

Germany Fighting for Readjustment of World Major von Bittenfeld of Kaiser's General Staff in a Letter to General Wood Tells of the Stake for Which War Is Being Waged

The cause for which Germany is fighting is set forth in the following letter, which was written by Gen. Leonard Wood by Major Wolfgang Herwarth von Bittenfeld, former German Military Attache in Washington, and now connected with the General Staff. The writer comes from a distinguished military family. His grandfather, Field Marshal Herwarth von Bittenfeld, took Alsace in the Danish war, commanded an army corps at Koenigsgratz, and was in command in western Germany during the Franco-Prussian war in 1870.

BISMARCK once said that never greater lies were told than in war time, and any one on either side, whether that of the Central Powers or the Triple Entente, may feel at this time how vitally his own views have been distorted. The actual tremendous fight unleashed so many national passions that it must be hard for you on the other side of the big gulf to get a calm and dispassionate judgment. I will try to give it to you so far as concerns the cause of Germany.

You and all our mutual friends in the army know that during my stay in Washington I had but one single aim and object, namely, to establish friendly and comradelike relations between our two services, hoping that such relations would spread from the armies to the people at large. It was consequently a great and unforgettable satisfaction when at my farewell dinner your flag and the German colors greeted me from the room's walls and ceilings.

You will remember that I was, like the majority of my compatriots, not an Anglophobe. I was always an exponent of Pan-Teutonism, including in this word all nations of the Anglo-Saxon and Germanic race, because I deemed such a movement throughout the whole world the only way to prevent this terrible war.

I saw no other mediator between Germany and England but the United States. I was never tired of pointing out that any European war that should find Germany and England in hostile camps would be perilous for the whole Teutonic race, consequently for the United States. For this very reason I wanted her to be a conciliator in the Anglo-German antagonism.

You know my idea about the Panama Canal, which I am well aware express the secret apprehensions of the British Admiralty and Government. Remember that England never considered this canal anything else but an extremely offensive and defensive weapon, a sceptre to rule the two greatest oceans of the world.

In the event of the loss of the Suez Canal the existence of the Panama Canal insures to England a short route to, and communication with, her possessions in the Far East. She has always, up to the present year, framed her canal policy accordingly, a fact which becomes perfectly apparent to everybody who studies the history of the canal and the previous sections of England.

What else is Jamaica but a Malta in the American Mediterranean? Both these islands are strongholds, naval bases near the two canals of world-wide importance. Germany's plan to land secured for herself these before anybody thought of the annihilation of the British Empire. British diplomacy began indeed early to study the chart of the world!

worth \$5,000,000,000, and in addition to that we must defend our threatened frontiers! Yet have we ever obtained a "two Power standard" on land like that of the British in 1907? A glance at the peace strength of some European armies answers this question:

Table with 2 columns: Country, Troops. Russia (colonial troops included) 1,844,000; Germany (colonial troops excluded) 787,000; France (colonial troops excluded) 648,000; Great Britain (322,910 territorial, 271,910 men Indian army, etc. excluded) 599,801.

Under the principle of the two Power standard our army would necessarily have to consist of more than 2,000,000 men to outnumber France and Russia. We did not claim that two Power standard, but for very palpable reasons we had to have something of an army and resolved to have a good one to guard us against attacks. We paid simply an insurance on our national fortune in people, land and money. That is our "militarism," that combated, now praised and desired by England. The entente had just as much right to look with evil eyes upon our national defence on land and sea as your neighbor has a right to feel hurt when you wire your house.

I have heard that some look of some retired General which the British called the "German Bible" and distributed all over the country has treated much upon it. I have never seen or read it. Retired officers in all countries write generally for money, because they want to add to their pension. Consequently they eventually try to be sensational. This may be the case with the "German Bible." The book, of which I have heard only now, means to us just as much as for instance, a book of Gen. Atsworth would mean to the United States army. It expresses our nation's aims and objects just as accurately as Napoleon's "Great Illusion" discloses the goals and views of the British Cabinet.

Ever since I heard about Bernhardi's book I inquired after it. Up to now I have not found one single man who had laid eyes on it. Not once! I am told that it was published several years ago, but did not sell. It is extraordinary the difference between the immense sale which this book had in England and the fact that it is practically unknown in Germany. Nevertheless, this book and similar ones have been used against Germany, although this kind of literature exists in all countries.

