

940.9111
V93g

Voss, L

The great European war...

V

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

THE GREAT EUROPEAN WAR

From the Standpoint of the German-American and Christian

—BY—

LOUIS VOSS, D.D.

WITH A BRIEF STATEMENT OF GERMAN ACTIVITIES
IN THE UNITED STATES

SENDER PRINTING WORKS, LTD.
319 Magazine St.
NEW ORLEANS, LA.
U. S. A.

THE CAUSES OF THE WAR.

In looking for the causes of the present European War, we must distinguish between them and the occasion for the war. The occasion was the assassination on June 28th, of the Austro-Hungarian successor to the throne, Arch-Duke Franz Ferdinand, and his wife, by a member of a band of Servian conspirators. This was the spark which fired the powder magazine. The powder had been accumulating for years.

The Servian crime was perpetrated with the connivance and co-operation of Servian officials, and executed with arms from the Servian arsenal. This was the third time in the last six years that Servia led Europe to the brink of a world-war. It could do this only because it was supported by Russia.

Since the collapse of European Turkey in the last Balkan War, the ambition of Russia, whose expansion in the Far East had been curbed by her defeat in the Russo-Japanese War, was to possess both the Straits of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus with Constantinople, and to include under the sceptre of the Czar all the Slavs in the Balkan States, with European Turkey and large parts of Asia Minor. The party of the grand-dukes in St. Petersburg, the party of the army officers, always ready for war, and the Pan-Slavists — all these declared openly that Austria-Hungary must give up all territory inhabited by Slavs.

The Germans felt that what was a danger for Austria-Hungary, their ally, was also a danger for them, and that they must maintain Austria-Hungary in the position of a great power to stem the great Slavic tide threatening to inundate Central Europe. The Germans did not want war. From the beginning of the Austro-Servian controversy, Germany declared that this matter must be confined to these two powers, and used all its influence in this direction. The French and English governments maintained the same standpoint. Only Russia insisted she must have a voice in the matter. Already she was mobilizing her army. When this became known in Germany, it notified Russia that these military measures would force it to counter measures. At the same time, Germany continued her endeavors to bring about an understanding between Austria and Russia, urging Austria to show every possible advance compatible with her dignity. These efforts were frustrated by the continued mobilization of Russia and France, both on water and land. Troops were accumulated on the East Prussian frontier. Nobody now believed that war could be longer avoided. The "Daily Graphic" of London wrote on August 1st: "If the mobilization order is also carried through in the provinces bordering on Germany, the work of the preservers of peace

868085

is ended, for Germany will be compelled to answer with the mobilization of her armed forces. We confess that we are unable to understand this attitude of Russia in connection with the renewal of the negotiations with Austria."

In a private exchange of telegrams between Kaiser and Czar, the Czar gave his word of honor that his troops would undertake no provocative action and that with the aid of God it must be possible to prevent the shedding of blood. On the same afternoon, on which this telegram was received in Berlin, Russian troops crossed the German frontier and marched into German territory. Thus Russia began the war.

Meanwhile the German Ambassador in Paris had been instructed to demand from the French Government a declaration within eighteen hours, whether it would remain neutral in a Russo-German war. The French Government gave an equivocal reply to Germany's ultimatum, saying that France would do that which her interests demanded. A few hours later, the mobilization of the entire French army and navy was ordered and on the following morning France opened hostilities. Nobody in Germany had doubted for one moment, that France would seize this favorable opportunity of getting revenge for her lost provinces which she herself had wrested from Germany under Louis XIV. Germany knew for forty years what to expect of France and no German blames her for fighting against Germany.

But what is England fighting for? We are told: "For the liberty of the world, for its deliverance forever from the barbarism of a military power like Prussia, for the most sacred democratic institutions! Not until Prussian militarism is destroyed, will the Golden British Age dawn!" One would think that a single word would reveal the sham and hypocrisy of this claim—**Russia!** How can one fight side by side with Russia for civilization, democracy and liberty? Even the average Englishman, though he is but poorly posted about German political and economic institutions, will admit that they are infinitely superior to the government of the autocratic Czar. But are they really inferior to those of England? Did not England copy almost verbatim the wise and beneficent German laws providing for the laborers, insuring them in case of accident and securing them in their old age? England declares there can be no peace until German "militarism" is crushed. What about English "navy-ism"? Suppose that Germany is defeated; will England then dismantle her battle ships and France and Russia agree to disarm? How long will it be before these nations will be fighting each other over the spoils of war?

