jones German-English Text, \$1.00

Heine's poem on "The North Sea" is made the basis of a splendid study of sea poetry using the untamed North Ocean as the background.

[Howard Mumford Jones is now head of the school of general literature of the University of Texas. He took his M. A. at Chicago U. of C. in 1915. He is a graduate of the University of Wisconsin and his home is in that state. He was chosen to write the ode celebrating the quarter-centennial of the University of Chicago in June, 1916; the ode has been privately printed. He is the author of a booklet of verse, and of contributions to various magazines—Poetry, The Forum, Contemporary Verse. He is much interested in the problem of getting foreign literatures before the college students and general public in good translations.

The Open Court Publishing Company

122 South Michigan Avenue

Chicago, Ill.





THE FLYING DUTCHMAN.
Painted by Mary Bassett.

Frontispiece to The Open Court.

THE OPEN COURT

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science, and
the Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea.

VOL. XXXI (No. 2)

FEBRUARY, 1917

NO. 729

Copyright by The Open Court Publishing Company, 1917

THE BELISS-TRIAL GOVERNMENT.

THE RUSSIAN AUTOCRACY AND ITS DUPES.

BY ARMINIUS.

Who Planned the War?

HOW comes it that Germany is short of nickel, copper, rubber, cotton, condensed milk, and that her colonies were almost without ammunition, when our wiseacres tell us that she has been planning this war for years, in order to gain world dominion? On the part of the uninformed, that accusation is simply another illustration of the well-known propensity of ignorance to jump at conclusions; on the part of those who know the facts, it has to be described by an uglier name.

"The great German aeroplane factory, the *Deutsche Flugzeug-Werke*," writes Bertram Williams in the *Scientific American* of November 4, 1916, "had for some months previous to the war been turning out fast biplanes for the British navy at a branch factory on English soil—surely a potent argument, one would think, against those who say Germany wanted war."

"We have the records of German imports," wrote the British trade papers toward the end of 1914, "and we have the records of exports to Germany from other countries. None of them in recent years show unusual quantities of nickel, copper, rubber or cotton. It is certain, therefore, that Germany has at best no more than a year's supply of these articles, so indispensable for modern military equipment. That means"—they added triumphantly—"that she can not hold out more than a year."

In other words, the British government knew that Germany

had not been planning the war. Why, then, was the assertion made? Was it because "all things are fair in love and war?"

Quite different is the case of Russia. Readers of trade journals are well aware that during 1913 and 1914 Russian industry suffered from a shortage of coal, because the Ministry of Transportation, as early as November 1912, ordered the accumulation of immense stores of coal at the railway depots. It is plain as day now that these were intended for mobilization, in order to seize Constantinople, that is to say, world dominion.

The Growing Shadow.

For Americans, with no strong neighbor within 3000 miles, it is difficult to imagine the situation of Germany, not as large as Texas, alongside of Russia, three times as large as the United States. The population of Germany is 67 millions, increasing at the rate of 800,000 a year; that of Russia is 170 millions, increasing at the rate of 3 millions a year. Germany's increase must soon cease for lack of land; Russia has enough land to keep up her increase for centuries. One of the staple features of German newspapers is a table showing how soon Russia will have 3 times, 4 times, 5 times, 6 times the population of Germany. A hint from Petrograd to Berlin will then be a command. Germany will be Russia's vassal. The Russian ambassador at Berlin will occupy the same position as the British diplomatic agent in Egypt. How would Americans feel in a similar situation?

The prospect would be less appalling if the Russian government were as enlightened, well-meaning, honest, progressive, as that of Germany. Look at these adjectives and see how ludicrous they appear when applied to the Russian government. It is to be hoped that some at least of those Britons and Americans who since the outbreak of the war have been hailing the Russian government with "Hosanna!" may be capable of a twinge of shame on recalling that only nine months before the war they were shouting "Crucify him!" The candid reader, wishing to gain a true idea of the Russian government, can do nothing better than go to the nearest library and consult the British and American periodicals of the year before the war, when they were filled with comments on the Beiliss trial, ended November 11, 1913. By their fruits ye shall know them. The apple-tree gets its name from the apple, the cherry-tree from the cherry. If the Russian government is to be named after its most characteristic fruit, it may well be called the Beiliss-trial gov-

ernment. It may be useful to recall the leading facts of that famous trial.

The Beiliss Trial.

Chronic riots and assassinations had proved that the revolution had not been quenched in 1905 but was still smouldering. The murder of a Christian boy at Kiev in March 1911 afforded a welcome opportunity for the autocracy to resort to its customary trick of occupying the popular passion with its favorite subject. Mendel Beiliss, a Jew, was arrested and charged with having murdered the boy "for ritual purposes." For two years and a half he was kept in prison, while the authorities were trying to find evidence against him. The whole civilized world rang with protest against this revival of a medieval myth for the purpose of inflaming the fanatic rabble against an innocent people. Conspicuous among the protests were those of the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Liverpool, London, Glasgow, and Dublin, the International Congress of Orientalists, the International Medical Congress, and many other associations, besides thousands of the world's most distinguished scholars and statesmen in Germany, France, England and the United States. Alarmed at being thus placed in the limelight, and unable to find the desired evidence, the local authorities were anxious to drop the prosecution and set Beiliss at liberty, but were restrained by orders from Petrograd, issued, it is said, by command of the Czar himself. The former chief of the secret police at Kiev, who conducted an independent investigation and came near discovering the real perpetrators and laying bare their motives, was suspended from office, tried on some pretended charges and imprisoned—a fact which plainly suggests that the crime was committed by government agents, in such a fashion as to indicate a ritual murder, for the deliberate purpose of providing a ritual murder trial to inflame the populace. The trial began on October 8, 1913, and then for the first time Beiliss was allowed to confer privately with his lawyers. Under cross-examination the children who were made to testify against him confessed that they had been coached by detectives. On November 11 he was acquitted, but the questions which the jury had to answer were so arranged as to make it appear that there was such a thing as ritual murder. The autocracy had attained its aim, for the result of the trial was a series of antisemitic outbreaks, sufficient to occupy public attention while the fetters were being tightened on the limbs of liberty.

Look here upon this picture, and on this!

