THE EUROPEAN WAR.

BY THE EDITOR.

PANSLAVISM.

WAR, a most terrible war, is now raging in Europe, and the most powerful nations have combined to break Germany's ascendancy. Germany is threatened by Russia from the east, by France from the west, and her extended commerce on the seas in all parts of the world has become a prey to Great Britain and Japan.

And why? What is the cause of the war? Because a short time ago the heir apparent to the throne of Austria and his wife were assassinated by a Servian with arms from the Servian arsenal.

Germany has nothing to do with the incident that occasioned the war, but we must know that this particular occurrence is a symptom only of the real reason. The assassination of a prince and his wife might have passed by and be forgotten if there did not exist a condition which made the war an unavoidable necessity. Though the occasion is an incident of secondary importance, it throws light on the political situation of Europe.

Austria-Hungary is a dual state represented by a double headed eagle as its coat of arms, and the Austrian emperor, formerly a Roman emperor of German nationality, is the monarch. In addition to the German Austrians and the Hungarians, the Magyars, there are a number of other nationalities most of which are Slavic: the Czechs in Bohemia, the Slavonians south of Hungary, then the Bosnians, the inhabitants of Herzegovina, the Poles in Galicia, and also some Servians. The Saxons of Transylvania again are Teutons surrounded by Hungarians, Slavs and Rumanians. It would be easy enough to solve the problem of the races if they lived in separate communities, but the trouble is that they live in the same countries and cities, and there are for instance about as many
German Bohemians as Czechs living in Bohemia, and the Saxon Transylvanian farmers employ as farm hands Slavs and other races, among them also Gipsies.

Austria is about as large as Germany and France, but it is weak on account of its lack of internal unity and the hatred among the different races. The Austrian army can not develop the efficiency which other armies possess where the same language is spoken by all the troops.

The race problem in Austria is a calamity but it becomes worse by the propaganda of Panslavism, which means that all the Slavs should be united under the most powerful Slavic state, Russia. Panslavism would ultimately lead to the ruin of Austria and to the suppression of the German elements now sprinkled over all the Austrian dominions. Panslavism has been advocated mainly by Russia, whose agents have been at work all over the world, also in non-Slavic countries, in Persia, Afghanistan, Tibet, India, China, and even in the United States. The rise of Slavism is proclaimed by them as the power to come; such is at least the intention of Russia, and Peter the Great, the founder of modern Russia, has sketched in his last will and testament a plan to expand Russia and make her the mistress of the world—a bequest holy to the patriotic Russian and a danger to European civilization.

The Slavs are upon the whole a hot-blooded and excitable race. They are good-natured but often thoughtless; they live in the present and trouble little about the future. Their money affairs are usually in great disorder; they do not save and are quite irresponsible. The most numerous of them are the Russians, and we may fairly well say that among the Slavs, the Poles are the most intelligent, while the Balkan Slavs are least civilized. The Russians are easy going and lack judgment. They are mostly extremists, either slavishly submissive to authority or nihilists and anarchists, unamenable to law and order. The leaders of Russia, that clique which runs the government of which the Czar is a helpless tool, are unscrupulous. They are descendants of Germanic invaders, but Russified, and their helpers mostly recruit themselves from German immigrants.

The Poles are not friends of the Russians. They know the government too well. The Poles live in those portions of Europe which were formerly inhabited by the Goths and it is more than probable that the common people are the remnant of the old Gothic population. We begin to understand the migratory movement of Europe better now than before and it seems that these expeditions
of conquest were never what historians formerly thought them to be—emigrations of whole peoples. It appears that the emigrants sold the acres which they owned, and the others who remained were too weak in number to resist invaders. The aristocracy of Poland is a well-built brunette race, Slavic in temper and rather small in stature, like the French in character, also jolly, amiable and especially shiftless, while the common people are blue-eyed, blond, tall and often thrifty. Are we justified in drawing conclusions from these facts? Are the two classes of different descent?

When Poland became Russian, the Poles became acquainted with Russian rule; their treatment has been approximately the same as the Irish have received from the English. Though Slavs themselves, they could never become enthusiastic over the Panslavic ideal.

The Finlanders and Germans of the Baltic provinces, perhaps also the intellectual classes of the Russians proper, have plenty of experience with broken promises of the Russian government, and Russian intrigues have done much harm even in the countries of Russia's friends. Think for instance of the Dreyfus-Esterhazy embroglio in France, which implicates Russia, not Germany, in the spy system, and also of the Russian attempts to alienate Asiatics from England.

If Austria breaks down, Germany will be surrounded by enemies on all sides. If the German portion of Austria together with Hungary should become a part of the Panslavic empire, the German race would have little chance of survival, especially as France has not yet forgotten her defeat of 1870-71, and is constantly clamoring for revenge. Under these conditions it is but a policy of self-preservation that the Germans are determined to support Austria against the Panslavism of Russia. The triumph of Panslavism implies the downfall of Germany.

The horrible death of the archduke and his wife was not due to the deed of a fanatic individual, it expresses the sentiment of the Servian nation which seems to have been supported by the Servian authorities. Yea, there are indications that these methods of procedure have been instigated by Russian agents and Austria insisted that investigations should bring out the truth. The conspiracy was well supplied with money and can not have been limited to a few private individuals. The report reads:

"So well laid was the plot that there was little chance of escape. Had the pistol shots failed to take effect, another bomb was ready to be thrown in the next block, while under the table at which the
archduke was to lunch two others were discovered. In the chimney of the Duchess of Hohenberg's apartments still another bomb was found, while the railway over which it was expected the imperial party would leave Sarajevo was literally mined with dynamite."

The roots of the conspiracy spread into Servia, and Austria insisted that an investigation should bring out the truth.

Servia promised an investigation, but since Austria did not trust the Servians to be impartial, Austria issued an ultimatum demanding Austrian representatives in court. This, however, was indignantly refused, and the refusal strengthened the suspicion that both the Servian and Russian governments were co-guilty of the criminal conspiracy. While Germany recognized the justice of the Austrian demand, Russia supported the Servian cause and the result was war—a war of the Slav against the Teuton, the object being the Panslavistic ideal of Russia, and in this war Russia was supported by France and England, according to the Triple Entente.

According to the British White Book, Sir Edward Grey sided with Servia in its refusal of Number Five of the Austrian ultimatum saying that it "would be hardly consistent with the maintenance of Servia's independent sovereignty if it (Austria's demand) were to mean that Austria-Hungary was to be invested with the right to appoint officials who would have authority within the frontiers of Servia."

That sounds very fair; but would Sir Edward use the same argument if the Prince of Wales had been assassinated and some little nationality on the moral level of Servia were for good reasons suspected of having helped in the deed and plotting renewals of the crime so as to endanger the British government and its royal family? That would have been different.

How can any one defend Russia's protection of assassins, or who can glance over the history of these events without suspecting the leaders of Panslavism of having instigated the deed? But that England rushed at once to the support of the methods of Panslavism is incomprehensible except on the assumption that England favored the plan of a most stupendous war in which Germany's prosperity, her manhood, her civilization, would be buried under the armies of the invading Russ.

Panslavism and the Russian Czar are to be helped by the French, and both are to be supported by the British fleet. The ruinous march of the Gallic foe in the time of Napoleon the First, about one hundred and nine years ago, is to be repeated but is being made more effective by the Slavic ally. What reason have the English
for joining such a war? They will rid themselves of an inconvenient competitor; and they feel safe in undertaking the war, for they believe success can be gained without much risk to Albion.

The Kaiser is a peaceful man. If any one deserves the Nobel peace prize, it is he. Since his ascent to the throne he has preserved the peace of Europe, often under the most difficult conditions. The bellicose party of Germany has often been disgusted with the Kaiser's policy and called him William the Pacific. If he declares war, war must be inevitable indeed—and what a war! He has to face the most powerful nation, Russia, with its army of uncounted and almost uncountable numbers, of enormous resources, unexhausted and inexhaustible. In Russia human lives are not only plentiful but cheap, and Russia is supported as a matter of course by France with her well-drilled impetuous men, both in turn being encouraged by England, the undisputed mistress of the seas!

Germany is supported by Austria-Hungary whose weakness is well known. Who can believe that Germany wanted a war of such dimensions, that she has provoked it, or ventured into it for lust of fame or with an expectation of conquest? What can she gain and how can she be benefited even if she keeps her enemies out of the fatherland? And yet her enemies blame the emperor for being responsible for the war!

Germany has been cut off from the rest of the world. America has not received any news of the war except from London, Paris, Petrograd (the new name of St. Petersburg) and Rome. We are informed that the Germans are beaten, and yet they advance. There is some news from Berlin, via Copenhagen or Rotterdam, of recent date, which shows the progress of the war in a very different light.

The murder of the archduke is not the real or only reason of the war; it is the symptom of Panslavism, and Panslavism is the reason why Russia has gone to war. But there are two other reasons: one is the French lust for revenge, the other England's determination not to allow Germany to appear in the field of commerce as her rival, which from the English standpoint means that Germany is England's "first and immediate enemy."

Great Britain has declared war on the ground that Germany would not respect the neutrality of Belgium, but the real reason lies deeper and appears in the anti-German policy of the British government which has established the principle that for every keel the emperor lays down, England will lay down two, and Sir Arthur
Conan Doyle says: "The first fruit of the new German fleet was the Entente Cordiale."

A BREACH OF NEUTRALITY.

Germany's breach of neutrality in Belgium was England's official and ostensible reason for war, but even in England the feeling prevails that this is a mere pretext, not the real and ultimate motive, for England herself has too often broken neutrality in her past history to take a breach of neutrality seriously.

Think of the unjustifiable bombardment of Copenhagen by Nelson, of the annexation of Dutch colonies, especially the seizure of Capetown and other unexpected attacks upon peaceful nations. Who believes that the English would have declared war on France, if soon after the beginning of the war the French had broken through Belgium to outflank the German army? Did Great Britain find fault with Japan for disregarding the neutrality of China? The United States too belongs to the signatory friends of the Chinese empire, and we have reason to dislike the Japanese policy, but we have preserved our attitude of "watchful waiting."

At the beginning of the Boer War, the English broke the neutrality of the Portuguese colony, the state of East Africa, by landing their troops in Delagoa Bay solely because the British army wanted to save going the roundabout way through British territory. There was no other excuse, no urgent need, no threat that the Boers had conspired with the Portuguese, or could break neutrality later on. In the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (11th ed., s.v. "Neutrality," Vol. XXXI, p. 131) the incident is called "an important precedent."*

What an atrocity of Germany not only to begin hostilities against France at once as soon as the war was plainly in sight, but even to trespass on Belgian territory and become guilty of a terrible breach of neutrality! What an atrocity! But there is one advantage for the English. As a result they were furnished with an excuse to justify their declaration of war, and the Germans, at the same time, had also to face the army of Belgium.

There is no need of discussing the atrocity of a breach of neutrality, because it is an acknowledged principle that in case of war the natural law of self-preservation demands of every power the completion of the war that has arisen or is about to arise, with the utmost dispatch and by the easiest method. In the present case the

*The author of the article is Dr. Thomas Barclay, vice-president of the International Law Association.*
Germans have carried the war through Luxemburg and Belgium because that was to them the straightest and safest way of attack. They would have been satisfied to have the Belgian assent to their march through the country and would have gladly paid every penny for food and forage or occasional destruction of property; but the Belgians refused and joined the French.

We do not know all the secret occurrences of European politics, but the probability is that the Belgians had agreed to allow the French to march through Belgium without any objection at whatever moment it would suit them; and that the Belgians intended to favor the French is fully proved through facts, mainly through the presence of French officers, prior to the declaration of war, in Liège, where they helped their Belgian neighbors to modernize the Belgian fortifications and acted as general advisers for the approaching hostilities.

Under the consideration that Belgium would be drawn into the war at a moment when it would suit the French best, it was preferable to the Germans to anticipate the French move and take Belgium first, and it is probable that the Germans were prepared to find the Belgians absolutely on the side of the French.

The neutrality treaty of Belgium had been signed by England, France and Prussia, not Germany, for the present German empire did not yet exist at the time. But since Germany has inherited Prussia’s policy, we are told that it was very objectionable for Germany to become guilty of this breach of neutrality.