The attitude of England in this present war has aroused more bitter resentment in Germany than even the perfidy of Russia and the cry of France for revenge. England was trying to hide her selfish motives from the world behind her vaunted championship of Belgium. She was jealous of Germany's growing commerce and alarmed at her competition in every branch of industry and trade. She had waited long for an opportunity of crushing her great rival in commerce.

For centuries England had enjoyed almost a monopoly in the markets of the world. This was fast slipping away from her. As far back as 1897 the London "Saturday Review" published a series of articles on this question, all ending with the refrain: "Germaniam esse delendam". One prominent Englishman said: "If German commerce could be destroyed to-day, there would not be an Englishman the day after to-morrow who would not be the richer." The policy of King Edward VII of isolating Germany politically succeeded but too well. Then the English press began its campaign of slander, surreptitiously undermining German influence in every part of the world.

Germany is fighting in self-defense. Her very existence is at stake. She is defending her right to a "place in the sun", her right of fair competition. She fights to refute England's absurd claim that she alone is mistress of the seas and to maintain an open door of trade in all the world.

The causes of the war are Russia's dream of a great European Slavic Empire at the expense of Germany and Austria, France's long repressed desire for revenge against Germany, and England's envy of German power and dread of German competition.

WHO IS TO BLAME FOR THE WAR?

When Germany accepted the challenge, first of Russia and France, then of Great Britain, many ill-informed persons blamed the Kaiser for it. They called him "the crazy War Lord" and attributed to him deep-seated ambition, lust for power and an apotheosis of self, and added, that they hoped Germany would be wiped from the face of the earth.

William II is to-day the best hated man in the English speaking world. In his own country he is the most beloved man. If to-day a head of the nation were to be chosen by the German people, the choice would fall on no other but him. He would have no competitor, for he symbolizes and represents the unity of the nation. The Kaiser is not a disturber of the peace. During the twenty six years of his reign he has steadfastly maintained the peace of Europe, never once seeking to profit by any momentary difficulties of the neighboring countries. He peaceably came to terms with France and England in sundry difficult African questions. On the first of August, 1914, he appeared on his balcony and commending his people to God in the approaching war said: "A fateful hour has fallen on Germany. Envious people everywhere are compelling us to our just defense. The sword has been forced into our hands. I hope that if my efforts at the last hour do not succeed in bringing

our opponents to see eye to eye with us and in maintaining the peace, we shall, with God's help, so wield the sword that we shall restore it to its sheath again with honor. War would demand of us an enormous sacrifice in property and life, but we should show our enemies what it means to provoke Germany. And now, I commend you to God. Go to church and kneel before God, and pray for His help for our gallant army."

The Reichstag met two days later and unanimously accepted all war measures. Its session filled the entire German nation with pride and enthusiasm. When Germany was threatened, when the Peace-Emperor was shamefully betrayed by the Czar, there was no east and west, north and south. No party, no class, no creed stood back. Protestants, Catholics and Jews were a "united people of brethren" in the hour of danger. All were imbued with one single thought: United Germany is unconquerable. Never before in its history has the German nation been so united as now. Even the Socialists declared they would sacrifice all, if need be, to save the country. Most wonderful of all, Alsace and Lorraine, instead of throwing themselves into the open arms of their "liberators", are openly and enthusiastically siding with their alleged oppressors. Two million volunteers offered their services to their country. They have not yet been needed.

The denunciation of the Kaiser as the instigator of strife is therefore an indictment against the German people, for as one man they not only endorse, but enthusiastically support him in his attitude. For all that they are not a war-like nation. They have lived in peace with the rest of the world for forty-three years. They are soldiers, because their neighbors on the east and on the west compelled them to become a nation of soldiers. They have no other desire than to enjoy and increase the blessings of peace. The nation that produced the great masters in arts and sciences, that has been the "school master" of the world for centuries, has not yet become a nation of soldiers satisfied with military drill.

There was no such unanimity among the people of the nations opposing Germany. In France the leader of the Socialists, the leading party, Jaures, was assassinated, because he openly opposed the war.

