DR. STEPHEN S. WISE, ONCE PACIFIST, NOW IS FIRM FOR WAR

"What We Are Fighting For" Is Title of Stirring Article by Former Portland Rabbi, Who Scores People's Council.

DR. STEPHEN S. WISE ON WAR.

Dr. Stephen S. Wise, author of the accompanying article, "What We Are Fighting For," is rabbi of the Free Synagogue of New York City. He is well known in Portland, where he was formerly rabbi of Temple Beth Israel.

Dr. Wise's antipathy for war is well known. Before the present war began he was a member of the executive committee of the American Union Against Militarism. He withdrew from that organization and has been a firm and enthusiastic supporter of President Wilson's war programme. The discourse here printed is an eloquent and convincing answer to the pacifists who are now crippling America in the country's great struggle for democracy.

1. And in the 18th year, the 2 and 20th day of the first month, there was talk in the house of Nebuchadnezzar, King of the Assyrians, that he should, as he said, avenge himself on all the earth.

2. So he called unto him all his officers, and all his nobles, and communicated with them his secret counsel, and concluded the afflicting of the whole earth out of his own mouth.

3. Then they decreed to destroy all flesh, that did not obey the commandment of his mouth.

4. And when he had ended his counsel, Nebuchadnezzar, King of the Assyrians, called Holofernes, the chief captain of his army, which was next unto him, and said unto him,

5. Thus saith the great king, the lord of the whole earth, Behold, thou shalt go forth from my presence, and take with thee men that trust in their own strength, of footmen an hundred and twenty thousand; and the number of horses with their riders twelve thousand.

6. And thou shalt go against all the west country, because they disobeyed my commandment.

7. And thou shalt declare unto them, that they prepare for me earth and water: for I will go forth in my wrath against them, and will cover the whole face of the earth with the fest of mine army, and I will give them for a spoil unto them:

8. So that their slain shall fill their valleys and their brooks, and the river shall be filled with their dead, till it overflow;

9. And I will lead them captives to the utmost parts of all the earth.

10. Thou therefore shalt go forth, and take beforehand for me all their coasts: and if they will yield themselves unto thee, thou shalt reserve them for me till the day of their punishment.

11. But concerning them that rebel, let not thine eye spare them; but put them to the slaughter, and spoil them wheresoever thou goest.

12. For as I live, and by the power of my kingdom whatsoever I have spoken, that will I do by mine hand.—Judith ii:1-12.

41. For the earth hast thou not judged with truth.

42. For thou hast afflicted the meek, thou hast hurt the peaceable, thou hast loved liars, and destroyed the dwellings of them that brought forth fruit, and hast cast down the walls of such as did thee no harm.

43. Therefore is thy wrongful dealing come up unto the highest, and thy pride unto the mighty.

44. The highest also hath looked upon the proud times, and behold, they are ended, and his abominations are fulfilled.

45. And therefore appear no more, thou eagle, nor thy horrible wings, nor thy wicked feathers, nor thy malicious heads, nor thy hurtful claws, nor all thy vain body.

46. That all the earth may be refreshed, and may return, being delivered from thy violence, and that she may hope for the judgment and mercy of him that made her.—II Esdras xi:41-46.

11. For thy power standeth not in multitude, nor thy might in strong men: for thou art a God of the afflicted, an helper of the oppressed, an upholder of the weak, a protector of the forlorn, a savior of them that are without hope.

12. I pray thee, I pray thee, O God of my father and God of the inheritance of Israel, Lord of the heavens and earth, creator of the waters, and king of every creature, hear thou my prayer:

13. And make my speech and deceit to be their wound and stripe, who have purposed cruel things against thy convenant, and thy holy house, and against the top of Sion, and against the house of the possession of thy children.

14. And make every nation and tribe to acknowledge that thou art the God of all power and might and that there is none other that protecteth the people of Israel but thou.—Judith ix:11-14.

BY DR. STEPHEN S. WISE.

I HAVE the right to speak out. I have never feared to be in a minority. I am not fearful today. Show me a cause, and I will speak out though alone. I have never held, "My country, right or wrong." Whenever I believed my city, state or country to be in the wrong, I have dared to cry out, and I have done it again and again. What is more, I have done it at a cost. My convictions, like my pulpit, are my own. I have ever held with another American of alien birth, whom the perfidy of Prussia gave to America, a patriot in peace and a hero in war, "My country, when right to keep right, when wrong to set right."

Today, my country is in the right. My country is not only in the right but it is wholly, gloriously, solely in the right, and I mean to proclaim this even though I find myself almost for the first time one of an uncomfortably large majority.

