

OUR WAR WITH GERMANY

V

(July 18—August 18.)

Active preparation for war, and active talk of peace—chiefly instigated by Germany or German sympathizers—were the dominant features of the fifth month of American participation in the "War of 1917." The preparatory feature included the formal drawing of the numbers of the nine million and more young men throughout the country registered under the selective draft law. This drawing officially determined the order in which those registered would be called for service. In accordance with the lists resulting from this drawing, the exemption boards in the various districts all over the country have been calling men for examination and for presentation of their claims for exemption from service. The work has progressed steadily and without very much friction or opposition—not more than might have been expected from American lack of national discipline and from the American habit of loose-mouthed disregard for law. In a few places, notably in the West and South, opposition to the draft took the form of violence and rioting, resulting in shooting and murder in Oklahoma—a fact most sharply impressed upon Senator Gore, of that State, in the Senate, where he has set an unpleasant mark upon himself by opposition to Administration war measures. But on the whole the selection of the new National Army under the draft procedure has progressed very well, and the closing of the fifth month finds something more than one-third of the men for the first 500,000 contingent selected, and regulations issued under Presidential authority for their concentration in training camps beginning early in September.

The formal drawing took place in a committee room in the Senate Office Building at Washington on July 20. Mr. Baker, Secretary of War, drew the first number, 258, and thereafter the drawing proceeded rapidly until at 2:18 the next morning the last number—3217—was drawn, and the order of calling the registered men in each of the 4557 districts of the country was fixed.

By the end of July the examination boards were ready for their work, the preliminaries had been completed, and the formal selection of men for service commenced. In different districts there were many claims for exemption, the ground most frequently urged being that the man was married and that his labor was needed to support his wife. That was the basis of the claim for exemption of Kingdon Gould, grandson of Jay Gould, who had been married but a short time when he was drafted. Mr. Gould, however, permitted his claim to lapse by not filing supporting affidavits within the required period. Charges of fraud in granting exemption were made in some cases, and one New York City exemption board was dismissed. Two of the members of this board pleaded guilty

and were sentenced to prison. In general, exemptions were cut down. The New York City board of appeals, headed by former Justice Charles E. Hughes, granted only one appeal out of the first twenty-three heard. It was announced from Washington that the rush of men of serviceable age to be married as a possible means of obtaining exemption would not serve the purpose, for such marriages would not be recognized as sufficient ground for exemption.

While the selection of the first contingent of the new National Army was thus proceeding, the formal calling of the National Guard kept pace with it. Under the President's orders the first part of the Guard was called into the Federal service on July 15, and the remainder on July 25. This step was followed on August 5 by the formal drafting of the Guard into the national service, a procedure made necessary by the constitutional limitations on the employment of the "Militia" outside the national boundaries.

Despite the singular infelicity of governmental treatment of the National Guard during the last year, many of the regiments had been recruited up to the full war strength on the basis of the new organization when they were called up. It was the announced intention of the Government to send the Guard to training camps in the South, and the men had been led to expect that they would be in their camps soon after being drafted into the Federal service. But various obstacles interposed. Camps were not ready, and equipment was not available in sufficient quantities. Several of the States had prepared camps which would serve for their men, but the Government has chosen not to make use of them. The result is that at this writing most of the Guard is waiting in its home States for orders to move to training camps. One division has been selected for early service abroad, composed of units from different States.

Contrary to the expectation of the Guard, and to assurance from Washington, the official designation of State units has been changed and they will serve in the National Army under national designation. The promise that the Guardsmen should serve in their own organizations has not been regarded, and men have been transferred arbitrarily from one regiment to another, although a strong recruiting argument has been that by enlisting in the Guard, men could choose their units of service and be assured of serving with relatives or friends. It was inevitable, however, that in the organization of a new American army of the proportions intended by the Washington Government, there should be room for some complaint. The calling of the Guard into service has brought the American forces under arms up to more than 800,000, with the first contingent of 500,000 for the new National Army yet to come, and a second contingent of the same size authorized.

With the bringing of so many men into service, the army organization which had been followed in this country since the Civil War has been changed to correspond to the modern organization employed in the armies of our European allies. It is urged that the new system affords opportunity for more effective use of the men with a smaller number of field officers.

