

LESSONS OF THE WAR.

BY THE EDITOR.

INTRODUCTION.

SO suddenly has war fallen upon Europe that we can scarcely realize it as yet, and are at a loss to know what to think of it. Many among us believe in the establishment of universal peace on earth, and are inclined to condemn armaments and readiness for war, which they call "militarism," and these people are least prepared to form a correct and sound judgment of the situation. Considering the difficulty of understanding the nature of war and the part it plays in the history of mankind we will here briefly outline the lessons which the war teaches us.

According to the theory of evolution the one main factor that determines the survival of the fittest is the struggle for life; and in commerce this struggle for life shows itself as competition, and in the rivalry of the nations, as war. Life is not a mere frolic; it is a combat, and our first duty is to maintain ourselves. The fit survive, the unfit go to the wall. War is the natural state of things; peace is introduced by civilization as an artificial means to alleviate the sufferings of war and to eliminate them more and more.

Civilization should not be regarded as unnatural because it is higher than the more primitive condition of a war of all against all. Civilization is higher nature; it is, and should be, nature refined and ennobled. So we will understand that peace is not the abolition of struggle, but simply a higher kind. Peace abolishes slaughter but leaves competition, and competition often proves to be more severe than war. The struggle for life in the time of peace in mercantile and industrial competition is frequently as keen as a battle, sometimes it is worse; it demands courage, quickness of decision, keen foresight and strong endurance as much as the conflicts of war.

The first lesson then is this: We shall never be able to do away with struggle altogether, for struggle is the nature of life. But we shall be able to avoid unnecessary sufferings, and this is slowly being accomplished by means of civilization.

A universal and lasting peace is an ideal which is not impossible, but we are sure that it can be realized only upon the basis of force. Peace on earth will come about as a matter of course only when the men of goodwill hold the balance of power. So long as the unjust, the brutishly greedy, the narrow-minded and stupid have anything to say in international affairs peace will remain impossible, and therefore it will be the duty of every civilized nation to be prepared for self-defense. This is the second lesson we have to learn.

Germany was pretty well prepared for war. She suffered so much in former centuries from being unprepared that at last she has learned the lesson. If other nations should fall upon the United States as the allies fell upon Germany, we should be unable to resist and would have either to make an ignoble peace or suffer great reverses before we could assert ourselves. And how few of us know that it is our duty to be prepared for war! In this rough world of ours we must unlearn that goody-goody morality which praises the ideal of peace at any price and denounces the lion as an evil doer because he lives on a flesh diet. Its emblem of goodness is the sheep, or the lamb innocently butchered. We do not glorify the wolf, the representative of lower nature, but we do not mean to worship the lamb with its passive virtue, so the third lesson of the war may be formulated thus: "Ovine morality is wrong." We must cease to admire and imitate the sheep because it is so good, so very good that it would rather be devoured than fight.

The ovine ideal was greatly admired in Germany till it brought on a dissolution of the empire and allowed the nation to go to wrack and ruin and be wiped off from the face of the earth. The Hohenzollerns with their people, the little state of Brandenburg-Prussia, learned the lesson of war and the duties of self-assertion; and from them came the salvation of Germany.

We do not mean to say that either the Hohenzollerns or the Prussians were faultless, or that Prussianism did not exhibit much onesidedness. The Prussians went too far in emphasizing militarism; they have often enough neglected the culture of art and science and have been eclipsed by smaller states in literature, in art, and other branches of intellectual progress. Certainly they can be criticized and have been held up to ridicule frequently and not

without justice. But when the time of danger came and the very existence of Germany was threatened, Prussia came to the rescue and saved Germany from extinction; and the lesson which the recent events teach us is this: "Go ye United States and do likewise," which means, "Be prepared for self-defense."

Let us not only educate our boys in Sunday schools, but let us make men of them. The desire for self-defense is natural. If we were to become implicated in a war on a large scale and if hostile armies were to invade our country, there is danger that our citizens might turn into snipers instead of warriors. It is to be feared that this will be the case with England if the country is invaded, and the result would be terrible.

In former articles¹ I have advocated the principle that our young men should be drilled in military service, and it seems to me that it ought to be done somewhat in the style of the Swiss army. I am firmly convinced that it would be beneficial to our youth. The boys need it, and a critical moment might come when such an institution would preserve peace, or, if that should prove impossible, would serve to protect our country efficiently.

The fifth lesson therefore is this: A military training will do good to every one of our boys, and militarism, the right kind of militarism, is a necessity which ought to be introduced in our own country. Its introduction into England in a system of compulsory military training has already been announced. The English propose to crush militarism in Germany where it has reached a certain perfection, but they do not and never did object to the barbarous militarism of Russia nor to their own navalism, and now are going to establish an English militarism.

MY CRITICS.

I may be excused for taking space to characterize my critics by citing quotations, but these specimens exhibit the violent nature of the great masses of the supporters of the English cause. They scold, they calumniate, they jump at unjustifiable conclusions; mere suspicions, absolutely wrong, are uttered as undeniable facts, and even if their errors are refuted they cling to their beliefs.

The letters of protest which have come to me in response to the October number of *The Open Court* are rare, only ten so far, while whole-hearted endorsements are numerous, among them a telegraphic greeting from the New York society of former German

¹ See, for instance, "Duplicate the Naval Academy, *Open Court*, XV, 495.

university students in appreciation of the view I have taken.² The language of my critics is bitter, and three of the ten come from Canada. A Canadian friend of mine assures me that Canadians, including German Canadians, have no opportunity to become acquainted with the German side of the question.

One letter from Toronto, signed "Jones," without street address, contains a long newspaper clipping relating to the establishment of a German secret service to influence public opinion abroad, but it is peculiar that this secret service is reported to have been founded in a public meeting. The letter reads: "Are you one of the Secret Service agents of Germany in America? From October issue would think so. The paper that sells its conscience, if its Editor has any, is contemptable."

Another letter of the same character reads: "...From the beginning to the end of the magazine you have shown that you are clearly a subsidized agent of the German government. For gold you have got together a lot of quotations and other material to belittle the British empire in the eyes of the world at the present time You were not thinking of the cruelties that were being practised by the soldiers of 'Cultured Germany' in Belgium...."

The same Toronto critic writes in a second letter:

"You are to me a 'snake in the grass,' and you are playing a double game which will finally reflect itself against you. The twaddle you have been publishing for the edification of your readers, could be, however, easily scattered to the four winds of heaven so far as its correctness is concerned. However, a man who apparently has been bribed with German gold or else become imbued or obsessed with the mental capacity of the mad professors of Germany, would not listen to any wisdom coming from a person who has traveled extensively throughout the world, and knows the feeling that is predominant among the intelligent portion of the world. Germany will be 'smashed' with all its *mad professors*."

A third letter, coming from the United States and anonymous, is on the same level. Its arguments are not rational nor logical, but delightfully vigorous in invectives: "Never again shall any publication bearing your name enter my house, nor any decent

² Men who have attended German universities are very numerous all over the United States and all belong to the most intellectual class of our citizens. Some of them have founded a society under the name *Verein aller deutschen Studenten* which is flourishing in many of our larger cities, especially New York and Chicago, but also in many smaller towns. Most of the members are Americans or German Americans, and I have reason to believe that the sympathies of most of them are pro-German in this crisis.

American household that I can keep it out of. Never again will I vote for any man who calls himself 'a German-American.' He lies. Moreover, he is a fool. I know that I cannot insult you by calling you a liar. You are a German. I call you a fool. You can feel that. To you and all other exponents of *die Kultur*, as illustrated at Louvain, my undying contempt. You remind me of the gorilla whose ego was too large for his cosmos."

A fourth letter from a Canadian resident in the United States, "saying a definite farewell" to *The Open Court*, because "in ethical sense it has fallen upon evil days," encloses an argument against the German side and claims that it "mirrors the sentiment of nine-tenths of my native-born American friends." He mentions "General von Edelsheim's plan to invade our shores," published in "that now classic monograph entitled *Operations upon the Sea*," and also the violation of Belgium's neutrality as well as "the deliberate destruction of the Louvain library and the Rheims cathedral."

