

TREITSCHKE

M.A. MÜGGE



THE · PEOPLE'S · BOOKS

Fernando de Serrano

THE
PEOPLE'S
BOOKS

HEINRICH VON TREITSCHKE

REMARKS FOR THE YEAR



HEINRICH VON TREITSCHKE

By MAXIMILIAN A. MÜGGE

AUTHOR OF 'FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE' IN 'THE PEOPLE'S BOOKS,' ETC.



LONDON: T. C. & E. C. JACK
67 LONG ACRE, W.C., AND EDINBURGH
NEW YORK: DODGE PUBLISHING CO.

PREFACE

DEALING with one of the wizards who are just now generally held responsible for the intellectual ingredients seething in the cauldron of the Unjust Cause, this small volume does not profess to be an exhaustive exposition of Treitschke's doctrines. Nor has any attempt been made to give the full genesis of the Thinking-shop of which he was a disciple. To do so would necessitate a compendious work. The Unjust Cause, "the first that contrived how to speak against both law and justice," is shown to be inferior in argument; but certain good points in Treitschke have not been left unmentioned. "The wise learn many things from their enemies!" said Aristophanes.

The shortcomings of this book are caused by the difficulty of condensing the vast and complex subject-matter within the scope of a few short chapters, and by the writer's inability to devote a great deal of time to its production.

I have to express my indebtedness to Professor Carruthers, of the University of Toronto, and to J. Charlton Hipkins, Esq., M.A., for their kind assistance in reading the proofs. Thanks are due to Mr. F. Lawrence, Barrister, of Lincoln's Inn, for translating some extracts; and acknowledgments must be made to Messrs. Allen and Unwin for a few passages taken from their book *Heinrich von Treitschke and His Work*.

For the guidance of those readers who may desire to make a more detailed study of Treitschke's line of thought, a bibliography is appended.

M. A. M.

CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
PREFACE	5
I. TREITSCHKE'S LIFE	9
II. WAR	30
III. ENGLAND	48
IV. UNITY	70
BIBLIOGRAPHY	90
INDEX	93

HEINRICH VON TREITSCHKE

CHAPTER I

TREITSCHKE'S LIFE

Name.—Although the derivation of the name “Treitschke” is rather uncertain, there is little doubt that it is a Czech name. May-be it has something to do with the Bohemian village Trzek; or perhaps it is a variation of the name of the counts Trzka, that family to which the count Terzky belonged, who was Wallenstein's loyal friend. Schiller's fine trilogy has made the name Terzky familiar to students of literature, and the words the poet puts into Terzky's mouth are interesting if we take them as spoken by one who was possibly an ancestor of Treitschke:

“Well, well, it shall content me; let but something
Be *done*, let only some decisive blow
Set us in motion
Fortune, we know, can ne'er forsake the Duke!
And only under Wallenstein can Austria
Be conqueror.”

Origin.—Soon after the battle of the Weiszer Berg (near Prague, November 1620), a Treitschke, or Treschky, left Bohemia on account of his religious beliefs. He settled in Saxony. His descendants were industrious and well-to-do people. One made a certain reputation as an entomologist and poet, and is responsible for the libretto of Beethoven's *Fidelio*. Another one, Karl Friedrich Treitschke, was a well-known jurist in Dresden where he died in 1804 as a King's Counsel.

Parents.—Treitschke's father, Eduard Heinrich von Treitschke, son of the jurist just mentioned, was born 1796. He was of a cheerful temperament and, without being a pietist, had a steadfast confidence in God. Eduard Heinrich was to study medicine, but after the battle of Leipsic had been fought he could stand the routine and studies no longer, and joined the army. The next year he became lieutenant and, thanks to his perseverance and thoroughness, he rose steadily in spite of the small chances of advancement during the long years of peace. It took the young lieutenant of hussars twenty-three years to become a captain of infantry, but he died a general and commandant of Königstein, that huge fortress which has been called "the key to Bohemia."

The title of nobility was conferred upon him, not for any merit on his part. His elder brother was a tutor to the young counts of Schönburg. The parents of these boys thought it would be much nicer if they had not to mix up with a commoner. The Schönburgs' influence moved the necessary wheels and the two Treitschkes were ennobled.

Treitschke's mother was Maria von Oppen, the daughter of a distinguished Saxon noble family, which counted the famous Franz von Sickingen amongst its ancestors. Her parents died early. Maria was of a rather serious nature which was partly due to a joyless youth and frequent illnesses. She was fond of natural history and liked starting all sorts of collections. Her unselfishness, her clear commonsense, and her deep devotion to her husband were the outstanding features of her personality. She married Eduard von Treitschke, who was fourteen years her senior, in 1832, and when she died in 1861, her husband was inconsolable.

Birth.—Heinrich Treitschke, the future historian, was born on the fifteenth of September 1834 in Dresden, in a house of the "Weisze Gasse," which is situated behind the Kreuzkirche. He was a big and healthy child, with black hair and brown eyes. The strong nose and the sharply delineated mouth made him appear

really ugly. The child at three years of age was described by his mother as "a little wild foal, but a really obedient, good boy."

Besides Heinrich there were three children, two girls and a boy.

Childhood.—The first years of his childhood Heinrich spent partly in Dresden, partly in the country. When but four years of age he received his first lessons together with his elder sister Johanna. Already then the astonishing ease with which he assimilated knowledge was noticeable. He was very fond of his father's horses and all things military. At Easter 1842 the boy entered a small private school in Dresden and soon he was a shining light in his class. During the same year he suffered from chickenpox and later on from measles. Through carelessness on his part he caused a very dangerous relapse when he was almost well again and the result was a bad inflammation of the glands, which, by the narrowing of the Eustachian tubes, brought about the first symptoms of his deafness. Although the boy had inherited the sunny nature and strong faith of his father, the martyrdom of his illness depressed him sometimes.

Greek became his favourite language and with his playmates he fought the Homeric battles over again, picturesquely draped in an old hussar's mantle of his father's. The latter was his best friend and absolutely in the confidence of the boy, who did not take quite so kindly to his mother. He was a soldier's child. Nothing delighted him more than to go camping with his father and mix up with the soldiery. He knew his partial deafness barred him from going in for the military career, but he never quite lost his interest in technical matters that concern the soldier.

At the Grammar School.—In April 1846, the boy was sent to the famous Grammar School at Dresden, the Kreuzschule. It had then about three hundred scholars on its rolls. Latin and Greek were the chief subjects of the time-table, which allowed very little time to any subject outside classical studies. The staff comprised

fourteen men, all really good, some quite excellent teachers, and one or two distinguished by their published works.

The year 1848 brought rapid advancement to Heinrich's father, who had won the trust and confidence of his king. In the absence of his father, due to the troublous times, the turbulent year made a deep impression on the boy's mind. Judging by his letters, an almost uncannily matured mind prompted Heinrich to take a most serious view of politics and the general state of affairs and to approach them with an insight quite beyond his age.

The turbulent year naturally excited the boy and stirred his enthusiasm, but his academical republicanism was looked at askance by his people, and the further developments of the movement, especially the revolution in Dresden later on, estranged Heinrich from it.

The almost exclusively classical character of the Kreuzschule underwent some considerable changes when Dr. Klee became headmaster in 1849. The teaching of German subjects gained in importance, and not a little of Treitschke's extreme patriotism is probably due to these changes.

In April 1849 the Confirmation of the boy took place, and the ceremony made a deep impression upon him, for at that time, at any rate, he was still cherishing deeply religious feelings.

The brilliantly gifted boy, who during the greater part of his years at the Kreuzschule easily beat all his rivals in learning, passed the leaving examination with the highest distinctions in 1851. His certificate states that he intended to study history, that in all subjects he had attained "*in primis idoneam scientiam*," but with regard to history, "*ad illud studium in academia inchoandum in primis maturum judicavimus*." On the last speech day he recited a long poem which he himself had composed :

"O fools! naught is so lasting as when a nation's soul feels
shame!

Well may we raise our prayer to Him who is our fathers' God.

What other strength could else remain beneath the foeman's scorn ?

And ours it is to wrestle for glorious manhood's strength,
Lest we should weakly perish in feebleness and woe.
That, when the great hour for us dawns, it finds us fully
armed

With ruthless sword of vengeance to extirpate the shame.
Ay, rage ye billows, rage and roar, dash wildly on our keel—
We bring it yet to issue, we yet shall reach our goal !”

At the University.—With this noble aspiration of German unity and German greatness, the boy of seventeen left the famous old Kreuzschule in March and towards the end of the next month he set out for Bonn University. He attended the lectures on middle-high German grammar and German mythology by Simrock, and on Roman Law by Böcking. The historian Dahlmann gave the young student a very friendly reception on the strength of the excellent letter of introduction which Dr. Klee had written. Treitschke liked the treatment of history by Dahlmann. The almost fanatic faith Dahlmann had in the future of a United Germany fascinated him, and Dahlmann's clear and simple language pleased him. Unfortunately Treitschke's weakness of hearing hampered him very much. Many lectures of his professors were absolutely lost for him. But his faith in God, and his love for German ideals cheered him in the dark hours of despondency.

