

A curious proverb is that relating to old Japanese mirrors, which were made of metal, "When the mirror is dim, the soul is unclean."

One of Saigo's didactic observations, "Heaven loves all men alike," recalls the Scriptural passage, "The rain falleth upon the just and unjust."

The moral element in success is recognized in the commonplace, "Money can do much, but virtue more."

Saigo's admirable definition of civilization—"What is civilization but an effectual working of righteousness, and not magnificence of houses, beauty of dresses, and ornamentation of outward appearance?"—suggests Sir William Jones's poem, "What Constitutes a State?"

In the ages gone sententious admonitions shaped the conduct of the farmer-peasant and the commonest fisherman of Dai Nippon. To-day the principles of morality are instilled into the minds of schoolchildren of tender years. Among other things ethics and loyalty to the emperor are taught. The imperial rescript on education, which went into effect in 1890, is a mine of valuable instruction. It is the law and gospel of the inhabitants of the Japanese realm, from the highest to the lowest.

"Give opportunity to genius," is the exhortation of an ancient phrase-maker of the Land of the Chrysanthemum. The love of beauty has been a national characteristic for more than a thousand years. Ever since the eighth century, if not earlier, the people of the Sunrise Kingdom have successfully cultivated the arts and letters. The craftsmen of Old Japan felt a hunger for idealism. This was the secret of the excellence of their workmanship.

OUR PATRIOTISM DOUBTED.

A DISCUSSION WITH THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE.

INTRODUCTORY.

WE have been attacked in the *New York Tribune* for "sedition" and "a German propaganda in disguise," an accusation which is ridiculous, for all that probably was meant seems to be based on the idea that we do not agree with the war policy of the administration. But even if that be true, we are as good Americans as any American citizen, and sedition or a fomentation of sedition has been as far from us as it would be impossible to attempt it. We

here present the case to our readers in expectation that they will form their own opinion.

Here follows the attack, my answer, and a letter from the *New York Tribune* explaining why they refuse me a hearing.

ENEMIES WITHIN.

BY H. ROGER THOMAS.

[An attack on *The Open Court* reprinted from the *New York Tribune*, September 17, 1917.]

To the Editor of the *New York Tribune*.

The other day Albert N. Weber, a loyal editor of a foreign-language newspaper, *The Croatian Flag*, advocated in a letter to the *Chicago Tribune* "an organized campaign of patriotism in our foreign language newspapers." This idea of Mr. Weber's surely can be endorsed by every true patriot.

But in his letter the Serbian editor made even a more trenchant remark. "By the way," he said, "I venture the information that the disloyal German papers are not the only ones to spread sedition in this country, but there are appearing every day a great many publications printed in other languages than German which are working industriously for the Kaiser." He was quite right as to this.

My purpose in writing this letter is to call the attention of your readers to another such as these. This, like the most harmful of German propaganda, lurks under misleading disguise. It is cleverly designed to influence favorably the opinions of the readers to the German *Aufschaung*.

The periodical I refer to is *The Open Court* magazine, whose cover-page assures the subscriber that it is a monthly devoted to "science of religion, the religion of science and the extension of the religious parliament idea." I am one of its untiring readers, and I can truthfully state that when it exercises the true function as a journal of comparative religion it becomes indispensable to the student of ancient and modern cults and faiths. Functioning in this way, I believe it fulfils the motive in the mind of the founder, Edward C. Hegeler; but under Paul Carus, whose erudite works on various phases of ancient art and modern philosophy denote a German-trained mind, the magazine has undergone such a change of policy that it is obviously, even to the casual reader, a poor camouflage, behind which pro-Germanism (in its best intellectual light, naturally) is rampant.

At the very beginning of the war the editor welcomed contributions to the pages of *Open Court* which were unmistakably

pro-Central Powers. No issue of the magazine appeared without having somewhere among its pages a few words of excuse for German policy and condemnation for England and Russia. Knowing this, I looked with interest at the numbers published since our proclamation of April 6, but Paul Carus did not waver in his firm loyalty to Wilhelm. He deserves the sort of praise that a German professor pays in a recent issue of the *Atlantic Monthly*. "From my own point of view, the German-American press should be criticised for lack of courage, which is easy enough to understand, but nevertheless is not commendable."

Herman Hagedorn, writing of the menace of the German-language press, spoke not long ago of "the subtler and therefore more insidious propaganda contained in the literary sections of these papers." It is in the book reviews of *Open Court* that I find the strongest support given to enemy doctrines; even the choice of books is significant. Nowhere else in America have I seen a review of a German book published in the empire on "England as Sea Robbers."

