

who have poisoned the German mind, are Bernhardt, Treitschke and Nietzsche.

F. von Bernhardt writes: "War is a biological necessity of the first importance, a regulative element in the life of mankind, which cannot be dispensed with, since without it an unhealthy development will follow, which excludes every advancement of the race, and therefore all real civilization." How can we believe in any permanent peaceful relation with Germany, as long as German statesmen, writers, teachers and preachers unanimously tell us that the philosophy of war is the only gospel of national salvation?

To make war a biological necessity is to declare the principle of the survival of the fittest as the method of human progress. According to this law, the "weaker nations must succumb." If Germany wins, smaller states, like Belgium, Holland and Switzerland, will be annihilated. All weaker races must be enslaved to German Imperialism.

History shows us that the small nations have in proportion contributed infinitely more than great empires to the spiritual inheritance of mankind. Let us note the viewpoint of England. The Englishman "the decisive struggle for life in modern humanity is not the external and superficial struggle of the battlefield, but the permanent and deeper internal struggle of the city, of the workshop, of the home, of the soul, the struggle for political rights, the struggle for a living or for a higher standard of living, the struggle for the recognition of the weaker nations."

Again, Bernhardt says: "Self-sacrifice is a renunciation of life, whether in the existence of the individual or in the life of the State. By self-assertion alone can the State maintain the condition of life for its citizens. The duty of self-assertion is by no means satisfied by the mere repulse of hostile attack; it includes the obligation to assure the possibility of life and development to the whole of the nation embraced by the State. This is not the verdict of history, nor the doctrine of Christianity. Self-assertion, that destroys the weaker nation, will ruin itself eventually. A self-assertion that recognizes the rights of others, and develops by friendly co-operation, will abide."

F. von Bernhardt considers the Courts of Arbitration as an interference with the natural course of history. By it "a weak nation is to have the same right to live as the powerful and vigorous nation. The whole idea represents a presumptuous encroachment on the natural laws of development, which can only lead to the most disastrous consequences for all humanity." This is following the ideal of Nietzsche, who claimed that the mass of humanity should be ruled by the "Master Class." His theory leads to autocracy.

This war represents the conflict between autocracy and democracy. It is not a question of whether King George or Emperor William shall be the War Lord of the world. On the one side, it is the death struggle of medieval autocracy; on the other side, it is the birth throes of a new international democracy. The problem of this war is to press to the last stage the democratic principle announced in the Gospel of Christ, partially developed in some nations, but which must be proven as the only solution of international problems. The Anglo-Saxon race have been the pioneers, who have partially worked out this principle. Like the Hebrew people, they have received this as their covenant blessing, but in them all the nations of the world must be blessed. The outcome will be a world democracy, governed by a Parliament of Nations, in which the smallest principality will have a voice, and can contribute its share to world progress.

Bernhardt and Treitschke claim that Germany has a very important mission to fulfill to the world. "No nation on the face of the globe is so able to grasp and appropriate all the elements of culture, to add to them from the stores of its own spiritual endowment, and to give back to mankind richer gifts than it received. It has enriched the store of traditional European culture with new and independent ideas and ideals, and won a position in the great community of civilized nations, which none else could fill." Bernhardt claims that "It is German science, which must regain its superiority in unwearied and brilliant research, in order to vindicate our birthright."

We admit the leadership of Germany in every line of scientific research, but we deplore the spirit animating it. National life is more than intellect. Intellectual development must serve the larger life of the nation. The German has become crazed by the phenomenal progress of this scientific age. He has made science his religion. Science, applied to the study of nature, has given us a new heaven and a new earth. But, for the Germans, it has done away with prayer, miracles and the Divinity of Christ. Science has revolutionized industry, and developed new social problems unheard of fifty years ago. It has forced the workingman into the position of a machine to be ruthlessly exploited. Even when labor was organized it was on the basis of the "Closed Shop." Science has given us, through Historic Criticism, a new Bible and a new interpretation of life. But the German can find no place for Virgin Birth, Resurrection and the miraculous. All that is dear of tradition and history must be ruthlessly destroyed, if it is contrary to science. Compare the attitude of the British theologians: "Let us have

are not the traits of a full-orbed manhood. "The weak and the botched must perish; that is the first principle of our humanity. And they should be helped to perish." According to this principle, we would not help poor suffering Belgium. We would gather up our skirts and pass on the other side, allowing her to be defeated and demolished, just because she is smaller and weaker than Germany.

The German people have a false view of British colonization. "All the colonies which are directly subject to English rule, are primarily exploited in the interests of English Industries and English capital." They are looking at Britain through German glasses. I wonder where they find the evidence that Britain exploits her colonies or forces them to trade with her. The policy of British colonization is

(1) to encourage self-government where possible, as in Canada, Australia and South Africa. (2) To lift the weaker races and build up a civilization tending to self-government. This is found in India and Egypt. What other illustration have we in history similar to British rule in India? (3) To maintain the policy of non-interference in relation to the question of trade and markets. The export and import returns of South Africa in 1910 show that over 70 per cent. of their trade was with Germany. The Canadian Government appealed to the country on the question of reciprocity with the United States. In neither case did the British Government complain or interfere. I wonder if Germany would allow one of her colonies to trade so extensively with Britain. (4) To maintain the spirit of religious tolerance. The British Government has allowed no interference with the religious traditions or customs of her colonies. The Mohammed-



ON THE GATINEAU.

Amateur Photograph. From negative sent by Miss Jean Smith, Ottawa.

all the historical criticism we can, but until science can prove that these facts are untrue, we will accept them by faith."

Finally, Germany applied science to war and international diplomacy, with the result that she aims at world supremacy, no matter what countries are crushed. It is nothing more than the worship of science. The spirit of Germany has sown the seeds of science, and must reap now the harvest of doubt, despair and ruthless destruction. Science has a work to do, but it must be governed by the spirit of mercy, brotherhood, liberty and equity. Nietzsche looked upon these qualities as the marks of the slave. They

dans of India are loyal to Britain today because of her religious liberty. (5) To prohibit slavery in every form under the British rule. The traffic in human lives would be universal in Africa if Britain had not interfered.

The British Empire is "the outstanding experiment in liberal statesmanship in the world's history, the most effective power for good in world politics, the most convincing proof that an unswerving respect for the political rights of the people is the strongest bond of unity and loyalty, that order is compatible with liberty, and that the conflicting claims of nationality can be and must be reconciled with the claims of humanity. . . . The