

riches of national resources to some bold grabbers, and that those whose duty it would be to protect the people are too much interested in other affairs to come to the rescue.

The law under special consideration is the Shields bill, and its supporters claim that its purpose is to make possible the development of water-power which has been held up for eight years by the absence of proper legislation. Mr. Gifford Pinchot on the other hand believes that this measure would turn over to the power interests in perpetuity (although there is a pretended fifty years limitation) water-power equivalent to twice the mechanical power of every kind now used in the United States, or enough to meet the needs of two hundred million people. Former Secretary James R. Garfield agrees with Mr. Pinchot in regarding the Shields bill as iniquitous. He says:

"These laws turn over to private monopoly public power in perpetuity. The fifty years' limitation as proposed is nothing more than a mere fiction. I realize the need of water-power development. I have no patience with that conservation which ties up our natural resources, but neither have I any patience with that conservation which destroys the public interest."

Strangely enough the Conservation Congress which met in Washington during the first week in May favored the passage of the bill but its opponents claim that the Congress was greatly under the influence of the special power interests. Mr. Pinchot favors the Ferris bill but considers the Myers bill an unsatisfactory substitute.

"J'ACCUSE."

The book "I Accuse! (*J'accuse!*) by a German" was highly recommended to me by several of my anti-German friends. So I bought it and perused it in the hope of learning some new facts about the war and finding some arguments in favor of the Allies' cause which I had not sufficiently appreciated. But I was disappointed. In fact I doubt the statement which the editor of the book, Dr. Anton Suttner, a Swiss lawyer, makes in his preface: "The book *J'accuse*, written by a German patriot, and entrusted to me, is herewith presented to the public. I regard this work as an act which can only confer a blessing on the German people and on humanity, and I accordingly assume responsibility for its publication."

A perusal of the book proves positively that the author is not a German patriot. He is well informed concerning German affairs and accordingly we may assume that he is a German and that the misstatements which he introduces here and there are intentional. The treatment of the material indicates that he is plainly a traitor and has written the book for the sake of misrepresenting the German cause. There are however some strange and ridiculous mistakes in the book, such as would be almost impossible for a German, and which may have been introduced by the translator, Alexander Gray. I will only mention that in a footnote on page 14, Ernst Haeckel is called "the celebrated professor of theology."

Much light is shed on the authorship of the book in a statement which has appeared in a German weekly (*Deutsche Volkszeitung*) published at Amsterdam, Holland, whose editor had information from Switzerland to the effect that the editor of *J'accuse* is, or rather was, a lawyer of Bern who was

disbarred for doubtful practices. In the book the author—a certain Dr. Richard Grelling—is introduced as a patriotic German. He is neither a patriot nor a man of high standing, but a fugitive from Berlin, where he is sought by the courts on account of questionable proceedings in his profession. It is stated that if he had not escaped from Berlin he might now be in the penitentiary.

After his flight he lived for some time in Florence, and then in Paris. Being hostile to the German authorities, he obtained at the beginning of the war official permission to stay in France, and there wrote the book for which he was supplied with useful material by the French government. It is also stated that he was paid for writing the book, and there is no truth whatever in the assumption that he is a German patriot and has written his accusation of Germany from pure motives.

TOLSTOY ON THE FRANCO-RUSSIAN ALLIANCE.

One of our subscribers sends us an old clipping from the *Weserzeitung* of Bremen, which has a special interest in the light of current history. The *Weserzeitung* contains an account of Tolstoy's opinion given at the time of the conclusion of the Franco-Russian alliance. With a sound judgment born of a large outlook upon the world, Tolstoy pronounced the alliance an unmitigated evil in terms which to us to-day seem almost prophetic. The extract from the Bremen newspaper is as follows:

“Count Tolstoy has for some years past been honored in France with real enthusiasm; his spoken and written words almost always make a very deep impression in that country, and carry the weight of law. The *Revue Bleue* has asked the Russian savant and eccentric some questions relative to the Franco-Russian alliance, and he has replied most unequivocally that he condemns it. He says: ‘My answer to the first question, what the Russian people think of the alliance, is as follows: The Russian people, the real people, have not the slightest idea of such an alliance; but even if they knew of it the whole populace would be indifferent about it, in the general feeling that this exclusive alliance with another people can have no other result than the arousing of enmity and the provoking of wars. And for this reason the alliance would be extremely displeasing to the people. To the question, whether the Russian people shares the enthusiasm of the French, I would answer that the Russian people does not share their enthusiasm, if such enthusiasm exists: and that, if it knew all that is being said and done in France in regard to this alliance, it would have a feeling of distrust and antipathy to a people that, suddenly and without apparent reason, is at pains to manifest a spontaneous and extraordinary enthusiasm for an alliance.

“To the third question, as to what result the alliance would have for civilization in general, Tolstoy answered as follows: ‘I am justified in assuming that it can have no other purpose than war or the threat of war against other peoples, and so can only be pernicious in its results. And even for the two peoples that have concluded the alliance it can bring nothing but the greatest disaster in its train, both now and in the future. The French government, the press, and all classes of French society, which have been active in the demand for the alliance, have already made great concessions from their traditions of freedom and humanity, and will make still greater ones. In

appearance, or even in fact, they will have to bring themselves into accord with the reactionary and most despotic and brutal government in Europe; and that will mean a great loss for France. While the alliance has already had a disintegrating influence on Russia, this influence will become even more powerful if the alliance endures. Since the conclusion of this unhappy treaty the Russian government, which formerly entertained a certain fear of European sentiment, and reckoned with it, no longer troubles about it. France claims to be the most civilized of peoples, yet inwardly she is rotten and disintegrated; and friendship with such a people must naturally lead to the Russian government becoming more and more reactionary and despotic. So the only possible result of this strange and unhappy alliance will be an unholy influence on the welfare of the two peoples as well as on civilization in general.⁷

"By a coincidence the famous Italian philosopher of law, Lombroso, has also recently discussed the Franco-Russian alliance with Tolstoy. Professor Lombroso writes as follows in *Das freie Wort* concerning his interview:

"Before taking leave I could not refrain from inquiring what his views were on the Franco-Russian alliance. And the answer he gave me was one of those utterances which seem paradoxical but are nevertheless eminently true: "It was the greatest misfortune that could have befallen the Russian people, for hitherto the government has at times been deterred from overtyrannical conduct, through fear of European public sentiment, whose great center lies in France; while now this fear will no longer exist." And the facts, especially the sad oppression of Finland, bear him out all too well."

MR. MANGASARIAN AGAIN.

Mr. Mangasarian prints an extract from my answer to him where I say that "if God stands for anything he means truth and justice, and the main thing in a war will ever be to have these on one's side." By this I mean that if people sincerely believe in God they will endeavor to purify their souls, and their belief will help them to think right and to do the right thing. As to my own conception of God, I will add that I define God as those factors in the world which constitute the world-order and find their clearest expression in what scientists call natural laws, including those highest laws which result in what has been called the moral world-order. In this sense I say that the laws of nature are the eternal thoughts of God.

In discussing the problem of God I have taken the course of inquiring what God meant to our ancestors in their experience, and in trying to understand their experience I have come to the conclusion that God meant to them truth, right and justice; that they personified their ideals in the belief of a supernatural personality.

Now to my mind the underlying idea of God contains a great truth, but it should be purified of errors and poetical imagery which can easily lead us into superstitions.

If I call God the All-Being I mean to say that he is not a concrete being that is in a definite place, but omnipresent; he is everywhere in the All. He is as omnipresent as is every law of nature which takes effect wherever conditions permit its application.