In the subjoined passage, extracted from a review of *Cosmos's* "Basis of Durable Peace" (which "Kappa," who thus signs his review, calls a ridiculously impossible solution of the problems of the war), is the boldest apologia for certain German offenses that I have ever seen in English or German:

"If *Cosmos* had been fair, he would have shown that the present submarine campaign is provoked by Great Britain, and Great Britain is alone to blame for it. . . . The condemnation of the Germans for the destruction of the *Lusitania* reminds me of the condemnation of a Russian Jew, who was accused of having caused the breaking of a great show window and was condemned to pay for the window and the costs of the court. The fact was that some person had thrown a stone at the Jew, but the Jew evaded the stone and the stone crashed into the window. When the offender was taken to court by the owner of the store he claimed absolute innocence of having smashed the window, because he had intended to hit the Jew and not the window; so the Jew was considered guilty because he had dodged the stone and caused the smashing of the expensive pane, and the court, in the truly Russian spirit, which condemns the Jew under all circumstances, made the poor Jew pay. The explosives were not intended for the passengers on the boat, but for the German soldiers in the trenches, so our manufacturers are innocent of the catastrophe—but the Germans are the guilty ones that should be blamed and hated as Huns the world over."

The advertisements are not such as are usually seen in loyal

papers, either. "Ayesha" and "Odyssey of the Emden," for example; but almost any one would say that as these are cracking good adventure stories, no harm is done in advertising them. But what do you say to "Carlyle and the War," in which it is conclusively proved that the immortal Thomas would have put out a manifesto condemning England's actions in the great war; of Roland Hugins's "Germany Misjudged"; or Eduard Meyer's "England: Its Political Organization and Development and the War Against Germany" (note the innuendo in the title)? The motto seems to be "anything to knock England." If not her commercial supremacy, as in Alfred Granger's "England's World Empire," wherein a well-known Chicago architect, to quote the booksellers' eulogy, strips bare the infamous project of Great Britain, then her intellectual products, as in W. H. Wright's "Misinforming a Nation," which pans the *Encyclopædia Britannica* for not being an *Encyclopædia Americana*, Gallia, Germania, Slavia, Italica, written by jig-time journalists and German savants with an up-to-date Freudian outlook.

If the scholar of religions expects that he will find more material proper to his interests in the August number after the wildest of the German journalists of this country have toned down, he'll be disappointed after looking at pages 458-464. I think the *Tribune* should cull a few posies for its German-American bouquet from the editor's article on "English Diplomacy," in which he would show that the sole aim of Lloyd George and the Cabinet is to make "rapprochement between these two countries [America and Germany] impossible." England, claims Herr Carus, wants no commercial rivals, so she would be glad of a chance to embroil her nearest possible competitors.

If your pro-German readers are dissatisfied with the half-hearted treason of the various *Zeitungs* and *Herolds* let them drop a line to 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, of course, and get a monthly that will be *fest und treu für Deutschland*.

Sincerely yours,

ANN ARBOR, MICH.

H. ROGER THOMAS.

NOT SEDITION BUT TRUE AMERICANISM.

(In Answer to the Attack on *The Open Court*.)

BY THE EDITOR.

To the Editor of the *New York Tribune*:

The *New York Tribune* of September 17 contained an article on *The Open Court* which is not so much a criticism as a mis-

representation, nor can it be called unfair so much as ill judged. When I read the article I could not help smiling, for there I was accused of sedition and of making a propaganda for Germany. And why? Because in the August number of *The Open Court* I set forth the character and superior qualities of English diplomacy and published the review of a German book on "England as a pirate state."

The article in the *Tribune* is signed by a certain Mr. H. Roger Thomas, of Ann Arbor, Michigan; and having read his accusations I really feel that no answer is needed, for the August number of *The Open Court* is obtainable, and readers of Mr. Thomas's article can convince themselves whether I attempt to make a German propaganda or to spread sedition. The worst I can say about myself is that I do not sympathize with our policy in entering into this war, and if that is a crime make the worst of it. I am willing to stand up for my conviction. If according to the present administration I am not entitled to have a conviction, I shall gladly bear the consequences whatever they may be.

There is at present a tendency to denounce every American as a traitor who does not bow to the Union Jack and to regard any reference to the facts of our Revolution as seditious; for Great Britain is now our ally, and we must twist our judgment of her institutions so that we regard them as a democracy in spite of the declarations of English officers when in a former war they had taken possession of Washington.

If I say anything about England, do I pay homage to the Kaiser? Or if I publish a review of a German book on England and her usurpation of the seas, does that stamp me as an unfaithful citizen of the United States? Assuredly not. I would sow sedition only if I delivered over the interests of my country to a foreign power, be it Germany or England.

I am an American, not in the sense that I was born in this country, but for a better reason than that of the accident of birth—because America is the land of my choice. I believed in Americanism before I set foot on American soil. I expressed my views on the subject publicly and I need not repeat what American patriotism is to me.