Following Dahlmann's directions, Treitschke worked out for his own use a history of the English Constitution, about which he said, “The subject gives me great pleasure, because it is one which necessarily arouses admiration and enthusiasm.” He read English jurists like Russell and Blackstone, and soon managed them without even a dictionary.

In February 1852 Treitschke joined the Students' Association Franconia. His brilliant conversational gifts, his unassuming manners and cheerful camaraderie, soon made him the favourite of all. He shared his fellow students' merry carouses, but he did not neglect his work. Several friendships were formed here which

lasted till death. There is a record of an excursion of the Franconia up the Rhine, when the old members, for that day once more the guests of their Association, grew young again with the young, when the wine was foaming in crystal glasses, when the eyes of the fair ladies shone with happiness, and the hills on the banks of old Father Rhine resounded with the echoes of the students' song. Treitschke had to recite, for he possessed some talent as a versifier, and several of his songs have been preserved. One or two of them have a decided swing and simply bubble over with the joy of life.

His father, who would have liked to see Heinrich one day Professor of Saxony's History in Leipsic, prevailed upon him to leave Bonn. The young undergraduate would rather have gone to Heidelberg or Berlin, since his ideals were already no longer identical with the narrow particularism of a small state like Saxony. It was Prussia and the whole of Germany that mattered to him. However, he complied with his father's request and in August 1852 he left Bonn, where Dahlmann, Abel, Simrock and Ernst Moritz Arndt had done so much for him.

In Leipsic he found out that his hearing made it impossible for him to follow the professors' lectures at all, and he was therefore quite dependent on notes and the libraries. He rarely went to lectures now. His fellow-students in Leipsic were not very much to his liking. The only bright spot in his studious and monotonous life there was the fact that he could easily and frequently visit his father's house in Dresden.

After a time he went back to Bonn, where he studied various branches of law, political history, statistics and agriculture. He became acquainted with Rochau's *Realpolitik*, a book which said, "The State is Power." Then he went for some time to the university of Tübingen, where the curse of the narrow-minded spirit that prevails in small states again became visible to him. In Freiburg, where he spent two months, he completed

his doctor-dissertation, and on November 20, 1854, the University of Leipsic granted him the doctor's diploma.

From Freiburg he went to the University of Heidelberg in order to come into contact with Kieszelbach, who had announced a course of lectures on the History of Political Economy. Although these lectures were never given, yet for the first time Treitschke found a teacher who personally and permanently helped him in his studies.

He fought a duel with pistols, and had to suffer a week's arrest since it was he who had sent the challenge. But there is no doubt that he was acting under severe provocation. On March 15, 1855, Heinrich Treitschke came back to Dresden. His student's days had come to an end.

Years of Indecision.—Many changes had taken place at home. Both sisters were grown up and had been presented at Court. The father had become the Military Governor of Dresden. Wisely everybody at home avoided political discussions, for the old general naturally was a loyal servant of the Saxon king, whereas the young scholar believed already in a great united Germany under the leadership of Prussia. Speaking about some of the tiny States then to be found in Germany, he once wrote to his father, "I have admired in Bückeburg and Detmold how the government, from lack of occupation, exercises all its imagination to find out new ways to dress its soldiers as oddly and queerly as possible, to keep going the most old-fashioned coinage and to fix warnings and prohibitions at every street corner."

Since the life at Dresden was not particularly congenial, Treitschke went to Göttingen, where he spent a year and a half preparing himself for the career of University teacher, and especially in collecting material for his inaugural dissertation. This took up most of his time. During this period he lost the child-like faith of his fathers, and a freer conception of religion, one akin to that of Lessing, grew up in him. He also published in 1856 a volume of poems, *Vaterländische Gedichte*. With decided talent, though not a genius, Treitschke

expresses in these poems his fervent wish for a powerful and united Germany :

“They yet will dawn, those golden days
For which in rage and grief we yearned ;
When like a gloomy legend old
The tale of German shame shall sound.
And though but our descendants reap
That bliss whose seed we *now* have sown ;
We, who in righteous combat fight,
We ask not after *our* reward.”

Knowing that his father had different views about the future, when sending a copy to him Heinrich wrote : “As a whole, Germany is powerless and a mockery for foreigners.” Another volume of poetry entitled *Studien* was published in 1857. He was then even wavering between the career of a poet and that of an historian, and he spent much time and enthusiasm on an historical play *Heinrich von Plauen*, the plan of which has been preserved.

Financially he was still dependent upon his father, and though his allowance was not inadequate, it was scarcely sufficient to meet the young Doctor's expenses. Several times he had to induce his father to pay some small debts. He made a little money by writing articles for newspapers, and since the professors thought that his increasing deafness would be a stumbling-block in his career as a University teacher, Treitschke considered the possibility of becoming a journalist. Yet, on the other hand, he revelled in the idea of becoming a famous teacher.

Tired of Göttingen, he went to Leipsic to finish his inaugural dissertation and also to be nearer his parents. His father was appointed Lieutenant-General about that time.

Two offers of the editorships of papers came to Heinrich, and he would have obtained the esteemed and lucrative post as editor of the *Preussische Wochenblatt* in Berlin had he not been too young according to Prussian law to “understand the legal responsibility

for a paper." Henceforth he dropped the idea of a journalistic career.

At last he had finished his inaugural dissertation: "Die Gesellschaftswissenschaft. Ein kritischer Versuch"—"The Science of Sociology. A critical study." The faculty approved, the Ministry of Education gave its consent to Treitschke's appointment as an academical teacher, and shortly after, on the 10th of December 1858, he delivered his first lecture, "Über den Charakter der Hauptvölker Europas in Bezug auf ihr Verhältniss zum Staate"—"On the character of the chief nations of Europe with reference to their relationship to the State." The University teacher, Heinrich von Treitschke, had entered upon his life's career.

University Lecturer at Leipsic.—Some doubts were raised whether it would not be wiser to preclude from the academic chair a man whose opinions were anything but specifically Saxon, and the rumours reached the old general. He had just been appointed Governor of Königstein—a post he had long coveted—and he wrote to his son, pointing out that an official must be loyal above everything else. The boy answered in a courteous and dignified letter that he would do everything to spare his father any grief, but that he would "serve Truth before the Government."

Treitschke's was a striking personality. We possess a description of his appearance in 1864. He was then a handsome, tall and broad-shouldered man; his hair was dark; his complexion showed the same colour and his dark eyes at times were dreamy as those of a poet, but sometimes would flash with the lightning of the warrior. He wore a powerful moustache. Owing to his deafness he could not judge the effect of his voice, which therefore was rather loud. On the whole, the Slavonic type was unmistakable in Treitschke's appearance. There was something of the Hussite preacher about him.

After a few terms the University authorities had to give him a larger lecture-room. His extraordinary oratorical gifts, his thoroughness, his enthusiasm, his

broad philosophical treatment were acting like magnets. A student who once attended one of his lectures never missed them. When in the summer of 1860 he announced a series of lectures on "The History of the Prussian State," more than eighty students attended. But his older colleagues did not very much like such lectures to be given on Saxony's soil and some friction and talk were the outcome.

In addition to his official duties, Treitschke got through a considerable amount of literary work. A number of very able articles for the *Preussische Jahrbücher* came from his pen. Amongst others, the one on Milton is of interest. According to him, the undaunted strength of conviction which has made Milton's character such an admirable one has harmed him as a poet. But he admired Milton as a man and as a statesman, whose prose works he deemed of imperishable value because they insist upon *the eternal truth that the moral excellence of a nation is an indispensable factor for the greatness of that nation's State, the perfection of her art, the purity of her faith.*

The Beginning of the Fight for Unity.—From a letter he wrote early in 1861 we learn that he contemplated writing a *Geschichte des deutschen Bundes*,—"History of the German Federation," in which he wanted to show to "the lazy mob that we are lacking all the fundamentals of State-existence, of law, power and liberty, and that no other salvation is possible but through the destruction of the small states." Hirzel was to be the publisher, and Treitschke thought about two years would be needed to complete that work which was to fight the miserable and petty state-conglomeration of some thirty odd states which constituted the German Federation. When, however, he contemplated leaving Leipsic for a year to collect material in Göttingen or Munich, a petition was signed by 180 students who tried to induce him to stay.

The authorities told the old general that his son's great successes were after all mainly due to a pro-Prussian attitude, that it was impossible to agree with

a lecturer at a Saxon University who stated that it was regrettable that Saxony had not been wholly incorporated with Prussia in 1815. In a pathetic letter to Heinrich, the soldier who had served his king fifty years said that it was a severe blow to him to hear of his son as Prussia's apostle at a Saxon university, but that the father's best wishes and assistance should never fail him. There was no rupture and father and son separated on the most friendly terms when Heinrich departed for Munich.

Treitschke now spent some time in Munich. Here he saw more of the pitiable small-state policy of his time. The famous historian Heinrich von Sybel had to leave the University of Munich because he was a "foreigner," i.e., he was an "alien" from the Rhine!