It ought to be generally known by this time that the Belgian neutrality treaty was indeed a mere scrap of paper. Even Gladstone in his time considered it as such and made a new treaty for the time of the war 1870-71 to last one year after the war—a fact pointed out by Professor Burgess—and it is acknowledged that in cases of necessity such obligations are broken, and statesmen admit that it is perfectly justifiable to break them. I will quote Sir Edward Grey in his speech in the House of Commons on August 3 where he cites English authorities, Gladstone and others, for the view that such guarantees are not always binding. Sir Edward Grey cannot very well uphold the absolute sanctity of Belgian neutrality, for the documents discovered in Brussels and Antwerp prove that Belgium, England and France had broken Belgian neutrality treaties long before a German soldier set foot on Belgian ground.³ Sir Edward Grey said: "There is, I admit, the obligation of the treaty....but I am not able to subscribe to the doctrine....that the simple fact of the existence of a guarantee is binding on every party to it irrespective altogether of the particular position in which it may find itself at the time when the occasion for acting on the guarantee arises. The great authorities upon foreign policy....as Lord Aberdeen and Lord Palmerston, never to my knowledge took that rigid, and if I may venture to say so, that impracticable view of the guarantee. The circumstance that there is already an existing

³ See the report from the German general headquarters as quoted on pages 663 and 664 in the editorial article, "Poor Belgium," in the November *Open Court*.

guarantee in force is, of necessity, an important fact, and a weighty element in the case."

So the breach of neutrality is unessential, the reason for war lies deeper. Sir Edward Grey continues: "There is also this further consideration, the force of which we must all feel most deeply, and that is, the common interest against the unmeasured aggrandizement of any power whatever."

The true reason for the war, according to Sir Edward Grey and others, was the maintenance of the balance of power, and thus there is no use for arguments, no use for logic, no question of right or wrong. Since Germany has become united she has disturbed the balance of power and must be crushed before she grows too powerful for England. Her "unmeasured aggrandizement" is the reason why the British entered into the war. It is this they call German aggressiveness and never tire of denouncing German imperialism, Prussianism and militarism. These words mean that Germany should no longer be a union, should no longer be strong and warlike, should not be able to defend herself. Rational arguments are not needed; defenders of the British cause simply scold and show a contempt for imperialism and militarism; at the same time they propose to introduce these heinous institutions in Great Britain. The colonies must be federated and the government must be allowed to raise big armies by drafting.

There is one more pro-British letter which I regret has been misplaced. It is quite similar to the others, only it adds. "You are a cur." These vigorous expressions of a difference of opinion are interesting, for invectives prove that the people who use them are without a convincing argument. Otherwise they would produce the argument instead of scolding. It is the man without reason that turns rude. And the easiest way to dispose of an opponent is to denounce him as immoral, as a liar, a man without conscience, low in an ethical sense.

The sixth of my critics has an argument. He is a scholar of keen discrimination in his own field, but sometimes a stickler for points which others consider as unmeaning. He is a native Britisher but pretty bold and impartial. He writes:

"In your reprint of the *Saturday Review** article of 1897 you omit the most damning words of all: viz., the last sentence: '*Germaniam esse delendam.*' On February 1, 1896, the same review,

* The first article of the October *Open Court*. The copy of the *Saturday Review* from which our article was taken did not conclude with the words: "*Germaniam esse delendam.*"

in an article 'by a biologist,' says: 'The biological view of foreign policy is plain. First, federate our colonies and prevent geographical isolation turning the Anglo-Saxon race against itself. Second, be ready to fight Germany, as *Germania est delenda*; third, be ready to fight America when the time comes. Lastly, engage in no wasting wars against peoples from whom we have nothing to fear.' These are the last words.

"Herman Ridder quotes the Catonic speech as of 1879 instead of 1897, and I controverted him in the Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin*. By this misprint it is made to appear that English jingoism was five years earlier than Prussian, for it was on November 25, 1884, that Treitschke said this: 'Mit Oesterreich, mit Frankreich, mit Russland haben wir bereits abgerechnet; die letzte Abrechnung mit England wird voraussichtlich die langwierigste und die schwierigste sein.'"^{*}

This proposition to place the guilt where we find priority in an authoritative statement of jingoism, does not seem to me applicable. The question is not who threatened first, but who has done right and who has done wrong. The breach of neutrality in Germany would have been wrong if it had not been contemplated first by the French, and it is justified by the English plans to take it in their schemes of 1906.

I will quote one more critic who is a Britisher living in the United States, a man distinguished by scientific erudition. He writes: "Your article in the October *Open Court* was extremely interesting to me, rabid Britisher as I am, in that it was the only exposition of the German side of the question which I have seen that was not made in the heat of anger. I do not agree with you, however."

A very unexpected letter reached me from England from quarters which do not have any influence on the government but represent *die Stillen im Lande* who may form a nucleus for a future reform. Our correspondent states that one of his nearest friends, a professional thinker with a strong leaning towards politics, is "of opinion that Grey is a very unscrupulous person; in fact he describes him as a 'devil.' Indeed, Grey's whole policy, especially about the Morocco crisis, is very bad. With regard to the violation of Belgium's neutrality, my friend is sure that Germany violated it first and with no provocation on the part of France, but that if

^{*}From *Die ersten Versuche deutscher Kolonialpolitik*; November 25, 1884, in Treitschke's *Deutsche Kämpfe: Neue Folge: Schriften zur Tagespolitik*. Leipsic, 1896, p. 349.

France had violated it England would not have interfered. It is interesting that Asquith made a great point of Belgium to appeal to the British public, while Grey, to do him justice, did not pretend that Belgium was the cause of the war. The fault of British diplomacy is that at the beginning England did not say definitely what she would or would not do. The English people are often unconscious hypocrites because, though the ideals they think they pursue are noble ones, they will not acknowledge that their policy is, like the policy of other nations, governed entirely by self-interest. The German policy is almost brutally frank, but the English policy has never been frank. What the English were afraid of about Belgium was that Germany should annex Belgium and establish seaports which would threaten England. When Germany had no navy to speak of, in 1887 I think, England did not propose to interfere on behalf of Belgium when Germany proposed to advance against France through Belgium. Also there was at one time a precisely analogous case in the Russian invasion of Persia: Persia's neutrality had been guaranteed by England, and England did not interfere, but salved her conscience by the reflection that the Persians were a bad lot. England's behavior to other nations is simply guided by the fact as to whether they have a navy or not: if they have a navy England's conscience awakes."

A man who approves the defense of Germany in *The Open Court* says:

"At the beginning of the war... I received the impression that the Kaiser was to blame for his rapid and quick action and that he could have prevented war. But it is evident that it would have been folly for Germany to wait longer after war was unavoidable. By her rapid mobilization and quick action Germany secured great advantage and located the destruction of property which accompanies warfare, outside of German territory.

"Our conscience and our moral support should not be neutral. To be neutral in this would be morally wrong. President Wilson's appeal for impartiality and neutrality has served its good cause by restraining people from taking sides on sentimental grounds. It is well if the American people remain neutral in action to guard against being drawn into the conflict, as, probably, more harm than good would be done if the United States would enter the war. It is commendable to remain neutral in arguments based on sentiments. But in arguments based on reason and moral principles it is a sacred duty not to remain neutral. This is the duty in particular of moral teachers. The evils in this world must be fought and

great effort made to overcome them, otherwise the evils will overcome the good.

"After considering calmly with reason both sides of the question, we ought to give our moral support to whichever nations deserve it, as determined by our sense of justice, leaving out our commercial and possible pecuniary interests. . . . The pocket-book is most people's guide in an argument. To make this clear it is necessary to state that there is only one other guide and that is the general welfare of the people.

"Particularly *The Open Court*—as seeking for truth and ethical ideals—should give moral support to whichever nations deserve it. We can hardly arouse the enmity of a nation to a sufficient extent to be drawn into the conflict, by condemning it on sound moral principles; but this should cause its humiliation and shame.

"American neutrality has actually gone so far as to give active assistance to the Allies by selling war material to them. It is necessary to counteract this, as Germany appears to be the most innocent of the nations engaged in the war."

In reply to my critics I wish to state that I am not anti-British, but I blame the British government for making the war and deceiving the British citizens so as to make them hate Germany and fear its prosperity and increase of power. I protest against the war as much in the interest of Great Britain as of France, Germany and the Belgians who are victims of the bad policy of their government.

I have investigated the origin of the present European war and have come to the conclusion that it was forced upon Germany, that Germany tried as far as possible to preserve peace. Considering the fact that Germany has been growing and expanding until the other nations of Europe became alarmed lest she surpass them in industry and power, the war was perhaps unavoidable. It was rather hard on Germany that the three biggest powers of Europe fell upon her simultaneously, but this concerted action was part of their agreement. It was the plan of the Triple Entente, and constituted their hope of victory. The war will be a test of Germany's strength and efficiency, and the test is great, very great.

The cause of Germany has been much misrepresented in the English speaking world but she has more friends than would appear from the opinions published in the newspapers. This is certainly true of the United States of America. I grant that many Anglo-Americans side with the Triple Entente, and most of England's friends are noisy in their denunciations of German militarism

and of the tyranny of the Kaiser ; they are untiring in their accusations of the German breach of neutrality, of the atrocities committed in Belgium, of the burning of Louvain and the destruction of the Rheims cathedral. The friends of Germany are quiet, but most of them are intense in their convictions and among them are the German Americans.