Such is the character of the government which covets Constantinople as the short-cut to world dominion, especially dominion over Germany. Consider now the character of the nation whom this government is trying to reduce to servitude. In Germany, illiteracy is practically zero; in Russia it is 69 per cent. The German governments have actually forced their people to become educated; in Russia a Minister of Education not long ago had the hardihood to say in public that "it is not good for the people to become educated." Why? Because the illiterate army is the only prop of the autocracy, which will be lost if the army becomes educated. Think of German universities overshadowed by such a government! According to recent dispatches, the Russian Imperial Council is contemplating a law to make education compulsory—ten years hence. Why did they wait till forced by the war? And how effective will that law be if the autocracy wins in this war? Germany is a true democracy, the Reichstag being elected by manhood suffrage and secret ballot. It will be remembered that King William I, being called to the headship of the reunited German nation in 1870, actually balked at the name Kaiser, preferring to be called "President of the German Confederation," till Bismarck pointed out to him that the title Kaiser, with its associations of past union and glory, would be the strongest bond of union among the people, at a time when such a bond was sorely needed. The present Kaiser never wearies of repeating the maxim of his ancestor, Frederick the Great: "I am only the first servant of the State and of my people." The Duma of Russia, on the other hand, is simply the puppet of the autocracy, dangled before the people's eyes to keep them quiet. In Germany there is freedom of speech and of the press; Russia has a rigid censorship. In Germany there is hardly a hamlet but has a good macadamized road; in Russia there are large cities without pavement. Germany is the birthplace of those rural credit associations which have lifted the farmer from penury to security; Russia until 1908 had no law under which these associations could be organized, and even now that immense empire, three times as large as the United States, has only 790. The German taxpayer gets most for his money; the Russian taxpayer gets least. Graft is unknown in Germany; in Russia it is supreme. An American consul in Russia, wishing to show that Germany is not so greatly superior to Russia, very innocently puts his finger on the vital spot. "Look at the theaters in Petrograd and Moscow; they

are fitted out with a magnificence unequalled anywhere. In dancing, Russia leads the world." Alas, that is where the taxpayers' money goes! The people are left without schools, without roads, often without food, that titled rakes may revel! And this is the government which has the sympathy of the American press—the press which is forever quoting Lincoln's "government of the people, by the people and for the people!"

"Government by experts" is the term by which the writer in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* defines the German government. If he had cared to be more precise, he would have said that Germany is ruled by the University of Berlin, the foremost educational and scientific institution in the world, representing the quintessence of the 67 millions of the best-educated nation. The influence of the daily contact between the legislators and this body of concentrated intelligence may be imagined, while the 9000 students, gaining an insight into national problems by the daily witness of eye and ear, become on their return to the provinces so many missionaries of enlightened legislation. We have something similar in Wisconsin, the most progressive state in the Union; but Congress, our national legislature, strangely enough, has hitherto been denied the incalculable assistance it would derive from a great national university at Washington, attracting the highest intelligence not only of this country but of the world. The Russian government, on the other hand, is constantly at daggers' points with the universities of Petrograd and Moscow, constantly suspending them, and would have abolished them long ago, if it could be done without paralyzing the economic life of the empire.

Brain Against Muscle.

No wonder that the prospect of becoming the vassal of the Beiliss-trial government seems a ghastly horror to the German people. To stave off the disaster till western Europe could be persuaded to unite against the common peril, there was only one means: the most thorough organization. That is the secret of the wonderful governmental machinery which the war has brought to light. Necessity was the mother of invention. Think of it for a moment and you will see what an infamous lie it is to assert that this preparation was meant for aggression and world-dominion, not for the cruel necessity of defense. The case is so plain that one can only wonder how grown people could fail to see what any child ought to be able to see without being told. Hemmed in between an unresigned

neighbor lamenting the past supremacy, on the west, and an enormous, fast-growing, despotic, irresponsible power, on the east, with no ally on whom she could safely rely, the German democracy had no choice but to strain every resource of intellect to make the most of her scanty material resources. Other nations, with abundance of land, and no overwhelming enemy near, could afford to be prodigal of their time and labor; Germany, with only 208,780 square miles, overshadowed by a power owning nine million square miles, had to make sure that every stroke should produce the maximum effect. In this way the German social machine, the most wonderful, most beautiful work of art of all the ages, was developed. Americans twenty years hence will hang their heads in shame on remembering that this wonderful work, by which the resources of a nation of 67 millions with 208,780 square miles were made to balance the resources of two nations of 215 millions with 10 million square miles, were regarded by the majority of the American press not as a heroic work of defense but as proof of wicked designs of conquest. Deeper yet will grow their shame when they recall the endless cargoes of ammunition which for filthy purposes of gain they supplied to those who attempted to smash the finest temple ever built. "Free Americans," some future historian will say, "secure between two vast oceans, beheld the superhuman effort of another free, educated nation to maintain its freedom against an overwhelming despotic power, growing daily more overwhelming, a huge mass of illiterates, deliberately kept illiterate by their government. And that superhuman effort was described by free Americans as Prussian militarism, and every effort short of actual warfare was made by them to perpetuate and extend the despot's power. And when the despot, in order to fasten his yoke more securely on the necks of free nations, laid claim to Constantinople, a city which had never been Russian, which to-day is inhabited solely by Turks, Greeks and Armenians, with not a single Russian—free Americans called the claim just. In all history it would be hard to find a case of more profound mental blindness."

Befogged Contemporaries.

How hard it is to view contemporary events in their true light, is strikingly shown in a recent article by Brander Matthews in the *New York Times*. To illustrate the blind hatred felt for Thomas Jefferson by his political enemies, Professor Matthews quotes from a poem, "The Embargo," written by William Cullen Bryant when he was only 13 years of age, and published in 1808.

“And thou, the scorn of every patriot’s name,
Thy country’s ruin and thy council’s shame!
Poor servile thing! Derision of the brave!
Who erst from Tarleton fled to Carter’s cave;
Thou, who when menaced by perfidious Gaul,
Didst prostrate to her whiskered minions fall;
And when our cash her empty bags supplied,
Didst meanly strive the foul disgrace to hide.”

Bryant, arrived at maturity, might soothe his own shame by the plea of boyish ignorance; but the adults from whom he learned those sentiments, if accessible to shame, must surely have called on the mountains to fall on them and the hills to cover them, when time had revealed the true character of the man they had reviled. When time shall have revealed the true character of the present contest, Germany’s revilers will have difficulty in finding a hole deep enough to hide their shame.

