

511
D28
Copy 2

GERMANY AND ENGLAND, THE · REAL · ISSUE

BY · HIS · EXCELLENCY · DR. · BERN-
HARD · DERNBURG ★ FORMERLY ·
SECRETARY · OF · STATE · FOR · THE
GERMAN · COLONIES ★
PUBLISHED · UNDER · THE · AUSPICES
OF · THE · GERMANISTIC · SOCIETY
OF · CHICAGO ★

Number Ten

Return to
Div. of Bibliography
Lib. of Congress
(Not yet Catalogued)

Copy 3

Copyright, 1914,
By the Curtis Publishing Company in the
United States and Great Britain.

Gift
The Society
FEB 3 1915



Ft Meade

D 511

D 28

copy 1

JCH 19 Mar 29

FOREWORD

The Germanistic Society plans to issue a series of pamphlets to appear from time to time, dealing with the war in Europe and its underlying causes. The present article has been reprinted from The Saturday Evening Post of November 21st, 1914.

Former publications

- No. 1—Germany and the Peace of Europe
by Prof. FERDINAND SCHEVILL.
- No. 2—The Causes of the European Conflict
by Prof. JOHN W. BURGESS.
- No. 3—How Germany was forced into war
by RAYMOND E. SWING.
- No. 4—The Session of the German Reichstag
by Prof. ALEX. R. HOHLFELD.
- No. 5—Germany's fateful hour
by Prof. KUNO FRANCKE.
- No. 6—German Atrocities and International Law
by Prof. JAMES G. McDONALD.
- No. 7—"Militarism" and "The Emperor," the latter
by Prof. JOHN W. BURGESS.
- No. 8—The Evolution of the German Empire
by Prof. GEO. L. SCHERGER.
- No. 9—German Resources and the War
by His Excellency, DR. DERNBERG.

Copies of these pamphlets are for sale at the office of the Society at the following prices:

Single copies	\$ 0.05
10	copies 0.25
100	copies 1.50
1000	copies (f. o. b. Chicago) 10.00

Profits, if any, will be turned over to the Society of the Red Cross.

THE GERMANISTIC SOCIETY
OF CHICAGO

Louis Guenzel, Recording Secretary
332 So. Michigan Ave., Chicago, Ill.

Germany and England, the Real Issue

By His Excellency

Dr. BERNHARD DERNBURG

As everybody knows, the trouble that led to the present world war started in a little corner in the Southeast of Europe, and it is remarkable to see how, in spite of this common knowledge, in the eyes of the world the European conflict has resolved itself into a question between Germany and England as to supremacy in Europe. Of course England claims that she went to war on account of the breach of Belgian neutrality and that she must fight to destroy the spirit of militarism that has led to such a flagrant disregard of solemn treaties, a tendency that is endangering the peace of the world and consequently must be crushed entirely. While England fosters no ill feeling whatsoever and no antagonism toward the good people of Germany, unfortunately, in order to crush militarism, led by the emperor and the military caste, the German people will have to be destroyed as a nation and what is left reduced to the size of a subordinate power. For this purpose England has created in her literary arsenal a special docket called German Militarism, with the works of Von Bernhardi, Treitschke, and Nietzsche as the main exhibits.

HOW GERMANY HAS KEPT THE PEACE

It is interesting to note the number of copies of the books of these three men that were sold in America before the beginning of the war. I dare say there were not twenty of the works of any one of them in the hands of Americans, outside of clubs and public libraries. Von Bernhardi is the chief witness for the prosecution. He is a retired German general of great learning, independent views and strong personality. His book makes interesting reading. Yet he is not among the German generals in the present war, having been retired from the service just because his writings and sayings did not meet with the approval of his superiors and because his teachings were considered very extravagant. His book

has excited some comment also in Germany, but it has been printed in only two editions, and certainly never more than ten thousand copies in all have been sold in our country. The book appeared in 1911, a little over two and a half years ago, and I fail to see how it can have created the feeling of militarism that is said to have been predominant in Germany for the last thirty years. I further fail to see how a book that is obviously written to warn the German people against existing dangers; to rouse in them a warlike spirit; to teach them the ethics of war and the rights of the stronger, can be used to prove that such a spirit of war was rampant in Germany. If it already existed there was no need to write such a book!

