

0

89

THE WAR AND RELIGION

LONDON AGENTS :
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL AND CO., LTD.

NEW YORK :
LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO., FOURTH AVENUE
AND THIRTIETH STREET.

THE WAR AND RELIGION

BY

ALFRED LOISY

TRANSLATED BY

ARTHUR GALTON

9.5.21.

REFERENCE

"Vos, quibus est virtus, muliebrem tollite luctum"

HOR.: Epod. xvi.

OXFORD

B. H. BLACKWELL, BROAD STREET

1915

Presented by
P. SOUTTER Esq.,
A.M.I.C.E.,
OF
BANGALORE CITY.

*(Sometime Deputy Chief Engineer
to the Calcutta Port Commissioners.)*

1921.

9.5.21.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
AUTHOR'S PREFACE - - - - -	vii
TRANSLATOR'S PROLOGUE - - - - -	xv
THE WAR AND RELIGION - - - - -	1
THE WAR - - - - -	4
THE CHURCHES - - - - -	28
RELIGION - - - - -	58



REFERENCE

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE TRANSLATION

THE following pamphlet was not written with a translation in view. The examination of any page will show that it was composed only for French readers, and solely with regard to the state of opinion and of parties in France, but above all to further the moral interests of our country. It is chiefly, then, as a French witness to matters concerning France that it can be offered with propriety to English inquirers. If perchance it bring them something more than information, if they find in it any reasons for esteem and friendliness towards our country, or maybe a reason for increased confidence in the value of her co-operation in our combined labours for the general culture of humanity, the author will rejoice all the more at a consequence which he did not in the least foresee.

It has not been thought advisable to make any change in statements which are now several months old. Nothing would be easier than to make changes and additions that might bring them into line with accomplished facts; but nothing, either, would be

more childish than such corrections. To insert them surreptitiously into a new edition would only render more glaring any disagreement between our forecasts and the actualities which time has now revealed.

The chief event which has occurred since our first appearance is the entrance of Italy into the European war, under conditions of perfect national sincerity and of loyal courage. Italy has intervened at the critical moment, when a vulgar prudence might have recommended her to wait longer; she is aiming at the realization of her political ideals, while she is also advancing the cause of humanity.

If certain people have found the judgment expressed here on the attitude of Benedict the Fifteenth too severe and premature, the Pope himself in some recent interviews has taken upon himself to confirm it. In so great a position and in such tragical circumstances, every utterance that is not favourable to justice and benevolence can only be a fraud; and it would seem that Benedict the Fifteenth is not cautious enough in his mystification of the faithful.

It is on account of the serious friction which the religious problem has caused in France during some twenty years; on account, also, of certain movements which seem likely not only to revive but to over-stimulate those religious questions after the war; as well, too, because some people have proclaimed that the whole French nation, both those who have been fighting and those who are

proud of their defenders, being carried away by the war, will surrender itself entirely and without reserve to the catholic and Roman faith: for these reasons, it has seemed advisable to show how groundless the latter assertion really is, and at the same time to draw attention to the disagreeable and unfavourable position that the papacy has brought itself into by its attitude towards the European conflict. As to its pretence of being a neutral witness, it must be urged that it is the meanest and most despicable attitude which could possibly be adopted in face of those problems of law, of political, social, and individual morality which the war has accentuated, on the part of an authority which professes to have been established by Christ to point out the way of righteousness and justice to all nations. From Belgium and from France, devout catholics have turned in their distress towards the throne of Peter; and they discovered, to their confusion, that his throne was empty.

If I have not hesitated to point out this failure of the Roman pontificate, and if I have indicated briefly why this eclipse has resulted logically from its history; even if I have not shrunk from emphasizing the contradiction, which certainly exists, between the gospel and the duty of patriotism, whether the latter take the monstrous form of Germanic imperialism, or the more lawful shape which it assumes among the nations of the anti-German alliance; I do not presume to settle by a single

event, however considerable it may be, those fundamental questions about which Roman catholics and the various reformed churches are divided, as well as Christians in general and all those others who find it impossible to give or maintain their allegiance to any Christian organization. I desire only to show why the war may not alter the relative position of parties in France, so far as religion is concerned; why the very numerous and varied parties or groups of those who are undenominationalists have good and permanent reasons for remaining as they are: why, even, they may find through the war itself, by the manifest inability of the gospel to soften its horrors, or to put an end to the scourge and to solve the problem which it raises, a confirmation of their principles and a further justification of their detachment from Christianity. Everyone will understand that the author could not touch on the general question of the Christian origins and the history of Roman catholicism without falling back on opinions acquired long ago, through a life-time of study; opinions which are well known to the learned public in France, and not wholly unknown abroad.

Every earnest Christian will protest against what he may read here about the impotence of the gospel to realize its ideal. Before this protest, which the author understands perfectly, he will maintain a respectful silence. He has dealt with it already, so far as he was able; and this is no time for vain discussions. Moreover, they will be entirely mistaken who, from the slight allusions which the author

has made to the Christian ideal and the papal system, imagine that he thought of denying the essential qualities of the gospel, or the important share that the church has taken in the progress of European civilization, or even the beneficent influence of both in civilizing our present society. The author has merely wished to point out that our own civilization, in order to grow, has had to emancipate itself from the catholicism of Rome, and to discard the letter of the gospel while remaining inspired by its spirit: indeed, to progress ever nearer towards an ideal which is truly and completely humane, our society must pursue this course of emancipation without disowning its inspiring cause.

What is said farther on about the spirit which animates the French Army is derived from personal information. It might be objected that the common run of soldiers in the midst of battle are not stirred by a religious devotion to their country, but that they are all possessed by a keen desire to slay so as not to be slain themselves; also that, outside the fighting, many plain men do not offer to the service of their country the lofty ideal expressed in the letter by an officer, which is reproduced in these pages from an article by M. Maurice Barrès. The religion of combatants, then, if the argument must be pushed to its extreme limit, has not receded from the Christian standard of the various national religions, but has approached the religion of wild beasts in the act of tearing each other to pieces, if indeed such beasts have a religion.

But, in the quotation mentioned, what is dealt with is the moral sentiment which inspires and guides the action of a combatant, rather than the natural eagerness which impels him to sell his life dearly, by killing as many as possible so as not to be himself killed. Godfrey of Bouillon and Saint Louis, in the heat of battle, slaughtered so as not to be slaughtered: they could not meditate on Christ and eternal life, except in the intervals of rest, unless indeed they were not even more preoccupied than in giving orders. They did not imagine they were less likely to obtain their place in heaven because they murdered for the holy sepulchre. The atrocity of their warfare has been dimmed by a religious atmosphere, which was that of Christianity. The religious atmosphere of our warfare, which is more revolting than the crusades, consists in the love of country.

Nothing is more likely than that the exterior manifestation and the intensity of patriotic sentiment should vary in different individuals; it is even possible that among a certain number of men almost wholly uncultivated this sentiment may be half, or more than half, unconscious. Such men, if they trust their leaders, will sacrifice themselves almost without a thought, and as generously as the choicer sort; they will offer themselves at need for the most dangerous enterprises, and this does not keep them from sinking directly afterwards into their usual common-place, since they are entirely unconscious of their own heroism. But who would

deny in them a true sentiment of patriotism ? Is it not even truer, that through not thinking for themselves, if one may say so, they nevertheless think and feel with their more educated comrades, and with their leaders; and that they have a share in the ideal which they are serving, although in ordinary times they are hardly capable of expressing it ? How many pious souls are there not, in all the Christian denominations who would be hard put to it to give intelligible answers to the following questions: "What is religion ?" or, "What is Christianity ?" And yet such people are at bottom just as religious as their pastors, or their priests, or even as the theologians.

For the rest, the author of this little work makes no claim, except to patriotism: such an exalted patriotism, such a national and truly humane ideal, as may be a return towards the religions of antiquity. His final conclusion is that this ideal can and should go far beyond Christianity itself. Still more should it surpass the religions of antiquity, from which it differs much more than from Christianity, since it approximates to them only by the form to which it must adapt itself at present. There is a narrow and grossly selfish national spirit which ends in barbarism: it is this which we are fighting. Our true nationalism ministers to the larger service of humanity.

Assuredly war is a bestial fact; let us even say, if it may be allowed us, that it is a legacy to man from his animalistic past. But if war has been an almost

inevitable evil, and one which will exist for a long time yet, if not always, nevertheless will it not be the glory of mankind to set ever growing limits to its cruelty ? And why should we not end by conceding that a lawful war may be waged only against a nation of assassins ?

It is advisable to affirm at the close of these reflections, that a look directed towards the future is in no sense a prophecy. It is only a means of approach towards a true peace ; a suggestion of agreement and concord between parties, whose inglorious quarrels exhaust the forces of a country at the cost of its permanent and essential interests. These are in no sense predictions, and not even expectations ; they are only hopes, or perhaps more truly aspirations.

A. L.

August, 1915.

TRANSLATOR'S PROLOGUE

IN the flood of war books by which we have been deluged, too many of them apparently by compilers who have not given themselves time enough either to write properly or to think, even if they were capable of either, it is encouraging to find the subject handled by an artist, and a wit who can use the keen weapon of irony. M. Loisy has inherited a full measure of those typically French qualities, lightness and clearness, in which he is not surpassed by any living writer, not even by M. Anatole France. His little book, which extends only to eighty-nine pages in the original, and which in that space deals so fully with the moral and religious as well as with the political aspects of the war, is necessarily condensed in thought and style; so that, besides being light and clear, it is unusually pregnant. For all these reasons, it has not proved easy to change into our heavier and wordier language. A literal English rendering would have been too weak and bald for the subject, and would not have conveyed the whole force and point of M. Loisy's argument. It seemed advisable, therefore, in some few passages, to add a little weight to the translated sentences by amplifying their expression; but it is hoped that no violence has been done in any case to M. Loisy's meaning. Since he has been kind enough to revise the proofs, this volume claims to be an expression of his thought, whatever it may be of his words. As to this, although the translator believes that he is a fastidious critic of language, he cannot hope to be unbiassed with regard to his own writing; and so he must leave to the judgment of his readers either

the merits or the defects of his translation, and its value as an exercise in English prose.

We are told that the characteristic and most effective weapon of our Scandinavian forefathers was their battle-axe. The French, skilful in every weapon, are perhaps unequalled with the rapier. These two weapons may illustrate the most obvious qualities of French and English prose, in controversial writing. One prevails by keenness and brilliance, the other by sheer weight. It is the difference between Voltaire and Swift, the contrast between Boileau or La Fontaine and Dryden. The keenness of M. Loisy's controversial weapon and his brilliant handling of it give him a signal victory over his Germanic and theological opponents, Professor Harnack and the court chaplain Dryander. As English cannot be manipulated so lightly and rapidly, weight has had to be substituted in this translation for the keenness of French prose; but with no approach, it is hoped confidently, to the clumsiness, the vagueness, or the ugliness of Teutonic verbiage. So long as the English language remains practical and concrete, obedient to common sense, truthful in spirit, sober in tone, and vertebrate in construction, it must be superior to German, which is not only deficient in all these qualities, but ignores and flouts them. English, however, must prevail in its own way, and not in the French manner. Perhaps the war, and the Germans' exposure of their real selves, may help to restore some of these fine qualities, which are characteristic of our seven-teenth and eighteenth century prose classics, as well as of their Latin models; for they have been cultivated too little, by many writers, during the long period of our stupid, tasteless infatuation for Germanic authorities and models. According to Selden, German or "High Dutch" is the language of scullions, in which no scholar would venture or deign to express himself. If this protection to decency and learning had been maintained, if German erudition had been restrained by the sanity and tact of Latin or French, the world would have been spared many critical absurdities, while the

German people might have been saved from innumerable crimes and much literary impudence.

With regard to the political aspects of the war, M. Loisy examines the official evidence produced by the various combatants; though it must be remembered that neither the Austrians nor the Germans have dared to publish the whole of their correspondence. Like every other unbiassed judge, he says that the Germanic Powers alone are responsible for designing, organizing, and precipitating hostilities, while they are even more guilty through the atrocious and illegal practices which they have brought back into modern warfare. In all this, he agrees with many writers who have preceded him; in fact, the evidence will not admit of any other ruling.

In the matter of religion, M. Loisy deals with a subject in which he is a specialist, both by the rigorous and consistent work of his life, and by his official position in the Collège de France, which guarantees the value of that work. So far, the relations of war and religion have only been touched upon sentimentally by various worthy ecclesiastics who, according to the habit of theologians, have rather evaded than faced the real and undeniable complexities of the subject, for those reasons which lead the ostrich to bury its head in dust. M. Loisy, on the other hand, goes to the root of the matter. He points out that, if we accept the documents, which are our only evidence, such as it is, Jesus ignored patriotism and nationality. His teaching postulates either the existence, or the immediate establishment, of an universal brotherhood. Moreover, he formulated principles of non-resistance which are incompatible, not only with war, but with several other practices and institutions that seem necessary for the well-being of society, and still more for national preservation. It may be urged that the doctrines of Jesus presuppose a speedy end to society as it existed then, and the substitution of a divine kingdom in its place, regulated by other laws and principles; that without the background of this kingdom, and the expectation

of its immediate arrival, the Sermon on the Mount becomes incomprehensible, or not worth comprehending, and the literal practice of it in existing circumstances would be not only impossible but mischievous. As to the latter, experience is unmistakable. The doctrines of poverty, celibacy, asceticism, the refusal of military service and the avoidance of civic duties, are responsible to a large extent for undermining the Western Empire and for destroying its Latin civilization. The Franciscan ideal would inevitably dissolve society into chaos. The survival of the Quakers was only possible because they have always been an insignificant minority, that has owed its protection solely to the maintenance by others of the very principles which itself repudiates and declines to share. A leading Quaker is reported to have said recently: "Trust in God, and damn the consequences." Most assuredly, the consequences of not resisting Germany would be damnable. Certain Jews, during a war, "trusted in God," and kept their sabbath in face of the enemy. As this occurred in historical times, there was no miracle; so of course numbers were massacred, until experience taught the survivors to differentiate between realities and phrases. The Quakers, unlike the Jews, have never been confronted with hard facts on a large scale; no doubt they have "trusted in God," but they knew other people would keep the powder dry, according to Cromwell's sane advice. For this reason, the Quakers' attitude is neither heroic nor patriotic, and it cannot be cited to show the effect of carrying out the Sermon on the Mount. Though the Quakers declined military service and deprecated force, they have always enjoyed the full protection of soldiers and police. It is incredible that Jesus anticipated or would countenance such a dishonest solution of his problem.

To explain the teaching of Jesus by our recovered knowledge of the Messianic literature and of its ideals has, of course, become inevitable for any sane and honest criticism; but the social and intellectual difficulties of the problem are not removed through being

taken a stage farther back, since the more serious question of his own mentality is substituted for the ideals and mentality of his time and of the preceding generations. As a matter of fact, it is not only the question of war that raises a difficulty between the ideals of Jesus and the traditional practice of the churches; the problems of justice and law, of crime and coercion, of marriage and divorce, of industry and thrift, of wealth and commerce in all their forms, are raised in the most uncompromising way by the Sermon on the Mount, which challenges the whole structure and practice of civilized society. So far, every attempt to understand and carry out these precepts literally has done more harm than good. All such experiments, however, have been made on a comparatively small scale and in artificial conditions, to say the least of them, either by petty and ephemeral sects or by certain religious orders. If by "Christian," we are to understand a literal interpretation and carrying out of all the precepts attributed to Jesus, there never has been, and there is not at present, any Christian church existing on a large scale or influencing national affairs; and, still less, has there ever been, or is there now, a Christian state. The point is not whether the teaching of the churches is right or wrong. Surely they are justified by the conditions with which they have had to deal, unless right is to be overborne by wrong, and mankind is to be sunk in apathy and ignorance. The only point in question is whether the traditional teaching and practice of the churches agree with the precepts attributed to Jesus; and which, if they be accepted as his, should also be accepted as the most essential and binding part of his message.

Whether Jesus believed himself, or proclaimed himself, to be the Messiah is an open question, which may be argued both ways with equal plausibility; since, on this point, the documents are not only contradictory but are unusually confused, if not intentionally misleading and obscure. It is certain, however, that Jesus announced the approach of a divine kingdom, and ap-

MATTHEW

XXIV. 29-3

parently its immediate establishment. It is equally certain that, after his death, his followers accepted him as the Christ, and expected his imminent reappearance. Only in view of these beliefs and expectations can the Sermon on the Mount have become current, and any attempts to practise it be explained. Though with regard to this, it should be remarked that there is a strange and ominous silence in the Pauline epistles about precepts, or more truly essential principles, which in the gospels are attributed to Jesus himself. It might be urged, in addition, that the military comparisons and metaphors, the alert and virile attitude towards life, the shrewd and practical morality, in the Pauline and pseudo-Pauline epistles are hardly compatible with the spirit of the beatitudes and of the precepts which follow them. Time, however, brought many disillusionments, not only about the Sermon on the Mount, but in beliefs which Paul and the early teachers undoubtedly held: former views of the *parousia* and the millennium became heretical; and, after two thousand years filled with bitter experiences, mankind is left with the sharp contrast, perhaps the irreconcilable contradiction, between the teaching attributed to Jesus and the invariable practice of the Christian churches.

A large part of M. Loisy's book deals with these interesting questions; and the closing or reconstructive portion of it should be studied with these difficulties always in view, if the author's mind and attitude are to be judged fairly. M. Loisy does not suggest that traditional Christianity has failed. Indeed, he acknowledges fully the civilizing influence of the church, both on the past and in the present. He does urge, however, that "Christendom has failed continuously and increasingly to carry out the principles laid down by Christ." "The brotherhood of man is an ideal to be achieved:" "Jesus presented it as an accomplished fact." And here we may leave these speculative matters, allowing everyone to draw his own conclusion, so long as it is compatible with the documents and checked by human experience. It is enough to add, that crimes and follies

have always been the inevitable consequence of mistaking the real for the ideal. The Messianic kingdom was, and is, an ideal. The church was the hard and mocking reality which usurped its place.