A Modern Isocrates.

However, the German leaders well knew that even the utmost education and organization could not in the long run avail against numbers. Their only hope of final safety lay in an alliance with those nations whose interests were identical with Germany’s, but which, having acquired the habit of considering themselves the chosen people, found it difficult to get accustomed to the idea of looking on Germany as an equal. To Britain, the expansion of Russia is not less menacing than to Germany. Nothing seemed more natural than that these two great Germanic nations should unite for mutual security. This in fact has been the Kaiser’s constant aim for the last 20 years. He never missed an opportunity of reminding Britons and Germans of “our common race,” while his remarks about France were actually characterized in the British press as “fulsome flattery.” That there was a responsive movement in Britain was proved by Mr. Chamberlain, who told Parliament that he had offered an alliance to Germany, but that it had been declined. Probably the conditions offered were such as to block every effort at expansion on the part of Germany and thus convert her into a British dependency, a hewer of wood and drawer of water for the children of Britain.

It was in fact difficult to devise a plan which would unite the two countries on a footing of permanent equality. To Germany the Near East, that is to say, Turkey and Persia, was the only re-

maining sphere of influence, the only "place in the sun," to enable her to remain a great power. Yet if that sphere were conceded to her, it was evident that, with her rapidly expanding industry, commerce and wealth, she would soon have Egypt and India at her mercy. In 1913 and the early part of 1914, especially after Lord Haldane's visit to Berlin, the differences seemed on the point of adjustment. Premier Asquith had declared that Britain had enough land and had no desire to acquire more, and that Germany was at liberty to take what remained. Germany, on the other hand, had practically agreed to a limitation of naval armaments on the basis of British naval supremacy. This very fact of the growing friendliness between Britain and Germany appears to have precipitated the war. To understand this, we must take a look at Russia.

The Dumb, Illiterate Millions.

There is no means of guessing what might be done if we could deal with the Russian people. The present Duma is of course a mere caricature of popular representation. The government which claims to represent the Russian people is in fact their worst enemy. The poor illiterate hordes which are fighting in Galicia are fighting to enable a ring of grafters, fanatics and rakes to perpetuate poverty and illiteracy in Russia—a ring nominally controlled by the Czar, but in reality controlling him. The fact that 790 agricultural cooperative credit associations have sprung up since 1908, when the law for that purpose was at last enacted, under compulsion of defeat in the Japanese war, proves that the Russian people are able and eager to help themselves if the government will let them. Zorndorf, Friedland, Borodino, Sebastopol have shown that in cool courage and tenacity the Russian soldier is unexcelled, and the names of Suvarov and Skobelev prove that the material for good leaders is not lacking. Why have Russian armies made such a wretched showing in the Crimean, Turkish, Japanese wars and in the present war? Because grafters, fanatics and rakes cannot afford to place the control of armies in the hands of able and honest men, but only in the hands of fellow-grafters, fellow-fanatics, fellow-rakes.

The euphonious and astonishingly rich and flexible Russian language is a source of perpetual delight to every one endowed with the slightest linguistic instinct, and suggests the perpetual reflection that the people who developed this language must be of high native quality. What revelations might come to humanity if these 170 millions had the same chance of mental development that Germany's 67 millions have! Russia's apologists point to the great

names in Russian literature — Pushkin, Lermontov, Dostoievsky, Turgeniev, Tolstoy, Gorki—as proof of civilization. The stunning, damning fact is that the works of these men are inaccessible to 69 per cent of their countrymen. Nothing can be sadder than the pictures of peasant life drawn by Turgeniev and Tolstoy—the frequent groan of some great soul staggering hopeless under its load of ignorance and drudgery. The haunting lines of Gray's *Elegy* come to mind:

“Perhaps in this neglected spot is laid
Some heart once pregnant with celestial fire,
Hands that the rod of empire might have swayed,
Or waked to ecstasy the living lyre.

“But knowledge to their eyes her ample page,
Rich with the spoils of time, did ne'er unroll;
Chill penury repressed their noble rage,
And froze the genial current of the soul.

“Full many a gem of purest ray serene
The dark, unfathomed caves of ocean bear;
Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
And waste its sweetness on the desert air.”

And to think that England and France, the great free nations, are doing their best to bolster up a government which deliberately seals up the fountains of knowledge from its own people! To think that free Americans send ammunition to a gang of grafters, fanatics and rakes, to enable them to keep the yoke on the necks of 170 million victims, and to crush the nation which for a hundred years has been the world's teacher, especially Russia's teacher!

Tolstoy tells us that public opinion in Russia is simply the opinion of “the 5000 idle rich.” Certainly in a censor-ridden nation with 69 per cent illiterates and an additional 20 per cent not much better than illiterates, public opinion cannot represent more than a very small fraction of the people. We are told that this public opinion regards the possession of the Bosphorus-Dardanelles as the indispensable condition of Russia's welfare. Some Americans imagine that they show their liberality, breadth of mind and other noble qualities by sympathizing with this supposed Russian demand for a free outlet to the sea. Let us look at the facts.

A People Chastised with Scorpions.

It would be preposterous to say that Russia needs more land. With 9 million square miles, three times the area of the United States, she has land enough for centuries, ample to secure her rank

as a great power forever. Think of it! In 1607, the date of the first English settlement in America, Russia was already in possession of a territory nearly as large as the present United States. The entire United States was then a wilderness; the European part of Russia was dotted with hundreds of cities and towns. Yet to-day (according to the *World Almanac* of 1916, page 327), the wealth of the United States is estimated at 188 billion dollars, that of Russia at 40 billions, compared with Britain's 85 billions, Germany's 80 billions, France's 50 billions. And the government which has failed so miserably to do its duty to its own people, a government which treats 6 millions of its most intelligent subjects, the Jews, as outlaws, a government which would have its hands so full at home if it wished to make up for past sins—such a government wants to dictate to civilized nations, simply because it has a huge multitude of armed illiterates under its control! Having chastised 170 millions with scorpions, it wishes to chastise additional millions. If the German government, with only 208,780 square miles, has brought its people to their present state of prosperity and enlightenment, what would Russia be, with her 9 million square miles, if she had an equally able and honest government! And yet we are told that Russia must expand and Germany shall not!