Marching almost side by side with all these efforts to organize a great force of American soldiers for active participation in the fighting in France, has stalked the steady effort of Germany and German sympathizers to induce consideration by the Allies of German peace terms. The

new German Chancellor put out his feelers only to meet prompt rebuff. At once, with merely a shift of location and personnel, the effort was repeated from Austria, with Germany immediately announcing her glad willingness to join.

But none of these peace kites of the Teutons, however ingenious or spectacular they might be, served to distract the American Government from the steady purpose with which it entered the war to make the world safe for democracy. For all these German inspired peace feelers but faintly concealed the German purpose to make a peace on the basis of German victory.

These various efforts did lead, however, to one striking utterance which has helped mightily to crystallize and make visibly clear to Americans and all the world the fundamental purpose of American participation in the war. This utterance came from an Englishman, Mr. Balfour, who as head of the British mission to the United States conversed at length with President Wilson and was familiar with the motives and purposes of the American Government. In a speech in the House of Commons, discussing one of these Teutonic peace feelers, Mr. Balfour stated the American and the Allied attitude in one unforgettable epigram. Germany, he said, must be made "powerless or free" before the world could make with her a certain and secure peace,—powerless for wrong, if still under the iniquitous Hohenzollern domination, or free from Hohenzollernism and so safe for association with the rest of the world.

As on previous occasions, Germany seized upon the incident of a military success to put out her peace feelers. The Russian offensive in Galicia, which started so well and gave such hopeful promise, and which was the cause of so much rejoicing in this country a month ago, was turned suddenly into disruption and disaster through the defection and disorganization of the Russian army. Russian troops fled shamefully before the German advance, and all that had been gained was lost again, with more added. This treachery in the Russian army was fostered, if not induced, by German machination, and was the direct precursor of new German peace suggestions.

The American Government, however, was not deceived or induced to waver for an instant. In a speech to the men of the Officers' Reserve Corps training camp at Madison Barracks on July 29, Mr. Lansing, the Secretary of State, declared that we "must overcome the physical might of German Imperialism by force of arms." He assailed Berlin's perfidy and asserted that Germany covets the United States as a prize. The world's liberty is at stake, he said, and added that "appeals to justice, to moral obligation, to honor, no longer avail with such a Power."

In striking confirmation of this appraisal of German official faith there appeared, on August 5, in the first published instalment of a book by James W. Gerard, formerly American Ambassador at Berlin, descriptive of his four years at the German capital, a copy of a telegram prepared by Emperor William himself on August 10, 1914, when the war was but a few days old, for transmission to President Wilson. In this telegram the Kaiser said to the President that Belgian neutrality "had to be violated by Germany on strategical grounds." Since that publication Berlin has made some attempt to deny or disclaim the telegram, but the original, in the Kaiser's handwriting, is in American possession.

Preparation for military participation in the war was by no means

confined to the drafting of men for the new army and the calling of the National Guard. Additional men and supplies were sent to France and England; work on cantonments and training-camps was pushed with vigor, as was that of procuring huge supplies of the various kinds of equipment needed—of ordnance, and of food and clothing for the forces soon to be in the field.

The great aviation bill which had passed the House but was held up in the Senate by the captious opposition of one or two men, was passed by that body on July 21, in the form in which it came from the House, so that no conference was necessary. It authorizes the President to make an unlimited addition to the signal corps of the army for aviation service, and carries an appropriation of \$640,000,000 for the procurement and maintenance of air machines and for the organization and maintenance of the men. President Wilson signed the bill on July 24, and active work under its provisions has been going forward since. In a public statement about the bill, however, Mr. Coffin, chairman of the Aircraft Production Board of the Council of National Defense, warned the people of the country against expecting the immediate creation of the immense fleet of aeroplanes of which there had been no little newspaper discussion. He pointed out that such an organization as proposed was not completed over night, nor could any such supply of machines as is desired be manufactured in a week or a month. But he did give assurance that by the opening of the spring campaign of next year the effects of this appropriation bill will be amply manifest upon the fighting fronts in Europe, and that Germany will know that the United States is in the war.

