



EDITORIALS

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 9, 1916



NO LUSITANIA CRISIS

REPORTS emanating from Washington assert that certain passages from President Wilson's addresses on preparedness foreshadow a near grave crisis with Germany. The gentlemen who are responsible for manufacturing a crisis where no crisis exists are playing with dynamite. There are many excellent reasons for the present Preparedness Propaganda. There are legitimate means for promoting its cause. But the attempt to hypnotize the people into the support of the defense bills of the Administration by giving out statements known to be false, to the effect that our relations with Germany are again approaching a critical stage, is irresponsible and objectionable in the highest degree. The country knows full well that these relations are far from critical, unless the Administration should deliberately choose to make them so.

The country knows that Germany has met our demands in connection with the submarine warfare long ago and that the formal settlement of the *Lusitania* controversy has been protracted by unnecessary quibbling over the exact phraseology for which our State Department is as much to blame as the Berlin Foreign Office. It may be safely asserted that the American people would never endorse the Administration if it should use its failure to find a mutually agreeable formula for a final settlement as a pretext to drag this country into war. Congress and the people would be up in arms. Even the attempt is nothing short of criminal.

Germany justly refused to settle the *Lusitania* matter until the good faith of the United States was established, until it was proved that, with our submarine protest, we were not playing the game of Great Britain. The long delayed protest to England, following certain German concessions, was not sufficient to dislodge Germany's well founded suspicions. But our recent vigorous protest against the piracy of the mails and the note on submarine warfare addressed to all belligerent nations proves that the Administration, spurred by Congress, is at last ready to meet Germany's demand for fair play.

It makes no difference whether the note in question was written as a concession to Germany, or as a concession to the common sense of the American people; it undoubtedly establishes the legal status of submarine attacks on merchantmen. The Administration evidently realizes that the concessions of the Central Powers must be illusory so long as merchantmen are armed or encouraged to escape. Hereafter every armed merchantman will be treated as a warship. This is entirely in accordance with the German contention.

Such being the case, it is not likely that the German Government is ready to jeopardize friendly relations with the United States by shilly-shallying over a word. Germany has nothing to gain by delay. Can the same be said of the Administration? The President's friends are deliberately troubling the waters of our interna-

tional relations to fish for political advantage. We know that their weird antics are for home consumption, but in Germany they may arouse again the suspicion hardly allayed that what the United States wants is not to find a solution of the *Lusitania* controversy but a way to save England. Upon their head must rest the blame for any hitch in the President's negotiations.

GEORGE SYLVESTER VIERECK.



EDITORIALS



NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 23, 1916

ARE WE DRIFTING INTO A NEW CRISIS?

THE United States is facing to-day the gravest crisis that has confronted us in the present war. When every newspaper in the country proclaimed that our negotiations with Germany were at the most "critical" stage—with war at arm's length—*The Fatherland* declared that there was no *Lusitania* crisis. Events have proved that *The Fatherland* was right. To-day we assert with equal emphasis that there is danger ahead. The Central Powers have declared that beginning with the first of March armed merchantmen will be treated as warships. We may be willing to eat our own words and to recant Secretary Lansing's memorandum on the subject of submarine warfare. We cannot expect Germany to do likewise. Poker is not the German national game. The Germans are not a nation of bluffers. Unless our Government issues an immediate warning against travel on belligerent vessels, we shall have to face in another couple of weeks the serious situation that a vessel carrying American passengers will be sunk without warning because such a vessel was armed.

Whatever policy the United States may pursue in the matter, it is fateful for us to drift without taking a clear and unambiguous stand before a new catastrophe occurs. If we defer our decision until such a time our course of action would depend not on the principles so clearly enunciated by Mr. Lansing in his submarine memorandum, but on the exigencies of the moment. With party strife in the land, the sword will rest but loosely in its scabbard. There would be scant opportunity for reason because we would be compelled to formulate our opinion not upon undisputable facts but upon colored partisan statements and upon the testimony of incompetent witnesses.