What the Possession of Constantinople Would Mean.

Russia's demand for a free outlet to the ocean, when candidly examined, is equally preposterous. Through the Black Sea, she has an absolutely free outlet for her commerce, so long as she remains at peace—and she can always remain at peace if she will stop dictating to other nations and simply attend to the needs of her own immense territory, which needs attention so badly. If Britain, France, Germany and the United States become allied, there will be perpetual peace, giving Russia perpetual free access to the ocean. Suppose Russia did gain Constantinople; can any one imagine that a single sack of wheat would ever be sent by rail to Constantinople and thence exported by boat, instead of being shipped from the port of Odessa direct? What fool would substitute 450 miles of costly land transportation for 375 miles of cheap sea transportation?

Evidently Constantinople is demanded not for commercial but for military purposes—to make Russia's overwhelming and fast-growing preponderance still more overwhelming and fast-growing. The distance from Russia to Constantinople is 400 miles on the European side, 700 miles on the Asiatic side. Don't take my word

for it, but take any schoolboy's geography and measure the distances, and then measure the same distances on the map of the United States. You will find that 400 miles is the distance from Washington to Detroit, 700 miles the distance from Washington to St. Louis. All the vast intervening territory, comprising Rumania, Bulgaria, Turkey, soon also Greece and Serbia, would necessarily be Russia's prey if she once got hold of Constantinople, for it would be silly to suppose that the Beiliss-trial government would respect the independence of those countries, when there is nothing but its own mercy and its own promises to prevent it from annexing them. These acquisitions would mean an addition of 50 million people to the scorpion-smitten 170 millions and of a million square miles to the 9 million square miles already comprised in the realm of graft. With a railway extending almost to the Egyptian border, even Turkey is a dangerous neighbor to Egypt. What would Britain's position in Egypt be alongside of a power of 220 millions, controlling the Black Sea and the Ægean!

"We cannot desert the Serbians," said "public opinion" in Russia. Disinterested sympathy indeed! Look into history and you will find that the Serbians time and again sought annexation to Austria, and would have succeeded, had not Russia threatened to mobilize. Up to 1914, crowds of Serbian laborers emigrated every year to the Serbian-speaking lands under the Austrian "yoke," because there they found better wages, better schools, better roads, better medical attendance, more humane treatment. They were only too glad to become Austrian subjects and escape from the clique of regicides which pretends to represent the Serbian nation. The restoration of Poland ought to suggest to Emperor Charles a still more brilliant move with which to inaugurate his reign. Let him unite Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Dalmatia into one autonomous kingdom of Greater Serbia, under a prince of Montenegro, and under Austrian suzerainty—and the entire Serbian army at Monastir will pass over to the Austrians bag and baggage. Similarly, if Rumania were united with Hungary into one kingdom, the remnant of the Rumanian armies would probably help Mackensen to conquer Bessarabia. National unity and autonomy under Austrian suzerainty is all the "reparation" that Serbia and Rumania need, all that they want.

In a word, nothing can be clearer than that the Russian demand for Constantinople and for a preponderant influence in the Balkans is a demand for world dominion. What, then, are we to think of those Americans who see nothing unreasonable in that demand, who

think it quite right that 50 million people should be annexed against their will and made to swell the power of despotism, while these same Americans accuse Germany of planning the conquest of the world, simply because she wrought miracles in the desperate effort to resist the Russian pressure till she could persuade Britain to become her ally! What does the Declaration of Independence mean by "governments, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed?"

Freemen Trying to Enslave Freemen.

History shows numerous cases of sudden delusions seizing upon whole communities, cases in which the evidence of the senses, reason and justice are thrown to the winds, and the wildest and most baseless fancies play havoc with men's minds. Such was the Salem witchcraft delusion of 1692. Such is the strange perversion which holds sway to-day. Americans glorify their ancestors to the skies because in 1776 they drew the sword rather than submit to tyranny; yet when another free nation draws the sword as the last resort against the menace of a more intolerable tyranny, free Americans do their best to help the tyrant to subdue that other free nation. If at the time of our Revolution there had been another republic which, instead of helping us in our struggle against despotism, had furnished arms to the despot, would not the name of that republic be now in the eternal hell of contempt, like that of Benedict Arnold?

Our champions of preparedness point to the war of 1812 and the Civil War as horrible examples of the disastrous results of unpreparedness; yet because Germany, in an infinitely more perilous situation, adopted that much-lauded system of preparedness, without which she would long ago have presented the most horrible example of the results of unpreparedness—these same orators denounce her as the incarnation of militarism, forgetting that Germany's standing army before the war numbered only 810,000 men, while the combined armies of Russia and France numbered 1,970,000. Consistency, thou art a jewel! No nation, situated as Germany was in 1914, could have acted otherwise than Germany did, without branding herself as a coward.

A Tweed Ring at Petrograd.

In reality the demand for more land and for the control of the Bosphorus-Dardanelles and the "independence" of the Balkan states is not the demand of the Russian people but of the ring of grafters,

fanatics and rakes whose interests are bound up with the maintenance of the autocracy. The events of the last forty years have proved to that clique that the days of their power are numbered, unless the people's attention can be diverted from the parasites that suck their blood. One easy method was to rouse the fanaticism, lust and greed of the rabble by hounding them against the Jews, as in the case of Kishenev massacres of 1903 and the "ritual murder" trial of 1913. The alternative method was aggression against other nations, with its prospect of glory and enrichment to the cunning, its appeal to the patriotism of the ignorant. That was the motive of the Manchurian adventure, blocked by Japan. Finding the avenue of expansion closed in the Far East, the grafters in 1907 announced their "renewed interest" in the Near East, that is to say, Constantinople.

Baccarat and the Triple Entente.

