

## CRAMB'S "GERMANY AND ENGLAND."

A VALUATION OF ITS PREMISES.

BY J. MATTERN.

[Mr. Mattern, the writer of the article which we print below, was born in Rhineland, Germany, in 1882. He graduated from the state gymnasium at Cleves and for his postgraduate work attended the universities of Münster and Bonn. After finishing his studies he came to the United States in 1907 on what he then considered a "temporary business trip." However he has since made this country his home and has become naturalized. In answering Professor Cramb's assertions concerning young Germany's ideals and aspirations Mr. Mattern, as will be admitted, is in a position to speak from recent and personal experience, a fact which is bound to lend to his argument special interest and weight. Mr. Mattern at present holds the position of assistant librarian at the Johns Hopkins University.—ED.]

CRAMB'S *Germany and England* was recommended to me as a "remarkable" book. I confess that while reading and rereading it I found it to be more than remarkable, it proved to be a veritable revelation. Born and raised in the western, that is, the industrial part of Germany, with a university record of four semesters at Münster i. W. and two semesters at Bonn, the Alma Mater of the imperial princes, I have up to the present considered myself entitled to claim some knowledge of my fatherland and of the aspirations of young Germany.

I therefore protest on behalf of myself and on behalf of the youth of Germany against the picture which Cramb chosés to paint of them. I protest against Cramb's assertion that Treitschke's supposed advocacy of world dominance and world empire is young Germany's political creed and that Nietzsche's megalomaniacal caricature of the superman is the ideal, and his pagan apotheosis of might the quintessence of young Germany's philosophy and religion.

Professor Cramb evidently never heard of the Wingolf, the

Cartellverband, the Katholischer Verband, the Unitas, each of which consists of from twenty to eighty individual student clubs, all having as their motto, not Treitschkean world-politics, not Nietzschean religion of sheer force (all politics and, by the way, the *Mensur* and duel being barred by statute), but "learning, friendship and chastity." All are built on the principle of a positive religious creed; the Wingolf being predominantly Protestant and the other three Catholic. In these circles reigns supreme not Nietzsche but the Galilean. Equally among the other, the so-called "liberal," organizations: the *Korps*, the *Landsmannschaften*, the *Burschenschaften*, the *Turnerschaften*, and also among the freely organized or unorganized German university students, Treitschke and Nietzsche are comparatively little known.

No doubt Treitschke during his time drew large crowds; no doubt Treitschke still has admirers and followers. I remember an address given about twelve years ago by one of the professors of the gymnasium which I attended. In this address war with England was the theme and was declared to be inevitable. The speaker either was under the spell of Treitschke or he had allowed himself to become alarmed over the hostile ravings of the *Saturday Review* which had then for several years been waging its inflammatory campaign against Germany, with its historic cry: *Germaniam esse delendam*. But whatever the causes for his fears, his alarming utterances elicited no response except a sceptical shrugging of shoulders and a significant shaking of heads. Students and parents alike refused to be stirred.

As far as Nietzsche's influence among young Germany is concerned I take full responsibility for the statement that, except those whom their particular course compels to make a special study of that "philosopher," not one in a hundred reads his writings, and of a hundred who read them not one understands all he reads or, rather, all that Nietzsche has written; and I am not ashamed to admit that I belong in the class of those who fail to follow Nietzsche to his lofty heights or bottomless abysses, or by whatever terms one may chose to describe his eccentric dithyrambics. The *Leipziger Neueste Nachrichten* of December 1, 1914, reprints from the *Münchener Neueste Nachrichten* an interview with Edward Seirer Disyen in which the latter is credited with the following statement: "To consider Nietzsche's philosophy of might responsible for the present war I hold to be absurd. As late as yesterday I cabled to America that there are not two hundred Germans who really know Nietzsche. I believe myself to be justified in making this state-

ment." A similar opinion is expressed by G. M. C. Brandes in his *Friedrich Nietzsche*,<sup>1</sup> where he says: "Friedrich Nietzsche appears to me the most interesting writer in German literature of the present time [1889]. Though little known even in his own country, he is a thinker of a high order, who fully deserves to be studied, discussed, contested and mastered" (p. 3).

