

yet must thou try to keep everything from going to ruin, leaving nothing but widows and orphans.

And in this subjects are bound to follow and risk life and property. For in such a case one must risk his goods and himself for the sake of the other. And in such a war it is Christian and a work of love to slay the enemy with good heart, rob, burn, and do every sort of damage, until he is overcome after the fashion of war; excepting that one must keep from sin, not violate women and girls, and when the enemy is beaten give mercy and peace to those that surrender and humble themselves, so that, in this case, all in all, one may apply the saying: God helps the strongest.

And what if a prince is in the wrong? Are his people bound to follow him? I answer, No, for it is not proper for any one to act contrary to the right; rather one must obey God, who wishes the right more than men. And what if the subjects do not know whether the prince is right or not? I answer, Since they do not know and cannot find out by any possible diligence, they may obey without peril to their souls. For in such a case we must apply the law of Moses, Exodus xxi, where he directs that one who has slain a man in ignorance and unintentionally shall be acquitted by the court by flight to a place of refuge.

Fourthly, which should have been Firstly, for what has been said above, a prince should act toward his God as a Christian, that is, subject himself to him with his whole trust, praying for wisdom to rule well as did Solomon.

So we will leave the subject here with this summary, that a prince should divide himself in four quarters: the first to God with hearty trust and earnest prayer; the second to his subjects with love and Christian service; the third to his counselors and mighty men with shrewd reason and frank common sense; the fourth to the evil-doers with discreet earnestness and severity. Thus his office will be right outwardly and inwardly and will please God and men. But he must weigh the grief and the envy that go with it; such a program will soon be burdened with its cross.

THE PROFESSORS' WAR.

BY ONE OF THEM.

THIS is no time, as a number of patriots have observed, for arguments. I shall not argue; I shall not even tell any one. I shall, however, put my cards on the table, though they be but four in number. I start from four assumptions:

First, that this war without hate was not willed or wanted by the majority, the masses, of America, who would have preferred to stay out of the European conflict; and that it was willed and wanted by a minority, probably not larger than a million or two, made up of financiers, gentlemen of leisure, lawyers, journalists, college professors, publicists—in short, of the more prosperous and more schooled.

Second, that Germany's submarine campaign was the occasion rather than the cause, and never would have put us into war had not the sentiment of articulate America been vehemently pro-Ally; and that, indeed, on the issue of the submarines alone, the Germans have as good a case against us as we against them, since the American government actively discriminated against the Central Powers, condoning the illegal and indefensible "blockade" to starve them, while insisting on the privilege of shipping unlimited munitions and supplies and food to their enemies.

Third, that there is much that is clean and fine and generous in the motives that prompted the minority in America to insist on war, and not a great deal that is sinister and sordid, and that this minority holds a sincere conviction that the defeat of Germany is necessary for the best interests of civilization, peace and democracy.

Fourth, that nevertheless the interpretation this educated and well-to-do minority has put on the European struggle is naive and sentimental, resting chiefly on the belief that Germans and their rulers are radically different, wickeder and more dangerous than the rest of the white race, a notion sufficiently childish, and also resting on the equally childish notion that if the Germans are humbled and crippled, a lasting world peace, guaranteed by a league of honor, can be forthwith established.

II.

The reader should not take these assumptions too seriously. I do not, myself. I am perfectly well aware that they are only my opinions, and that I may easily be mistaken. I will go so far as to say my views may possibly be foolish. This gives me, I think, an advantage over the intellectuals who have been paging war these two years. For example Messrs. Putnam, Roosevelt, Eliot, Ladd, Thayer, Beck—gentlemen of that stamp cannot conceive, even theoretically, that their views may be foolish. That could be urged as a good reason, in itself, for questioning their good sense.

It is my misfortune to spend most of my time among the edu-

cated classes. A long association with college professors and authors has given me a very high respect for the opinions of store clerks, farm hands, bootblacks, teamsters, bricklayers and boilermakers. Persons of the latter sort have humility and a desire to find the truth. Consequently they sometimes find it.

The educated man and woman, on the other hand, are seldom humble intellectually. They strive to vindicate their opinions. They have the power of rationalizing and elaborating a prejudice. And they often end by sinking their prejudices too deep for reconsideration. No one, obviously, can know a great deal about more than one or two specialized subjects, and furthermore no one in the world has won the right to be dogmatic about human institutions and human nature. And right there the intellectuals are most dogmatic.

Again and again I have seen learned men whose competence in one field or another commands my respect sophisticate themselves into ignoring the most elementary facts about the world war. I have heard them urge us to go to the rescue of the Anglo-Allies against out-numbered and hard-pressed foes, on the ground that the German "hordes" were likely to inundate the earth. I have heard them argue that the British Empire, after all, is nothing but a coalition of self-governing daughter states, disregarding the five million square miles governed directly and exclusively from London. I have heard them condone the whole war with a phrase, and speak of America's entry into this titanic butchery as though it were a light expedition.