For obvious reasons, it has long been a cardinal principle of British policy that Russia must under no circumstances be allowed to take Constantinople. This is one of the few points on which the policies of Britain and France have until recently been in agreement. Of late, however, they have been between the devil and the deep sea. The question has been: Shall Constantinople be controlled by Russia or by Germany? Had Queen Victoria died twenty years earlier or ten years later, Britain would probably have declared in favor of Germany, and the new era of perpetual peace might have been initiated bloodlessly through the voluntary reunion of Germany and her great colony. As it was, Edward VII, as Prince of Wales, finding nothing to do in a harvest-field crying for workers, and growing weary of Tranby Croft and baccarat, sought distraction in Paris and became a bosom friend of various kindred spirits in that gay capital. In that company, of course, he was not likely to imbibe the deepest friendship for Germany, least of all for the Kaiser, whose strongest passion is work. When Edward came to the throne, on January 22, 1901, what a magnificent chance he had, as *persona gratissima* at Paris, to mediate between France and Germany and thus effect the union of civilization under British leadership! Instead of that, the pro-German current started by Chamberlain was quickly reversed; the *entente* with France (signed April 8, 1904) was concluded in an anti-German spirit, and Edward's Parisian friends became the natural mediators between him and the Russian diplomats who shared his fondness for the gay French capital. The result was the Triple Entente (August 31, 1907), conceived in

gaiety, and dedicated to the proposition that the hardest-working, best-educated, most progressive nation must not be allowed to enjoy the fruit of its labor, a place in the sun; that it must be condemned to atrophy in its little flower-pot of 208,780 square miles, while its neighbors sent their roots all over the globe, till they became giants while their victim became a dwarf. Baroness von Suttner, in ecstasy over the "peace pact" of the Anglo-French *entente*, bestowed on its author the title of "Edward the Peacemaker." Were she living now, she would be horrified to find that the title "Edward the War-maker" would have been more appropriate. The British and French partisans of the Triple Entente knew perfectly that their successors, in order to escape from Russian vassalage, would have to seek the aid of the nation whom they were trying to condemn to atrophy. "After us the deluge."

However, any one might see that an artificial creation like this Triple Entente could not long hold out against the pressure of real interests, especially after the death of Edward on May 6, 1910. The Russian grafters knew that, and determined to make hay while the sun was shining. That is the meaning of the immense coal piles at the Russian railway depots in 1913. No sooner in fact was the Triple Entente signed than the French socialists started a vigorous campaign against the unnatural alliance with Czardom and in favor of an understanding with democratic Germany. Mention has already been made of the growing friendliness between Britain and Germany in 1913 and the early part of 1914, culminating in Lord Haldane's visit to Berlin.

The Grafters' High Tide.

Haldane's visit, in fact, seems to have been the spark that set off the powder keg. "Britain is preparing to swing over to Germany," the Russian grafters whispered to one another, "and if she does, she will carry France with her, and we shall be isolated and all hope of gaining Constantinople and world dominion will have to be abandoned. The Russian liberals will eagerly seize on this defeat as a weapon against the autocracy; a revolution like that of 1905 will follow, and a new Duma will sweep away all the privileges now enjoyed by the autocracy and its favorites, at the same time giving equality to Jews and other malcontents. If we hesitate, we are lost. Not only shall we lose all our plunder, but our heads may go with it. Now or never is our chance to seize Constantinople and world dominion, and tenfold opportunities of graft. Britain's suspicions of Germany are still at fever heat, and Haldane will not find it easy

to cool them. If we can find a pretext for striking the blow, Germany will not dare interfere, knowing that an attack on us would bring France and Britain to our aid and involve Germany in a war which would ruin her commerce and expose her people to starvation.

“On such a full sea are we now afloat,
And we must take the current when it serves,
Or lose our ventures.’”

The outcome was the Serbian conspiracy, aiming at the dismemberment of Austria-Hungary, Germany's only reliable ally. In all probability the Russian government, relying on the promise of French and British aid in case of attack by Germany, expected to accomplish its object without actual war. The Russian mobilization did place Germany in the most cruel dilemma. If she attacked at once, she would bring the whole strength of France and Britain down upon her; if she delayed, the Russian mobilization would soon reach a point where resistance would be hopeless. The Russian government probably expected that Germany would shrink from the awful consequences of a sudden break, but would negotiate as Japan had done in 1903. Internal friction would soon convince the Austro-Hungarian government that it was in no shape for war, and without Austro-Hungarian help Germany could not afford to take the field. The backdown of Austria-Hungary and Germany would convince the Balkan states of Russia's omnipotence and make them obedient vassals. A new Balkan confederation, under Russian patronage, would capture Constantinople, and the divided councils of the West would have nothing to do but to take cognizance of an accomplished fact. When the Balkans had become a Russian province, a new propaganda among the remaining Slavs of Austria-Hungary would create a new crisis, and a hint from Russia would suffice to secure the “liberation”—that is to say, the Russification—of these Slavic brothers, as well as of the Hungarians. Germany and Scandinavia would then become dependencies of Russia, giving her “free access” to the Atlantic and world dominion. Since nothing succeeds like success, the triumphant autocracy would be more firmly established than ever; freedom for the Russian people would be relegated to the dim future; repressive laws against the Jews would quickly follow; in fact the autocracy has taken advantage of the turmoil of the war to harass the Jews more than ever. Whoever cares for data on this subject can obtain them from the National Workmen's Committee on Jewish Rights, 175 East Broadway, New York City. The value of the promises of autonomy to Poland may be judged by

the fact that the autocracy is even now engaged in abolishing the autonomy of Finland. A nation whose illiteracy is 69 per cent is trying to "assimilate" a nation whose illiteracy is 1.2 per cent.

They Shall Take Who Have the Power.

That these are not mere speculations is proved by an article by Professor Mitrofanoff in the *Preussische Jahrbücher* for June 1914, to be found, no doubt, in all the leading libraries in the United States. Professor Delbrück, the editor, had asked for an explanation of the violent anti-German campaign which, by permission of the censor, was then raging in the Russian press. Professor Mitrofanoff's reply, on the lines and between them, amounts to this:

"Let the world understand that Russia has made up her mind to take Constantinople and to exercise a preponderant influence in the Balkans. We know perfectly well that this will make her dominant over the globe. Why should that make us hesitate? No nation that had a chance to become dominant ever scrupled to use the necessary means for that purpose. Germany is the main obstacle. We know that the road to Constantinople passes through Berlin. We also know how the subject looks from your standpoint. If we merely wanted to make sure of our future as a great power, we need not acquire another inch of land; our 9 million square miles will afford room for 500 million people without much crowding. We know that the Near East represents your only chance of growth, your only avenue of escape from suffocation. By annexing it, we shall of course convert 67 million Germans into unwilling Russian subjects. We hate to blast your hopes, especially when we consider how much we owe to Germany. But the situation before us is this: Shall we take Constantinople and rule the world, or shall we refrain from taking it and thus allow Germany to remain a great and independent power? Russia has made her choice. She has decided that Germany shall not remain a great and independent power."