Amongst Treitschke's short papers for the *Preussische Jahrbücher* written at that time, the one on "Liberty" is remarkable. W. v. Humboldt's idea of the State as an Institution for Public Security; that, according to that writer, the State ought neither directly nor indirectly to interfere with the customs and character of the nation; and that individual man is freest when the State does the least: these propositions Treitschke fights with his "Political liberty is politically limited liberty." The State is an end in itself.

End of his Stay in Leipzig. — In January 1862 Treitschke returned from Munich to Leipzig. His prospects here were better now. The opposition had tackled the Minister of Education with the frequent losses of excellent men at the University, and he had been compelled to make a public statement to the effect that "Dr. Treitschke, who has given historical lectures with great success, has only gone on leave to Munich to make researches." Still, the authorities were determined that the pro-Prussian's path should not be an easy one. The last period of his stay, however, was much more pleasant than the former days of his Leipzig teaching. He mixed with a very interesting and congenial set, in which the most eminent personality was that of Gustav Freytag, the gifted novelist, the author

of *Soll und Haben* and *Die Journalisten*, who, like Treitschke, was a brilliant champion of Prussia's hegemony in Germany.

Another of his Leipzig friends deserves special mention, since he was the connecting link in the relations between Treitschke and Nietzsche. Already in Göttingen Overbeck had been introduced to Treitschke. In 1857, when they both lived at Leipzig, they met again, and a few years afterwards their acquaintance had ripened into a friendship which lasted many years. From 1861 to 1863 they came into almost daily contact and both enjoyed the pleasure derived from the interchange of ideas. Then they had to separate, for Treitschke went to Freiburg and Overbeck to Jena. For years both men corresponded with one another until Overbeck came under Nietzsche's influence. Overbeck had been appointed professor of theology at the University of Bâle. For several years he lived in the same house as Nietzsche. Again and again he tried to interest Treitschke in Nietzsche. There was even some talk of the latter's *Birth of Tragedy* appearing in the *Preussische Jahrbücher*. The *Birth of Tragedy*, however, was published as a book half a year later. Henceforth Nietzsche sent a copy of each of his books to Treitschke, who, for Overbeck's sake, usually acknowledged them with courteous though carefully phrased words of thanks. But in 1874 he wrote to Overbeck: "My dear friend, you ought not to allow your penetrating and clear intellect to be spoiled through mysticism, your modesty through violent arrogance." And in 1881 Treitschke referred to Nietzsche as a crank and a megalomaniac. Nietzsche's influence, however, grew, and Overbeck and Treitschke slowly drifted apart.

The number of his students kept on increasing, and how he managed to get through his official work and his many social obligations and yet keep on writing essay after essay is amazing.

One paper on "August von Wangenheim" was another violent attack upon the ridiculously small "Statelets" of the German Federation, and again he

denied their right of existence. No wonder that official circles in Bavaria and Saxony groaned. Another essay dealing with Byron points out that the cause of the poet's faults and errors was not his hot blood, "it lies deeper, it is genuinely tragic! Nowhere in this rich life do we meet the idea of Duty!"

In the summer term of 1863, his last in Leipsic, he announced lectures on "The History of Europe from 1848-1850." Over two hundred and sixty students attended. During the same term he accepted a call to Freiburg as a professor extraordinarius of History and Politics. His Leipsic students were bitterly disappointed, but when they saw his decision was unalterable they arranged a magnificent torchlight procession, and all his friends and great numbers of the people of Leipsic showed him how beloved he was.

Professor Extraordinarius at Freiburg.—In October Treitschke arrived in Freiburg. Here he spent some quiet years fulfilling conscientiously his official duties as assistant professor of Politics, and devoting all his spare energy to his literary work. The Roman Catholics in Freiburg, a benighted and superstitious lot of people, of course did not like him. Here Treitschke the Liberal, the Protestant, learned that the abyss separating Catholicism from his own Creed was deeper than he had thought, and we read "it is not the question of the difference between a few dogmas, no, it means the opposition between servility and spiritual liberty."

Hirzel, the publisher, had waived the contract for the delivery of the planned *History of the German Federation*, and published instead in volume form a number of the various essays and papers that had appeared in the *Preussische Jahrbücher* and the *Grenzboten*. Treitschke greeted with delight the Danish defeat in 1864 and—although till now he had never agreed with Bismarck's home politics and unconstitutional administration, which ran counter to his own most cherished liberal ideals—he welcomed the Iron Chancellor's action. The liberal in Treitschke gave way momentarily to the "Unionist," whose one aim was the Unity of Germany.

In such a mood he finished the most comprehensive and effective of his politico-historical papers, the essay, "Bundesstaat und Einheitsstaat," "The Federal State and the United State." According to its size, one might almost call the essay a book. On every page it shows the detailed thoroughness of the author's studies and the wonderful power of his gripping style. But its thoroughness and style do not constitute the great importance of this essay. Written during a time of hesitation and uncertainty, it meant the political deed of a fearless man who with a clarion voice and without regard for any interests called into the turmoil of quarrelling parties: "What ye believe is error; what ye desire, Foolishness!" He disregarded the rights of the Duke of Augustenburg, he demanded that Prussia should annex Schleswig-Holstein, and again he pronounced the sentence of death on all the tiny "statelets." In order to create a United Germany, the leadership of Prussia must be acknowledged. If necessary, the power of the greatest State must *break* the power of the silly "Statelets."

That which Treitschke demanded in 1864 he was destined to see fulfilled not many years later. Schmoller characterises this essay of our historian as "the acme of the whole publicistic and historico-political school, *without the help of which the German Empire would not have come about.*"

Treitschke expressed the same view in a paper he sent in January 1865 to the *Preussische Jahrbücher*, the "Lösung der Schleswig-Holsteinschen Frage," "The Solution of the Schleswig-Holstein Question."

Treitschke could say things which Bismarck, for obvious diplomatic reasons, dared not suggest yet! The positive rights of the Duke of Augustenburg were acknowledged, but were declared "to run counter to all the best interests of Germany. Therefore only one decision remained possible, a decision revolutionary, but revolutionary in a good sense: one must simply forsake the realms of law and right." The paper made an enormous sensation. The authorities in Saxony natur-

ally blamed Treitschke, to the greatest grief of the old general, who wrote: "Leave off this partisan scribbling and become an exact historian." But Bismarck, on the occasion of a request from Treitschke for admission to inspect the documents of the Berlin Archives, wrote a very fine letter to the author.

1866.—Returning from his archival studies to Freiburg, two events of importance happened. He became engaged to Emma von Bodman, whom he loved sincerely and whom he had known for three years.

Then the growing war clouds and the certainty of Baden taking Austria's side, made it impossible for Treitschke to hope long to remain in Freiburg.

The more noble and admirable is his refusal to come to Berlin, there to assist the politics of Prussia with his pen. He was offered a full professorship with excellent remuneration. Twice Treitschke refused Bismarck's requests, because, he says, "I did not wish to lose the reputation of an independent man and to serve a government, the home politics of which I fight." And to his friend, Freytag, he wrote, "In such a serious time, surrounded by foes that are almost mad in their fanaticism, I often feel the need of having a chat with my old friends. The uncertainty and instability of the present position has had considerable influence on my life. I have passed through some very hard days. Bismarck wanted me to come and stay at his headquarters. I was to write the war manifestos, work for the German policy of the government, &c. A professorship in Berlin, the aim of my wishes, was assured for me; the proclamations against Austria and for the German Parliament I could write with a good conscience. In short, the temptation was very great, the more alluring, since life here has become almost unbearable. But I had to refuse; I could not pledge myself to a policy, the final aim and end of which only *one* man knows, the sins of which I have no power to make up for; I could not risk my honourable name for the sake of a very doubtful success. According to my political ethics, it is true one must be prepared to

sacrifice even one's good name for one's country—but only for one's own country ; that is to say, when one is in possession of power and has the right to hope that one is really benefiting the state by actions which the masses would call wicked. But I am not in that position.”

Pamphlets and threats against Treitschke appeared in Baden. His house had to be guarded by the police. When finally Baden joined Austria's cause, Treitschke, in a personal letter to the Grand Duke of Baden, handed in his resignation.

In the beginning of July Treitschke came to Berlin, where he began to edit the *Preussische Jahrbücher*. With great insight he said during the war that a unification of the whole of Germany would scarcely result, “Only a closer alliance between the Northern and the Southern German States will go on for some years to live in most uncomfortable conditions and have leisure to think about its present madness.” Exactly so it happened.

A paper, “Die Zukunft der deutschen Mittelstaaten,” “On the Future of the German Middle States,” dealing with the future of Hanover, Kurhessen and Saxony, the most passionate and most merciless essay Treitschke ever wrote, estranged him from his father, who, though no longer on active service, was naturally loyal to his dynasty. The old General published in the Dresden newspaper a bitter protest of indignation and deep sorrow over his eldest son's attack on his beloved king's house, and in a letter to Heinrich said that although it would be very hard, he would have to forego the pleasure of seeing his son again in Saxony unless it had become quite Prussian. But fortunately, for death called away the General in 1867, father and son soon became reconciled, prompted by their genuine affection and esteem for one another.