Indeed? But why should Germany keep this treaty concerning the Belgian neutrality under conditions so obviously changed? When Germany recognized this treaty, the German authorities believed that Belgium would try to be truly neutral and the hostility of Belgium seemed to be excluded. On the other hand the mere suspicion of a Franco-Belgian entente is sufficient to attack France through the territory of the Belgian frontier. There is no diplomat who denies the established right of any power to break all peace treaties in case of war—especially if conditions have changed to such an extent that to keep them would be dangerous.1

The duty of neutrality toward a buffer state like Belgium presupposes in its turn also the duty of a strict neutrality on the part of Belgium. Belgium has not maintained a rigorous neutrality but concluded a friendship with the Triple Entente, especially with France, and this canceled Germany’s obligations. Never-

1Note here Mr. Roosevelt’s criticism of peace treaties which under serious conditions will have to be broken or might become disastrous.
theless, Germany was ready even then to respect Belgian independence, provided Belgium would allow the German army a free passage through the country into France. If England had been fair and if she had first of all considered the welfare of Belgium, she would have advised Belgium to abstain from war under these circumstances and to be satisfied with a formal protest. The attitude of Belgium during the war has justified German suspicions.

The German side of the question is set forth in a German telegram addressed to Prince Lichnowsky, the German ambassador at London:*

"Please impress upon Sir E. Grey that the German army could not be exposed to French attack across Belgium, which was planned according to absolutely unimpeachable information. Germany had consequently to disregard Belgian neutrality, it being for her a question of life or death to prevent French advance."

Why, when Germany, as stated in this message, claimed to know that the French were about to break Belgian neutrality, did not England then guarantee Belgian neutrality? Germany might not have believed England, but it would have been worth proving whether England was serious on this point of preserving the independence of Belgium. However, England gave no such assurance in time, for the declaration of Sir Edward Grey came too late.

Afterwards Sir Edward Grey declared in his answer to the German Chancellor Bethmann Hollweg that England would have fought France to save Belgium but even Englishmen will find it hard to believe this statement of their leading statesman.

Would the king of Belgium be ready to deny on his royal word of honor the fact that French officers had visited Belgium and had been in collusion with Belgian officers? Facts are becoming known which indicate that even the English themselves have broken neutrality. Dr. David S. Schaff of Allegheny, Pa., one of the leaders of Protestantism in the United States, who like myself had been a friend of England, writes to *The Independent* (Sept. 21, 1914) as follows:

"On August 1 the British Ambassador was asked a second time whether England would remain neutral in case Germany respected the neutrality of Belgium and guaranteed the integrity of France and also her colonies. Here England again said she must be free to act.

"And, if the letter of the staff correspondent of the New York Evening Post in London is to be accepted for the statement that Lord Kitchener was in Belgium two weeks before the war began

*Quoted from the British *White Book*.

*Italics are ours.
to make dispositions for English troops—was not Belgian neutrality broken in principle?

"An American student just returned tells me that he saw two trains of prisoners and wounded passing through Marburg the first days of the siege of Liège and Frenchmen were mingled with the Belgians, having been there before the declaration of war.

"I was intensely adverse to Germany at first, threw up my hat when England declared war, but I have changed my mind. Mr. Carnegie's second dispatch to the London Times is in the right direction."

Both France and England had broken Belgian neutrality before the Germans. What right have they to complain about it?

In the present instance the Germans did not do the English government the favor of being beaten as easily as was expected of them, and as a result official explanations have been proclaimed. how England had "the choice only between war or dishonor." and "was bound to fight for Belgian independence." Sir David Lloyd-George in a reference to the case of Servia, quoting Czar Nicolas as having boasted to the emperor of Austria, "I will tear your ramshackle empire limb from limb," and, added Sir David, "he is doing it." These are the ipsissima verba of Great Britain's chancellor of the exchequer!

It is commonly believed that England stirs others to war but is careful to keep out of it herself.

In 1864 the English encouraged Denmark to resist Prussia and Austria on account of Schleswig-Holstein, and the Danes, relying on English assurances refused any compromise, the result being that they lost the duchies. A Danish friend of mine expressed himself very vigorously in condemning British statescraft, saying that the warfare of Prussia was square and honest, but the attitude of England was unpardonable. The English did not want Prussia to lay the foundation of a naval power, so they proposed to protect the Danes, but they did not do it. If the English, said my Danish friend, were not willing to fulfill their promises they ought not to have made them.

The British White Book gives us a psychological insight into the manner in which the Russian minister induced Sir Edward Grey to join the French-Russian alliance. We read there that according to Russian opinion, the Germans would never believe that the English would fight. The English had supported Servia in diplomacy, and the Russians hinted that after all the English would not be credited with making good by joining the fight, and it seems that
the Russian suggestion helped to bring the English into line. The Russians remembered that the English had encouraged the Japanese to fight Russia but the English kept out of the fray.

A stray notice in the North German Gazette states on the authority of the Belgian Ambassador at St. Petersburg that Russia did not venture into the war against Germany until England had given a definite promise to take an active part in it.

This time the English meant war and were ready to join France and Russia. England's intentions can not have been very pacific. for according to a statement published in the French paper *Gil Blas* of February 25, 1913, England had stored in the fortress of Maubeuge large deposits of ammunition for the English artillery in case of a Continental war. Maubeuge is situated between Paris and the Belgian frontier, and what was the purpose of this unusual act?

There is another objection hurled at the Germans; it is this: that they should not have started the war and should not have mobilized their army before the first enemy had dared to trespass on German territory. But such criticism can be made only by people who do not know that priority of attack may decide the whole war and the advantage of a position may save the lives of hundreds of thousands. If the Germans had waited until the French had joined the Belgians and surprised the Germans by a sudden and unexpected attack on Treves and Cologne, the first situation of the war would have presented greater difficulties to the general staff of the Kaiser, and being confronted by other foes in the east might easily have led to ultimate defeat.

We ought to add here that later reports announce that Russians trespassed upon Prussian territory on the day before the declaration of war; and how did they behave! One Russian general, now a prisoner in German hands, had the whole male population of a Prussian village slain, and some Russian officers had adopted the custom of carrying on their persons the fingers of their slain enemies, both male and female.

It has become apparent that the Germans anticipated the French plan of campaign. A newspaper clipping on the subject reads thus:

"We may assume that the French, just as did the Germans, during times of peace prepared a complete plan of campaign, and when hostilities began they naturally attempted to carry out this plan, in order to be able to fight their battles on territory selected by themselves, which always means a considerable advantage over the adversary.

"That such a plan was in existence is certain, and, as has been
declared repeatedly from Berlin since the beginning of the war, the German general staff has proofs that this plan not only included a march through the alleged neutral territory of Belgium, but also that a real military convention with the Belgian government was in existence under which Belgium granted free passage through her country to the French, but was going to resist by force a passage of the German troops, the French promising help in such a case. If this original plan of the French general staff had been realized, Germany actually would have been in a very bad position. Progress of the French to the Rhine could not have been prevented and the German troops certainly would have been compelled to evacuate Alsace-Lorraine.

"Contemporaneous with the passage of the French forces through Belgium an attack upon Alsace and later upon Lorraine had also been planned.

"The grand success of the German army is based upon the fact that its leaders succeeded in throwing over the whole plan of campaign so splendidly elaborated by the French, by appearing first on the place where the Frenchmen intended to be in Belgium. The French mobilization probably did not proceed quite as smoothly as the German.

"For, instead of bringing help to their hard pressed allies in Belgium, their southern neighbors kept back for weeks and gave sufficient time to the Germans to make that country the base of their operations. The advance of the Germans showed itself as so strong that the approaching French armies and reinforcements were not able to withstand the attacks, but were pushed back step by step.

"The knowledge of the French plan of campaign possessed by the German general staff, the preparedness of the German army and the irresistible momentum of the German masses put into the field suddenly ended the hopes of the French general staff, right at the beginning of the war, for the realization of their own plans and indirectly enforced very soon the evacuation of Upper Alsace by the French, without any larger battles at that point.

"Notwithstanding all the apologies for the facts, as they have been offered by the French commander in chief, Gen. Joffre, the French have been restricted to a defensive war policy at nearly all points right from the beginning of the war. The Germans have fought their battles exactly where they intended to, have driven their opponents where they wished to and will succeed in further driving them to a place where they can defeat them in the easiest manner. Upon the execution of this plan the splendid success of the
German arms is founded: upon the inability of the adversary to see beforehand the moves of the enemy or to cross them, the reverses of the French find their explanation.”

**THE ENGLISH POINT OF VIEW.**

The English people remained strictly neutral during the war between the French and the Germans in 1870-71, and if there was any sympathy in Albion it was rather on the side of the Germans, not only because the English and the Germans are closely akin in blood, in civilization and in religion, but also because the two ruling houses are intimately related. The present Kaiser is the grandson of Queen Victoria. In the nineteenth century a war between the two nations would have seemed impossible, but the sentiment has changed in the twentieth century, not because either the English or the German people are much different from what they formerly were, but because a propaganda has been started to sow the seeds of hatred, of jealousy, of envy and discord in England and to denounce Germany's growing power as a menace to England. This propaganda had its origin and impetus in influential circles, and may have started in the government itself. One thing is certain: it took a firm hold on King Edward VII who favored the anti-German policy and prepared the way for a war of extermination to be carried out by Russia, France and England. The English propaganda found an echo in Germany, and old Bismarck after his discharge sounded the alarm.

The anti-German policy in England was first proposed in articles that appeared in the English *Saturday Review* in 1897, and it has made headway ever since. In order to represent the English tendency that has led to the war through the policy of the anti-German party of England we have republished the article “England and Germany” from the *Saturday Review* (London) of September 11, 1897. It is apparently inspired by the British government and its tendency has gradually become the guiding principle of English policy. Official representatives of the British government enunciated this plan again and again until the public became accustomed to it, and now it has brought on the war.

We need not mention that “the wise man of Europe” referred to in the mooted article is Bismarck in his advanced age. Bismarck foresaw the British danger and warned the Germans. On the other hand we learn from the *Saturday Review* article that while in February 1896 the idea of regarding Germany as “the first and immediate enemy of England” was considered “an eccentricity,” the
propaganda against the Germans spread quickly, so that a month later the German flag was hissed at in London. Afterwards the anti-German movement led to the Triple Entente, formulating the program for the present war.

True, Germany has become a competitor of England. German industry has gradually developed into a rival of English industry, yea has even outdone it in many branches, and the Germans have built up a navy which is intended to protect their trade. The German navy is nearly half as strong as the English navy and if it continues to grow it may by and by be equal to it. The British government, backed by public opinion, decided that that must be prevented, for the British have so far lived up to their popular hymn "Britannia, Rule the Waves" which is the indispensable condition of a dominion over the world. Now Germany comes in as a rival trying to gain her share of the world market. That is a sin and should not be tolerated. Therefore German progress must be checked in time in order to preserve Britannia's monopoly in commerce. England still rules the waves and England can fight Germany, as our English author trusts, "without tremendous risk, and without doubt of the issue."

This means in plain language that the English own the world of commerce and will not share its dominion with anybody. Our author declares that "If Germany were extinguished to-morrow, the day after to-morrow there is not an Englishman in the world who would not be the richer."

This policy is not only egotistical and barbarous, not only unfair and narrow, but it is also stupid. It is the logic of a villain and the error that so often props up the arguments of a criminal.