Common folk, apparently, hold life's values in truer perspective than cultured people. They do not make blinders of their opinions. When they think of war they think of the thing itself; of the trenches, and of death on the wire. Laboring people are always, partially at least, pacifists. They see that some things are worth fighting for; but that these things do not include colonies, trade, national egotism, the virile virtues, big talk, and inherited hates. They see that no dispute in the world is worth the lives of seven million men, the toll of the war to the present.

Many persons think they know what is wrong with the world, among the number, Gilbert Chesterton. I suspect that the real root of many of our troubles is the monumental lack of levity on this planet. The world is morbidly serious. As soon as men anywhere come into positions of power they grow very solemn. They stand about in uniforms or frock coats, chests slightly expanded, and receive visitors with great dignity. Politicians are sometimes hu-

man, statesmen almost never. Their pleasure consists in having their own way.

All over the world it is the peasants who wear gay costumes and dance in the market places and walk along the streets holding hands. They want a good time and they have earned it with their sweat. But certain solemn asses at the top will never let them alone. Periodically men in power march millions away to slay one another, for issues they themselves cannot clearly define. And if the millions are not made to die young, they are made good. In America our legislators are mainly engaged in squeezing the joy out of life. It would be a glorious experiment if sometime, somewhere, leaders and rulers would arise who would say to the people: "Go ahead, and within the limits of liberty, enjoy yourselves. We shall not interfere." It has still to be tried.

III.

President Wilson, it is to be feared, looks on the world, and on himself, very solemnly. He is unquestionably a man of great ability and high ideals. But recently he appears in danger of losing his sense of humor and his tolerance. He has once or twice professed himself "astonished" that any one should disagree with him. He would undoubtedly consider that a person who differed with him over an important national policy must be unpatriotic and un-American—at least that, and possibly malignant and stupid in the bargain. He has forgotten, for the moment, that there is one right the American people cannot delegate, the right to do their own thinking.

Mr. Wilson has been indulging in some professor-talk. For instance, he said:

"We have no quarrel with the German people. We have no feeling toward them but one of sympathy and friendship."

This must sound odd to the German people, whom we are going to kill and maim, despite all lines we draw between them and their rulers. But who cares what these deluded Germans think? We know.

Speaking of the draft, Mr. Wilson remarked:

"It is in no sense a conscription of the unwilling; it is rather a selection from a nation which has volunteered in mass."

That must sound rather odd to any one who stops to reflect that neither the war itself nor conscription was submitted to a referendum of the people, and that furthermore the conscription

bill, as passed, does not exempt conscientious objectors, other than Quakers, and a handful more.

President Wilson has never been quite frank with us about his reasons for wanting war with the Central Powers. The real reason seems to me to have been this: that he found his policy of peace incompatible with his policy of acquiescence in British overlordship of the seas. When the two came, inevitably, into conflict, he had to make his choice. During the days that followed the German resumption of submarine warfare, Mr. Wilson patently suffered from a "balked disposition." His method of escape was to ask war in the ultimate interests of peace. Yet even in his mind there must linger a doubt that the entrance of another neutral into the European conflict will surely secure the boon that all mankind desires. An avowed object is not an accomplished object.

A number of people are inclined to be bitter toward Mr. Wilson, alleging that he secured his reelection on the boast, self-urged, that he had kept us out of war. I think they do the President an injustice. He did not intrigue for war. He did not lead the war sentiment in America. He merely, at the end, concurred in the opinion and took up the cries of his class. The war mania had to fight its way into the White House.

To find the war sentiment in full bloom we must look to other and more bellicose men than President Wilson. Just at present he is doing creditably as a maker of slogans. He tells us we must pour out all our blood and all our treasure if need be, until our end is achieved. What end? There can be no mistake about that: until the world is made safe for democracy: that is, (it should be added) for our kind of democracy, not the Russian kind.

Joseph Choate, at the age of eighty-five, spoke at the luncheon in New York, May 10, given in honor of the French Commissioners. It was his last effort. Three days later he succumbed. About to die, he salutes us:

"Why am I so glad we entered this war? Why, we were spoiling for the lack of a fight; we were absolutely rotting with riches, steeped to the lips in luxury, abandoned to sports, without one thought of the terrible struggles that were being endured by the British, the French and all the other Allies, in fighting our battle. That is what we have been doing for this last two years, and I for one thank God that we are ready to join them, and the sooner we get our men over to stand by their side the better."