The other war cry was against "autocratic" Germany. We are a constitutional and Federal monarchy, just as the United States is a Federal republic. Federalism, if it is permitted to quote John Bassett Moore, implies democracy. And in fact, on what a democratic basis Germany has solidly built a empire from this war. The Kaiser is not Emperor of Germany like the Czar of all the Russias, he is "the German Emperor" and has less personal power than the President of the United States. Neither of them could unfold the banner of war for an unjust cause. But in the present case the State was in danger.

According to our conception the State is an end, the individual the means to that end. What else is that but collectivism? If consequently the end is threatened the means are the means collect and fight for them and no matter whether they are called to arms or not. And I assure you, they did more right away, and two millions more than we wanted, men who were under no obligation whatsoever to assist in this war, than they did for their fatherland. You have within your own borders many of them who cannot return, because England, against the rules of international law, prevents them from getting home.

That is the spirit of the people. Can anybody sincerely believe that such spirit would prevail were this to be the "Kaiser's war," long plotted, planned and prepared by "militarism" and directed by an autocratic class? I should think not. The German people are animated by feelings such as I well expressed so beautifully in the word renowned words, quoted on the monument at Soldiers Field in Harvard University. "Though love and wine and reason chafe, there is a voice without reply: 'tis man's perdition to be safe when for the Trust he ought to die!"

Had we wanted to attack our neighbors there were plenty of other and better opportunities! We did not do it during the Boer war nor during the Russo-Japanese war. We did not only "miss these chances," but we purposely denied other Powers our help when after the famous Fashoda case they wanted to fall on England's back while she was engaged in South Africa.

The "autocratic Kaiser and War Lord" has kept peace, and we with him! Mind you, there exists a firm and fixed solidarity between every German and the Kaiser. It exists just on account of the fact that imperialism in Germany is a tree rooted in the best democratic soil and bearing its crown right in the heart of every single German. That is the secret of our unity, that is why we forget minor quarrels when the fatherland is in danger, that is why our Emperor could say: "I know of no parties any more, I know but German brothers." That is why also

without reply: 'tis man's perdition to be safe when for the Trust he ought to die!"

Although, as mentioned before, we knew all about the so-called Belgian neutrality, we asked the Belgian Government twice, the second time after the fall of Liege, whether it would grant us free passage upon our guaranteeing Belgium's national independence and territorial integrity. This offer was not only declined but people were incited to wage a franc tireur war. This has been proved by documentary evidence, and every one is aware of the unpalatable suffering the misled Belgians had consequently to endure.

Some day the historian may call this war the growing pains of the world. But we who live in the present, must and do look upon it as the greatest crime that ever has been committed in the world's history. Not so much on account of the fighting itself—war being neither immoral nor immoral, simply non-moral—but for the fact that a most sacred principle has received a deadly hurt: Properly invidious this principle of race was hurt and could have been hurt only because it had not been recognized nor cultivated in the right moment.



Prof. J. A. Cramb.

For this grievous fault the whole western world will have to pay very dearly in the years to come! The fault, the crime is theirs who sacrificed racial feelings to the hunger for gold.

Everybody feels intensely hot about this war. I do not attribute this fact to personal sympathies or antipathies. They hardly count, they come and go like the tides. But here is something quite different: here is a subconscious feeling that we all, friends and enemies, partisans and neutrals, stand on the threshold of a new era. Prepared for its tasks of gigantic importance, in helpless disunion we sit down upon us, and we realize the unspeakable misfortune that today has been blinding the eyes of those who ought to have seen.

This is new neither to you nor to me, but the fact seems to take hold of the masses. They resent something they feel intensely uneasy, not knowing why. The mountain has not yet erupted from the mist.

Therefore I deem it so necessary that in the mutual interest of our two countries something gets done to calm the passions and to enlighten the minds.

That is why I wrote this letter. I did not mean it to be an argument. About some vital question I received, I could not speak so dispassionately as I wanted to. I feel keenly that the time of controversies is over. We have now to cope with figures and facts, the sum total thereof being a readjustment of the world. In this world I see the place of our own side by a war that saves the principle of race. The basis must be laid down now during the war, not after it.

Some day the historian may call this war the growing pains of the world. But we who live in the present, must and do look upon it as the greatest crime that ever has been committed in the world's history. Not so much on account of the fighting itself—war being neither immoral nor immoral, simply non-moral—but for the fact that a most sacred principle has received a deadly hurt: Properly invidious this principle of race was hurt and could have been hurt only because it had not been recognized nor cultivated in the right moment.

Some day the historian may call this war the growing pains of the world. But we who live in the present, must and do look upon it as the greatest crime that ever has been committed in the world's history. Not so much on account of the fighting itself—war being neither immoral nor immoral, simply non-moral—but for the fact that a most sacred principle has received a deadly hurt: Properly invidious this principle of race was hurt and could have been hurt only because it had not been recognized nor cultivated in the right moment.