No wonder the German people blamed the Kaiser for delaying the declaration of war three days and thus giving their enemies that much more time for preparation. The sudden and overwhelming invasion of Galicia proved that the Russian mobilization had been going on for months. And in this desperate effort of the most honest, most enlightened government on earth to escape from a trap set by a clique of grafters, the American press, with few exceptions, is on the side of the grafters!

Britain's Dilemma.

The resignation of three British cabinet ministers proved that Britain's dilemma was hardly less cruel than that of Germany. We may be sure that Haldane, who recognizes Germany as his "spiritual home," made an ardent plea for neutrality.

"We have no reason to doubt the sincerity of the Germans," he would say, "when they assure us that they have not the slightest design against our empire. Nothing could be more reasonable than their desire to remain a great power. Hence their demand for a free hand in the Near East, their only possible field of expansion. That would be a very modest sphere of influence compared to ours and Russia's. If we thwart them in this modest ambition, we cannot expect that they will be anything else than our consistent enemies, trying to thwart us in return. On the contrary, if we say Amen, they will be our eternal allies, and we shall forever be rid of the Russian nightmare. Between us and Russia we shall then have a buffer that can buff."

"It may be true," somebody would reply, "that the present statesmen of Germany have no evil intention against us, but it is equally true that if they controlled Turkey and Persia, they would have the British empire at their mercy. We need more substantial guarantees than their mere word. Though we own nearly one-fourth of the globe, with 440 million inhabitants, we are in reality not as strong as Germany, with her 67 millions. The total number of white people in the British empire is only 56 millions; our 384 million dusky subjects are a source of weakness to us, in that they require white garrisons to keep them in subjection. Even now, with her limited territory, Germany bids fair to dethrone us from our commercial, industrial and naval supremacy. If she gains control of the Near East, she will have threefold resources, and then our supremacy will be at an end."

"You seem to think," Haldane would insist, "that Germany alone knows the trick of growing, while Britain has forgotten how to grow. Please remember that Canada alone is larger than Europe, and is sure to have 100 million inhabitants fifty years from now; that the same or nearly the same is true of Australia; that in South Africa there is room for another 50 millions. The utmost hopes of Germany can never equal these opportunities. Moreover you seem to think that, if we allow Germany a free hand, she will convert Austria-Hungary, the Balkans, Turkey and Persia into German provinces. Nothing could be farther from the truth. They will be

Germany's faithful allies for defense against Russia, and for no other purpose. So long as we do not support Russia's designs against them, they will not listen to Germany if the latter tries to turn them against us, which is not at all likely. On the contrary, if Germany is beaten, nothing can prevent Turkey and Persia from becoming helpless provinces of Russia, which means that our possession of Egypt and India would soon become nominal, till we were ordered to quit. If Germany wins, we shall not be at her mercy; but even if we were, it is better to be at the mercy of a government responsible to the best-educated nation, our own flesh and blood, willing at any moment to be our ally, than at the mercy of an irresponsible, unprincipled government, controlling an illiterate nation. Let us not forget what Chamberlain said about the Long Spoon. The government which was capable of the deliberate villainy of the Beiliss trial is capable of any villainy. To allow the safety of the British empire to become dependent on the good faith of such a government would be insanity."

"We have not yet reached the point where we must be at the mercy of anybody," would be the reply. "Suppose we help the Russians and French to beat the Germans. The Russians would doubtless wish to crush them completely, but neither we nor the French would allow it. If afterward we had trouble with the Russians, both the French and the Germans would be compelled by their own interests to stand by us. In a word, the German peril is more imminent than the Russian."

"You are all wide of the mark," some one else would impatiently interpose. "You talk as if we had some ground for hesitation, when in reality we ought to thank our stars for this heaven-sent opportunity. Through the rashness of our rival in putting himself in the attitude of an aggressor, we have the chance to unite the world against him and to crush him, a chance which we shall never have again. Italy would surely be with us, for this is her great opportunity to gain control of the Adriatic. Thus with little cost to ourselves, by our usual method of hiring continental armies to fight our battles, we can put an end to the domination of the Prussian military caste threatening the national existence of the deluded German nation and its freedom of development, which we welcomed so long as it was in the paths of peace. We are now in a position to obtain the most complete guarantee against the possibility of that caste ever again disturbing the peace of Europe. Prussia, since she got into the hands of that caste, has been a bad neighbor, arrogant, threatening, bullying, shifting her boundaries at her will, and taking

one fair field after another from her weaker neighbors and adding them to her own dominions. With her belt ostentatiously full of weapons of offense, and ready at a moment's notice to use them, she has always been an unpleasant, disturbing neighbor in Europe. She got thoroughly on the nerves of Europe; there was no peace near where she dwelt. It is difficult for those who are fortunate enough to live thousands of miles away to understand what it has meant to those who live near. Even here, with the protection of the broad seas between us, we know what a disturbing factor the Prussians were with their constant naval menace. But we can hardly realize what it meant to France and Russia. Several times there were threats directed against them even within the lifetime of this generation, which presented the alternative of war or humiliation. There were many of us who hoped that the internal influence in Germany would be strong enough to check, and ultimately to eliminate it. Now that this great war has been forced by the Prussian leaders, it would be folly not to see to it that this swash-buckling through the streets of Europe and this disturbance of peaceful citizens was dealt with here and now as the most serious offense against the law of nations.

"We are sure of victory. We know that Germany produces only 96 per cent of her food, and cannot do even that when her best laborers are engaged in fighting. The Board of Trade has accurate records of the German imports of nickel, copper, cotton, rubber and petroleum, and accurate records also of the exports of the same articles from foreign countries to Germany. These articles are indispensable in modern warfare, and as the Germans have hardly enough of them to last one year, they will soon be at our mercy like a flock of sheep."