In October 1866 Treitschke was appointed professor in Kiel. In February of the next year he married.

Professor at Kiel and Heidelberg.—His lectures were well attended and he moved in an amiable and pleasant circle. He liked his students better than those at

Freiburg, who were, in his opinion, "stink-faul," disgracefully idle. His stay, however, was not to be a long one. In spite of his wicked "Future of the German Middle States" he was called to Heidelberg as Professor ordinarius. Again the usual success with his audiences; again the constant references to present-day politics. His lectures to the young undergraduates were "a welcome substitute for politics, philosophy and religion." His chief effect upon his students was not so much in the actual transmission of subject matter, but in the incomparable magnetism of personality and his stirring oratory. Unfortunately his power of hearing went altogether, and he was restricted to reading from the lip movements of those speaking to him, who sometimes had to help him with pencil and paper. His wife too assisted when she was present with the deaf and dumb finger-language.

The whole world had become silent around him like a vast landscape of the snow-clad Alps. He could not hear the sweet voices of his children, two girls and one boy; he who was so fond of children. In the street the traffic threatened him, yet cheerfully and courageously he went about, during his holidays even travelling in Spain, England, Holland and France.

1870.—In 1870 Treitschke published a second collection of his historico-political essays. The war with France broke out in July. At a farewell "Kommers," an official drinking-bout, he made a speech to the undergraduates about to go to the front. Two of his colleagues had spoken before him, well-chosen, appropriate phrases, just such as any good University professor would use. But Treitschke simply carried away, dazzled, intoxicated his audience. "Fichte," he concluded his oration, "dismissed the German youths to the holy war of 1813 with the watch-word 'To die or to win!' but we say: To win whatever the price!"

Shortly afterwards he wrote his excellent little book, *Was fordern wir von Frankreich?*—"What do we demand from France?"—which also appeared as an essay in the *Preussische Jahrbücher*. He demanded Alsace.

Treitschke was furious when Bavaria and Würtemberg, on the conclusion of peace, managed to get special privileges granted to them, spoiling his "Unionist" plans of a great united, indivisible Germany.

He spent some very happy years in Heidelberg after the war, with his three children. A fine, sympathetic and distinguished wife made his home a veritable bower of happiness. His students idolised him. So one quite understands why he did not like the pessimistic philosophy of Hartmann, "the philosophy of the *Tabes dorsalis*," as he called it.

Member of Parliament.—In 1871 he became a member of parliament for the constituency, Kreuznach-Simmern, which he represented till 1884. At first on the side of the Liberals, Treitschke joined ultimately the Moderate-Conservatives. Fittingly he chose as the topic of his maiden speech an attack on the Ultramontanists—the Roman Catholic Party—whose hypocrisy and reactionary intentions he revealed. It was soon evident that Treitschke's great successes were not so much due to any particular oratorical gifts—in fact his delivery and voice were not at all pleasant to listen to at first—but to the power of his convictions, his unique faith in his ideals and in himself. Although his deafness prevented him from participating fully in the affairs of the House, yet by sitting near the official shorthand reporters and following their script, he managed to get along. He soon became a power with which the parties had to reckon, and was recognised as the ablest M.P. from the Grand Duchy of Baden. Those who threatened the successful welding together of the component parts of the newly created empire and the Papists were his *bêtes noires*. Not that he was always consistent; he often changed his views and the reproach of a certain inconsistency cannot be withheld from him.

In 1879 Treitschke forsook the national liberal party altogether to assist Bismarck in the passing of the finance bill, embodying a new commercial policy.

As the years passed on Treitschke tired more and more of the "talking shop," and after 1884 he sought

no longer election. In spite of his friends having learnt for his sake the deaf and dumb language, in spite of the constant use they made of scraps from his note-block, his deafness made it extremely difficult for anybody to convey to him subtleties, complex matters, and much of his uncompromising attitude in the intercourse with his fellow-men was simply the inevitable result of his infirmity.

In 1872 the offer was made to him of becoming editor-in-chief of the *Preussische Zeitung*. £1200 was to be paid to him, he was to retain his professorial position; but he said, "I am not a journalist. I like to let things develop until one can think something about them. To write a leading article straight away on any telegram just arrived, and to have to say the opposite a week after is a job for other people."

Professor at Berlin.—The year afterwards Treitschke received a call to a chair at the University of Berlin. He accepted, mainly because the researches for his great German History made it necessary to be near the Archives of Berlin. He led a very busy life; his lectures, the attendances at the House, his editorship of the *Preussische Jahrbücher* tested his energies to the utmost. Fighting for his ideals, which, though often changing, meant more than life to him, waging fierce wars in the *Preussische Jahrbücher*, now with the Papists, now with the Jews, Treitschke reminds the observer of a grim old swordsman. A kind of intellectual Blücher, he simply had to fight regardless of the cost. He was on the side of the government, and whether the latter attacked the Socialists or the Poles, or the Catholics, Treitschke was always in the thickest of the fray.

Interesting is his slow change from a free thinker to a Christian conservative after 1880. Religion, according to him, ought to be the chief subject in elementary schools. Almost reactionary tendencies appeared in his articles, and finally (1889) he had to give up his post as editor of the *Preussische Jahrbücher*, since the owner wanted to keep them in the service of the Liberal Party.

Many a friend and admirer he lost, but on the other hand, of course, he gained many. The Jews hated him; the South German democracy loathed him. They abused his great work on *German History in the Nineteenth Century* as full of exaggeration, biassed judgments, as a mixture of truth and fiction.

Treitschke's *German History in the Nineteenth Century*, his finest achievement, is, however, more than "Wahrheit und Dichtung." Next to Bismarck's speeches, it is one of the greatest monuments of the historical literature of the German nation. It is true it is full of unfair judgments and too partial in the treatment of matters and men the author disliked; it is not so bright as some of the essays Treitschke has written, its arrangement leaves much to be desired; but it is nevertheless an inspiring, a magnificent work, full-blooded, full of deep thought. It does not pretend to be the work of an objective historian. If Ranke was wise and objective, a kind of Göthe amongst modern historians, then Treitschke, in his passionate, subjective attitudes, was a kind of Schiller. He was a German Macaulay.

For eighteen years he had worked and collected material before he brought out the first volume in 1879. At intervals of about three years, the other volumes followed. Volume five appeared in 1894 and brought the story up to the threshold of the year 1848.

Overwork and too much smoking threatened the poor man, who had to suffer so much already through his deafness, with a worse affliction. In 1892 his eyesight began to fail. The evening of his life was as an unutterable sad adagio movement concluding a Concerto that opened with the ring and the swing of a martial Alleg-rissimo. His wife was in an institute for nervous disorders; his only son had died when only fourteen years of age. His married daughter did not live in Berlin. Bismarck's fall in 1890 embittered Treitschke, who, with the resignation of his post as editor and his seat in Parliament likewise withdrew more and more from public life. Only his lectures and his great historical work were left to him. Worldly honours, how-

ever, were showered upon him. On Ranke's death Treitschke, the greatest panegyrist Prussia ever had, was appointed Historiographer of Prussia. On Sybel's death Treitschke became editor of the *Historische Zeitschrift*. In the same year (1895) he was elected a member of the Academy of Sciences. During the summer of this year he visited England, and came back more convinced than ever that England was a decadent country, a colossus with clay feet.

Fortunately, an improvement in his eyesight set in, and in 1894 the fifth volume of his life-work, *German History in the Nineteenth Century*, appeared. He began working at the sixth volume, but he was not to finish it. Nor could his plan of a crowning achievement, a work on "Politics," be realised. Two years afterwards an incurable kidney disease attacked him, and soon dropsy was added. On April 28, 1896, he died. The German nation mourned him, and the Kaiser sent a telegram.

CHAPTER II

WAR

Outlines.—Göthe's saying : " I have been a man and that means a fighter," is a fine comment upon an incident which Treitschke gratefully records in his *History*. The Secondary Schools of East Prussia presented the famous old castle, the Marienburg, with a costly painted window, and the inscription they chose was : " He who is not a fighter shall not be a shepherd." It is a trifling but significant incident.

The ancient idea of an everlasting contest as the essence and meaning of existence has had its adherents during all ages and in most nations, but Germany during the last century has had more than her average share of war's apologists. They scorned Kant's dreams of an ultimate rule of reason and of permanent peace. They quoted Göthe. They referred to Schopenhauer's Will expressing itself as a Struggle. They brought forward scientific evidence that strife and conflict are the very life of Nature.

Others, like Treitschke, indulged in futile vague statements as to some mysterious mythical transcendental force behind war.

To Treitschke as well as to Cramb, war is a Something that all the pacifists from Aristophanes to Angell cannot possibly UNDERSTAND.

Of course, if there is any truth in Treitschke's phrases about " the moral majesty of war," " the greatness of war," " the moral magnificence of war," mankind has wasted all those years during which individuals fooled away valuable time and precious energy in building cathedrals, carving statues or composing music, or writing a *Midsummer Night's Dream*.