A word must be spoken in justification of those of us who have been peace men, opponents of militarism, who seem now to belie the professions of a lifetime. The easiest way to dispose of us is to hold that we were fair-weather friends of peace, and that the moment it became difficult and hurtful to remain peace advocates, in that moment we scuttled like rats. Some of us think we may claim to have earned the right to respect for the integrity of our convictions on the score of unafraid speech and acts. But, I ask, what has happened to convert great numbers of us, lifelong anti-militarists, into inflexible supporters of the policies of the President, supporters of, to name a concrete embodiment of those policies, the reply of President Wilson to the peace-note of the Pope.

What is it, unless one lightly hold that we have succumbed to public clamor and stifled all convictions at its behest, that has moved us to keep these convictions to ourselves, and to urge, as I urge today, that we cannot and will not consider peace at the instance of Prussia or of any witting or unwitting agents of Prussia. The only peace the American people will ever be prepared to consider is a peace which must be disastrous to every hope of Prussia's rulers or a peace made over their heads and perhaps over their bodies with the German people, returned to reason and humaneness after the dethronement of the war-mad lords, who have been suffered to defile and to damn the whole German people.

What is the secret of the transformation of us who have been life-long anti-militarists into unequivocal supporters of the Government and its war policies? And, may I not parenthetically ask the further question, have we not the right to cherish a sense of grievance against a government, which makes us feel that such is the Germanled conspiracy against the peace and well-being of the world that we must first save the world as best we can before we dare hope to free it from the curse of war? The answer to the question, what has moved us to waive or to seem to waive our faith that war is never justifiable has been given adequately, as far as we are concerned, by the course of the President of the United States since August, 1914. He willed, as we willed, not to enter the war; he believed, as we believed, that the cause of just and durable peace would best be furthered by keeping our continent outside of the war zone, not that we might softly and meanly save ourselves and our sons, but that we might greatly and nobly serve a war-wearied world.

In all this, the personal reference must be forgiven, I was not neutral, not for one moment since the war began. I did not choose to side with the Allies. Prussia and Prussianism left me no freedom of choice. Prussia made a choice unnecessary, even impossible, since the beginning of the war to all those whose power to judge morally was not deadened by a sense of mistaken loyalties.

Is there any man who imagines that, because his mother or father was born within one of the Central European states, he must be a supporter of the present German government? I loved and honored my father, who was a native, and throughout much of his life a citizen, of one of the German Empires, but I will not dishonor my father in his grave by believing that if he were living he would not have felt as deeply as I feel that no room must be left in the world for that species of organized criminality temporarily invested with the name and title of the German government. It were a poor and woefully mistaken loyalty on my part to assume that my father would have condoned and even commended the Prussian way of 'live and not let live," which is abhorrent to the soul of every just being.

The President not merly willed to keep us out of war but throughout nearly three years of irritation and insult, of contumely and outrage, he achieved the miracle of keeping us out of war. Why did the President in the end lead us into the war? Because he saw that we were not so much challenged to war as to defend the elementary treasures and sanctities of life in the only terms intelligible to that band of militarists who had brought hurt to half the world and shame unutterable to their dumbly trusting and therefore unrevolting peoples. They who cry out that we at last yielded to the war-impulse and the war-hysteria forget or will to ignore the three years of unexampled patience on the part of the American people and our leader, and that we have not so much gone to war as set out to stay the fury of a desolating forest fire, its murderous flames fed of human will and purpose. If in the process we, starting backfires, must put our hands to weapons of force and fury, the fault before God lies not in ourselves but in those creatures of blood and iron whose last war this was in truth to be. None other would have been necessary if their work of terrorism had been well and quickly done in accordance with longtime and foul plotting. This is to be our last war that it may never again become possible to renew the criminal aggressions through which Germany planned to make war forever impossible.

We have frankly and fully given the reasons which have moved not a few peace advocates like myself to see that we could not serve Prussia better than by dealing with this war as if it were just another in a series of wars for land plunder, for trade spoliation. In the light of our candid confession, we may venture to turn to the People's Council with its resounding demands for peace and briefly consider the character of its leadership. Included therein—let us be just—are some men and women of blameless integrity, who hold that war is never justifiable, who therefore are opposed to the war in which we are engaged and to its vigorous and triumphant prosecution.

These are the pacifists in whose eyes England and France were as guilty yesterday—and we today—as was and is Germany of the crime of war. Perhaps even guiltier than Germany, for if the latter had met with no armed resistance in Belgium and France on the West, in Serbia on the south and Russia on the east, instead of bloody war we should have had peaceful, even benignant, penetration of all these lands by unchallenged and therefore unoffending Germany!