While this military preparation was thus going forward with regular strides, economic preparation was also making some headway. The food control bill, creating a food administration to which the President had announced his intention to appoint Herbert Hoover, reached, at length, the end of its weary and wordy course through the Senate on July 21, and was passed by a vote of 81 to 6. For more than a month the opposition of six men, some of them Democrats and some Republicans, had sufficed to prevent action on this measure of vital importance to the nation and to the war plans of the Administration. As passed by the Senate, the bill carried a number of provisions utterly repugnant to the Government. It created a food control board of three, to be named by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Also it created a joint war board composed of Senators and Representatives ostensibly to supervise the war expenditures of the Government, but denounced by President Wilson as an evidence of lack of confidence in himself. The opponents of the bill were able to prevent its being sent to conference until July 25, and in conference the fight over some of the Senate amendments was continued for several days. Senator Gore, of Oklahoma, one of the chief opponents of the bill, was chairman of the Senate conferees, by virtue of his position as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture. Conference agreement was reached at length, however, with elimination of the Senate amendments so objectionable to the President, and this report was agreed to by both houses, the House acting on August 3 and the Senate on August 8, the senatorial opponents of the bill contributing an additional five days of delay. The measure became law by the President's signature on August 10, and immediately Mr. Wilson announced the formal appointment of Mr. Hoover to be Food Administrator.

The law prohibits profiteering; makes wastefulness of food a public offense; authorizes the President to license the importation, manufacture, storage, mining or distribution of necessities; prohibits hoarding; authorizes Government requisition of packing and other plants for the production of necessities; fixes a minimum price of \$2 per bushel for the wheat crop of 1918; prohibits the use of foods, feeds or fruits for the production of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes and authorizes the President to comander liquors in bond or stock for redistillation for Government use if needed for munitions or other purposes. This prohibition of the use of foods, fruits, or feeds for manufacture of beverages has usually been described as a "prohibition" measure. But it will not operate to prevent the manufacture of alcoholic beverages from other materials, and in the opinion of the Bureau of Chemistry of the Department of Agriculture, large supplies of potable alcohol can be produced from materials which cannot be classed as foods, fruits or feeds.

Along with the food control bill, the prior bill known as the "Food Survey" was agreed upon by the conferees and signed by the President. So that the Administration food control legislation has at length been secured. Mr. Hoover has already displayed much activity as Food Administrator. He has announced the organization of a committee headed by President Garfield of Williams College, and including a number of representative farmers and commercial experts, to fix prices for wheat for the 1917 crop, with the intent of Government purchase of the entire crop if necessary or advisable. He has also organized a Government wheat corporation to handle the wheat business of the Food Administration.

With the Government Food Administration under full headway on an announced policy of reducing the cost of food to the people of the United States, while at the same time conserving the supply and insuring a surplus for shipment to our Allies in Europe, there has been a reorganization and consolidation of some of the purchasing agencies in a new War Industries Board, auxiliary to the Council of National Defense. This board is headed by Frank A. Scott, of Cleveland, who was chairman of the General Munitions Board, which is absorbed in the new organization. A Central Purchasing Commission has been formed, composed of three members of the War Industries Board and Mr. Hoover. This Commission has announced its intention to protect the general public from extortionate prices, and to work with the Federal Trade Commission and the White House to that end.

Inspired, perhaps, by the fight over the so-called prohibition provision in the Food Control Bill, the Senate on August 1, adopted a resolution proposing an amendment to the Federal Constitution carrying a genuine prohibition of the manufacture, sale, importation or exportation of intoxicating liquors. This amendment must be ratified by the States within six years in order to become effective. House leaders announced that the resolution would not be acted upon in that body until the regular session next winter.

A number of minor measures of war preparation and of economic importance in domestic affairs passed through the final legislative stages within the month, including the measures increasing the Interstate Commerce Commission and providing for priority in transportation for certain classes of commodities essential to national defense. Other measures advanced toward final enactment, and new projects of legislation include

bills providing compensation, insurance, and indemnity for officers and enlisted men of the army and navy for injuries received in line of duty during the war.