We descend at once to reality and practice when M. Loisy examines the utterances of Benedict the Fifteenth about the war, and his attitude towards the various combatants. This is not the least important section of his treatise; because the Pope's words and attitude affect so many people, and they both seem to have been misunderstood, if not intentionally misrepresented, in the English Press. The Pope asserts that he has neither the duty nor the opportunity to decide about the responsibilities of the combatants; that manifestly he cannot take either side, because he has adherents on both sides; that all he can do is to remain completely neutral, passing no judgment either upon the causes of the war or the conduct of any belligerent. On this point, M. Loisy makes a fine distinction, which is obvious when it is pointed out; though English journalists and *The Times* especially have been blind to it. He shows that neutrality and impartiality are different, though Benedict confuses them. The Pope should be impartial between the different nations, since he has interests among them all; though impartiality not only implies, but requires, an examination of responsibilities, as well as an acknowledgment of the claims of righteousness and justice. Bare neutrality is a cynical attitude, in itself immoral or unmoral, fit only for opportunist and selfish politicians. "Neutrality has nothing moral in it." "Impartiality is a duty and a virtue: neutrality is only a matter of common prudence." "Impartiality and neutrality are quite different things; in fact, they are incompatible with one another in the sphere of morals; for no one has any right to be neutral in moral questions; and whoever pretends to be neutral in matters where justice is concerned fails to be impartial. As a matter of fact, whoever in such questions pretends to be indifferent is in reality siding with him who is in the

“wrong, and against him who is right.” So argues M. Loisy, with undeniable correctness, and no answer can be made to his criticism: “Most Holy Father, with “all due respect to your infallibility, you are in error “about your phrase.” The Pope, then, is neutral with regard to all the questions of righteousness and justice which are involved in the war and its origins, about which he should hold and express opinions that make neutrality impossible; but we cannot go on to say that he is impartial between the combatants. For it is notorious that the sympathies of the Vatican are pro-German, and that the clerical Press in Italy has been as virulently anti-British of late as it was during the South African War. The Vatican seems to be unteachable, even by the plainest facts. Pius the Ninth might have presided over a united and regenerated Italy. If Leo the Thirteenth had spoken out boldly for truth and justice in the Dreyfus case, there would probably have been no separation in France for many years to come. The barbarous and cowardly treatment of modernists by Pius the Tenth has only aggravated, by deferring, those grave problems of modernism by which his church remains confronted. The attitude and policy of the Vatican, which appear inexplicable to those who measure them by Christian standards and requirements, are always influenced chiefly by traditional views and aims with regard to its temporal power. It still has more faith in carnal weapons than in spiritual influence. This is the verdict of history and experience, and M. Loisy endorses it. He urges farther that the words and attitude of Benedict the Fifteenth reveal how low the political influence of the Vatican has fallen; so that its traditional policy would not seem to be justified by material success, the only reward that political opportunism can expect.

George Tyrrell's most forcible work, *Medievalism*, is a rebuke to Cardinal Mercier for the submission of the whole church to the ambitious and unwholesome centralizing of the Roman Curia. Since it was written, the Cardinal has emerged with honour from the dreadful

experiences of the war in Belgium; he has shown himself to be a wise and courageous patriot, and has won the admiration of every generous heart. Nevertheless, we may wonder how far he has been disillusioned about his former Vaticanism: would he say now of Benedict the Fifteenth, as he said about Pius the Tenth at the close of his Lenten Pastoral in 1908, "Let us gather more closely than ever round Peter, the Vicar of Jesus Christ;" or will he caution his people in future against the *jocosa Vaticani montis imago*,¹ which seems indeed to have played with him, and to mock the sufferings of martyred Belgian Catholics? These melancholy echoes *infamibus Vaticani locis*,² which under Nero were guilty also of Christian blood, will probably resound effectually through France and Belgium. It may be that the Pope has minimized in either country the danger of a clerical reaction, which is usually one of the consequences of a war, and not the least mischievous. The prophetic motto for Benedict the Fifteenth is *Religio Depopulata*: the war is carrying it out literally; but perhaps the cynical attitude of the Pope towards the moral aspects of the struggle, and his chilling words about the victims of German atrocities, will do even more in the end to prove it true. In any case, it is a menacing and gloomy label for a pontificate; and this Pontiff will occupy an unenviable place in history if it should be fulfilled through him.

M. Loisy's distinction between impartiality and neutrality should be meditated by the American President, as well as by the Pope; for Dr. Wilson's attitude at the opening of the war was, if not cynical, yet verging towards self-righteousness; and, in his earliest utterances, he seemed to have no care for the moral issues involved, but to think only how the commercial interests of the United States could be furthered while their European rivals were shattering themselves to pieces. It is strange he did not see from the first that this war was not a mere political quarrel between certain European states; did not realize that it was a struggle

¹ Hor. 1 *Carm.* xx.

² Tac. *Hist.* ii. 93.

of life or death for European liberty and civilization against a sinister and arrogant despotism which would inevitably destroy them both. With their destruction, there would have certainly perished in our part of the world all those ideals and institutions through which the United States were established, and by which they profess to live; moreover, by their destruction here, they would be seriously threatened and imperilled there. The danger would be all the greater because, as the experience of this war has shown more clearly than ever, the United States have not proved capable as yet of moulding an homogeneous and united nation. So far, they are too largely a collection of hostile and incongruous elements; a *colluvies* of many nations, in which the Negroes, the Irish Romanists, and above all the Germans, appear likely to raise problems that are insoluble, to say nothing of the internal and external Yellow danger, besides the grave social, economical, and political difficulties which are so evidently maturing for a troubled future. However all this may be, we can say to the President, thanks to himself, as M. Loisy says to the Pope, "No one has any right to be neutral in moral questions." "Whoever in such questions pretends to be indifferent is in reality siding with him who is in the wrong." In addition, the United States, as the largest neutral Power, ought from the beginning to have protested against the violation of Belgian neutrality, and have stood forward boldly, at whatever cost, as the champion of small, neutral states against unprecedented and illegal outrage. These noble and splendid opportunities have all been missed, and cannot ever be recovered. Instead of action, there has been feeble talk, and even that has not been acted up to: "Always jam to-morrow, but never jam to-day," as Alice in Wonderland complained. This is Dr. Wilson's method in diplomacy: something serious may happen next time, but nothing vigorous is ever done on account of any outrage that has been perpetrated, however heinous and unpardonable. To be dragged and goaded into war, unwillingly, timorously, by a series of petty,

but most dishonouring outrages to oneself, is a very different matter from taking up arms to protect the feeble, or to vindicate the rights of honour and humanity. As Mr. Roosevelt says: "There is no meaner moral attitude than that of a timid and selfish neutrality between right and wrong." He adds that it was less criminal to sink the *Lusitania* than not to deal with such an outrage promptly: at any rate, it seems more contemptible; and apparently Mr. Henry James, by ceasing to be an American citizen, is very decidedly of this opinion. However terrible war may be, there are worse evils: injustice and tyranny are among them; but assuredly the most demoralizing of all evils for any nation is peace with dishonour.

If certain people amongst ourselves had had their way, we should have been in the same despicable position, or worse. The United States may have had a moral duty to protest against the violation of Belgium; but we were pledged to resist it, by the direct and solemn obligation of a treaty. Yet some newspapers and many individuals were base enough to clamour for neutrality, or to chatter about inaction; in other words, we were to look on and do nothing while cruelty and tyranny were rampant, while our friends were being destroyed, our own vital interests undermined, and our ultimate ruin assured. "If Belgium is invaded by German or French armies we must protest, but we need not fight."¹ "For England to join in this hideous war would be treason to civilization and disaster to our people."² "I can conceive no circumstances in which continental operations by our troops would not be a crime against the people of this country."³ We might add almost indefinitely to this shameful and silly catalogue. It is difficult to say whether the crime or the folly of these opinions is more censurable. To such reasoners, the honour and good name of their country is nothing, and they seem

¹ A Member of Parliament.

² A Bishop.

³ A Cabinet Minister.

blind to her vital interests. These are the natural results of wallowing in sentiment and faction. But, after a year of war, what are we to think of these utterances; and what should the authors think of their advice, and of themselves? How exceedingly foolish, after the experiences of Belgium, and the object-lesson of the *Lusitania*, is the statement of Sir John Brunner: "I declare emphatically that I should infinitely prefer the protection of recognized international law to the protection afforded to us by our Navy." We do not know what the Little Navyites may think of themselves now, but there can be no doubt what the country should think of them. If they had had their way, the Empire would have been broken up, our trade would have been destroyed, our home population would have been starving, and probably outraged as the Belgians have been. Never have false prophets been so utterly confuted and discredited as by these twelve months of war. Pacifist and pro-German newspapers, fatuous professors, emotional and tactless bishops, sentimental politicians, clerical demagogues; they have all been exposed by the stern logic of events. That they should repent and be converted is hardly possible, but let their dupes beware of them in future: "by their fruits ye shall know them;" by their words, they must be judged.

Not less guilty, but far more responsible, are those who, with all the information of a Government at their disposal played fast and loose with the vital interests of the country up to the very outbreak of the war. Such desperate gambling with national safety is unprecedented in our history. Economic and social reforms, which might have been carried through efficiently and quietly, were utilized as pretexts for class warfare and national disunion; and the consequences of a reckless oratory are now being felt in these times of danger. Our navy was first of all reduced, and then kept at the lowest margin of bare safety, not without a suspicion on the part of our colonies that they were being cheated, and that Imperial interests

xxvii

A

of Britain, replete with Princes, Peers + Painters; Police, Pub
+ Prisons; Priests (of all sorts) + stocking Profligacy; Holiness
any Hellenism? "God created man in his own Image" (Gen i. 27). "But—"

A What about the 175 Millions spent yearly for "DRINK", + 325 Millions wasted yearly on Social Functions, Display, Betting and Boozing by the highly "Civilized" Christians!

and the Allies should deal with them accordingly. Every German colony has been acquired and utilized for further aggression. German finance and commerce are weapons of intrigue. German diplomatists and consuls have misused their privileged position, by spying and plotting. The abuse of the German Embassy in Washington is far more insulting to the United States than any of the attacks on its shipping. Germans have habitually outraged the hospitality of friendly countries and violated the decencies of private intercourse; and as General Botha has proved recently, the German Emperor is as false and vile as any of his tools. Not only in war, but in peace, are Germans odious and impossible; and these experiences should never be forgotten so that similar outrages shall never be repeated.

Still more do we hope that all the victims of German tyranny may be delivered; that the long martyrdom of Poland will end; that the Danish populations of Schleswig-Holstein will come back to Denmark. Of course, Alsace-Lorraine must be restored to France, and to civilization; Italy must recover her lost children; and all the nations oppressed for so long by Austria and Turkey must if they wish it be freed. Never again should any native race be subjected to the far more odious cruelty of German colonists; and probably every one will be more cautious in future about naturalizing Germans. For the rest, no sane person wants either to dismember Germany, or to subject any Germans to a foreign rule. In a liberated and re-created Europe, there should be no more national servitudes or racial injustice. Let the Germans manage their own affairs, or "stew in their own juice" as Bismarck said; and out of the unsavoury ingredients, we hope that something much better will emerge eventually for the general benefit of mankind.

Meanwhile, let us take courage. The prospects of the Allies are not gloomy, even on land, however slow our progress may seem, and they are certain to become better:¹ *Nos manet Oceanus ; and so long as we hold*

¹ Hor. *Epod.* xvi.

the sea, ultimate victory must be ours. As to resources: the England of George the Third, with a population of about eleven millions, and no empire behind it, not only sustained a heavy war expenditure during almost twenty years, and survived a debt of over £1,000,000,000, but began to expand at once into the wealth and prosperity of the Victorian age. Surely the present British Empire will not fail even under a debt of £4,000,000,000 or more, should victory demand it. It is impossible that Germany can conquer Italy, France, the British Empire, Russia, Japan, Serbia, and the other Allies who will come in with us, however unprepared we may all have been, however slow our preparation may still be. The Germans practically lost the war when they were turned away from Paris, baffled. In an older, and a much longer, war than the present is likely to be, it was said of the two adversaries: *Adeo varia belli fortuna ancepsque Mars fuit, ut propius periculum fuerint qui vicerunt.*¹

¹ Liv. xxi. 1.

If the characteristics of Germans, as described on pp xxvii + xxviii, were known how comes it that some people are so eager to have German Royalties to rule them?

*Paveat quis Germania
Thez are quos horrida parturit foetus
found incolumi Britannia?*

all over "Christian Europe"; and seem to be held as the true stock of the LORD ANOINTER ONES! Verily "Man is born as a Wild Ass's Colt" Job xi. 12

THE WAR AND RELIGION

WE are in a state of war; but it is not a religious war. The chief religions of the world are involved in it, since their adherents have taken sides; but it is neither by these religions nor on account of them that the plague has broken out. In like manner, the belligerents are not grouped according to their beliefs; since the most divergent creeds, one might even say the most incompatible with one another, are mingled indiscriminately in each hostile army.

This is not because there has been no attempt in certain quarters to rouse and enlist the gods; or, failing to exploit them otherwise, at least to make them shout. The god of the Germans, who has ever been a chatter-box since William the Second began to reign, has made many arrogant assertions through the Emperor, his mouth-piece; and, making an ally of Mahomet's deity, the god who is the genuine and only God, has proclaimed a holy war: the newspapers even assert that in some places the standard of the Prophet has been unfurled. These acts and words have of course a meaning for the performers; but they are not enough to make the exist.

ing war a religious one, if by the term "religious" is to be understood the profession and propagation of any particular belief.

The Germans are not battling for the gospel as interpreted by Luther, nor are the Turks for their venerable Allah. Still less are the quieter and better-mannered gods a pretext of strife. Nicholas the Second is not the champion of Orthodoxy, since he has guaranteed the liberty of catholic Poland.

The hoary Francis Joseph, who has apparently not even yet seen enough blood flowing round him, has assuredly not gone to war in his rôle of Apostolic Sovereign, in order to be a soldier of the Pope.

England is not marching to defend the ecclesiastical organization of Henry the Eighth and Queen Elizabeth. Belgium and Serbia are wrestling to save their lives, and France also is fighting that she may not be squeezed out of existence.

Nevertheless, though the various religions are not touched directly by the present crisis, they certainly are concerned with and are interested in it; they have the right to ask, and they do ask, what they stand to lose or gain. Still more, this crisis by its nature, since its ultimate bearing seems likely to go deeper than all the existing forms of religion, may well have a more profound religious significance than these religions themselves, however respected they may be; a significance which the future will disclose more or less promptly according to the measure in which we have aided or hindered it. Let us try, therefore, to understand a little more clearly the

body & drank the blood of his God. Thus
spake the Priests. But of his Ancestors,
they spake not.

conscious and confessed desires of the various peoples concerned; the feelings and behaviour which characterize the official representatives of the different religious bodies; the new ideal or reality, the super-religion, which our crucified humanity is bringing to its birth through so many dolours.

THE WAR

AN Arch-duke and his wife had been assassinated at Sérajevo, in a province annexed recently by Austria, but which had not the least wish to be swallowed by her. Thereupon Austria demanded from Serbia a reckoning for this murder. It seems to be proved sufficiently that Austria would have attacked Serbia, whether her Arch-duke were alive or dead, to reduce it into a state of vassalage, and to smooth her own way down to Salonica. No one believes that Austria would have cared to make war on Serbia merely to revenge her dead Arch-duke, whom she does not appear to have mourned very deeply. She is thought to have seized the most propitious moment for enslaving a people which stood in the way of her ambitions; but she finds herself compelled at present to carry on a defensive war, and it does not look as though her various populations were keen about it. At first, the Austrians and Hungarians were delighted to go and fight the Serbians, because they thought it would be an easy job. The Slavs in the Austro-Hungarian Empire were less enthusiastic; and, at present, defeat seems to have spread a general mistrust.

If one dwells merely upon the superficial con-

nexion of events, it is Austria who has caused the war, while Germany only came in afterwards, as an ally, to support her. Austria, however, arranged her policy beforehand with Germany; and if the initial plots, from which the European war has resulted, were launched from Vienna, the guiding spirit appears to have been altogether in Berlin. The ambitions and plots of Austria were arranged with Germany in their mutual interest, which anyone can fathom without being an expert in politics. Germany, holding Serbia by means of Austria, and itself dominating Constantinople, would have become supreme in the East. Of this supremacy, Austria would have been merely the helper and the tool. Her responsibility for the war would seem to be that of a leading and necessary accomplice rather than of a principal.¹ Her share is what the policy of her government has made it, and it is not inspired by any genuine sentiment among the nations which form the empire of Austria-Hungary. At the critical moment, when it was plain that Russia would not abandon Serbia to the will of Austria, she seemed terrified by the danger into which she had plunged herself, and appeared willing to negotiate; but then the real master of the Austro-Germanic alliance stepped in, and William the Second, by declaring war on Russia, has dragged Austria with him into a struggle of life and death for the sovereignty

¹ The special question of direct responsibility for the present war has been treated very well by MM. Durkheim et Denis, *Qui a voulu la guerre ?* (Paris, 1915).

of the universe. So there is nothing grandiose in this affair: it is a matter of squalid and criminal politics, and of subservient ambitions; it affects a congeries of people for whom the war, if it should turn out ill for those who devised it, will prove an opportunity for separating from, instead of rallying to, the ancient dynasty which has absorbed and oppressed them all in turn.

