

Captain Martins at the left, the German commander at Malines, who personally took upon himself the relief of the poor of the town.

Our next picture carries us into the ranks of the British where the late Field Marshal Earl Roberts is seen inspecting the colonial recruits of the British army. It is probably the last snapshot obtained of the veteran commander. It seems to us that the appearance of the new troops is not very favorable. When passing through the streets of London one is impressed with the fine figure of the British guards, but here the men seem to be under-sized and underfed, merely "food for powder" as Falstaff says.

---

### PRECONCERTED ARRANGEMENTS OF THE ALLIES.

BY A. KAMPMEIER.

In the report of Baron Greindl to the Belgian government [quoted above, page 42] we have the key to the explanation why Holland, some years ago, decided to fortify the mouth of the Schelde at Flushing, a decision which caused such a great outcry in Paris and London. Holland had apparently got wind of the fact that England, disregarding Dutch neutrality, intended to bring supplies and war material to Antwerp on the Schelde. This would of course have brought about reprisals on the part of Germany, something which could have been avoided only by Holland seeing to it that its neutrality was defended not only on paper but with armed forts.

Captain Faber is the same member of Parliament who was angrily reproached by Sir Edward Grey with "political alcoholism." This happened after the Morocco-Congo agreement between France and Germany in November, 1911. At that time the question was discussed whether England had had any intention of attacking Germany during the last chapter of the Moroccan crisis. English politicians who were irritated over the final outcome of the matter, which they considered had been weakly handled and to England's disadvantage, gave vent to their vexation at a dinner by letting out the secret that the plan had been to transport an English army to Belgium and fall on the right flank of the German army. It also became known at this time that there had been differences of opinion in the English government, some being for war while others were against it, and that finally the declaration of the admiralty that it was unable to guarantee unconditionally the safe transport of the troops in the face of the German fleet, was perhaps the deciding factor in there being no decision for war. These revelations, of course, aroused public opinion in Germany not a little. Sir Edward Grey was very much provoked at the disclosure of the plan, and gave assurances that there was no truth in it whatever, calling those who spoke of it and believed in it "political alcoholics." But perhaps there is some truth in the old saying, *In vino veritas*. Thus writes Dr. P. Rohrbach in No. 43 of *Die Hilfe* (October 22), a publication edited by Dr. F. Naumann, member of the German Reichstag.

The same writer also compares an article in the *Westminster Gazette*, the British official organ, with some notes from St. Petersburg on a conference of the Russian naval staff. He points to ten documents which the *Nord-deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* has published in its second edition concerning an Anglo-Russian naval agreement made last summer. Mr. Grey made the announcement in June that "there is no naval agreement and no negotiations

are going on in regard to such between Great Britain and Russia." Several weeks before, in May, the following minutes were recorded at the quarters of the Russian naval staff: "Proceeding from the fact that an agreement between Russia and England is desirable regarding the cooperation of their marine forces in the event of war with France participating, the conference reached the following conclusion: 'The contemplated naval convention shall regulate the relations between the Russian and English forces at sea; therefore an understanding is to be arrived at regarding signals, special ciphers, radio-telegrams and the mode of intercourse between the Russian and English naval staffs. The two staffs shall also regularly make mutual communications regarding the fleets of third powers and their own fleets, especially regarding technical data, recently introduced machinery and inventions. Following the example of the Franco-Russian naval convention, there shall also be brought about a regular exchange of opinions between the Russian and English naval staffs concerning matters which interest the marine ministry of both states. . . . The Russian interests in the Baltic demand that England confine as large a part as possible of the German fleet to the North Sea. In this way the overwhelming superiority of the German fleet to the Russian would be offset, and perhaps a Russian landing in Pomerania be made possible. To this latter end the English government could render a signal service by sending, before the commencement of war operations, a large number of merchant ships to Baltic ports, that the lack of Russian transport ships might be remedied. . . . Russian ships should be allowed, with the consent of England, to use English ports in the English Mediterranean as a basis, just as the French naval agreement allows the Russian fleet to use as bases the French ports in the western Mediterranean.'"

---

#### CRITICISM.

One of the critics of *The Open Court's* editorial position on the European war stated that every nine out of ten Americans are pro-British in their sympathies in the present war; but judging from letters received and practical results in the way of subscriptions and renewals to *The Open Court* the very opposite of this statement is true. I have published every criticism which contains pro-British sentiment, but if I were to publish pro-German replies I should not find room in the magazine if I doubled the size of the regular edition.

One of these anti-British critics advises me to omit the word religion from the cover of *The Open Court*, because, he says, religion is wrong and science is right, and that science teaches one to fight his way and not to be trodden under foot. For this reason he sends in his subscription, saying that *The Open Court* is not so "silly" as he had expected it to be.

I will say, however, that religion is by no means the entanglement of ancient superstitions which hold man in subjection. Religion is the world-conception which we hold, and its application to practical life is called ethics, and the basis of our ethics is science. If science teaches us that life is a struggle for the survival of the fittest we must learn to be the fittest, and to be the fittest is sometimes not possible without severe struggle. It is wise to avoid war, and we do so by trying to live peaceably with our fellow creatures. We sometimes consent to terms in which we make concessions that would be