But groups other than the uncompromising pacifists are to be found in the leadership of the People's Council and these, mindful of the seriousness of my charge, I accuse of readiness to accept an outcome of the war which would not bring peace to men, but seal the dominance of the sword in the world. Numerically strongest in the leadership of the People's Council is a group of Socialists, not of the parlor or drawing-room variety, but of the basement and cellar type, who, like their German colleagues from the beginning of the war, have served the interests of Germany rather than that genius of internationalism which is supposed to preside over the councils of the Socialist party. These American Socialists have not frankly admitted that they were pro-German, but, if their lead had been followed, we should have remained permanently neutral as between savage, offending Germany and all her desolated victims. The Socialist party has, we have come to see, been politically and morally tainted by the German captaincy of a nominally internationalist movement and we are rejoiced to see some brave spirits step out of the Socialist ranks and protest, to use the vocabulary of Socialism, against a completely bourgeois acceptance of the Prussian programme by the rank and file of American Socialists.

The strict and straight pacifist attitude is intelligible, however gravely erring we deem it. Even the Socialist position is not inexplicable, though lamentable from the view point of those who had hoped for a helpfully international mind in Socialist circles. But there is a third group dominant in the People's Council, its supermen, to use what is not unfitting in the circumstances—a bit of German terminology. The impromptu peace advocates tell us: "We have come in the midst of war to aid in the cause of peace." Is it ungracious to ask the question—what has moved these persons for the first time in their lives to espouse the cause of peace? They know, but they will not speak. I know and I will speak for them. They have come to aid the cause of peace not for the sake of America, nor yet chiefly for the sake of peace, but primarily, if not solely, for the sake of Pax Germanica, a peace that shall be made in Germany even as the war was made by Germany.

These gentlemen, whose peace passion is rather recent and belated, long viewed with the equanimity of silence, if not with vocal satisfaction, the war that is, although the war today is not one whit more terrible than it was on the day the Prussian wreckers of the world's peace battered down the gates of Belgium and flooded the land with a sea of terror. The war is more extensive in area, but it is not by one iota more awful than on the day which found the German armies, under the captaincy of the Prussian mind, desolating Belgium and France and beginning a reign of terror, which will justly move the world to give the Huns a second place by the side of the unpitying brutism of the Prussian hosts.

These improvisators in the symphony of peace were little disturbed by the fiendishness of the German army, the dishonor of German statesmanship, the ruthlessness of every step in the processes of Germany's war upon mankind. Therefore, we who were and are anti-militarists and have never been neutral as between Germany and a world at bay, we, who in the word of Professor Vernon Kellogg, are not for war, but for this war to a just end, we

turn to these gentlemen of the People's Council—one of whom grievously and it may yet prove disastrously, misrepresents the mind of the American Jew—and we say: You cry for peace and purport to be the People's Council. Which people do you represent? Not the American people! Not the British, nor the French, nor the Belgian, nor the Russian, nor the Serbian, nor the Italian! The People's Council! You are the betrayers of the peoples of earth. God pity the peoples whose cause you feign to champion. Is it perhaps the German people? No, not even they, for you are not their friend as are we who would, and under God will, liberate them. If by any moral calamity the People's Council should gain the ascendancy in American life, the German people would be perhaps forever enslaved by that Hohenzollernism whose doom under the heavens we have willed and spoken.

No, these gentlemen, the impromptu advocates of peace a la Bernstorff, are not doing the will of Germany, unknowingly or unknowingly they are doing the will of Germany's imperial masters. They represent the people of Germany as little as they represent the people of the United States. As far as their participation therein is concerned the People's Council might be given the subject of—Wilhelmstrasse. If anything this is a conspiracy against the people of Germany—to perpetuate their bondage, to rivet a little tighter the Hohenzollern chains. After another generation, not Michaelis, not Luxburg, not Kuhlemann nor a handful of their American coadjutors—one of whom, I grieve to say, is a Jew, negligible in himself, but for one reason or another possessed of powerful friends and supporters in Jewish affairs—will ever be cherished as the liberators of Germany as will be cherished Liebknecht the German and Woodrow Wilson the American.