There are Von Bernhardis in all countries. I refrain from citing American examples, because I have made it a rule in this country not to fall back on them. The feeling of obligation I have as a guest of the United States does not permit me to become personal. But what about Lord Charles Beresford who, together with Captain Faber, has for years and years been egging on the English to increase the British Navy at a great sacrifice to the country? What about Lord Roberts' writings and sayings for years back that England must have universal conscription and a compulsory service? What about Senator Humbert who has vigorously denounced the French ministry for neglecting the defense of the country? Did they teach anything different from Von Bernhardi's teachings? I cannot see it.

Then about Treitschke. He was a professor of history and the historian of the Prussian Government. His ideas were formed from a lifelong study of this history. He hated England sincerely and thoroughly for the way in which she had conquered her Empire by using might versus right; but his conferences were mainly attended on account of his refined rhetoric, for he was indeed an orator of the first order. But from being an orator to having an influence on the German people as a whole is a very far cry, and Treitschke's preachings of twenty years ago have not even formed a school. One might just as well say that it can be proven that America is a warlike nation, because a celebrated Harvard professor at a later day urged his women audience to go into war and help the Allies. If that were presented to the world as a proof of the American spirit there would be a very energetic protest.

And now I come to Nietzsche: He was one of the finest of poetical philosophers, or perhaps rather a philosophizing poet. His teaching of the right of the individual as the basis of all right is in direct contradiction to Von Bernhardi's teaching that the right

of the collectivity—that is, of the state—is paramount to the right of the citizen as an individual. How, therefore, can it be said that Von Bernhardi is a disciple of Nietzsche?

The expression *superman* is universally attributed to Nietzsche. This is just as incorrect as it is to cite the German song *Deutschland, Deutschland Ueber Alles* as a proof of the world-wide aspirations of my people. Superman, in German *Ueberschensch*, is a word coined by Goethe and used repeatedly in his *Faust*, and so one might just as well lay the present war to the door of Goethe.

The absurdity of the thing is patent, and those who cite *Deutschland, Deutschland Ueber Alles* in proof of German aspirations do not know even the first lines of this song so dear to the Germans. It is a song of modesty and shows better the tendencies of the German nation than anything else could:

*Germany, Germany above everything, above everything in the world.
May her sons stand united for defense and protection
From the Maas unto the Memel,
From the Etsch unto the Belt
Germany, Germany above everything, above everything in the world.*

Now the Maas is part of the western frontier of my home country and the Memel part of the eastern frontier, and so are the Etsch in the south and the Belt in the north. Could a patriotic song be more modest? It may be compared with the American saying that the United States is the finest country in the world. The meaning is the same. Everybody praises his country and loves it best. And is *Rule Britannia* without aspiration, without pretensions?

And just as our national anthem is cited, so is our militarism. It has been created as a dire necessity for the defense of our four frontiers and has never been used beyond them. If every country could stand on as good a record as Germany, there would not be so much cant about the reasons for the present war. It has been stated that militarism in general is a threat to the peace of the world. Yet German militarism has kept the peace for forty-four years. While Russia went to war with Turkey and China and, after having promoted The Hague Conference, battled with Japan and “protected” Persia, conquering territory double the size of the United States on the might-is-right principle; while England, the defender of the rights of the small states, smashed the Boer republics, took Egypt, Cyprus and South Persia; while the French Republic conquered the Sudan, Tunis, Madagascar, Indo-China and Morocco; while Italy possessed itself of Tripoli and the islands in the Ægean Sea; while Japan fought China, took Formosa, Corea,

and Southern Manchuria and has now, with the aid of her allies, invaded China, a neutral country; there is not one annexation or increase of territory to the charge of Germany. She has waged no war of any kind and has never acquired a territory in all her existence except by treaty and with the consent of the rest of the world.