An interesting statement on Treitschke's relation to his hearers is quoted in the *Literary Digest* of November 14, 1914, p. 936: "The vigor of his utterances often called forth strong opposition among the students which they expressed, according to the German custom, by rubbing the floor with the soles of their shoes. Although Treitschke was stone-deaf it seemed as if he must have felt these demonstrations in some way, possibly through the vibrations of the floor, for whenever one occurred he would hit back with some oracular utterance like a sledge-hammer, calculated to crush if not to convince his critics." In the closing paragraphs of his sketch of Treitschke, published in *The Bookman*, December, 1914, p. 457, Munroe Smith expresses his opinion of Treitschke's influence on the Germans as follows: "It seems to me improbable that Treitschke's theories of the state and of war have appreciably affected the conduct of Germany. Conduct is more strongly influenced by sentiment than by theory. For this very reason, however, the extent to which he associated love of country with hatred of the foreigner has made his influence baleful." This should effectually counteract Cramb's claim that Treitschke and Nietzsche dominate the very thoughts and wishes of young Germany.

There is, however, still another consideration which should not be passed by lightly even though it is based on the human element of the question at issue, that is, on purely personal experience. As I said at the beginning, Cramb's book proved a real revelation to me. I do not hesitate to confess that after reading and rereading it I found, for a time at least, my confidence in the knowledge of the land of my birth and youth and of its hopes and ideals severely tried. Only once before has the reading of a book ever played such havoc with my equanimity, and that was when the orthodox youth laid hands upon Haeckel's *Welträtsel*. When I regained my bearings after reading Cramb's phantasms, I wondered if it were possible that I should have grown up and lived among my German brethren and cousins as one of them; that I should have attended the state gymnasium for seven long years; that I should have

<sup>1</sup> Translated from the Danish by A. G. Chater, New York, Macmillan Company; London, W. Heinemann, [1889].

listened for three years more to the professors of two universities, thus imbibing their teachings of all kinds of *Weltanschauungen*, those of the believer and of the professed atheist, of the imperialist and of the socialist; and that after all, or rather in spite of all, I should have utterly failed to discover what, according to Cramb, animated all the rest of my fellow students, namely the craving for world dominance, and the thing for the realization of which all the youth of Germany was yearning—world conquest. Is it possible that I alone should have failed to realize that among the “most earnest and passionate young minds” of Germany “intellect is wrestling against Christianity” itself and that Nietzsche’s paganism has replaced the teachings of the Galilean? I say—and I say it most emphatically—it is impossible that I should have lived and breathed in an atmosphere such as Cramb claims for young Germany without having become contaminated by the same spirit or without having at least become conscious of its existence. Is it possible then that thousands of German youths of my closer sphere, sharing with me the same faith, the same ideals, the same *Weltanschauung*, as expressed by the principles of hundreds of German students’ clubs represented at every German university, should have walked through life blindfolded? Is it possible that all of us should have failed to be taken into the confidence of those whom Cramb calls “the most earnest and passionate,” those under the spell of Treitschke, the political propagandist, those disciples of Nietzsche, the high priest of the new religion of brute force? I declare with the same emphasis that this is equally impossible. It is true, young Germany as well as old has its religious and political differences, but all have been and are being nourished at the same fountain of learning, and the very fact that the German student visits at least two, and sometimes three or four different universities while pursuing his postgraduate work must exclude all possibility of clannishness and onesidedness. It is thus utterly unthinkable that the individual as well as groups of individuals should not have come in contact with the sentiments Cramb scores.