The first, in a sense inclusive, demand of one of the authoritative spokesmen of the People's Council is "A speedy and universal and democratic peace." But this raises the fundamental question to which a new emphasis has been given by the President's reply to the Pope—a reply that is not so much, as it has been called, a political coup as a spiritual achievement of the highest order. How can any terms of peace be considered as long as the present German government remains unshaken and peace must be concluded therewith? There was a time when it might have been asked—who will guarantee the good faith of the imperial masters of Germany bound up with the eternal infamy of the names Liege and Louvain, the Lusitania and the Sussex, Cavell and Fryatt? Who can guarantee the good faith of any covenant made with the professors of the scrap-of-paper theory of treaties? That day has gone and gone forever. The Kaiser's work is become the villainy of Zimmermann, the perfidy of Luxburg, the shame of Bernstorff.

The only way to guarantee the good faith of any treaty made with the German government is to make no treaty with it that is not sealed by the German people after it shall have regained freedom. Let some of the leaders of the People's Council get into touch with the governments, if not the peoples, of the central powers, which governments ought not be inaccessible to them, and let these make clear that the world is resolved to make no peace with the German peoples as long as Kaiserism, uncontrolled and irresponsible, remains their accredited agent. They must give guarantees of good faith to the allied peoples which guarantees Kaisers must be certified to be neither free nor able to repudiate.

Speedy, universal and democratic peace! Let us not be deceived. These terms are not interchangeable. Peace might be effected speedily and universally. If withal the peace be not democratic, it will not be worthy of the name of peace. That the peoples of earth desire peace, speedy and universal, is the veriest truism, for such yearning is born out of the travail and agony of three years of hell-like war. The one guarantee upon which the bleeding peoples must insist is that the peace shall be democratic, for none other can be just and lasting. Kaisers broke peace and made war. The people must break Kaisers and make peace.

The first urging of the authorized representative of the Peace Council was an immediate public statement of our war aims and our peace terms. The President has since made such a statement—a statement instinct with the statesmanship which the imperial German government is unable to envisage, instinct with the magnanimity which it had confounded with all-suffering cowardice. None the less, in the light of the President's immortal utterance, which rather takes the matter alike out of the hands of the Kaiser and the People's Council, we may give more specific answer to some of the questions raised by and on behalf of the People's Council.

"Will we be ready to end the war and make peace if this ruthless submarine warfare be ended?" The war has long ceased to be a matter of ending ruthless submarine warfare. There will be no peace until the German people, disobedient to the Hohenzollern vision, are ready to end their sub-human warfare, ruthless and truthless, on sea and on land and in the air, against the peace and security of the world. It seems needless iteration to say to the spokesman of the People's Council, anent his sneer touching the making of the world safe for democracy, that what we the fighting for is nothing less than that high and majestic end. "What degree of safety do we require and what degree of democracy will satisfy us?" Such a degree of safety is required that a renewal of the German imperial felony shall be impossible, such a degree of safety as shall be assured to the world by the inability or the unwillingness of Germany to renew the crime of 1914, such a degree of democracy as can come only after the passing of Kaiserism, militarism, junkerism.

What are we fighting for? The answer is best given by considering a further query, far from ingenuous, of the People's Council, "Is a military defeat of Germany absolutely essential before we shall agree to peace so that Germany and all men may know that Germany's militarism is not invincible?" Yes, I repeat, Germany and all men must know—and Germany must prove that she knows—that her militarism is not invincible by adopting such a policy of national renunciation as shall make clear her understanding, however sorrowful, that no nation against which the world must perforce unite is invincible. Far from achieving gains of territory and population and power through assailing the sons and daughters of men and violating every scruple of the moral sense of mankind, the German people must come to see that German militarism has brought down upon her the loathing of the lawful and honorable peoples of earth and that it necessitate a concert of peoples in order to prevent the world being made unsafe for democracy and peace by reason of German autocracy and German militarism.

Germany must not only be compelled to realize that her militarism is far from invincible, but this must be brought home in a Germanly, understandable way. In a word, no gain of any kind must be suffered to accrue to Germany in consequence of the war. Not invincible and most unprofitable must German militarism be shown to be to the German people. It is because of this that the evacuation of ravaged lands and the restoration of plundered goods will not suffice. If at the end of the war the central European alliance be established under Prussian domination, for one thing Prussia will have won a hundred Belgiums and Alsace-Lorraines, and over and beyond that the seed will have been planted which in the next generation will yield a harvest of bitter and bloody revolt against Prussian dominance by the alien rather than allied, peoples of Austro-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey. In a word, Prussia must not be permitted to reimburse itself for its failure in the west by annexing Central Europe. No gain or profit of any kind for Germany from this war—must be Germany's fate as it is the decree of free peoples. Germany must long remain, as she is become, infinitely poorer by reason of the forfeiture of the world's respect, which nothing less than the exorcism of the devil of militarism shall ever regain for the purged soul of the Germans.