But fortunately these apologists of war, Clausewitz, Moltke, Treitschke, Von der Goltz, Bernhardi, are all *absolutely* mistaken.

The devil can quote Göthe. Schopenhauer's self-fighting Will is a metaphysical nightmare, and the old pessimist with his nice little private income—he loved life, and never took poison, as an honest pessimist ought to do. And the scientists, especially the biologists with their instances and parallels, neglect reason. It is this power alone that has raised man from the hopeless outlook and perilous position of the savage to the noble perspective of a Plato, an Aristotle, a Bacon, a Newton, and a Kant. Reason, by other methods than war, will overcome the difficulties of a surplus in the birth-rate of this nation or the limited food supply of that nation.

There will always be war, but one day it will be a *divine* contest between men, a mental or a spiritual struggle for supremacy, and not the useless body-killing horror of to-day. Man, the cosmic rebel, certainly has worthier foes than his fellow-men! And even if war, the bloody body-eating Moloch of our day should still remain enthroned for a few centuries until Reason rules over human stupidity and passion, and makes gory battles avoidable, there can be but one opinion about Eulogists and Apologists of War as a General Proposition; men who speak about the “majesty of war,” about the “moral magnificence of war.” They belong to the Stone-Age of mankind.

Some Predecessors of Treitschke.—Few people have fired the imagination, roused the enthusiasm, and excited the hatred of their contemporaries to such an extent as the Prussian King Frederick II, who, by the force of arms raised Prussia, till then a comparatively small and insignificant State, to a mighty European Power. His grateful subjects called him “The Great.” For the first time after many centuries German poets again had a real hero. “Arma virumque cano.” A Lessing, a Gleim, a Kleist, sang him. Even abroad the deeds of Frederick stirred up writers to emulate the

feats of the sword with their pen. Carlyle spent years on his great work of a million words.

Frederick the Great laid the foundations of that stronghold, which Scharnhorst strengthened, which Moltke expanded, and of which Treitschke was a panegyrist and a watchman on the Keep.

The fame of the author of the *Ars Amatoria* never allowed Frederick's ambition to sleep; for the king-warrior did not think much of his conquests and feats of arms, but the king-author, the sometime friend of Voltaire, was extraordinarily conceited. So he wrote a lengthy poem, *The Art of War*. On the whole it is very dreary reading. But the following passages are interesting :

"First of the arts was War in earliest times,"—
 "For if for glory's meed your deeds would call
 Encamp like Fabius—march like Hannibal!"— —
 "Advance!—Bellona, clad in martial state,
 Armed with her sword, now opes the brazen gate,
 Which ever hides, from vulgar souls confined
 The secrets yielded to the accomplished mind :
 Secrets within the sanctuary enclosed,
 And but to Mars's favourites e'er exposed—
 Deep in the temple, from his splendour bright,
 The god of battle shines with beaming light ;
 High in the air, while genii's wings sustain
 His throne, he's seen where martial glories reign ;
 This dreadful god, amid an awful host
 Of military virtues holds his post :
 First Valour's noble form is near him placed,
 There tranquil Courage bares his dauntless breast,
 There watchful Toil, whose eyelids never close,
 Is seen—there Artifice, who overflows
 With well-judged methods to deceive the foe,
 And gain the time to strike a certain blow ;
 In troubles still a borrowed form he wears,
 Like Proteus vanishes and reappears.
 But see where fair Imagination shines,
 Her sparkling eyes implying great designs,
 The fire divine that glows within her breast
 Gives not the ethereal form a moment's rest,
 A thousand brilliant schemes she soon conceives,
 And to Minerva wise direction gives.

With downcast eyes and face composed, is seen
Dumb Secrecy's impenetrable mien ;
Her finger resting on her lips appears,
She speaks not, but all Mars's notions hears,
Eternal laurels flourish round his throne,
The just rewards of valour's sons alone :
To these, earth's demi-gods, with hands divine
He gives his wreaths, as they approach his shrine
Those brilliant souls, who victory can enchain,
And lead her, bound by genius, in their train !
Unfading wreaths ! for you the heroes dare,
The arm of death, the horrid front of war :
Their other passions yield to glory's charms,
And to enjoy her smiles they rush to arms !
Within this temple, graced with trophies round,
Whence, as he pleases Mars can man confound,
The statues of the children of the god
Are placed in niches of the bright abode ;
Between its brazen columns is their seat,
The realms they conquered lying at their feet."

As said above, it was not enthusiasm and admiration alone which the warrior Frederick aroused. A whole literature of bitter and hostile pamphlets and books exists. Most of them are as ephemeral as war books usually are. A few, however, are worthy of notice and one decidedly deserves mention here. It is *The Mornings*, a work generally attributed to Frederick himself but apparently spurious. In this book, a mixture of Treitschke and Macchiavelli, instructing his successor à la Lord Chesterfield, the king says :

"I revisited my treasury and there was a sufficient surplus to enable me to double my army. It was natural I should not limit myself to preserve what I already possessed, so I very soon decided to profit by the first occasion which presented itself.

"As it is universally admitted by all men that to dupe one's equal is a cowardly act, a term has been chosen which modifies the act, and this word is policy."

A reference to these *Mornings* seems the more justifiable in connection with Treitschke, and in view of the present war, if it be mentioned that an American edition of them was published in 1870 under the title,

Origin of the Bismarck Policy or The Hohenzollern Doctrine and Maxims, and an English edition in 1914 under the title, *Origin of Von Bernhardt's Gospel of Inhumanity or The Confessions of Frederick the Great*. There is not the slightest doubt that Frederick the Great is the father of Modern Militarism. If his immediate successors had been gifted with genius and courage equal to his own, who knows whether Prussia would not have expanded more than a hundred years ago, and whether Napoleon would not have shattered big forces against the rock of Prussia long before he wasted them in the deserts of Russia? As it was, Frederick's successors had fallen asleep on the laurels won by him. Arrogance and inefficiency were rampant in the Prussian Army. With one or two exceptions the commanders of the fortresses were cowards. When Napoleon came, the State of Prussia collapsed like a house of cards, and the army was all but disbanded by decree of the Emperor.

Then came Scharnhorst, a fervent patriot, a military and administrative genius. Scharnhorst, though he had to deal with the crafty and all-powerful Napoleon, though he received little assistance from his weak king, resuscitated the Prussian army. How this Prussian minister in face of the most awful odds refounded and reorganised the Prussian army shall be told in Treitschke's words: "In September, 1808, Napoleon forced on the Treaty of Paris by virtue of which the ill-treated Prussian State had to bind itself to have no more than 42,000 troops. The only course, therefore, that remained was to outwit the conqueror, to evade the treaties, and to create in addition to the standing army a reserve, a militia, or territorial force, for the chances of war. But the straight course even to this goal was barred. Scharnhorst recognised at once that the simplest plan was to make the territorials pass through the school of the standing army, to form the reserve out of discharged soldiers. And yet this was for the moment impossible. The enlistment of so large a number of recruits would have at once aroused the suspicion of Napoleon, and, moreover, a territorial force thus formed

would not attain a considerable strength for some years, while men expected the renewal of the war every month. Therefore they must content themselves with a militia which had no visible connection with the standing army, and was intended apparently only for the maintenance of internal order; but, being schooled by repeated military trainings, and provided with adequate arms and munition, should come forward as an army of reserve immediately upon the outbreak of war. Four times during the period 1807-10 did Scharnhorst bring forward these plans for a militia, and discuss them with the Sovereign. His first scheme he completed, all alone, on July 31, 1807, long before the Austrian militia existed.

“The older plans had for their main object to prepare for service in war the sons of the well-to-do classes, who could arm and clothe themselves; these were to be trained in peace under the harmless name of a Civil or National Guard. In the summer of 1809 the restless statesman gave his plans a far larger form which already showed the main features of the organisation of 1813. He thought highly of the heroic force of an angry people, but he also prudently foresaw how much time was required before an armed crowd could become an efficient military force. His plan was this: the standing army begins the attack; meanwhile the reserve-army is being formed of discharged and supernumerary soldiers, and of all the younger men liable to be called out; the well-to-do come in as volunteer sharpshooters. This territorial force undertakes the defence of fortresses, and the siege of places occupied by the enemy; as soon as it is efficiently trained, it joins the army, and in its place comes the Militia or Landsturm, which has been collected meanwhile, and which includes all the others liable to service. Scharnhorst knew what a bitter memory that of the struggles in La Vendée was to Napoleon, and how he dreaded a popular rising; he hoped to begin the struggle for liberation with a little war which could be limited to some fortresses or entrenched positions, and he had the terrain of the North

German plains, which are so unfavourable for such a purpose, carefully reconnoitred. Gneisenau, indeed, thought of making little Spandau into a Torres Vedras of the Plains when he heard of Wellington's successes in Portugal.