A large number of well-known Englishmen from all stations of life raised their voice against the participation of their country in the hostilities. Lord Morley, president of the Privy Council, immediately after the resolution of the government in favor of war, handed in his resignation. Professors from all the great English universities protested against England's joining in the strife, saying that "a war against Germany would be a sin against civilization". Ramsay Macdonald, leader of the Labor party in Parliament, publicly accused Sir Edward Grey of having involved England in a war which could have been avoided and which to avoid would have been to her best interest. The atti-

tude of Ireland towards the war is described in the following news item excluded by the great American dailies:

"The fifth of a great series of protest meetings against the present war took place on Sunday in Beresford Place, Dublin. The last meeting was the greatest. F. Sheehy Skeffington and Michael Mullen were the principal speakers. References by the speakers to England's double dealing were loudly cheered. The speakers were unanimous in declaring that Ireland's position in the present war should be strictly neutral. The speakers also expressed their delight over the failure of Lord Kitchener to obtain any recruits in Ireland, every effort in that direction having ended in a great fiasco."

The Czar of Russia may have been sincere in his desire for peace, but during his whole reign he has been the tool of others. It is said that he did not approve of the brutalities in Finland, nor of the iniquities of the Jewish Pogroms, but his hand was too weak to stop the fury of the reactionary party. A Russian Princess replied to the question of a fellow passenger on a train from Ostend to Berlin, why the Czar had not prevented the war: "What was he to do? He is such a good man, such a noble man! But he can do nothing. He must do what the grand-dukes want, especially his uncle Nicolai Nicolajevitch. Those grand-dukes are to blame for everything, they and no one else have brought this misfortune upon the country. They only think of amassing wealth. They should be thrashed. They ought to be hanged!" Asked, if the Czarina could not have exerted her influence, she only replied in a melancholy tone: "Alas, the poor woman!"

The war party in Russia would not have dared to assail Austria and Germany, without a previous understanding with France and England. Sir Edward Grey strove to the last to prevent a European war, but he had already so pledged his country's honor, without its knowledge, to fight for France or Russia, that he was compelled to yield to the pressure brought by both these nations upon him. The country had been so helplessly committed that Grey had to refuse point blank every overture made by Germany to keep England out of the conflict. The German ambassador asked him to propose his own conditions of neutrality, and he declined to discuss the matter. These facts were suppressed by Grey and Asquith in their speeches in Parliament. Had they been told, the speeches could not have worked up a war sentiment. The above facts were published by Ramsay MacDonald who says that for the last eight years Sir Edward Grey has been a menace to the peace of Europe and his policy a misfortune to his country.

The one man, more than any other, responsible for the present war is Sir Edward Grey, British Foreign Minister.

BELGIAN NEUTRALITY AND ENGLISH MORALITY.

So much has been said about the German Chancellor's reference to the Belgian neutrality guarantee as a "scrap of paper," that the facts ought to be brought out and widely published. Germany violated no neutrality treaty with Belgium because no such treaty existed.

Prof. John W. Burgess, of Columbia University, New York, wrote an article on this question which was released to the press weeks ago. Which newspaper printed it? The entire daily press has passed it over in silence or "referred it to the office cat," as a New York daily did contemptuously with similar articles. This is a sample of the fairness of a large part of the American press. The article appeared in the "Vital Issue," New York, of Oct. 10, 1914. The American historian referred to, says the question of Belgian neutrality is not a moral question. It is a question of truth. He shows that in 1870 the British Government sought and procured from the French Government and from the North German Union treaties guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium during the period of the Franco-Prussian war and for one year from the date of its close. These treaties expired in 1872 and the present German Empire has never signed any treaty guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium. The Hague Conference of 1907 drafted a convention, forbidding belligerents to move troops or convoys of either munitions of war or supplies across the territory of a neutral power. Great Britain, Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy refused to sign it and did not sign it. Russia was not represented. "Perhaps," says Prof. Burgess, "we may now somewhat more clearly understand why the German Chancellor referred to the guarantee of Belgium neutrality, as a scrap of paper. At any rate, these facts, taken together with the facts that Great Britain refused to pledge her own neutrality in the present war even on condition that Germany would agree not to attack the north coast of France, while she declined to formulate any conditions upon which she would remain neutral, clearly reduce England's much vaunted altruistic reason for entering upon this war to a diplomatic subterfuge."