Patriotism, however, has come to mean something else in these days. It means to-day a faithful allegiance not to America alone but also to Great Britain, and we are guided by English advice, and England's slogan has been adopted, *Germania est delenda*.

Here is the point where I cannot follow. My logic gives out.

From the principles of my Americanism we ought to have remained strictly and honestly neutral in this war. So far as I can see, that policy would have been not only the most righteous way but also the best and wisest—yea from the standpoint of worldly cunning, the most correct and the cleverest. It would have set the United States at the head of civilized mankind.

I wish to say that neither *The Open Court* nor I myself as its editor, have ever been an enemy of the United States; nor have I ever favored sedition or made any German propaganda. I have always been a faithful and true citizen of the United States.

The United States, the country which is my ideal, and to which I owe allegiance, is the great republic of the Western hemisphere as it existed of old since the days of George Washington, and as it took its attitude toward the whole world under its founders as well as the several presidents of our historic past. I believe that this country should be an independent country, not directed or influenced or guided by any foreign power. Therefore I approve of George Washington's principle that we should beware of entangling alliances.

It is true we stand up for liberty and have been fighting for our own liberty. We like to see liberty spread all over the world, but it would be wrong to fight for the liberty of foreign nations. We would like to see liberty established in Ireland, in India, in South Africa, and we hope that the British empire will gradually grant liberty all round but we are not called upon to fight for them. The time must come when Ireland will be free, and we hope that the less we interfere the more peaceful will be the advance of her liberty. Our own liberty does not seem to be in any way endangered. The story that the Kaiser had ever seriously thought of conquering the United States is to me ridiculous; the scheme is too impossible—ridiculously impossible.

Are we fighting for the liberty of England? I do not know. Possibly the war will bring it about in one way or another; in a similar way as it did in Russia. Possibly yes, but it is not probable, not as yet, and it is certainly as little our intention to liberate England as it was to bring about the Russian revolution.

Perhaps we are fighting for the liberation of Germany? It almost seems so! Indeed we fight the Kaiser, not the German people, and have extended our hand of good fellowship to the people if they but abandon the Kaiser. Strange to say, the German people do not understand our good intentions; on the contrary even the Social Democrats have become faithful adherents of their

imperial tyrant. So we have no alternative but to fight and force their liberty upon the Germans.

The Germans do not understand us; they do not see that we come as liberators and wish to change their constitution into a democracy. But possibly we do not understand the Germans either. They have an hereditary constitutional monarchy in which the emperor is the head, but not the ruler in an unpleasant connotation. He is the head of the government, just as the father of adult sons is the head of his family. His sons are not his slaves but independent persons who however look up to their father with reverence and are willing to be guided by him—except when conflicts arise, and for such cases definite rules have been established. Probably it would have been wiser if before deposing the Kaiser from his office and denouncing him to his people, we had tried to understand the German mind and appreciate the meaning of the German constitution, even in details so similar to ours.

It is a pity that the Kaiser, and with him the cause of Germany, has been grossly misrepresented, and it would not be wrong of me, if I felt obliged to stand up, not for Germany, but for the truth. If an error becomes known to be an error, it becomes a lie and we should not uphold a lie even for a good purpose and with noble intentions inspired by patriotic motives. I have not done it, and do not mean to. I will stand up for the truth. History may misrepresent facts in single cases for some time, but not forever. History may officially falsify, but not forever. It will be possible to misinform our nation for quite a while, but in the long run the truth will come out and it would pain me to see the country of my choice taking a wrong position and making a stand that will not be to our credit. I know very well that under present conditions the English cause is advocated by us, and our department of Justice protects English conceptions.

The English view has become the standard of judgment, but it seems to me impossible that we can suppress forever the American view and make a foreign cause superior to our own. I cannot yet believe it and am ready to have the query proposed whether those who hanged Nathan Hale many years ago on this very day, the 22d day of September, in a New England orchard, those who sacked and burned the city of Washington and insulted the Constitution of the United States in the very assembly-room of Congress, are to be the dominant rulers in this country, or whether there is still something left of the spirit of George Washington to protect American interests and uphold American ideals.

A few years more than a century ago such views as held to-day by our most enthusiastic patriots were characteristic of a certain class of people who under the name of Tories were persecuted and suffered the martyrdom of expulsion. How times change! Who would have thought that to-day the situation would be reversed. The Tories claim to be patriots, and where they meet a man of George Washington's spirit they call him traitor and threaten to have him interned. To-day voices are heard who regret certain facts of history—the history of our revolution, and actually propose to re-write our schoolbooks so as to pass over in silence the execution of Nathan Hale and kindred events; indeed a little drama on the Spirit of '76 has been barred from the stage because it was deemed to offend, or would not be creditable to our noble allies, the English.