The pending measure of chief importance is the so-called "War Revenue" bill, intended to raise about two billion dollars a year toward war expenses by taxation. This bill was passed by the House weeks ago and has been pending in the Senate Committee on Finance, undergoing a very thorough revision while the Food Control Bill occupied the floor. The Senate Committee was ready to report the bill in the latter part of July when Secretary McAdoo, of the Treasury, startled the Senators by announcing that the Government would need five billions more money than had been authorized. Thereupon the committee withheld the report and prepared to alter the bill so as to raise some hundreds of millions more than had been estimated. On July 27 Senator Smoot made a speech in the Senate in which he estimated the Government war expenditures for the first year, including loans to the Allies, at seventeen billions.

That same day Mr. McAdoo estimated that the Government requirements for the first year would be \$10,735,807,000, which included \$2,500,000,000 for fortifications and artillery for the army in France. Loans to the Allies would require several billions in addition to the three billions now authorized, most of which has been furnished them.

On August 10 Mr. McAdoo raised his estimate of additional funds needed to six billions instead of the five he had asked for a few days before. He intimated that the Government contemplated raising 500,000 more men than had been planned at first.

Four days later, on August 14, Mr. McAdoo submitted a still further estimate in which he again raised the amount needed—this time making it nine billions, which he said should be authorized at the current session and during the regular session next winter. This is to cover the expenditures and loans to the Allies for the first fiscal year of the war.

The War Revenue Bill was reported to the Senate from the Committee on August 6, and was estimated to provide \$2,006,970,000 a year. The committee estimates were that \$777,000,000 would come from the income tax; \$562,000,000 from the tax on excess profits; and \$207,000,000 from taxes on liquors. Senator Simmons, chairman of the Finance Committee, described the bill as a "flexible scientific war tax." Chairman Kitchin, of the House Committee on Ways and Means, who hails from the same State as Senator Simmons, denounced the Senate revision of his bill as drawn in the interest of corporations and inimical to small dealers and business men. The bill was made the unfinished business in the Senate on August 8, and the hope of its managers is that it will be passed early in September.

Administrative preparation for the month included a settlement of the quarrel between Chairman Denman of the Shipping Board and General Goethals, which had delayed action on ship construction and disgusted the nation. General Goethals, after consultation with the President, wrote Mr. Wilson on July 21, offering to resign. On July 24 the President accepted the resignation, and wrote Mr. Denman, calling for his resignation also. Simultaneously he appointed Edward N. Hurley, a Chicago business man and manufacturer, who had been chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, to succeed Denman, and named Admiral W. L. Capps,

of the Navy, to succeed Gen. Goethals. Also he accepted the resignation of J. B. White as member of the Shipping Board and named Bainbridge Colby, a New York lawyer, in his place. Since then the Shipping Board has been a marvel of harmony and activity, and there is every prospect that ship construction will be pushed most energetically. When Mr. Hurley, the new chairman, was asked for an interview, he replied that his business was to build ships, not to talk about them.

Another measure of Administrative preparation, or rather of active economic warfare, has been the work of the Exports Control, provided by a part of the Espionage bill. The Administration has favored a rigid policy toward neutral countries from which supplies of food or war materials had been going to Germany. This policy has occasioned distress and evoked protest and appeal, without effect. Commissions from different countries, from practically all, in fact, of those affected, have come to Washington and are urging relaxation in their relief. Meantime some seventy Dutch ships, loaded with grain, are held up in American waters for lack of licenses permitting the shipment of their cargoes. The longer this policy continues the more evidences of internal distress come from Germany, and the more frequent become the German feelers about peace.

The close of the month was marked by the return of the Root commission from Russia, with a message of cheer and confidence in the renewal of national vigor and fighting will in that country. At the same time Mr. Root and his colleagues issued a serious warning against the sedition and even treason that stalks but half concealed about American streets and cities.

Simultaneously with the return of the Root commission, there arrived the Japanese commission headed by Viscount Ishii, which comes, according to his announcement, to discuss war measures in the fullest harmony with us and from the point of view of Allied advantage.