The Serbians are struggling bravely for their independence. They know well why they are fighting. They had no desire for war, since they were in no condition to bear it, and they went to the extreme limits of concession when Austria claimed to hold an inquiry among them into the murder of Francis Ferdinand. As this demand was a mere pretence, and as the Serbians were assured that Russia would never leave them to be crushed by the Austrians, they put a bold face on the matter; they have even beaten the Austrians, and are preparing to free their kinsmen in the very provinces which Austria had thought were annexed. It is easy to understand what the Serbians wish, and whither they are going.

For titanic Russia, peace was not only an advantage, but almost a necessity. At any rate, they seem to have thought so in Vienna and Berlin. Russia had emerged with difficulty from a political crisis, and was recovering from a military disaster; she was most evidently in need of rest. Was it merely a question of political influence in the Balkans that forced the Tsar into an uncompromising resistance to Austria's ambitions? Or would he have

opposed, before all other objects of his policy, the extension of the Central Empires towards the East ? One may well be doubtful in both cases. The Tsar and his advisers might have balanced the disadvantages of Austrian influence in the Balkan States, and of German penetration into Western Asia; but the Russian people is less affected by these considerations than by its sentiment for Slavonic brotherhood; and the Tsar became the mouth-piece of this sentiment, which in any case he must have felt profoundly. The enemies of Serbia reckoned upon the pressing and immediate interest which Russia had to remain quiet. They failed to understand, perhaps they were incapable of understanding, the sentiment which would not allow Russia to abandon the Serbians to their fate.

Nicholas the Second had, nevertheless, explained it quite simply to the German Emperor in his message of July 29, 1914:¹ “ A shameless war has been declared against a weak nation; I associate myself completely with the profound indignation of all Russia; and I foresee that very soon I shall not be able to resist the pressure which is weighing on me, and that I shall be forced to take steps which must lead to war. To prevent the misfortune of a European war, I adjure you for the sake of our old friendship to do everything in your power which may stop your ally from going too far.” The sincerity of this appeal is manifested by its perfect candour. In addition, the minister

¹ Yellow Book, 209.

of Nicholas the Second, while dealing with the question from a political point of view, was able to say truthfully when writing on the second of August to the Russian ambassadors abroad: "His Majesty the Emperor has pledged himself to the German Emperor not to take any aggressive action so long as the discussions with Austria continue. After this guarantee, after all the proofs which Russia has given of her desire for peace, Germany neither can nor has any right to mistrust our declaration, that we shall accept gladly any peaceable solution which is compatible with the honour and independence of Serbia. Any other decision, while wholly incompatible with our own dignity and honour, would assuredly over-turn the balance of power in Europe by establishing the domination of the Germans."¹

If one were to believe the hot-heads among contemporary Germans, it was England, England only, that planned and launched the war, in order to wipe out the inoffensive and wholly pacific Germany. Through the depth of her hatred for Germany, she has concealed her antipathy and all her grievances against Russia. A late King, who in his day was a worker for European peace, but who undoubtedly had other ideals than a subjection of the universe to Germanic preponderance, (or as Germans would say, to their *Kultur*) is pointed out as the cause of that encirclement which was intended to stop the legitimate growth and expansion of

¹ Yellow Book, 216.

Germanism. England proposed quite coolly to end Germany because this rival was inconvenient to her trade; while the Russians and French would face the burden of a war from which England alone could reap any advantage. And the German professors, who denounce this mean trick with all the horror which ought to inspire the righteous, overlook the fact that if England were really dazed by the wonderful increase of German trade, were made uneasy by the growth of German militarism, were galled by German ambitions, she showed herself most hesitating up to the last moment over the question of war with Germany; so hesitating that the Germans themselves appear to have thought she was too unprepared to face a great European war, and that she would allow them to seize Belgium in order to attack and beat France more certainly, and then to subdue Russia, so long as the war were not waged by sea, and the Germans promised neither to annex Belgium nor any further portion of our territory. The Germans relied upon the selfishness of England; being deceived in this, they attributed to her the most perfidious designs. But, if England had acted as they describe, she would only have been doing what they themselves have done, and with as much right,—if it be a right,—for she would have arranged at all costs for her commercial expansion and the predominance of her “culture” throughout the world.

It is, however, only too clear that England never desired the war; that she neither wished for it, nor

though Lord Roberts and others, earned & urged the country absorbed in Edenism.

had prepared herself in any way for such an eventuality. On the part of so prudent a nation, this negligence would be inconceivable if England had cherished the base designs of which Germany now accuses her. It has been proved that the English government made every effort to avert the war; that it actually refused to make any definite engagements with France and Russia, so long as Serbia were the only question at issue; that she strove earnestly for an understanding with Germany, so that an agreement between Russia and Austria might be reached; and she only decided at last to make war against Germany when the neutrality of Belgium had been violated. Up to the very last moment, English diplomacy acted with entire frankness on the side of peace, and as long as it was possible it trusted in the good faith of Germany. On the one hand, Sir Edward Grey warned Germany loyally that the neutrality of England could not be guaranteed in all circumstances; but, on the other hand, on the twenty-ninth of July, he cautioned our ambassador that the support of Great Britain would not be secured to us by the sole fact that France might be dragged into war at the heels of Russia.¹ The British government did every thing it could in favour of peace with Austria, Russia, Germany, and France. The haughty ultimatums of William the Second to Russia and France revealed to the English government the intentions of Germany;

¹ Correspondence of the British Government on the European Crisis, 58. (London, 1914.)

and it was the violation of Belgium's neutrality that convinced the English of the dangers which were threatening themselves. Then only, upon the fourth of August, the English government resolved to despatch its own ultimatum to Berlin: "Since Germany has declined to give us in the matter of Belgium similar assurances to those which were given last week by France, in answer to our demand which was addressed simultaneously to Paris and Berlin, we are forced to repeat the said demand, and to require that there be made to it a satisfactory answer, which must be here with us this evening before midnight."¹

On the thirtieth of July, Sir Edward Grey had replied very nobly to the German Chancellor, who expected he could buy the neutrality of England: "What the Chancellor asks of us in effect is simply that we should bind ourselves to stand aside with our arms folded while Germany is seizing the French colonies and ruining France herself, provided only that Germany on its part agrees not to seize any French territory except the colonies. From a material point of view such a proposal is inadmissible, because, even though not depriving France of European territory, Germany would so crush her as to make her lose her position as a great power, and thus lower her into a mere satellite of Germanic policy. But, putting these considerations out of sight, it would be disgraceful

¹ Correspondence of the British Government on the European Crisis, 102. (London, 1914.)

“in us to make such a bargain with Germany at the expense of France: it would be so utterly disgraceful that the honour of our country could never be cleansed from the defilement. What the Chancellor goes on to ask of us is that we should play fast and loose with our obligations and interests in connexion with the neutrality of Belgium. We cannot listen for a moment to any such vile traffic.”¹

Thus England did not stop at offering Germany her help in maintaining peace: she refused it her neutrality, one might say her complicity, in case of war. She did it by reminding Germany that considerations of material interest are not the only ones which ought to regulate the policy of a great nation, that moral considerations also have their value, that the terms “duty” and “honour” have a meaning even in politics. Germany has shown itself wholly unable to profit by this lesson given to it by England; and when it saw England turn against it, though after so many warnings, its disappointment broke out into accusations which are even more ridiculous than their injustice: England has betrayed the cause of civilization, in order to rid herself of a world-wide competitor in trade.² These

¹ Correspondence of the British Government on the European Crisis, 69.

² M. A. von Harnack, among others, has formulated this accusation, and he has ventured on a reply to certain English *savants* who had sent him a respectful protest: “England believes the hour has struck for annihilating us.” “And why does she wish us annihilated?” “Because she

maniac noises cannot alter the facts: that London was the sanctuary of peace, and that the manufactory of war is at Berlin.

In reality, England is not so like Germany as the Germans have done her the honour of imagining. She did not think only of her own interests. She considered herself, in some degree, as the guardian of an equilibrium in Europe; perhaps she was repentant for having allowed France to be crushed and dismembered in 1871; in any case, she seems to have understood thoroughly the danger to our general "culture," the peril to the freedom of all nations, and not merely to her own trade, if the Germans practically destroyed the nationality of her neighbours, Holland, Belgium, France. England would have been blind if she had not perceived in the ambitions of Germany for an universal domination the renewal, a century afterwards, of Napoleon's attempt. Therefore England resigned herself to the war; she made up her mind to face it, and carry it on with vigour; because she could not endure the kind of peace that Germany would like to impose on the world. England agrees, as we do, that Germans may govern themselves despotically, if it so please them; but that Germany shall govern Europe and the world despotically, England will not allow, either for Europe, or for the world, or on her own account. For this reason, she has been able

"cannot tolerate our power, activity, and prosperity." "There is no other explanation."—*Internationale Monatschrift*, October, 1914, p. 26.

to denounce, in all sincerity, Germany's violation of the neutrality of Belgium; because in this attack on the independence of a neighbouring people, she foresaw an attack upon the common rights of every people, as well as a serious threat to her own security. The Germans will take some time to discover that their mad wish to boss the world is precisely what has roused the whole world against them.

The resistance of Belgium would appear to have surprized them, since it has evoked an access of frenzy which is a long way from calming down. They have thought it advisable to pretend that Belgium was hindered from following her true interests; because she had bound herself imprudently by treaties with England and France, and that she would be lost in consequence, through refusing the Germans a favour which would have cost her nothing. The Germans have never asked whether the service they required from the Belgians could only have been rendered at the expense of other parties, or whether the Belgians had any right to perform it. They do not seem to have considered that the Belgians, by the mere fact of granting them a free passage, would have allied themselves with Germany against France; or that, being neutral, they could not rightfully take the side of their Germanic neighbours against their neighbours in France. They cannot recognize in others a delicacy of feeling which they themselves are without: the reverence for what is right. The Belgians never had a thought of betraying us, any more than of betraying Germany

for our advantage; but the Germans never scrupled about tempting the Belgians to be traitors. It was not in them to appreciate the candour of the reply which was made to their summons: "If, contrary to our expectation, Belgian neutrality should be violated by France, Belgium will carry out all her international duties, and her army will make a vigorous resistance to the invader. . . . Belgium has been ever faithful to her international obligations. . . . This attack on her independence, with which the German government threatens her, is a flagrant violation of the law of nations; and no military advantage can justify a violation of law."¹

Still, it is not through loyalty alone that the Belgians have refused to be made the humble servants of Germany; it is even more because they did not choose to be in servitude. They had no obligation to sacrifice themselves for us; and it was neither in the interests of France nor of England that the Belgians wrecked their country: it was to save their souls. The Germans do not understand that other nations have a soul, and they ignored the soul of Belgium. They never doubted that the Belgians would like to be Germanized. It is plain, however, that Belgium, by opening her territory to the hordes of William the Second, would have done nothing less than violate the charter of her existence; she would have favoured Germany, and have contributed to its victory: in other words, while pre-

are not
the King
& Queen
of Belgium
Germans

¹ Diplomatic correspondence on the war of 1914 (Grey Book), 22.

paring her own servitude, she would have helped to enslave Europe. The real problem before her was not whether she should yield to a temporary violence, in order to save her towns, her artistic treasures, and her wealth; but whether she should enter the Germanic federation, and become, while retaining merely the name and shadow of herself, a province in the German Empire.

The Belgians have preferred to show that they mean to remain Belgian. It was for this vital reason that, not choosing to hand themselves over to the Germans, they protested none the less that they had no right to betray France to them; and then, instead of submitting to a brutal violence, and in order to cherish a hope of liberty in the future, they exposed their country to immediate ruin. The brutal conqueror who is crushing them now would make no scruple, if he were ultimately victorious, of holding them for ever under his tyranny; he would continue to ignore the soul of Belgium, which he would wring and tear in his mailed fist; and he would never cease to be enraged with a people that knew not how to appreciate the benefits of "German culture."

As to us French, the Germans have tried to persuade themselves that ever since 1871 we have been suffering an insane desire of revenge for the disasters which they inflicted upon us in those days: it was with a view to this revenge that we allied ourselves with the Russians, to whom our sympathies would not be given naturally; and then, we threw

ourselves into the arms of England, our hereditary foe. This unappeasable desire for revenge has always opposed every genuine effort made by the Germans to get nearer to us, to accept us as co-operators and chief beneficiaries in their mission of peace.

Now it does not look as though this desire for revenge had stirred us much. We were doubly humiliated in 1870: by the bungling of our rulers, by the facile German victories and the defeats themselves. For all these, it was possible to be consoled; and we did in fact console ourselves by our political and military reorganization. If we have never ceased to be uneasy, if the shadow, the dread,—but not the wish—of a future war never left our minds, if we have never been able to help seeing an enemy in the Germans, this is assuredly because they have dismembered us, tearing from us provinces which did not wish to be theirs, depriving us of brethren who longed to remain ours. Germany has not only humiliated us; it has lacerated our national conscience by hurting the rights of Alsace-Lorraine, and it has stricken us to the heart. It has also taken pains to envenom and keep open the wound which it has made. Our grief, in spite of everything and in spite of ourselves, might have been assuaged in the end if the yoke of Germany had proved less heavy to our former countrymen, if they could have become reconciled to being German; if we ourselves could have felt secure that Germany, gorged and shamed by the previous robbery, had shown herself

likely to respect our national independence for the future, and would not look out for a chance of ruining us completely if we refused to let ourselves be directed and over-awed by it. We could not forget the injustices of 1871, because they remained active upon our eastern frontier. Neither could we forget the danger of a war with Germany, because the danger was real and always menacing. If this danger became an obsession, a mania, it was not our nationalists but Germany itself which was the cause. And if France, at the opening of the war, rose to the call of her government without complaining, if she has enrolled herself universally and eagerly, with dignity and courage, it is not because she has flung herself with ferocious joy into the work of a revenge that was desired feverishly, but because she was summoned at last to the task of saving herself from a danger that had been threatening for over forty years, and which had now taken shape. This will to live was joined to the hope of liberating our brothers who had been torn from us by brute force; but it is in the first place to defend ourselves, that we have taken arms.

Our government was not more desirous of war than the country was; and it co-operated with perfect good faith in all the attempts made by England and Russia to obtain a peaceful settlement of the conflict which Austria had provoked. The government did nothing to rouse public opinion on the side of war; in fact it did its utmost, up to the very last moment, to encourage those hopes of a peace, which

it certainly desired to maintain. The proclamation that was issued with the order to mobilize explained that mobilization is not necessarily war, and that in the circumstances it was the surest method of securing peace. It was almost a declaration of pacifism, at the very moment when it might have been more advantageous to kindle a patriotic sentiment.

France, like Belgium and Serbia, is fighting for her existence: she fights to remain herself, to avoid being subject to Germany. The Germans, who can only esteem and admire Germans, have underestimated us more than we deserve, by imagining us to be stupidly anxious for war and incapable of waging it. Now we did not seek war, we dreaded it. We can assert with all confidence to-day that we were not sufficiently on guard, that we ought to have been more determined and alert, that we should have been more distrustful of an enemy who was always ready to spring: considering what his ever-growing armaments must mean; and, since all his efforts were aimed at the enslavement of the world, we should have concentrated ours on the defence both of our own national existence and of the general freedom. We allowed ourselves to be soothed too easily by the peaceable assertions of Germany, and we did not realize sufficiently that it would only give us peace if we obeyed. But, since war has been forced upon us, we will meet it, without shrinking, and certain of our good cause, with a hope and confidence which the sad experiences of

Would it not be equally true of France, that it also, was so saturated with Hedonism, indeed paralysed, that it was unable to make an effort to defend itself?

1870 had made strangers to our hearts before these recent occurrences.

The German aggression has recalled us to ourselves. We understand that we must conquer or die, and we are resolved to conquer. The opening failures have not discouraged us. Not only was our mobilization carried through without a hitch, without confusion, and without regret, and every one betook himself quietly to the post which duty had assigned him; but when our armies fell back before the enemy, when crowds of refugees came from the invaded districts, recounting the barbarous acts of the German soldiery, neither did those who were so miserably exiled give themselves up to despair, nor were the people who received them affected with panic. Every one felt the extreme danger of France, but no one believed she would succumb; we were confident that, like Belgium, she would make any present sacrifice for her independence and her future. We were possessed by the same feeling as the Belgians: "We will not become Germanized." And this feeling among us becomes stronger the nearer men live to the German frontier, and so more exposed to the greed of the barbarians. So long as we live, we are determined to live in our own way; and that which gives us our vigour now against the invader is neither a lust of conquest, nor the hate which an unjust, cruel, and fanatical enemy deserves, but the love of our ancient France, who is our all, whom we yearn to preserve, and whom we are vowed to save.

Moreover though we do not brag of our culture, we are sure that the ruin of France would be no gain to civilization; and, that in resisting the German tyranny, we are not hindering the spread of truth and justice throughout the world: that, on the contrary, we are securing them a fair chance in the future, that we are safeguarding a notable portion of our human inheritance from the madness of the destroyer.

Nevertheless Germany pretends to be as innocent as a new-born babe, and as gentle as a lamb; it does not even wait for its virtues to be acknowledged, but praises them itself through the mouths of all its pastors and professors, at the very time when it is displaying its brutality to the world, and its contempt for all public and private law. It is a beast of prey which asserts loudly that it has always desired peace; but only because it would have preferred to satiate its lust of domination without incurring the risks of battle. Germany complains that it has been forced into war, because it has not been allowed to rule Europe and the world to the full measure of its ambition. It had long prepared for war, and at the last moment precipitated it, when not one of those whom it is fighting was resolved on it. Germany was behind the Austrians while the independence of Serbia was being threatened; it threw off the mask in sending its ultimatum, first to Russia, and then to France, when it knew that neither France nor Russia could yield to the truculence of its Emperor. When England threat-

Its Emblem is a "Bird of Prey". And do not "Civilized" Nations; PRAY to their gods for "GRACE", and PREY on each other without compunction?

ened Germany, it answered that it could not stay the mobilization that was begun: doubtless the sudden intervention of England deranged its plans; but it knew that England could not send any considerable force abroad at once; and it calculated that by marching through Belgium it could take Paris, and destroy the French army before the Russians had time to concentrate upon its eastern frontier; then it would turn upon the Russians, and annihilate them with the help of Austria. After all this, the Germans and their culture would be lords of the universe; for England, single-handed, would not be strong enough to curb them. To realize this gigantic plan, which had been long maturing, Germany, confident in its power and greedy for plunder, threw itself into a war which no one but itself had forced upon it.