Whether Treitschke’s and Nietzsche’s teachings actually are all they are claimed to be by Cramb and his camp-followers, or whether their interpretation as given to the English-speaking world on the strength of detached quotations is correct, space will not permit me to discuss as thoroughly as I should wish to do. Munroe Smith’s article is extremely interesting in this respect. I take the liberty of quoting some of the most salient points: “Treitschke was before all things a literary artist. It was largely the lucidity,

energy and brilliancy of his style that won him influence and fame as a publicist and historian. This should be taken into account in endeavoring to determine his real political opinions. Without accepting Seeley's contention, that in proportion as history becomes literature it sacrifices its proper aim of exact truthfulness, it must be recognized that a writer of marked literary gifts is often tempted to sacrifice precision for the sake of antithesis or epigram. And when such a writer devotes his talents, as Treitschke did, to the moulding of public opinion in a period of national stress, it is hardly fair to cite detached sentences, or even entire essays, as expression of his final and deliberate judgment. . . ."

To illustrate Treitschke's views of war I let him speak for himself: "Those who declaim this nonsense of a perpetual peace do not understand the Aryan peoples; the Aryan peoples are above all things brave. They have always been men enough to protect with the sword what they had won by the spirit. We must not consider all these things by the light of the reading lamp alone; to the historian who lives in the world of will it is immediately clear that the demand for a perpetual peace is thoroughly reactionary; he sees that with war all movement, all growth, must be struck out of history. It has always been the tired, unintelligent, and enervated periods that have played with the dream of perpetual peace. . . . However, it is not worth the trouble to discuss this matter further; the living God will see to it that war constantly returns as a dreadful medicine for the human race."<sup>2</sup>

Ruskin, who was considered the most peace-loving man of his time, in a speech before the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich in 1866, had this to say on the subject of peace and war:<sup>3</sup> "When I tell you that war is the foundation of all the arts, I mean also that it is the foundation of all high virtues and faculties of man. . . . The common notion that peace and virtues of civil life flourish together I found to be wholly untenable. Peace and the vices of civil life only flourish together. We talk of peace and learning, of peace and plenty, of peace and civilization, but I found that these were not the words which the Muse of History coupled together; that on her lips the words were: peace and sensuality, peace and selfishness, peace and corruption, peace and death. I found in brief that all great nations learn their truth of word and strength of thought in war; that they were nourished by war and wasted by

<sup>2</sup> Selections from Treitschke's lectures on politics, translated by A. L. Gowans, pp. 24-25.

<sup>3</sup> "Christianity and War," in *Journal of the Military Service Institution*, No. 193, p. 91.

peace; taught by war and deceived by peace; trained by war and betrayed by peace; in a word that they were born in war and expired in peace. . . .”

If we compare the two statements we cannot but confess that Treitschke's version is comparatively mild.

It is true, Treitschke teaches that “of all political sins, weakness is the most abominable and the most contemptible; it is the sin against the Holy Ghost of politics.” It is true, he teaches that “the state is might.” But on the whole Cramb's version of Treitschke's supposed propaganda of a German world empire is given a rather rude shock by Munroe Smith. Let me quote: “Although [according to Treitschke] the state is might, Treitschke does not admit that might is right. The state is unquestionably subject to the moral law. Acquired power must justify itself by its employment for the highest moral benefit of humanity; and ‘power which tramples all right under foot must perish in the end’ . . . In the main he [Treitschke] gets no further than to assert that the statesman should be as moral as he can be under any given circumstances. . . . It is desirable, and as a rule it is advantageous, that diplomacy should be truthful; but in the state of ‘latent war’ in which Europe lives this is not always possible; and we should not applaud the statesman who would warm his hands over the smoking ruins of his country and declare with smug satisfaction, ‘At any rate, I have never lied.’ On one point, however, Treitschke is quite clear: no state has a right to extend its sway over people of a different race whom it cannot assimilate. . . . It follows that world empire is contrary to the highest morality. In his ‘German history’ Treitschke recognizes that the humiliation of Germany in the ‘Thirty Years’ War was a just retribution for the attempts of German kings to rule Italy and to reestablish universal empire. ‘In the merciless justice of history,’ he wrote, ‘those who lusted to rule the world were trampled under the feet of the stronger.’”