As this review month closes, comes the announcement of the formal appeal of Pope Benedict to the world for peace, an appeal accompanied by a statement of the terms upon which His Holiness conceives peace negotiations to be possible. But his terms had hardly been made public when they were denounced in the Entente countries and in the United States as but very thinly disguised from those previously put out by approved German sources. At this writing, no official response has been made to the advances of His Holiness either by our Government or the Allies.

(This record is as of August 18 and is to be continued.)

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

THE CHALLENGE TO THE CHURCHES

Sia,—Many people are much interested in and view with satisfaction the frank and open discussion in some of our periodicals of the question of the status of the Christian Church, so-called, and its creeds.

There is great confusion in the popular mind, and even in the minds of thinking people, of the terms *Church*, *Christianity*, and *Religion*; and, if we wish to go deeper into the matter, which we must of necessity do—for any discussion of creeds leads us inevitably to it—we must consider the *philosophic basis of Theism*.

We have recently been honored by the visit of that distinguished English gentleman, Mr. Arthur Balfour, philosopher and statesman, who through theism, finds support for his belief in Christianity, as do most of the great minds of the thinking world who continue in the Church to-day. They are content to allow the ignorant and unthinking to be controlled and live by the symbolisms, superstitions, and fears by means of which priest and Bible hold the great masses to the Church; aids to government and a help in ordering society. For themselves they justify the Church by finding a philosophic basis for their belief in Theism. But in spite of the dominant theistic philosophy which justifies the Church to-day, if not its creeds, like a thin pure thread of gold through English thought has run the religion of its clearest minds; and they have lived or died by their reasonableness and clarity of intellect quite apart from the Church; quite apart from Christianity except as it held some kernel of universal truth within the scope of the human mind.

It seemed to me, in reading Dr. McConnell's article in *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW* and later the discussion of it, that he was conscious of the two elements in the Church and was seeking to justify both: to find an honest place for both in its fold. But, to the man who sees most clearly, to Truth in its highest form the word compromise is unknown; and so to many of us the thinking man who compromises with the church through Theism lacks courage and falls just short of Heaven. He is unwilling to recognize his human limitations.

To be very concrete, I recall a pleading, ignorant priest of the Protestant Episcopal Faith using his very last argument to keep in the church one who was breaking away, and the reply of a fearless, clear-sighted woman. "Do you not believe that God is love?" said he in his irritation. "I am prepared," said she, "to assign *no* attributes to Deity: to that something of energy which we perceive working in the universe."

There was nothing more to be said. She had touched bottom. Can philosophy to-day justify the assumption of attributes to Deity? Upon this rests the whole structure of Christianity, creeds and all. In the pure atmosphere of higher thought for fifty years a titanic battle has been waging. Some of the best of our periodicals have admitted more or less of the controversy which in various ways is filtering down through to the masses.

There is a vast field for popular education and clarification of thought in this great period of expansion along these lines. The popular mind is grasping slowly the teaching of the last fifty years: of science; of the higher criticism; of archaeology; of psychology—and it is stooping to weather the gale of that temporary phase of the world's history, industrialism. But above and outside industrialism as much as above feudalism or any other phase of civil history hangs that transcendent truth: from simple to complex and from complex back to simple—as true of the rhythms of human society as it is of world building and disintegration under the great rhythms of the universe. Christianity, so-called, as expressed in various organized Christian churches with their creeds is a phase of civil and social history.

You may be interested in a little experiment in popular education which came to a head in a small way in this remote section of the country some three years ago. It is in part an effort to combat the insidious and insistent proselytism of Christian sects in the public schools and the County Agricultural Associations. It is the evangelical churches in particular that have attempted to attach themselves as a rider to agricultural rehabilitation in our country districts. The Young Men's Christian Association, backed by what funds is not always certain, is one of the most potent forces of intemperate and insidious proselytism to the evangelical forms.

Hector Macpherson is an author almost unknown in this country, a personal friend and biographer of Herbert Spencer, and yet he finds in philosophy, through Theism, bases for the belief in the Calvinistic idea of God. He plays easily over the whole field of philosophy and frankly admits that the whole evangelical world is without a creed to-day; but he naively adds in substance: nothing but a creed as stiff as the creed of Calvin ever could have driven the Jesuit out of Scotland. If we are to-day, as we must admit we are, without a creed, let us set about making a creed that will arm us effectively against our religious enemies.