THE GERMAN AMERICANS.

The German Americans stand by Germany because they feel that Germany and all that Germany represents in the history of the world, *das Deutschtum* or Germandom, the spirit of Germany itself, is at stake in the present crisis. The Germans in America are by no means blind in their judgment. They have not always stood by the fatherland, nor do they now without due consideration of the facts. They do not take sides simply because Germany has been their home and Germany is on one side while the rest of Europe is ranged on the other. They stand by their fatherland because they are fully and firmly convinced that their fatherland is in the right and that the others, especially the English, are in the wrong. The German Canadians do not know the actual facts, they know only the British side of the war, so they appear to stand by England.

No better evidence of the objectivity of thought of the German Americans can be furnished than their position during our war with Spain. After Admiral Dewey had taken Manila the German navy under Admiral Dietrich entered Manila Harbor with a force superior to the American fleet and behaved in such a way that they practically challenged the American fleet to battle. Their attitude almost brought about a war between Germany and the United States, but in this dangerous crisis the German Americans stood faithfully by their new home, the United States. They openly denounced the attitude of Dietrich, and the German government, noticing that it had made a serious mistake, made up for its blunder as well as it could. The Kaiser sent Prince Henry to the United States to show his good will and Prince Henry was well received here.

The story goes that once in the Kaiser's younger years when a visitor was announced to him as a German American, he remarked that he knew Germans and he knew Americans, but German Americans he knew not. The remark reflected the spirit of a certain portion of German officialdom, and alienated many German Americans from the German government. They felt that the German

government was too narrow to understand that we have a very strong representation of German nationality in the United States just as we have traditions of all nations. We have Irish-Americans, Anglo-Americans, Franco-Americans, etc., and the German Americans are certainly not the least among them. The Kaiser's hasty comment cost him a great deal of sympathy in the United States, for if the German Americans feel that their Germandom is no longer recognized in Germany, they will naturally drop it and become purely American. To be sure the German Americans are Americans, but the patriotism of this country is not so narrow as to demand an absolute cutting off of former traditions. Every one in this country is welcome to become an American, and American patriotism is broad enough to cherish all the old traditions of other nationalities. Every one who comes to this country is expected to bring with him the best he has acquired in his old home and there is no need to lose his love of that home. We do not hate any nationality and every stranger can find a home here without abjuring his former fatherland. It is well recognized that the Germans make very good American citizens, while English-Americans are rare. English people who live in this country mostly retain their allegiance to the British crown.

Upon the whole, English people think quite disparagingly about America. I feel justified in calling it a prejudice, for it is in most cases a prejudice without reasonable foundation. They judge Americans after the type of the loud and uncultured specimens who force their presence into conspicuous evidence wherever they are, mostly so abroad, and they disregard the better classes. They forget that England too has specimens of whom the better Englishmen have no reason to be proud. All nationalities are pretty much alike in this respect, but it may be a good symptom of strength that the English are more English, and therefore more vigorous in national self-consciousness than any other nation. This impressed me particularly when the first Englishman I met here answered my assumption that he was naturalized since he had become a permanent resident of America. He said: "I have never foresworn my allegiance to Her Majesty, the Queen!" To become naturalized here necessarily includes that allegiance to a sovereign should be foresworn, but it does not mean a break with one's ancestral traditions. On the contrary, here in America we want every foreigner who comes to preserve everything of his old country that is good and introduce it into the American commonwealth we are building.

It is a requirement of the Greek church that any convert who

enters its fold must curse his former faith in pretty vile terms, and from this rule not even a Czarina is excepted; for, as the story goes, it was quite hard on the wife of the present ruler of Russia, a German princess, to curse her old faith when joining the church of her husband, since she could not be exempted from this awful obligation. In court circles it is secretly asserted that the poor empress feels pangs of conscience whenever new misfortunes visit the empire, as if they came as a just punishment for her apostacy from the evangelical church. This demand of the Greek church is in line with old traditions and is deemed right in Russia; but everything is quite different in American patriotism, for here we are in the habit of cultivating all that is good and noble in other nations. Yea, our own patriotism is to be based on cosmopolitan grounds. We cherish the idea that universal love of all mankind should be compatible with the love of our own country, and so we believe that German-Americans may just as well live harmoniously in this country together with Irish-Americans or Anglo-Americans, with Franco-Americans or with emigrants from any country of the world.

Our American ideal has not been fully realized, for we must confess that we welcome only the European nationalities. Theoretically we draw no lines, but practically objections have been raised against the Asiatic races: and even in this case we feel the incongruity of measures against the immigration of special races for reasons which we must grant, but we need not enter into a discussion of them here. Here we are followed by Canada which discriminates against the Hindus. This is more illogical since they belong to the British empire as well as the Canadians themselves.

Germany is not without faults, and nobody is more critical than the Germans themselves unless it be the German-Americans. The wrong kind of militarism has sometimes made itself felt in Germany, and nobody has criticized its obnoxious traits more than the Germans. The German people themselves objected to the Zabern affair most severely, while in the Dreyfus case the French were drunk with militarism in favor of Esterhazy, the Russian spy, and no other nation has reacted against military superciliousness more strongly than the Germans.

The officialdom of Germany, the pride of men in high position, has proved offensive in many respects, but whenever it occurred publicly it has been more emphatically and effectively criticized by Germans than any similar attitude of other governments by their own people. On the contrary, most of the objectionable deeds of other gov-

ernments have passed by unnoticed. In Russia all objections to the tyranny of the government are suppressed with iron severity. Nor are the French and English governments without blame in this regard.

What people in the common walks of life call "bureaucracy" in lower German officialdom, is often represented in our country by a tyranny of petty officials, and strange to say Germany has often been denounced on account of its "intolerable bureaucracy." We have reasons to envy Germany's bureaucratic institutions, for Germany has attained the best and the most efficient service at the lowest cost by granting her lower officials positions for life on condition of unflinching honesty and good behavior. German officials are strict in enforcing rules, and punctual in their duties, but they have little or no opportunity to tyrannize any one. Reformers have often endeavored approximately to introduce one or another feature of German bureaucracy here, but upon the whole our political bosses oppose reforms of this kind. It is precisely in the distribution of bureaucratic positions that the power lies by which political leaders are able to pay their supporters for campaign assistance.

The lack of religious liberty in Germany is still to be lamented, and I can tell instances from my own experience; but I have discovered that conditions are worse in England and even to some extent here in America.

There is no need of entering into further details. The Kaiser's speeches were criticized, and not least severely by the Germans themselves, until he mended his ways. We may incidentally add that what he really meant was by no means as terrible as his words sounded, and it is sure that if his successor were to rule in the spirit in which the imperial speeches have been interpreted, Germany would soon change into a republic. However, as long as the coming Hohenzollerns will fill their high office in the sense of Frederick the Great, as the first servants of the state, they will never be a danger to liberty nor need they fear a revolution.

Other faults noticeable in modern Germany are perhaps common to mankind in other portions of the world, including England. These are the snobbishness of some rich, the increasing indulgence of pleasure-seekers, a deteriorated taste in literature, a preference for Bismarck's kind of *Realpolitik*, the loud swagger of false militarism and the insolence of officialdom. But wherever these unpleasant features appear in Germany they are not a whit worse than in other countries, Great Britain not excepted. Certainly all

these faults are no reason to make war on a country. Any enumeration of them can only be—and indeed, as I understand the situation, is meant to be—a mere excuse of English people for endorsing the government's action in making war.

ENGLISH VIEWS.

The English periodical *The Nation*⁴ notes the striking resemblance between the German mind as shown in German papers and the English mind as exhibited in the English press. In both countries there prevails "the unanimous confidence in the justice of the war, the conviction that it was forced upon them by the base and treacherous designs of their enemies, and the confident assurance that their cause will be triumphant in the end." After quoting some German verses and characterizing some German opinions, the unsigned article continues: "What a farrago of hypocrisy! English readers will be disposed to say. Yet it is impossible to read such writing without recognizing that the writers are saying what they believe." After noting the views of Romain Rolland and Gerhardt Hauptmann (the latter a severe critic of German officialdom and militarism) we read on: "How can such men be blind to what appears to us the hard facts regarding German aggressiveness and German atrocities and lawlessness?" And again further down: "However preposterous it sounds to us, for the German people this is a defensive war, primarily against the long-laid designs of France and Russia, though the bitterest feelings are directed against England for our 'treachery.' It simply enrages English readers to read expressions of pity for Belgium from Germans, for the people they have so foully and brutally maltreated."