"Rotting with riches." Is not that putting it a bit strong, considering that the food budget of the average American family has

increased 74 % in the last two years, that there is right now intense suffering among the poor, and that there were food riots on the East Side of New York last winter? Possibly Mr. Choate was not in a position to see these matters clearly. And what curious twist is it in human nature that makes old men counsel war? In all countries they do it. It must be akin to the deep callousness that tempts men of power, in any form of government, to vent their ill-temper in other men's blood, enforce their wills through other men's agonies.

But let us be fair to Mr. Choate. He spoke for a caste, and for the caste he spoke honestly. On the well-to-do the enthusiasm of war often acts like a tonic. L. T. Hobhouse wrote, in 1904, "In days of prosperity Jeshurun waxes fat, the war passions are readily excited, the appeal to justice or humanity is heard with impatience and stifled by counter appeals to the civilizing mission of a great nation."

That observation sounds shrewd to-day. The book from which it comes is *Democracy and Reaction*; and although the book was published ten years before the Armageddon began, I respectfully submit that a reading of it would enlighten some of the Americans who are so cock-sure they know what this war is about.

IV.

It is hard to explain the collapse of the American mind before the challenge of the world tragedy. Yet the fact is clear. Our intellectuals have reverted to the simplest possible psychological explanation; the whole hellish thing is due to Prussian ambition, Prussian militarism. They have followed the lead of our Colonials, a mental Foreign Legion self-recruited in our midst. They have paid more attention to the conduct of the war than its deeper causes, and they have been gulled by atrocity tales like any old quidnunc. They have put their energy into elaborating a moral indictment of Germany, an easy enough task, but fruitless for wisdom. However pretentious their premises, they have ended with the same conclusions as the man in Oxford Road. And all this, as I say, is hard to explain.

If our intellectuals were ignorant of the economic and historical background of the war, if they did not see that it had been preceded by a long series of cruel and thievish aggressions in the Balkans, in Persia, in Turkey, in Morocco, in the Congo, all over Africa, aggressions participated in by all Europe, but leaving the powers of Europe at swords' points, if they did not know that this

war was the logical outcome of that reaction—the crest of which had been passed before 1914—against the humanitarian ideas of the mid-nineteenth century, a reaction that brutalized the thought of Europe, if they did not understand that Germany, being more philosophical, wove for *Realpolitik* an evil doctrine of state irresponsibility, whereas England, France and Russia, being better politicians, put *Realpolitik* into successful practice, if they did not know that for several decades there has been no European policy, no civilized policy, toward the smaller nations and the weaker races, but only a collective scramble to assert national dominion and material force—if they were oblivious to all this, at least they might have realized that the issues were somewhat too complex to be judged off-hand, and they could have listened to hear if the voice of truth was anywhere raised. They did not need to follow the snap judgment of a provincial press. A sound interpretation of the war was furnished them ready-made by European intellectuals. The truth has been told by such men, to mention a few, as Lowes Dickinson, Georg Brandes, E. D. Morel, Bertrand Russell, Francis Delaisi, H. N. Brailsford, Francis Neilson. These writers have pointed out that the guilt of this war is too heavily interlaced with the whole European system of imperialistic plunder to allow any but a casuistic division of responsibility, and that no nation has the right to indict another nation when by its own greed, duplicity and blood-lust it has helped sting that other nation into fury. But our American thinkers turned their backs. They were too busy and too happy among their prejudices.

How far astray their catch-phrases, militarism, autocracy, Prussianism, have led American leaders of opinion is shown by the confusion into which the Russian Revolution has thrown them. The program, "no annexations and no indemnities" evidently pushes democracy and idealism too far. From the doctrinaire point of view, of course, the new Russia is a better ally in a war for democracy than the old oppressive Russia of the autocracy, but a new Russia liberal enough to insist on a peace without victory collides alarmingly with the will to conquer.

The only road along which a better European order can be reached is a revision of the temper and purposes of the major European powers. Russia has made the revision. She has purged herself by the drastic physic of revolution. For the moment she is a democracy, and a real democracy; in her the masses really rule. She may outgrow this. Give her time, say ten or twenty years, and she may become a republic like England and France. photo-

cratically controlled. But for the moment she speaks with the voice of common humanity.

And Russia has announced that she does not propose to be hoodwinked. She understands that the dethroned autocracy talked the same phrases that are talked now by the Western Powers. She does not forget that these Western Powers gave that autocracy enormous loans. She does not propose to repudiate her national honor, but she declares, quite unequivocally, that she is done with cant. In May, the newspaper organ of the workmen's and soldiers' delegates, after quoting two English newspapers to the effect that the declaration of the Provisional Government and the pronouncements of the revolutionary leaders show that the Russian peace formula coincides with the Anglo-French war aims, said:

"You are deceiving yourselves, gentlemen, or rather, you are vainly striving to delude your fellow countrymen concerning the real policy of the Russian revolution. The revolution will not sacrifice a single soldier to help you repair the 'historical injustices' committed against you. What about the historic injustices committed by yourselves, and your violent oppression of Ireland, India, Egypt and the innumerable peoples inhabiting all the continents of the world? If you are so anxious for justice that you are prepared in its name to send millions of people to the grave, then, gentlemen, begin with yourselves."—*New York Tribune*, May 30, 1917.