How far Belgian neutrality had already been violated by the other powers will be determined by history. From the report of the Belgian ambassador in St. Petersburg it appears without a doubt that France would not have respected this neutrality. Belgium had received with open arms the French staff officers and generals on their frequent excursions for the purpose of studying the Belgian territory. Belgium had become the vassal of France. Germany was on the de-

fensive against two powerful enemies. What would Great Britain do about it? That was the question. Great Britain demanded that in return for her neutrality the German forces should not enter Belgium. In other words, it asked that Germany should allow the French and Belgian troops to form on Belgian territory. Germany could not consent to this. It would have been suicidal. Germany acted on the law of self-preservation when she outstripped her enemies in choosing the nearest road into the enemy's country. When a man's home is threatened with destruction and the only way to prevent it leads through his neighbor's yard, he does not stop to ask the neighbor's permission to cross his yard. Germany had always been a good neighbor to Belgium. Without Germany, Belgium could never have acquired the Congo State. It was England that wanted it, but King Leopold turned to Germany for protection and received it from Bismarck who called the Congo Conference in 1884-85 and obtained the recognition of the Belgian Congo Independent State from the Powers.

Before one German soldier had crossed the German frontier, a large number of bomb throwing French aeroplanes came flying into Germany across the neutral territory of Belgium and Luxemburg without a protest from Belgium. The French army was about to enter Belgium. Then Germany requested the Belgian Government to allow her troops to march through its territory. Belgium was to be indemnified at the close of the war and to retain its sovereignty and independence. Belgium's answer was a declaration of war.

Then England exclaimed with pharisaical cant: "Germany has violated the treaty of Belgium's neutrality! May God's vengeance fall on her!" When it suits her interests, England pleads morality as her motive. Ordinarily her own interests determine her course without regard to morality or justice. For the last two hundred years she grabbed all the available lands throughout the world. She has taken India from the Indians and North America from the Dutch and French. She has taken Gibraltar and Malta. She took Hong Kong as indemnity for several shiploads of opium that were destroyed by the Chinese to prevent the accursed drug from poisoning their people. She forced the contemptible opium war on China to foist on that nation a continuance of the curse from which China sought to rid her people. In a sneaking fashion England occupied Egypt. She snatched the Sudan from the French. She killed the Orange Free State because of gold and annexed Transvaal and killed thousands of Boer women and children because of diamonds. Or did she violate the neutrality of the Boer republics under the stress of stern necessity? Did it involve her very life and existence? For the last twenty years England has watched with ever growing alarm and jealousy the marvelous development of German industry and commerce. Fearing to attack Germany single-handed, she could not allow the present opportunity of crushing her rival to pass, through she must stoop to fight with the Russians, her ancient rivals

in Asia. Not enough with this, by inviting and inciting the Japanese to fight her battles in the East, and by bringing thousands of native Indian soldiers to fight and kill the white soldiers of Europe, England has committed a crime against the whole White Race.

Prof. Burgess puts it mildly when he says England's much vaunted altruistic reason for entering upon this war is a "diplomatic subterfuge!"

CHRISTIANITY AND WAR.

War in its outward aspect and immediate effects is undoubtedly a great evil and is a result of sin. Looking at the sufferings and horrors it entails, the sacrifice of human life, of domestic happiness and material wealth it demands, and the bitter hatred it engenders between the warring nations, one is tempted to join certain Christian sects like the Quakers, Mennonites and others in utterly condemning war. But this is a one-sided view, and it is not justified by the Savior's words: "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also," and similar passages. It is true that in the kingdom of heaven, which is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, there is no room for war and the divine work of redemption aims at a condition when the nations shall live in peace; when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more; the weapons are turned into implements of peace. But this state can only be brought about by an universal outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Not until God will send from heaven a new Pentecostal storm and cause His breath to enter into the dry bones, when at last "all flesh" is converted to God and the Spirit of God controls the hearts of all men and their selfishness is turned into true love, will a new era dawn upon earth and the relations between individuals and between nations will become radically different from what they are now. But this blessed state cannot be anticipated. Christians must reckon with the imperfections and evils of this present time.