They, who speak with the authority of the People's Council, not alone urge that we must accept the peace programme which more than anything else has divided, and, for a time in any event broken, Russia, but that it is incumbent upon us to take over the Russian programme in its entirely because of its finer ethical quality. These friends neither of Russia nor of Russian freedom scornfully bid the American people remember "that the idealistic war aims of the Russians must be made the war aims of their allies." I make bold to hold that no aims can be more idealistic than our own, not even the Russian war aims, assuming that these were Russian rather than what they are, namely, of Prussian origin and Prussian imposition. The Russians at best are fighting for their own freedom primarily and only secondarily for the freedom of the world. We are warring primarily for the freedom of the world and only secondarily, if at all, for our own. They are the friends of Russia who understand that any alliance with the Hohenzollerns at this time would prove fatal to Russian freedom and democracy as has been the rule of the Romanoffs, with the difference that the Romanoff dynasty was blundering, ineffective and removable, but that it might take generations of bloodshed to dislodge the super-efficient rule of the Hohenzollerns. The Prussian alliance with the Romanoffs long delayed the day of Russian freedom. Let not Russia again invite Prussia to become her evil star.

Happily the Russian people do not require to be warned against the insidious counsel of Prussian agents, whether in Germany or in these United States, that they must choose between Prussia on the one hand, and England, France, Italy and these United States on the other. If they choose Prussia, they will go back to autocracy. If they choose the Allied nations they will take their place in the march of triumphant democracy. If the Russians choose Prussia, they will have neither peace nor democracy. If they and we stand together, Russia's will be democracy and peace will be the portion of all free peoples. If Russia, I repeat, should part from her allies, these will go on, but Russian freedom and democracy will for a time in any event go out. And Russia will have been betrayed not for the first time by the wiles and power of Prussia. The House of Romanoff appears not to be alone in its readiness to sacrifice Russian wellbeing upon the altar of Prussian purpose.

What is this German-manufactured peace programme to which when we are told "Would to heaven that this were Germany's programme for peace," we are tempted to reply, "Why drag in heaven?" For in truth this is not Russia's heavenly peace programme but Germany's hell-born war aim. The People's Council of Peace and Democracy offers its approval of the so-called peace terms of the Russian Republic. "No forcible annexations, no punitive indemnities, free development of all nations and peoples and nationalities." "No forcible annexations!" We understand the English of it, but what is the Prussian of the term, "No forcible annexations?" Even if it were true, as it is false, that the resolutions of the Reichstag commit Germany, as far as Germany is commitable, to the acceptance of "No forcible annexations," such of the world as is guided by the instinct of honor and truthfulness will rightly demand that Prussia define in unequivocal and unmistakable terms, "No forcible annexations." The German government may conceive that the permanent occupancy of Belgium, or the choicest parts thereof, would not constitute "forcible annexation," but rather peaceable permeation. Who besides the leaders of the People's Council will presume to guarantee that the retention of Belgium will not come under the category of a much-used term in Prussia, "the rectification of the western frontier," that this is the obviating of a neighbor inconveniently faithful to a plighted covenant? Germany wills not to annex. She merely aims to bless, to be surrounded by morally rapeable neighbors such as broken little Luxemburg or Switzerland, Holland and Sweden.

But the German Chancellor, with strange disregard of the niceties of relationship to one's allies and defenders in belligerent countries, has refrained from indorsing the programme of the People's Council, "No forcible annexations." His word is "The fate of Belgium must be left to the hands of our negotiators"; and our word to him and through him to the people to whom he is nominally responsible is, "As long as you speak of Belgium in the terms of negotiation, no American who is not ready to palter with American honor will mention the word peace. Preliminary and unconditional must be the evacuation of Belgium, the restoration of the land and reparation to its tragically suffering people." As long as Germany and her rulers speak of Belgium's fate in the terms of future negotiation, we cannot meet to consider peace, for there is no language which we can speak in common. We are in truth ready to sacrifice much, to invest all we have and all we are, the treasure of the Nation and the priceless life of its sons. Yea, there is no sacrifice that we will not offer up ere we shall suffer Germany to hold a foot of Belguim soil, to retain any power tangible or intangible over Belgium with the freedom of which the honor of free peoples is bound up.

For yet another reason, "No forcible annexations" does not meet the needs of the world's situation as we see it. For "No forcible annexations," even assuming that it imply the restoration of Belgium to itself, has no reference whatsoever to the question of Alsace-Lorraine. Alsace-Lorraine must be restored to France as truly as Belgium must be restored to itself. The restitution of stolen goods is not in courts of law considered cruelly punitive but elementarily just. Alsace-Lorraine, apart from the agony endured by its people for 40 years, was the price which Prussia offered the kingdoms and peoples of Germany for their acquiescence in the Imperial hegemony of Prussia, for their assent to the programme of blood and iron, that is the looting of lands and the blood-letting of their peoples.