Public opinion in England to-day finds no fault with Germany as a center of art and science. The Germany of Goethe and Schiller in the days of her political weakness was harmless, but modern Germany in its political strength, Prussianism, militarism, imperialism, is most objectionable. Nor should Germany build up industries and increase her commerce. Germany would be quite delightful if it had no army, if it were without a navy, in short if it were defenseless. But do not let us forget that Germany has learned by long and bitter experience that she needs Prussian leadership, she needs an army. Undoubtedly she would abolish her militarism if her neighbors, the French and the Russians, would disarm, and if the English would sell their navy as old iron. The English want their navy to be bigger than any two other navies together, but Germany should remain defenseless.
MONUMENT OF THE BATTLE OF LEIPSIC.
RUINS OF HEIDELBERG CASTLE.
Devastated in 1688 by the French under Melac, previous to the establishment of militarism.
We grant that Germany's progress is a danger to England. So far England has enjoyed an undisputed dominance in the world of commerce, and she has gained her advantages by her progressive methods and by unrivaled energy; but in her safe control of the seas she has become self-sufficient and stagnant. England is at present conspicuously unprogressive. The proper method of combating rivals in the field of industry and commerce does not consist in the extermination of the new competitors but by beating them with their own weapons. England should have raised herself from her lethargy, should have followed the example of Germany, should have built schools or reformed her antiquated system of education in order to fit her citizens to compete with German industry. That, however, would be too much to expect from the English. They want leisure and prefer their traditional stagnancy, still believing that the best policy is not to aspire to surpass a rival, not to excel him, but to call him an "enemy" and to conquer him by exterminating him.

Our English author knows that the issue between England and Germany is a commercial question. He says: "Nations have fought for years over a city or a right of succession: must they not fight for two hundred million pounds of commerce?"

According to Dr. Richet, statistician of the University of Paris, Germany has an annual export of $331,684,212 and an import of $188,963,071; Austria an export of $23,320,696 and an import of $19,192,414. All this is stopped and will remain stopped through the war so long as Great Britain has command of the seas. But British trade does not suffer any direct interference. That is a great advantage for England; but is it really so great as to involve the world in a most tremendous war and risk serious reverses?

The Italian senator, Count San Martino, was present at a dinner on July 22 where he met Sir Edward Grey and Sir William Edward Goschen and heard the remark made that a civil war could not be avoided except through a war with Germany. The statement was published recently in the Giornale d'Italia and similar contentions have been made in other papers. Did the Count let the cat out of the bag? Let us hope that even if there be an element of truth in the statement, the ministers merely noted a convenient coincidence, and did not follow a preconceived plan.

THE GERMAN CAUSE.

And what are the Germans fighting for? Our British author tells us that for the sake of securing these two hundred million
pounds Germany must be exterminated. That appeals to the thoughtless, but what does it mean for the Germans? It implies that the Germans have to fight for their very lives, and the Germans know it. They feel that they fight for their civilization, for their right to labor and to earn a fair living; for progress and for the right to progress, for the right to do better than others, for the right to play a prominent part in the development of humanity, for their homes, their hearths, their liberty, their manhood, their national existence, for "all they have and are."

There have been so many lies in French and English papers, e.g., that Dr. Liebknecht, the Social Democrat, had been shot, that a revolution of the Social Democrats was impending, that the Kaiser’s throne was tottering; but the reverse is true. The liberals, like all the political opponents of the government and of the aristocratic or conservative faction, stand by the Kaiser in their faithful devotion to the German fatherland, and the _furor teutonicus_ comes _unisono_ from all ranks. In glancing over journals of a recent date we find a poem coming from the pen of G. Tschirn of Breslau, a freethinker whose political confession approaches more nearly that of a democrat than that of a monarchist, a man who is against militarism in any form, an advocate of the ideal of peace on earth; but he sees that Germany is fighting for her existence and so he calls his poem "The Battle Wrath of the Friend of Peace," which ends thus:

"Jetzt gilt es, Notwehr zu üben
In tapfer-tapferstem Streit
Für alles, was wir nur lieben,
Was das Dasein zum Leben erst weiht." [Onward with courage to battle
Into the heart of the strife,
Defending all that is dearest,
All that will consecrate life.

"Drum auch durch Donner und Blitze
Schreitet der Friedensheld,
Dass er wahre, rette und schütze
Unsere Zukunftswelt." So afar, 'mid fire and slaughter
The guardian of peace will raise
His standard, defending, preserving
Our homes for the oncoming days.]

The Social Democrats are against militarism and imperialism and oppose war as a matter of principle, but in the present case, they have declared in support of the government, because they are opposed to the Czar and his friends. They do not believe that the Russians and their allies take up arms to bring them deliverance from the yoke of social injustice, and they propose to _fight them_, not to uphold the Kaiser but to defend their homes.

Germany, faced by the danger which the Triple Entente has brought upon her, has risen in all her greatness, and holy wrath
has come over her. Germany is seized with the determination to 
meet her foes and die rather than yield, a spirit which is well 
expressed in the following lines:

"For all we have and are, 
   For all our children's fate, 
Stand up and meet the war— 
The Hun is at the gate.

"Our world has passed away, 
   In wantonness o'erthrown; 
There's nothing left to-day 
   But steel and fire and stone.

"Though all we know depart, 
   The old commandments stand. 
In courage keep your heart, 
   In strength lift up your hand.

"Once more we hear the word 
   That sickened earth of old: 
No law except the sword, 
   Unsheathed and uncontrolled.

"Once more it knits mankind, 
   Once more the nations go 
To meet and break and bind 
   A crazed and driven foe.

"Comfort, content, delight— 
The ages' slow-bought gain— 
They shriveled in a night. 
Only ourselves remain

"To face the naked days 
   In silent fortitude, 
Through perils and dismays, 
   Renewed and renewed.

"Though all we made depart, 
   The old commandments stand. 
In patience keep your heart, 
   In strength lift up your hand.

"No easy hopes or lies 
   Shall bring us to our goal; 
But iron sacrifice 
   Of body, will, and soul.

"There's but one task for all, 
   For each one life to give. 
Who stands if freedom fall? 
   Who dies if freedom live?

These lines have been written by Rudyard Kipling, and are 
meant to stir English patriotism, yet so far they have not lured 
many volunteers to the British colors. In quoting them we have 
changed but one word in the last line, inserting "freedom" where the 
English poet writes "England." Otherwise the poem might serve 
the purpose of any nation that is ready to defend her highest 
ideals, her liberty and her very existence, but it does not fit the 
English. The hymn might have been sung by the Boers when 
attacked by the British army, it might inspire the Hindus when 
asserting their independence of the English yoke, it might ex-
press the patriotism of the many Irish who laid down their lives 
for Ireland; it might have been written by an American minute-
man when joining George Washington in his fight for independence, 
but it seems out of place in the mouth of a British poet, who ought 
rather to have sung in the present case that they will fight

"For the market which we want, 
   For two hundred million pounds, 
   For the ruin of other commerce— 
   For this our bugle sounds."

The war was not begun by England for the sake of protecting
the English nation, but for ruining the trade of brethren on the European continent, and it was begun because victory seemed easy.

The English have gradually found out during the course of the war that the Germans are not so easily conquered and that the tables might be turned. The English wanted the Hun to appear at the gate of Germany, but suddenly the possibility rises that the Germans may knock at the gates of England, and now the German is called the Hun.

Some time ago the right to hold slaves was declared "liberty" by the slave-holders of the United States, and the Romans called the suppression of a country under the Roman yoke its pacification. When the Celts were conquered the Roman historian used the phrase *Gallia pacata*. In the same sense the English poet laureate speaks of England as "Thou peacemaker," and this variety of peace-making is called "glory" by the old French conqueror while in England it is praised as "honor." The Germans having become ambitious to develop a nationality of their own, independent of England, are regarded as disturbers of the peace and are called "slaves of monarch Ambition." Here is the poem of Robert Bridges who complains that England is too pleasure-loving. Her monopoly is endangered and she will have to fight for the liberty of owning slaves. He says:

"Thou careless, awake!  
Thou peacemaker, fight!  
Stand, England, for honor.  
And God guard the right.

"Thy mirth lay aside,  
Thy cavil and play,  
The foe is upon thee  
And grave is the day.

"The Monarch, Ambition,  
Has harnessed his slaves,  
But the folk of the ocean  
Are free as the waves.

"For peace thou art armed.  
Thy freedom to hold.  
Thy courage as iron,  
Thy good faith as gold.

"Through fire, air and water  
Thy trial must be,  
But they that love life best  
Die gladly for thee.

"The love of their mothers  
Is strong to command;  
The fame of their fathers  
Is might to their hand.

"Much suffering shall cleanse thee.  
But thou through the flood  
Shalt win to salvation  
To beauty through blood.

"Up, careless, awake!  
Yea, peacemakers, fight!  
England stands for honor,  
God defend the right."

We say "Amen! God guard the right and God defend the right." But we do not believe that in the present war the right is on the English side.

It is difficult to say when the English have waged a righteous war. Was the Opium War in China righteous? And how shall we ex-
cuse General Gordon's suppression of Chinese Christianity, called the T'ai Ping movement? Was the Boer war undertaken for the protection of English homes, and English liberty? Was the treatment of Ireland fair? Was the subjection of India an enterprise for English honor? And what shall we say of General Cornwallis's Hessian soldiers in the English colonies of North America?

**THE FOES OF GERMANY.**

The plan of the English government has for a long time been to make other nations carry on wars intended to benefit Great Britain. A short time ago this method caused them to use Japan for the purpose of humiliating Russia, and, soon after the Russo-Japanese war, the same principle led to the formation of the Triple Entente between England, Russia and France.

In her anxiety for revenge France has looked for an ally ever since 1871, and has courted Russia, although the French know very well that Russia is in every respect antagonistic to French ideals of republicanism, liberty and progress. Yet it was a foregone determination that should Russia ever attack Germany, France would fall upon her enemy from behind.

Russia is an inveterate enemy of England, for Russia endangers the spread of English influence by subtle intrigue so characteristic of Russian policy, which has shown itself in Persia, Afghanistan, Tibet and China, and even in India. It was considered very clever of Edward VII to make Russia join England, and, in company with France, to establish the Triple Entente. The English people should have known that Russia would never abandon her intrigues against England, and it is excluded that she would help to establish England's supremacy on sea; as a matter of fact the Russians have never ceased to continue their anti-British policy. Russia meant to use the English for her own advantage, just as Edward VII hoped to make Russia subservient to England. The English have not yet learned that smart tricks are boomerangs.

France was easily induced to join Great Britain and Russia, for France is a monomaniac nation dominated by the hope for revenge.

2 The English claim that the T'ai Ping possessed a spurious Christianity, for the T'ai Ping believed only in the sermon on the mount; according to Chinese notions they called Christ the Elder Brother, i. e., the authoritative son who represents God the Father. They worked out a Chinese conception of Christianity and did not belong to the Anglican church. That was enough to condemn their Christianity as spurious.
The French are like big children. They are amiable and really lovable. They are enthusiastic and, like their Gallic ancestors, excitable in character. Caesar found it easy to subdue them because, like children, they were unsteady, and lacked the serious insistency of their Teutonic neighbors.

The Romans used the same methods in Germany that Caesar employed in Gaul, and were to a certain extent quite successful, but when the Germans discovered that a Romanization of Germany meant an end of German institutions, of German language, and of a development of the characteristic traits of German nationality, they became roused to the danger and beat the Romans in the battle fought in the Teutoburg Forest, a battle which saved not only Germany, with its germs of a national civilization, but also England. It will be well for the English to remember that England's fate, too, depended on the victory of Arminius, for at that time the Saxons were still living in Northern Germany, and if the Germans had been Romanized, England would never have risen, and the very roots from which English speech developed would have been destroyed 458 years before they were transplanted to British soil.

France is no longer purely Celtic in blood, but the conquerors of the country, first the Romans, then the Franks and other Teutonic invaders, have changed into Gauls, and even to-day the people who settle in France, mostly Germans, acquire the Celtic characteristics. France has become Teutonic in all the most important spots, but the childlike nature of their inhabitants remains the same. Charlemagne was a Frank, his children and children's children behave like Celts. The Visigoths settled in the southwest, the Burgundians in the southeast, other German tribes in Lorraine, the Norsemen in the north, but all of them acquired the childlike gayety of the Celts; and the same can be observed to-day. There is a continuous stream of German immigration going on still, but the children of the German immigrants are indistinguishable from their French fellow citiziens, while the French Huguenots have become Germans in Germany.