Has the author of this article in *The Nation* never seen the vindication of the Germans by the American reporters, Messrs. Bennett, McCutcheon, Irvin S. Cobb, Harry Hansen, and Roger Lewis? No one who knows them doubts their honesty and impartiality. English people do not seem to have seen the statement signed by them in common,⁵ nor any other of their descriptions of the war. So our author continues:

"But how is the ordinary German to know the crimes he has committed? The *Berliner Tageblatt* is quite a respectable paper. It devotes some space to atrocities. But they are assigned to Rus-

⁴ October 17, 1914, p. 59.

⁵ For their statement see "The European War" in the October *Open Court*, p. 630.

sians in East Prussia, to Belgian peasants and occasionally to Frenchmen. German soldiers are so well-disciplined that they do not commit atrocities! It is the enemy that uses dum-dum bullets, fires on white flags, and abuses the Red Cross, mutilates or assassinates wounded soldiers, shells ambulances, assaults women and children, sets villages on fire for sheer wantonness, and brutalizes in every way the art of war! So far as material destruction is concerned, we have the evidence of the photographer and the admission of the German commanders that these things have been done in the course of the Belgian invasion. But Germans at home believe that these charges brought against them are wicked calumnies, the products of 'lie-factories in Paris and London.' They conduct the war in a civilized fashion: but those Russians, Belgians, and French are capable of anything!"

The photograph of a ruined house is no evidence of Germany's brutality, and we know very well that war is hell. Blame the men who have started the war, not the men who expose their lives in battle; and remember that many houses and beautiful trees (as for instance in Malines) have been destroyed by the Belgians, not by the Germans. The photograph shows neither the author of the war nor the men who have made the ruins.

In explanation of the unreliability of photographs I will insert here a little story told me by a German American who had served in the German army in 1870-71. His name is Windmiller and he was on his return to his American home with his wife and daughter after having visited the fatherland and some battlefields where he had faced the French mitrailleuse. He had lain in a house with one lieutenant of his sharpshooter battalion, for the purpose of keeping off some French assailants. The two held the enemy at a distance by keeping up a brisk fire so as to give the impression that there were great numbers of them. As a result they drew upon themselves the hostile fire from different quarters and even of artillery. The house was often hit but its two defenders remained unharmed. Upon his visit, Mr. Windmiller found the house preserved in the same condition he had left it in with all the marks of the French bullets. He climbed on an opposite wall to photograph the place, but an old woman told him that he could buy a picture of the house in the village store, and truly there he found it printed on a postcard with an inscription which declared that it had been "*défendue par des braves francs-tireurs.*" Pictures do not prove the stories told about them.

In America the opinion is often strongly expressed that it is

a right of every one, of civilians and also of women, to attack an invading enemy, to shoot at hostile troops from their windows, from ambush, from anywhere. But we answer that if this be the case, if private persons take part in the war, they forfeit their right as neutrals to the enemies' protection of their lives and property; and it will be a matter of course that war will revert to its original savagery. If civilians take part in the combat the invading enemy will be forced in sheer self-defence to extend the war to civilians.

Before condemning the punishment of snipers, please take the trouble to read the reports printed in German papers about Belgian civilians' participation in the war, and consider that German officers are human beings possessed of a deep-seated love of their men. What are they to do if they enter a village and are suddenly attacked from all sides by snipers hidden in surrounding houses? I saw the letter of a captain published somewhere who reported that he had lost more men in such a situation than in the open battlefield. How would one of our most kind-hearted humane readers act if he were in a similar position? Perhaps he would say: "A goodly number of my men have been killed and wounded; the dead have gone to heaven. It is Christian to forgive the enemy, and I will bless the people who have done the deed."

* * *

Another English opinion appeared in the *Saturday Review* as long ago as February, 1896. It is written from a "biological" standpoint; it makes a plea for the Russians and the French and is important because it is this view which has directed British politics, which created the Triple Entente and caused the British government to conspire with Belgium in secret treaties by which England was in honor bound to begin the war. This article was written for Britons alone, not for Germans nor for Americans. In its closing paragraph it insists first on imperialism ("federate our colonies"); second, on the defeat of Germany; and, third, readiness to fight America. It is reprinted on another page of this issue.

The article is apparently written by the same author who a year later wrote the other article of the *Saturday Review* republished as the first article of the October number of *The Open Court*. The underlying ideas are quite similar and here also the principle of extermination is taught as the most important factor in the progress of evolution. We read:⁶ "Were every German to be wiped

⁶ Compare this with the sentence quoted in the middle of page 608 in the October *Open Court*.

out to-morrow, there is no English trade, no English pursuit that would not immediately expand. Were every Englishman to be wiped out to-morrow, the Germans would gain in proportion.... One or the other has to go; one or the other will go."

How untrue this principle is we shall see later on. England is even now suffering from the war by having her trade with Germany ruined.

The Bishop of Carlisle, the Right Reverend J. W. Diggle, D.D., must have read the article from the biological point of view. In an article in the *Hibbert Journal* of October, 1914, "The Ethics of War," he says: "Biological science affirms that in the animal world the highest types have been evolved out of pitiless struggles." The Lord Bishop seems to accept this affirmation as a fact and declares "that war, both in its roots and fruits, is evil." But he takes comfort in the "most encouraging fact that, under the moral government of the world, even evil can be compelled to bring forth good.... And the unparalleled crime of the crucifixion is still leading humanity forward toward its final redemption. These facts are very strange and deep."

Mr. L. P. Jacks publishes his opinion editorially in the same number of the *Hibbert Journal*, under the strange title "Mechanism, Diabolism and the War," and we quote the following sentences:

"Every one who reflects on the present state of Europe must feel that he is in the presence of something anomalous, self-contradictory and absurd.... Intellect, trained for the discovery of truth by elaborate systems of education, takes service under the Father of Lies, calls itself 'diplomacy,' and lures nations to ruin.... What is the force that unites us? The sense of common danger, the call of common duty, the certainty of common suffering, the memory of a common past—each plays a part.... Having regard to all the circumstances under which this war has been forced upon us, I cannot doubt that it may be converted into a great moral opportunity.... The primary feature will be the reawakening of the moral consciousness of the people.... Luxury, frivolity, and class selfishness will receive a check.... We shall all know better than before what it is to have a man's part to play in the world.... Our religion also will be less voluble and more sincere; we shall have seen something of the terrors of the Lord."

Sir Henry Jones in the same periodical expresses his conviction in the words: "This war has come upon us as a duty".... "The British people as a whole.... have gone forth into this struggle with an open brow and a clear conscience." "All the same, the substan-

tial truth is that the German people regards itself as a nation with a mission, and we will do well to remember that *its* conscience also is in the war."

German policy is thus characterized: "It is the *reasoned* belief in territorial brigandage and in the methods of barbarism, provided they are employed by and for the sake of the German nation.... The pathos of the situation is overwhelming."

On another page T. W. Rolleston speaks of "the megalomania of Germany, or more strictly of Prussia, which is now forcing such terrible issues on Europe, her towering ambitions, her attitude of cynical disregard of every national or individual right which might stand in the way of these ambitions or clog their flight towards the goal of world-power."

ENGLISH CRITICS OF BRITISH POLITICS.

It does credit to the English people that there are independent men among them who do not endorse their country's war policy and who denounce the government for having started the war. Best known of these critics are the three cabinet members who resigned because of their disapproval.

We will here quote two other opinions, one of the Hon. Bertrand Russell, as reprinted in the *Cambridge Magazine* from the *Labour Leader*, the other of Arthur Ponsonby published in *The Nation* (London) of August 22, 1914, p. 763.

The former blames as the cause of the war the intolerable dread of one another in which the people of Europe have been living. Mr. Russell says:

"In every nation, by the secrecy of diplomacy, by cooperation of the press with the manufacturers of armaments, by the desire of the rich and the educated to distract the attention of the working classes from social injustice, suspicion of other nations is carefully cultivated, until a state of nightmare terror is produced, and men are prepared to attack the enemy at once, before he is ready to inflict the ruin which he is believed to be contemplating. In sudden vertigo, the nations rush into the dreaded horror; reason is called treachery, mercy is called weakness, and universal delirium drives the world to destruction.