For a minute, the well-informed and philosophic Haldane would be speechless with astonishment. "What hysterics are these?" he would gasp at last. "Have you ever been in Germany? Have you ever taken the trouble to read a German newspaper or periodical? An untruthful Briton is supposed to be a contradiction in terms. You are a Briton, and therefore I must infer that you are not aware of the atrocious falsehood of your statements, but are merely weak enough, in this supreme hour, to repeat the wild phrases of irresponsible scribblers. Where did you study history? Will you specify the year in which Prussia was, as you say, threatening, bullying her neighbors? Was it when Frederick the Great, fighting our battles as well as his own, was facing those weaker neighbors, Austria, Russia, France and Sweden combined? Was it when Blücher at

Leipsic freed Europe from the yoke of Napoleon, or when, swallowing his resentment at Wellington's desertion, he marched to Waterloo to save an English army from defeat and possible annihilation? Was it in 1870, when Germany, after 200 years of French aggression, being attacked once more on the most frivolous pretext, for the deliberate purpose of despoiling her and preventing her unification, beat back the aggressor? If Germany was bent on conquest, why did she not profit by the opportunity presented by the Boer war and the Russo-Japanese war? Is it possible to imagine anything more preposterous than the so-called German menace to France and Russia? As well might you talk of the intolerable menace of David to Goliath. Germany numbers only 67 millions, with a standing army of 810,000, while France and Russia number 40 and 170 millions, with armies of 770,000 and 1,200,000 respectively; Germany's expenditures for army and navy in 1913-14 were only \$294,390,000, while Britain spent \$448,440,000, Russia \$439,300,000, France \$311,002,000. You are perfectly aware of these facts; they are set forth in the *Statesman's Yearbook*, which you have before you on your desk every day, and to which you yourself are a contributor. If I am not mistaken, you yourself have cited these facts in your speeches. Then why do you all at once talk as if the facts were the reverse? Is the truth a sail to be trimmed in accordance with the wind? If the 67 million people of Germany, with \$294,390,000, created a stronger armament than the 170 million people of Russia did with their \$439,300,000, and their far cheaper labor, what other reason can you discover than that the German government is honest, while the Russian government is worm-eaten with graft? Clearly the so-called German menace is simply the menace of honesty to dishonesty. And shall we ally ourselves with dishonesty against honesty, with illiteracy against education, with despotism against freedom? Scores of candid and well-informed Britons have admitted over and over again during the past twenty years that Germany would have been crushed and despoiled long ago by Russia and France, had they not had a wholesome respect for her army. Has Britain never bullied weaker neighbors? Do we not own thirteen times as much land as Germany? How did we get it except by taking it from weaker neighbors? People who live in glass houses should not throw stones. When China tried to stop the importation of opium, which was ruining her people, did we not make war on her for the deliberate purpose of forcing her to allow us to continue that nefarious traffic? To all remonstrances, did we not reply, year after year, with cynical effrontery,

that we would stop shipping opium to China as soon as somebody would tell us where India was to get her revenue? Have you ever met any of those German army officers whom you call swash-bucklers? Do you know that 99 per cent of them are the most modest, most unassuming gentlemen in the world, profoundly learned, spending their time not in swaggering through the streets but in the hardest kind of work? If a rowdy is found among them occasionally, is that not true of every army, including the British? Sir Norman Lockyer told us a few years ago, with the approval of every learned man in England, that we were sure to lose our place of eminence among the nations unless we reorganized our system of education on the model of Germany, the most highly educated nation in the world. If Germany is thus the leader in civilization, has she not the right to enjoy the boon of national unity, and the power conferred by that unity? And is it not a piece of effrontery on our part to block such a nation in every quarter of the globe—Morocco, Turkey, Persia, New Guinea—with the declaration: “Hands off! You have no business here!” What you call swash-buckling is simply the natural resentment of self-respecting men at being thus bullied.

“You say we are sure of beating Germany. But what if Germany rises as one man, as Prussia did in 1813, sending 6 per cent of her population into the field! If that was possible then, it is possible now. If you say that the Germans have not enough copper, nickel, rubber, cotton, to last more than a year, you confess that they have not been planning this war, for nothing would have been easier than to accumulate those articles. And if Germany did not plan the war but is merely turning at bay, what a foul blot shall we make in our history if we try to crush her and fail!”

It is to be hoped that Lord Haldane will some day give the world an account of his mental struggle on that occasion. Before arriving at a decision, that erudite and well-meaning man must have passed through hours of cruel agony. If he quitted the cabinet, after his vain effort to make an impression on minds nailed up against argument, he would further weaken the government and incur the reproach of refusing to lend his best service to his country in her hour of need; if he remained, he would necessarily be compelled to strain every nerve to defeat the country which next to Britain was dearest to him. It may not be rash to surmise that he consented to remain on condition that Germany's territory remain intact and that Constantinople be not surrendered to Russia; and

that he resigned when the course of events made it increasingly uncertain whether Britain would be able to guarantee these conditions.

Cain Outdone.

And so the impossible, unspeakable enormity came to pass. England joined her own natural enemies to fight her own natural friends, her "historic ally," with whom she had never been at war before. With parricidal fury, the Daughter attacked the Mother. She decided to trust the Government of the Long Spoon, the Government of the Beiliss Trial, rather than her own flesh and blood. The leading democracy of Europe, which itself had long felt the menace of the autocracy, nevertheless joined hands with it against a government which, according to British testimony, takes better care of its subjects, in other words, is more truly democratic, than any other government. The nation of 13 million square miles decided to aid the nation of 9 million square miles in absorbing the pitiful remnant of land which to the nation of 208,780 square miles represents the only chance of remaining a great power. The nation which produced Darwin, Spencer and Galton combined with the illiterate nation to crush the most educated nation. Yellow, brown and black men, of all degrees of barbarism and savagery, were armed by white, civilized Britons and hurled against white, civilized Germans. "We are fighting for you and you attack us!" was the furious shout that came from Germany. No wonder German soldiers learned to take a grim pleasure in the imprecation "May God punish England!" When the British people come to their senses, when the suicidal character of their policy stands out, grim and ghastly, in the light of its consequences, what a reckoning will they exact of their misleaders! Had Cleon lived long enough, what punishment would the Athenians have meted out to him!

Republicans Propping up the Last Despot.