Now, who is right, Cramb or Munroe Smith?

I could have given the same quotations and the same phrases from Treitschke's teachings myself without reference to Munroe Smith, but for reasons too obvious to be mentioned I chose to give Smith's judgment and opinion the preference.

Since I have candidly issued for myself a *testimonium pauper-tatis* as far as a thorough knowledge of Nietzsche and his teachings is concerned, I am forced to let those who know speak. I suppose that the judgment of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* will be accepted as beyond suspicion by all. This is in part what it has to say: “In

1878 eye (and brain) trouble caused him [Nietzsche] to obtain sick leave, and finally in 1879 to be pensioned. For the next ten years he lived in various health resorts in considerable suffering (he declares that the year contained for him 200 days of pure pain), but dashing off at high pressure the brilliant essays on which his fame rests. Towards the end of 1888, after recovering from an earlier attack, he was pronounced hopelessly insane, and in this condition he remained until he died on the 25th of August 1900. Nietzsche's writings must be considered in their relation to these circumstances of his life, and as the outcome of a violent revolt against them on the part of an intensely emotional and nervous temperament. His philosophy, consequently, is neither systematic in itself nor expounded in systematic form. It is made up of a number of points of view which successively appeared acceptable to a personality whose self-appreciation verges more and more upon the insane and exhibits neither consecutiveness nor consistency. Its natural form is the aphorism, and to this and to its epigrammatic brilliance, vigor, and uncompromising revolt against all conventions in science and conduct it owes its persuasiveness. Revolt against the whole civilized environment in which he was brought up is the keynote of Nietzsche's literary career. His revolt against Christian faith and morals turns him into a proudly atheistic 'freethinker' and preacher of a new 'master' morality, which transposes the current valuations, deposes the 'Christian virtues,' and incites the 'overman' ruthlessly to trample under foot the servile herd of the weak, degenerate and poor in spirit. His revolt against the theory of state supremacy turns him into an anarchist and individualist; his revolt against modern democracy into an aristocrat...."

This is the man who, if we believe Cramb, has shaped the German youth of to-day into men of exceptional will power, into disciples and worshipers of the religion of might. Nonsense! German youth need no Nietzsche to improve their will power. Before I had read anything of Nietzsche's works, before Nietzsche had been mentioned to me, I had shaped my motto: *Ich kann was ich will, und ich will was ich kann*: "I am able to do what I want to do and (or because) I want to do (only) what (I know that) I am able to do." Herein lies the whole secret of the Germans' strength of will and consequently of their phenomenal power of perseverance, endurance and success. They know how to learn and to demark their own limitations, and within those limitations there exists no *non possumus* for them. To think and to seriously state that such qualities could be the result of the teaching of a man of yesterday

is the height of folly. They are the product of centuries of struggles, disappointments and battles such as only the German nation has endured in this world. But to appreciate this requires more than a smattering knowledge of European battles and of historical facts in general; it requires above all a sympathetic understanding of the race, or of what the Germans call *die Volksseele*.

On Bernhardi's book, *Germany and the Next War*, Mr. Cramb among many other things has this to say: "The book has the interest derived from the fact that it represents a very strong trend of German and, above all, of Prussian opinion—that accumulated mass of determined anti-Englishism. It is useless to see in Bernhardi's book the expression of a morbid or heated Jingoism. It is no rhapsody on war. Bernhardi is not a man who takes any excessive pleasure in the contemplation of war; on the contrary! But he is a man who recognizes the darker, obscurer forces shaping the destiny of nations. To him this war with England is inevitable. And his book is symptomatic; that is to say, it represents the mood, the conviction, the fervent faith, of thousands and tens of thousands of Germans—Prussians, Saxons, Suabians, Bavarians." From a review of Bernhardi's book in the London *Athenæum* of 1912 (pp. 513-514), it appears that the *Athenæum* has its doubts about Bernhardi's views being "symptomatic" of the mood and the conviction of "thousands and tens of thousands of Germans" when it writes: "He [Bernhardi] does not hesitate to exaggerate the dangers which beset Germany. He tells his fellow countrymen that they are in the midst of hostile rivals; and when some of them who are not Prussians read about the 'curse of petty nationalities,' they may not appreciate his words. He writes from the standpoint of one who thinks that aspirations for peace threaten to poison the soul of the German people. . . . General von Bernhardi attempts to prove to his German readers that 'England will attack us [the Germans] on some pretext or other'. . . . but he admits that some of his [German] friends say that 'England would never resolve to declare war on us.'"