“But all these hopes were doomed. As soon as Napoleon heard of a new scheme for a Prussian territorial force, he burst forth into masterful threats; not a step should the hated enemy take beyond the engagements of Paris, only for himself he reserved the right to transgress them. Men had to admit that the formation of a territorial force was absolutely impossible as long as Prussia was not in a position to declare war against France. The only thing that could be done until then without arousing the distrust of the Emperor was the more rapid training of the men of the standing army. The legal twenty years' service of those liable remained unaltered, but they levied as many of them as possible, and discharged these moderately trained men after a few months. With this, the numbers of the army prescribed by the treaty were not adhered to too strictly; the guard-regiment at Berlin for years used to have part of its strength in barracks when it went out for field-service, in order that Napoleon's spies might not observe the strength of the battalions. Of course many of those liable to service evaded this stricter levy by flight; but, on the other hand, many conscripts from the Confederation of the Rhine fled across to Prussia; there were constantly small disturbances on the borders, as the poor became quite confused in that dreadful time. On the whole the Prussian people showed devoted fidelity to the King; once, indeed, some peasants of the district stole a cannon from the ramparts of the Westphalian fortress of Magdeburg, and carried it off in a boat to Spandau: their hereditary Lord, they said, needed arms against the Frenchmen. By means of this system of half-trained men Scharnhorst gradually and with great difficulty created 150,000 soldiers. It was a tragi-

comedy to see how the great man year by year sought by a thousand tricks and pretences to escape the notice of the all-seeing enemy. His soul yearned for the joy of battle. That Germany might again be free, he would sacrifice the last breath of man and horse, every male in the country; but the watchful foe always destroyed his plans for mobilisation. Only when the hour of open combat struck could that which had been prepared by five years of consuming toil and indescribable anxiety, burst into life all at once.

“Scharnhorst and no one else is the father of the Army of 1813.”

If Scharnhorst was a man of action, his contemporary Fichte was to him what Treitschke was to be to Bismarck later on.

Fichte discontinued his lectures on February 19, 1813, after he had stirred up the nation by his *Reden an die deutsche Nation*, and after he had worked up the patriotism of his students to fever-heat. He it was who, long before Treitschke, expressed the wish that in Germany there might grow and mature “the character of war,” and it was he who said, “to have character and to be German means the same thing.”

The Bernhardi of that period was Clausewitz, with this difference, that Clausewitz was a scientific expert whose works are still classics, whereas Bernhardi, our contemporary, has too much of the publicist about him and his importance has been unduly exaggerated by the gallery. To quote Clausewitz would be a thankless task within the limited space of this small book. Suffice it to say that war, according to Clausewitz, is an unalterable fact in the scheme of things, with which fact the statesman has to reckon; it is part and parcel of politics, the execution and fulfilment of a given policy by force. Clausewitz already preached “frightfulness” in war.

The Prussian army decayed during the forty years after the days of Frederick the Great. It needed a Scharnhorst to rejuvenate the army so that it could

beat Napoleon. Again followed a peaceful period of forty years and once more decay set in! It needed a Bismarck to repeat the work of Scharnhorst. The Iron Chancellor, with the help of Von Roon and Moltke, reorganised the army and defeated Denmark, Austria, and France. Treitschke was to Bismarck's policy what Fichte had been to Scharnhorst's.

In order to bear fruit the policy of both statesmen required war; war, therefore, was preached by Fichte, Treitschke preached war.

The Blessings of War.—"Without war," says Treitschke, "there would be no State. It is through war that all States that we know of have originated. It is the essence of the State that it can realise its will and wishes with physical force." Treitschke, the M.P., once said in that debating society which, under the name Reichstag, passes in Germany for a Parliament: "The Germans love their army, they are proud of its deeds because it has raised Germany from a thousand years' dissension to a strong nation." Referring to the Southern German States which he wanted to see welded together with Prussia, Treitschke wrote to his friend Freytag: "Only the sword of the conqueror can weld these countries together with the North."

These are not isolated statements of Treitschke's. There are many passages in his books which tell us of war as a wholesome medicine against decay, an efficient stimulus for waning patriotism. "War is the *examen rigorosum* of the States. In war nations reveal their genuine strength, physically, morally, and intellectually speaking. War is an institution ordained of God. War is the great international law-suit."

We find some of Treitschke's ideas, though differently expressed, in the writings of our hostile contemporary Von der Goltz. He says:

"Through the sharpness of our sword, not through the sharpness of our mind, was the dream of all Germans finally realised. Our material development is taking place on so rapid a scale that it must cause misgivings,

for it increases the sense of security and the lust for enjoyment. Both have invariably proved perilous to a nation. Only so long as the cultivation of the warlike spirit keeps pace with general cultural development has a nation been able to maintain its place in history."

Treitschke's dictum that all States known to us are children of war unfortunately applies to almost all our present-day States. Someone has classified States into (1) States based on robbery, (2) States based on law, (3) States based on professions. Leaving alone the third class, which appeals to the adherents of the Guild-system, there can be little doubt that the majority of the fifty States on our planet originated through force.

The more civilised States among them, however, are now a peculiar mixture of power and law. *Within* these civilised States the tendency to make law supreme is apparent. There are already a few State communities, e.g. Switzerland, who owe their very existence to law. Why should we not hope for a supremacy of law between the States such as prevails within each of them? Treitschke and Von der Goltz keep back mankind with their narrow-minded parrot-cry: "War ever shall be, as it was in the beginning and is now. Amen!" There were slaves in antiquity who built the pyramids. *The New Zealander* on the ruins of Panama might similarly argue: Slaves built the Panama Canal.

Since war is the founder of States, the State compels the individual to sacrifice himself for it. Treitschke has of course never missed an opportunity of pointing out reason after reason why the individual should do so. "The State is a purpose in itself as every other living thing; for who dares to deny that the State leads just as real a life as each of its citizens." So the State, in Treitschke's opinion, is a person. But it is not an "organism." "The State is sovereign and cannot acknowledge any authority above itself. The State is Power. The State is also a moral community, aiming

at the education of the human race." There are some other definitions to be found, a few contradicting one another, even more than those given above.

"The State is Power." "Let us remember that the essence of the State is power, therefore the highest moral duty of the State is to care for power." For this purpose all means are justified. Spying, lying, and bribing. Says Treitschke in his paper on "Cavour": "The statesman has not the right to warm his hands by the smoking ruins of his country with the comfortable self-praise: I have never told a lie; that is a monk's virtue."

"The State is a will, a personality." This definition contradicts the alleged absolute sovereignty of the State. No individual can exist perpetually in isolation. That applies to the corporate person, the State too, at any rate nowadays. Therefore no one State can claim to be sovereign. Individual man, though he may pursue personal culture, must ultimately take his proper place in a higher order. A State must do likewise. Treitschke dimly guessed it and so he contradicts himself when he says: "If the state wants to be solely and exclusively physical force without reason and conscience, then it can no longer keep itself in a state of security." "A State which on principle would despise faith and honour, loyalty and truth, would be constantly menaced by enemies and would simply not be able to realise its purpose of being physical power." "For the final object of the State's existence is not physical might; it embodies might only in order that it may protect and develop the nobler aspects of mankind. The unadulterated doctrine of Might is Right is absolutely senseless and is immoral because it cannot justify itself."

Treitschke's State tells the poor individual: "It is a matter of utter indifference to me what your feelings are as long as you obey me!" Yet he acknowledges that, when a young professor, he adhered to the doctrine that it is the right of every subject to resist uncon-

stitutional decrees of the government, and even later on in life he accepts conditionally the truth of *Salus populi suprema lex*. After reading these various statements of Treitschke's it is difficult to escape the feeling that, however noble his aspirations may have been, Treitschke cannot be counted amongst those political thinkers who take supreme rank owing to their clear intellect and cool judgment. Treitschke disagreed with Hegel and yet believed in Hegel's god : the STATE.

War v. Peace.—"Scarcely was the independence of Holland assured when the curse of peace began to influence the nation. Misfortune contains a steeling force for noble nations ; in prosperous times they run the danger of becoming slackers."

Treitschke naturally will use this cheap historical argument. Nations, with some exceptions, have decayed, not so much on account of their experiencing too long and prosperous times of peace, but from many other more weighty and usually very complex causes, either inherent in them or slowly accumulated through environmental influence.

Here is another pæan of war, elaborated on the catchwords decay, sacrifice, glory :

"War is not only a practical, but also a theoretic necessity, a requirement of political logic. In the idea of the State the idea of war is included, for the existence of the State depends on power. The State is the people organised into a sovereign power, and its first business is self-preservation, defence against foreign and internal enemies. It may, as it develops, impose upon itself other, higher aims ; but without tribunals for the disturber of internal order, without arms against the foreign foe, no State can exist. A State which renounces war, which subjects itself absolutely to an international tribunal, gives up its sovereign power, that is, gives up itself. The hope of driving war out of the world is not only senseless, it is deeply immoral. It would, if realised, cripple many essential and splendid forces of the human soul, and would turn the world into a temple of selfish-

ness. I am not repeating in this the well-known and by no means unreasonable proposition that it is a good thing for the energy of a race that is ever sitting in factories or counting-houses to be led out at times into the noble strife of arms ; for vigorous habits will ensure the hardening and good condition of the body in time of peace. We must rather touch upon a main point of political economy, so closely is war entangled with the existence of the State.