My critic says that *The Open Court* was founded by Edward C. Hegeler in the interest of "the science of religion, the religion of science and the extension of the religious parliament idea," and implies that I have been faithless to the founder's intentions. If there is one point of which I am sure, it is that I am in full agreement with the late Mr. Hegeler in my political convictions. He was a good American exactly in the sense that I am—a good American in the spirit of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. I have always borne in mind the purpose of Mr. Hegeler's ideals and I know that part of his religious aspirations was their application to political and practical life—above all the recognition of truth; and it is the truth which I have always served and will serve in the future.

In the question of war, the politics of our administration is not superior to truth, and if there is a conflict between the two I shall cling to the truth and not be dominated by our Secret Service police. I am an American. I have sworn allegiance to the Constitution and I will remain faithful to my oath.

At present there is a tendency to condemn every one who differs from the policy of the moment as a traitor, and even true Americanism is branded as disloyal. If George Washington himself came back, he would be persecuted for having uttered opinions which have now gone out of fashion.

Is it true that freedom of speech has been abolished? No! I do not believe it. Not yet. I hope that our country is not run down to such an extent as to suppress truth, and I will say that this is part of the principle with which the late founder of *The Open Court* was permeated when he founded it. In this special case I know exactly that I am one with him, and my attitude in these political questions has been fortified by the thought of his

ideals, especially by his hope that this country should not be a catspaw of England, but a truly free and independent country, and its power should be utilized not for the benefit of Great Britain, but for good the world over.

The United States will not suppress free discussion in order to enable our administration to neglect the constitution of this country and be at the service of an alien nation which was its master once, then tried to split the country into two rival confederacies, and has always been a sinister factor in our national history.

It would indeed be wrong to disavow the deeds of our ancestors and to forget that our liberty has been bought by a bitter struggle. We have grown large within a century, but with our outer expansion and increase of power we should not dwindle in courage or be reduced to pusillanimity. We ought not merely become large and larger but also great and greater, and we should not yearn after the fleshpots of Egypt or long again for subjection under British dominion, to become as of old the servants of Pharaoh, our former master, but should preserve our freedom for ourselves as well as for the benefit of the whole world.

May God protect America! May he sustain the ideal spirit of our ancestors, of the fathers of our country. May he strengthen the spirit of our pride of independence, of our noble aspirations to be free and brave and just. Otherwise we will be small in spite of the large dimensions of our growth.

This is the common wish of all Americans, and we all hope that in the future development of mankind America will be and forever remain a factor for good, and that for a worthy accomplishment of America's great task she will maintain her independence from generation to generation in the traditional spirit of the father of this country, George Washington.

PAUL CARUS.

LA SALLE, ILL., September 22, 1917.

LETTER FROM THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE IN EXPLANATION
WHY AN ANSWER WAS RULED OUT.

NEW YORK, October 8, 1917.

Dr. Paul Carus,

122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR:

I am returning herewith, not very regretfully, the tract you have sent us as a communication to the editor on the subject of *The*

Open Court's relation to the war. We do not feel obliged to print it. Before we printed Mr. Thomas's communication we verified his quotations, and read, besides, more of *The Open Court* than we had ever read before and more, perhaps, than we shall ever again have the leisure to enjoy.

We were persuaded that Mr. Thomas's article was quite justified and we printed it, and we do not feel called upon to unprint it. So much for that. I say it purely from the publisher's point of view.

Now if you wish to carry the matter into another region, I may say to you, personally, that I disagree mainly as to the emotional propriety of treating the war at all on an intellectual plane. The war is the herd's business, we are in it, and before anything else we must win it, and that is not a matter to be reasoned about.

Yours very truly,

GARET GARRETT.

CONCLUSION.

Here we rest our case. We might prove our good Americanism by quotations, for we have often given expression to our views in editorial articles and also in verses, but we do not wish to play to the galleries or to burn off the fireworks of a fourth of July celebration. We only appeal to the feeling of justice in our readers and to their sense of logic whether Americanism, if it is true Americanism and not exactly either anti-German or pro-British must mean anti-Americanism. With the permission of *The Tribune*, we shall continue to consider ourselves good and faithful Americans.

FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE VATICAN.¹

BY OTTO ROESE.

[Mr. Otto Röse, a German literary man who happened to be in Rome during the time just preceding Italy's declaration of war against her former ally Austria-Hungary, had an excellent opportunity to watch the development of the political situation in the Quirinal and has published his observations in the chronological form of a diary under the title *Im römischen Hexenkessel 1915*. We take pleasure in presenting here an English translation of a portion of his book referring mainly to the attitude of the Vatican during this critical

¹ Translated from Röse, *Im römischen Hexenkessel*, 1915, pp. 99-114, by Lydia G. Robinson.