Some day the historian may call this war the growing pains of the world. But we who live in the present, must and do look upon it as the greatest crime that ever has been committed in the world's history. Not so much on account of the fighting itself—war being neither immoral nor immoral, simply non-moral—but for the fact that a most sacred principle has received a deadly hurt: Properly invidious this principle of race was hurt and could have been hurt only because it had not been recognized nor cultivated in the right moment.

Some day the historian may call this war the growing pains of the world. But we who live in the present, must and do look upon it as the greatest crime that ever has been committed in the world's history. Not so much on account of the fighting itself—war being neither immoral nor immoral, simply non-moral—but for the fact that a most sacred principle has received a deadly hurt: Properly invidious this principle of race was hurt and could have been hurt only because it had not been recognized nor cultivated in the right moment.

Some day the historian may call this war the growing pains of the world. But we who live in the present, must and do look upon it as the greatest crime that ever has been committed in the world's history. Not so much on account of the fighting itself—war being neither immoral nor immoral, simply non-moral—but for the fact that a most sacred principle has received a deadly hurt: Properly invidious this principle of race was hurt and could have been hurt only because it had not been recognized nor cultivated in the right moment.

Some day the historian may call this war the growing pains of the world. But we who live in the present, must and do look upon it as the greatest crime that ever has been committed in the world's history. Not so much on account of the fighting itself—war being neither immoral nor immoral, simply non-moral—but for the fact that a most sacred principle has received a deadly hurt: Properly invidious this principle of race was hurt and could have been hurt only because it had not been recognized nor cultivated in the right moment.

Some day the historian may call this war the growing pains of the world. But we who live in the present, must and do look upon it as the greatest crime that ever has been committed in the world's history. Not so much on account of the fighting itself—war being neither immoral nor immoral, simply non-moral—but for the fact that a most sacred principle has received a deadly hurt: Properly invidious this principle of race was hurt and could have been hurt only because it had not been recognized nor cultivated in the right moment.

Some day the historian may call this war the growing pains of the world. But we who live in the present, must and do look upon it as the greatest crime that ever has been committed in the world's history. Not so much on account of the fighting itself—war being neither immoral nor immoral, simply non-moral—but for the fact that a most sacred principle has received a deadly hurt: Properly invidious this principle of race was hurt and could have been hurt only because it had not been recognized nor cultivated in the right moment.

Some day the historian may call this war the growing pains of the world. But we who live in the present, must and do look upon it as the greatest crime that ever has been committed in the world's history. Not so much on account of the fighting itself—war being neither immoral nor immoral, simply non-moral—but for the fact that a most sacred principle has received a deadly hurt: Properly invidious this principle of race was hurt and could have been hurt only because it had not been recognized nor cultivated in the right moment.

Speculates Upon Destiny of Imperial Britain Prof. J. A. Cramb's Reflections on the Decline and Fall of Empire--His Beautiful Interpretation of British Ideals

SOME few years ago the late Prof. J. A. Cramb of Queen College, London, prepared a series of essays on the "Origin and Destiny of Imperial Britain." They are particularly interesting at the present moment and so are now being published for the first time by E. P. Dutton & Co.

Though life itself and all its modes are transient, says Prof. Cramb, but shadows cast through the richly tinted veil of Maya upon the everlasting deep of things, yet such dreams as those of perpetual peace and of empire exempt from degeneration and decay, like the illusion of perpetual happiness, the prayer of Spinoza for some one "supreme, continuous, unending bliss," are not to be regarded as mere fancies. They are ancient as the rocks and their musings from eternity, inextinguishable as the plan of the soul imprisoned in time toward that which is beyond time.

And yet the effect of these, as of all false illusions, is but to render the value of reality—had almost said of the real illusion—more poignant. Indeed, "false" and "unreal" at all times are mere designations we apply to the hours of dim and uncertain vision when tested by the standard which the moments of perfect insight afford. Nothing is more tedious, yet nothing is more instructive, than the study of the formulated ideals, the imaginations of what life might be or life ought to be. Of poets or systematic philosophers, nothing so instantly reconciles us to war as the delineations of humanity under "meek eyed Peace"; and to the passing of visible things, empires, states, arts, laws and this universal frame of things, as such attempts as have been made to stay time and change, and abrogate the ordinances of the world.

