

glancing blow on the chest and ripped off the flesh, carrying the word "Coward" with it. It left a great, red dripping gash. "Now I can die," another bullet hit him squarely, "like an Englishman."

The military report was very brief. It said: John West—died on the field of honor.

### America's Summons

*By Richard W. Wood*

My country! What art thou doing to-day?

What is this rush to arms?

Couldst thou not, for the greater good,  
Stand where the Christian martyrs stood?

Or must thou stoop to blood-shed

At the sound of war's alarms?

My country, which we hoped to see

Stand above fire and sword,

And bare her breast to the dagger-stroke,  
Trusting, amid the battle-smoke,

To the power of reason, the force of right,

And the strength of a loving word;

Why hast thou turned from the path of love,

To mark which Jesus died?

Why art thou turning, arms in hand,

To the arbitrament of the dripping brand,

Turning from the way for which

The Christ was crucified?

America, our country, we beg thee rise again,

Turn to the conquering way.

Throw away cumbersome gun and sword,

Arm thyself with the flaming Word,

Stand shoulder to shoulder with thy Lord,

And in this Armageddon

Uphold Him in the fray!

### America Enters the War

*By William Henry Chamberlin*

THE declaration of war upon Germany by the United States, was, in many respects, a unique historical event. It came not in a moment of popular frenzy, not as a measure devised and put into effect to serve the selfish interests of a few men, but as the deliberate and carefully considered act of the American people, expressed through their highest representative bodies. The vote on the war resolution in both houses of congress was tremendously impressive for a country which has always encouraged the freest expression of individual opinion, especially in view of the pro-German and pacifist influences, open and secret, which were constantly working to keep the nation out of the conflict at any cost. And not only was the war eminently popular and democratic; it was also, in the highest sense, unselfish and disinterested. One would think that even statesmen of the somewhat distorted vision of Senator La Follette and Mr. William Jennings Bryan could recognize the self-evident fact that the munition manufacturers of the country could gain infinitely more by selling their goods to the Allies at unlimited prices than by selling them to their own country at greatly curtailed estimates, with high taxes into the bargain. No, all the glib oratory of the pacifist, socialist and pro-German agitators will never convince any fairminded man that the act of April 6th was anything but the spontaneous expression of the desire of a united people, outraged beyond endurance by an unprecedented series of insults and injuries, culminating in the proposal of the German government to the governments of Mexico and Japan for the occupation and partition of United States territory. The solidarity of the nation is a vindication of the President's much criticised foreign policy. Better to go to war with a united nation in April, 1917, than to have entered the conflict in May, 1915, with the country beyond the Alleghenies lukewarm and doubtful.

Not even an excess of patriotic feeling can well overrate the significance of our entry into the ranks of the active belligerents. The historians of the Great War will almost certainly pick out the Russian Revolution and the American declaration of hostilities as the two most significant events in the course of the struggle. It is only another proof of the war-mad folly of the Reventlows and Von Tirpitzes that they ignore, or affect to ignore the portentous consequences of American intervention. It is not an exaggeration to say that, on the day when the

President delivered his epochal speech, the doom of the German imperial ambitions was definitely sealed. The enormous material resources of our country are alone enough to turn the scale in a contest which depends largely upon endurance. But we have far more to give than money and munitions. We have an inexhaustible supply of fighting force, which, although not immediately available, may well prove a decisive factor in the later stages of the War.

But the question of ultimate victory is relatively unimportant compared with the question what that ultimate victory will mean for the future peace and liberty of the world. The Great War would have been a sorry waste of blood and treasure, indeed, if it had merely set up a Romanoff tyrant in place of a Hohenzollern. In fact, during the early stages of the conflict, many liberals echoed the illogical, but natural hope of George Brandes, that France and England might win and that Russia might lose. But the overthrow of the treacherous, pro-German, reactionary bureaucracy at Petrograd has completely altered the situation. The issue at stake is now impressive through its very clarity. On one side are four nations, very different in temperament, traditions and civilization, united by the one bond of a common autocratic form of government. On the other side are practically all the great democracies of the world. The line of demarcation between the forces of freedom and the forces of despotism could not be more distinctly drawn. On one hand an iniquitous cabal of king, kaiser and sultan, bent on war and conquest. On the other hand a holy alliance of free peoples, desirous of peace, but resolute to fight to the utmost for their national honor and integrity.