Another view of war is not only permitted but forced upon us from a Biblical standpoint. When Moses says (Exod. 15:3): "The Lord is a man of war," and the Hebrews, before entering on a war of aggression, sought for the divine sanction by consulting either the Urim and Thummim or some acknowledged prophet, or in actual warfare sought divine aid by bringing into the field the Ark of the Covenant which was the symbol of Jehovah Himself, when David invokes help of the Lord in his battles, we cannot evade the con-

clusion that they regarded war as legitimate. Nor is this view confined to the Old Testament. Nowhere in the New Testament is war condemned outright. John the Baptist did not demand of the soldiers, nor Jesus of the centurion at Capernaum, nor Peter of Cornelius that they should forsake their martial calling. The Book of Revelations (6:4) speaks of the rider on the red horse, to whom power was given to take peace from the earth and who was armed with a great sword — evidently the personification of war — as sent from God, and in 19:11 the Lord Himself is represented as a Prince of War going forth to His last conquest and victory at the head of His army, and the angel standing in the sun crying with a loud voice to all the fowls of heaven to come and eat the flesh of kings and captains, of mighty men and their horses and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great.

We must admit that war, as a divine visitation, has often exerted a purifying effect upon nations, calling forth the noblest traits in human character such as valor and bravery, love of home and country even to the point of sacrificing all, and resulting in a religious revival of otherwise worldly people. Even now a wave of religious fervor is sweeping over Germany. The churches are crowded at every service. Similar scenes are doubtless witnessed in England. Even the French are reported as calling upon the Virgin Mary to intercede in their behalf, while the Russians brought to the battle field a famous ikon which they hoped would bring victory to their arms. All seem to agree that this contest must be decided by the Judge of all the Earth.

As long as human nature is constituted as it is, there will be war. There are some questions which can be decided in no other way. Courts of Arbitration may avert some wars, but when one of the parties refuses to accept their verdict, the decision can be enforced only by the sword. Where a nation considers its honor and its very existence threatened, the court of last resort can only be war. Just as civil courts with the powers of the State behind them are necessary to settle disputes between individuals, by using force if necessary, and criminal courts with the power of police to protect society against criminals and evil doers, so armies are needed to protect the rights of nations. There is no use crying, "Peace, peace," when there is no peace.

Paul says: "There is no power but of God (Rom. 13:1), the powers that be, are ordained by God;" they "bear not the sword in vain, but to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." If the government exercises such power to maintain law and order in the commonwealth, it has also the unquestionable duty to protect and defend it from alien foes. Luther laid down the principles that a war of conquest is always reprehensible, but when a nation is assailed or threatened by another, war may become a duty. In such a case war is an act of self-defense. Never should actual hostilities be begun, until all peaceable means of redress have first been exhausted. The only legitimate purposes of war can only be

to redress wrong and to maintain right and order. The above implies that a Christian has the right to become either a soldier by profession, serving as officer in the army or navy, or to join the military forces of his country when the latter is in danger, and in such cases he must discharge the peculiar duties of his position. Patriotism and Christianity do not exclude, but include each other.

Viewed from this standpoint, Germany is now engaged in a legitimate war. Hers is not a war of conquest. She is not fighting to gain one inch of territory. She exhausted every means in her power up to the last minute to avert the dreadful conflict. She is fighting for her very life and existence against an unholy alliance of the most heterogeneous nations and interests welded together by a common hatred against Germany.

CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE IN REGARD TO THE WAR.

The war has aroused such intense anger in the nations engaged in it and has created such hatred against their opponents that they can see only evil in them; consequently men are utterly incapable of viewing the situation except from the standpoint of their own national honor and interest. Each side is blaming the other. Good men on both sides are arguing that theirs alone is the cause of righteousness. Great Britain claims she stands for the honor of treaties and for the protection of weaker States. Germany, on the other hand, proclaims that her desires were for peace, that this war was forced upon her by a ring of enemies who envied her commerce, of whom Great Britain was the chief, and that only necessity compelled her to force her way through Belgium to whom she offered ample reimbursement and guarantees of her independence.

However, while due allowance should be made for national and racial prejudice on the part of those actively engaged in the hostilities, what shall we say of the intensely partisan attitude of so many American writers and indeed the great majority of the newspaper editors in a neutral country like ours? Day after day in shrieking headlines they gave to their readers the palpably false accounts of alleged German defeats, while reports issued from German sources and statements favorable to that cause, if published at all, were hidden away in small print on the inside pages.