Was machst du an der Welt? ist also when we ask: Why shouldst thou the world? 'twas shamen long ago. Nor does this result in the mood of Candide. The effort unrequited and unending to behold the visible and the passing as in every truth, it leads to a deeper vision of the unseen and of the eternal, as in every truth it is.

Thus we are prepared to consider the following question: Given that death is nothing and the decline of empire but a change of form, will this empire of Imperial Britain also decline and fall? Will the form of new empires pass away for the forms of Persia, Rome, the Empire of Akbar, have passed away? The question resolves itself into two parts—what does the youth of a race or of an empire consist of? And secondly, is it possible by any standard from the past to measure or gauge the possible or probable duration of Imperial Britain, to determine to what era, say in the history of such an empire as Rome or Islam, the present era in the history of Imperial Britain corresponds?

The first of all will be found in the former question. Recent studies in ethnology have made it clear that youth, and all that this term implies of latent or realized energies, mental, physical, intellectual, is not the invariable attribute and exclusive possession of uncivilized or of recently civilized races. Yet this assumption will underlie much of the current speculation on the subject. Last century it was received as an axiomatic truth. Thus in the time of Louis XV, when a romantic interest first invaded the American Indians, French writers saw in them the prototypes of the Germans described by Tacitus. Not only Voltaire and Rousseau, but Montesquieu, Hume, and others, regarded them as a remnant of the primitive state of the future dominators of the world. Comparisons were drawn between their manners, their religion, their customs and those of the Goths and the Franks, and literatures inquired the facts that delineating the Huns of the Middle Ages, they were preparing for posterity a literary surplus and a document lasting as the Germania. Such comparisons are still at times made, but they are like the comparison between a rising and a setting sun. They trace the same line along the sands, but it is the same line only in appearance. It is the contrast between

the simplicity of childhood and of senility, between the simplicity of a race dowered with many sided genius and of a race dowered with but one sided genius. It is neither in the absolute capacity to form or to realize, nor does the old age of a race consist in refinement, nor capacity for the arts necessarily imply decline of political energy. The victories of the Germans in 1870 were like fate's ironic comment upon a race whose development had not untried the race for war, nor "Wertherism" for the battlefield.

But, as in the life of the individual, so in the life of a race, youth consists in capacity for enthusiasm for a great ideal, capacity to form, to realize, to pursue, devotion to sacrifice all to a great political end. Russia, for instance, has only recently come within the influence of European culture, but this does not make the Slav a youthful race. The Slavonic is indeed perhaps the oldest people in Europe. Its literature, its art, its music, its characteristics of its society alike attest this. Superstition is not youth, else we might look to the hut of the Samoyede even with more confidence than to the cabin of the Moujik for the imperial race of the future. And profligacy in a race does not surely denote resignation to be governed as the genius of good others.

And the Slav, as we have seen, has at no period of his history shown that "youth" which consists in capacity for a great political ideal, either in Poland or among the Czechs or in Russia. The United States as a nation bears the same relation to Britain as the Moorish kingdom in Spain bore to the Saracenic empire of Baghdad. It is a fragment, a colossal fragment torn from the central mass; but not only in its language, its literature, its religion and its laws, but in individual and national peculiarities, at least in the deeper moments of history and of life, the original stock asserts itself. The State is young, but the race is precisely of the same remoteness as Britain and the Greater Britain.

Passing to the second point—at what do we now stand as compared with the past? It is not unusual to speak of Britain as an aged empire, but such estimates or descriptions commonly rest upon a misapprehension; first, of the period in which the nation of England strictly speaking arose, and second, of the period in which the present form of the nation of England was founded. The traditional date of the arising of the nation of England is the year 1066, the date of the foundation of the monarchy of the Normans. It is not until the close of a process of racial assimilation and slow evolution, extending over centuries, so that the king of Romulus and the early kings, Numa, Ancus and Servius, may be regarded as an epoch in Rome's history, analogous to the period in England between Sinoe and the constitutional struggle of the thirteenth century. The former is the period in which the civic unity of Rome is completed. The latter is the period in which the national unity of England is completed. Rome is now firmly constituted in itself of its career as a city, and Rome, as England in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries is finally constituted in itself of its career as a nation. The analogies are not followed. The national and political life of England as much as the Servian Code founded the civic unity and determined the character of the constitutional life of Rome.

And already in Rome and in England there are prophecies, fore-shadows of the future. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city, and the design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city.

The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city.

The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city.

The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city.

The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city.

The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city.

The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city. The design of the city on the seven hills is the design of the eternal city.

NEW COATS OF ARMS--SUGGESTED BY RIGBY



France. John D. Rockefeller.