

quick service;" and to the shipbuilder the thought that the life of the war depends upon him.

The food and the war supplies must be carried across the seas, no matter how many ships are sent to the bottom. The places of those that go down must be supplied, and supplied at once.

To the miner let me say that he stands where the farmer does: the work of the world waits on him. If he slackens or fails, armies and statesmen are helpless. He also is enlisted in the great service army.

The manufacturer does not need to be told, I hope, that the Nation looks to him to speed and perfect every process; and I want only to remind his employees that their service is absolutely indispensable and is counted on by every man who loves the country and its liberties.

Let me suggest also that every one who creates or cultivates a garden helps, and helps greatly, to solve the problem of the feeding of the nations, and that every housewife who practices strict economy puts herself in the ranks of those who serve the Nation.

This is the time for America to correct her unpardonable fault of wastefulness and extravagance.

Let every man and every woman assume the duty of careful, provident use and expenditure as a public duty, as a dictate of patriotism which no one can now expect ever to be excused or forgiven for ignoring.

In the hope that this statement of the needs of the Nation and of the world in this hour of supreme crisis may stimulate those to whom it comes and remind all who need reminder of the solemn duties of a time such as the world has never seen before, I beg that all editors and publishers everywhere will give as prominent publication and as wide circulation as possible to this appeal. I venture to suggest, also, to all advertising agencies that they would perhaps render a very substantial and timely service to the country if they would give it widespread repetition, and I hope that clergymen will not think the theme of it an unworthy or inappropriate subject of comment and homily from their pulpits.

The supreme test of the Nation has come. We must all speak, act, and serve together.

WOODROW WILSON.

## AMERICA AT THE FRONT

"We shall never be a real factor in this war until our troops are in the trenches."

These words, from a recent address by General Francis V. Greene, which has been printed in full in the New York "Times," should be placarded throughout the country. The Administration evidently realizes the fact that these words express; it is the people of the country that still need to realize it. To give our allies access to our financial and material resources is plainly the duty we can most easily and most promptly perform. But, as General Greene says, "You cannot buy your way through war with your check books. You must pay with your own sweat and blood." And every American who remembers his country's history—its mistakes and its achievements, its ideals and the hardships it has endured for their sake—will want to have America count as a factor in the war as soon as possible.

General Greene points out that in order to do this it is necessary to put through the plan which the Administration proposes—the raising of the regular army to war strength and of the National Guard to nearly half a million men, and to raise an army of half a million on the principle of universal liability to military service.

But, as he also says, it is important to send our men to France to get their training there. He would have this country transport an infantry division to Europe, and he gives military reasons for the need of sending them there as soon as practicable. But there is more than military reason for this. The chief reason is a moral one. The effect of the appearance of our troops in Europe "in heartening up the French and British soldiers in the trenches, as well as the Belgians, Italians, and Russians, will be as immense," says General Greene, "as the effect upon Washington's ragged and starving soldiers one hundred and thirty-seven years ago when Lafayette arrived with money, gun-

powder, and clothing, but, above all, with the news that some of the finest regiments of the French army were already on their way to America. Our independence really dates from that period, rather than from July 4, 1776."

This is a reason why every facility should be given to Mr. Roosevelt in his plan of raising a division to go overseas.

The military man, intent on securing military efficiency, is likely to overlook forces that are not purely military. For that reason, some military men deplore the proposal to send from this country at an early date men of military training who could be used in training the forces that we shall need a year from now. In such a war as this, however, purely military considerations should not control. It was because the French people recognized this fact that the governmental authorities of France declined to acquiesce in the proposal of some French military men that Verdun be abandoned to the Germans, for these authorities recognized the truth that whatever military advantage might be gained by yielding this spot in the line would be more than offset by the moral loss in its surrender. And these military men were wrong and the governmental authorities were right; and the repulsion of the Germans at Verdun was a victory far surpassing any incidental military advantage. It meant new moral strength to the whole French Republic.

It is such moral strength that it is our duty to give to our allies as soon as we can. And we should do this not merely for our old-time friend France, but for our new sister democracy, Russia.

It is planned, we understand, to help Russia by lending money to her and by sending a commission to Petrograd to act as an expert advisory board for the new Government. This is well and good. But we ought to give Russia more than money, more than expert advice. We ought to give her the moral strength that can come from the presence of Americans in uniform on Russian soil.