THE BATTLEGROUND OF ALL EUROPE

But why, then, did she keep up such a tremendous army? Certainly not for aggressive purposes. She never was aggressive toward anybody. She needed this army, because her exposed situation in the middle of Europe, without natural boundaries and between unsettled neighbors, has made her for ages and centuries the cockpit and the battleground of all Europe. Her soil was drenched with blood and her population nearly exterminated in the Thirty Years' War; Louis XIV. in the Palatinate left hardly one stone on the other, destroyed old Heidelberg and took Alsace and Lorraine, then a German-speaking dukedom; the devastations of the Seven Years' War, the battles and six years' occupation of the Napoleonic times, all taught Germany bitter lessons. Her soil has been the rendezvous of Swedes, Danes, Russians, Croats, Poles, Italians, French and Spaniards for centuries past. Impotent and not able to ward them off, she has been continually destroyed, until the genius of Bismarck welded her twenty-six states together into one unit, and Germany made the vow that she would never again give anyone such chances. That is why we kept our army, and if a people have an army at all, it is a waste not to make it strong enough for any emergency. That it is not too strong may be judged from the fact that Germany is now attacked by seven nations.

You hear people say that the large standing establishment, the enormous cost of it, and the time wasted is a sin against culture, advancement, and scientific progress. The Germany of to-day proves the contrary. While we have been keeping up a big army—which, by the way, is the cheapest of the European armies so far as the taxpayer is concerned—we have increased our population, we have enormously increased our wealth, we have built up a gigantic oversea trade, we have constructed the second largest merchant marine in the world. More, we have been able to spend as much as \$250,000,000 a year to take care of our workmen, giving them a compulsory insurance against sickness and invalidism, accident, and old age, pensioning widows and providing for orphans. Every German employee earning less than 5,000 marks a year can, with a degree of security, look forward to a comfortable provision for himself and for the people dear to him when his own forces

fail. We pay yearly more for this social work than we ever paid for our army.

And our productive and inventive genius has not suffered. I do not say that Germany's civilization is superior to that of England and France; it certainly is superior to the civilization of any of the other warring nations. We have been able to give our people a primary and technical education of the highest type, and that in turn has led to the perfection of scientific work and to inventions that are a comfort to all the world. Germany stands in the first rank in applied science, be it in chemistry, or electricity, or in the perfection of medicines. With just pride the Germans provide a great many absolute necessities of life to a very large part of the world. While the population has increased fifty per cent, the wealth of the nation is now three times what it was before and, thanks to our democratic government, the repartition of this wealth is such that we have a well-to-do middle class and few colossal fortunes; and the number of really poor people in Germany is infinitely small in comparison with other countries.

This is the story of German militarism, unaggressive and certainly not unproductive, based on actual facts. Those antagonistic to our nation say it has created a warlike spirit, and that such a spirit by itself is a danger. This warlike spirit is generally shown by people going to war; and yet of all the European peoples Germany alone did not do that.

The case of Belgium is frequently cited as proving Germany's reckless warlike spirit. It is said we have broken wantonly most solemn treaties and, therefore, we ought to be punished for it. The question as to the right—so far as obligations under treaties go—has been decided by nearly all nations in the same spirit—namely, *that no nation can bind itself by a treaty to its own destruction*, just as no individual can so bind himself by contract; that the national interest supersedes the international interest, and that treaties are closed on the basis of circumstances existing at the time they are made, and that, therefore, they are not binding when those circumstances change.

TREATIES THAT ARE NOT BINDING

England, who claims to have gone to war on account of the breach of Belgium's neutrality, has never hesitated to break her obligations whenever she considered doing so of paramount interest. She has done so in this war any number of times. There is a treaty of peace and amity between Germany and Portugal which is to be broken on England's bidding. There is the Triple Alliance which is to be served at English solicitation. Egypt is a sovereign

state where the rights of the foreigner are guaranteed by solemn pledges, yet the Khedive had to banish the German Minister and even the judges of the mixed tribunal at England's command. China is a neutral country and bound to the open-door policy by international treaties; she has been invaded by the Allies in breach of these treaties. Morocco has pacts binding England as well as Germany and regulating the rights of the foreigners; yet the German diplomatic representative has been chased out of the country.