To the representative of the People's Council, who with an almost Prussian sense of reality and a wholly Prussian scorn of the immaterial, asks: "Have we gone to war to help France get back her lost provinces, and are we committed to the theory of restoring all provinces lost in the past 50 years?" I answer: "No, we did not go to war to help France get back her lost provinces, for France refrained for 40 years from attempting to right the unspeakable wrong which the world suffered Prussia to inflict upon France. While we have not gone to war to help France get back her lost provinces, we are not going to have peace until the shameful deed of 1871 be undone, until the crime which wrested two lands and two peoples from the France of their imperishable love and put them under the heel of that foreign brutality which culminated in Zabern shall have been expiated by the return of inalienable Alsace-Lorraine from the hands of Prussia to the arms of France.

To the spokesman of the People's Council it appears to be highly undesirable "to embark upon the complicated enterprise of restoring lost provinces," and that "all territorial readjustments must be secured through negotiation." We must be permitted to dissent from the designation, "the complicated enterprise of restoring lost provinces," and to say that nothing could be simpler than the enterprise of restoring stolen not lost provinces, provinces as wantonly ravaged from France in 1871 as Belgium was ravaged in 1914. It is not without significance that the voice of the People's Council anticipates the decree of a Prussian master. "All territorial readjustments must be secured through negotiation." Let it be understood alike by the People's Council of Prussia and the Michaelists and Kuhlemann's of the United States that evacuation, reparation and restoration are beyond the reach of negotiation until that hour, which will never come, that shall find the American people wearied of sacrifice in order to reaffirm the freedom even of the least of peoples.

The People's Council, with an indifference to the wrongs perpetrated by Prussia that is born either of cynical levity or an insufficiently disguised Prussian sympathy, reaffirms the "no punitive indemnities" of the quasi-Russian peace plan. With appalling disingenuousness this aim is linked with the word of the President: "We desire no conquest and no dominion. We seek no indemnity for ourselves, no material compensation." For one thing, it is of the very essence of insincerity to allude to indemnity as if it were of necessity punitive. Moreover, it is known of all men that we shall never stoop to demand indemnity nor defile ourselves by taking over any measure of Germany's gold. We, however, are not circumstanced as are Serbia and Belgium. These are entitled not merely to evacuation and to restoration, but to that indemnity which the superrefined and Teutonically delicate taste of the People's Council may look upon as punitive, which an unvindictive world will view as justified by every instinct of right feeling alike toward Germany and the peoples which she has brought low.

As for the third item of the programme, "The free development of all nations and peoples and nationalities," —to offer this in the name of Prussia is a sorry jest. The very cornerstone of the Prussian structure of state is none other than a complete and wanton disregard for the freedom of nations and peoples unless these are physically strong enough to maintain their own freedom. A German victory, happily become unthinkable, would mean the end of freedom for every nation and people that was not able to secure it through the arbitrament of the sword. Germany is warring upon the world and the world, including our Nation, has accepted the gage of battle because all men, who are not in thrall to Teutonism, understand that the triumph of German arms would end freedom and self-rule for every lesser people that did not bow the knee in the temple of the new Rimmon. For it is incontestably true that the German government has ceased to revere right as right. It obeys no law but that of might; it honors no sanction save that of power; it reveres no shrine unless it be a fortress.

In maintaining as we do that the policies of the People's Council, if accepted by Americans, would inflict untold hurt not only upon Prussia's bleeding victims, but upon the moral fabric which up to this time has withstood the storm of war, I point out and literally cite utterance after utterance of an authorized spokesman of the People's Council. The People's Council is for the most part guilty of a blundering moral judgment which vitiates every counsel that it may choose to offer the nations. The People's Council is neutral as between Germany and Belgium, between Austria and Serbia, between Turkey and Armenia. The American people have long since ceased to be neutral as between Germany and the nations upon which she is waging war. The People's Council deals with this war as if it were "just a war," "another war," as if it were another of history's mighty conflicts in the interest of territorial agrandizement or trade opportunity, as if Germany and England, Germany and France, being alike at war—these nations were equally guilty of the unspeakable crime of war.