And it is important that we do this at this moment, for it is this moment which is supremely important in the determination of Russia's destiny.

We should send to Russia an American regiment, or even a smaller military body. We should send that unit to cross the Pacific, and, traveling across the Russian Empire, to be seen by the common people at the railway stations, to parade in Moscow and Petrograd, and to go to the front. A thousand or five hundred men would give no new military strength to the Russian hosts. There are as many men at the Russian front as Russia needs—more, perhaps, than she can well supply. In a military sense, five hundred Americans might be regarded as five hundred men in the way. But in a moral sense their presence in Russia would be of inestimable value. These men might never actually be in the trenches. It does not matter whether they are or not. But they would find their way into the hearts of the Russian people, and that is where they are needed.

Russia is an infant democracy, and she is looking to the United States, as the oldest of the great republics, for encouragement, for moral support, and for an example of disciplined liberty. The one hundred and sixty millions of Russian peasants regard America as a dream country. Nothing else in the world, we are assured, would create a greater sensation and arouse a greater enthusiasm among the Russians than the fact that Americans—not dream Americans, but real Americans—in American uniforms and bearing the American flag were on Russian soil as comrades of the men of the armies of new Russia.

And these Americans would be the strongest safeguards against the perils that threaten Russia to-day. Reverses suffered under the Czar did not break the Russian spirit, because the Russians knew that it was not their fault, but the fault of their reactionary Government. Reverses to-day would be harder to bear because they would engender doubt among the Russian people in the strength of democracy itself. What the Russian peasants, who do not read the newspapers and who do not get the news by the printed page, need is an ocular demonstration of the power of democracy. They need a symbol, a democratic ikon, and this America can give to them.

We must not leave these Russians, these allies of ours, without the moral reinforcement which out of our one hundred and forty years of tried democracy we can furnish them.

And, best of all, we can do this without weakening the future military strength of the United States, and we can do this by

rendering an additional and practical service as well as a symbolic one.

Russia needs engineers for her railways. She has troops enough; she probably has munitions and supplies enough; but she has not means of easily getting her supplies and her munitions to her troops or distributing her food among her people. For the building of such railways America can send American engineers. There are Americans already in Russia building railways. There is no difficulty about putting our civil engineers and all the mechanical engineers we can spare to the service of Russian railways and Russian factories.

We propose that this military contingent that should be sent to Russia be composed of such engineers. They should be formed into a regiment, under the command of a colonel of the American military establishment, with a Russian officer as an aide-de-camp. These engineers need have no more military training than is necessary to enable them to march together and to live under the simplest of military conditions. They can be called from out of civil life. They should be put into American uniforms; they should carry the American flag; they could elect their own subalterns and non-commissioned officers; they could serve as well as any other military contingent as the symbol of America's military force; they could march as well as any other body through the towns and villages of Russia. And when they had served to rally Russian courage, Russian faith in democracy, and Russian confidence in American fidelity, they could disperse to their engineering tasks and serve Russia where Russia most needs service.

Such a regiment of engineers in American uniform would hearten Russia.

They would renew Russia's respect for America.

They would demonstrate to the Russian peasant, inclined, with his new-found freedom, to throw off restraint, that democracy can be not only free, but also disciplined.

And they could render to Russia, through their expert work, invaluable service.

Not the least of the benefits that such an American force of citizen-soldier-engineers in Russia would bring would be the benefit to our own land. Their progress across the American continent to the Pacific coast would be told in daily despatches. Their arrival in Japan, one of our allies, would be dramatic and significant. Their journey across Siberia would be told to the American people. The story of their reception in town after town in Russia would tell to the American people what Russia means to democracy to-day. They would help to awaken Americans from lethargy, and give to America a new inspiration and faith in the ideals which Americans profess.

## AN OPEN LETTER TO A FORMER PROGRESSIVE

*My Dear —:*

In 1912 you and I were singing together "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" and in imagination were fighting the battle of Armageddon. We had enlisted for life in the war against social injustice. But now we have separated. You are all for peace, and I am still for war. Why? Have you changed? Or have I changed? Or has the issue changed?