The Central Powers having acknowledged the justice of our contention that submarines must not destroy merchantmen without first safeguarding the lives of American passengers, it was clearly the duty of our Government to insist that the lives of such American passengers shall not be jeopardized by the merchantmen themselves. There can be no greater danger for non-combatants than to place weapons capable of destroying hostile submarines in the hands of captains of merchant vessels. Our Government has wisely attempted to remove that peril by proposing an international agreement for the disarming of merchantmen.

Since the declaration of Paris of 1856, armed merchantmen have no status in international law except as auxiliary cruisers of the national navies. It is significant that France as well as Germany has consistently observed that rule, while England violates her plighted word in arming merchantmen. In order to save her battleships England conducts her war against German submarines by arming her merchantmen in a manner sufficient to sink any submarine. The argument that the armament is for "defensive purposes" only is nothing but a hollow pretext, dangerous to unsuspecting passengers. For what defensive purposes can these ships carry guns unless to offer resistance to submarines signalling them to stop? However, every vessel offering resistance under such circumstances may admittedly be sunk without much ado. Hence every passenger on board of such a ship is in peril of his life, and his death will be upon our heads, unless the United States issues to him an unmistakable warning.

The idea of abolishing the malpractice of arming merchantmen by common consent is hardly feasible in times of a world-war. England, bent on exterminating the German submarines by every means, fair or foul, is not likely to abandon that malpractice by amicable persuasion. If we desire to remove every possibility of friction, and if we desire to safeguard the lives of our citizens, there is only one peaceful course open to us: the United States must declare without delay that citizens traveling on board armed ships of belligerents do so at their own risk. This should apply not only to ships leaving American ports, but to all ships on the Seven Seas, no matter from what port they hail. If we permit American citizens to board vessels which, while leaving American harbors without armament, are armed at sea we shall only increase the possibilities of disaster.

We may not be able to compel the belligerents to comply with our demand, although France already recognizes the principle on which our attitude is based and refuses to arm her merchantmen, but at least we can deny the protection of the United States to American citizens who, in spite of the perils with which their course is fraught, insist upon traveling on belligerent privateers, unless the Allies issue definite instructions to their merchantmen forbidding them to carry arms or to resist capture. It seems only fair that citizens placing themselves under the protection of the guns of a belligerent should for the time being be placed outside of the protection of the United States.

LET US HAVE PEACE

THE stage is set for a war with Germany. Wilson's speech before Congress confirms our worst suspicions. We are convinced that Woodrow Wilson acts in accordance with the secret understanding existing between himself and Great Britain. His ultimatum to Germany has saved the tottering Asquith Cabinet. England is delaying conscription. She has found another henchman to fight her battles. She has fought to the last Belgian; to the last Montenegrin; to the last Serbian. Russia, Italy and France are exhausted. She is now prepared to spend for the conquest of Germany the last American dollar and the life of the last American soldier. Woodrow Wilson wants war. He is determined to have war at any price, no matter what concessions Germany may be prepared to offer. It is for this reason that he has sanctioned the unspeakable violation of the sanctity of the German Embassy, deliberately timed for its dramatic effect. It is for this reason that he has summoned the two Houses of Congress in such unseemly haste, because he knows that if public opinion has time to crystallize there will be no war.

Woodrow Wilson is nothing if not theatrical. He prides himself upon his knowledge of the psychology of the crowd. He can teach a turn or two in stage management to Belasco. No matter what answer Germany may give, the President, we are creditably informed, intends to break off relations with Germany melodramatically on the anniversary of the sinking of the *Lusitania*. Wilson knows that a rupture of diplomatic relations means war. But, as he has said to Senator Stone and Representative Flood, war with Germany would not be "ungrateful." He has chosen May 7th, the anniversary of the *Lusitania* disaster, for the step he contemplates, because it will supply him with a dramatic gesture.

THE President hopes to regain in this manner the favor of those who have condemned his policy toward Germany as too weak-kneed. He believes that a severance of relations, coming at such a time, will appeal to the sentiments of the people, especially as the munitions press wilfully belittles the dreadful significance of this fateful step. The President is convinced that he will be able to overcome even the resistance of the Bryan wing of his party against war by pointing out that he has given Germany one year—the full measure provided in our various arbitration treaties with other powers—to atone for the *Lusitania*.