Its check has not yet taught it to disguise its ambitions. Temporarily in possession of Belgium, it behaves as though Belgium were henceforth its own. Not content with ravaging, and blackmailing, and plundering, it will not allow an Archbishop to say, for the encouragement and consolation of his people, in such cruel circumstances, even while advising the civil population to submit to a foreign occupation which it had neither the duty nor the means to resist, that Belgium belongs always and only to herself. The Germans imagine that a nation is a mere property, which can be taken by laying hands on it, if you are strong enough. Thus they have already stolen Alsace and Lorraine from

us; in like manner they are inclined to steal more, and to go on stealing. They themselves, perhaps, may soon be reduced to making war solely for their own existence; but they are not at that point yet, or at any rate they won't own it;—and it was not for this that they began. They still wish to set "Germany over all." Their belief in the excellence of their culture remains intact; and they will go on wishing to spread this culture, without ever perceiving that the world is revolted and outraged by it.

German culture requires nothing disinterested from its adherents: rather, it inflames their covetous desires, since it is nothing but a calculated, scientific, methodical scheme to achieve supremacy by armed and brutal force, instead of by intellectual superiority. For it would be difficult to find at the bottom of German culture any predominant notion except the lust for Germanic predominance. This war which the Germans are waging is very far from being a crusade for the triumph of Christian ideals throughout the world: it is the tyranny of the Germans, and not the Kingdom of God, which they desire to establish.

It is true, no doubt, that of all the belligerents the Germans make most noise about God; the other peoples call upon God for help: the Germans don't take this trouble, for they are sure he is with them. For is not God the god of the Germans? Is he not also tamed, and enlisted; is he anything more than a general officer on the staff of the Emperor, who

A. Are they not encouraged to think thus?
 When a nation wants a "Grimed Head" to
 "boss the show" don't they get one "MADE IN GER-
 = MANY?"

deals with him in such a free and easy way ? This venerable god is the essence of Germany, its tutelary genius, the mystical embodiment of its brutality. He is not the personification of a great and humane ideal, of a civilization that is really universal in its principles and effects, but only of German culture; that is, of a science put at the disposal of the narrowest Germanic interests, and of Germany's covetous and greedy appetites.

The god of the Germans personifies a nation's appetites, and he only seems great because of the colossal size of the appetite which he impersonates. He is as much a part of his people's military equipment as a cockade or the spike of a helmet. The people thinks itself religious because it sports this emblem; and for this reason the German army should be esteemed as immaculate. Quite recently, William the Second's most notorious theologian, M. Adolf von Harnack, was brazen enough to indict what he described as the calumnies of the foreign press against the German army, which is "so chivalrous and so austere in morals."¹ The German god inspires his believers with a remarkable admiration for themselves; and the atrocities of which they may be guilty in making war are no sins in their eyes. The Germanic god is merely a form of German arrogance. It is not for him that they fight; though he, with and by the Germans, fights for Germany. William the Second wrote, not long ago, that this god had inspired his grandfather,

¹ *Internationale Monatschrift*, October, 1914, p. 28.

The "God of the Germans" is an Expression frequently used by Loisy, and on pages 23-25 he refers more particularly to the German Kaiser's attitude in respect to his national deity. But the NAME of the "God of the Germans" is not revealed; & to the curious enquirer, the question suggests itself; Who is the deity so frequently invoked by the Kaiser; & who, according to him, approves of the dreadful doings of the Kaiser's myrmidons, who apparently are assured of the ultimate success of deeds becoming fiends? The God must surely be like his children?

The learned German Divine

The Rev. Dr. Dollinger, in his Work

2

"The Gentile & the Jew" quotes Strabo
the Greek geographer (BC 54 - AD 21)
who described the ancient Germans
as a race which surpassed the Celts
"in ferocity, size, & yellow-hairedness,"
a description which applied to them
also in the XIX Century - (see Vol. i. | 263).
Dr. Döllinger (in Vol. ii | 2123) quotes
Tacitus, the Roman historian (A.D.
54 - 117); thus :- "We learn further
through Tacitus (Germ. 2) that the
DIVINE PROGENITOR of the German races
was the GOD TUISCO, a son of the Earth,
and that from his son Mannus, &
his three sons, the three principal
branches of the nation descended".
Therefore, tradition affirms that
the ferocious Germans were the

progeny of their gods, & the inference is, they must have inherited the natures of their progenitors. What the Teutonic Gods were like is fully set forth in the Mythology of the race.

Before proceeding further it will be as well to note, that Dr Döllinger writes (Vol ii. p 123 "Gentile & Jew") "The Anglo-Saxons traced the ^{back} origins to Woden (or Odin) himself. Woden was the "All Father" of the Teutonic Pantheon.

According to the Articles of Christian Belief, the Supreme Being, the Creator of the World, is both Invisible & Incomprehensible, and all other religions are

4

compelled to make the same admission: but they have gods invented by themselves, the products of their imaginations, as Xenophanes the Greek Philosopher (330 B.C.) rightly observes. The early

Christian Father, Clement of Alexandria (2nd Century). Quotes the Greek Philosopher, Xenophanes, thus:-

"One God there is, 'midst gods and men supreme: In form, & mind, unlike to mortal men". x x x x

"But men have the idea that gods are born; And wear their clothes, & have both voice & shape." x x x x

But had the osen or the lions, hands, or could with hands, depict a work like men; Were beasts to draw

the semblance of the gods; The
horses would then, like to horses
sketch; & To Oxen, Oxen: and
their bodies make of such a shape
as to themselves belong" (Miscell v. 14)
again in (Miscell vii. 4):-

"Not as the Greeks represent the Gods
as possessing human forms, so also
do they as possessing human
passions. And as each of them
depict their forms similar to
themselves, as Xenophanes says:
'Ethiopians as black, and aëtes, the
Thracians ruddy, and Caucasian'; so
also they assimilate their souls to
those who form them: the Barba-
rians, for instance, who make them
savage & wild; & the Greeks, who

6

make them more civilized, yet
subject to passion". ←

[Mr. H. A. Guerber has recently
published an excellent summary
of "The Myths of the Norsemen" which
is of much assistance to the general
reader].

On sheet 2. it was stated, Juisco
was the Progenitor of the German
races; & that he was a son of the
Earth. This information is illu-
minating, explaining "Mysteries"
which are concealed from the
unlearned rabble. (1). It would
seem that the peoples of Europe
are bent upon having German
Royalties to rule them; and we
see they fill the Courts of Europe.

In the Hebraized version of the Babylonian Creation Myth, it is written: - "and Elohim (God) created MAN in HIS OWN IMAGE: in the IMAGE of Elohim created HE him" (Genesis 1:27). The converse is true: The ^{ancient} Jews pictured a God, like themselves. This matter will be referred to further on.

I
Whether these strips of Royalty a
stupid or Intelligent; Moral or
Immoral, Sane or Insane, is of
no consequence. It is sufficient
for the Masses (of asses) that they
are Divinities, the possession of
which confers dignity on the
fortunate possessors, and are high
esteemed by the Masses (of asses)
as potent Belishes. (2) There can
be no doubt now, regarding the
motives of the German Caesar &
his myrmidons for plunging the
nations of the World into the
bloodiest war, history has recorded.
It is the fiendish desire to conquer
and possess, the whole Earth.

Was not the Divine Ancestor's mother, Jorda or Erda, Mother Earth, the husband & lover of whom, was the All-Father Odin? What could be more appropriate, than the divinely descended progeny of Mother Earth should rule the whole of their ancestral domains?

Who can tell what ideas lie at the back of men's minds? Heaven, Hell, the World are within us. Man is the great ABYSS.¹¹ (Cuniet).

Trisico was said to be son of Tyr, the War God, or Teutonic Mars, and it is said his hand

was bitten off by the Wolf Fenris
a son of Hel, goddess of the
Fenonic Infernal regions. It is
this goddess Hel who has given
the name to the Christian Infer-
nal region, "HELL"; to which all
unbelievers are cordially consign-
ed by the "Ambassadors for Christ."

(ii Cor. v. 20)

Now, it is well known that the
German Caesar, & War Lord, has his
left arm maimed, & useless. Some
say he was injured in the arm in
childhood; others say the defect is
a congenital deformity. Any way
the War God Tyr, & the War Lord
Caesar Wilhelm II, have each a
disabled arm. Civilized man

Like his "savage" brother is drenched
 in superstition; and is it not pos-
 sible that in their War Lord who
 has one arm maimed, they see
 a re-incarnation of their maim-
 ed God, Tyr, & obey his insane
 commands, & worship him as a
 reincarnated mythical deity?

Some such hypothesis seems to
 be a reasonable cause for so-called
 rational beings being led to per-
 petrate fiendish actions. Actions
 which surpass in ferocity & pitiless
 cruelty, the Tiger & the Wolf? The
 terrible Wolf, Fenris, son of Hela,
 the Goddess of the Teutonic Inferno,
 is ^a conspicuous figure in Teutonic

11
Mythology: he bit off the hand of
Tyr the War God. 'As the God of
courage & of War Tyr was frequently
invoked by the various nations of
the North, who cried to him as well
as to Odin (Woden) to obtain victory
--- This people, venerating the God
as they did, were wont to worship
him under the emblem of a SWORD
his distinctive attribute; & in his
honor held great SWORD DANCES
The "Prussian Sword" is a common
phrase, used to express the character-
istic tendency of Prussians to use it,
unjustly & ruthlessly, to attain their
savage purposes. And the pro-
found veneration paid to the

German Caesar, suggests, that if through the modern Germans are supposed to be "Christians", yet beneath the veneer & embroidery of "Christianism" there still lingers the ancient savage traits & beliefs; and if not openly avowed, the veneration paid to the one-armed Caesar, is because he is, if not a reincarnation of the one-armed Tyr, at least, inspired by that ferocious deity & utters his oracles.

The dominant theme in ancient Norse Mythology was Battle, slaughter & plunder. Those slain in bloody conflicts were

certain of admission into the
 Sueton Paradise, Valhalla. and
 when some distinguished warrior
 was brought to Asgard, the home
 of the Gods, the Valfather, or father
 of the slain, as Odin was called,
 would rise from his throne &
 welcome him at the great entrance
 gate. Such a reception, no doubt
 will be accorded to Caesar Wilhelm
 II. when he goes to Valhalla.

The glorified denizens of Val-
 halla enjoyed themselves perpetu-
 ally in feasting and fighting.
 They feasted on the flesh of the
 divine Boar Sæhrimur & small
 flagons of delicious mead: the

supplies of pork & mead were
 inexhaustible, and were served to
 the feasters by beautiful white-
 armed Virgins, the VALKYRS. After
 a feed the beatified warriors donned
 their armour & weapons & went out
 into the great courtyard, where
 they fought one another, repeating
 the feats of arms for which they were
 famed on earth; recklessly deal-
 ing terrible wounds, which, how-
 ever, were miraculously & completely
 healed as soon as the dinner-horn
 was sounded; when they resumed
 gorging & guzzling. Such were
 the Suetonic conceptions of bliss.
 Has "Christian Civilization" erad-
 icated, or even tempered these gross

15
and ferocious conceptions & appetites.
On the contrary, under the veneer of
Christianism they flourish. The
ancient Northern nations deemed
warfare the most honorable of occupa-
tions: it is still considered in this
light. In civil life, if one man kills
his fellow man maliciously, he is
held to be a murderer & is hung.
But if a warrior kills many men
he is acclaimed as a HERO. Such
are Christian concepts. What is
more appreciated in Christendom
than Banquets? The Duels of
old, used to drink TOASTS: the first
toast was drunk in honor of Odin
the All-Father. In the present
day, the first toast is drunk in

honor of the ruler of the realm
 because he is held to be "The
 Gods' Anointed": a visible
 incarnation of a deity: it is
 held, he can not do wrong. One
 not ^{modern} Zuekons noted for their par-
 tiality for pork and beer? Over
 the principal gateway to Val-
 halla were a BOAR'S HEAD and
 an EAGLE. Now Swine were
 held by the Jews to be an abom-
 ination, and the Christ consid-
 ered them to be fit receptacles
 for devils - see the account given
 in Matt viii. 30-32. yet swine's
 flesh is esteemed not only as an
 article of food, but as a delicacy,
 by modern Zeutonic Christians.

17
Cultures which feed on putrid
corpses are shunned by mankind;
but boars feed not only upon putrid
corpses, but also upon human excreta.
They are conspicuously salacious.
Yet at Royal Banquets on the annu-
versary of the birth-day of the Christ
a Boar's Head is laid before the feed-
ers with much ceremony. How is this
accounted for? It is anti-Jewish.
Can it be, that under the veneer
of Christianity they symbolise the
Boar's Head placed over the prince-
ly gateway to Valhalla; & reverence
the DIVINE BOAR, Sæhrimnir, upon
the flesh of which glorified Juto
feasted in Valhalla? A curious
blend, indeed, of Christian & savage

Tue-tonic ideals.

An Eagle was perched, also over, the principal gateway to Valhalla; & when the All Father, Odin, went on the Warpath, he wore his EAGLE helmet. The Eagle adorns the Scesor's helmet also, & it is emblazoned on his imperial standard. Is this an accidental decoration, or is it a survival of primitive ideals? The Eagle is a bird of PREY, and an appropriate symbol of other bireds who ^{PRAY to} ~~make~~ their gods to aid them when PREYING on their species.

Of the seven days in the Christian WEEK, three are dedicated to Planets - Sunday to the Sun; Monday, or Moon-day to the Moon;

and Saturday, or Saturn's-day,
 to the malignant planet, SATURN.
 The remaining four are dedicated
 to ancient Teutonic deities. Thus
 Tuesday, to Tues. or Tui, the
 Teutonic Mars; Wednesday to
 Woden or Odin, the Allfather in
 the Pantheon; Thursday to Thor,
 the god of Thunder; + Friday to
 Freya, the goddess, + one of the
 wives of the Allfather. Another
 curious blend of Ancient Teutonic
 + Judean ideals.

The Masses of Christians are
 not enlightened about the Mysteries
 and accept in good faith, the revela-
 tions made to them. Few indeed have
 the opportunity of probing the secret

which are concealed from the
 common herd; but to those who
 are so fortunate as to have the
 leisure & the inclination to probe
 Hebrew Mythology, a wonder-land
 is revealed to them. The most
 important day of the week to the
 Jews, was the 7th day, which
 was called the Sabbath, & on which
 work was forbidden under pain
 of death. The reason for this "Day
 of Rest" being naively stated to be
 In 6 days the Lord made heaven
 & earth, & on the 7th day he RESTED
 and WAS REFRESHED" (Exodus XXXI.17).
 This is not the place to trace the
 origins of ancient Jewish customs,
 and the reasons for their observance.

That has been excellently executed
 by learned & outspoken scholars,
 cleric & laic, Jewish & Christian.
 Brights. The ancient Jews called the
 7th day of the week "Shabbath": the
 planet Saturn was called "Shabbeta"
 & the "Star" of the Jews was Saturn,
 according to the Rabbis. Itronos
 = Saturn, was called by the Pheni-
 cians, (an allied Semitic tribe), ISRAE.
 To Itronos, or Saturn, bloody sacri-
 fices, & human sacrifices (of children)
 were made. The Mosaic Law
 enjoins such sacrifices: the former
 were offered in the Temple, & the
 latter in the Vale of Hinnom bet
 the Temple. The Children of ISRAE
 were, the "Children of Saturn."

The Law was said to have been given on Mt SINAI. SINAI means the Mountain of "SIN", & "SIN" was the ancient Babylonian Moon-god, & it was at his mountain-seat, the LAW was said to have been given. There is ample evidence in the O.T. about the observances of New & Full Moon which indicate it was worshipped. Up to the present time, the Jewish months are lunar, & the antics of Orthodox Jews at seeing the New Moon, and "Blessing" it, are relics of ancient Moon Worship.

That the Sun was also worshipped, there is also evidence in the O.T. The Hebrew name for the Sun was "SHEMESH". They had towns named

after it - Beth - Shemesh = "The house
of the Sun". etc; & it is said Sun-wor-
ship was observed in the Temple itself
by "Idolatrous" Kings. Up to the
present time, formulae of "Benediction
on the Sun" are recited when the
Sun enters upon a New Cycle of 28
years; which occurs on the first
Wednesday every 28 years; to com-
memorate the birth of the Sun
on Wednesday Eve of the Creation!
This ceremony was performed in
New York City on the 7th April 1897.

Thus the "Christians" adhere ^{to} the
ancient "pagan" or "heathen" names
for the days of the Week. Their
EASTER is a Spring Festival ~~festival~~
in Christendom; and takes its

name from the ancient Saxon Goddess Eāstre, or Oskara, the Goddess of Spring!

In conclusion: one of the German Cæsar's sons is named EITEL. Who was Eitel? He was the Son of Attila, the terrible King of the Huns, called "The Scourge of God" for his terribly ferocious and pitilessly cruel acts. He was of Hahnuck-Barbar origin, and a "Christian" Emperor, named one of his sons after the Barbarian son, no doubt because he appreciated ferocity & cruelty, ^{because it was} inherent in his ^{own} nature.