Is further proof required of the moral neutrality of the People's Council, which moral neutrality was indefensible even during that time in which neutrality of action was officially enjoined, than the proposal of the representative of the People's Council that there be "an international assumption of the expense of reconstruction devastated areas in Europe, a large proportion to be borne by the United States in return for guarantees of future peace"? Such "international assumption" would be thinkable in a world which had surrendered to Prussian arms or been subdued to Prussian alms. But nothing less than Prussian triumph could ever necessitate so basely craven a solution of a war problem. That many, if not all, of the leaders of the People's Council view the Teutonic and the allied nations as equally responsible for the world disaster is witnessed by the use of the phrase "the imperialistic ambitions of the belligerents," "be they called autocracies or democracies," as if this war were the result of clashing "imperialist ambitions" — a phrase which in truth points not to moral neutrality, but to the condonation of all that Prussia has done and the condemnation of the allied powers, irrespective of guilt or innocence.

Nothing interprets the mind of the People's Council better than a word of its accredited champion, seemingly innocuous but in truth charged with the poison of ill-will and bitterness toward those European nations, that thwarted the lawless and dastardly conspiracy of the imperial German government. "We know how futile all wars are, this one among them." Futile, forsooth! The war of 1871 was not futile. It was an immeasurable triumph for the new Germany created by the mind of Bismarck and fortified by arms under the leadership of Von Moltke. The war of 1914 would not have been futile if England unconquerable and France all-glorious had not stepped into the breach and by the side of little Belgium, with bared and bleeding body have withstood the most foul and fiendish assault upon the peace of the world that has ever been made. This war, viewing the ambition of imperial Germany, will be futile because our allies and we have willed that futile it shall be. It will not be futile if the American people commit the inexpiable moral blunder of bargaining and trafficking with Germany touching the fate of any of the lands German-invaded.

The American people will give scant hearing to any unpaid servant of Kaiserism possessed of such imperturable moral serenity as to look upon this world-war and to speak of it as nothing more than futile. In truth, if futile it happily prove, it will be because of the righteous and holy wrath, not shared by the People's Council, which the godlessness and inhumanity of Germany's deeds have aroused among such Americans as are not serenely indifferent to the supreme moral factors of the international strife. They can do little for peace and democracy who speak and act with regard for the war as if two bands of ruffians were causelessly scrimmaging in the streets, as if nothing more were at stake than the outcome of a futile struggle between two equally guilty war groups. They can little serve either peace or democracy who are indifferent to the origins of a war, which is nothing less than a mightily and all but irresistibly organized assault upon the right of the lesser peoples to choose their own way of life instead of having it made in Germany for them.

I charge the People's Council with inability or unwillingness to understand the majestic purposes of the President in moving to make the world safe for democracy as revealed by its word, "The Peace Conference will be convened as soon as the German people move on from the measure of democracy they now have to the measure of democracy which the President thinks they ought to have." The question is not one of the measure of democracy which the German people have, for they have none, even though they have been deluded anew by their imperial masters into prating of the democracy by them enjoyed. Nor is the issue bound up with "the measure of democracy which the President thinks they ought to have," a fling at the august aims of the President of which no man concerned with the attainment of democratic ideals by any people could be guilty. It is not that the President thinks the German people ought to have a larger measure of democracy. The German people might be free to go on under the autocratic conditions which are their own, were it not for the circumstance to be commended to the People's Council that it is because of the absence of democratic control in Germany that the world is in arms today. If Germany could be isolated from the rest of the world, it might remain undisturbed in its autocracy forever. A Germany that would dwell by the side of free peoples must free itself to the point of denying to any man or group of men the right and the power to stage such a dire tragedy as has befallen the sons of men by reason of the unchecked power of a group of imperial dynasts.

The People's Council affirms that the "basis of peace as outlined by the President are substantially agreed to by all the belligerents." That may be the Prussian, but is not the English of it. This statement is one which proves, alas, that the debasement or Germanization of the minds of men is a phenomenon not limited to German-speaking lands. "Substantially agreed to," granting of course that the restoration and enfranchisement of Belgium are not of the substance of the issue at stake.

Knowing as we do that the voice of a great organ of German opinion, "Neither Hindenburg nor the Emperor is minded to deprive himself of the fruits of victory by adhering to the surface-meaning of the resolution adopted in the Reichstag," has not ceased to embody the mind of Germany, to hold that the bases of peace as outlined by the President are substantially agreed to by all the belligerents is of a piece with that solicitude for the well-being of the Kaiser which moves the People's Council nervously and fearfully to insist, "the President's message does not call for the dethronement of the Kaiser despite newspaper headings, nor of any of the present rulers of Germany," is of a piece with that insincerity that deprecates "the suppressing of Stockholms and such other international meetings of non-governmental representatives as the peoples themselves may arrange," when it is known of all men that Stockholm was but one skirmish in the Prussian peace-drive which would have menaced anew rather than have safeguarded the freedom and integrity of peoples; is of a piece with that un-American, if not anti-American, attitude which suffers the People's Council to proclaim, "certainly these political changes in Germany, in America, in every land of the world are essential," as if the German autocracy and the American republic were in the same need of democratization. Any man who directly, or by indirection, alludes to political changes in Germany and America looking toward democratization as if these were equally needed in both lands has morally forfeited the priceless dignity of American citizenship.