The President conceals the fact that his obstinate refusal to warn American citizens from off belligerent vessels in accordance with the principles established by himself in Mexico, makes him the real author of the appalling tragedy in the Irish Channel. He also conceals the fact that the trickery of the Administration in connection with the issue of armed merchantmen alone defeated a settlement of the *Lusitania* controversy.

WAR would be welcome to Wilson. He could pose as the President of "humanity" and the savior of Anglo-Saxon "civilization." The date set for the war is only a few weeks before the gathering of national conventions. The American people, he argues, will not swap horses while crossing a stream. Now can there be any doubt that the Money Trust will indorse his candidacy, if he rushes to the aid of Great Britain? If the United States enters the war, the financial agents of Great Britain will unload the staggering debt of the Allies upon the broad shoulders of the American people.

War with Germany would paralyze the German and the Irish-American vote. In fact, it would insure for the next century the absolute domination of the Anglo-Saxon element in the United States. So at least runs the argument of the war mongers. War would take the wind out of Roosevelt's sails. War would defeat even Hughes. It would obliterate Mexico. It would also save the President from several very embarrassing personal questions.

It is true that the country, outside of the munitions centers, is fiercely opposed to war. Michigan, North Dakota, Wisconsin and Illinois have clearly expressed themselves not only for peace, but for an embargo on arms. Wherever the voters have been able to express themselves in primaries, the war fiends have been snowed under. It is always a small organized and Morganized minority that precipitates a country into war.

NOW is the time for us to speak out. After war is declared, it will be too late. We may not be able to break the President's headstrong determination, but the blood-guilt will be upon our own heads if we do not object in unmistakable accents. Protests, petitions, telegrams, letters, mass meetings, parades are the only weapons available to the friends of peace. Let us exhaust these possibilities to the utmost.

Let us enunciate our message so clearly that even Woodrow Wilson, surrounded by evil or incompetent advisors, in the isolation of the White House, cannot blind his eyes to the handwriting on the wall. Perhaps in his heart there is still a voice that tells him that the United States must bring, not a sword, but peace to the world. Let us catch the echo of that voice. Let us repeat it until the clarion call of Christ shall drown the sinister whisper of Sir Cecil Spring-Rice in the White House.

If the man in the White House remains deaf and blind, Congress has ears and eyes. Congress will hear and see. Congress may not be able to prevent a rupture of diplomatic relations, but Congress will resent being forced into war. Congress can repudiate the President, but it will not do so until he is repudiated first by the people. Let us stand by the country and by the President, if we can, but if the President errs, let us stand, not by him, but by the country. Let us have peace.

GEORGE SYLVESTER VIERECK.

America Unneutral

NO one with the exception of a few Northcliffe newspapers, caught in the meshes of their own Anglo-Saxon cant, still maintains the pretense of American neutrality. The most advanced pro-Ally, capable of intellectual honesty, agrees with the most pronounced pro-German that the attitude of the United States has been deliberately unneutral. We find Mr. Walter Lippman, writing in the *New Republic* at one on this point with Mr. John Devoy, the editor of the *Gaelic-American*. Mr. Lippman's opinions are of special interest because his periodical is regarded by some as the mouth-piece of President Wilson. Mr. Lippman frankly admits that the blockade and the submarine are both terrible weapons. "In choosing between them," he says, "we are not choosing between legality and illegality, nor even perhaps in the last analysis between cruelty and mercy."

"We are an inveterately legalistic people, and have veiled our real intentions behind a mass of technicalities. The reason for this legalism just now is to be found in something besides our intellectual habits. *We have wanted to assist the Allies and hamper Germany, but we have wanted also to keep out of war. Our government therefore has been driven to stretch technicalities to the breaking point. We have clothed the most unneutral purposes in the language of neutrality.* But we have never had any right to expect that we could go on for ever without facing the consequences. Having started on the road of assistance to the Allies we have to follow it through. So when we talk about American honor being involved we mean just this: that since we have created an unneutral policy we cannot now abandon it because it is dangerous. Our honor is involved only because in the last thirty months we have made a choice which requires us to keep open the seas that lead to the western Allies. Had our judgment of the issues of the war been favorable to Germany, we would with honor have followed a different policy. . . .