But regarding Bernhardi's reception and influence among his German fellow citizens, it is imperative that we consider above all the reviews of his work in German journals and newspapers.

Of fifty German military journals (including the Austrian and German Swiss) as enumerated in the *Deutscher Journal-Katalog für 1914*,<sup>4</sup> the *Bibliographie der deutschen Rezensionen* for 1912 has re-

<sup>4</sup> Published in Leipsic by Schulze & Co.

viewed thirty, and from these thirty it records only three as reviewing Bernhardi's *Germany and the Next War*, namely the *Marine-Rundschau*; *Ueberall, illustrierte Zeitschrift für Armee, Marine und Kolonien*; and Streffleur's *Oesterreichische militärische Zeitschrift*. From more than fifty of the leading German newspapers (not including the Austrian and German Swiss) the same bibliography records only seven reviews of Bernhardi's work in the following seven papers: the *Berliner Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*; the *Reichsbote* (Berlin); the *Tägliche Rundschau* (Berlin); the *Münchener Allgemeine Zeitung* (formerly a daily, now a weekly); the *Leipziger Zeitung*; the *Danziger Allgemeine Zeitung*; and the *Schwäbischer Merkur*. In addition to these military journals and newspapers, the *Oesterreichische Rundschau*, a serial publication of a general character, and the *Friedenswarte*, an Austrian pacifist monthly, are mentioned as doing the journalistic honors to Bernhardi's book.

The fact that of thirty military journals reviewed by the bibliography in question only three are recorded as having paid attention to Bernhardi's work, out of more than fifty of the leading newspapers only seven, and out of the great mass of weeklies, semi-monthlies, and monthlies, only two, indicates a rather niggardly treatment of a book which Cramb claims to be a "remarkable book," a book which is supposed to be "symptomatic of the mood, the conviction, the fervent faith of tens of thousands of Germans—Prussians, Saxons, Suabians, Bavarians."

Still more significant than these statistics are the reviews themselves. Of the military journals the *Marine-Rundschau*, April 1912, is rather noncommittal. After reviewing the contents without any comment whatever it closes by saying: "The exposition by the talented author is distinguished by acuteness of judgment, temperament and great frankness in his verdict on the conditions, mistakes and peculiarities of the Germans as well as of Germany's relations to France and England."

Streffleur's *Oesterreichische militärische Zeitschrift*<sup>5</sup> lays stress on the fact that "this book by its entire treatment of the subject and through the depth of its thoughts is considerably distinguished from the products of that profuse 'future-war' literature of late years, which is seeking sensation by the unrollment of its fantastic war scenes." Without further comment on Bernhardi's theories we are assured that "this book transmits to us the opinions of a mature politician, philosopher of war, experienced military tactician and leader," and that "though primarily intended for the German people,

<sup>5</sup> 1912, *Literaturbeiblatt*, p. 42.

it contains so many truisms full of general validity that its importance reaches far beyond Germany's boundaries."