And so the merry war, the strife and bloodshed, goes on in the little triangle of Anglican, Evangelical and Roman Catholic, and we must include Greek Catholic too, all termed Christian, with the armed Mohammedan on their frontier. To it is largely due the Irish question, the Mexican difficulties, if not the great war abroad.

The destruction of Rheims was prophetic. In the high lights it would seem as though creeds and our churches, examined as social and economic institutions, were an anomaly, and that religion so soon as it is organized by human hands, ceases to be religion. It fails to rise above the tide of our social and economic life.

But with all due deference to Dr. McConnell, whatever may be true of sects and creeds, there is no such thing as compromise in religion. Either a man is or he isn't.

CLAREMONT, N. H.

ELLEN P. SANDERS.

DO WE NEED A NEW LUTHER?

SIR,—The article contributed to a recent REVIEW by S. D. McConnell, D.D., entitled, "What Are the Churches to Do?" and subsequent comments thereon in following numbers, suggest the pressing need of reform in the twentieth century Church. It is also devoutly to be wished that the churches would give careful attention to what is being said along this line by men of keen perception and independent thought.

It is, however, too often the case that he who points out the means of avoiding in the future the costly mistakes of the past is denounced as an iconoclast—an enemy of the Church.

The Pagan, the Mohammedan, the Christian and the Jew represent the grand divisions of the modern religious world. These are each and all rent, sundered

and fractured into numerous cults, creeds and classes, differing in variant degrees, but all unanimous in the opinion that their division is based on Truth, while all the others are fundamentally erroneous, and hence false and spurious as systems of religion.

Assuming that the Christian system is the one existing with divine approval, we find it likewise divided, sub-divided and re-divided into numerous sects, schisms and fragments, some differing merely in superficial detail, and others along lines as antithetic as they are fundamental.

If any one of these is identical with the primitive Church, established in conformity to divinely revealed Truth, it follows that all the others which are inconsistent therewith, or divergent therefrom, are inconsistent with or divergent from divinely revealed Truth.

We do not say that no modern Church conforms to the primitive pattern; for this would imply a knowledge of church conditions which we do not profess. Nor do we say that the range of our observation includes none such; for even this would imply an acquaintance with revelation and a wisdom of interpretation which modesty forbids we should assume. But we do say that if any Church within convenient reach claims such distinction, it would please us to be an occasional attendant on its ministrations.

And why not such a Church? It would evince, on the part of its adherents, a disposition to exalt private character and public worship to a conformity with divine standards; while opposition thereto would betray a desire to degrade divine standards to the level of a perverted human taste.

Justification for perpetuating the present schismatic condition of the modern Church is founded on two assumptions, viz:

1. It adapts the Christian System to the variant human conditions.
2. As there is a germ of good in each of them, they should all be fostered and encouraged for its preservation.

The first of these has been refuted times without number; but it is sufficient to say that it is unsparingly condemned by the Scriptures.

The second needs no refutation; its fallacy becomes obvious on being reduced to the form of a syllogism.

L. J. COPPAGE.

CRAWFORDSVILLE, IND.

GERMAN MORALS

SIR,—The theory proposed by Mr. Ayer in your July number, that the indifference of the German people to justice, mercy and the rights of others is due to the doctrines of early Christianity, will not hold water, because all the peoples of Europe were subject to the same influences and have not developed the same characteristics. We cannot conceive of Holland, Norway, Denmark, or England rejoicing undisguisedly over the drowning of innocent neutrals, or justifying the barbarous treatment of non-combatants in Belgium. Why is it that Teutons outside of Germany recognize a code of ethics repudiated by those living in the old home? While the following reasons do not entirely account for this remarkable phenomenon, they may do so in part.