William the First, to found the German Empire: doubtless, he has equally inspired William the Second to make the present war. The god of the Germans is an antique divinity. When the Kings of Nineveh, who in their time were great slaughterers of men and robbers of territory, made an official record of their campaigns, they never failed to state: "By the help of my Lord, the god Assur, I "marched against such and such a country." This god bore the very name of his people: Assur was Assyria, and was Assyrian. The god of the Germans is Germany, and he is a German. His name on the German flag does not keep the war planned by William the Second from being concerned solely with Germanic interests: indeed, it implies nothing else than these interests, than the rabid wish to beat down all the neighbours of Germany for the profit of the Germans. William the Second's war is not fundamentally more religious than were the wars of Sennacherib and Nebuchadnezzar. The invocations of the German god only accentuate the rigid nationalism and the egotistical greed of his character.

Whatever religion there may be in the policy of Turkey, of Italy, or of Roumania will not weigh heavy in the scales of history. At a lucky hour, Turkey has aimed at making a useful diversion for Austria and Germany, and to get from this diversion abundant profit for herself. If she only reaps a harvest of defeats and a fresh dismemberment, the glory of Allah need not be compromised seriously; since it is only the fortune of the Turks, and not of

Islam, which is at stake. Allah has no more reason to be proud if a victory for the Germans should put the Turkish Empire definitely under their control, than if the victory of the Allies should drive Mahomet the Fifth from Constantinople. Italy and the Roumanians seem to waver, fearing to enter the conflict either too early or too late to profit themselves at the expense of the conquered. "Sacred Egotism," an Italian statesman has said with justice. It is a religion of humbler scope, but of precisely the same kind as that of the Germanic god. Let us admit, however, to the honour of the exceedingly prudent governments of these two peoples, that they are watching above all the propitious hour for liberating the men of their race whom the predatory House of Hapsburg has pinned into their patch-work of nations.¹

And it may well be asked if Europe be still Christian, or if it has ever been. For Christianity proclaimed the brotherhood of nations, or rather the brotherhood of all men without any distinction of nationality. But the professedly Christian nations are now exterminating one another without mercy. Is Christianity then bent upon destroying itself, or does it exist no longer? Has it passed over the world like a happy dream of immortality, without leaving a trace of that law of love which it vaunted as peculiarly its own. The gods whom it supplanted have risen again: Assur of Nineveh, Marduk of Babylon, Ammon of Thebes, Jupiter Capitolinus,

¹ See Author's Preface, p. viii.

The author queries: "It may well be asked if Europe be STILL CHRISTIAN, or if it has ever been" (Christian).

If by the expression CHRISTIAN is meant a man who made the moral teachings of the Christ the invariable rule of his life; then it may be said without hesitation, that, no doubt some few, very very few, obscure, pure souls, did so, but both profane & Ecclesiastical history shows that the vast mass of so-called "Christians" were no better than "heathen". The "Christians" beneath their "Christian" emblem were just as ferocious as the heathen. According to Judeo-Christian ethics, it was considered

an act of murder" for one man
to kill another during times of
"Peace"; but during War-time
if a man succeeded in slaughter-
ing many men, he was acclaimed
as a "Hero", & was immortalized;
even as was David, the "man
after God's own heart" (1 Sam^l xiii. 14;
Acts xiii. 22) "Saul hath slain his
thousands, and David his ten thous-
ands" (1 Sam^l: xviii. 7). Even so it is
to-day. And when not engaged
in slaughtering their kind, they
slaughtered birds & beasts: indeed
they reared harmless deer, &
birds, for the pleasure it afforded
to kill them - even Kings and
Princes distinguished themselves

in such feats - and termed the
cruel pastime SPORT. The gentle
and humane "Christians" framed
laws to prevent Cruelty to Animals
and if a man used in harness a
horse that had a gall the size
of a farthing, he was haled before
a magistrate & punished for the
execrable deed. At the same time
the same "Christians" considered
it the "correct thing" to pay high
prices for horses, train them for
military purposes, & lead the
beautiful, trusting, brutes, into
battle, to be horribly mangled;
shot & killed & left squealing
terrible agonies on the "glorious
field of bloodshed." "Christians"

considered that a military
career was most honorable; if
they maimed or killed their
kind in War, or were maimed
& killed in their efforts to do so,
their names were inscribed on
the Rolls of "Glory & Honor." And
those who shrank from deeds
of what they deemed were those
of "Gory Horror", were called
"cowards", & were "jumped upon".
At the same time, their "Cin=
bassadors for Christ" unctuously
obtained the Evangel of "Peace
& Good Will toward all
men".

Mookenius "Ecclesiastical Hist-
ory" gives a lurid picture of

the Christianity from the 15th to
the 17th Centuries. In the earliest
centuries "to deceive & to lie was a
virtue when religion can be promoted
by it" (p. 70, 148). Prof. W. E. H. Lecky's
"History of European Morals", & the
"Rationalism in Europe", are grave
indictments; and the writings of
A. R. Wallace & Walter Vaughan
& others, commenting on later
aspects of the social fabric, & its
insatiable policy of "Grab & Get", &
obsession by hedonism; occa-
sions no surprise at the out-
break of a World-wide War;
characterized by an entire
absence of all moral principles
and the exhibition of craftiness.

characteristic of savagery; surpassing in ferocity & pitiless cruelty, Tigers, Leopards & Wolves.

The following texts proclaim the Essence of true religion.

Do they regulate National & Social policies absolutely? It would be well for Mankind if they did so.

Matthew v. 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 16, 37, 42, 48.
vi. 1-7, 33; vii. 12, 21; xviii. 3; xxiii. 4-33.

live again in the god of the Germans. Meanwhile, what is happening to the god of the Christians? Governments and peoples are behaving as though they knew him not; though the world is still crowded with his official representatives, who assuredly will not remain silent in the present crisis, which is the most uncompromising challenge ever made to their faith since it came into existence.

THE CHURCHES

IT is astounding how little the gospel and the churches have found to say. This is no time to discuss either the remote or the proximate causes of the attitude towards the war taken both by ministers of the gospel and by the head of the Roman church. Nevertheless, it may be well to point them out, not to raise any futile controversy in so critical an hour, but to show by typical examples how the case appears to a detached observer. The respect which we owe to other peoples' beliefs should not be carried so far as to deprive us of the right to enunciate openly what we consider true.

The gospel, the pure and primitive gospel, has innumerable preachers in all those Christian denominations which have sprung from the reformation; and never did they have a finer chance to proclaim the central teaching of Jesus about the brotherhood of man, as well as the consequences which follow from this principle; but how few voices have recalled the teaching of the Galilean prophet, and how thin the echo which has answered.

A venerable pastor, M. C. E. Babut, of Nîmes, wrote to M. E. Dryander, first chaplain to the court of Berlin, submitting to him a form of declaration

that might be signed by all "the Christians of Germany, England, Austria, France, Russia, Belgium, and Serbia," without any distinction of creed; the wording of the declaration being so expressed that it could be accepted, as it surely ought to be, by all who profess to believe in Jesus. The letter of this French pastor, and the answer of the German,¹ are instructive in different ways; and both of them appear to lead us to a general conclusion, not only as to the small practical effect which the ideals of the gospel exercise on peoples professing to be Christian, but as to the manifest impossibility of the gospel to solve that human problem which actual events are urging upon us in its acutest form.

M. Babut aimed at having a declaration made by all believers who are baptized in the name of Jesus Christ:

"1. That, profoundly attached to their respective countries, they wished neither to do nor to say anything which was not compatible with the sincere patriotism that inspired them;

"2. But, at the same time, they could neither ignore nor forget that God is the god of every nation and the father of all men; that Jesus Christ is the saviour of them all, and has commanded his followers to esteem and love one another as brethren; that from the stand-point of the gospel there is no longer, as Saint Paul declares, either Jew or Greek, barbarian or Scythian, so, in conse-

¹ They can be read in *Foi et Vie*, November 16, 1914.

“ quence, there are no longer Germans and French, Austrians and Russians, but Christ is all in all.

“ Therefore they undertake, in the sight and with the help of God, to expel from their hearts all hatred of those whom they are forced temporarily to describe as enemies, and to do good to them whenever there is any chance; to use all the influence at their disposal, so that the war may be carried on as humanely as possible; that the conqueror, whoever he may be, do not abuse his power; that the persons and rights of the weak be respected: they will also continue to exercise a fraternal charity towards their brethren in the faith, to whatever nation they belong, and will pray to God for all the victims of the war without exception; beseeching him earnestly that he will soon cause the horrors of war to be changed into a just and stable peace, and that he will direct the unhappy and cruel events which are occurring now towards the advancement of his Kingdom.”

Catholics might venture to regret that these principles were not promulgated by Benedict the Fifteenth, and moreover that he did not emphasize them as expressing fully the sentiments and policy which in the actual circumstances inspire the head of the Roman church. No one can deny the evangelical spirit of M. Babut. We can flatter ourselves that there is at least one Christian still in the world, and that he is French. The letter of the Nîmes pastor is dated the fourth of August: M. Dryander replied on the fifteenth of September.

The chaplain of William the Second commended the proposals of M. Babut without any hesitation; but he, and the two colleagues who were associated with him in the answer, declined even more resolutely to accept them in a way which might seem like an engagement to remind their fellow-citizens of a duty. "We must repudiate them," they wrote, "because, as we think, there should not lurk in them *even the remotest suspicion* that Germany has any need of a warning about carrying on the war according to Christian principles or the requirements of mercy and humanity. For our whole people, as for our general staff, it is a matter of course that the fighting is confined to soldiers, that the weak and defenceless population be spared carefully, that the ill and wounded be cared for without any distinction. We are convinced, through a knowledge of the facts, that these are the rules of our whole army; and that, on our side, the men are fighting with a self-control, with a tenderness of conscience and behaviour, of which history has never yet perhaps given an example." It is, therefore, only the enemies of Germany who are in need of "a protest by the Christian conscience." No action need be taken with regard to the Germans and their responsibilities in war. "If England upbraids us hypocritically for brutally violating the neutrality of Belgium, the answer to this vain pretence is obvious: when a man is fighting for his life, you do not ask him whether in the struggle he has broken down his neighbour's

“gate.” The Germans are likened to “a peaceable man who is attacked by three hyenas at the same time, all thirsting for his blood.” “If as Germans we ought to sign such a declaration as you have submitted to us, we could only do it with propriety after English, French, and Russian Christians had publicly condemned the infamy of the attack on us, and the impious crime which alone has brought about this war.” Pitying the illusions of French patriots with regard to the progress of the war, M. Dryander—on the fifteenth of September!—thought well to add to his letter “certain official statements” by the German government, which may “put matters in their true light.” He ended by saying: “Our righteous anger, and the moral condemnation before God, which we bring against our enemies, extends also to their nations and governments. God alone knows how much responsibility lies upon each individual member of a nation; but, by the law of solidarity, everyone shares in the faults of his people and in their consequences, just as he does in the honour of his country. All this, however, does not withhold us from saying that we consider all men to be brethren in Christ, to whatever nation they belong, and that we shall treat them as such whenever the occasion offers.”

May heaven preserve us from ever having to endure the charity of the court chaplain Dryander! His benevolence would be so inhuman that gratitude would be impossible. His answer to the evangelical

M. Babut contains nothing of the gospel, except the sham prayer of the Pharisee: "God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers." His Christianity is only on the surface: it is merely the baptismal robe with which a German hides his nakedness when he wishes to profess himself a disciple of Jesus. Below, there is always the Germanic arrogance. Besides the pedantry of the German *savants*, and the intellectual conceit which misleads them into thinking Germany the fount of light, there is the equally unintelligent spiritual pride of the German ecclesiastics, which makes them consider Germany a paradise of right faith and of every perfection. One can imagine that M. Dryander, the court preacher, would hesitate to explain the gospel to his imperial master, lest by so doing he might appear to insinuate, quite unjustly, that William the Second is not steeped in it, even to his bones and marrow. Our common experience, and the slightest consideration of oneself, not to speak of others, prove to us that the intelligence and moral worth of every human being are limited. The Germans appear to be amazed at finding themselves so clever and flawless: but, of a truth, this is surely because their self-knowledge is at fault; for it is impossible that their abilities are unbounded, their knowledge without gaps and flaws, or that there is not a single rent in the garment of their virtue. Meanwhile, the whole world is edified by "the pity," "the humanity," "the self-control," "the conscience," "the tenderness," with which

the Prussian general staff and the German army are pursuing their operations in France and Belgium.

M. Dryander, court chaplain and minister of the gospel, compares Belgium to a gate, which Germany has broken down through a mere oversight, while struggling for its life. M. A. von Harnack, librarian of the court, to which M. Dryander is preacher, compares the same Belgium to the sacred loaves which David eat of old time, according to the scripture, when other food was wanting, so that he might escape dying of hunger. Neither the unctuous preacher, nor the erudite librarian, has deigned to consider that Belgium means the Belgian people; that the Belgians are human beings, and that these human beings have a right of ownership in their native soil, and in themselves: the Germans, on the other hand, unless indeed their god has invested them with special rights over all other people, have no business to consider Belgium and the Belgians as their mere chattel, nor to overwhelm them in a war which is no concern of theirs.

If the politicians, pastors, and professors, who manipulate German public opinion, were capable of understanding and criticizing themselves, even a little, instead of admiring each other unreservedly, they would see clearly that Germany is chiefly responsible for the remoter causes of this war, since it prepared for it; also that it never ceased to threaten Europe, and that it counted on the war eventually to secure the foundations of that hegemony which Germany was to exercise over the world. They

would perceive, as well, that the least spirit of conciliation on the part of the German government, even at the last hour, would have prevented the catastrophe, but that there came from it nothing except overbearing demands, suggested by a foolhardy pride and a rash confidence of winning.

“English, French, and Russian Christians” are under no obligation to formulate “a public denunciation” of their governments for “the infamy of their attack”; because upon other shoulders lies the burden of responsibility for “the infamy of attacking and the sacrilegious crime which alone have brought about this war.” Only Germans think it is a sacrilege not to submit to being enslaved by Germany. And most ridiculous would be the German claim that it had attained the perfection of Christian heroism in this war; if, alas, the horror of it all did not extinguish ridicule, on account of the undeniable, numberless, and unheard-of crimes which have disgraced a soldiery that has the effrontery to pose as an army of saints. If the word sacrilege still have any meaning, it applies to those who have glutted themselves with murders, rapes, and pillage, while invoking the name of Jesus.

Jesus! that figure whose splendour illuminates the centuries which are gone, has it not become a mere shadow that is vanishing from our horizon? Vainly do the reformed Christians flatter themselves that they are renovating features which they also say are immortal: they have, rather, hastened their

disappearance. To be convinced that the Christ and his gospel are barely alive in the country of Luther, in the home of protestantism, it is sufficient to read M. Dryander. Even M. Babut, one of the rare survivals of a genuine Christianity, helps us to understand why its failure is inevitable, why Christ is ignored and forgotten everywhere, and not alone in that Germany which boasts of him so hypocritically. For M. Babut does not appear to see that the first article of his declaration is invalid from the standpoint of the gospel, and is in flat contradiction with the second article.

The gospel knows nothing of patriotism; and when M. Babut affirms that he means neither to do nor to say anything incompatible with the true and zealous patriotism which animates him, he stultifies in advance all that he affirms later about God the father of all men, about universal brotherhood, and the essential obligations of charity; for, indeed, this second affirmation annuls the former. If we should defend our country against those who attack it, war is lawful; but, if we are all brethren, we should embrace instead of killing one another. The gospel of Jesus implies the non-existence of nationality: it effaces it. War between genuine Christians would be silly and unimaginable, if such Christians existed; for M. Babut himself is not wholly Christian, but only so far as his patriotism allows. Are we then right to be patriotic, even at the risk of being less or not at all Christian? Doubtless; because our only chance of living is bound up

with our patriotism. A genuine Christian, according to the gospel, is one who allows himself to be killed without resisting, one who declines still more to take up arms, even in the service of his country. According to the gospel, only the peaceable have any right to be called children of God. The true believer endures persecution, suffering, and death, because the kingdom of heaven belongs to him.

The ideal of human brotherhood is not, however, to be deemed a folly; and it is the everlasting honour of Jesus that he outlined the principle in clearer and more winning terms than anyone before him. But we are compelled to acknowledge that Christendom has failed continuously and increasingly to carry out the principles laid down by Christ. And the reason of this failure is not to be sought in our human imperfection, which of course is undeniable; but, rather, in the too simple, imaginative, and rigid form which the principle itself has assumed in the gospel. The brotherhood of man is an ideal to be achieved: Jesus presented it as an accomplished fact. The same God has made all men, and cherishes them under his protection; nevertheless, the world hastens to its ruin, and men lose themselves in wickedness; but God will appear, and by a sudden manifestation of his power will re-establish all the victims of injustice in a kingdom of never-ending happiness, where will be no more sorrow or tears, neither fear nor death, but an eternity of pleasure in a divine world.

It was a sublime and unrealizable dream, which

the uneasy, agitated, and suffering populations of the Mediterranean countries accepted, though not without eliminating, one by one, its improbabilities. Judaism, ardent and unfortunate, had conceived these enthusiastic hopes sooner than wreck its faith. Jesus accepted them as an earnest of the divine pity, insisting that the law of love must be the supreme rule for the children of God. To console men for the uncertainties and frequent cruelties of the present life, he offered them a place in the city of blessedness which God was about to establish on earth. These hopes of the despairing were mistaken in only one point: they misread the actual conditions of human life. Men adopted them, nevertheless, and clung to them for long; and some believe them still, because to keep a firm hold on life man has need of hope as an indispensable anchor. How shall he stake everything upon efforts which wear him out, of which the utility is often lost so far as he is concerned, if in spite of everything he cannot manage to believe that he is neither suffering nor dying vainly? An illusion is not vain which gives one the courage to face unavoidable deprivations.