"This basic truth has been clouded for us by something more than our legalism. The radical pro-Allies especially along the eastern seaboard have raised the absurd legend that the policy of the administration was either pro-German or at least neutral in effect. Fastening all their attention on the dramatic patience of the President, they often seemed to forget entirely the drastic effects of his inactivity in regard to the blockade. They never seemed able to realize that the decision not to break the encirclement of Germany is one of the great strategic facts of the war. It may be the most decisive victory the Allies have won, and it has earned for us the dangerous hostility of the German people."

John Devoy, most beloved and most fearless of Irish patriots, reaches the same conclusion as Mr. Lippman. He is in the State Department and the Department of Justice

of being the most effective agencies of the British propaganda in the United States.

"Every demand made on Germany in regard to submarine warfare was really in the interests of England, not those of the United States. The intention was plain—to help England and hurt Germany by dictating to Germany the manner and method of its naval war against England. The prosecutions conducted by the Department of Justice were the most effective part of the British Propaganda. *Every one of these prosecutions was intended to help England and not one was undertaken to curb English violations of neutrality.* . . .

The result of all this is the present attempt to precipitate war with Germany over an English question, with which America has no legitimate concern—for the contention that Americans have a right to sail on belligerent ships is made entirely for the purpose of giving the United States a cause of quarrel with Germany. *All the President's demands on Germany were made in England's interest and were wholly without justification.* His notes supplemented and gave official sanction to the British Propaganda and influenced hundreds of thousands of people who could not be reached by the hired newspapers. And his last act in suddenly breaking off relations with Germany because she refused an unreasonable demand, brought the country to the verge of war when no genuine cause for war existed. This action was wholly within the rights given the President by the Constitution, but it took an unfair advantage of Congress and of the people. Whatever his motives, the effect of his action was to consummate the work of the British Propaganda and make war almost inevitable."

Mr. Devoy would scorn to deny the accusation of being anti-British. Mr. Lippman, in spite (or because) of his German name frankly admits his pro-Ally affiliations. Mr. Devoy is a better American than Mr. Lippman, because the interests of the United States and the Central Powers are identical, whereas the interests of the United States and England conflict in every part of the globe. However, if we dismiss the testimony of both men as partial, let us listen to the testimony of still another American whose judgment is influenced neither by racial bias nor by intellectual snobbishness. No one can deny the Americanism of William Randolph Hearst. Adolph Ochs, publisher of the *Times* and Mr. Ralph Pulitzer, publisher of the *World*, may be good Americans, but their Americanism is of recent vintage. The publisher of the *Tribune* is related by ties of blood and affection to the British Court. Mr. James Gordon Bennett, the publisher of the *New York Herald*, is frankly an expatriate whose home is not in New York but in Paris. The Americanism of Mr. Hearst dates back many generations. This does not make him a better American than many of those who have made America their own, not by the accident of birth, but by

choice, nevertheless it invalidates the reproach that his attitude is determined even unconsciously by the call of ancestral blood.

Yet the judgment of Mr. Hearst, fearlessly proclaimed throughout the land in his powerful organs of public opinion, confirms the judgment of the pro-Ally and the pro-German, that the conduct of our Government has been a travesty on the President's neutrality proclamation. In fact Mr. Hearst charges in the New York *American* that our Secretary of State in his eagerness to assist the Allies has exceeded the prerogatives of his office. Mr. Lansing, he asserts, has formulated "rules for capture" and *definitions* of "felonies on the high seas and offenses against the laws of nations" without any authority whatsoever and *in direct derogation and impeachable usurpation of the sole functions of the Congress of the United States*. "Senators and Representatives," remarks Mr. Hearst, eloquently addressing himself to Congress, "if our fathers wrote any one grant or prohibition of powers clearly into our Supreme Law, they clearly commanded that you, and you alone, should have the power or exercise the power to define what acts of a submarine are and what are not felonies on the high seas and offenses against the law of nations.