In connection with the last statement I cannot refrain from calling attention to a remark attributed to George Sylvester Viereck, editor of the *Fatherland*. Cecil Chesterton, editor of the London *New Witness*, had challenged Mr. Viereck to a joint discussion on the question "The Cause of Germany and that of the Allies." In the course of the debate, which took place on January 17 at the Cort Theater, New York, Mr. Viereck is reported as having said that "Bernhardi... was better known in England than in Germany."<sup>6</sup> While I fully endorse this remark I beg leave to amend it so as to read: "Bernhardi was better known in England and America than in Germany."

The critic of *Ueberall* (1911-1912, pages 567-569), Major-General Constantin von Zeppelin—who must not be confused with Count von Zeppelin of airship fame—introduces himself as an ardent partisan of Bernhardi. He criticises in no uncertain terms the *Berliner Tageblatt* which, as he claims, is to his knowledge the only voice condemnatory of Bernhardi's book. Zeppelin's criticism is all the more interesting because he quotes in part the disapproval of the *Berliner Tageblatt* in his attempt to discountenance its importance and value. He resents the fact that the *Berliner Tageblatt* classes Bernhardi's book as a "brochure," but he admits that this is a "matter of taste." The *Berliner Tageblatt* disapprovingly interprets Bernhardi's intention as demanding close cooperation between the political leaders and the General Staff. This Zeppelin denies and seeks to disprove by his claim that Bernhardi's is only "an academic discussion," although when it suits his argument he maintains that Bernhardi "of course avoids all description of a fantastic war, such as is furnished us persistently by French officers of the reserve as well as of the active service and even by some in responsible positions." The *Berliner Tageblatt's* sardonic confession: "For the present we are astounded by the scrupulousness with which a level-headed (*objectiver*) general launches his—happily rather clumsy—attempt to force the civilized world into a general war," and its fitting reminder of Bismarck's abhorrence of "those generals mixing in politics" is met by Zeppelin's somewhat weak rejoinder: "We believe that when the German people must choose between the views of the *Berliner Tageblatt* and those of Bernhardi... the choice cannot

\* *The Fatherland*, No. 25, p. 11.

be in doubt." He urgently recommends Bernhardt's "excellent" work to "our" readers, but he "does not know whether the future will bear out his [Bernhardt's] prophecy that Germany's development cannot exert itself in the face of France and England without war." And before effecting his "exit" he considers it wise to assure us that "we are far from being willing—be it said with emphasis—to identify ourselves with every viewpoint (*Wendung*) of Bernhardt's spirited work." He concedes that "like all such personalities, he [Bernhardt] also invites opposition," and that as an "enthusiastic patriot" he may "permit his enthusiasm to run away with him," perhaps he even may "err," but never does he "err in one thing, in his confidence in the future of his people."

Of the seven newspapers I have been able to consult two. The critic of the *Münchener Allgemeine Zeitung* of April 6, 1912, Major a. D. (of the reserve) Bellville laments Germany's inner party strife and criticises what he considers a sad failure of the German foreign policy in the Morocco affair. Under the circumstances he welcomes Bernhardt's book as a timely warning. This is in part what he writes: "We must consider the latest work of General Bernhardt. . . as a warning that will appeal to the opinions of all patriotic Germans. . . The General's political views may probably be looked upon by not a few as somewhat pessimistic and the conclusions drawn by him from his premises for the enlargement and strengthening of our defense as too far-reaching, nevertheless it must be held that pessimism in such matters is less harmful than optimism such as has reigned among us altogether too long, and that the military measures resorted to by other great powers and especially in most recent times mainly by France and Great Britain surpass the General's proposals in more than one respect. . ." The *Berliner Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* of May 12, 1912, considers Bernhardt's political teachings as being contrary to the views and the politics of the government: "From the politico-geographical position of the fatherland General von Bernhardt deduces the necessity for the strengthening of army and navy. We confess that in many respects we cannot by any means agree with his views. His interpretation of the relations of the German empire with its neighbors does not tally with that of the imperial government, but it leads him to the same conclusion that is found in the speech of the chancellor introducing the bill for military defense."