But fragile indeed were the terms on which the hopes and ideals of the gospel depended. The divine kingdom did not come, and it was only the church that established itself on earth. Neither did the professing children of God feel that they were brethren, although taught incessantly that they were. They forced themselves duly to believe it,

but they practised poorly what they believed. The *mirage* of the faith lasted for many centuries, in spite of being dissolved by hard realities; because there was more urgent business than to examine and verify it. It was necessary to live, to struggle, to endure; and heaven above, the invisible heaven, was always a consolation for the miseries below. When the strife of peoples was mitigated in some degree, when Greek knowledge was reborn, when philosophers again had time to think, western humanity was enabled to reason about the faith by which it had lived morally, and thence to discuss its claims.

The vast difference, which was noted immediately between the Christian ideal and the life of the peoples who had grown up within the church, brought about the first crisis; that the world was so little Christian was attributed to the church, as though she were responsible for her creeds being shattered by realities; viz., that God, the father of mankind, looks down upon them all benevolently, and puts into their hearts that brotherly love towards which he urged them; that the present life had no meaning except in relation to a future immortality, since God himself did not will, whatever Jesus may have promised, that the reign of justice should prevail in this world. Essentially, the church, to a very large degree, had modified the illusions of the gospel; and the notion of bringing back the pure and genuine gospel was another delusion. The main effort of protestantism could

lead to only one result: to bring about the dissolution of western Christianity by drawing attention to the inconsistency of its very starting-point.

A large part of Germany, and most of all Prussia, came into Christendom much later than the Mediterranean peoples. The Christian ideal did not take hold of it so deeply or widely as its existing theologians pretend. After the collapse of the ancient faith, which happened in the eighteenth century, Germany for a moment seemed likely to turn itself, as France did, towards that fine ideal of humanity which was in some sort a transformation, or an adaptation, of the New Testament ideal. But its old national temper revived during the course of the nineteenth century; and, instead of the god of metaphysical Christianity, in place of the god of the gospel, in the place of Christ, there reappeared the god of the Germans: a reincarnation of Yaweh in the Old Testament, who butchered the Canaanites to give their land to his people Israel; a resurrection also of the warlike and ferocious primeval gods of Germany, who were valued for their use. The Germans, Caesar writes, honour only the gods who are manifestly of use to them: *quorum aperte opibus juvantur*.¹

The influence of the genuine gospel is shown us accurately in the correspondence between M. Babut and M. Dryander: the former demonstrates in his two propositions, though without intending it, the essential incompatibility between a patriotism which

¹ "De Bello Gallico," vi. 21.

is necessary for the life of nations, and the whole programme of the Sermon on the Mount; and the latter makes us realize, with an unconsciousness that is indeed colossal, the hypocrisy of a murderous Christianity. Judging from without, and superficially, might not anyone be tempted to declare that the ideals of the gospel had failed completely?

Side by side with those who have spoken, because they have something to say, there is One who has kept silence, or who has spoken only for the express purpose of saying nothing, which comes to much the same.

Pius the Tenth was killed through realizing the evil which was unloosed by his friends and patrons, the Emperors of Austria and of the Germans. He did not live to see how they carried out their schemes. Benedict the Fifteenth was elected at the very time when the German warfare displayed in Belgium the characteristics which we know. The name that he chose had the advantage of breaking the alternate monotony of Pius and Leo, while recalling one of the most learned and moderate Popes whom the church has seen. Moreover, there were attributed to him the large views of Leo the Thirteenth, as well as that intelligent good will towards the present age which is described generally by the term liberalism. But the liberalism of a Pope is always bounded by his office, which does not allow of his being himself but compels him always to be the Pope. Thus it has been with Benedict the Fifteenth.

Many, however, encouraged themselves by thinking that the new Pontiff would be stirred by the infinite pain which now afflicts the heart of the nations, and that he would proclaim it loudly, without passion or violence, and so express the horror which every human being who is not a tiger must feel at the sight of so terrible a massacre. He should have proclaimed the eternal disgrace of a civilization which ended in this butchery. He should have mourned for the expiring human race; for that splendid youth, so full of intelligence, of courage, and of promise for the future, which goes down into the night with all our hopes. He should have expatiated on the desolate homes, the ruin of the countryside, the towns destroyed, and above all on the moral shipwreck, the accumulated infamies. He should have rebuked those who for so long have inspired a credulous and inflammable populace with mistrust, jealousy, hatred, and a thirst for blood. He should have denounced the mystery of iniquity, the atrocious crime of those who planned the war, and who must bear the responsibility of it in history, or as he would have said before God. He could have said all this without naming any one, in fact he should not have named anybody. He should have made an appeal to the general conscience before that final Judge, the conscience of all mankind. He should have reminded everyone that the nations themselves have sacred duties to one another; that pledges given are not empty words; that no nation is merely a prey to be devoured by a stronger

neighbour; and that war legalizes neither robbery nor rape, nor the killing of inoffensive people, which is nothing but assassination; that the invasion of a country does not abolish its right to independence; that brute force used unjustly is sheer brigandage. Through justice itself, he would have shown the true solution of the conflict; for Europe cannot be finally at peace so long as any one of her peoples is oppressed. He would have ended in words of love, pointing out the immense efforts required, the infinite good will that must inspire these efforts, in order that the peoples may revive after their torture, that their minds may be restored to quiet, that men may learn at length to love one another as Jesus desired, that all the loss and devastation may be repaired; that a new world, and a better one than the old, may emerge from the ruins and hide them, so that these hours of darkness may be forgotten.

However, we have not heard any such discourse; but only, after a common-place and vague lament over the misfortune of war, an utterance in which Benedict the Fifteenth excuses himself from looking at the facts of the war from the standpoint of justice. While equivocal and baffling at first sight, the text of this solemn utterance is an involuntary confession of what the papacy has become to-day. The successor of Gregory the Seventh and Innocent the Third, in his consistorial allocution of January the 22nd, with reference to the war says this:—

“If it be not granted us to hasten the end of so grievous a misfortune, may we at least be able to modify the wretched consequences! . . . Our apostolic office does not allow us to do more at present.” To proclaim that no one is allowed, for any pretext whatsoever, to do violence to justice is doubtless the highest duty which devolves on the Sovereign Pontiff, who is commissioned by God to be his chief interpreter; and we proclaim it without reserve, denouncing all injustice by whichever side it may be committed. In doing this, there is no need to involve the pontifical authority in the controversies of the belligerents. For assuredly it must be clear to every unbiassed thinker that in this frightful conflict the Holy See, without failing to watch it with close attention, is bound to a complete impartiality.

“The Roman Pontiff, in so far on the one hand as he is the vicar of Jesus Christ, who died for all men and for each individual, and on the other hand as he is the common father of all catholics, is constrained to exercise the same charitable feeling towards all the combatants. For on each side, there are a large number of his sons, whose salvation must be to him an equal object of anxiety. It is therefore necessary that he should regard in them, not the several interests which divide them, but that common link of faith which makes them brethren. If he behaved otherwise, not only would he fail to promote the cause of peace, but, what is much worse, he would bring

“dislike and hatred upon religion, and would
“expose the internal peace and concord of the
“church to the peril of serious disturbance.”

Thus the Pope does not choose to involve the pontifical authority in the quarrel of the belligerents, or to weigh the several interests which divide them, because his duty as head of the church binds him to “a complete impartiality” towards them all. This confession must be borne in mind; though we must point out that it is expressed in dubious terms. His Holiness ignores or mistakes the proper meaning of the word *impartiality*, which he seems to identify here with the term *neutrality*; if, indeed, the former have not been substituted of set purpose for the latter.

By impartiality is understood that perfect justice which ought to be followed in the treatment of persons and the estimate of things. Neutrality has nothing moral in it, has no common link with justice; it implies a wholly passive attitude with regard to other people's quarrels, considering neither the facts nor the reasons which may influence the opposing parties. Impartiality is a duty and a virtue: neutrality is only a matter of common prudence, one might even say of policy. Thus impartiality and neutrality are quite different things: in fact, they are incompatible with one another in the sphere of morals; for no one has any right to be neutral in moral questions; and whoever pretends to be neutral in matters where justice is concerned fails to be impartial. As a matter of

fact, whoever in such a matter claims to be indifferent is in reality siding with him who is in the wrong, and against him who is right. Now Benedict the Fifteenth is covering himself with neutrality, while pretending to be impartial; and we may ask why the Pope is neutral, and how it is that while claiming the right to declare what justice is, in the name of the god for whom he speaks, nevertheless he dispenses himself from judging the causes and events of the present war with complete impartiality.

His conduct from the opening of the hostilities assured us that he was completely neutral, even before his utterances confirmed it. He has tolerated the crushing of that noble Belgium, the victim of her loyalty, of Belgium the only country left in the world whose government is professedly catholic; he has borne the sight of Louvain in flames, the destruction of the fairest and most famous among catholic universities; he has been able to witness the massacre by the Germans of a multitude of helpless men, women, children, and priests, all members of the catholic church; he has even endured to see a Cardinal of the holy Roman church treated as a prisoner, and hindered from saying a word to his people which might remind them of their rights and sustain their hopes; he has been able to witness all these things without allowing the world to know whether he has uttered a single genuine word of protest; he seems rather to have censured Cardinal Mercier cautiously than to have spoken up for the right. Assuredly Benedict the Fifteenth has been

neutral; as neutral as the governments of Switzerland, Holland, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark; as neutral as his neighbour on the Quirinal was, perhaps even more, and he really had no need to tell us so.

However, he has told us, and we should be grateful; because his speech enables us to understand what his cold attitude had somewhat obscured: what was really unintelligible to all those, whether believers or not, who continued to hold persistently that the Pope was in a special way the spiritual father and the moral guide of all faithful catholics. We French know well, know to our cost, that the war is a human fact about which we can and ought to form a moral judgment; it is a fact that is just or unjust in its causes and circumstances. We know well, in addition, that the law does not put Belgium at the disposal of the Germans so that they can misuse it to our disadvantage. We know, also, that the Germans have conducted themselves frequently, both in France and Belgium, like savages. Benedict the Fifteenth has thought good to assure us that, as Pope, he ignores all this, that he does not choose to form an opinion about it, even that he ought not to do so, that the quarrel of the belligerents is outside his responsibility, and that he has no business to trouble himself about their conflicting interests. The reason being, as he affirms, that he is impartial. To this, the whole world should answer: "Most Holy Father, with all due respect "to your infallibility, you are in error about your

“ phrase. Do not say you are impartial, or you
“ will be compelled to formulate a judgment, and
“ even to declare yourself against the cause of
“ injustice; but say frankly that you are neutral,
“ because that is the naked and shameless truth.”

If the Pope acknowledges that in questions of justice he has the right only to a vague opinion, which does not go farther than expressing the theoretical obligation to do no wrong to one's neighbour, he will never meet with any serious difficulty. But any chance person can fulfil that easy task, which is not properly an act of justice. Since Benedict the Fifteenth has notified us that he will not compromise the pontifical authority in the squabbles of the belligerents, he hopes assuredly to persuade us that their squabbles are not discernable by justice: he means to say nothing else than that he neither will nor ought to concern himself with them, in other words he chooses to remain neutral in regard to their quarrel. And so when he talks of the inconveniences which might result from any action upon his part, that is from a judgment dictated by the claims of impartial justice, he does not consider the matter from the standpoint of truth or right, but merely of political opportunism, and that is precisely the standpoint of neutrality. The troubles about which he alarms himself are not the uneasiness and the remorse of consciences which are convicted of their faults and crimes, but the embarrassment which might be caused to the pontifical administration by the displeasure of govern-

ments and peoples whose ambitions and calculations would be deranged by any public intervention on the side of right and law. Whence it follows that the Pope could not intervene on the side of justice unless he thought there were no risk, in other words not if justice were being violated by the strong. As a consequence, in spite of appearances, and of the verbiage in which the Pope's utterances are clothed, his authority is not concerned chiefly with moral questions; it is, above all other things, the relic of a political power which its possessor aims very naturally at preserving by means of his neutrality.

It should be understood by this time why Benedict the Fifteenth has not uttered the words of deliverance which numberless catholics and even non-catholics, notwithstanding so many adverse experiences, were expecting from the Roman pontiff. To speak these words of justice, charity, and hope, he should have begun by thinking and feeling them; to have thought and felt them, so as to have been urged irresistibly to scatter them throughout the world in a stream of pity and consolation, he should have been the representative of humanity, both its brain and its heart. Now the Pope is not, in truth, such a representative: he neither professes to be, nor chooses to be. Lamennais, long ago, imagined that the Pope had been this, and that he could become so again. Gregory the Sixteenth answered him harshly that the Pope does not represent humanity, but the authority of Christ and the church, and that his function is not to love but

to command. Others who have shared the illusions of Lamennais, more or less, have been given a similar reply. The Pope embodies the traditions of the Roman church, and is a government functionary; he is the administrator of an ancient ecclesiastical creed and organization, which, as of divine origin, he must safeguard from every attack. It is needless to refer to biblical criticism, or to history, to common sense and sane philosophy, in order to challenge the claims of Roman catholicism, because anyone can see that in the present matter the real question is elsewhere; and that if the Pope has said nothing which is of any value in the existing circumstances, it is really because he has nothing to say, either to those who are dying or to their survivors. He has even resigned to the clergy the duty of recalling the hopes of their belief to the faithful, and no one can blame him for it; because these hopes can only be recalled usefully to those who profess them, and it is not advisable to repeat them noisily in public before men who do not share them.

For a long while now, and ever more and more, though behind pious and inflated titles, the terms of which are superfluous to the present question, the Pope has become in the first place the leader of a body of Italian priests who hold as their own the administration of the catholic church. The divine right which is flaunted is to shield this prerogative.

In the Middle Ages, there existed a sort of Christian commonwealth,—it was not always a paradise of

justice,—of which the Pope was president, and he was in varying degrees obeyed or resisted. The nations that were formed out of the western empire retained under his influence a certain unity. He prided himself on being their judge and arbitrator; and, occasionally, as vice-gerent of God, he deposed sovereigns. Raised above all nations, he belonged to none: he was chosen from one or from another, and the papacy was not monopolized by Italians. In those days, the Pope was not ever neutral, because he was powerful; and he flattered himself that he was impartial, since he often undertook to judge. His justice, however, even when he followed its principles, was not altogether ours. Often, when he had excommunicated a ruler with a view to deposing him, he granted his territory to another, thus treating the people as a flock, to which he appointed the shepherd. Although times have changed, and the Pope no longer excommunicates sovereigns, unless with extreme caution and reserve, he is not much more enlightened about matters of right and law. In matters of right, he acknowledges chiefly his own; that right which he says he holds from God, over what he describes as the Lord's flock.

Little by little, the peoples were emancipated; and, the papacy becoming Italianized, there was during several centuries a petty Italian prince who was also head of the catholic church; and he retained as much as he could of the political authority which the medieval Popes had exercised, and as much as

possible of the revenues which they had extorted. His yoke soon appeared too heavy for the Germanic peoples, and most of them threw it off. The Latin peoples went on submitting, although their governments offered some resistance. At present we are witnessing a curious situation: Italy, having taken Rome as her capital, the Pope is no longer a temporal sovereign, but he remains a political personage, and is always an Italian; because he has been allowed to centralize the whole administration of the catholic church in his own hands, to such an extent that he holds all its clergy, and especially the French clergy, in his power. Thus the Papacy has become an international organization, directed solely by Italians, with which all governments, whether catholic or not, must treat, because it continues to be influential throughout the world by means of the clergy whom it sways despotically.

We should not be astonished if this organization does not trouble itself about popular rights. It has no definite theory about them, which would be inconvenient: least of all would it acknowledge them. The rights over nations and individuals, which it arrogates to itself, it has no intention of holding by their free consent, but from God alone. It is not a practical and existing right, but merely traditional and dead. It is an imperious right before which one has only to be prostrate. Its claims may, indeed, be founded only upon a myth, but this matters nothing; they must be maintained as question of belief. They no longer serve the interests of the

peoples; but this matters even less, since they are identified with the interests of the pontifical domination. The Vatican is inclined neither to understand nor to admit the right to dispose of themselves which is possessed by bodies of men who are conscious of their moral unity, and who wish to preserve it. This right is connected with that of the individual conscience, for it is nothing else than a collective liberty of conscience. And Rome will not admit any liberty of conscience; she reserves to herself the right of commanding, and recognizes in the mass of humanity and of peoples only the duty of obeying. Her underlying and obvious sympathies, even when they are not openly declared, are with the despotic powers, with those which rely upon divine right and force. For this right is similar to her own: it is a right which imposes itself from without, and can only justify itself by being thus imposed.

The honest Belgians and their loyal King appear to have been astonished that the Pope did not protest against the injustice done to them, and against the atrocities perpetrated in their country by the Germans. This was probably because Benedict the Fifteenth has not felt the injustice, as they have; because he has understood, and was able to understand, the behaviour of Germany. There is a catholic nation whose history for more than a century has been a continued martyrdom: you will seek in vain among the pontifical utterances for any express declaration of the right which Poland

had to preserve her national existence; but you will find, on the contrary, more than one invitation to yield to the rights of conquest: the rights of three monstrous robbers to share the remains of a martyred people. If an evil fate were to decree that Belgium should remain under the German heel, and that William the Second should annex it to his empire, there is little doubt that the Pope would not protest any more to-day; he would be careful not to compromise his pontifical authority by defining the rights of the conquered; if he spoke at all it would be to exhort them to obedience, and to support the administration intruded by an arrogant conqueror. Is it not clear "to every unbiassed thinker," that the Vatican regards otherwise than the Belgians did the questions of right and duty in the matter of their neutrality? Would it have raised any difficulty about granting them absolution for any failure of their word that would have been profitable to Germany? Would it not have forbidden them to imagine that they had any obligations towards anti-papal England and anti-clerical France; and have urged that, instead of risking their destruction by the Austro-German coalition, they could not do better as catholics than range themselves on the side of pious Francis Joseph and of the most religious William the Second, whom Pius the Tenth described as "the holy Emperor"? Rome would seem to have been as much astonished by the loyalty of Belgium as the Belgians are at present by her coldness towards them. If she regards their

misfortunes with an "impartiality" that is so serene, is it not because the Belgians, by their faithfulness to human rights, have done something to avert the divine chastisement which was about to overwhelm France?