"All the nations suffer by the war, and knew in advance that they would suffer. In all the nations, the bulk of ordinary men and women must have dreaded war. Yet all felt the war thrust upon them by the absolute necessity of preserving themselves from in-

vasion and national extinction. Austria-Hungary, a kind of outpost of western civilization among the turbulent Balkan states, felt its existence threatened by revolutionary Slavs within its own borders, supported by the aggressive and warlike Servians on its frontier. Russia, being of the same race and religion as the Servians, felt bound in honor to protect them against Austria. Germany, knowing that the defeat of Austria would leave it at the mercy of Russia, felt bound to support Austria. France, from dread of a repetition of 1870, had allied itself with Russia, and was compelled for self-preservation to support Russia as soon as Germany was involved. And England, believing that the German navy was designed to secure our downfall, had felt impelled through fear to form the *entente* with France and Russia.

"If, when this war is ended, the world is to enjoy a secure peace, the nations must be relieved of the intolerable fear which has weighed them down and driven them into the present horror. Not only must armaments be immensely reduced, but the machinery of mobilization must be everywhere rendered more cumbrous and more democratic, the diplomacy must be conducted more publicly and by men more in touch with the people, and arbitration treaties must bind nations to seek a peaceful settlement of their differences before appealing to brute force. All these things can be secured after the present war if the democracy is insistent; none will be secured if the negotiations are left in the hands of the men who made the war."

Mr. Ponsonby's letter reads in extract thus:

"I am not an uncompromising 'peace-at-any-price,' 'stop-the-war' advocate, but am as jealous of my country's honor as any one that could be found. Nothing matters while our national safety is threatened, and I ask myself: . . . Would it not be better to be silent and so tacitly express approval of the past policy of the government, and applaud the self-laudatory articles with which the press is filled? It would certainly be very much easier, and I wish to goodness I could do it.

"But principles I believe in cannot be dispelled at will, and do not allow me any peace of mind. Inconvenient questions keep on presenting themselves to me and waiting for an answer. . . . I am not going to embark on a long-reasoned argument which cannot be compressed into the limits of a letter. I will simply ask some questions and answer them with a single monosyllable.

"Have the Government during the past six years joined in the

insane competition in armaments, and led the way in matters of expenditures? *Yes...*

"Have they consistently advocated, supported, and encouraged the policy of the balance of power, which divided Europe into two hostile camps, producing high tension and possible outbreak of war at every diplomatic dispute that arose? *Yes...*

"So far from the correspondence in the White Papers being the cause of the war, does it not clearly show that our previous policy had committed us, and we were simply entangled in meshes of our own creation? *Yes.*

"Is it right or even advisable to make binding engagements with other nations behind the backs of the people in secret? *No.*

"Did the Government declare in the most explicit way that we were free and unfettered in the event of war, when all the time British and French naval experts were drawing up plans for mutual defence and assistance? *Yes.*

"Should we have declared war on France if she had found it incumbent on her for the sake of national safety, to send her army across the Belgian frontier? *No.*

"Did Germany know from the first that we were bound to support France and did she want to fight us? *No....*

"Did the Prime Minister in referring to what he called the 'infamous proposal,' at the same time draw attention to the German Ambassador's conciliatory request at a later date that we should 'formulate conditions on which we would remain neutral'? *No.*

"Is not Germany's chief fear, which has been enormously increased of late, a Slav inroad from Russia? *Yes.*

"Does our support of Russia mean the strengthening of Russian autocracy and Russian militarism, and the consequent check of the development and enlightenment of the Russian people? *Yes.*

"Will Russian success mean a further acquisition of territory by Russia in Europe, and is not this very undesirable? *Yes.*

"Is there a vestige of foundation, in view of the hopeless strategic position in which Germany now finds herself, for the idea that this is all the outcome of a German plot against this country? *No.*

"Is it possible or desirable that the German empire should be shattered and her national expansion forever prevented? *No.*

"Is the capture of all German colonies likely to make a passive and submissive Germany in the future? *No.*

"Was there before the outbreak of the war any animosity among the British people against the Germans? *No.*

"Is there reason to suspect that in the official world an anti-German policy has been steadily pursued for some time past? *Yes.*

"Is it not deplorable that when Great Britain is plunged into the most devastating war the world has ever seen, we should none of us know clearly what we are fighting for? *Yes.*

"Are the peoples of Europe going to be massacred in hundreds of thousands, and are incalculable numbers of non-combatants going to be reduced to misery and ruin only because a few ministers, diplomats, and monarchs have quarrelled? *Yes.*

"Are the victors going to gain anything, either materially or morally by this war? *No.*"

England may be proud of the fact that these isolated criticisms have been published in England.

TWELVE POINTS ASSURED.

I repeat here that I shall change my opinion and gladly confess it publicly if I can be convinced of being mistaken. I deem the following facts assured:

1. Pan-Slavism is a movement instigated and directed by Russia. Its true aim is to confederate all Slavs under Russian rule, and since many Slavs, including the Poles, the Bulgarians and the Bosnians, are opposed to Russian rule and against Pan-Slavism, the Serbs are its main supporters outside Russia. A victory of Pan-Slavism would not only doom Poland to a continuance of her slavery but also deal a death-blow to Austria-Hungary, because there are numerous Slavs living in that country intermingled with Germans, Magyars, the Saxons of Transylvania and Roumanians. The present war is a conflict between Pan-Slavism and Germanism in which Great Britain, against her real interest supports the former.

2. As the Russians have developed a system of international intrigue, mainly against the English, and have employed spies more than any other nation, so the Serbs deemed it proper to fight their real or supposed enemies by assassins and were encouraged by the Russian government.

3. Both Serbia's method of practising assassination and Russia's support of it were carried on officially, even the Crown Prince of Serbia being implicated in suspicion, and so Russia was in honor bound to protect Serbia when Austria-Hungary demanded a thorough investigation into the conspiracy which caused the death of the archduke at Sarajevo. However, neither Serbia nor Russia

could afford to let the truth of the details become fully known and established.

4. The Germanic races detest assassination. It should be remembered that when Napoleon I crushed Germany, the German people rose against him and beat him in an honest and open fight at Leipsic and at Waterloo after several failures such as Schill's rebellion, but not even one attempt was made to assassinate the tyrant. It seems quite unintelligible that England, a country more Germanic in blood than Germany, could support or sympathize with the Russo-Servian cause which spells ruin first to Austria-Hungary and then also to Germany, and there is but one excuse: England always plays the protector of small states. The point may briefly be summed up that while Austria-Hungary meant to extirpate assassination, Russia and England insisted that Servia's sovereignty should not be interfered with; its government should be allowed to continue its policy which Austria-Hungary and Germany regard as criminal.

5. Russia continued to mobilize in spite of official assurances that it was not doing so, and Germany came to the conclusion that war had become unavoidable.

6. The Kaiser made vain efforts by a personal correspondence with Czar Nicholas and King George of England to avoid the war, or at least to isolate it as much as possible, but Russia had promised to support Servia and England was "in honor bound" to help Russia and France.

7. Germany had positive information that the French intended to advance into Germany through Belgium, and since she was threatened by Russia and France at the same time, determined to prevent the French plan. Germany regretted that she was compelled to break Belgian neutrality but was fully justified later on by finding positive evidence that the Belgians had broken neutrality long before a German soldier set foot on Belgian ground.

8. Germany's breach of Belgian neutrality was made England's pretext for a declaration of war—a very questionable act in consideration of the fact that England herself had been guilty of a breach of Belgian neutrality. We grant however that England was "in honor bound" to come to Belgium's assistance, on account of her former agreements with Belgium.

9. From the standpoint of Belgium it is to be regretted that England did not protect her in her extremity as Belgium had a right to expect, but England was not sufficiently prepared for the war she

had declared, except perhaps on sea. Apparently she expected that her continental allies would be sufficient to crush Germany.

10. France went into the war because she nourished her old grudge against Germany and demanded revenge. She believed she had considerably improved her army, especially her artillery, and was convinced that Germany had remained stagnant; at the same time she felt assured that Russia with her overwhelming numbers would soon enough invade Germany on the east and take Berlin.

11. England, jealous of Germany's expansion and determined not to allow any further increase of her navy, had concluded the Triple Entente with France and Russia and felt in honor bound to join the belligerents, thinking it would be safe—an easy task.

12. Germany has suffered much in former centuries from incursions of her neighbors, especially the French. Under the pressure of repeated and unprovoked unjust attacks Germany has been compelled to unite into an empire and introduce a well-organized institution of self-defense, recently called "militarism." Through many sad experiences, Germany has learned that the best defense is to take the offensive and strike the first blow. This foresight on the part of Germany has been called "aggressiveness." As soon as the Kaiser recognized that war was inevitable and that the Triple Entente was determined to crush Germany, he acted promptly and led his army against his enemies.

These are the twelve main points that characterize the origin of the war and we will here only add that the Belgian civilian population took part in the fight on a large scale, sometimes even in a most barbarous fashion, so that the German troops frequently suffered heavier losses by sniping than in battle, and this naturally led to severe punishments of the guilty. These reprisals were called "atrocities" and are stoutly believed by the supporters of the British cause, although they are sufficiently refuted by the Round Robin of the five American reporters.