The condition is unique because it has never been even remotely duplicated in history. Immediately after the French Revolution the new republic proclaimed its intention of carrying liberty, by the sword if necessary, to all parts of the earth. But the French democracy, founded too much on the mere license of the Parisian mob, fell an easy prey to the aspiring ambition of Napoleon; and the wars for the overthrow of foreign tyrants were transformed into wars for the glory and power of the man who hypnotized and turned to his own advantage the glowing enthusiasm of revolutionary France. But it would be impossible to compare the spirit and motives of the coalitions against Napoleon with those of the Allies to-day. For Russia, Austria and Prussia, the chief continental powers opposed to the French Emperor, were at that time governed by despotisms equally tyrannous and far less enlightened than that of Napoleon himself, while England's policy was largely guided by a small group of wealthy capitalists. Consequently

the final victory of the Allies in 1815 cannot be considered a real triumph for the cause of human liberty. In fact it was followed by a period of repression and wholesale exploitation of the working classes by their employers. But the conditions in Europe now are quite different. Of the powers who are now lined up against Germany there is not one that is not thoroughly democratic and controlled by the will of its citizens. Victory for the Allies means far more than the restoration of Belgium, the autonomy of Poland and the rehabilitation and racial unification of the Balkan States. These conditions are all important; but they are mere incidents compared with the larger aspect of the victorious peace that is to follow the War. The real historical significance in the triumph of the Entente arms will lie in the fact that it will mark the greatest advance in the cause of human freedom in the history of the world. It will mean just as much for the future liberty of Germany as for that of any other nation. That is why Reventlow, Von Tirpitz and the rest of the monarchical fanatics in the German Empire are growing more and more desperate as the War drags on and the chances for an ultimate Teutonic victory grow dimmer and dimmer. They know, as Reventlow frankly admitted in a recent interview, that the power of the Hapsburg and Hohenzollern houses cannot survive an unsuccessful war. And with the passing of these irresponsible autocracies there is every probability that wars in the future will be few in number, local in character and short in duration. As President Wilson said in one of the most significant passages of his speech:

"A steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations. No autocratic government could be trusted to keep faith within it or observe its covenants. It must be a league of honor, a partnership of opinion. Intrigue would eat its vitals away; the plotting of inner circles who could plan what they would and render account to no one would be a corruption seated at its very heart. Only free peoples can hold their purpose and their honor steady to a common end and prefer the interests of mankind to any narrow interest of their own."

And so, while we may not feel the physical pressure of the War as do our Allies, the French and English, yet our moral concern for the successful termination of a conflict which is so clearly a battle for the sacred rights of humanity, should be equally keen. Our material boundary may be the Atlantic Ocean, but our spiritual frontier is that long line, "somewhere in France," where the future destiny of the world is now being wrought out. There are two means by which we can prove

the sincerity and earnestness of our attitude in regard to the crisis with which we are confronted.

In the first place, we should, if possible, persuade our Allies to refuse to enter into any negotiations with the present, non-representative German and Austrian governments. The offer of a fair and reasonable peace to the peoples of Germany and Austria, together with an uncompromising stand against entering into any relations with the rulers who are in no sense representative of those peoples should do much to strengthen the hands of the liberals in the teutonic Empires who must be relied on to bring to pass a revolution similar to the late happy event in Russia. It should convince the most skeptical of our enemies that the President was using no empty rhetoric when he said:

"We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been as secure as the faith and the freedom of the nations can make them."

If we are to have any weight in the councils of our Allies we must give them something more than words. It is not even enough to supply them liberally with money and munitions, although both these commodities are very valuable. Whether considered from the moral or material standpoint, it is in the highest degree expedient that we should send as many troops to France as we can raise and equip. The fact that it would require a year for a large expeditionary army to be fitted out and despatched ought not to hinder our preparations in the least. There is every indication that the War will last for at least two more years, possibly longer. The prompt arrival of American reinforcements on the western front would have an incalculably inspiring effect upon our Allies and a correspondingly depressing effect upon our enemies. No considerations of selfish cowardice masquerading as prudence should prevent us from sending the largest possible army that can be raised from our young men to fight the battles of freedom in the trenches of France and Flanders. Where our forefathers fought for a local and national liberty we shall be fighting for a liberty that is universal and international. Surely no American who has caught the spirit of Saratoga and Gettysburg, who has felt the inspiration of Washington and Lincoln, will hold back from offering his life in the present Armageddon for the sake of permanent peace and enduring righteousness.

Senator Norris, one of the "little group of willful men" who did their tiny best to jeopardize the nation's honor and safety in the course

of the recent crisis, hysterically cried out during a debate that we "were putting the dollar mark in the American flag." Just where the Herr Senator got his idea of the dollar mark is not very clear. Perhaps he was thinking of the dollars which the German government magnanimously proposed to pay us for the dead of the *Lusitania*. Perhaps he was thinking of the large number of dollars that the accredited diplomatic agents of Germany have spent in a country with which they were supposed to be at peace, for the amicable purposes of blowing up factories, destroying public works and stirring up treasonable internal sedition, under the guise of pacifism. But the vast majority of the American people, who do not agree with Herr Norris and his fellow-conspirators that peace is more precious than right and that death is worse than any dishonor, have a different feeling about the entrance of their country into the War. With no feeling of jingoism or chauvinism they are determined to take out of the flag the last vestiges of the dollar mark, which is an appropriate symbol of selfish pacifism and cowardly shirking from duty, and to put in its place the stars and stripes that stand for freedom, justice and humanity. With a full consciousness of the heavy burdens and tremendous responsibilities that lie before them, the true expression of their inmost feeling is perfectly expressed in the immortal conclusion of the President's address:

"The right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own government, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free."

"To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other."