Benedict the Fifteenth, in reality, draws only one moral from all these events. "God," he says, "allows nations, who have fixed all their desires on the things of this world, to punish one another by mutual slaughter on account of the contempt and neglect with which they have treated him; and other events have happened also, in addition to these, which should constrain men to humble themselves under the mighty hand of God." The god, then, whom Benedict the Fifteenth represents, has, in order to punish men for their faults, induced the worst among them to commit a crime which surpasses in horror all preceding wickedness; of which an immediate result is the extermination of numberless people who are innocent. The Pope insinuates that to this chastisement of an European war, his god has added the scourge of an earthquake in Italy. It were better, perhaps, to veil more decently these pranks of the Eternal.

Someone in Belgium has said what the Belgians desired to hear from the Pope. Cardinal Mercier, the Archbishop of Malines, in a pastoral which the German authorities endeavoured to suppress, described the sufferings of his country; and then went on to say frankly that Belgium remains Belgian always, that the invader is not a lawful owner of

the country he is occupying, that the civil population owes him no allegiance of the mind, nothing beyond putting up with his presence and his requirements in order to escape worse evils. On the essential point, the declaration which asserts the right of Belgium to remain herself, the brave prelate has expressed the national conviction, the soul and the conscience of the Belgians;¹ but this conviction, which is so simple, natural, and true, was not re-echoed in the Pope's allocution. The Pope, in face, ignored it deliberately when he touched on the subject handled by the Archbishop of Malines, and uttered these colourless phrases: "For those who see their country occupied by the enemy, we understand how hard it is to be oppressed by a foreign yoke; but we do not wish that their ardent desire to regain their liberty should stir them to oppose the maintenance of public order, and thus render their position much worse." In what he calls "the maintenance of public order," there, ultimately, is the sole right acknowledged and proclaimed by Benedict the Fifteenth. The Pope seems even to be censuring Cardinal Mercier for having forgotten it; and the "order" which now reigns in Brussels would appear in his own eyes to be worthy of all respect.

Let us convey to Benedict the Fifteenth all the admiration with which Cardinal Mercier inspires

¹ The soul of Belgium speaks again in the fine letter which Cardinal Mercier wrote to the Archbishop of Paris on the fifteenth of last March.

us; but do not let us fail to record, besides the impotence of "the gospel," the impotence of the Roman pontificate in face of the present crisis of humanity. The great moral forces of the past influence our present conditions no longer. The abominable scene which we are witnessing at present may well be more disquieting for that which is described popularly as belief than for what we define usually as unbelief.

RELIGION

THIS is not to say that a breath of religious feeling does not stir the soul of the nations at the present time, or is not working obscurely for their future. But above all things it is necessary to make a wide distinction between this profounder movement and any conscious return towards the beliefs and practice of catholicism in our country.

As happens usually, at such awful times, everyone is inclined to resume ancestral acts, and turn again to ancestral gods. The resort to heavenly protection will vary much in character, according to the temperament of the diverse peoples. Russia has not failed to carry out her most imposing ceremonies, to venerate her holiest *icons*. The trust of our population in succour from on high should be similar to that which sustained Joan of Arc, and such of her fellow-warriors as were piously inclined. The popular faith, or the national sentiment, is tinged by Christian hopes. The Serbian fighters, many simple believers in the armies of Austria and Germany, numbers of courageous Belgians, are probably of a like mind. The official god of the Germans cannot be the same divinity to whom honest and simple men pray; for that god of the

general staff is the spirit of Germany, extolled by an hundred thousand tongues, which boast solely of the Germanic force; he seems to profit by all the flatteries which the Germans address to themselves; but they rely on him as they do on themselves; and few of his votaries can feel any need to supplicate him. The English, a punctilious nation, have certainly not omitted their duty towards the Eternal, but they do not make a parade of fulfilling it; they do not profess that the god of the universe is enlisted in their service, as the Germans do; they know well that for a very long time God has been with mighty England, and they do not feel that they are anywhere near being abandoned by him.

Certain people argue that a marvellous revival of the faith is being produced in France; and undoubtedly there is such a revival of the faith among us, but only among those who believe already. All those who have not completely abandoned the religion of their childhood, through conviction and principle, have attached themselves to it again enthusiastically. It is probable, too, that a certain number of undecided persons, of half-believers, have driven themselves to believe altogether, have persuaded themselves that they do believe, and so perform the outward acts of faith; because the time is so grave, and a man must find a support where he can. It is quite natural, then, that our churches should be better attended now than before the war. It is to be expected, also, that our soldiers do not

jest about religion, that priests and believing catholics should feel at ease among them. When all are in the presence of death, no one mocks at those who fancy they know something about what is beyond. That even unbelievers should associate themselves with believers in certain religious acts, and support them by their presence, that they should be led to hear a mass celebrated by the chaplain who accompanies them, or by one of their fellow-soldiers, even more that they should take part in religious acts in the hospitals, all this need not imply that they have abandoned their unbelief; rather, it is a friendly act towards the believers, it is to please the kindly sister or the pious lady who is so prodigal of her devotion towards the sick and wounded.

Other proofs, which are alleged, of this religious revival are also capable of a simpler explanation. In certain organs of the press, there is much talk of pious medals, with which a great number of our soldiers have provided themselves. The fact cannot be disputed. But to state it, is almost enough to qualify the meaning of the said revival. To fortify oneself with a talisman is not perhaps an act of the highest faith or of the best kind of religion. A man may also accept a medal in order not to hurt the person who offers it; and if it be a mother, a wife, a *fiancée* who gives it, how is it possible not to keep it? It is much the same if it be offered by any kindly person. And more, we must grant that the majority of human beings still believe more or

less in good and bad luck. Since a medal is taken to be a protective talisman, who knows if by refusing it, or by throwing it away, one is not depriving oneself of good luck, or tempting bad fortune? Carrying a protective medal may, for the most part, have no more religious significance than the habit, still practised in our times by many of the lower people, of touching iron when a bird of ill-omen is met, or still more an ecclesiastic.

Nothing could be more improbable than the expectation, which is indulged openly by notorious journalists, of utilizing the war for a political and theological reaction. On the pretext of enforcing these views, or at any rate of explaining what is thought in the trenches, there has been an attempt to make us think that our soldiers are actually drawing up a full scheme of reforms, and that they will enforce it as soon as peace is made. This programme, which circumstances do not allow to be detailed as clearly as might be wished, seems to be concerned with matters which the majority of our defenders, if not all, have never wasted their time by troubling about. Indeed, they have something else to do. For the present, there can be no question of reforming our national life, since the only question is to save it; and to this, they are devoting themselves courageously. Those among us, whom age has kept this winter by their fireside, and who are not proud of their inactivity, may speculate with propriety about the old quarrels and the coming problems of our internal policy. Our

army has a more urgent duty, and is fulfilling it. It is represented to us as wishing this, and wishing that; it wishes only and chiefly what it ought, that is the salvation of France. There are a faith and a love in which it is unanimous: the love of our country, and an imperishable belief in her future; over these sentiments, all are in communion, and the whole country agrees with the army. Here, is our common religion: one which has no unbelievers; in which those who are faithful to the old creed may fraternize indiscriminately with the adherents of newer principles. Nothing can be less conformable to facts, nothing perhaps is more imprudent than that sort of rhetorical fiction,—very like a calculated suggestion,—which tries to maintain that national unanimity is being realized through a profession of the catholic and Roman faith, which henceforth is to be rooted in all French hearts. For the differences which existed formerly about religious views and practices continue to exist under the same conditions and in the same degree. Only these differences count no longer in face of the absorbing interest, the burning passion, the true religion, both of this and of every moment, namely devotion to the immortality of France. It is on the basis of this common religion that there can and should be constructed presently a France more united, strong, and admirable; not upon the foundation of obsolete beliefs, which all are prepared to respect in their fellow-citizens, but cannot share with them.

Among those who die gloriously for their country
are some who have retained the feeling of a Christian
hope, while there are others, and large numbers of
them, to whom these feelings are unknown. It is
not becoming, therefore, that catholic journalists
should have the assurance to try to persuade us
that only priests and believers in the old faith
know how to die. All our brave men might well be
hurt, those who are ready to make the same sacrifice,
and who make it simply, from the same essential
motive, without professing the Christian hope,
which in this case is only an accessory. A young
soldier, who had the faith once but no longer has it,
being asked about this spirit of catholicism, which
is said to pervade our whole Army, answered thus:
“Without any prejudice, I can affirm that I have
“never known a single soldier, either in the trenches
“or in the rear, give any proof of the least anxiety
“about religion.” Nevertheless, these men do not
ignore the fact that they are in continual and
immediate peril of death. “The know,” writes
the same correspondent, “by daily experience that
“death may overtake them at any minute; and they
“do not even think about a future life. I firmly
“believe that nothing pertaining to religion exists
“any longer so far as they are concerned.” As-
suredly there are in our Army, by the side of the
priests and monks who were enlisted, a vast number
of believing and practising catholics, to say nothing
of many protestants and Jews who are equally sincere.
But it would seem clear that the predominant note

in the sentiment of all, believers and unbelievers, is that which a French officer has expressed poetically in a letter published by M. Maurice Barrès (*Echo de Paris*, December 31, 1914):

“The harmony of fighting and its high poetry
“are not in its music, any more than in the spectacle
“it offers to our sight, which on the whole is often
“tame enough. They consist altogether, and to a
“very high degree, in the notion of complete and
“lasting sacrifice that each combatant accepts
“voluntarily and with a sustained rapture. To
“prefer something to one’s own life, and to give it
“for that something, namely that the existence of
“one’s country may continue, this really is the most
“gorgeous canticle that an inspired musician, who
“should also be a great poet, could compose for the
“delight of men. Well, every soldier during a battle
“is that poet and musician; and the gathered sound
“of all these lyres, each of which gives its most
“beautiful sound, its mellowest note, when it is
“broken, makes up that tremendous orchestra, the
“Elysian concert of a reddening battle which grips
“even the listening gods.”

Our poetical officer has written “the gods,” and certainly he would not be quoted in the *Echo de Paris* if he were pagan; so possibly he is the best of catholics. In any case, it is not from oversight, although spontaneously, that he has forgotten here both the god of the Christians and his promises. He says “the gods,” as he would say “the angels” or “the stars,” because in the circumstances it never

came into his head that the God of the Christians looks for his elect as they depart from this life. It is not for the sake of this God that those die who believe on him, nor do they die in order that they may go to him. Certainly it is an august life for which a man will sacrifice his own without grudging it; but it is not for a blessed immortality in the company of Christ and the saints: it is for the life of the country. What remains beyond this is secondary, even for a Christian who believes. Thus the religion which is most alive, which for a great number of people is the only living one, is not the Christian faith, but devotion to one's country.

Have not nineteen centuries of Christianity led only to the revival of national religions, and to the shipwreck of internationalism, and chiefly of internationalism in religion? At first sight, this conclusion seems inevitable. When M. Babut asked M. Dryander to pray to God "for the benefits of a just and stable peace," M. Dryander replied: "We demand the triumph of our just cause." When M. Söderblom, Archbishop of Upsala, asked the heads of the protestant bodies to make a joint demonstration to their rulers on behalf of peace, he met, it would seem, with no support from those who were chiefly concerned; and the Archbishop of Canterbury answered, on his part, that such a movement did not represent the sympathies of the Anglican clergy.¹

¹ M. Söderblom's proposal, which was made towards the end of September, 1914, was accompanied by a statement

When Benedict the Fifteenth ordered universal prayers for peace, there were people who asked, not unreasonably, if this manifesto were not likely to weaken our national efforts, and would not imperil our unity; but the answer was forthcoming namely that the French bishops, while issuing the pontifical command, had appointed prayers for a peace compatible with justice and through victory; that is, a definite peace through the success of our armies. This was not altogether the intention of the Pope, but it was the only position which Frenchmen could admit. Benedict the Fifteenth, as is natural, found that he alone was in a position to address heaven in a prayer that is neutral. Each nation at present,—and perhaps it will be so always,—has for an essential religion its love of country.

But it follows necessarily that all these religions, though distinct and even opposed to one another by the differences and rivalries of the countries which are the object of them, are similar in the common ideal that is represented by patriotism and in the sentiment which it inspires.

There is, however, one idolatry, an *autolatry*, of principles in which it was said, amongst other things, that the causes of the war must be referred to history, and the intentions of the actors to the judgment of God. The chaplain Dryander, when refusing his signature, declared that history could prove only one thing, namely the rightness of the German case, and that in defending itself against aggressions (?) Germany was fulfilling a "Christian" duty. See quotations in *The Yorkshire Observer*, November 27, 1914.

which is eager to sacrifice all the rest of mankind to its own arrogance and the increase of its power; this is the religion of the German Fatherland, which means the worship of Germany and of the Germanic god. It imagines itself to be a religion of humanity; but the worship of Germans, not of humanity, prevails in it, and a German is only adorable to another German. A German is mistaken altogether when he imagines that his iron culture is the supreme ideal to which all mankind should aspire. One must be German to be able to think that the rule of Germany over the world would be in truth the reign of justice and the kingdom of God; that the German people alone carry the torch of civilization; that, at present, it is defending against envious neighbours the whole treasury of spiritual and moral blessings. This mania for being important is wholly unbearable to those who watch its excesses; and it calls down upon those who are afflicted by it the only lesson which can restore them to the way of health, if indeed they be curable, namely the lessons of adversity.

The English have a different notion of the part they should take in the world. The leading writers of Great Britain expressed themselves as follows, in a manifesto which they issued about the war:¹ “Whatever may be the mission of Germany in the world, we in Great Britain are conscious of a vocation and a duty. This destiny and this duty, both for us and for the whole race which uses our

¹ From the translation in *Foi et Vie*, November 16, 1914.

“language, is to labour for the rule of equal justice
“between all civilized peoples, to protect the rights
“of small nations, and to defend the ideals of
“liberty and equality in western Europe against
“the reign of ‘blood’ and ‘iron,’ against the
“domination of the whole continent by a military
“caste.”

No one can deny that this spirit of liberty, which is requisite for all human development, is a really living ideal and sentiment among the English people. It is sufficient to examine the constitution of the British Empire, and the manner in which England administers her colonies. Doubtless there is Ireland; a legacy from the past, which it is difficult to clear: though England has been freeing Ireland, bit by bit; and the Irish question can probably be solved without much difficulty after the war. These are not the methods which Prussia has been following in Poland or in Alsace-Lorraine. The British Empire is more of a confederation than an empire: it does not wish to impose itself on its neighbours; what is said about the “rule of equal justice between all civilized peoples,” and the “ideals of liberty and equality in western Europe,” is a programme which is compatible with universal culture. It is not, however, a complete programme, nor altogether a religion; it is part of a very old experience, which a practical nation puts at the disposal of the human race.

Why should we not confess that the presence of England by the side of Russia is an useful counter-

poise in the anti-German coalition to the temper which so far has characterized the empire of the Tsars, which has not been precisely the spirit of liberalism? But the Russians are a comparatively new people, who are still on their way towards maturity and civilization. They will soon feel themselves that they have nothing more to desire in the way of power, and they have perceived already what they have to gain by a genuine culture. They should not be blamed overmuch because they have not hurried over political experiments, in which they might have incurred the danger of being ruined. Like all the European peoples who are taking part in the war, they are getting a general experience which will give them much useful teaching.

Nicholas the Second, as soon as he began to move his huge armies, considered the duty of promising autonomy to Poland. It has been called an interested promise, and enemies have described it as insincere. To admit the interest, is no slur upon the Tsar. It was most important that Russian Poland, which would inevitably have to face the burden of war, should be given confidence in the power that was coming now to defend it from invasion, but which it could not forget had taken away its liberties. Since there were other Polish territories, other fragments of the monstrous pillage, which the Russians will have to occupy when they pass their own frontiers, it was equally important that these provinces should be reassured by giving them a hope of the restoration of their ancient

country, which they had never forgotten. In this case interest goes farther than the promise: it may well go on to the accomplishment. Whatever may have been the secret thought of Nicholas the Second and his advisers, will it not be disclosed by the sincerity of its results? The whole world has heard the promise; the allies of Russia have heard it, too, and are agreed about it; the Poles, finally, have taken it up, and will not let it be forgotten. It is inconceivable that the Poles should suffer all the horrors of war for nothing; or that Russia, in taking the severed parts of Poland from the Austrians and Prussians, should join them again to their natural body only to make the fate of them all more wretched. Russia will train herself in the practice of justice, and of religious toleration. In whatever form the Polish nation may be reconstituted under the protection of Russia, which will certainly be needful, there will emerge, let us hope for the honour of Europe, a real Polish nation, the ancient catholic nation, mistress of her own language and free in her religion; not any longer a people tyrannically governed and oppressed by Russians.

The Belgians, on their part, will have had a very strange experience. Alone among the nations, they had a government which, in a political sense, was described as catholic; and they have had the opportunity of learning that this quality is of no value, even in the judgment of the Pope, the head of the catholic church. The Pope has not chosen to

decide between them and their German assassins;
this refusal was in fact a preference for the Germans,
of whom the majority are protestants. What counts
in the eyes of the Pope is the power of a nation, and
not its denominational badge. This badge, the
Belgians themselves have ignored, without perceiv-
ing it, by declaring themselves, before anything else,
to be unanimously Belgian. In the face of Germany,
catholics and liberals or anti-catholic socialists are
simply Belgians. The best thing they can do is to
remain so. They will have understood that they
are agreed about the essential matter of their religion,
the type of a free nation, industrious and honest,
which Belgium intends to realize; and that they
were divided only about an unimportant detail, the
influence that should be left to the Roman pontifi-
cate. Cardinal Mercier, with the Belgian bishops
and priests, has shown that the clergy was filled
with a national spirit. Benedict the Fifteenth has
seized the opportunity of showing, on his part, that
the Roman papacy disapproves this national spirit,
unless it be useful to its own policy and interests.
The Belgians know that they can trust their clergy:
it is for them to see if they can place full confidence
in the Pope. The true father of Belgium has been
her King.