"Article I, Section 8, paragraph 10, of the Constitution says:

"The CONGRESS shall have power:

"To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas and offenses against the law of nations."

"And paragraph 11, continuing, says:

"To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal and make rules concerning captures on land and water."

"Now, it is impossible," Mr. Hearst goes on to say, "to make language more explicit than that.

"Mr. Lansing's notification to belligerents that our Government defined and would hold an armed merchant ship to be an armed ship under certain conditions, and an unarmed ship under other conditions, and would hold certain submarine acts to be legal and others to be offenses against the law of nations, was a high-handed and impeachable usurpation of the power conferred solely upon yourselves, sitting as Congress of the United States.

"At this tremendous hour," Mr. Hearst continues, "Senators and Representatives, we appeal to you in the name of the whole

American people to resume, manfully and resolutely, your rightful place in the Government."

"Now upon these questions hangs the issue of peace or war, and since the COMMON PEOPLE must be the ones to pay for the war, to fight the war and to endure all the agonies of the war, if war happens, we insist that the common people have a right to be consulted by you, who are their only representatives and their only voice, before they are plunged into war by any vote of yours:

"Therefore, we most earnestly urge that you Senators and Representatives order a referendum of these questions to the people themselves, and that the majority of the votes cast in that election be considered binding upon you when you act IN YOUR OFFICIAL CAPACITY upon the questions so submitted to the people's decision.

"That you have the power to go to the country for an expression of the people's will is beyond question.

"The Constitution, both by implication and by direction, gives you the power to order and to regulate elections of all kinds.

"The constitution also expressly recognizes THE PEOPLE as the fountain of all power, including the power of deciding to make war or peace.

"The Tenth Amendment reads:

"The powers not DELEGATED to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, OR TO THE PEOPLE."

"The Tenth Amendment was ratified in 1791, and it is practically an integral part of the original Constitution.

"The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are rightly construed to recognize the inherent, inalienable right of the American People to instruct their Government to do the will of the people; and, even in emergencies grave enough to justify such an extreme measure, to unite in convention or by referendum to change the forms and the personnel of their Government."

Pro-Ally as well as pro-German agree with the unbiased American patriot that our country's course has been distinctly unneutral. Let the people decide whether they approve this course, whether they are ready to sacrifice the lives of their sons, to maintain the naval supremacy of Great Britain. The voice of Mr. Hearst is the voice of Americanism. There are rumblings in Washington that lead us to hope that they will not die unheard.

Peace or War?

A Last Appeal

GENTLEMEN OF CONGRESS:

Though this appeal bears the date of April 4th, it will be in your hands on or before the 2nd of April. The 2nd of April ushers in the most important session of Congress since the Declaration of Independence made us a nation. In your hands rests not only the issue of peace or war, but the decision of the momentous question whether or not we shall disown forever the traditions of our Fathers. Shall we join the ensanguined circle of the war-crazed nations of Europe? Shall we sacrifice our cherished ideals, our interests, and the lives of our sons for the benefit of Great Britain, Russia, France and Japan?

Before you consent to plunge our nation into the maelstrom, consider calmly the forces that are at work to precipitate us into the war. Fortunately Wall Street has shown its claws: they protrude under the velvet cant of donating billions of dollars of our money to France. Wall Street is hungry because it cannot live on a paper diet. Wall Street discovers that the paper of the Allies is indigestible. Wall Street desires to change that paper into gold even if the blood of the American people is needed to accomplish the transmutation. The shameless attempt to foist upon the American taxpayer the war debts of the bankrupt Entente too clearly reveals the cunning of J. Pierpont Morgan and his associates.

