

South German, the Swabian. The contrast is more a contrast of language and education than of race, and the present conflict is the more unreasonable since it is as much a fight between brothers as was the war between Sparta and Athens which ruined Greece. The present war has been repeatedly compared with the Peloponnesian war and the warning has been issued again and again that the result may be the same, the ruin of both nations, leaving the world neither to Saxon nor Teuton but to the growing Slav who would be the happy heir to their civilization. Russia is only waiting her time to pounce on India and to reach from Constantinople to the Suez Canal.

In case the Anglo-Saxon should win there is little chance left that he will survive the results of the war. That he would be able to use Germany afterwards against Russia is not likely, and all we can say concerning the present war is that the English Cabinet who made it committed the greatest historical blunder in modern times.

## THE STRIFE BETWEEN NATIONS, AND ITS MORALITY.

BY S. HONAGA.

IT is a fact that war may have a beneficent effect in purifying society and evolving human culture. Accordingly it has been said: "*Alles entsteht durch den Streit*" (All things spring from strife), and "*Der Krieg ist der Vater aller Dinge*" (War is the father of all things). But that beneficent effects may follow from war is no reason for assigning war as the only factor capable of developing civilization, or for considering that war must necessarily be encouraged, or for believing it altogether impossible to do away with war. War is not a mechanical work of men acting under the will of some non-human being, but really occurs only from the human will to fight; and where men decide not to fight, no war can be provoked. In the next place, if we consider war as indiscriminate fighting it is devoid of morality, for the most important ideal element of war, a lofty motive, is lacking; and in present-day warfare the absence of such an ideal always involves ultimate failure. Now it is a great defect in the ideal of national morality wholly to neglect to see what root-relation its own morality has with the morality of other nations. Just as the morality of a nation, though not altogether the same as individual morality, is never independent of it, so international morality (as regulating

relations with foreigners) should not be confounded with national morality *per se*, although never to be dissevered from it. Thus as national morality is connected with that of the individual on the one hand, so it is also connected with international morality on the other; and all three stand on the common grounds of moral principle, though in detail they are not quite the same. It follows, therefore, that a national egoism which ignores other nations, which adopts such principles as: "The state is self-sufficient"; "The maintenance and development of its own power and well-being is the supreme principle of politics"; "The state can only have regard to the interest of any other state so far as this can be identified with its own interest"—can never succeed in making a state truly fit for its place in the world. Doubtless it is highly important for any nation to consider how social evolution may best be secured, but attention has often been very one-sided in considering this matter. Two definite lines of evolution must be recognized: (1) evolution in the world of biological phenomena, which arises from conflicts of the strong preying on the weak; and (2) on the other hand, spiritual evolution, which springs from the factors of self-sacrifice and mutual aid. Rivalries and conflicts are equally important in both cases, but in one the struggle is for goodness and beauty in the battle of social life. This higher ideal element plays a most important part in present-day contests between civilized peoples; and the principle of physical force, the indiscriminating affirmation that "might is right," must be altogether rejected. What we thus learn from a broad consideration of the evolutionary process is quite in accord with the oriental doctrine of self-sacrifice, which has developed from the idea of the microcosm as opposed to the macrocosm, or from the conception of "man as being a child of heaven." With such sanctions, then, the doctrine of "love to God and love to man" should be regarded as the principle upon which international peace must be based. In other words, among the most important principles which any state should remember in its international relations are the following:

1. Physical strength and intellect are not the only essentials for progressive human life, but also beauty and goodness.

2. Consequently the new ideal of international peace should be constructed not only on political and economic, but also on spiritual, that is moral and religious, foundations; and this might well be claimed as the only worthy national principle and political ideal for every country.

Now with regard to the great problems which the present great

war has proposed to the civilization of the world, nothing could be more pressing than the question of international morality, originating from the idea of humanity, which has been developing in recent times. A most important feature of that morality is an appreciation of the freedom and dignity of each nation, as we appreciate the freedom and dignity of individuals; and, as a matter of course, if the attitude of disdaining other nations and ignoring small countries is to be revised, the principle of "To attack is the right of the strong," and the fundamental idea that "envy and hatred between nations are natural and right" must be given up in the future. And the people who have a higher civilization and stronger traits of character, government, position, etc., should not use these advantages for selfish ends, but endeavor to contribute to others according to their ability. This is merely the quality of self-restraint which must not be lacking if the strong is to continue to maintain his qualification as a superior. As the oriental saying has it, "The superior man does not exhaust himself; that is how he attains completeness."

Accordingly, the nation which makes progress and at the same time appreciates the value of the individuality of other nations, approaches that spirit of reverence for others which Goethe regards as the essence of religion—a spirit, indeed, which makes the first requirement of an international morality concerned with a wider humanity. And as nations come into closer contact and feel more the necessity of understanding one another's conditions, and in proportion as the intercourse becomes rapid in succession, it is clear that they ought to rid themselves not only of prejudices but also of the indifference and aloofness which have marked the foreign relations of the Great Powers up to the present time. And it need hardly be said that such a general cultivation of friendship among the nations, by removing the causes of friction which arise from the lack of mutual understanding, would powerfully demonstrate that international peace depends not so much upon diplomacy as upon international morality.

If that were so, and yet nations found themselves unavoidably at war, they should nevertheless observe morality, even in conflict, and fight "fairly and squarely," in the manner known in the East as "*Bushido*" (the way of *Samurai*), or "*Kunshi no Arasoï*" (the conflict of true gentlemen—"clean fighting"). It ought to be a matter of course that morality should rule both the aims and the means of war. And when for the sake of justice and freedom war becomes inevitable every nation should consider the enemy's case impartially, as a judge, appreciating the good points of their foes even

while combating their faults ; hating their failings, but not necessarily hating their people. Any nation can only secure "the moral compensation of war" by advancing after war into a new kind of life, in the new light of this international morality. If war simply rouses the mutual hatred and hostile feelings of nations, and does not lead them to deep heart-searchings, it can have no other effect than sowing seed for another war ; it can never lift the world to a higher plane.

## STRAWS IN THE WIND.

BY THE EDITOR.

VARIOUS communications have been received at this office which are straws in the wind indicating the various sentiments that prevail in the United States concerning the war. The pro-British are mostly hysterical and their opinions are based on the assumption that the reports of the German atrocities are true and that the Germans are barbarians who take a special delight in murdering women and children. The Kaiser is represented just as Lincoln was years ago by Great Britain when she sympathized with the South against the North in the hope of having the United States split into two hostile countries. The pro-German views are better grounded, and it is noteworthy that German sympathizers are gaining in numbers. The time will come when the utterances of the pro-British Americans will only be quoted as curious aberrations.

There is one queer communication which we received bearing the title : "George Washington and German Americans," which reads thus :

"I abhor the thought of independence," was the declaration of George Washington previous to the Revolutionary War. To sever connections with his beloved fatherland, England, was a thought intolerable, but when forced by the repeated crimes of the British to seize defensive arms, Washington, under the guidance of God, became the mighty liberator of America.

"Even so the German citizens of the United States, shocked by the iniquities of the Imperial Government, will stand united against a land that has systematically destroyed all the ties of affection that bound them to its shores.

"America has quelled a great civil war ; she can prevent all