When Sir Edward Grey expounded the European situation before the English Parliament he cited Gladstone in regard to Belgium—Gladstone! who said that the maintenance of the obligations of a treaty without regard to changed circumstances was an impracticable, stringent proposition to which he could not adhere; and when England seized two Turkish dreadnoughts on the Tyne on August 8th, she proclaimed the fact with the following words: "In accordance with the recognized principle of the right and supreme duty to assure national safety in times of war." France has been doing the same in Morocco, and Japan, when she sent to the German Consul in Mukden—a Chinese city in Manchuria—his passports, acted on the same principle, leaving aside all her other infractions on Chinese treaties and rights.

This is sad and does not portend well for the permanent peace by arrangement of international affairs through treaties; yet it seems that it cannot be helped. The United States Supreme Court in a judgment rendered in 1889, written by Judge Field and expressing the unanimous conviction of the whole court, says the following: "Circumstances may arise which would not only justify the Government in disregarding their treaty stipulations, but demand in the interest of the country that it should do so. There can be no question that unexpected events may call for a change of the policy of the country." This judgment was handed down when the Chinese were excluded from the United States in violation of a previous treaty which had assured them the same rights as United States citizens; and the United States has acted on the quoted decision ever since.

THE CASE OF BELGIUM

It is, therefore, universally recognized that the vital interests of a country supersede its treaty obligations. But though this is the theoretic side of the question, there is a practical one as regards Belgium: When the war broke out there was no enforceable treaty in existence to which Germany was a party. Originally, in 1839, a treaty was concluded providing for such neutrality. In 1866 France demanded of Prussia the right to take possession of Belgium, and

the written French offer was made known by Bismarck in July, 1870. Then England demanded and obtained separate treaties with France and with the North-German Federation to the effect that they should respect Belgium's neutrality, and such treaties were signed on the 9th and 26th of August, 1870, respectively. According to them both countries guaranteed Belgium's neutrality *for the duration of the war and for one year thereafter*. The war came to an end with the Frankfurt Peace in 1871, and the treaty between Belgium and the North-German Federation expired in May, 1872. Now why these new treaties, if the old one held good?

The Imperial Chancellor has been continuously misrepresented as admitting that in the case of Belgium a treaty obligation was broken. What he said was that the neutrality of Belgium could not be respected and that we were sincerely sorry that Belgium, a country that in fact had nothing to do with the question at issue and might wish to stay neutral, had to be overrun. But it should not be forgotten that the offer of indemnity to Belgium and the full maintenance of her sovereignty had been made not only once but even a second time after the fall of Liege, and that it would have been entirely possible for Belgium to avoid all the devastation under which she is now suffering.

England takes the position that, in case France had used Belgium as a stepping stone, England would have gone to war against France for breaking the Belgian neutrality. This is a remarkable proposition. On July 30th the Belgian chargé-d'affaires at St. Petersburg wrote to his government—and the authenticity of this letter cannot be impeached—that the Russian war party got the upper hand upon England's assurance that she would stand in with France. This was written before the Belgian question ever came up; and before Sir Edward Grey expounded in the Parliament the Belgian question he insisted that England was obliged to protect the French coast against Germany because of the amity and friendship existing between the two nations. He then read the correspondence of 1912 between himself and the French Minister of War, where the arrangement is alluded to that the French fleet should protect the Mediterranean Sea and the English fleet the northern coast of France. So in consequence of this Sir Edward Grey answered Count Lichnowsky that the maintenance of Belgium's neutrality *alone* would not keep England from going to war, but that if France should be attacked England would aid her.