True, the decision is already taken out of your hands. The Union League Club, usurping your functions, has declared war against Germany. Theodore Roosevelt has ordered the mobilization of our armed forces on land and sea. Poor Roosevelt! His memory was ever treacherous! He seems to forget that he is no longer President. Mr. Taft, repudiated as no President before him, gently indorses Roosevelt. Root, the perennial spokesman of corrupt interests, joins. What is the Constitution to Elihu Root, since his constitutional amendments were turned down by the people? Hughes who, by his double-dealing, forfeited not merely the election but the respect of the American people, likewise clamors for war. Can that be the same Hughes who assured a committee delegated to see him before the election that Mr. Wilson was responsible for the sinking of the "Lusitania"? Can it be the same Mr. Hughes who stamped his foot and denounced the one-sided neutrality of the Administration.

THE Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations asserts that a cabal of newspapers is attempting to dragoon us into war. Would it not be advisable to investigate the statement of Senator Stone? In a question of peace or war, his word should count no less than a message from President Wilson. Would it not also be desirable to ascertain from Secretary Lansing why he omitted from the official White Book submitted to Congress the British Order in Council

declaring the North Sea a war zone. This order is the root of all our evil. It is responsible for Germany's policy of retaliation. Without this order in Council, there would be no submarine warfare. If the Secretary of State had not done his utmost to obscure this fact, would the country, would Congress, be ready to go to war? What powerful influences, what sinister machinations, what egregious blunders, were responsible for his omission? Before you plunge into war, let us have the truth.

We are told that Germany has taken American lives, whereas England has merely violated and destroyed our property. This is untrue. We must charge against the State Department another grievous sin of omission. Why has the Secretary of State failed to call the attention of Congress to the destruction of the American steamship "Evelyn," on the 21st of February, 1915, by a British mine, illegally planted on the high seas? Why has the State Department suppressed the sinking of the steamship "Carib" by the same agency, without warning or warrant in international law? There was destruction of American property and American lives in both cases. We do not know all the facts, but all the facts should be in your possession before you make your decision. You also should endeavor to ascertain what would happen to American ships rashly entering upon the mined zone marked by Great Britain. What would happen to an armed merchantman opposing the indefensible and illegal demand of a British cruiser to submit to search in a British harbor?

When is the loss of American life a cause for war and when is it a subject for peaceful discussion? The Mexicans took American lives. They invaded our borders. They murdered our citizens in cold blood on our territory. But we are not at war with Mexico. England, in the case of the "Evelyn" and the "Carib," murdered American citizens by planting her mines upon the highways of the ocean. We did not go to war with England. We concealed the news from our people. Germany, in the pursuit of her war against England, not with the intention of harming us, destroyed American lives. We did not go to war with Germany when our provocation was great indeed. We expressed high admiration for the exalted attitude of the Imperial German Government after the "Lusitania." Why go to war, now, on far less provocation? Can it be, because for the first time the German submarine blockade seriously interferes with the transport of food and munitions to England? Shall we go to war, not to avenge our dead, but to protect our traffic in murder?

Are we to draw the sword not to maintain our rights, but to fulfil a gentlemen's agreement between our Government and the Government of Great Britain? The rumor of such an agreement persists. It may be traced to the mysterious will

of Cecil Rhodes. It may be of more recent origin. It may be entirely informal. But it would explain, where all other explanations fail, the contradictory attitude of our Government in dealing with the Entente and with the Central Powers. England had such an agreement with France, yet when the question was asked in the House of Commons, Sir Edward Grey lied like a gentleman. He denied the agreement. Nevertheless, it was this agreement that forced England into the war against the will of her people. In the beginning she hoped to be able to escape the consequences of her act. She was willing to pay with her fleet. She was willing to pay with her gold. To-day she is paying in blood. If we enter upon the war, no one knows into what abyss the next step may lead us.

WE have broken off relations with Germany. We are not at war with her. We are not at war with her allies. Any day may, however, bring the news of a clash. The Administration, in defiance of its constitutional limitations, decided to arm our merchantmen. Although she desires no war with us, Germany may be compelled to meet us by force of arms. Even in that event we may still escape the horror of war if, instead of following in the footsteps of Sir Edward Grey, we hold before our eyes the exalted example of Washington, Adams and Cleveland. Washington, according to Professor William I. Hull of Swarthmore College, in a situation similar to that confronting President Wilson to-day, sent a special envoy to England. The John Jay Treaty was the result. After the hostilities between France and the United States had actually begun in 1779, President Adams sent delegates to France and the war was stopped. A test of armed strength was avoided in the Venezuela boundary dispute by means of a joint commission. Can we not profit to-day by the examples of our fathers?