The French, like big children, are vain. Flatter them and you can dupe them easily. They are also theatrical. Note for instance how theatrical was the deportment of the great Gallic chief, Vercingetorix, when he surrendered to Caesar, and also how Thiers behaved when he signed the peace treaty in 1871. All proclamations made by the French government to the French people, of any event, even of the enemy's progress, are appeals to their vanity. They are
assurances of French greatness, even when retreats or defeats are announced. They praise French gallantry, French triumphs, French deeds of valor and prophesy ultimate victory. Read for instance the transfer of the capital from Paris to Bordeaux. There we gain the impression that the Germans are beaten and the French army intact, but the government prefers a change of air for the good of the country and so it moves to Bordeaux.

The great Corsican, Napoleon the First, brought up in France, was a typical Frenchman, at least in vanity, and it is his vanity which proved ruinous to him when dealing with the Czar. When these two most powerful monarchs of the age met at Erfurt in 1812 Czar Alexander was bent on outwitting the great conqueror, and he succeeded by flattering his enemy. When the two met, Alexander turned round to his aide-de-camp and whispered, careful at the same time to be overheard by Napoleon, "How beautiful he is. If I were a woman I would fall in love with him." In further conversation, Alexander pretended to be overwhelmed by admiration for Napoleon's genius and, sitting at his feet, he pretended to be his faithful disciple. It was this attitude of Alexander which influenced Napoleon's plan of the Russian campaign. Napoleon thought that a victorious battle or a bold rush into the interior of Russia or some display of his dashing genius would most easily convert Alexander to make peace. So he ventured to capture Moscow and—lost the war.

The French clamor so much for revenge that the world has become accustomed to it, and whomsoever it suits, he encourages this clamor. But let us see first what right the French have to demand revenge.

First, as to the war of 1870-71: Was it not a war undertaken by Napoleon III with the loudly expressed acclamation of the people who paraded through the streets of Paris shouting "à Berlin"? And the cause of the war was the unjustifiable demand that the King of Prussia should humiliate himself before the French Emperor. He should beg pardon for a Hohenzollern prince of an entirely different line because the Spaniards had offered to the latter the crown of Spain. As Napoleon was beaten he received the fate he had deserved, and the French, having approved the war, have lost their right to complain about their defeat.

Secondly, as to the conditions of peace: The surrender of Alsace and a small piece of Lorraine was demanded by the victors for the sake of rounding off the lines of Germany's defense, and incidentally it was remembered that the people of Alsace were Ger-
mans, that Alsace had belonged to the German empire and its people even in the year 1871 were still speaking German. The French had appropriated Strasburg and other cities some time previously, without even taking the trouble to apologize for their robbery. But having taken Alsace-Lorraine, and having held it in their possession for almost two and one-half centuries, the French claim to be justified in their sentiment of revenge.

If that revenge were proper, why should not England constantly clamor for revenge because the United States were once English colonies? Why should not the Spanish clamor for revenge to regain Gibraltar? Why should not Sweden use every opportunity to drive the Russians out of Finland? There is no need of swelling the number of instances from the books of history, ancient and modern, but the French policy of revenge and the clamors of the French people for the re-occupation of Alsace-Lorraine have surely the very slightest foundation.

The real interest of France would naturally lie in an alliance with Germany. France and Germany have common interests in the establishment of mutual business relations and a mutual protection of their colonies against England. This has often been recognized by the Germans, but the French are blinded by their vanity, their vaingloriousness and their narrow-minded hope for revenge. Like big children, they became an easy prey to the British King who ensnared them to fight the battles of Albion, and to suffer more than the English themselves, for whose benefit they are willing to sacrifice themselves only in the expectation that England and Russia will support their lust for revenge.

Even to-day the French are theatrical and vain. Every defeat is represented as a glorious retreat, and every German victory is a disgrace to the enemy. In their rhetorical style the surrender of a fortress always appears as a deed of valor, a patriotic act for the glory of France, and is sure to lead to ultimate victory. Every position abandoned is an advantage gained, and the forts either taken by the enemy or evacuated are of no strategic importance. When it can no longer be denied that the enemy marches into the interior of the country, we are informed that his advance will lead him into a trap, where he is sure to be annihilated. The Germans seem to lack intelligence, for they walk into the French traps; but instead of being caught, they somehow smash the trap to pieces. Even their victories are symptoms of the barbarism of these hordes.

The French well know why they have their war news ornamented with a most exaggerated optimism, for they know that under
the gloom of truthful reports, their troops are not likely to display overmuch courage, and a little lie is condoned if it buoy up the soldiers in battle. For assuring the publication of the desired variety of reports the office of a strict censorship has been instituted.

It is strange that the English have learned from their allies this principle in spreading war news. Though the English people are gradually beginning to resent this kind of censorship, it is still most faithfully adhered to, and the war news coming from Paris, London and Petrograd has proved so unreliable that in certain circles in the United States it is now accepted as a joke.

It is interesting to note the contradictory character of the war news. So for instance the Prussian guards have three times been absolutely annihilated, but they are fighting still; and The Scoop, the organ of the Chicago Press Club, publishes a humorous poem by J. F. Luebben of Buffalo, N. Y., on the treatment of the German army in newspaper reports. We read in The Scoop for Saturday, Sept. 26, p. 1068:

"The German soldiers, strenuous men, In peace and war and thunders, Have not been killed by French or Russ, But by newspaper blunders. Ten thousand they must die a day (They cut such funny capers); They do not die from cannon balls, But from big wads of papers. Ten thousand dying day and night, According to the guesses— They dip them all in printer's ink, And squeeze them in the presses.

Five million Germans in the war, With officers and chattels, What will the press soon do for men To fight the German battles? The German, every inch a man, Is doing some good walking. He's fighting now to beat the band, And lets us do the talking. Now news comes flying through the air,— Although they've cut the cables, The Germans found the wireless. And that may turn the tables."

The Franco-British reports praise the English and the French troops. They speak of the superiority of the French artillery and the excellence of French gunners; yet by sheer luck the Germans hit. The Germans are inferior in every respect, they are repulsed, they have heavy losses; the are losing battle after battle. And yet they advance. It is almost a miracle, and we newspaper readers in the far west wonder how a defeated army can take one position after another and enter into the territory of the victors!

Germany is at such a tremendous disadvantage; why must lines also be employed to run down that poor nation? And, as if it were not enough to be faced by the three greatest powers of the world, England, France and Russia, not to mention Belgium, which has been in the fight from the start, there is still in the distant
Orient the little nation of the farthest East, Nippon, who plays the pick-pocket on Germany, and steals the Kaiser’s possessions while his hands are full and he cannot whip the little urchin for his impudence. Japan’s behavior is cowardly, but, encouraged by England, the bold Asiatic feels that he can act with impunity. Such are thy allies, proud Albion!

It is strange that the English boast of their own free institutions and characterize the Germans as abject slaves, but any one who knows England will understand that the poor of England have scarcely any influence on the British government. Not so the Germans! The Reichstag is elected by universal suffrage. The Germans know what they are fighting for, and they are willing to fight. Young men in Germany who had formerly been rejected from military service, have offered themselves at the recruiting stations to the number of one million three hundred thousand, while in England about one hundred thousand joined the colors when volunteers were urgently requested.

The emperor has been characterized as an autocrat, a czar, a tyrant, but one thing is certain: among all the monarchs of the world the Kaiser is most closely in touch with his people, much more closely than King George is with the English people; and the reason is this, that no one doubts that the emperor’s soul is filled with the idea of duty; even where he errs he acts with the intention of doing the work that God requires him to do, and he feels the responsibility of his high position.

JAPAN.

Japan has joined the war.

The action of Japan has been received in the United States with feelings of deep distrust. On the one hand it seems an indication that the English cause must be very weak if Japan’s help is needed, and on the other hand it seems to open the possibility of drawing the United States into the war. We have sympathized with Japan during the Russo-Japanese war, but since then the Japanese have shown a strange antagonism towards the United States in the Philippines, in Honolulu, in Mexico, and now they manifest an ambition to take possession of German China as well as of the German islands in the Pacific. Their assurance that they do not enter the war for the sake of self-aggrandizement has been officially believed by President Wilson and Secretary Bryan, but finds little credence among the people.

Here are some sentences quoted from the Chicago American.
showing William Randolph Hearst's reflections on this subject, views which have found an echo all over the United States:

"The intrusion of Japan into the European war is a matter to excite the especial interest and attention of the American public. Japan has no quarrel whatever with Germany or Austria, no reason, as far as surface indications are concerned, for injecting herself into the European situation. What, then, was the secret or subterranean reason for Japan's action?

"Great Britain has often assured the government and the people of the United States that no such intimate alliance with Japan existed, but the plain facts and Japan's frank acknowledgment are incontrovertible. The action of Japan is wholly inexplicable upon any other assumption.

"Never before in the history of the country has the far-seeing wisdom of George Washington in enjoining our government to keep free from entangling alliances with foreign powers been more apparent.

"But if, in order to keep free from conflicts like that now raging in Europe, we must not enter into any alliance with any other nation, then must we all the more depend on our own resources and have resources sufficient to depend upon.

"But we should have a great navy.

"Furthermore, we should have a Panama Canal owned by the United States, controlled by the United States, fortified by the United States and in time of war at the service of the United States alone.

"If the people of our nation imagine that the reason we are not involved in this war is because of any special diplomatic inspiration of our government, or because of any impregnable situation of our country, they are as absurd in their assumption as the ostrich, who thinks if he hides his head in the sand he will not be hit by the hunter.

"We always are and always will be anxious to avoid war, but in the light of recent events it is evident that no country can tell when it will be compelled to defend itself. A great navy is our best protection and all far-seeing citizens of the United States hope that the party now in power at Washington will end its foolish and dangerous "no navy" policy and proceed promptly to give our country the protection it needs and demands."

The attitude of Japan and her procedure against Germany is a warning. Might we not over night have a war on hand on account of the secret treaties between Japan, England, and Russia in which
Mexico and the South American republics would join just for the fun?

ANTI-MACCHIAVELLI.

Some centuries ago statecraft was deemed an intricate and profound science and was assumed to have an ethics of its own. The men in power were either voluptuaries by God's grace or crafty intriguers, and the principles which guided the latter, the successful princes, were presented by Macchiavelli (1469-1527) in a book entitled Il Principe, which has been, and in certain circles is still, regarded as the primer of statecraft, and every statesman was expected to follow its precepts.

According to Macchiavelli a prince should keep up quarrels between the factions of his own state in order to preserve his dominion, and he should also stir up war between other states in order to profit by the difficulties and perplexities thus caused; or as the Latin formula runs: Divide et impera, that is to say, Cause dissensions and keep the balance of power.

A piece of practical statecraft in perfect agreement with Macchiavelli's unscrupulous maxims, is preserved in the testament of Peter the Great* from which we will here reproduce a few specimens to show our readers what it means to support Russia and how little any one can rely on Russian faith. The clauses 9-11 read thus:

"Clause 9.—Russia must incessantly extend herself toward the north along the Baltic Sea, and toward the south along the Black Sea. Our kingdom must advance as far as possible toward Constantinople and the East Indies. Whoever shall reign there will be the true master of the world. Therefore we must excite continual wars, sometimes with Turkey, sometimes with Persia: create dockyards on the Black Sea; take possession, little by little, of that sea, as well as of the Baltic, which is a point doubly necessary for the success of the project; we must hasten the downfall of Persia; penetrate as far as the Persian Gulf; re-establish, if possible, the ancient commerce of the Levant through Syria; and advance as far as the Indies, which is the emporium of the world. When once there we can do without the gold of England.

"Clause 10.—Russia must carefully seek and keep up the alliance with Austria; apparently second her design for future domination over Germany; and we must excite underhand against her a jealousy of the princes. We must incite each and all of

* Peter the Great ruled from 1689 to 1725.
these to seek succor from Russia, and exercise a sort of protection over the country, which may prepare our future domination.

"Clause 11.—We must interest the House of Austria in the expulsion of the Turk from Europe, and neutralize her jealousy after the conquest of Constantinople, either by exciting a war between her and the old states of Europe, or by giving up her part of the conquest, to retake it from her afterward."

The last will and testament of Peter the Great, proposing the plan to expand Russian influence, to Russify the whole world, and make the Czar supreme on earth, is Russia's sacred heirloom, but Russia accepted also the Triple Entente, not with an idea of benefiting England or France, but because she discovered a plan of thus using France and England for the enhancement of the grand Russian ideal. How shortsighted was Edward VII not to understand the situation, nor to suspect that he gave Russia a chance to further the Czar's ambitions!