I wish an intelligent American reader to picture to himself a situation where England protects the French coast against Germany and goes to war against France for breach of the Belgian neutrality.

But Belgium was in fact not neutral any more, and with her circumstances had greatly changed. Since 1906 she had been in correspondence with England, elaborating plans for a common defense, providing for the landing of a hundred thousand English at Antwerp. She had been in correspondence with France, building fortresses all along the German frontier which form a continuous chain with the French fortresses along that same frontier. She had been changing her military system to a system of compulsory conscription, establishing an army of more than three hundred thousand men and creating—on English instigation—a spy system on her eastern frontier. She had acquired enormous oversea possessions of nine hundred thousand square miles, an area three times as great as Germany and populated by nine million inhabitants. This acquisition, by the way, was also obtained by breach of treaty.

Belgian population at home is bigger by one-half than that of Portugal. Though Belgium left her frontiers toward France entirely unprotected and open, she was actively preparing to make a stand against Germany. This is not the “poor little country” that is being pictured to the Americans. I think the Belgian fighting, which she has had to do almost alone against a large part of the German forces, should fully prove that.

But she did more. The Imperial Chancellor said that he had proofs that the French were to invade Germany by way of Belgium. Proof there is. French soldiers and French guns, in spite of all the denials made by the French ambassador at Washington, were in Liège and Namur before the 30th of July. This proof is only in private letters, but it comes from absolutely unimpeachable people. Of course it is not to be found in the White Books, such as are held up as evidence of the purest water.

But do Americans believe all the “official news” that the Russians are sending continuously from the seat of war as to their enormous successes, the routing of the Austrians, the destruction of their whole army, the march on Vienna and Berlin, and so forth? I do not think they do; but why then place an implicit faith on so-called White Books, written by identically the same people? Such books are written for the purpose of making out a nation’s case, and they are the diplomatic war weapons used in the war of diplomatists that always precedes the war at arms.

There is a great deal of talk of crushing Germany, and the necessity for it, because of her military spirit. I confess we are a manly people and want to be strong and want to be secure. We want to live and to thrive and are ready to pay for our civic liberty

and national independence with our blood. And we should despise a nation that did not feel the same way.

SAFETY FOR THE MONROE DOCTRINE

The case of England is different. Though she wants to be free and independent, she has always managed to have her fighting done for her by others, from the time she trafficked in Hessians, and that is why she has not had a standing army such as Lord Roberts and his friends have always demanded. Though there is a fighting spirit in the English Army, it is mostly Irish, and so are the leaders: Lord Roberts, Lord Beresford, Sir John French, Admiral Jellicoe and Lord Kitchener of Khartum. The way in which she cares for the little nations whose interests she has so much at heart is to allow her fighting to be done by the Belgians, of whom Sir Edward Grey said that he expected them to fight to the last man for the independence of the country. And so she called in the Canadians who should have much better things to do, and she made a treaty with Portugal to help her—the Portuguese, who do not know what the conflict is about. She brings over ambitious Indian princes and poor ignorant Indian soldiers to fight against the white men. She relies on Japan, she gets the Boers to attack the German possessions, and she tries to persuade Italy to do some fighting for her. Most of these are "poor little states," who now are expected to fight for the sovereignty and independence of Great Britain. In this way she has time left to talk at home and to force the unemployed into a new army that is going to be created. That she too must become militaristic she now finds out to her surprise and grief.

The fact that Canada has taken part in this struggle has opened up a new prospective to Americans. It is a willful breach of the Monroe Doctrine for an American self-governing dominion to go to war, thereby exposing the American Continent to a counter-attack from Europe and risking to disarrange the present equilibrium. But I think America can set her mind at rest on that point. I, at least, would most emphatically say that, no matter what happens, the Monroe Doctrine will not be violated by Germany either in North America or in South America. When she is victorious, there will be enough property of her antagonists lying about over the four parts of the globe to keep Germany from the necessity of looking any farther and causing trouble where she seeks friendship and sympathy.