Why have not the President and the Secretary of State entered into a discussion of the whole subject of submarine warfare with Austria-Hungary? The recent friendly note of that power offered a broad basis on which to consider the whole question in the light of actual conditions, with regard for the essential rights of all parties. Why has the Administration rejected the suggestion of mediation recently made by a neutral? We do not know if it was actually submitted to us, but the press dispatches from Washington were such as to discourage even the attempt. How can we, who have peace treaties with all the world, honestly refuse mediation, unless

our hands are tied by a secret agreement? Why was the Swiss Minister subjected to indignities and to ridicule when he tried on his own responsibility to find a peaceful solution after the break, unless we have already sacrificed our independence? The United States was the first power to propose world-arbitration. Shall we be the first to toss it aside when it comes to a test? There can be no doubt that, with the exception of the munition makers and the professional jingoes supported by them, the people of the United States want, not war, but peace.

LET us remember this also before we plant our standard upon the bloody field that every European war in which we engage is necessarily fratricide: whoever the foe, some of us must shed the blood of their brothers. The loyalty of the Americans of German birth or descent is beyond question. Tried by fire and battle (never more severely than in the last thirty months) it has never failed. Yet our active participation in the war against German civilization will leave a rift in a million hearts that time cannot heal. We shall never be again what we were before if we fight England's battle. We shall undo the work of the Melting Pot. Whatever victory or defeat may bring to others, to us it will bring race hatred and prejudice and dissension.

Mr. Hughes was repudiated by the people, because the hate-distorted visage of Theodore Roosevelt seemed to peer over his shoulders. Mr. Wilson was reelected because "he kept us out of war." He was reelected because we believed that he would KEEP us out of war. Can the President, can you, go to war against the unmistakable mandate of the American people? The people want no war. Those who desire war are a small vociferous group whose shrill voices, raised again and again, awaken no echo save in the vaults of Wall Street. The war mongers represent millions—dollars, not men. Madness, with ravages exceeding in horror those of the Plague, has seized all continents but one. Dare we open our gates to that madness without consulting the people? Shall we deprive common sense and humanity of their last refuge, so that the angel of peace has not where to lay her head? War, even in Sherman's time, was hell. It is ten times as hellish to-day. Gentlemen of Congress, will you unloosen hell to redeem Mr. Morgan's coupons?

GEORGE SYLVESTER VIERECK.



EDITORIALS



NEW YORK, APRIL 18, 1917

PREPAREDNESS AND THE GERMAN-AMERICANS

THIS is the bloodiest Easter in the history of mankind. To us the entrance of the United States into the theatre of war spells a ghastly tragedy. We must accept the inevitable, but we may still strive to limit our participation to strictly American issues. Even the war cloud may have a silver lining. Distressing as war is to us, let us at least wring from adversity the utmost possible advantage to our country. We enter the fray unprepared. Let us profit by the hard school of experience. In the distance, through mists of blood and sweat and tears, we see a vision of America efficient.

Americans of German descent believe in preparedness. They opposed certain advocates of preparedness, because these men were in favor of equipping the United States not for its own need but for the needs of Great Britain. It may be that this attitude, as Edward A. Rumely points out, was mistaken. There is no question that weakness on our part drives us into the arms of England. Only the strong can be independent. With Germany's navy free, the rivalry between Germany and Great Britain was our safeguard. With the German navy landlocked, we are at the mercy of England. A reconciliation between the two foes would leave us at the mercy of either. Let us face this situation squarely. Since we must prepare, let us prepare thoroughly.