“ Two fundamentally different conceptions are at all times fighting about the existence of the State, the social and the political. Civil society, the sum of the individuals, sees in the State only a means of making its objects easier : the hard politician recognises in the claims of civil society only greed, and wishes to subject all its activity to the State. In the eyes of historical knowledge and of the real statesman both conceptions appear to be equally justified and equally partial. For since State and society are connected by mutual rights and duties, they cannot stand to each other simply as means and end. Society does not merely serve the greed of the individual, its activity extends beyond the State, it tries to win the wide earth to civilisation by means of the complicated machinery of economic and intellectual labour, and by the side of this exalted task of the human race the State appears to be but a means. The State, on the other hand, is right when it regards itself as end, because it knows that its own existence has first made possible the wealth of social life. This eternal contradiction is adjusted in quiet times by the free peoples of to-day by the fact that the individual, while he devotes his best efforts to social ends, yet keeps some of his time over for political duties. If this quiet life lasts long, then his own individuality with its finite objects will infallibly become dearer than the fatherland to the average man.

“ Every nation—and most of all a highly cultivated people—runs a danger of falling away into selfishness during a long peace. To such a race it is a blessing

when Fate sends it a great and just war; and the more pleasantly the comfortable habit of social life has crept into men's hearts, the more terrible is the reaction. I say: Fate sends the war; because the value of this cruel remedy is very seldom understood, since no physician among men will have the courage to prescribe war as a healing draught to a sick nation at a fixed time.

“As soon as the State cries out: ‘Now it is a question of me and my existence,’ then wakes up in a free people that highest of all virtues which can never flourish so largely and greatly in time of peace, the spirit of sacrifice. The millions meet in the one thought of the fatherland, in the common feeling of love unto death, which once known is never forgotten, and ennobles and consecrates the life of a whole generation. The strife of parties and classes yields to a holy sacrifice; and the thinker and the artist feel that, if the State goes under, their ideal creation is but a tree without root.

“Among the thousands who march to the battle-field, and, without will, obey the will of the whole body, everyone knows how absurdly little his life is worth compared with the glory of the State, and feels about him the influence of inscrutable powers. Hence the inwardness of the religious feeling in every earnest war; hence the grand phenomenon (incomprehensible to the dull mind) that hostile armies pray to the same God for victory. The grandeur of war lies just in those features which weak-minded enlightenment regards as wicked. These men kill each other who have never done each other an injury, who esteem each other as chivalrous enemies; they sacrifice to duty not only their lives, they sacrifice what weighs still heavier, natural feeling, the instinct of human love, the dread of blood. The little Ego with all his noble and mean impulses, is swallowed up in the will of the whole body.

“Whenever the State recognises that existing treaties are no longer the symbols and expressions of the actual power, and actual relations, if the State in such a

case cannot by peaceful persuasion induce its neighbour to yield, the international law-suit sets in—War.”

The limitations of State sovereignty, already mentioned, which the close network of interrelations and communications in our modern civilisation has brought about, make the claim of any one State to be its own and other nations’ judge and jury simply ridiculous, and to speak of war as an “international law-suit” is on the same level as calling a drunken brawl a “civil law-suit.”

The concept of national honour and glory is one that underlies Treitschke’s numerous diatribes against peace. “That State which will not be untrue to itself must possess an acute sense of honour. It is no violet to flower unseen. Its strength should be seen signally in the light of open day, and it dare not allow that strength to be questioned even indirectly. If its flag be insulted, it must ask satisfaction; if that satisfaction be not forthcoming, it must declare war, however trifling the occasion may seem.” “Wars are not really waged to protect the life and property of the citizens, but for the sake of honour.” “Unless a people over-rates itself it will never know itself.” “Without proper self-esteem, which a nation usually possesses, it would also lack the feeling of common interests.”

The last two remarks are exceedingly interesting because they are very human. Already Fichte stated: “A nation simply cannot do without self-conceit.” Of course there is a grain of truth in it. Individual man could not bear existence without a certain amount of self-conceit. It is the old story of the beam and the mote in the eye. But we, the community, have put limitations on any tendency of the individual to allow his self-conceit to grow to such an extent that the other individuals suffer by it considerably. We have our law-courts. The Germans still allow the duel. War is nothing but an international duel. Ever so many obstacles will have to be removed, almost insuperable difficulties to be overcome, the character of the majority

of men to be almost changed before we can finally abolish war. War, as things still are nowadays, may be just at times, but it is always regrettable. But to come along and tell us: "Declare war, however trifling the occasion may seem," that is *lèse-humanité*!

Political idealism, according to Treitschke, demands war, political materialism rejects it. Besides, peace is very often only a sham. "There may exist between two countries, nominally at peace, a latent state of war, as now is the case between France and Germany." Books on permanent peace he calls "mad books"; the defenders of permanent peace, "weak minds." "War is just and moral, the ideal of eternal peace is both unjust and immoral and impossible." "The mere fact that there are many States proves, of itself, that war is necessary." Treitschke also said: "Anyone who desires to become imbued with a genuine political spirit must steep himself in the rejuvenating fountains of classical antiquity, which produced the finest work of political philosophy—the *Politics* of Aristotle—in the light of which we all seem amateurs and muddle heads!" We shall leave it at that. Let us only remark that Treitschke does not seem to have been presented by the spirit of antiquity with its best gift: Moderation.

The Army.—Treitschke defines the army as: "The nation in arms, the great school of courage, of discipline, of moral devotion to the finest assets of the nation."

"The State is Power, and it is only natural and sensible that a great nation should realise and increase such Power in a well-organised Army." "Every State ought to look out for guarantees of its safety nowhere but within itself." "Trade, Science and Art belong to all nations in common. But a really national army unites all the citizens of the country in question. If the army means the nation in arms it will restrain the latter from plunging into wanton war."

Conscription, which is implied by the term "the nation in arms" is, of course, defended by Treitschke.

He agrees with Scharnhorst, who introduced conscription, that "military service ought to be considered an honourable distinction of the free citizen as it was amongst the Romans."

In a speech in the Reichstag he said: "Without this army that fought in Bohemia, in France—where should we be, where the Empire, where this House? Therefore I desire that once for all the peace-establishment should be numerically fixed and Parliament should have only the right of annually passing any supplementary estimates. With that will be pronounced clearly and unmistakably the great principle that the army is a permanent, essential, legal institution of the State."

"In war, however important technique may be, it never turns the scales unaided. Economic considerations such as skill in engineering or in systematic collaboration can never help one to determine the value of an army. We know now that moral factors in warfare weigh more heavily than technical excellence."

"It is legitimate to carry on the war in the most drastic manner. A warring nation may call to its fighting line the whole of its troops—whether barbarian or civilised. If the soldier coming through a hostile country does not know whom to regard as soldier, and whom to look upon as robber and highwayman, he is driven to show himself cruel and heartless."

Germany and War.—Acknowledging in a speech in the Reichstag that "the Germans are chiefly responsible that Europe is an armed camp," Treitschke was of the opinion that "Germany's strong armaments are the only means to keep the peace of the world."

"In the short time since the establishment of the empire the population has increased by a full eighth, and this rapid growth, in spite of all the misery which it involves, is nevertheless the characteristic of a healthy national life, which, in its careless consciousness of power, does not trouble itself with the warnings of the 'two children system.'—Just as little as prudential counsel could restrain the Crusaders from their sacred

enterprise, so little can considerations of reason prevail against the vague longing for the West. It is easy to calculate that our population, provided its growth continues as before, must in no distant future rise to a hundred millions and more ; then their fatherland will be too narrow for the Germans."

CHAPTER III

ENGLAND

“ And with him he has taken
The Empire's golden crown.—
One day he will awaken
To bring those ravens down ! ”

Outlines.—These insignificant lines from Rückert's poem embody all the imperial aspirations of Germany.

The German Emperor Frederick I, called Barbarossa by his Italian subjects, was much beloved. When in 1190 he was drowned whilst on a Crusade and the news reached Germany, no one would believe in his death. The story sprang up that he had retired into the Kyffhäuser mountain and fallen into an enchanted sleep. Every hundred years he awakens to see whether black ravens are still flying around the Kyffhäuser. The ravens are the internal and external foes of German unity. It was this story which Rückert told in his well-known poem, written in the middle of last century. And in it he expressed the hope of all Germans that Barbarossa one day might return to restore the grand German empire of the Ottonides and Hohenstaufen. Some German poets in 1871 said that Barbarossa had then come forth. But he did not then restore the grand Old Empire in its full splendour. It has been reserved for this generation to witness the bloodshed, the horrors, the misery wrought by the Teutonic legions led by the ghost of Barbarossa on the quest for World-Empire.