The sorest and most painful disappointment to German-Americans is the prejudice of many religious papers and churchmen who sounded the same Anti-German note. A man like Dr. Parkhurst, of New York, could give utterance to the vile statement that the German Emperor should be re-

moved as a madman, just as a mad dog is shot for the good of the community. As a Christian, the Kaiser can afford to bear such malignant vituperation, as his Master bore the intense hatred of men all his life and finally, when it reached its most diabolical rage, prayed: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

Christian charity requires us to assume that much of the Anti-German sentiment prevailing in this country is due, not so much to outright hatred of Germany and the Germans, but to a lack of information resulting from the fact that nearly all the news about the war comes to us by way of London and Paris, where it is censored and doctored to suit the convenience of the Allies. England's first act of war was the cutting of the German cable. This enabled her to shut out all information unfavorable to the cause of the Allies and to fill the American world with their own version of the causes of the war, placing on Germany the blame for this world-conflagration. Reports about alleged German atrocities were widely published, while news about the outrages committed by the Belgians and Russians was suppressed.

The British cable greatly exaggerated the partial burning of Louvain — only one-sixth of the town was really destroyed — and denounced it as vandalism, but ignored the mad acts of its citizenship in firing upon the German soldiers from ambush in the silly belief, encouraged by the government, that they could rid the town of the invaders. The punishment meted out to them was an act of necessary and justifiable retribution. Even the Westminster Gazette has since admitted that, if the citizens suddenly fired upon the German soldiers from the houses, such a mad act had to lead to just such results, and that Field Marshal Roberts ordered Boer farms to be burned for like offenses.

Belgian girls gouged out the eyes of wounded German soldiers on the battlefield. Belgian officials invited German officers to dinner and shot them across the table. Belgian women in whose homes German soldiers had been lodged, cut their throats while they were sleeping. These things were suppressed by the censor. England said nothing about the inhuman "dum-dum" bullets which were used by English and French soldiers and found in original packages upon prisoners. All these statements are vouched for by the German Chancellor.

The cruelties of the Belgians against the natives of the Congo State a few years ago are too well remembered. It seems like a nemesis that **their** country should now be devastated and the lives of their non-combatant citizens sacrificed because of similar cruelties practised by them upon the Germans.

But, in the face of the one-sided and partisan information sent abroad, is it to be wondered at that American writers of English descent, whose sympathies are naturally with the land of their ancestors and whose entire bent in politics, literature and religion is still largely dominated by English

ideals, should frown upon Germany in the present conflict? It is not hatred based upon a true conception of the facts, but an erroneous opinion due to a lack of information and unfamiliarity with German history, ideals and aims.

Such an attitude cannot be overcome by a mere display of indignation but only by patient and kind representations. Our strongest weapon will be Christian forbearance, on the assumption that "they know not what they do."

Even Christians are in danger of yielding to a sense of indignation when they or their cause are so unjustly accused. No one can emancipate himself entirely from national and racial pride, and the more patriotic a man is, the more is he in danger of losing the calm, impartial, objective view point. We need that Christian sobriety which the Apostle demands of all Christians: "Let us, who are of the day, be sober, putting on the breastplate of faith and love, and for an helmet the hope of salvation".

Faith in God! The reins of Providence are in His hands. Even this war has not come without His permission and He must have good and gracious ends in permitting it. Already the war is awakening men to solemn thought and is evoking a widespread spirit of prayer.

Charity — not only for the unhappy victims of the war, but also for the enemies. There is one ray of light in all this horrible darkness of war. It is the demonstration of the power of Christian love which is stronger than racial and national prejudice and hatred. The enemies of true religion and strangers to its power have asserted that this war has proved Christianity to be a failure. To the contrary it has furnished new evidences of its power. The sufferings of the wounded and dying, of the widows and orphans of the slain, have called forth a noble benevolence in contributions to the work of the Red Cross Society. The call to self-sacrifice has received a hearty response and many luxuries are being abandoned in order that the widespread suffering may be relieved. English Christians have started a fund for the relief of German and French missionaries in British territories cut off from their home base. Christian love extends even to the enemies, giving them credit for sincerity in believing in the righteousness of their cause, even though they be mistaken in their belief, and praying that God forgive them even as we pray that He forgive us. Such love is truly Christlike.