Just before the Christian era we find Teutonic tribes occupying nearly all the territory between the Danube, the Rhine, the Baltic and the Vistula. These tribes were continually fighting among themselves. Partly nomadic and partly agricultural, they were continually moving west and south. The Goths passed through France and conquered Rome, the Vandals subdued a large part of Spain and Northern Africa, the Franks conquered France, the Angles, Jutes and Saxons conquered Britain. In some cases they were amalgamated with the conquered people, as in the case of the Lombards and the Franks; in others they

established themselves and became a nation. Sometimes, as in case of the Danes in England, they reconquered lands conquered earlier by other tribes. In all cases they brought with them the seminal idea of the equality of the freemen, the election of the chief, and serfdom, the latter abandoned by degrees, the former the germ of democracy. In all cases the expeditions were organized by energetic chiefs who took with them a certain number of capable volunteers. Consequently there was a constant drain of the most independent characters westward. Those who remained were the conservative, the docile, the unenterprising. Thus we find in England a nation of "kickers," jealous of their rights, ready to fight their chiefs, and, in modern days, to "write to the *Times*." They went so far as to execute one of their kings because he did not respect the ancient rights of the freemen. Those who remained behind in Germany have never executed a tyrant though they suffered under his exactions. Except in Switzerland they submitted to exactions and oppressions.

In Berlin ten years ago, the people did not resent, energetically, insults by their army officers which in England or this country, where many enterprising Englishmen fled in the seventeenth century, would have provoked instant retaliation regardless of personal danger. How can we account for this except by supposing that for two thousand years the bold, energetic, irascible, individualistic men had been drained off to the west, taking their women with them or intermarrying with Gauls and British Celts, raising children who should carry out the English and French and American Revolutions, and leaving behind in the old home the conservative, the docile, the laborious, who have not spirit enough to resent insults and impositions as long as submission will insure beer and sausages, who have never beheaded an emperor or a king in two thousand years. In no other part of the world has this social selection been carried out on so large a scale. It is true that there are some servile Englishmen and Frenchmen principally in domestic service, but many of these would fiercely resent a personal indignity beyond what they considered their rights. Furthermore, for several centuries bold and enterprising Englishmen have migrated to Canada, to New Zealand, to Australia. But they return whenever they can, they make every effort to have their children educated in England. They are not permanently detached. Consequently England has not become, like Germany, a horde of men lacking spirit to achieve freedom.

Men who lack courage for adventure are usually servile to superiors in social station and tyrannical to those below them. There is no other such brutal tyrant as the German non-commissioned officer. If you do not insist on your own rights as an individual, you are not apt to pay much attention to the rights of others. The chivalrous qualities have been drained out of Germany, for they go with the energetic and enterprising qualities. There has been in Germany a survival of those most fit to be the tools of tyranny. In modern warfare obedience is the prime requisite. Acting in large masses, individual courage and initiative are not needed except in aviation. So a million Germans make as good a modern army as a million Frenchmen, though individually inferior in dash and reckless courage, and fighting for a less inspiring ideal—unwarranted conquest instead of defense of home and children. Which will prove the most lasting remains to be seen, though there can be little question which is the higher. But to a machine gun the cause is of little importance, and the German army has the morals of a machine gun.

C. F. JOHNSON.

HARTFORD, CONN.

GERMANY IN CHINA

SIR,—In the April number of *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW* there appears a letter from the pen of Mr. Ernest P. Horowitz on the subject of the former

German settlement at Kiaochiao in Northern China, of which Tsingtau is the chief port and residential city.

The author of the letter does not state whether he has ever visited Tsingtau, and in view of the exaggeration of his description of that "matchless 'pearl of the Orient'" the present writer can only conclude that the information contributed by Mr. Horrwitz is not first-hand.

As a resident of over twelve years' standing in Shanghai, and a visitor to Tsingtau at varying intervals from 1908 to the present year, I may, perhaps, lay claim to some knowledge of the facts.

It is indeed true that the German Government spent very large sums upon the development of Tsingtau, but Mr. Horrwitz refrains from stating that the greater portion of this expenditure was devoted to the work of constructing the fortifications and the naval harbor, and to the upkeep of the military and naval establishments in the city and territory, in defiance of the fact that Kiaochiao was *not* a German *Colony* but territory leased from China for a definite period of years.

The chief aim of the Germans appeared, in fact, to be to render Tsingtau a formidable military outpost, and a desirable place of residence for the official and commercial Teutonic community; and the success of their efforts in this direction must be admitted.