While England in the Venezuelan case of 1895 most coolly challenged the Monroe Doctrine, it was Germany in 1904, in a similar case also with Venezuela, who submitted her claim in

Washington and got the consent of the United States Government to prosecute the collection. Moreover, I am in the position to state here that immediately after the outbreak of the war, by one of the first mails that reached the United States, the German Government sent of its own free initiative a solemn declaration to the Department of State that, whatever might happen, she would fully respect the Monroe Doctrine.

THE DANGERS OF NAVYISM

I wish also to make clear to the American people that Germany neither wanted nor started this war which had its origin in Russia's pretensions to mix in Austrian affairs, and that got its size from the fact that England and France joined the conflict, the latter from treaty obligations, the former from self-interest, and that *we have no ambitions of enlargement in Europe or in America*. Modern democracies and especially the German one which is directed by the most liberal ballot law that exists, even more liberal than the one in use in the United States, rest, at least in Europe, on a national basis.

We do not believe in incorporating in our Empire any parts of nations that are not of our own language and race. The history of Europe has shown us the danger of such a thing. The difficulties between France and Germany are over the French-speaking population in Lorraine; the small internal differences in Germany came because of some millions of Poles and thirty thousand Danes; the trouble between Austria and Italy is because of a few hundred thousand Italian-speaking people under Austrian government. England had what nearly amounted to a civil war because of Ireland. The trouble in Russia is on account of the Poles, Finns and Baltic Germans; and Austria, the country of many nations, is not very strong just for this very reason. And as to oversea possessions, as I said before, there are enough to be had without borrowing trouble; especially in Africa, where considerable tracts lend themselves to colonization by the white man.

Even there our ambitions do not go very far, and we are quite content with what we have and with our spheres of influence in Mesopotamia and some countries, such as Morocco, that a civilized nation with great resources and inventive genius might open to the world's culture. All assertions that our ambition goes beyond this are untrue and simply invented for the purpose of rousing distrust between the United States and a country that has for generations been the friend of the Stars and Stripes, and that has never gone to war with them as England has done.

I have read in American papers statements to the effect that probably the next thing Germany would do after the close of the present war would be to invade the United States or take Brazil. Why not say the same of England? She has always had a navy twice the size of that of any other nation; she is now creating a big army; she has always been aggressive; she has conquered half the world; she has shown utter disregard of treaties; she has coaling stations all along the American coast which form a fighting basis from Halifax down to the Falklands and from Chile up to British Columbia; she controls the entrance to the Panama Canal; she is even now dictating to Uncle Sam her own rights and laws in regard to contraband, seizing American petroleum, seizing American ships flying the Stars and Stripes, harassing American citizens, cutting cables, using wireless stations as she pleases, maiming the trade of America, locking up the Mediterranean, the North Sea, the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf.

Why not consider navyism in the same light that is applied to militarism? I ask, who is bulldozing the rest of the world, including America, at this present moment? England wants to rule the seas. There lies her power; thence comes her commerce and therefore her riches. Whenever a nation that is but human—as I think the English are—poses as being on a higher level than any other nation, doing everything for the benefit of the under dog, because of altruism and a recognition of the sacredness of her given word, disclaiming emphatically any self-interest, while at the same time advertising through her writers the loftiness of her intentions, I cannot help feeling suspicious, and everybody else should, it seems to me, feel the same way.

Americans have been hearing a great deal about the English angel without wings standing with a sword drawn for the protection of liberty, freedom, humanity and other just causes, using as watchwords the fight against militarism, the principle that might is right, the infringement of the Monroe Doctrine, and so on. She has sent a host of English authors of a very special type to defend her case. I read articles by W. K. Chesterton, Hall Caine, H. G. Wells, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, and other writers of fiction. They consider the American people a sentimental people, preferring humane stories to the cold truth, fiction to facts, and unused to doing their own thinking. Well, fiction is what these men are writing; that is their business, and the gentleman who detailed the English case in the issue of *The Saturday Evening Post* of October 17th, Mr. Arnold Bennett, is an artist of no common attainments.