Russian policy has been and will continue to be directed mainly against England, and the English know it; but the recent fear of growing Germany caused Edward VII to form the Triple Entente, a coalition based on Macchiavelli's principles of statecraft. English people are honest, but they do not seem to realize that the English government is guided by the policy of Macchiavelli, that they are befriending a dangerous enemy with which they will later have to reckon.

In the thirties of the eighteenth century, a new view of statecraft, first proclaimed anonymously under the title Anti-Macchiavelli proposed the principle that a prince would hold his own best if he performed his duty, if he made himself indispensable to his subjects by giving them the best possible service, and soon the secret leaked out that the author of the tract was Frederick, the brilliant young crown prince of Prussia. The news created a sensation in the European courts, for Prussia, a small upstart state of Germany, had just aroused wide-spread suspicion on account of its vigorous militarism. But now all fear was allayed; the world became convinced that the Prussian crown prince was a visionary; he loved art and science and manifested literary—especially French literary—interests; he believed in honesty in politics; he wished to be honest to other states and also to his own subjects, and indeed, in his later life as a king, he regarded himself as the first servant

*In one English paper I find that Bernard Shaw understands this point and prophesies that after the downfall of Germany, the English will be confronted with Russia. But it does not seem so certain that the English will crush the Germans.*
of the state, *le premier domestique de l'état*. How silly that principle must have appeared to the admirers of the grand and pompous Louis XIV, who is reported to have said, *L'état c'est moi!*

It is noteworthy, however, that Frederick's principle of honesty in statecraft included militarism in the proper sense of the term, i. e., the obligation to keep a country in a state of strong defense and to be prepared to fight enemies who might grudge its growth and attack it. The first act of his government consisted in maintaining his claim to Silesia in two wars against Austria.

In 1756, Austria, Russia, France and the German empire united to crush him and wipe Prussia from the face of the earth. The situation seemed absolutely hopeless for the young king. How could he defend himself against the whole world?

At that time Saxony was implicated in the alliance, and so Frederick broke the neutrality of Saxony because he saw the necessity of anticipating the crushing onslaught of his enemies. The result is known. He remained victor, and history honors him by calling him Frederick the Great. There is no need to tell the story of his life, his difficulties, his occasional defeats and his final triumph.

The spirit of Frederick the Great has not yet died out; on the contrary it has grown; it spread all over Germany; it founded the German empire and it animates the German people of to-day. It is Frederick's spirit which is now branded by the enemies of Germany as "militarism."

The Kaiser's idea that he is king of Prussia and emperor of Germany by God's grace may be based on an antiquated and superstitious notion of his divine dignity, but we must grant he interprets it in the sense that as king and emperor he is responsible to God for his government and even the Social Democrats do not doubt that he acts according to his conscience.

**BISMARCK'S VIEW.**

Bismarck foresaw the origin of the Triple Entente and feared the results of it. Would he have been able to prevent its evil results?

Here is a discussion of this topic by Dr. George L. Scherger, professor of history at the Armour Institute of Technology. He quotes some prophetic utterances of Bismarck:

"The following remark, made as early as 1875, has been fulfilled literally:

"'Mighty Germany has great tasks; above all, to keep peace
in Europe. This is my chief consideration also in the oriental crisis. I do not intend to interfere if there is any way to avoid it, for such an interference might cause a European conflagration, especially if the interests of Austria and Russia should clash in the Balkans. If I should take the side of one of these powers France would immediately join with the other, and a European war would break out. I am trying to hold two mighty beasts by the collar, in order that they may not tear each other to pieces, and in order that they may not combine against Germany.

"As regards Russia, Bismarck says again and again that Germany would not have the least interest in waging a war with her, nor would Russia with Germany, because neither has any antagonistic interests.

"Russia's Asiatic interests are not in any way dangerous to Germany, although they are to England. If Russia should defeat Germany she could only take from her a strip of territory along the Baltic which would really be a nuisance to her because its inhabitants are very democratic. Germany, on the other hand, could only hope to increase her undesirable Polish territory."

"Bismarck even stated that he would have no objection to Russia's taking Constantinople, and thought that with the possession of this gate to the Black sea she would be even less dangerous to Germany than at present. Of course he knows that this would endanger England's possession of Egypt and the Suez canal, both of which she needs as much as her daily bread.

"Not less striking are Bismarck's observations concerning France:

"'If the French are willing to keep peace with us until we attack them,' he says, 'then peace is assured forever. What should we hope to get from France? Shall we annex more French territory? I was not even strongly inclined in 1871 to take Metz because of its French population. I consulted our military authorities before I reached a final decision. It was Thiers who said to me: 'We will give you your choice between Belfort and Metz; if you insist upon both we cannot make peace.' I then asked our war department whether we could give up our demand for either of these and received the reply: 'Yes, as regards Belfort, but Metz is worth 100,000 troops; the question is whether we wish to be weaker by that many men in case we should ever have another war.' Thereupon I said: 'We will take Metz.'"

"'If Germany became involved in war with France, it would not be necessary to expect Russia to strike Germany, but if Russia
should strike first, France would be sure to join her in attacking Germany’—a most remarkable forecast of what has now actually taken place.

“As early as 1887 he said: 'Russia and France will sooner or later attack Germany.' He added that in this case the Germans could put 3,000,000 men into the field within ten days, 1,000,000 on the French border, another 1,000,000 on the Russian, and 1,000,000 reserves. There would be arms and clothes for 4,500,000. The next war would signify that either France or Germany would be wiped out of existence.

'Concerning England, Bismarck says: 'As regards foreign countries, I have had sympathy only for England, and even now am not without this feeling; but those folks do not want to be loved by us.' At another time he remarked: 'The English are full of anger and jealousy because we fought great battles—and won them. They do not like to see us prosper. We only exist in order to fight their battles for pay. That is the opinion of the entire English gentry. They have never wished us well, but have done all they could to injure us.'

'Bismarck commented upon the traditional English policy of stirring up trouble on the continent, according to the principle that when two quarrel the third may be glad. Especially desirous had she been to get Germany and Russia embroiled, so that she herself would not need to fight Russia. This is the very game England has succeeded in playing in the present war. Bismarck acknowledges that he would do the same thing if he could find some strong and foolish fellow who would fight for him.

'Bismarck thought that England, having only a few thousand troops of the line, was, when standing alone, really a negligible power, which, by playing the part of a guardian aunt, had gained a certain artificial influence, but ought some day to be limited to its proper domain. If England and France should combine against Germany, the English might destroy the German navy, which at the time was still in its infancy, but Germany would in that case make France pay the bill.

'Bismarck said: 'The Germans are like bears in this respect; they do not attack of their own accord, but they fight like mad when they are attacked in their own lairs. An appeal to fear will never find an echo in the German's heart. The German is easily betrayed by love and sympathy, but never by fear. The Germans will not start the fire. Some other nation may, but let any nation that provokes Germany beware of the furor teutonicus. We Ger-
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mans fear God, but nothing else in the world; and the fear of God induces us to love and seek peace. Whoever breaks the peace will soon realize that the same patriotism which called weak and downtrodden little Prussia to the standards in 1813 has to-day become the common property of united Germany, and that whoever attacks the German nation will find her presenting a united front, every soldier having in his heart the firm faith: God will be with us.

"Our soldiers are worth kissing; every one so fearless of death, so quiet, so obedient, so kindly with empty stomachs, wet clothes, little sleep, torn shoes; friendly to all; no plundering and wanton destruction, they pay for all they can and eat moldy bread. Our people must have a deep fund of religion, otherwise all this could not be as it is."

It almost seems that the war was unavoidable because the three great powers, Russia, France and England were determined not to allow Germany to grow too big. Perhaps Bismarck would have been able to prevent the Triple Entente.

MODERN WARFARE.

What wrong notions prevail about warfare can be seen in almost every American newspaper. In the opinion of many people, including reporters in America as well as abroad, the purpose of war seems to be to kill as many of the enemy as possible, and the losses of the victor are sometimes described and emphasized as if the vanquished army had got the best of the battle. This might be compared to a game of chess in which he would be the victor who loses the fewest pieces. It is true that every party laments the loss of men for humanitarian reasons and also on account of weakening its forces, but for the significance of the war the purpose of a battle is to gain a position which dominates the roads and places the enemy's country at the invader's mercy.

For this reason the Germans have introduced the use of bullets making clean wounds from which a healthy man may easily recover. There is no advantage in massacring the enemy, but it is very desirable to put great numbers of them hors de combat. The humanitarian motive of sparing the lives of the enemy is not uppermost in this idea, but the practical advantage of burdening the enemy with the care of their wounded men.

For the same reason, the principle has been adopted in the international agreements as to the rules of warfare that all expanding rifle bullets shall be strictly barred. It is sufficient to hit an enemy and wound him; it is unnecessary to cause him to die in
agony, or to inflict upon him wounds that are incurable. Dumdum bullets are no factor in the decision of victory in battle and are barbarous and inhuman.

A French report informs the French public that only two percent of their wounded soldiers die, which means that 98 percent, i.e., almost all of them, survive; and the writer of that note adds that the Germans are poor riflemen; they cannot shoot, and when they hit they do not kill.

Victories may be gained without a battle, by forced marches; for a victory consists in gaining a dominant position. How little the British generals know of warfare appears from the report of General French who finds himself in an untenable position and is proud of having escaped annihilation. Tommy Atkins is brave in battle, but he must be placed in the right position or his courage will manifest itself in his "brilliant retreat." Courage is an essential element in the winning of a victory, but leadership cannot be dispensed with. A general should at least be familiar with the fundamentals of warfare.

There is another superstition prevalent which is that the results of war may be calculated by seeing troops on paper. England will find out that material consisting of raw recruits is not dangerous to her enemies. A new army of one or several hundred thousand may be raised to serve as food for cannons, not to turn the tide of German triumph. In war, as everywhere, it is quality that counts and not quantity, efficiency, not numbers.

Still another error is repeated ad nauseam in British and French papers. Whenever the Germans are to be recognized for advantages gained, they are accused of unintelligent energy, slavish obedience, or the display of brutal force with their superiority of numbers. As to numbers, there is no question that the Germans are by far inferior in this respect to their enemies, the allied troops; but it is an important principle in warfare that at the critical point there must be a display of superior strength, and it is the part of strategy to recognize the decisive point and concentrate there a superior number of men. This is not brute force but superior intelligence. By and by the English will learn more of warfare and will gradually appreciate the part which intelligence plays in battle.

Modern warfare is based upon the principle that the armies should fight, not the citizens. When the citizens of a village or a city attack soldiers from their windows, thus taking part in battle, they forfeit the right to have their lives and their property respected, and the enemy punishes them by burning their houses. Strict neu-
trality on the part of civilians is universally considered an indispen-
sable rule because only in this way can an invading army be expected
to confine its attack to the hostile soldiers. If invading troops were
obliged to regard every inhabitant as an enemy who may shoot from
an ambush, they would have to massacre every one in sight in self-
defense. The participation of civilians in the fight is of no assis-
tance to their country, for they are necessarily unorganized bodies
of fighters; though they inflict damage, they suffer more in return.
Thus they would renew the savage condition in which hostility
between two nations becomes a struggle for mutual extermination.
For this reason a civilized army can not allow civilians to take
up arms and participate in the war; nor can any government let such
occurrences go unpunished, first because it must protect its own
men, and then because a combat of civilians leads back to a most
terrible barbarism.

Now the Germans claim that while the Belgians made a sortie
from Antwerp, some patriotic Belgians distributed rifles among the
citizens of Louvain, who thereupon suddenly attacked the small
force of Germans in their midst. After a battle in the streets they
were overpowered and for punishment the city or part of the city
was doomed to destruction. It is stated, however, that the quaint
old City Hall was spared. The incident of Louvain, having occurred
simultaneously with an Antwerp sortie, seems to have been in-
spired by Belgian government officials acting in concert with military
authorities at Antwerp. Similar outbreaks of the same kind have
happened before and the King of the Belgians officially expressed
his thanks for the brave resistance not only of the army but also
of the people against the invader.