Of the "exquisite picture galleries" (remark the plural) I have never heard. The hotels worthy of the name are three in number—the largest, the Strand Hotel, being a seaside resort for the residents on the China Coast during the summer months. The shops do not bear comparison with those in the International Settlement of Shanghai, nor, for that matter, with Hongkong.

It appears to be a fundamental principle of American and British Colonial policy to encourage friendly intercourse, as far as differences of customs and mode of life permit, with the people of the governed territory. As an example of the "heart of hearts" democracy of German colonial policy I need state no more than the fact that the Chinese were debarred from residence in the foreign (European) city of Tsingtau, proper,—native servants and a few necessary Chinese tradesmen alone being allowed in this quarter. No such restriction prevails in Hongkong, Singapore or Shanghai, where the Chinese may own or lease land and build and reside where they please.

The story of German Colonial administration in Africa is, I venture to think, sufficient to raise doubts as to the "beneficial" effect of Teutonic methods to the people under their control.

Distance from New York is responsible for this communication being rather belated, but even at this late date I feel that such an exaggerated view of the "model" settlement of Tsingtau as that presented to your readers by Mr. Horrwitz should not be allowed to remain unchallenged.

GEO. H. CHARLTON.

SHANGHAI, CHINA.

TEUTONIC INSANITY

SIR,—Your splendid editorial in the July REVIEW on Lord Northcliffe, "the man of the war", is both truthful and inspiring. It voices a well-earned appreciation of the far-sighted vision of the constructive journalist. It clinches that appreciation with numerous published statements of "the man of the war" which have appeared in the London *Times* and elsewhere. It gives the Allies strong hope that the outcome of the World War is not uncertain nor doubtful, and may not be even long delayed.

All this is worthy and well enough. But one quotation from Lord Northcliffe himself, which appears in the editorial in question, utters a truth which

496 THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

cannot be repeated too often nor burned too deeply into the public conscience of the civilized world. Let every nation give heed to the unanswerable pronouncement:

If the German multitude will throw off that insanity of theirs which makes them believe that Germany is another name for God, we will see them as men, and treat them as men; we will forgive the wrongs which they did when they thought themselves God; we will not exult insolently over that country of theirs which has exulted over all the world.

Surely, that is a magnanimity which is altogether too rare, a magnanimity, nevertheless, which does unspeakable credit to him who uttered it.

DUANE MOWRY.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

LET THEM FIGHT THE COMMON ENEMY

SIR,—In the July Number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, under the caption "Information Wanted," you reproduce an editorial from the *Jacksonville Times-Union*, which can not see why "the former protests of President Wilson" against British interference with our neutral trade should now be succeeded by "a plan which puts neutrals on rations fixed by belligerents."

If, Mr. Editor, you do indeed possess the "singular lucidity of statement" which Colonel Watterson says characterizes you, can you not make clear to this bewildered Floridian that we were a neutral when protesting, but a belligerent—an enemy of Germany—now? They are pretty dense down in the Everglade State, but you might try!

The truth is, the war would be over to-day but for the surplus importations from the United States resold to Germany by Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland and Switzerland. For the sake of the American lads we are sending to the trenches in France, not another ounce of food or supplies should be sent to these nations. They have an aggregate of two million men under arms. Let them fight the common enemy or starve!

WASHINGTON, D. C.

H. R. L.

A PATRIOTIC SERVICE

SIR,—All your life you have been performing patriotic services for your country and the cause of freedom and democracy. In my opinion, you never did your country a better turn than you did in publishing "The Japanese Point of View" from the pen of Judge Henshaw in your July issue.

As an humble American citizen who loves his country, I deplore the attitude of the California people generally on this subject, because I believe the senseless agitation against the Japanese is fraught with grave consequences for the United States.

ERNEST A. STOWE.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

OLD FRIENDS

SIR,—I have had the REVIEW in my home for the past thirty-one years and would sooner do without the clock on the mantel than without the REVIEW on the table. Here is to your good health, and long may you live to edit the REVIEW!

H. F. MERRICK.

KENSINGTON, OHIO.