What are we fighting for? I have sought to give answer. I have not spoken without regard to such mothers and fathers as have heard me nor been unmindful of the heartbreak which the war will soon come to mean to men and women scattered throughout the land, the light of whose eyes will have failed and the joys of whose hearts will have faded forever if the war go forward to its awful consummation of loss and sacrifice. What are we fighting for? My answer to mothers and fathers is, enviable, even glorious, is your lot if you give your sons or bless their self-dedication to the highest and hollest of causes in which a people was ever engaged.

Remember that you, American men and women, give your sons to no ordinary war, though outwardly it be war and nothing more. Remember that America is not in the war for the sake of war. Grimly mocking paradox though it be, we have taken up the burden of war not for war's sake but for the sake of peace, which we would fain have bless victor and vanquished alike. We have taken up arms, which we shall not ground until the world be made safe in the only way in which the life of nations dwelling together can be made safe—by democracy with peace and healing on its wings.

Remember, mothers and fathers, this is not a war. It is the war. It is the contest of the ages, which we and our allies together can make the last holocaust of we be mighty in war and even mightier in the generosities and magnanimities of peace. Your sons have taken up arms not to slay but to bring the hope of unbroken life to countless generations unborn. As your sons face forth, be strong, mothers and fathers, in the knowledge that the sacrificial task upon which they are bent is nothing less than to make the world free. If suffering and agony be your lot, call to mind the little children of Armenia, the wronged women of Belgium, the enslaved men of Servia, and know that these things can never again come to pass if your sons, our younger brothers, be equal to the challenge which a free world dare not refuse to meet.

And when you join in the act of sacrifice, let your spirit be willing and even joyous as befits the task that summons. Forget not that the sacrifice is to be for that which is more precious than life, even as holy as love, the liberty of men, the security of peace, the faith of nations. Your readiness to sacrifice may make sacrifice unasked hereafter and your children's children, yea all the children of men, shall dwell amid peace and security if the nobleness of the fathers be equal to the heroism of the sons.

It is not too late to save the world, to make and keep the world free, to rebuild an order of life that shall be just and righteous altogether. That shall come to pass if you claim for your sons something better than life, remembering:

"Twer man's perdition to be safe
When for the truth he ought to die.

Lincoln loved not war, nor more than we, who loved humanity as few men on earth have loved humankind, nor more than Woodrow Wilson, who endured all for peace until he must needs dare war thereafter. And Lincoln on the 4th day of March, 1865, as the shadows were beginning to darken around him after four long, terrible, bloody years of war, said, and we the heirs of his spirit and of his hope proclaim anew: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace."

MARION GRANGE ELECTS

Subordinate Branches Report at Turner Meeting.

TURNER, Or., Oct. 20.—Marion County Pomona Grange met here on Wednesday with a large representation present from the subordinate Granges. The reports from the subordinate Granges were very encouraging, showing the interest which they manifest in all live topics of the day.

The address by Mr. Eddy on "Vocational Education" was followed by an address by County Agent Brown. A class of 12 was initiated in the fifth degree. Thelma Deizell sang a patriotic selection.

The officers elected are: Master, W. H. Stevens; overseer, J. E. Whitehead; lecturer, Mrs. Rebecca Smith; steward, A. P. Kirsch; assistant steward, W. A. Jones; chaplain, Mrs. Mary Howd; secretary, Mrs. Eva Jones.

HOOD RIVER WOMEN BUSY

More Than $3000 Raised by Newly Organized Chapter.

HOOD RIVER, Or., Oct. 20.—(Special.)—The ways and means committee of the Hood River Chapter of the Red Cross, organized on May 17, by various sources adopted for raising revenue for the chapter in a period of five months has accumulated a net sum in excess of $3000. Walter Kimball, a rancher of the Summit district, appointed chairman of the ways and means committee, has devoted practically his entire time to the work of the Red Cross.

The sum of $700 has to date been realized by the ways and means committee's rummage sales. The largest item of the total sum raised, however, will come from donations of fruit and vegetables made by Valley ranchers and orchardists.