Of the two journals I failed to place the *Friedenswarte*, but considering that this is a pacifist journal we can almost divine its

opinion, and without fear of disagreement on its stand in this matter pass to the *Oesterreichische Rundschau*. Prof. H. Kretschmayr,<sup>7</sup> while referring to the much-attacked German *Marokko-Politik* is there of the opinion that "this question the politicians may settle among themselves," and then turning to Bernhardt's *Germany and the Next War* continues: "No more should on this occasion Bernhardt's much-talked-about book meet with approval or disapproval. We of course believe that strong objection must manifest itself. The question as it is put is not 'war or peace?,' but 'how will the German empire meet the inevitable war with the Triple Entente?' It is a strictly military book. Against the modern peace ideas it calls to the front all the priests of war from Heraclitus to Treitschke, and even if one does not associate oneself with the pacifists one can hardly follow whither its philosophy of war leads."

These reviews speak for themselves, and I shall let it go at that. But I cannot resist the temptation of comparing them with a few reviews from English and American journals of Homer Lea's *The Day of the Saxon*, which is a worthy counterpart to Bernhardt's *Germany and the Next War*.

In the advertising matter found on the protecting cover we are informed: "In the *Valor of Ignorance* General Lea endeavored to arouse Americans from their fancied security from invasion, and now in this new book he awakens as with a trumpet call the British empire to the dangers which each day threaten more and more the 'thin red Saxon line' engirdling the earth." The *Book Review Digest* of 1912 gives only the reviews from two English journals, the *Athenæum* and the *Spectator*. According to the *Athenæum* of June 22, 1912, the *Day of the Saxon* is interesting as a violent counterblast to the peace movement, but is too extravagant to be taken seriously." This comes indeed very close to the criticism of Bernhardt's work in the *Oesterreichische Rundschau*. The *Spectator* of August 24, 1912, admits that the book "bristles with contentious points." It expects that "the pacifist will, of course, deny the value of the supremacy for which so much is to be sacrificed" and that "the democrat will be scandalized by his [Lea's] apparent glorification of a military bureaucracy." The *Spectator* concedes that "some of the special prophecies must seem a little fantastic, and there will be considerable difference of opinion on many of the strategical views." Beyond such general criticism of the technical value of Lea's book neither the *Athenæum* nor the

<sup>7</sup> Vol. XXXIII, p. 76.

*Spectator* venture to go, which means that neither specifically approves or disapproves of the politico-ethical side of the work. This cannot be said of the German reviews of Bernhardt's book, all of which more or less accept the conclusions as a timely warning but repudiate, with the probable exception of the military journals, Bernhardt's philosophy of war and his political and ethical views in point. By the way, the closing paragraph of the *Spectator's* review of Lea's *The Day of the Saxon* is, *mutatis mutandis*, of course, almost identical with part of the criticism of Bernhardt's book as found in the *Münchener Allgemeine Zeitung*. The *Spectator* concludes by saying: "When all is said, there is a great deal of sound sense and timely warning. The book demands serious attention for its good will, its earnestness, and its many penetrating comments. We have been drifting of late into a false conception of the meaning of naval power, and, if for nothing else than this, Mr. Lea's analysis should be deeply pondered by those responsible for our imperial security."

American opinion of Lea's book as expressed in the reviews of American journals and newspapers is rather unfavorable. Graham Berry, in the *Bookman* of 1912, grants that the book is "no small achievement," but he does not admit its "gigantic conclusions." E. B. Krehbiel, in the *Dial* of the same year, thinks that "in the hands of others [besides cool and well-informed men] it may do real harm, for it bristles with a show of learning and scientific understanding of world affairs that will catch the unlearned with consequences none the less dire, because of its flamboyant pretensions." Similar expressions of the same opinion by the *New York Times*, the *New York Nation*, the *Review of Reviews* are recorded in the *Book Review Digest* of 1912, on page 272.