When it appeared that the land of universities could not be reduced to subjection by all the civilized, semi-civilized and barbarous countries of the Old World combined, and that the tyrant's own subjects were about to be freed from the yoke, the "land of the free," ambitious to be known in history by the twin titles of "Servant of Despotism" and "Murderer of Germany," came to the rescue of the tyrant. She set a thousand ammunition factories going, to furnish, in her nominal neutrality, a ghastly illustration of the letter that killeth. But for this malevolent neutrality, the war would have come to an end a year ago, on the very best terms

for all humanity. All the lives that have been lost since then, and those that are still to be lost, all the horrors of mutilation, famine and disease of the second half of the war, will hereafter be a permanent burden on America's conscience. "Their blood be upon us and upon our children!" Guilty of wilful ignorance will be those who believe Germany to be in the wrong, because they are too sluggish to open their eyes to the glaring facts; guilty of swinish greed will be those plutocrats who would sell ammunition to the enemies of their own country if they got a chance; guilty of cowardice will be those who knew what ought to be done to stop the vile traffic, but shrank from the toil or the political risk of doing it.

Some Americans seem actually to be proud of the fact that the Brussiloff drive, intended to reconquer the land of Kosciusko and Pulaski, was made mostly with ammunition of American manufacture. The land of the free does everything short of actual warfare to crush the land which enjoys the truest freedom, to delay the day of freedom for the Russian people, and to make the autocrat of the Beiliss Trial supreme over the globe. And the heartless, conscienceless plutocrats who carry on this traffic are no doubt liberal donors to the American Red Cross and are praised for their "philanthropy"! Stop the ammunition traffic and there will be no need of any Red Cross.

All over Europe the cry is: "We must reorganize our government on the German model, if we want to be up-to-date." In other words, we must do exactly as the Germans did, but we must crush them for doing it. Has mankind gone insane?

"Public opinion should be suspended," was Admiral Sigsbee's warning at the time of the Maine explosion. Alas, how few people know how to suspend their opinion; how few, having formed an opinion at haphazard, know how to change it! "Remember the Maine!" was the slogan of millions who neither knew nor cared to know how the explosion occurred. The mere fact that Germany declared war was by many Americans deemed sufficient proof that she was the aggressor. And yet in 1812 and 1898 we ourselves declared war, and for what? Was our independence at stake? Were we threatened by an unprincipled, overshadowing despotism? We did have grave motives in both cases, but they were trifles compared to Germany's motives in the present war. Colonel Roosevelt tells us that there are occasions when it would be a crime for a nation not to draw the sword. Let him tell us what he would have done if he had been in the Kaiser's place on August 1, 1914.

To throw the blame for America's attitude on President Wil-

son would be manifestly unjust. What the President's private sentiments may be, cannot without rashness be inferred from his utterances or his acts. In a republic, the chief magistrate can do little else than follow the drift of public opinion, such as he understands it. The blame must rest with the public, which allows its opinion to be manufactured by hirelings, ever ready to call black white at their masters' bidding.

Willing Dupes.

How the grafters, fanatics and rakes in Russia must rub their hands and chuckle when they see the democrats of Britain, France, and the United States toiling in the service of despotism! "Was there ever such luck!" they crow when they meet. "For thirty years we have had daily cold shivers to think that the democrats of Britain, France, Germany and the United States might at any moment have sense enough to combine and lend their support to the Russian liberals, which of course would mean the end of the autocracy and of our soft snaps. And here they are spending their money and their lives to make our darling despot supreme! We have been racking our brains to find some way of making these simpletons swallow the transparent lie about Germany's schemes of world dominion. And here the republican press takes that task out of our hands and performs it with incredible zest and ingenuity, and howls down any one that ventures to tell the truth! We never dreamt that they were such easy marks! 'We are fighting for our lives,' say British statesmen, and proceed to exhort their people to commit suicide. 'Liberty, equality, fraternity!' shout the French, and rush to demolish the rampart that stands between them and tyranny. 'America first!' shout the Americans, and proceed to send us ammunition with which to batter down the American ideal and keep our 170 millions from setting up a 'government of the people, by the people and for the people.' For inspiration, these sons of liberty invoke the shades of Hampden, Mirabeau and Washington, and then proceed to do the work of Pobiedonostsev. If there is a special devil that takes delight in making people cut off their noses to spite their faces, he must by this time be almost dead with laughter."

If the Dam were Broken.

What will happen if Germany were defeated? The program of the Beiliss-trial government will be carried out to its full extent, for Britain would be powerless to oppose it, and neither France nor

Italy would help her if they could. The only help—ye heavens!—could come from the "historic allies" of England whom she now is trying to starve and crush. Will they return good for evil? Will they not on the contrary feel tempted to make the Russo-Japanese alliance still more overwhelming, in the hope of sharing in the spoils? A Russian garrison will soon make its appearance at Jerusalem, ready to march on the Suez canal. Half of Persia will be taken at once, and the other half will be left in nominal British control, which will cease at the first hint from Petrograd. India may for some time continue nominally a British possession; in reality it will be part of the Russian empire as soon as Germany, hitherto its rampart of protection, has been broken down.

And to bring this ruin on herself, Britain is striving tooth and nail!

AN AMERICAN JUDGMENT OF GERMANY'S CAUSE.¹

A LETTER TO MY FRIEND IN KHAKI.

BY JOSEPH W. PENNYPACKER.

YOUR interesting narrative of life among the cacti I can answer only by giving you some reflections made as I look out upon the pageant from my watch-tower. You are for Germany. You may not know it, or possibly you are not aware of the reasons why. Here are some of them.

Texas contains 265,780 square miles, Germany 208,830. Contrast her size with that of the three great powers that have acquired extensive colonies, England, Russia, France,—and then smile at the mistranslation which our ignorant or malicious press has given to the song-title "Deutschland über Alles." Yet upon that small territory exist 70,000,000 people, whose total share in the world-commerce before the war was \$5,000,000,000 a year. The great British empire had \$7,250,000,000 a year, and the United States stood third with \$4,250,000,000 a year. To this second place commercially Germany had climbed in fifty years. What does that mean? It means that by a spiritual process the German people had cultivated intensively, efficiently, frugally, the home products and industries of their

¹ With one or two omissions of personality, this is a *bonafide* letter written from back home to one of "the boys" on the Mexican border in August, 1916.