WAS THE WAR UNAVOIDABLE?

War was avoidable if the belligerents had used any sense at all, common sense or foresight, or wisdom. The Czar would have kept peace, so far as he personally was concerned, but in his correspondence with the Kaiser he speaks of the pressure exercised upon him, and this pressure comes from those around him, the archdukes headed by his uncle Nicolaus Nikolajewitch. The Kaiser tried his best to avert the calamity of fighting all Europe. Never-

theless, as soon as he saw that his enemies were determined on war he no longer hesitated but took a most vigorous initiative according to his old Prussian traditions.

It appears that Russia would not have ventured into the war if England had not promised to join. Statements have been made to this effect, but documentary evidence is still lacking. We deem it probable.

One thing may safely be asserted, that whereas the Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy was intended to preserve the present status of Europe, the Triple Entente of England with France and Russia meant war. It was a federation of three positively antagonistic races made for the purpose of combining these three most unlike and mutually uncongenial nationalities to serve one common hatred. The aim of the three was to crush Germany, and it can scarcely be doubted that English statecraft is the moving power of the whole scheme. Thus it seems assured that war became unavoidable at the moment when the Triple Entente was concluded.

England has always been anxious to rule the seas and her European policy has always pursued the aim of antagonizing the main powers on the continent and posing as protectress of the small states. She has been especially careful not to let the coast opposite England fall into powerful hands, so an attack on Belgium appeared to her like an attack on Great Britain.

Here lies the defect in English statecraft. Either England should have sent the English army at once to Belgium for the sake of protecting Belgium efficiently against a German invasion, or she should have advised Belgium to allow the Germans to pass through the country on their promise to respect Belgian independence. In this latter case the Germans could not have taken the Belgian coast for the purpose of attacking England. As matters stand now, English diplomats have ruined Belgium and forced Germany into a hostile attitude towards England. The statesmen of England thought they could afford to venture into a war when Germany was surrounded by enemies on both the east and west, and England would thereby maintain her supremacy on the seas.

Speaking of the wars of England since Queen Elizabeth, Field-Marshal Earl Roberts expresses his view in the *Hibbert Journal* (October, 1914) as follows:

"This struggle has always the same underlying motive—viz., the determination on the part of England that no single state shall be allowed to upset the balance of power and to dominate the

western half of Europe. As soon as any state attempts this, and then gains possession of, or tries to establish itself in, the Low Countries, then England is compelled to take up arms.

"In Queen Elizabeth's reign Spain was the powerful and aggressive nation of western Europe, and she was established in the Netherlands; and when the great Armada sailed the chief design of the whole operation was that this powerful fleet should gain command of the English Channel, pick up the Duke of Parma's trained veterans in the Low Countries, and escort them to the English coast. The real menace to England lay in the fact that Spanish power was established in the Low Countries. The main purpose of Marlborough's famous campaigns was to check the ambitious designs of the French under Louis XIV, and the great battles of Ramilies, Malplaquet, and Oudenarde were fought in the Low Countries.

"The war against the French Republic was undertaken because the French had seized the mouths of the Scheldt: the fighting began in Flanders in 1793, and ended at Waterloo, a few miles south of Brussels, in 1815.

"At the beginning of the twentieth century we find ourselves engaged in a colossal struggle against Germany, for she is now the strong and aggressive power which seeks to dominate the western half of Europe, and has, we hope only for a time, established herself in Belgium.

"If Germany succeeds in maintaining her hold on Belgium, Holland and Denmark will pass under her sway. Then her seaboard will extend in one unbroken line from Memel, along the southern shore of the Baltic, round Denmark, and then by Holland and Belgium to the shores of the English Channel itself. In Holland and Belgium she will find great naval bases close to our own shores. The hardy sailors and fishermen of Denmark and Holland—seamen little, if at all, inferior to our own—will be taken to man the warships of the German navy, and the naval competition between Germany and ourselves will become many times more severe than it is at present."

Incidentally we will say in comment on Earl Roberts's historical reflections that the victories which in England are commonly attributed to Marlborough were won by Eugene, Prince of Savoy, and the battle of Waterloo was lost by Wellington when the Prussian army under Blücher appeared in time to save the day and route Napoleon.

The English denounce German militarism as barbarous; but

their "naval supremacy" is considered as unobjectionable. Says Earl Roberts: "The British Isles are the heart of the empire, parts of which are scattered all over the face of the globe. These scattered portions of the empire, though sundered by the Seven Seas, are kept together by the British navy which guards those seas. Naval supremacy is therefore absolutely necessary for us if we are to maintain the empire."

By "empire" Earl Roberts means imperialism, a union of England with her colonies which would make the colonies obedient dependencies in such a way that if the British premier decides on war, Africa, India, Australia with New Zealand, and Canada shall be drawn into the struggle. The same proposition is made in the *Saturday Review* article of 1896, cited above and reprinted on another page, where the demand is expressed by the words "to federate." We remember that imperialism in Germany has been bitterly condemned by British authors, but for the maintenance of Great Britain's dominion all over the world the federation of all colonies into an empire is an indispensable principle; and further the British empire, in this sense of imperialism, presupposes Great Britain's naval supremacy.

In addition, the powers on the continent ought to be equally balanced; Earl Roberts quotes from Lord Milner: "But in order to help maintain that balance we require an army, and no puny army." This means "militarism." Militarism is to be destroyed in Germany, but England ought to have it.

And we agree with Earl Roberts. If militarism had existed in Great Britain as it exists in Germany, if every Englishman had to serve in the army, Sir Edward Grey would not have ventured into this war so unconcernedly as he did, and for this reason, if not for others as well, it is highly desirable that the German system of militarism should be introduced into Great Britain.

If we grant the premises from which Earl Roberts argues, that British dominance over the world (or, as he more guardedly expresses it, her "naval supremacy") is "absolutely necessary" for the British, his warlike attitude is quite natural, and, both from the old standpoint of Macchiavellian politics and from the biological point of view, the policy of the English government would be quite intelligible. The British cabinet held these views and so war was unavoidable.

But is the biological standpoint really true, and is it wise to act accordingly? It risks England's present position by a war

which might hasten the crisis with exactly the evil result that English statesmen intend to avoid.

A STRUGGLE FOR LEADERSHIP.

There is a certain justice in English ambition to keep ahead in the struggle for leadership in the world. Every nation has a right to do her best to excel all the others and be the first among them. It is the old principle taught in ancient Greece where Homer thus expressed it in his *Iliad*:

Αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπείροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων.

"Always to be in the lead and to be to the others superior."

England has been the dominant nation in the world and maintains her prominence by ruling the seas; but two rivals are slowly growing stronger with the probability that each of them will take a place beside Great Britain, and these are Germany and the United States. Should their growth be tolerated? Should not the increase of their power be stopped in time before it is too late? From the standpoint of the English author who expresses the biological view, Great Britain should be on guard. Russia is not dangerous; France is not dangerous; no other smaller power can become dangerous. There are only two rivals, Germany and America. Our English author says directly *Germania est delenda*, and implies as the future aim, *America est delenda*. Is not this principle right? Is not the maxim of Homer both true and noble? And is not the struggle for existence a law of nature fully proved by science?

Britannia still rules the seas; and we can very well understand that she would and should do anything, even risk a war, to maintain her supremacy. We grant that she has a right to do so, but we believe that she has not taken the right way to carry out her determination.

England has done wrong in forcing the war upon Germany, and though the moment is comparatively well chosen, though Germany is at present in a most precarious position, it seems clear to me that England is greatly endangered and has herself to blame if she loses her world dominion in the struggle.

Has not Great Britain's action in declaring war on Germany fully justified Germany in building a navy? Without any cause of her own for war England joined Germany's enemies and destroyed her large trade over sea through the use of superior naval power. England's statesmen know perfectly well that Germany's

breach of Belgian neutrality was excusable and fully justified, but they claim that the war was deliberately forced upon England by Germany's aggressiveness because Germany has been from time to time increasing not only her army but also her navy, and especially after the establishment of the Triple Entente. Her navy is now almost half as large as the British navy, and according to English opinion this is reason enough to claim that Germany has forced England to begin the war and to blame her for aggressiveness. Says Earl Roberts: "The agreements between Great Britain and France were signed in London 1904"...the "good understanding between Great Britain, France and Russia was completed in 1907," and in another place he points out the great fault of Germany saying:

"The German Army was increased in 1912, and again in 1913, to such an extent that the peace strength expanded from about 650,000 in 1911 to 822,000 in 1913; and it is a fact worthy of note that this addition of 170,000 men to the numbers with the colors—an addition just equal to our Expeditionary Force—was made almost immediately after the Morocco crisis of 1911, when the British Government had shown its determination to stand by the side of France against any attempt of German aggression."