King Albert, of Belgium, has given the military golden cross to
Private J. J. Rousseau of the Fourth Belgian Chasseurs for killing
Major General von Buelow after the battle of Haelen. It must
have been a lonely spot on the battlefield where the German general
appeared unfolding a map and studying the geography of the place.
Rousseau was lying on the ground among the wounded; he fired
and mortally wounded the general. The newspaper account adds:
"On the general's person the Belgians found besides a number of
dispatches $33,000 in currency which money was turned over to
the Red Cross." Disguised with the helmet of a Prussian cuirassier,
Rousseau escaped. The deed was confessedly done from ambush,
not in open battle, so it is difficult to appreciate its heroism; and the
appropriation of the dead man's property is scarcely defensible.

The government of France has been guilty of similar offenses.
The French have preached revenge in their schools and have praised the brave francs-tireurs, thus encouraging a repetition of civilian hostility against the Germans by sowing hatred against them in the minds of the children and fostering the barbarous habit of allowing the participation of the populace in war. To reproach the Germans for burning Louvain is the more unfair, as under the same circumstances every other army would have done the same. Think of the treatment which the English accorded to their Hindu prisoners as presented in a most horrifying picture by Verestchagin!

The Belgian explanation of the occurrence in Louvain, to the effect that the Germans had shot upon their own men by mistake and had then attempted to cover up their error by accusing the inhabitants of Louvain, is strangely improbable and lacks verification as much as the accusations of other alleged "atrocities."

There are vulgar men in every army, but any one who is really acquainted with armies of different nationalities will grant that the German men are more cultured and of a higher moral standing than any other private soldiers the world over; and the reason is that they are not soldiers proper, but sons of honest citizens, children of home folks who perform their military duties while being themselves traders or craftsmen or laborers, who before and after military service earn their honest and peaceable living in some regular calling in the community. There are no soldiers of fortune among them, no adventurers, no warriors by profession.

Americans have heard only one side of the situation. The cable being cut, uncensored news begins to reach us very slowly, so the sympathy with Belgium has developed among us an unfair hostility towards Germany. Not only was it known to the Germans that the French would break Belgium's neutrality with the consent of the Belgian government, but hatred against the Germans was spread among the population, afterwards causing many civilians to take part in the fighting. Shortly before the actual beginning of the war the Germans were treated most barbarously in Antwerp. The Chicago Herald of September 15 contains a letter, written August 7, which Mrs. O. C. Buss, of 6104 Kenwood Avenue, received from her sister:

"In Belgium they are murdering Germans everywhere. They dragged German women out of their beds and through the streets by the hair. Threw little children out of windows while their mothers begged for them."

About happenings which took place during the war the same lady writes: "They fired on and killed Red Cross nurses and mur-
dered the wounded. They went into a house where three wounded German soldiers were and murdered them. At the railroad station when Germans and Austrians were leaving, they tore children from their mothers' arms, and the mothers have never seen them again.

One poor fellow was wandering about with his hands tied behind his back, and his eyes gouged out. Others were found dead from the same treatment. All war news is given to the people through the police. Every policeman stands at the corner and cries out the news like a 'barker.'"

The French did not remain behind the Belgians in maltreatment of inoffensive Germans. We will quote only one statement of an American eye witness, dated New York, August 24, and published in the Chicago Examiner, August 25:

"It will never be known how many Germans were killed in Paris during the riots July 30 and 31 and August 1. The crimes of that period, could they become known, would shame the civilized world.'"

This statement was made today by Henry M. Ziegler, a Cincinnati millionaire who has made his home in Paris for five years, but fled with the American refugees on the steamship La France. Describing the scenes in Paris during these three days, before martial law was declared, Mr. Ziegler said:

"It was unsafe for any foreigner, particularly one who could not speak French, to go on the streets. For a German it was little short of suicidal. I saw one German driving down a boulevard with a woman in a cab. The mob upset the cab. The woman fainted and was trampled on, but some one finally dragged her away.

"The man made a gallant fight for his life. With his back to the overturned cab he fought desperately for several minutes. He was a big fellow, too. He struck out right and left with his fists and bowled over his assailants as fast as they got within reach, but he was finally overpowered, trampled and stabbed to death.

"I know a family that had a German cook who had been with them many years. The sons went off to war, but that was no guarantee of protection for the woman. Some one told the mob, and my friends had to hide the old woman in the cellar to save her life.

"One evening a friend and I saw the mob chasing a German. He almost got away, but was caught in an alley. My friend recognized one of his employes in the mob. The next day his employe boasted that they not only got the German we saw them after, but three others. All were stabbed to death after being beaten into insensibility.
"One of the most noticeable things in Paris are the electric signs of a big milk distributor. He has upwards of 100 milk depots in Paris, and is worth more than $5,000,000. He is a German who has lived in Paris for twenty years. The mob wrecked his electric signs and milk depots, and then some one started the report that he had poisoned the milk and was going to kill all his customers. The mob went hunting for him, but he escaped."

According to German testimony recorded in German papers, the cruelty of civilians towards helpless wounded German soldiers on the battlefield has become quite common in Belgium, and gouging out the eyes seems to have developed into a sport among a certain class of patriots who, when caught, are not treated very tenderly. It is the punishment of these offenders which has given rise to the stories of German atrocities, so far as they are based on facts.

Five American reporters, three of whom are residents of Chicago and all well known throughout the United States, write thus in a round robin about the alleged German atrocities:

"After spending two weeks with and accompanying the troops upward of one hundred miles, we are unable to report a single instance unprovoked.

"We are also unable to confirm rumors of mistreatment of prisoners or of non-combatants with the German columns. This is true of Louvain, Brussels and Luneville while in Prussian hands.

"We visited Chateau Soldre, Sambre, and Beaumont without substantiating a single wanton brutality. Numerous investigated rumors proved groundless. Everywhere we have seen Germans paying for purchases and respecting property rights as well as according civilians every consideration.

"After the battle of Biass (probably Barse, a suburb of Namur) we found Belgian women and children moving comfortably about. The day after the Germans had captured the town of Merbes Chateau we found one citizen killed, but were unable to confirm lack of provocation. Refugees with stories of atrocities were unable to supply direct evidence. Belgians in the Sambre valley discounted reports of cruelty in the surrounding country. The discipline of the German soldiers is excellent, as we observed.

"To the truth of these statements we pledge our professional and personal word. James O'Donnell Bennett, Chicago Tribune.
John T. McCutcheon, Chicago Tribune.
Roger Lewis, the Associated Press.
Irvin S. Cobb, Saturday Evening Post.
Harry Hansen, Chicago Daily News."
Some of these American reporters had been arrested for some time in the German lines. The subject is resumed in the Tribune of September 17 where we read on the first page in big print:

"That Mr. Bennett's fears of British censorship were well founded is made clear by the fact that the copy of the round robin sent by Mr. McCutcheon and himself direct to The Tribune has never been received in this office. The copy 'wirelessed' to the Associated Press from Berlin is the only one that got through."

Mr. James O'Donnell Bennett is very serious in his insistence that the truth shall come out because the untruth is spread with the obvious intent to injure the German cause. He speaks of the "round robin" as "a bare statement in which we expressed our earnest belief—a belief based on days of personal observations in the theater of war—that the reports of barbarities alleged to have been perpetrated by German troops on an inoffensive Belgian countryside are shocking falsehoods."

Referring to English censorship he speaks of that "thing as the vaunted English sense of fair play"; he mentions the "bundles of London newspapers" containing "column after column of the most harrowing and dreadful accounts of most infamous barbarities inflicted upon the Belgian peasantry by German troops." Trying to verify one case Mr. Bennett says: "Always on our march the facts relative to the German atrocities evaded us. Always it was in 'the next village' that a woman had been outraged, a child butchered, or an innocent old man tortured. Arriving at that 'next village,' we could get no confirmation from the inhabitants. 'No,' they would say, 'it did not happen here; but we heard that it was in the next village, messieurs.' But the next village would develop naught authentically—only wild stories, rumors, hearsay. At Soire-sur-Sambre, all around which there had been fighting on Sunday and Monday, the 23d and 24th of August, the burgomaster said to us in the late afternoon of Wednesday, the 26th: 'As reports come in from surrounding towns I am unable to verify these rumors of cruelties perpetrated against unarmed civilians, and I give no credence to them.'"

Much has been said also of the maltreatment of women, and this subject, too, is mentioned by Mr. Bennett who says:

"The most terrific outrage any of us has seen was seen by Cobb. With his own appreciative eyes he saw a laughing German soldier, who was crossing a street in Louvain, lean forward and imprint a kiss on the cheek of a Belgian girl who was bantering him. The girl promptly slapped his face. The soldier laughed the
louder. The girl began to laugh, too. The incident was closed. Cobb said it was as quaint and merry a scene in homely life as ever he saw. That was week before last."

Mr. Bennett in speaking of the falsehoods of the English reports of German atrocities blames the Louvain citizens themselves for the destruction of their city. Having mentioned another item he says: "A few days later Louvain lost its head. It went mad. Its civilians fired from ambushade upon German soldiers. The deed was the supreme outrage against laws of civilized warfare. The punishment was terrible and it has put the fear of the Prussian god into every Belgian city and hamlet from Antwerp to Beaumont, from Ostend to Liège. To-day the ancient and renowned university city of northern Europe lies in ashes."

Louvain is not a "university city" in the usual sense of the word. Its great educational institution is called "the Catholic University," in contrast to modern scientific universities, and some young priests there appear to have taken a prominent part in the fight against the heretical Germans.

While I write, the German official report of the destruction of Louvain reaches me. It was published in Berlin August 30 and disposes of all the Belgian fables:

"The city of Louvian surrendered and was given over to us by the Belgian authorities. On Monday, August 24, some of our troops were shipped there, and intercourse with the inhabitants was developing quite friendly.

"On Tuesday afternoon, August 25, our troops, hearing about an imminent Belgian sortie from Antwerp, left in that direction, the commanding general ahead in a motor car, leaving behind only a colonel with soldiers to protect the railroad (Landsturm Battalion 'Neuss').

"As the rest of the commanding general's staff, with the horses, was going to follow, and had gathered on the market place, rifle fire suddenly opened from all the surrounding houses, all the horses being killed and five officers wounded, one of them seriously.

"Simultaneously fire opened at about ten different places in town, also on some of our troops just arrived and waiting on the square in front of the station, and on incoming military trains. That it was a designed co-operation with the Belgian sortie from Antwerp was established beyond a doubt.

"Two priests who were caught handing out ammunition to the people were shot at once in front of the station.

"The street fight lasted till Wednesday, the 26th, in the after-
noon (twenty-four hours), when stronger forces, which arrived in the meantime, succeeded in getting the upper hand. The town and northern suburb were burning at different places, and by this time probably have burned down altogether.  

"On the part of the Belgian government a general rising of the populace against the enemy had been organized for a long time; depots of arms were found, where to each gun was attached the name of the citizen to be armed.  

"A spontaneous rising of the people has been recognized at the request of the smaller states at The Hague conference, as being within the law of nations, in so far as weapons are carried openly and the laws of civilized warfare are observed; but such rising was only admitted in order to fight the attacking enemy.  

"In the case of Louvain the town had already surrendered and the populace submitted without resistance, the town being occupied by our troops.  

"Nevertheless the populace attacked us on all sides and discharged murderous fire on the occupying forces and newly-arriving troops, which came in trains and automobiles.  

"Therefore it is not a question of the means of defense allowed by the law of nations, nor of a warlike ambush, but only of a treacherous attack by the civilian population all along the line. This attack is all the more to be condemned as it was apparently planned long beforehand to take place simultaneously with an attack from Antwerp; for arms were not carried openly, and women and young girls took part in the fight, blinding our wounded and gouging their eyes out.  

"The barbarous attitude of the Belgian population in all parts occupied by our troops has not only justified our severest measures, but forced them upon us for the sake of self-preservation.  

"The violence of the resistance of the populace is shown by the fact that in Louvain twenty-four hours were necessary to break down their attack.  