For the French, too, a striking lesson, which seems
to have been grasped by the majority, has been
made clearer through the work for which they have
united their energies.

During many years, through the fault of men far

more than of events, a deep chasm was forming between the old church and everything connected with it, and the new society with all its activities and aspirations. After 1870, the sympathies of the church were not at all with the young Republic; and the Republic, not without good reasons, looked upon clericalism as its chief enemy. The policy of Leo the Thirteenth was not the remedy which the situation required. For Leo the Thirteenth was a Pope; and, when he urged a rallying to the Republic, his only object was the securing of a clerical republic; that is, of a form of government precisely opposite to what the French understand by a republic, namely a system of justice and of democratic freedom. A republic after the heart of Leo the Thirteenth would have been merely a tool of pontifical policy, and the Pope would have used it assuredly for coercing Italy. If Benedict the Fifteenth, who is, as it is said, a reincarnation of Leo the Thirteenth, shows himself so completely neutral, it is because he does not expect much of us.

Between Leo the Thirteenth and Benedict the Fifteenth there came Pius the Tenth—"a religious Pope"; that is, one blindly confident in the divine right of his political supremacy. Pius the Tenth could not resign himself patiently to the diplomatic check in which his predecessor had ended; and, the rupture of the concordat having followed, a little by his own act and largely by the force of circumstances, he could imagine nothing better than to regain by strife what his predecessor would have aimed at

getting by subtlety. We know how he succeeded. A two-fold consequence would seem to have been reached: on one hand, the extreme care which was taken to spare the Pope in regulating the political status of the church in France handed over the episcopate and clergy, bound hand and foot, to the arbitrary domination of the Roman curia; on the other hand, the sterile agitation which Pius the Tenth fomented, in order to counteract the work of our legislators, only discredited him in French public opinion. One is accustomed to think of clericalism as almost conquered: undoubtedly it was, it still is, and probably will remain so. For the indifference of the masses towards the old faith goes on increasing; and catholicism appears, more and more, to be the religion of a minority which tends to live outside the main current of national life, very ill-contented, but still more impotent.

The events of the present time, which have not changed the interior feelings of everyone with regard to the more rightful objects of the old faith, have not failed to alter the mutual relations of the contending parties; because these parties have ceased to exist, and after the war they cannot be reconstructed on their previous lines, even if they be reconstructed with labels which imply the profession or non-profession of catholicism. In the trenches, neither priests nor laymen, neither believers nor disbelievers, neither clericals nor anti-clericals, are distinguished from one another; there are now only Frenchmen, and they get on excellently well together, because

for the time being they all have the same religion: a religion which they can and will preserve. They perceive in advance, and without any doubt, that they are all agreed over this religion, which is indeed the essential religion; and that they have been grievously in the wrong to imperil the interests of this indispensable religion by quarrelling about the old faith or the Pope. If there be people in France who wish to drag all the world to Mass, or others who wish not less eagerly to keep everyone from going, these two sorts of fanatics vanish "at the front," where there exists only a firm desire to resist the invader. One may hope, then, if any previous leaders of the clerical or anti-clerical agitations survive after the war, and are disposed to carry on their former strife, that neither one nor the other will be able to find any adherents, which will force them to lay down their arms. Thus if it should become impossible to embitter the clergy against the nation, or to rouse the nation against the clergy, the country will assuredly be all the better.

Thanks to Pius the Tenth, catholicism exists among us outside the law, and this position is disadvantageous to it in many ways. Pope Benedict the Fifteenth, who is a diplomatist, has a taste for negotiating. Our statesmen, if they think well, could afford him the gratification of discussing certain matters of ecclesiastical policy resulting from the war itself, and from the new conditions which must prevail in certain parts of our national dominions: they could in the same way regulate

the *status* of the church in France by an arrangement which Benedict the Fifteenth would grant more willingly, because the law of separation has made him the master of the French clergy. Our anti-clerical politicians need not fuss themselves: the Pope is not more anxious than they are for a concordat.

As to reconsidering our educational laws and the law of associations, so that the genuine liberty of the former should be abandoned, and an unlimited freedom with regard to the other should facilitate an unchecked growth of the religious orders, it is probable that the country desires neither one nor the other; that our Government would hesitate over the risks, and that the Pope would waste his time in asking for either, even if he had the wish. Lay education, too, has its right to freedom; and the majority, which is detached from catholicism, should not give way in this matter to the pressure of the minority. The latter should utilize the liberty which has been conceded; we owe it nothing more. The question of the religious orders, by its nature, is political; and one may be sure that the Pope, who in politics has the reputation of being very shrewd, will prove himself more accommodating than the lay representatives of the church. But all these calculations, which may be of great importance to Benedict the Fifteenth, and which have a certain importance for the internal peace of our country, have no bearing whatever upon the religion of the future.

There is no need to be a prophet to say what the basis and the essential thought of this religion will be. That which is revolting in German culture, which renders it impious at bottom, although it invokes God so noisily, is its lack of humanity. We can have nothing to do with that brutal culture and its anthropophagous god. What mankind yearns for in our time is an ideal of healthy freedom and real justice. It desires that force shall be utilized no longer to create laws, but that law shall regulate the use of force.

Christianity has not freed this ideal clearly from primitive thought. Christianity, to be accurate, is not founded upon the notion of humanity, but upon the transcendental and unverifiable notion of a plan of eternal salvation devised by the Master of the universe for those whom he has willed to choose. From the first, it offered itself rather as an international confraternity than as an universal religion: it became the religion of the Roman Empire; and, from this imperial religion, there descended, in varying forms, Roman catholicism, the national churches of the East, and the reformed communities. One can see why the present crisis, with the anguish it causes and the questions it intensifies, seems to break through the ancient creeds, and the explanations they give, and the promises they make.

The evangelical hope, however much it may have been altered by the churches, has persisted nevertheless as the essential feature of Christianity, *estimation" is a Pauline discovery*

which is a religion of the world beyond; that is, not of the unknowable, but of the unknown, of what is dreamed: and this hope, the only actual good thing which Christianity guarantees to mankind in this life, does not concern the whole of it. For Christianity is a religion of the elect; its god has his predestined ones; it is said that he left the nations formerly to pursue their own courses, and he has not made an end yet of this negligence; he is reputed to govern the world and to mould history for the benefit of an exceedingly small number of persons, whom he will drench with felicity in a better world. In the meanwhile, they must suffer, and the others with them.

But the more genuine religious notion of humanity, which is beginning to make its way in the world, very painfully and slowly, but surely, and the bare apparition of which has scared the ancient divinities, adjusts itself neither to a nebulous hope as the supreme good, nor to inequality as a divine law. We have ceased to understand a religion of which the principal object is to form a privileged caste in eternity. The principle of our faith is that man, each individual man, is born with a right; that the *status* of being human gives a claim on life, to a life of which the most essential right is the ownership of oneself. The reign of God in a problematic eternity appeals to us no longer. In truth, it is passing from us, and we are escaping from it. Even those, whose imaginations still harbour this belief, are not tied to it in the depths of their mind.

They are held chiefly, as one is always held, by the thought of the dead, whom one neither can nor will imagine as being non-existent; but they do not regulate their present conduct, their way of estimating and conducting the present life, according to their hopes of a life to come.

If there must be a reign of justice, and we desire there should be one, let it be now. Since we are not labouring in a void, our activities should have lasting consequences; but whatever these consequences may be, and whatever may be the laws of the unseen world, it appears to us that this law of justice should be the rule of this visible world; it should be the law of a living humanity, instead of being the vague and uncertain hope of those who are dead. The best of our efforts tend to bring forth and realize this law of justice. We devote ourselves to shaping it, for it is only perfect as yet in our desires, and even the applications which its principle admits are only revealed to us gradually; and we formulate them as we see them. By degrees the conscience of humanity is formed; in some directions, this conscience with us has been derived from the gospel; it has been prepared by the gospel, and would not have been born without it; but it is going beyond it.

It does not grow without opposition, and struggles, and martyrs, and its smallest progress is bought dearly. Our little terrestrial world is composed of innumerable and dissimilar groups of human beings, each one of which, unless it be on its guard, con-

siders itself the sum and perfection of human nature; while the other groups count for little or nothing compared with the one to which itself belongs. In the lower stages of human evolution, a foreigner is not far from being an enemy, if he be not one actually. In the higher stages of our evolution, among people who think they are really civilized, he still seems in practice to be of another species, because he has a different mentality, and unusual ways. Each separate human group has thus a fashion of collective egoism, whence comes self-satisfaction; a pride which may possess dignity, which may be a power, but which also may become a source of blindness and wickedness. Among the types of humanity, which come to be formed in these ways, there is none which is perfect, but there are some most imperfect: and there are some which succeed to perfection in making themselves odious and evil, which are all the more redoubtable and hateful in proportion to their strength.

Through what a chaos of brutality, tyranny, and injustice the simple notion of human personality, and of what is due to it, has had to make its way. Is it not true that this notion, which is hardly realized by the masses among the peoples which are called civilized, has not much influence even yet upon the internal concerns of these peoples, and has even less when anything happens to put them into an attitude of hostility? If one is willing to believe the Germans, they, before anyone else, discovered the rights of the human conscience,—

which the first Christians, and Socrates before them, both affirmed and practised, without waiting for Luther,—they exalted human personality, and in the most spiritual senses, because certain of them have placed the infinite value of the soul as the ultimate object of religion, summing up the essence of the gospel in this *formula*, which however is not evangelical: God and the soul, the soul and its God. Still, they are forced to own that, among themselves, their individualism is very much attenuated in practice: attenuated, they say, by discipline. But the discipline in question, which is altogether military, narrow, and hard, results in a species of automatism; and, in the great war machine that Germany has become, it does not appear that the number of exceptional men increases. And what regard has Germany for the personality of others? We have seen it at its work. What care for human lives and personalities have those murderous officers, who have exterminated in cold blood helpless people, old men, women, children; or that soldiery drunk with wine and lust, whose shameless excesses cannot be described in their proper terms? The god of the Germans has eclipsed too thoroughly the thin shadow of the evangelical god of the individual soul.

There is also a personality of nations, to which a similar right belongs as well, the right to remain itself, and to develop according to its own genius. If the rudimentary feeling of this right goes back as far as the earliest grouping of human families, how much more should the right itself be acknow-

ledged truly by the nations which only survive by means of it ! Each people has a sort of confused conscience for its own benefit, but is inclined to overlook it in others. The France of the Revolution is, perhaps, the country which has developed the sentiment of a national conscience most intensely; the ideal of a people which rules itself by liberty, equality, and fraternity; acknowledging the right which every other people has likewise to its own individuality; the notion of a humanity made up of free and friendly peoples. It was only after lowering this very high ideal, and giving up her own freedom, in other words the better part of her personality, into the hands of Bonaparte, that she flung herself under his orders into the conquest of Europe. Nevertheless, the idea was started, and has made its way. Most European nations, Italy and Germany itself among them, owe their revival to it. But Germany had not yet accomplished the reconstruction of its own national conscience when it hurled at ours an attack, of which Europe is now suffering the ultimate consequences. And in what did the majority of the European "Great Powers" employ their energies formerly, except in stifling the national consciences that they wished to suppress by absorption into their own ? Still more, have not all these Powers on their hands a large part of the blood which Turkey has spilt during the last thirty years, in order to hold under her sterilizing rule those Christian peoples whom she will not ever be capable of assimilating ?

However, the ideal grows, even through the wounds it receives; and sometimes events have brought it about that those who have mocked the loudest have become its most zealous apostles. Indeed, it is not impossible, and it is to be wished, that Germany, taught by misfortune, recovered from its conquering frenzy and its senseless pride, but always remaining Germany and living within the true limitations of its nationality, may look forward to no future except in liberty and justice, devoting itself with ardour to justice and liberty. If in that coming time, only the people whose history is without sin are justified in throwing stones at Germany, it will certainly not be stoned. The war perhaps will bring about other conversions, which will not be without significance; but even if Germany be the last and greatest of the criminals, no one will refuse it the forgiveness promised in the gospel to all sinners who repent. No one either can convert Germany against its will, and its future is in its own hands. It is for itself to see whether it will refashion its culture according to the standards of a reasonable and genuine humanity.

We must not indulge too many illusions about the coming future. It is chiefly in the ideal that mercy and truth will meet together, that righteousness and peace will kiss each other. In real life, these excellent things are achieved with difficulty. Surely, it is right and necessary that the coming peace be founded in justice. But we all know, and we should all remember, that neither justice nor

peace can be defined completely by the words of a treaty. International agreements can only sketch the lines within which the future life of a people must develop. A treaty can only make a geographical outline, and the people must fill it in. That the outline of the sketch hurt no essential right of any nation is the utmost that can be required: beyond that, each people must organize itself in the ways of peace and justice. It is certain beforehand, that wisdom will not come to everyone in an equal degree, or at once. In any case, much wisdom, even merely political wisdom, will be required everywhere to put things in order, after so great a disturbance. The professional politicians will try to effect it, but we have no special advice to give them; for we are dealing now only with the moral and religious elements in the work of pacification.

Everyone should have experienced that the country is his mother in the fullest meaning of the phrase. She is the shrine of his humanity. It is right to discourse on the brotherhood of nations; but one can only serve the universal republic efficiently through working chiefly for one's own commonwealth, by reverencing it, and being devoted to it. To love it usefully, one must learn to understand it. To shut oneself up in a narrow, selfish, and sullen nationalism, is to do it grievous wrong. What has made Germany odious, and will bring about its ruin, is that form of blind and covetous patriotism which recognizes nothing but self, which

esteems and admires oneself alone, despising and oppressing all else. A civilized nation which gives itself up to these feelings is likely to become insane. Our country will probably become all the greater if we think we have never done enough to make it great. If we understand where its true greatness lies, we shall not incur the risk of fanaticism. We can see at present whither the folly of conquest leads. France is a place apart in the midst of the nations, because she was the earliest to lisp the new gospel of truth, liberty, justice, and fraternity. This ideal was infinitely greater than herself; and our chief error in the past was to think we had realized it because we had hit upon an imperfect phrase. We have been too much duped by phrases, and we pay ourselves still with too much rhetoric. The essential worth of a nation, as of an individual, is its moral worth. Ours will be in the ever more fervent and enlightened practice of our ideal.

Let us not listen to those who, by the pretext of faithfulness to our ancient glory, would draw us backward, imprison us in the past, rivet us to beliefs and institutions that were the mould in which our ideal was shaped, but which the ideal itself has burst. It is impossible that our future, the future of human civilization, can be behind us.

Let us realize, according to our national temperament, the maximum of justice that we can achieve. There was much talk among us formerly about the rights of man, perhaps a little too much. The time has come to consider those duties, which are

not less essential than our rights. Duty is understood on great occasions; during the time which is passing, France does her duty; and few are those who talk of their rights, and they have not been heeded. But duties are not only for a time of war, they are for the whole of life; and this is what should be well understood, because in this is the true religion. The famous rights of man are the obligations of society to the individual, the duties of all to each. Not less obvious or necessary are the duties of the individual to society, of each to all. The foundation of these duties, which is also the foundation of society, of all human order, of the enduring religion, is simply that each individual owes himself entirely to the society which has reared him, because he owes to it everything he is. Let him give that which he has received. By this continual exchange, human society subsists; by it also societies grow and prosper, when by the efforts of all, but especially of the most gifted and the best, the common treasure of knowledge, justice, physical and moral health, artistic taste, and material prosperity are increased. This gift of oneself is not made directly to humanity, or even in normal times to the majority, it is only made to the country in a limited measure; each one gives himself to his family, to his profession, to some particular sphere of usefulness. All, however, in their degree, whether high or low, are labouring at the national work, and through this national work at the work of humanity. The moral notion of humanity, of human

solidarity, thus gives human life a meaning of which the grandeur cannot be exaggerated. This notion drawn from the very heart of humanity, of humanity as it is actually showing itself now, has in consequence a profound value, a value based on reality, yet at the same time a mystical, a religious, value.

It is veritably a faith; in one sense, the faith of the past centuries, as it is of the present, and will be of the future, so long as a reasonable humanity survives upon the earth. It can be based on sound reasons and solid experience; but its principle, its activity, and its power come from sentiment. One would be a heretic to this religion if he thought to found it upon any narrow conception of personal interest. Because, where, for one who sacrifices himself even to death, is the profit of this sacrifice? The ultimate gain is for others, not for himself; since he is not repaid otherwise than by the generosity and even the beauty of his sacrifice. The pure love of God, on which Christian mystics speculated formerly, was precisely that entire sacrifice of self to an ideal seen imperfectly. But because it is less abstract, less metaphysical and transcendental than that of the old mystics, it does not follow that it is less efficacious. The proof is in the untold number of its martyrs. Never were souls possessed by a more generous faith, one more essentially moral, more puissant in its results, and therefore with so rich a future.

We can see that it reigns, as a matter of fact,

among those of our people who remain attached to the old beliefs. But should we add, for those who do not understand yet, that it is already in itself a creed? It repudiates nothing of the past which resembles itself, and by which it has been fostered; it throws off and lets go only that which fetters it; it cherishes among its heroes the true saints of old; it inspires itself through all its manifestations, and nothing hinders it from celebrating all the commemorations likely to recall its law, and to warm its hopes. If then it becomes more and more difficult for those who have this faith, but have no other, to find any definite meaning in the first words of the old declaration: "Glory to God in the highest," they will become only more firmly attached to the second, which they will understand according to the measure of their highest aspirations: "Peace on earth to men of good will!"

March, 1915.