England desires to weaken all her allies financially. She also desires to weaken their sea power. Let us keep this fact in mind. She is playing her old game with us. She is playing it with a masterly hand. Before long we shall risk our ships while she keeps her ships at home. After the war, we shall be weaker instead of stronger, unless we carefully map out and carefully follow a program of naval expansion. Germany, with the second largest navy in the world, is unable to land troops in England. We, with a navy almost equal to that of Germany, are unable to maintain our sea rights against Great Britain, even when Great Britain is engaged in war with the Central Powers. Our merchants have been blacklisted. Our mails have been seized. Our commerce has been diverted. We submitted to Great Britain's lawless aggressions. We even decided to throw our weight into the balance in her favor. This policy may be farsighted, it may be wise, but it is the extreme of folly, unless we clearly determine to establish a navy equal to the combined navies of England, Germany and Japan. Never again must we play second fiddle to any power in the concert of nations.

With our tremendous resources, with a population of one hundred and ten million people, with a continent that can be self-sustaining, we can construct the most powerful machinery for defense in the world. England and her friends realize this danger. In spite of their vociferous protestations they are not honest advocates of preparedness for the United States. A powerful American army raised on the Swiss plan would be able to dominate absolutely the North American continent. This conflicts directly with British interests. It was to the advantage of England that, in a military sense, we should be weak. Hence she began a propaganda for pacifism. She pointed out that there was no need of defending our border. She foisted peace treaties upon us. Her spokesmen in our ranks were the opponents of militarism. The Carnegie Peace Foundation was horrified at the thought of universal service.

Pacifism was a mask of the Tory. When, however, England in distress needed our help, the mask slipped. Peace had no

friends among the pacifists. A few like William Jennings Bryan and David Starr Jordan, pacifists for the sake of humanity, not for the sake of Great Britain, continued to champion the cause of peace. The majority flopped to "preparedness." Compare the list of the so-called preparedness organizations and the list of advocates of peace in one form or another, and you will find that their membership is almost identical. However, the cloven hoof of John Bull is not difficult to discover. These gentlemen are for preparedness temporarily only. Their preparedness is a pseudo-preparedness. We are to raise soldiers only until German "militarism" is crushed. They have less to say of naval preparedness. When they speak of the navy they speak for preparedness with a reservation. We are to have the largest navy in the Pacific, but only the second largest navy in the Atlantic. The National Security League clearly proclaims this. Elihu Root tearfully pleads for preparedness, but never, never, for a navy in the Atlantic equal to cope with Great Britain. A large American navy in the Pacific is not displeasing to England. Japan may prove obstreperous. In time England hopes, the two navies may destroy each other.

England aspires to be our protector in the Atlantic. Our own Tories, likewise, wish us to remain dependent upon the British navy. It suits their plot to bring the United States again under the British crown. Honest Americans do not share this view. Yet the friends of Great Britain have so far been the most outspoken advocates of "preparedness." They have seized the movement and guided it to serve their own special interest. Now is the time for genuine Americans, irrespective of descent, to take this preparedness movement out of the hands of British agents and to make it a movement for America solely. Here lies the path of duty and the path of patriotism for Americans of German descent. Our navy may not take a decisive part in the present struggle. It will take us years to construct a navy great enough to meet the combined navies of the world. Except for the submarine, we may not have to grapple with the German navy at present. We may have to grapple with it in the future. We must also be prepared to defend ourselves against our present allies.

We are warring against Germany for the freedom of the seas. At present the odds are favoring us. We must be prepared to repeat our challenge under conditions less favorable. England, like Germany, is hourly offending against us. She will offend against us even more grievously when she no longer needs us. We must be ready to defend the freedom of the seas against England no less than against the Kaiser. We can defend ourselves against neither, if our naval power is crippled. Let us refuse to expose our ships except in defense of purely American interests and let us build ten ships for every ship that is sunk. Prudence dictates this policy. Patriotism demands it. The voice of the people confirms it. If we conscientiously adhere to this plan, if we increase our navy systematically until it is equalled by none, we shall be no longer the catspaw of any nation on land or sea. We shall occupy at last the place that is our due. We shall be first in war and first in peace.

GEORGE SYLVESTER VIERECK.