"We ourselves regret deeply that during these fights the town of Louvain has to a large extent been destroyed. Needless to say, these consequences were not intentional on our part, and could not be avoided."

The truth leaks out more and more. Mr. Joseph Medill Patterson, editor of the Chicago Tribune, now on the theater of war, writes an explicit account of the alleged atrocities and says: "I firmly believe that all the stories put out by the British and French of torture, mutilation, assaults etc. by Germans are utter rubbish."
George F. Porter of Chicago, now in London, writes in the same spirit. Here is an account of one of his many personal investigations and the inkling of truth it contained:

"They did tell me, however, of a Belgian nurse at the St. Thomas Hospital here [London] with the tendons of her wrist cut. I went there immediately, saw the secretary of the hospital and found there was a nurse there, but that instead of the tendons of her wrists being cut she had burned her wrists badly by the explosion of a spirit lamp on which she was making tea. Here was a typical example of the way stories are fabricated out of nothing."

We learn from German papers that only about one-sixth of Louvain has been burned down. The rest has been preserved. Some churches and other valuable buildings were destroyed during the fight, but were not set on fire by the Germans. Some German officers did their best to save valuable pictures.

The lies of German atrocities are strangely offset by the great wrongs committed by the Belgians, not only in taking an active part in the war but also in the most heinous crimes of battle-hyenas. Many persons have been captured who found a pastime in torturing wounded German soldiers and indulged mainly in gouging out the eyes of their helpless victims.*

The Belgians complain of German atrocities, but they seem to think that private citizens are not bound to respect the rules of warfare. They deemed it right to drive German inhabitants out of Antwerp in a most cruel feud; and the French and English make use of dumdum bullets. The Kaiser made the following statement to President Wilson, to whom complaints had been submitted by the Belgians:

"I consider it my duty, sir, to inform you as the most notable representative of the principles of humanity—that after the capture of the French Fort of Longwy my troops found in that place thousands of dumdum bullets which had been manufactured in special works by the French government. Such bullets were found not only on French killed and wounded soldiers and on French prisoners, but also on English troops. You know what terrible wounds and awful suffering are caused by these bullets, and that their use is strictly forbidden by the generally recognized rules of international warfare.

"I solemnly protest to you against the way in which this war

*The Chicago Herald of September 22, page 1, contains an extract from W. Scheuermann's report of the cruelty of Belgian civilians, among them young girls.
is being waged by our opponents, whose methods are making it one of the most barbarous in history.

"Besides the use of these awful weapons, the Belgian government has openly incited the civil population to participate in the fighting, and has for a long time carefully organized their resistance. The cruelties practised in this guerrilla warfare, even by women and priests, toward wounded soldiers and doctors and hospital nurses—physicians were killed and hospitals fired on—were such that eventually my generals were compelled to adopt the strongest measures to punish the guilty and frighten the bloodthirsty population from continuing their shameful deeds.

"Some villages, and even the old town of Louvain, with the exception of its beautiful town hall (Hotel de Ville), had to be destroyed for the protection of my troops.

"My heart bleeds when I see such measures inevitable and when I think of the many innocent people who have lost their houses and property as a result of the misdeeds of the guilty."

The worst feature of the citizen's fight in Louvain is the attitude of the Belgian government in sending out official orders in writing to the leaders of the patriotic party. These misguided fanatics had hoped to exterminate the entire little garrison. That the Belgian government had taken an important part in this murderous work, may serve as an excuse to the citizens who ventured into the fight, but we can not blame the Germans for insisting on severe punishment. Apparently in the opinion of the King of Belgium there is no difference between war and assassination. He may be well-intentioned, but appears to lack judgment.

MILITARISM.

The term "militarism" is of recent coinage, and it may mean the German institution of universal military service, or the shortcomings of military institutions. The former is militarism as it ought to be, the latter are excrescences of military arrogance, a kind of social disease which will naturally and from time to time make its appearance, or develop into an epidemic. There is no need of explaining the disease of militarism which, as it seems, was contracted by some members of the officers' corps at Zabern, and which has been severely censured in Germany by the Reichstag. We will only say that militarism, in that sense, has always been of a transient nature and has never been worse in Germany than in other countries.

Militarism, as an institution of the German empire, established by law, with the full consent of the German people, for the sake
of national defense, is a state of things that can neither be condemned nor commended off-hand, but must be studied and understood. Only people who know it, not merely from experience but also in its history and actual efficiency, can really express an intelligent opinion regarding it.

If there is any one outside of Germany who can speak with authority on the subject, it is the writer of the present article. He is sufficiently informed as to its history during the last one hundred and six years; he has served in the German army and has been an officer in a Saxon artillery regiment; he knows the German needs, which demand the sacrifice of military service, and is well acquainted with the spirit of German patriotism which, for the sake of patriotism, assents to it.

The German army is different from any other, and especially from the English army. The official definition of the German army reads that it is "the German people in arms"—das Deutsche Volk in Waffen. The fatherland does not enlist mercenaries; it calls upon every able-bodied man of the nation to appear at the colors and be ready for the defense of his country. The Kaiser is the leader, the lord of battle, who has the highest command, and to whom every soldier has to swear his oath of allegiance.

How often do foreigners misrepresent the state of things, and pity the German soldiers for allowing themselves to be enslaved in the service of a tyrant who will lead them to be slaughtered. What foolishness! Does any one believe that the German army could win its decisive battles if it consisted of slaves and were serving the private interests of a vainglorious monarch? Great battles can be won only by free men inspired by an idea, and the Germans of to-day do not fight for the possession of a few hundred million pounds sterling, not for dollars and cents, but for their homes, their liberty, their country. In order to defeat Germany, her enemies will have to slay the whole male population capable of bearing arms.

The origin of the present system of militarism dates back one hundred and five or six years, to the time when Napoleon I had humiliated Prussia. One of the conqueror's conditions of peace was that the Prussian army should be limited in numbers. So the Prussian general Scharnhorst kept on changing his soldiers; he had them trained and discharged, only to be replaced by new recruits, and when the day of liberation dawned, the inhabitants rose in great masses, not as raw recruits, but as trained men, in an army about four times as strong as had been permitted to be kept. This system of regarding the standing army as a school has been worked
out first for Prussia and then for Germany, to its present completion, not for the benefit of one man, but for the people; and the history of Germany has impressed the necessity of militarism upon the whole nation. The suddenness with which the present war broke upon Germany is but a new proof of the absolute necessity of a national defense.

Militarism in this sense, as a systematic defense of the nation, will not be abolished, as some ignoramuses predict, but will be more securely and permanently established than ever in the fatherland, and all the enemies of Germany will have to adopt it if they intend to have the same, or approximately the same, military efficiency.

France has introduced militarism, but the English newspaper writers find no fault with French militarism, although it is more severe than the German system, and lacks its intellectual advantages. I will only mention here the one-year service in Germany, reserved for youths of higher education, a distinction which is not permitted in France, on the ground that there ought not to be preference of any kind in a republic. But the preference shown is not that of a privileged class, it is not due to noble birth, nor to wealth; this preference is allowed to those who, by public examinations or in their course of education, prove themselves worthy of this distinction; any one can secure the privilege if he but reaches the required standard of education. From these volunteers for one-year service, the officers are chosen for the reserves. This privilege of a one-year service looks like an aristocratic institution. It is not, and, as a result, there is no one, not even among the Social Democrats, who finds fault with it. On the contrary it is a stimulus to education.

The German army is one of the most democratic institutions in the world. Its supreme law is efficiency, and that is being attained without respect to persons. The son of a duke, a prince, the millionaire's son, or any poor fellow from the lowest ranks of the peasantry, all are treated alike, all have to perform their duty, and from the beginning the best example has been set by the princes of the imperial house, the Hohenzollerns themselves.

And what is the result? The German people acquire an invaluable education in duty, in promptness, in accuracy, qualities in which all other nationalities, without exception, are sorely deficient. Even young men who do not serve are benefited by German militarism, for they inevitably imbibe its spirit.

How often has the criticism been made, that the German youths lose two or three years from the most important part of their lives,
in military service; but the truth is that the money annually spent on the army brings as great returns as that which is expended for public schools; this militarism is part and parcel of the German education, and sometimes men wonder where Germans have acquired those qualities of sturdiness, of a sense of duty, of exactness in details. A wealthy foreigner living in Germany, and wishing to engage a driver, will naturally first propose to a candidate for the position the question whether he has served in the army; for if he has done so, he will probably be the more efficient and the more reliable. Would not our American youths be better equipped for life if they had served in the army?

Germany's militarism does not suit Germany's enemies, for militarism, in the best sense of the term, has enabled Germany to withstand the attacks of her foes. While the Germans were absolutely peaceful, their neighbors fell upon the fatherland and tore off province after province from the empire, and those German tribes that found no support in the common fatherland became independent. Strasburg and other cities of Alsace-Lorraine became French, Pomerania fell to Sweden, the Netherlands and Switzerland became independent, and finally the entire German empire broke down. Thus the exigencies of national struggles developed German militarism so called, to supply the manhood of the country with a methodical training in self-defense.

Mr. H. G. Wells, the English novelist, declares that "every soldier who fights against Germany now is a crusader against war." He adds: "This greatest of all wars is not just another war: it is the last war!"

There are many apparently intelligent people who claim that England, France and Russia are not fighting Germany, but the militarism of Germany, and as soon as the power of this institution is broken, the era of universal peace will be at hand. There is scarcely any need of refuting the hypocrisy of this claim. One thing is certain: if in Great Britain every man were in duty bound to rally to the defense of his country, the British would not have rushed into war, and it is probable that if the German type of militarism were introduced throughout the world, there would be fewer wars, and none of them would be entered into with such frivolous and unscrupulous stupidity as the war of this year.

GROWING MILITARISM.

The advocates of peace are often peculiar people; they preach peace on earth, and their ideal is quite commendable; but each clam-
ors for his own peace. England will preserve peace so long as she owns the seas, and Germany's chief fault is the exasperating persistence with which she builds up a navy. Italians of the "peace" party condemn war, but they justify the conquest of Tripoli; and there are Americans, for example, Mr. William Randolph Hearst and Mr. Richmond P. Hobson, who demand a strong American navy to dominate the Pacific and the Atlantic.

Such views are often uttered. A certain famous "peace advocate" once said that he would shoulder the gun himself to keep the Japanese out of the United States, and Mr. Tschirn, whose German poem we have quoted above, also belongs to those who desire "peace at any price."

There are some in England who declare that the present war will be the last one; that it is commendable, because it is a war against militarism; but one Englishman, Mr. C. Cohen, a liberal and freethinker, prophesies that this war can not lead to peace, but is sowing future discord. He says: "Who is to say that there shall be no more wars? Is it England? Is it Russia? Is it France? Is it the three combined? Will any of these trust the others enough to depute the task? Are Russia and France and England in alliance with each other because of their mutual love or because of their enmity of others? Was it love of Russia that drove France into alliance, or hatred of Germany? And with Germany eliminated what bond is there that can unite the autocracy of the Czar and the republicanism of France?"

He continues: "An international agreement that would secure peace is a laudable ideal, but how is it to be secured? England, it may be assumed, will still demand the control of the seas. It suits us, and we say it is necessary to our existence. Very good; but can we expect every other country to submit to this ownership of the world's highway for ever and with good feeling? Why, this fact alone will drive other nations along the old line of offensive and defensive alliances, the fruits of which we are reaping in the present war. And alliances based upon such considerations as hold the Christian nations of the world together may be broken at any moment. Nor is there any power based upon force too strong to be overthrown. Of course, it may be said that it is to everybody's interest that some international agreement should be reached when this war is concluded, and such outbreaks prevented in future. Quite so; but, on the other hand, it is never to anybody's real

*See "The Metaphysical Point of View of Italy in the Turkish War" in The Open Court, XXVI, p. 190.
interest to go to war. Even to win is to lose. The truth is, that nations do not go to war because it really pays them, but because of misdirected ambitions and mistaken ideals; in other words, because of lack of intelligence and defective civilization.