Here speaks a new and harsh diplomacy. I do not profess to know if it expresses the policy Russia will pursue. But certainly it promises more for the ultimate peace of the world than the expressions of implacable hatreds we are hearing from other belligerent camps.

VI.

I wish, in conclusion, to offer a little advice. I would not give advice to the officials in Washington, because they would consider it an impertinence; and they have intimated that they do not care to receive advice, even on the question of the terms of peace. I wish rather to advise those persons, few or many, to whom this war has brought mental distress and resentment.

A large number of dissatisfied persons are not expressing themselves openly these days, but in the utterances of those who do speak out, I detect a note of bitterness, of intolerance, of anger, that reminds one of our advanced jingoes. Undoubtedly the shrillness of these protests is due in part to their authors' feeling of

impotence, and to their conviction that, had the issue of war been submitted to popular decision, we should still be at peace. There they have a genuine grievance. It is extraordinarily difficult, in America, to secure an authoritative expression of the popular will on any question. The decision to resort to war and the decision to resort to conscription, for examples, are not reached through a referendum to the people. Congress does not have the power, in a crisis, to force a general election, as does the Parliament of Great Britain. A presidential election in America presents a jumble of issues, political, economic, and personal. Almost never, in this republic, do the people have the opportunity to debate and decide a definite issue. One of the reforms that will come up for consideration after the war is some change in our democratic machinery that will ensure that the major policies of our democracy are wanted by a majority, at least, of our citizens.

The present war was declared, however, in entire accord with our present constitutional methods. It is the present policy of America, and it imposes on all of us the duty of backing up that policy. So long as that policy is in force it commands our loyalty. I know that such language rasps the nerves of those who are weary of patriotic cant. But I submit that in the present situation the spiritual unity of America is at stake, too precious a thing to be lightly shattered. The men who have willed this war are, speaking generally, high-minded and sincere, holding the same ideals and principles that we all hold. The differences of opinion that the war has disclosed are probably irreconcilable, for they are after all differences of opinion, not of purpose. Many Americans abhor this war, holding it futile to accomplish the ends for which it is ostensibly fought. But the critics of present American policy should at least be as generous as are some Germans. Leopold von Wiese recently said in Berlin: "We Germans should realize that Americans often really believe in what they proclaim in high-sounding language. . . . It is a mistake to disbelieve the honesty of intention of the majority of cultured Yankees to bring about a world peace. They mean what they say, however small their competence may be."

There are persons in the opposition who evidently are persuaded of their infallibility, in quite the same degree as the war party. But from such intolerance, wherever manifested, the world will never arrive at sanity. With America fighting for a program of international idealism, I do not see how any American can refrain from helping in the prosecution of that fight, in any way that he conscientiously can. I put in the weasel-word "conscientiously,"

because I approved of the provision in the conscription law that exempted from the business of actual killing, members of certain religious sects, and I should have liked the law better had it exempted all conscientious objectors. Our leaders are right, it seems to me, when they urge the obligation to push the war with full vigor, that America and her purposes may be saved from defeat. That obligation does not nullify the right of any citizen to insist that the high objects with which we entered the war shall not be perverted or lost from sight.

The second consideration I would urge upon the disaffected element in America is this: that in this country the popular always in the end prevails. If the war drags out for two years more, no power in America can prevent the war from being the dominant issue in the next Congressional elections. In what form the issue will be presented no one can predict, for the face of world politics may be greatly altered by then. But the war and its aims will be voted on, just as our Civil War was voted on. That the war party is not unaware that it must vindicate itself before the people is indicated by the nervousness displayed over the utterances of pacifists, and the hysterical efforts of some newspapers to attribute all criticism of the war to pro-German sources.

If a political struggle is inevitable, it ought, obviously, to be conducted with as little rancor as possible. American tradition calls for open discussion and quiet acceptance of results. Any lingering indifference to the war will disappear—when the casualty lists begin to come in. Before two years have gone by the struggle may have been won by arms, or it may have been won by statesmanship, through a negotiated peace. But whatever happens the American will to peace and the American will to justice will persist, and it will choose courageously the best means to encompass its ends.

THE NEW SOUL OF INDIA.

BY BASANTA KOOMAR ROY.

AMERICA, through a chain of causes, has come to know of the present-day unrest in India only in connection with the bomb and the Bengalee Babu, the conspiracy cases at home and abroad, and the execution of young Indian patriots for the crime of patriotism. And it is not out of season for the Americans to know something of the underlying forces that are remaking that ancient land.