So it is apparent that in British opinion Germany bears all the guilt. The Triple Entente succeeded in thwarting Germany's attempt to receive a portion of Morocco which the French reserved for themselves. The English succeeded in gaining the good will of the strongest nations against Germany, and Germany deemed it wise to strengthen her defense. If Germany had remained as weak as in 1806, England would have condescended to patronize the German people as she patronizes all weak nations, for instance Servia and Belgium.

England has always been an enemy of every nation that might become a competitor of her naval supremacy, but small nations enjoy her ostensible friendship. A small nation is one that could never gain headway on the ocean, never build a navy and never have a chance to dominate the world. England's love of small nations has always been praised by the British as her benevolent humanitarianism, as her kindness for the downtrodden, but closely considered it is due to selfishness, for these smaller nations have always given pretexts for England to promote her own interest. So, for instance, Belgium is now claimed to be a protégée of England, but in fact Belgium has been utilized as English territory on the continent, and at the instigation of English statesmen the Bel-

gians have been fighting the battles of England in the vain confidence that England was defending their cause.

Poor Belgium is a victim of English politics, for the English have not even given them enough assistance to protect Belgian territory from the horrors of war. The people living on the same stretch of country, formerly connected with Holland under the name of the Netherlands, were once a most powerful sea-faring state, but England waged a war on these Netherlands for no other reason than because the country had become almost as powerful as England on the seas. But no nation may rule the waves but England, and so the Netherlands fell a victim to English politics and lost valuable colonies beyond the seas. Now it is Germany's turn to have her navy destroyed, and English jingoes do not hesitate to announce the United States of America as the next power to be overcome in order to preserve for the future that supremacy on the seas which is absolutely necessary for the maintenance of the British empire.

THE HIGHER VIEW.

We grant that life is struggle and struggle cannot be avoided in life. We grant that struggle implies war and that under certain circumstances war is unavoidable. Therefore every nation (our own United States by no means excepted) is in duty bound to be always ready for self-defense, and this implies militarism. But we maintain that the fierceness of the struggle, its suffering, its unnecessary pangs and pains can be eliminated, or at any rate reduced, and this is done in the progress of civilization. Unnecessary wars can be avoided, and they will be avoided not so much by humaneness and kindheartedness as by intelligence. Humaneness does not work, because a genuine true humaneness, a humaneness associated with intelligence, is too rare, and is practically pure sentiment which does not affect the broad masses, for we must not forget that mankind is brutish, not humane. The salvation of mankind can be brought about only by education, by teaching how the worst ills of life can be avoided, and that much of the evil which people suffer is of their own making.

Why was this or that war unavoidable? Because the people who started it did not possess sufficient insight to recognize its inadvisability. To speak plainly, the stupidity of the leading men is the ultimate cause of a war.

Take an example.

The war of secession was actually unavoidable because at the

time the people did not understand the slave question. First, there were some idealists who believed in the liberty, equality and brotherhood of man, who thought the negro was as much a child of God as the white man, and slavery a most damnable institution. I shall not enter into details which modify the ideal; suffice it to say that if men are equal before the law it does not mean that they are of the same worth and value. Those who felt instinctively the errors of the ideal saw the reverse aspect of the statement and claimed that the land of cotton needed workers in the fields and that the maintenance of slavery was a question of life or death for the southerners. The difference of opinion caused the demand for secession. Hence the war was unavoidable.

Now let us assume that one among the leading men had understood the slave question, and especially this phase of it: While slavery seems to be a special phase in the economical development of mankind, it always abolishes itself when the time comes. Slavery is a benefit not only for the slave owner, but as a rule also for the slave, who is incapable of making a living for himself. The slave owner has to provide for him, has to care for his future and in this way takes many burdens off his shoulder which he is as yet incapable of carrying. To keep slaves is expensive, and as soon as there is a sufficient amount of free labor that can do the work more cheaply, slavery will die out rapidly.

This statement is simple and undeniable; and it is a fact that no one would now be willing, even if it were not against the law, to reintroduce slavery in the southern states because free labor is cheaper than the maintenance of slaves, and from this point of view we will learn that slavery would in time have abolished itself and the abolition of slavery would possibly and probably have come about gradually and at a more seasonable period.

If this truth had been known and appreciated there would have been no necessity for our war of secession. Ignorance made the war unavoidable. I do not mean to say that the people were unintelligent and stupid in every respect, they were as clever and intelligent as people are nowadays; but they were ignorant on one point which happened to be the salient issue of the day. Their excitement blinded them to the truth that would have been their salvation.

The present war is unavoidable in the same sense, but it could have been avoided if the men who started it had been possessed of more intelligence on the point at issue. God did not endow them with that wisdom, and so I pray that their stupidity may be re-

garded as an extenuation of their crime—but the results are terrible.

What is the reason of the war, the underlying ground that makes it unavoidable? I do not now mean the occasion. The occasion is the assassination of the archduke and the right of Servia, on the plea of her sovereignty, to have an investigation of the plot prevented. The real reason of the war is Great Britain's fear that Germany might grow too powerful. The jealousy that has developed between the two nations is founded on their rivalry. The author of the English article in the *Saturday Review* written from a "biological" point of view said that Germany is at present the only dangerous competitor and in the future the next will be America. If the laws of nature can be relied upon the struggle is unavoidable. Men impressed with the truth of this idea have guided the destiny of England; they brought about the Triple Entente, they planned to utilize neutral Belgium as a basis for a British attack on Germany. Germany knew that the war with England was threatening and she began to prepare for it, nor can we blame her for doing so. She began to build a navy which, though very much weaker in numbers than the English navy, is by no means inferior in quality.

Now the question arises, was the war truly unavoidable under these circumstances? I answer, Yes. It was unavoidable if we grant that the men who brought it about were blessed with that gift of God we have characterized as a lack of intelligence. These men are no doubt very clever and bright in every other respect, but they lack a deeper insight into what I call the higher view, which throws light on the salient point at issue. The present war could have been avoided if the men who made it had understood the law of progress in the history of the world; but the avoidance of unnecessary war will be possible only when the leading men of the world's affairs will take the higher view of politics and learn the law of civilization by which the unnecessary ills of struggle may be eliminated.

First I would tell the man who wrote *Germania est delenda*, that England would not gain by the destruction of Germany. On the contrary she would lose, as she actually has lost now in many quarters through the destruction of her own commerce with Germany. But I want to make another more important point.

Suppose I were the owner of a drugstore doing a lucrative business and just when I felt that I had established a good business, which practically amounts to a monopoly, another drugstore was established by an enterprising young competitor across the street,

and at a further distance in the American quarter of the town a third one was starting in business. My business had become somewhat stationary, we might even say stagnant, but I had a hard time in establishing it and felt that it was my own and that my competitors had no right to interfere with my trade. If I could do away with them, there was no branch in my store which would not become more prosperous. By killing a competitor I would certainly get rid of him, but would gain nothing. The shop would remain as sloven as before. In order to make true progress I must imitate my rival's progressiveness, must improve my methods and do better than he! To kill people is against the law in a civilized society, but sovereign states do not recognize any international law, and the sword must decide questions of right. So it has been in the past and I fear it will still continue for a long time. Here comes in the duty of developing manhood, or, to use the modern term, "militarism."

In history, the progressive nation has generally been superior in intelligence to her powerful aggressor. Take for instance the world power of Persia and little Greece, the former inexhaustible in resources, the latter inspired by ideals representing a definite stage in the development of mankind, the study of which was called later on *humaniora*. The situation was absolutely hopeless for Greece on any human consideration; a miracle only could save her from the teeming millions of the Persian hosts, and yet the miracle happened. Greece came out victorious. It is true the stupid rivalry between Sparta and Athens ruined Greece, but the spirit of Greece lived in the Macedonian hero Alexander, and he made Greek civilization triumph over the older culture of Asia.

Numbers of soldiers are very important in battle, the quantity of tonnage is a great factor in a naval encounter, but after all, quality is decisive, the quality of soldiers and sailors, of ships and armament, and above all of intelligence.

I wonder whether the English cabinet has taken that point into consideration. It does not seem so, for they were apparently unprepared for the occurrences in the war. They are now clamoring for "an army and a large army." Why did they not train an army before they declared war? Because they were so uninformed about Germany that they regarded her army an easy prey to superior numbers.

And what constitutes Germany's strength? It is the German spirit, German grit, German intelligence, it is a quality which we

might characterize in the word "Germandom," to translate what the Germans call *Deutschthum*.