Before leaving this chapter the reader may duly expect an explanation for the fact that the *Berliner Tageblatt's* review of Bernhardt's work is not recorded in the *Bibliographie deutscher Recensionen*. From a prefatory statement of the bibliography it can be learned that some of the papers are, unfortunately, not submitted regularly and that consequently incomplete records cannot be laid at its door. Such admission by no means influences the argument and conclusions in our case. For we must assume that the papers or journals would submit whatever reviews they consider important enough to the compiler of the bibliography, who is only too anxious to receive and to embody them in his records. Thus the absence of the *Berliner Tageblatt's*, and possibly a few more reviews of Bernhardt's work can safely be interpreted as a more or

less intentional pigeon-holing due to either an indifferent or unfavorable attitude.

Why then, if the public reception and opinion of Lea's work in America and England and of Bernhardt's work in Germany are practically identical, is the *Day of the Saxon* simply ignored in the camp of the English and their friends, or, if mentioned at all, dismissed with a noncommittal smile, while Bernhardt's *Germany and the Next War* is being taken so seriously that, together with Treitschke's and Nietzsche's writings it has been made the fundamental basis of Cramb's lectures and ever since has been held up to the world as the one unquestionable sample of all Germany's principles and intentions?

The answer to this question would be the indictment of Cramb's judgment if not of his sincerity, but such indictment would at the same time constitute his most effective defense. The concluding paragraph will explain this apparent paradox.

It must be remembered that Professor Cramb's lectures had a political aim and thus were nothing more or less than a political campaign in which the most had to be, and actually has been, made of the capital at his disposal. However, Cramb was no ordinary, no hired speaker; he was the ardent patriot, stirred to a frenzy by the flat failures of Salisbury and Roberts to arouse their countrymen to the realization of what they claimed to be their impending danger from an unrecognized or underestimated foe, and to the acceptance of compulsory military service in place of their present mercenary system; he was, in his own opinion, the man of destiny, determined at all costs to succeed where others had failed, and he had at his disposal fervor of speech and an apparently boundless imagination, means which his predecessors had lacked in one form or the other. Unfortunately, however, in spite of his pretended intention of fairness to the antagonist the alarmist in him prevailed and led him to exaggerations and, *volens volens*, to misrepresentations, or at least misinterpretations which in the judgment of the calm and critical reader must weaken his argument and cause. As a layman he had a distinct advantage over Salisbury the statesman, and Roberts the soldier. It is only natural that in a country where heretofore the national defense has been found secure in the hands of willing professionals a statesman's and soldier's plea for general conscription should have met with a cool reception, while the ardent clamors of a university professor without direct connection with the government and the military should have made a more deep and lasting impression.

Last but not least needs be mentioned a fact which should receive the widest possible publication. A. C. Bradley in his foreword to the "ante-war" edition of the lectures<sup>8</sup> tells us: "Mr. Cramb did not write his lectures; speaking without notes, he departed widely from the syllabus he had issued; and no shorthand report of his words exists. What is printed here has been put together from his own partial reconstruction, from scattered indications in his note-books and from full notes of the lectures taken by his hearers. The work, so far as I can judge, has been very faithfully and skilfully done; and, although the result must of necessity be much inferior to the book which he would have produced, it preserves what is most characteristic both in his ideas and in the manner of their expression." Why is it that in E. P. Dutton and Company's more recent edition, with a preface by Joseph H. Choate, dated "8 October, 1914," not a word about these important facts concerning the "history" of this "remarkable" book which is supposed to be Cramb's is given? Why is it? In my experience of more than five years of library work there have passed through my hands many a dozen of lectures issued in book form, and I dare say that in practically every case the author assures us that he considered himself not only justified but compelled to resort to considerable modifications and changes ere he would wish or consent to let his spoken word appear in cold print. Thus it must be admitted as a certainty that if Cramb himself had been permitted to prepare his lectures for publication they would have appeared in a dress considerably less assuming and glaring than that in which they now, without his approval, have gone out into the world.

<sup>8</sup> New York, E. P. Dutton and Company.