And Christian hope in the final victory of His cause! The Prince of Peace has come to this world and His coming will not be in vain. A new day is breaking — perhaps this very war with all its horrors may hasten it — a day of universal peace and brotherhood and love. Let us live and labor in the hope of its speedy appearance.

LOUIS VOSS, D. D.

GERMANS IN THE UNITED STATES.

We are now getting approximately 40,000 newcomers from Germany each year, and the occupations of that host are significant. Of those Germans who came in 1911, 7390 were farm laborers, 1356 avowed farmers, 1728 were merchants, 1108 were carpenters and joiners, 1911 clerks and accountants, 794 bakers, 689 tailors, 353 teachers, 109 sculptors and artists, 206 musicians, 72 architects, 103 electricians, and 295 professional engineers.

6,000,000 Germans have emigrated to the United States, and at present 15,000,000 of our people are either German or of German descent, that is about $\frac{1}{6}$ of our total population, or 22% of our total white population.

A number of our States owe their prosperity largely to the Germans. This is particularly the case in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Maryland, Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, California, Oregon and Wisconsin. Wisconsin stands at the head of the German farmer element. Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Illinois and Nebraska contain half of our German farming population.

In Louisiana it was the German farmer who made the cultivation of rice profitable. In Texas the cotton from the plantations of the Germans is considered the best.

The German is a good voter and can be depended on to exercise the franchise intelligently. There is evidence that in every important election for the past fifty years the German vote has turned the scale.

The first speaker in the House of Representatives was a German, August Muhlenberg, son of one of the greatest of Revolutionary heroes and grandson of Henry M. Muhlenberg.

Eminence in scholarship and music stands first among the Germans. We can name at least fifty German professors in our universities whose names are world famous. We can name more than thirty distinguished musicians in the country. In commerce, art, religion, literature, politics, mechanics, Germans stand in the front ranks in surprising numbers.

Stolid and phlegmatic are the two adjectives frequently used in connection with the Germans. None but the ignorant or unthinking would use them, as we will prove herewith.

Is that race stolid that has throughout American history fought as well as pleaded for liberty, that furnished all of the 700 men that under Herkimer fought the battle of Oriskany, the bloodiest conflict of the war for Independence; that fought from the siege of Boston to Yorktown; that sent the first regiment to Washington when President Lincoln

20
called for volunteers; that took the bridge at Antietam, held Cemetery Ridge at Gettysburg, stormed Fort Fisher and marched with Sherman to the sea?

Is that race stolid that produced the hero that first faced trial and suffered imprisonment in order that the freedom of the press might be established in America?

Is that race stolid that furnished five of the chief officers of the Revolutionary army, that furnished 180,000 fighters to the Federal army in the civil war, of whom 5,000 were officers, among them nine major generals and thirty-three brigadier generals, when the conflict ended?

Is that race stolid that braved the terrors of the Atlantic and made history on this continent years before the Pilgrim Fathers thought of coming to this country? Do you call that race stolid that furnished the first martyr in the struggle of the American people for liberty?

No other nationality has stamped itself so indelibly upon the population map of the United States as has the German.

If all of our Germans could be gathered in one State its population would be more than the combined population of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland, Georgia, Louisiana, Minnesota, Kansas, Colorado, and Utah.

There are more Germans in New York City than in any city of the German Empire excepting Berlin and Hamburg. More Germans in Milwaukee than in Bremen. More Germans in Buffalo than in Heidelberg.

No nationality enjoys a higher reputation for honesty, integrity, truthfulness and trustworthiness. German business men rank high in the estimation of bankers and merchants.

To the Germans in America we owe:

The first paper mill.

The first type foundry.

The first linotype machine.

The first chemical factories, and the greatest in the world are still run by Germans here.

The first leather factory.

The first powder mills.

The first iron and glass works.

The first Brooklyn bridge.

The first bridge over Niagara.

The first book ever printed in America.

The first musical instruments.

The first pipe organ.

Agriculture is the backbone of American economy and the Germans have always been the strongest vertebra in that backbone. No other farms are so carefully cultivated, so well kept up or so generally productive as those of the Germans, and no others are so homelike. They are the best home-builders. Prosperity follows the Teuton. Wherever he settles a superior quality of citizenship is sure to develop. — From the Almanac of *The Neue Freie Presse*, Lincoln, Nebraska.