Germandom, or *Deutschthum*, is a peculiar phase in the development of mankind, and its essential feature may be characterized as objectivity. I do not mean to say that objectivity is absent in England, in France, in the United States and other countries, but it is more predominant in Germany and constitutes an aim, an ideal, a state of mind to be desired for certain purposes and is closely connected with the efflorescence of science.

Science is the ideal of the present age, and it is best realized and most widespread in Germany. It is there applied to practical life more than in any other country. German education is superior and the Germans are more quick-witted and versatile than the English.

England has not been so progressive as Germany. A comparison of the two countries does not show England in a favorable light. France has improved wonderfully, but not as much as Germany. The wealth of England is still enormous, but it is not well distributed. There is the rich aristocracy and the wretched population of London's east end, whose destitution can nowhere be equaled either in France or Germany. It even seems as if every conservative man was shrinking from having any change introduced into the social system. A great scientist in England once told me: "We make no changes because one change might lead to others and our whole system of social arrangements might collapse." What would appear as a reform in the beginning might end in an utter breakdown of the entire body politic.

Several visiting foreigners have assured me that according to their sincere conviction England is on its downward march, that it is the least progressive nation and is beginning to lag considerably behind the advance of the times. Englishmen, they say, can least easily adapt themselves to new conditions; they are slow and at the same time proud, they look upon other European nations, the Germans and the French included, at best with benevolent condescension, sometimes with contempt, while Americans, so far as they approve of them at all, are but second-class Englishmen. More accurately speaking the people of the United States are third class, because the Canadians and other colonials range in second degree. I will make these statements without further discussion because a full explanation will lead too far here, and I prefer to set forth the higher view which would make a war avoidable.

From the lower standpoint as expressed by the anonymous

author of the article from a biological point of view, the war is actually as unavoidable as the war of secession was in the United States. Germany has grown with an unprecedented rapidity in prosperity and power; if her progress continues, she will outgrow the British empire within a calculable time and if the British empire means to retain her grip on the globe, she will have to outdo Germany and keep ahead of her. This is as much England's duty as it is Germany's right to grow and expand and do better than Great Britain.

Λὲν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπείροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων.

But I will ask the question right here, If Germany were eliminated would every Englishman really be benefitted thereby? In a certain sense, perhaps; England would lose a rival. But in another sense, not; the British would remain or fall back into their old slovenly way of carrying on their business. They would not profit by killing off their rival, they would not learn, they would not progress; and when other rivals rise, either in America or in some other continent from their own colonies, or perhaps in Russia, they would again be obliged to dispose of their rivals by knocking them out. If they are smart enough and follow the old methods taught by Macchiavelli, they might succeed, but they would not succeed in furthering mankind to a higher and higher development.

The stages of progressive mankind are not accidental, they are predetermined. And when the Persians, those sturdy mountaineers, appeared in history they took the lead and became the rulers of Babylon and the whole Babylonian empire. But the Greeks reached a higher plane, and though few in numbers could not be subdued but grew and expanded until they overthrew the Persian empire, and the Greek spirit permeated all hither Asia.

A new civilization arose and it took root in all civilized nations, but mainly in what we have characterized as Germanism; and this Germanism is not the civilization born of German blood, it is the civilization of mankind which concentrated mainly in Germany. The Greeks passed away, but if mankind wanted to advance and become superior to the Greeks, it could not have done so by eliminating the Greeks, by slaying them or disposing of them in any way. The northern barbarians would always have remained barbarians had they not risen above their own stage and attained the plane of Greek thought. The Germans have done this more than any other nation, not merely by learning what the Greeks taught, but by becoming Greeks

themselves. I do not deny that since the Renaissance there have been Greek spirits in Italy, France and also in England, but the Germans have imbibed Hellenism into their souls in its purest form, and in their literature it rose to a classical efflorescence in Schiller and Goethe.

Further the Germans were always more cosmopolitan than others and this is instanced in the fact that they were interested in all other nations. There has been no work of significance in England, in France, in Spain, in Russia, that has not been translated into German. Shakespeare, Cervantes, Molière, Turgeniev, are as well known and appreciated in Germany as in their own countries, and the most valuable thought of all the world has grown into the spirit of German literature. The soul of every other civilized nation has taken abode in Germany; every one was welcome, every one was appreciated, every one has grown into Germanism.

Nor is Germany limited to German blood in its inmost constitution, its biological system. Some of the most representative Germans are Slavs, Poles or Wends, some are French Huguenots, still others Italians, and there is no nationality of Europe which is not interwoven into the texture of the German nation. Nor must we forget that Germany owes valuable contributions to Judaism, the main and best representative of the old Oriental nations. Germanism has become most cosmopolitan, a feature which is developing in a still higher degree in America.

If the English would outdo the Germans, they can do it not by killing them but by imitating them. They must adopt that Germanism which they now despise. They must learn from the Germans. They must adopt their methods, they must introduce reforms which will best be modelled after German patterns, they must imitate German efficiency also in defense, or in other words, they must copy German militarism.

To eliminate by war and slaughter a rival who is dangerous because he is too progressive and growing too powerful, may be the proper thing to do from the lower standpoint, which in the *Saturday Review* has been called "biological," but at best it will be a poor and unsatisfactory method of keeping ahead. This method of keeping ahead is dangerous, for history teaches us that the people to be disposed of in this brutal manner usually accomplish exactly what their enemies planned to prevent, and so the Biblical sentence is frequently applicable that "ye thought evil against me, but God meant it unto good" (Gen. 1. 20).

The underlying question of this war is after all a question of

power. The war is to decide whether England will retain her supremacy over the seas, which means her dominance over the world; and questions of power cannot be decided by argument, they must be decided by the proof of actual superiority. England's strength lay in peace,⁸ but she has chosen war. England risks much more than Germany, certainly more than her leaders think or have thought. The author of the articles in the *Saturday Review* thinks "that England is the only great power who could fight Germany without tremendous risk and without doubt of the issue."

To me it seems almost pitiable that a few men could mislead the English people and rush them into the war, the greatest calamity that ever could fall upon England. It is a misfortune that these men, originally a few jingoese, seized the government, manufactured opinion, induced the country to ally itself first with France, then with Russia, sowed hatred against Germany, the nation that is most kin to the English, and walk a path that will lead to perdition. When the war is over we shall understand history better, we shall see more clearly, and those statesmen who have begun the war will be wiser.

Before 1870 Germany counted thirty-eight million inhabitants and now contains sixty-six millions. She has grown in power not by militarism but by a peaceful development. But according to Sir Edward Grey himself the "unmeasured aggrandizement" is the true reason of the war. If that is the case, the reason of the war is indeed a mere question of power. Two cannot be the first. According to such a conception the seas must belong to one nation; any important rival must be disposed of in battle while the small ones may be tolerated. There is no question of right; it is a question of supremacy, of retaining leadership. Herein lies the reason that the British have no arguments and do not even need a *casus belli*. They state their reasons in general phrases, as Germany's militarism, Germany's increase of power, Germany's unprecedented growth, etc. England does not seem to feel the unfairness of the present war, but neither did she see the unfairness of her former wars. It is really an astonishing fact that no English war in modern times can be defended. And now, why begin a war to exterminate Germany's militarism or imperialism? France has a severer militarism, and real imperialism is most developed in Russia. And if Germany be crushed now, will she not rise phoenix-

⁸ The war with the Boers was the same mistake. The Boers would have lost in a peaceful competition with the *uitlanders*, but England preferred war, a war most disastrous to England. England subjected the Boers but laid the basis for a future United States of South Africa.

like again and again? And will not that spirit which now dominates Germandom surely conquer in the end?

Here is the point we make on the issue: The English statesmen will not attain what they want, they will not keep England in the lead, they are positively endangering England's predominance in the world most terribly. The odds are awful against Germany, the moment for attacking her was shrewdly chosen; but it would have been wiser to conquer Germany with her own weapons by introducing German methods in England and raising the level of English institutions, of English schools and industrial conditions, of English science, medicine, chemistry, and other branches, to the German standard. The reverse is done. In Russia the very name Petersburg is changed to Petrograd, and if every trace of German influence were wiped out in Russia the Muscovites would certainly be the losers, and if German music is to be cut out in England as has been proposed, and if German medicines are to be replaced by English imitations, the English drugstore may have reasons to be grateful, but scarcely English patients.

One way to keep in the lead is to kill a rival. It is the old barbarous way and after all inefficient. The higher way is not only nobler, but also better and leads to success. It consists in the firm endeavor to excel your rival. That is not easy, for it demands hard labor, but it leads to the goal.