Professor Eduard Meyer eulogizes Germany as the most monarchical government in Europe. The power of its monarch he says, "must be unlimited, and it cannot, therefore, be responsible to man, but to God alone." He wrote before the revolution in Russia, but even then his statement was correct. Absolutism was more apparent in Russia, but more real in Germany. In December last a Russian teacher in this country said to me—I am quoting from memory: "The intellectuals in Russia are democratic; the spirit of the universities is democratic; the army is pervaded by democratic aspirations; the peasantry have learned in the communes the first lessons of democracy; when the next revolution breaks out in Russia, it will achieve its purpose with little bloodshed." And the revolution of last month proved him a wise student of life.

But in Germany the whole structure of government—political, educational, military, industrial—is autocratic.

At the head of this Government is an Emperor who with

frank egotism has thus defined his own idea of his powers: "Only one is master of this country. That is I. Who opposes me I shall crush to pieces. . . . *Sic volo, sic jubeo*. . . . We Hohenzollerns take our crown from God alone, and to God alone we are responsible in the fulfillment of duty. . . . *Summa prema lex regis voluntas*."<sup>1</sup>

There is a Parliament, but the Ministry is responsible to the Emperor alone, not, as in England, France, and Italy, to the people through the Parliament.

There is universal suffrage, but that suffrage is so adjusted that Prussia controls the Imperial Parliament and a few rich men control Prussia.<sup>2</sup>

There is a public system of education which is highly efficient for the purpose for which it is organized, but that purpose is distinctly autocratic. There is compulsory education in free elementary schools, but they carry the pupil only up to fourteen years of age. There are secondary schools which carry the education on up to the universities, but there is no open door between the elementary and the secondary school. The elementary school does not prepare for the secondary school. The secondary school is not free; entrance into the universities, the professions, and the higher offices in the civil government, the military organization, and the educational system is confined to graduates from the secondary school, and eminent success in the industries of the nation is exceedingly difficult for any others. No private school can be maintained without Government consent, and, in fact, there are only about forty thousand students in the private schools, and these are mostly church schools. The whole educational system is admirably devised to educate the few to govern and the many to be governed.

Such is the constitution of Germany. The Emperor rules Prussia; Prussia rules Germany; and now Germany is attempting to rule the world.

That this is the attempt of Germany The Outlook has heretofore made clear to its readers by quotations from leaders of German thought and rulers in the German state. One quotation must suffice here: "Germany," says Professor Ostwald, "thanks to her genius for organization or social efficiency, has attained a state of civilization far higher than that of all other peoples. This war will in the future compel these other peoples to participate, under the form of German social efficiency, in a civilization higher than their own. . . . You ask me what it is that Germany wants. Well, Germany wants to organize Europe, for up to now Europe has never been organized."<sup>3</sup>

In this attempt of Germany to *compel* the free nations of the earth to throw away their hard-earned liberties and accept Germany's autocratic system you have urged America to acquiesce. Or, if you have not actively protested against America's entering into the war, you have not advocated her entrance. Government of the people, by the people, and for the people does not seem to appeal to you. Why?

Do you think that overtime and underpay of laborers is unjust in America, but the enslavement and deportation of laborers is just in Belgium? To work in mines and factories for mothers and wives is wrong in America, but giving them over to the victims of criminal lust is allowable in Belgium? That child labor ought to be fought against in America, but child murder ought to be winked at in Belgium? Or do you think that justice is worth voting for, but not worth fighting for? Does the dramatic spectacle of a battlefield appear to you more horrible than the spectacle of tyranny unresisted, wrong unpunished? If so, I do not agree with you. The Battle of the Marne in France is glorious compared to the futile revolution of 1848 in Germany. The French Revolution is less dreadful than the Bourbon despotism which that Revolution destroyed.

I do not judge the Germans. They are the victims of a tyranny whose deadly influence they did not suspect. A hundred years of autocratic education has transformed the Germany which believed in liberty of thought, if not of action, into a

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in the "Nineteenth Century and After," by J. Ellis Barker, an English writer born and educated in Germany.

<sup>2</sup> Of the 397 seats in the Reichstag Prussia has 235, or about three-fifths of the whole number, and in the Parliament of Prussia the largest taxpayers—that is, the comparatively few of the richest men—choose as many electors as the great mass of laborers.—A. Lawrence Lowell, "Governments and Parties in Continental Europe," Vol. I, pp. 253, 305.

<sup>3</sup> Statement by Professor Ostwald in the "Journal de Genève."