"How wrongly the lessons of this war are being read, may be seen in the newspaper talk about 'blotting Germany out,' or 'wiping Germany off the map.' These are the greatest fools of all. If by 'blotting out Germany' is meant the destruction of the German navy and defeat of the German army, that may be done, and looks like being done—unless our press censorship is keeping us in the dark. But Germany remains, the German people remain, German ambitions remain, and there will also remain the memory of a crushing defeat. And the man is a lunatic, blind alike to the lessons of history and the facts of human nature, who imagines that a nation of seventy millions can be 'blotted out.' All the power of Russia has not been able to crush the sentiment of nationality in Finland. All the power of Russia, Germany and Austria has not been able to crush out the sentiment of nationality in Poland. After four centuries, England, in spite of all it could do, finds the sentiment of Irish nationality as active as ever. Short of an absolute, a complete massacre, a nation of seventy millions cannot be 'blotted out.' They remain, their ideals and ambitions, and their way of looking at life, must always be reckoned with.

"Armaments will go on; of that I feel assured, although I should be only too pleased to find myself mistaken."

Note that Mr. Cohen expects Great Britain and her allies to win, but his belief is subject to a slight doubt. Certainly we agree with him in his conclusion when he says: "There is only one way to peace; and that is the growth of intelligence and humanity."

The peace advocates in England are certainly mistaken if they claim that this war is a war against militarism and that it will be the last war. There are symptoms of a growing militarism.

The British government has come to the conclusion that the war will not be so easy as originally supposed. It will need more soldiers, and so recruiting offices are opened. We read in the newspapers that Rudyard Kipling has offered his oratorical talent to persuade young men to join the army, and that he said:

"We must have many men, if we, with the allies, are to check the inrush of organized barbarism. We have only to look to Belgium to realize the minimum of what we may expect here. Germany's real object is the capture of England's wealth, trade and world-wide possessions."
EXECUTION OF RUSSIAN PEASANTS.
By Verestchagin.
If you knew a little more about Germany and were a little less infected with English egotism, Mr. Kipling, you would be ashamed of what you have said!

Speaking at a great recruiting meeting in Liverpool, Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, said: "If the German navy does not come out and fight, they will be brought out like rats in a hole....The English should have no anxiety about the result of the war."

No comment is necessary on this specimen of modern English, as spoken in these days by the men who are guiding English destinies. England's navy must be proud of the First Lord of the Admiralty.

In the second week of September another inducement to join the army appeared in London, on large bill-boards which read thus:

"We've got to beat Germany because her arrogant brutality is a menace to civilization; because she breaks treaties; because she murders non-combatants; because she destroys beautiful cities; because she sows mines in the open sea; because she fires on the sacred Red Cross; because her avowed object is to crush England.

"Men of England, remember Louvain.

"The fight is democracy vs. tyranny.

"Do you wish to share the fate of Belgium?

"If not, enlist now."

Why did the author of these posters not say: "The Germans are cannibals; they are coming to roast your babies for supper and will make boots of human skin!" Such descriptions of the Germans might have been more effective. They would not have been less false than the placard, and would have been more fanciful, more poetical and more romantic. In modern English newspapers, Germany is almost comparable to the ogre shouting:

"Fee, Fi, Fo, Fum.
I smell the blood of an Englishman.
Be he alive or be he dead,
I'll grind his bones to make my bread."

My dear English friends: If your liberty is really at stake, rush to the colors, have your names enrolled in your country's service, take up arms to defend England's honor; but I fear the honor of England has been tarnished, not by the Germans, but by your own ministers, by your statesmen, your diplomats, by those men who, by their secret treaties, by the machinations of the Triple Entente, have led you into a most perverse and stupid war. If your country needs defense, join the army, but first have your generals replaced by
disable men, men who are able to meet an enemy as great as your Saxon brothers of the continent. And, above all, see to it that you fight for a cause that is honorable, not merely a flimsy excuse to rid your shop-keepers of a dangerous rival, even though the sum at stake may average two hundred million pounds a year! Fight for a cause endorsed by men of understanding, by men of honor!

And if you fight, do not slander your enemy, do not discredit him, do not lie about him, do not brag about your own superiority, your greater prowess, your courage, your unrivaled heroism; history will correct your bravadoes and you are running the risk of making yourselves ridiculous. The writer of these lines has been your friend, your defender, your supporter. He feels ashamed now of the misjudgment he has shown, and even yet he feels inclined to defend you by saying that, in his opinion, you English people are perfectly honorable, and that it is only a very small diplomatic clique that has misled you. This small clique has brought on the war without the consent of the people, and even now your government establishes a censorship of news and propagates deliberate falsehoods for the sake of defending the war, and to induce English youths to prop up the blunders that have been made.

I would try to convince you that, by provoking the war, Great Britain has not only done wrong—a grievous wrong—but she has proved to be blind. The war policy leads you to your own ruin. You have made an enemy of a people that has been your friend, and, in Germany, you will have a most insistent and dangerous enemy. At present you do not care, but the time will come when you will regret having lost Germany’s good will. I can not help seeing greater danger in this war for England than for Germany. Great Britain is scarcely prepared to face the danger.

As soon as war has begun, people, as a rule, become impervious to reason, and I fear that my friends in England have reached that stage. They have grown mad: they have become incapable of arguing calmly and impartially. They believe all, they hope all, they suffer all. They believe all accusations against their enemies, the most impossible ones. They hope for victories where there is but little if any chance. They suffer defeats with patience, in anticipation of a final triumph which they, in their vanity, think must be theirs.

In Germany, warfare has been developed into a science, and it is not left to a genius who is able to assume leadership. The German army is a school in which German youths are trained to be good soldiers, and the German general staff is also a school in which
officers are instructed in strategy. There is not a Moltke to lead them, but Moltke's spirit guides them all. Should one of them die to-day, even if he occupy the highest rank, there are dozens who can take up the work.

The indignation of the Germans against the English is tremendous. The Germans were prepared for French hatred and Russian impudence, but the bickerings between these brother nations were (at least in the writer's opinion) petty jealousies such as often exist among quarrelsome brothers. But now England declares war at a moment when Germany is in the greatest danger from the simultaneous attack of her two neighbors, in the east and in the west, the two mightiest land-powers next to herself. And at this critical moment for Germany, England casts in her lot with Germany's foes, in the hope of dealing a crushing blow. But England may be mistaken. Things may turn out differently from what is now expected. My good English friends, how I wish you had not been so rash in venturing into this war—this abominable war, this vicious, mean, ill-intentioned war, this most stupid war.

The Roman proverb says, Quern Deus perdere vult cum de-mentat. When surrounded by enemies, Ulrich von Hutten, the valiant knight of the age of the Reformation, exclaimed, Viel Feind, viel Ehr! Certainly, Germany, much honor is thine, for thine enemies are numerous, and England among them! What a glory for Germany! What a shame on England!

Quantilla prudentia Britannia regitur! How small is the wisdom with which Great Britain is ruled.

CONCLUSION.

A few personal comments may throw light on the fundamental conception upon which my opinion of the war rests. I have been, for almost my entire life, since I began to think, an advocate of the federation of the great Teutonic nations, as a guarantee of the peace of the world,—Great Britain and her colonies, Germany with Austria, and the United States.

This political ideal of mine is not founded upon pan-Germanism, though it does not in the least exclude it. Modern civilization has been worked out in England, Germany and the United States. Here are the centers of progress, here live the people from whom we may expect further progress, deeper thought, clearer science, and advancement in a conception as well as in a realization of noble humanity. Other smaller countries cluster about them; they are
either of kindred blood or kindred language and thought. They belong to them as younger brothers who look up respectfully to their elder brothers.

If these three groups of nations, centering about Germany, England and the United States, stand together, the peace of the world will be assured. So long as they do the right, all the smaller nationalities, states and groups of states will have to behave, and the peaceful realization of a highly cultured civilization will most assuredly be ours. But now this ideal—a by no means impossible one—has become an illusion. My hope of seeing it established has now, within a day, turned to despair. And why? Because one brother does not want another one to grow beyond his present stature. The Anglo-Saxon grew at first more quickly than the older German, but since, of late, the German has made a sudden start, and threatens to outdo the Saxon, the specter of war has appeared, and the two brothers face each other, sword in hand. And the end will be that one of them will fall. What a tragedy for mankind! Whatever the final result may be, mankind, with its ideals, will be the loser.

Woe unto those villainous advisers who have begun the war. They think themselves wise, but they are short-sighted. They appeal to the lowest and vilest motives of their countrymen, and hope to enrich their country by the ruin of their brothers. Woe unto them! The curse of their own people will most surely fall upon them. So far the English people seem only to have expected to see the Germans crushed between the French and the Russians. But what if Germany should rise beyond her present state, and develop a grandeur of untold strength? What if the spirit of God should come upon her, and she should smite her foes, and chastise them according to their deserts? What if, after conquering her Gallic enemy, she should overcome the giant Slav, and finally the Saxon, her own wicked brother beyond the channel?

My dear English friends! I love the English nation, and I wish that England could be regenerated. On my last visit to Europe I beheld with joy a new growth in France, but sensible thoughtful minds do not yet figure sufficiently in her politics. They are still in the minority. Any mob of self-styled patriots can cry them down, and if they should ever dare to utter an honest opinion they would be denounced as traitors.* In Germany I have witnessed an almost incredible advance in every line, and though there

---

* M. Jaure was against the war and he was shot by an unknown hand. No serious effort appears to have been made to punish the assassin.
are still many things which have not my approval, I must state my conviction that, upon the whole, the life of the nation is developing in the right direction. Even a hater of Germany cannot deny her his admiration. In England conditions are different; wretched poverty, almost unknown on the continent, is apparent in the very streets of London, and in the by-ways of the country. My dear good English friends, believe me, for the sake of your own best interests, that you cannot enrich your poor countrymen by ruining your German brothers on the other side of the channel. It will do you no good to wipe the Teuton, with his competition, off of the face of the earth, but it will be terrible to face him when he rises against you with all his might, in his just wrath. Why did Greece fall? Because Sparta and Athens hated each other. Will you not learn from history, and must you repeat the sin of older generations, only to reap the same punishment? The Germanic civilization, represented by Germany, England and the United States, is leading now, but the Slav hopes to take their place, and the Japanese, the most active people of the yellow race, are filled with ambition also to enter the field. An internecine war of the Gemanic nations is apt to pave the way for both Slav and Asiatic ascendency.

As a friend of the English, and also in the interest of the further development of the British empire, I cannot help feeling a grim dissatisfaction with English politics. The present war which Great Britain has undertaken against Germany and Austria-Hungary is against the real, the vital, and the all-important interest of Great Britain; hence I believe that the statesmen who, by their advice, their conduct, and their decisions, have brought about this war, have shown an obvious lack of judgment and have become guilty of gross criminality.

The war is unjust, the leaders of government affairs have not been fair to the German cause; but, in addition, they have neglected to acquire even the most superficial information about the ability of the German people to wage a war, and have thoughtlessly and unnecessarily changed a vigorous, powerful and friendly nation into a most formidable foe. The consequences of this action will endure into the most distant future, and can, under no circumstances, even in case of a victory, ever be or become favorable. And, in addition, England will, of course, have to suffer the usual curses which follow in the wake of war,—slaughter and ruin, the blighting of civilization and culture, of industry and commerce, and the death knell of the blessings of peace.

The men of England who have advocated the war and have
stirred the English people with hatred, are guilty of the blackest crime; they have committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, that sin which can never be forgiven. If I were an English citizen, I would advocate their removal from those high offices which they have so shamefully disgraced, and would even go so far as to have them indicted for high treason against Great Britain for their neglect of duty and because they have brought upon the British empire the curse of evil counsel.

* * *

The outbreak of war between Great Britain and Germany has proved to me the greatest and saddest disappointment of my life. I have investigated the conditions and motives which led to it with sincere impartiality, but I have come to definite conclusions which place the guilt first of all, mainly and almost exclusively at the door of English diplomacy. Should I be mistaken, I wish to be refuted not by general declarations against German militarism, by denunciations of Kaiserism and Prussianism, such as betray mere ignorance and prejudice, but by real facts or good, sound arguments. I am open to conviction and I shall carefully study all answers which contain actual points worth considering, yea, I will give publicity to them and, in case I shall have to change my views, promise to confess my errors openly and without reluctance.