But I shall make free to dig somewhat deeper into what I see

to be the reason for the English attitude. England has created a large shipping trade and acquired enormous possessions oversea, and she felt secure in her supremacy. She was uneasy only on account of the United States, which—until Germany loomed up on the horizon as a big power—she tried to treat as she was treating Germany before the war. But now she feels that her absolute sway is in danger. Even in her own domain she does a very large share only by foreign help. Most of the big bankers, from Rothschild down, are of German descent; the whole English credit would have broken down if the English authorities had not, within four hours, forced Baron Schroeder to become a British citizen; the diamond and gold business is in the hands of Anglicized Germans; theirs is a large share in the produce business. The English cannot do without German clerks.

A COMMERCIAL QUARREL

I remember a speech by the chairman of the London Chamber of Commerce, Lord Southwark, not longer ago than last June in which he said: "You Germans are getting ahead of us because you are working 16 per cent longer than we and because you do not consider Saturday a holiday. That state of things was not felt much so long as it was going on within British confines and for the interest of Great Britain alone—that is, until about 1880; but then the German nation commenced to assert itself. Germans learn all the languages whereas the English very seldom do. If an Englishman wants a stenographer to write Portuguese letters to Brazil he must take a German clerk. German dominion in trade all over the world has been established through the fact that the German talks to the people in their own language, respects their national feeling, finds out their national wants, and delivers to them exactly what they wish to get. He never says, "We cannot do this" or "You have to take our standard," but carefully carries out their orders according to the best scientific methods and therefore at the best price. The German iron industry has, because of its improved methods, obtained a great part of England's trade. German machinery, except in the textile business, is more efficient than English machinery. The field of electricity has been entirely abandoned by England to America and Germany. Dyestuffs are now even shipped by way of America and Canada back to England. German proprietary medicines have conquered the world market and the German competition is felt everywhere.

Then, too, there is the enormous increase of German shipping, in spite of the fact that practically all the English companies doing passenger service are half broke. While the International Mercan-

tile Marine Company has suspended payment and the big liners of the Cunard Line can live only by subsidies, Germany has been building up a most magnificent merchant marine with ships that exceed in comfort and size anything launched from England's shipyards. Even in the tramp-steamer business, the backbone of English shipping, the Germans have made big inroads. So while the trade of Great Britain and Ireland since 1870 has risen from two billion dollars to five and a half billions, that of Germany has risen from one billion to five billions—in other words, while Germany's trade is now five times what it was in 1870, English trade is only two and a half times its former amount. For a commercial nation such as England this condition is very serious. It goes to the very core of the nation's existence. Therefore, Great Britain faced the alternative of getting better habits of work, improved machinery, better education, better knowledge of foreign languages—that is, being more industrious, less luxurious, and more painstaking—or of fighting. But England was not accustomed to do her own fighting, save with her fleet. The other fellows, whose welfare she has so much at heart, could fight for her, so it was not very difficult for her to make her choice.

This is the real explanation of the present war. The correctness of this view is proved by the constant invitations sent out from England to America to help her get away with the German trade, an idea that is justly repulsive to the American mind. So it was not Germany's militarism that England feared, but German trade and commerce which she could not destroy because of the military and naval forces behind them.

Germany is now attacked by seven nations. She is fighting morally for her freedom and for her existence. She has no special grudge against anybody. She is modest in her aspirations and merely wants to maintain her place under the sun. She wants equal opportunity, open-door politics, and open commerce throughout the world. Nor is she either Hunnic or barbarian, as Americans will have learned from the twenty-five million Germans or German-American people who live in their midst. She is out for conquest on a peaceful line, the line where the higher culture wins, where the more industrious and laborious are sure to prevail. This is to the interest of all the world. Germany has to her record forty-four years of peace, and she has never coveted her neighbors' possessions. So, as far as the moral issue goes, she has much the best showing to make of all the nations now at war, and it is within eternal justice that she should and will prevail.