There is no doubt whatever that the dazzling splendour of the first German Empire has during the last century exercised a great influence on the mind of the German

people. Till about the time of Napoleon I, but a few scholars and poets troubled themselves much about the period of a Charlemagne, an Otto I, a Frederick I, a Barbarossa. After the overthrow of Buonaparte national consciousness, roused during the wars of liberation, began to grow considerably and soon asserted itself. A whole school of poets, the Romantiker, extolled the formerly so neglected and despised dark middle-ages. The magic wand of their fancy turned anything and everything mediæval into pure gold. The song of the Nibelungen came into its own again. Uhland extolled Walther von der Vogelweide. Germanic philologists and historians of literature began to speak of *two* golden ages of German literature, one that period during which Göthe and Schiller wrote, the other that during which Wolfram von Eschenbach and Gottfried von Straszburg and the Minnesänger flourished, seven hundred years ago. Wagner's *Ring* and *Parsifal* are amongst the latest artistic yearnings after that long past glory.

Gothic architecture, though sporadically extolled during the eighteenth century, now became again a national art. Cologne Cathedral was at last completed. A historian like Giesebrecht fascinated his readers with finely painted pictures of past grandeur. Novelists like Dahn showed how almighty Rome collapsed before the onrush of united young Germany. Gustav Freytag in his *Ahnen* tried to link together the last two thousand years of German life and history.

Then came 1871. A new German Empire was founded. Barbarossa "arose," defeated the French foe, and chained internal discord and dissent. The New Empire grew rich and strong. Soon it was one of the mightiest of the Great Powers.

Charlemagne ruled over almost the whole of the continent, and German historians speak of their Old Empire as the "Holy Roman Empire of German Nationality." (Das heilige römische Reich deutscher Nation.)

Sentiment counts for much in politics. It is one of those disturbing imponderabilia that upset the finest

calculations of the diplomatists. The historic sentiment of the Germans, pining for the loss of their first Empire, and longing for the establishment of an Empire as great as, if not greater than the one they possessed a thousand years ago, has been one of the most powerful factors in bringing about the present hostility between England and Germany. The Old German Empire was only possible on the ruins of the Imperium Romanum, and this time it is England that stands in the way!

“For us,” said Bernhardi, “there are two alternatives, and there is no third—World Dominion or Ruin.” And the Germans, according to Cramb, have drawn up an indictment of the most formidable kind against “perfidious Albion,” to show that Germania ought to rule the world instead of unworthy Britannia:

- (1) England has acquired one-fifth of the habitable globe, not by any merit of her own, but by violence and theft. England is the great robber-state.
- (2) British Imperialism has had no elevating but rather a bad influence on humanity; it has been a failure in India and will fail in Egypt.
- (3) The Church of England is the most provincial of all the creeds born of the Reformation.
- (4) English Universities are inferior places of learning.
- (5) The English army is a mercenary army whose “soldiers on the march chained Boer women together in order to form a screen to protect themselves from the bullets of outraged husbands and fathers.”
- (6) English women, like suffragettes, are loud-voiced, coarse-minded.

Cramb quite rightly says “the accuracy or inaccuracy of the various counts in this indictment is irrelevant here; *what concerns us is that, now on this point, now on that, it is accepted by thousands of Germans at the present day as a fair portraiture of England and the English.* All Germans do not subscribe to all these counts; few Germans do not subscribe to some.”

Of course there are other points of view from which any two warring nations may be judged. For after all such indictments as the one given are just as one-sided as the generalisations of some halfpenny papers on our side. Burke already has said, "*You cannot indict a whole nation.*"

Philosophically speaking, a serious conflict between any two great nations is a tragedy—tragedy in a finer sense than that of the melodrama-conflict between virtue and vice! To avoid on the one hand the sensationalism of the modern stage with its cheap victory of virtue and, on the other hand, the over-awing influence of the classical stage, with its inexorable fate, we may rather define such a tragedy as a conflict not between good and evil, not between right and wrong, but between right and right. Here is one nation, just as much an environmental product as any other, which, forced by its geographical position, becomes a great land-power; and there are sea-bourne nations which simply must insist on naval supremacy. On the one side preaches Treitschke, on the other side teaches Mahan. If there existed a philosophical or historical stand-point from which the whole of humanity's development could be surveyed in its entirety from beginning to end, then one "right" would probably turn out to be a "wrong." With the limitations of our present human perspective, however, there is but one way open to us; to denounce men like Treitschke and Professor Delbrück, his successor in the chair of History at the University of Berlin, who indirectly assist in bringing about such a tragedy, and to pray for the Rule of Reason over the masses.

Biologically speaking, there are certainly, behind all this antagonism, some of those influences at work which cause intertribal marriages to be declared taboo, which cause near relatives like dog and cat to hate one another. Even amongst human beings relatives, if they once begin to hate one another, are credited with a greater venom than strangers.

From the point of view of political economy, a cause for Germany's hatred of England may be sought in the

fact that after 1871 the Germans began to object to what they called the exploitation of their country by English capitalists. Treitschke states that the Phoenix Insurance Company was almost a monopoly. Also a great many gas-works, asphalt-works and tram-lines had been founded and were managed by the English.

Sociologically some reasons for such an enmity as that between Germany and England may be found in the utter lack of international co-operation for the regulation of the birth-rate of all countries, for the computation and distribution of the earth's products; may be found in the wasteful competition during the production, manufacture and transport of goods. Although yet apparently a hopeless Utopia, until some such kind of planetary co-operation comes about there will always be vested interests and greed; there will be slander and lies about some hated rival-nation and finally—War.

English Civilisation.—Already in his student days Treitschke showed great interest in everything English. He read Gneist's *English Constitution*. In the *Preussische Jahrbücher* he published a paper, "The Foundations of English Liberty," which made quite a sensation and was considered by many as Mommsen's work. But as the years passed by the young idealist and liberal became more and more an Anglophobe; and the scathing remarks he made to his friends about England after he had spent a holiday there can only be explained by the assumption that he was suffering from a species of spleen akin to that which some decades ago caused English travellers to look down upon those "funny" foreigners.

The following extracts from Treitschke's writings are but a few of the more important passages. It will be observed that occasionally Treitschke grudgingly admits some good point in matters English, but invariably follows it up with the assertion that the thing would never do for Germany. In the historical passages he, the pleader for "superior" Germany against presumptuous decayed Albion, naturally with all the perversity of a lawyer picks out and marshals all the black spots,

without which the history of neither an individual nor a nation is to be found in this imperfect world.

Treitschke puts English civilisation above that of America. "England has a culture based on classical education, America has not." "But," he says, "among the other States there is one—I mean England—which is fundamentally averse to being schooled by noble thoughts." It is an "awful prospect, that of England and Russia dividing the world; and one really does not know what would be the more immoral and horrible, the Russian knout or the English purse."

English Poetry.—Treitschke's essay on *Milton* is one of the best papers ever written about the author of *l'Allegro*, and, in an article on Lessing, the great Antagonist of England writes: "We can never sufficiently envy the Britons for that finest symptom of their health and harmonious strength, their art, matured on the firm soil of political greatness. If an Englishman reads the verses from the *Faerie Queen*, there rises up before his eyes the picture of the great Elizabeth, he sees her riding on a white palfrey in front of that army to which the invincible Armada yielded, and behind the warrior-hosts of the angels in Milton's *Paradise Lost* he beholds Cromwell's God-trusting Dragoons." Not to be unfair to his own tongue Treitschke, however, says: "We all hope that our language side by side with the English will be ruling the world's commerce."

English Liberty.—"The world-historic importance of Milton consists in this, that more daringly, more insistently than any one before, he championed Liberty as the inherited privilege of nations."

Treitschke speaks of "the much envied liberty of the Britons." "No all-powerful State determines there the policy of the remotest village; even the smallest county retains its self-government." But "in the freest great States of modern times the yoke of public opinion is heavier than anywhere else."

English Government.—Treitschke's attitude towards the English governmental system is not altogether unfriendly, although of course it goes without saying that "to

set up the English monarchy as a model for us Germans means to advise a healthy man to have a leg amputated in order that he may strut along with a wonderfully constructed artificial limb."

Yet our great antagonist envies these "modern Romans" whose greatness was made possible by the favours of an almost too friendly "Fate." "This England whose isolation, the very loss of her French possessions, made a uniform development possible, whose very limitations made it possible that just here already in the earliest times was solved the first task of young nations—political unity."

"The Britons had maintained their ancient constitution against the wanton arbitrariness of an alien princely race in two revolutions, when the free will of the two aristocratic parties gave the Crown to a foreign usurper. Then followed another foreign ruling house, princes who became English only in the third generation, and in all generations down to the last distinguished themselves by an astonishing hereditary incapacity, a dynasty without hereditary right, which for a long period lived only by the grace of the Whigs. Such a monarchy deserved to be only a costly, though otherwise harmless capital on the pillar of the State.

"This Court afforded no centre even for the social life of the dominant aristocracy. As George I did not understand English, the rule obtained that the Cabinet should not deliberate in the presence of the Sovereign: then—not before 1739—came into being the principle that the wish of the Sovereign should never be mentioned in Parliament. George II ventured upon the foolish attempt to bend the aristocratic parties under the Crown; and since then the monarchy has been systematically pushed aside step by step. The first Georges enjoyed the liberty of choosing, not indeed their own policy, but the members of their Cabinets. To-day the Sovereign nominates only the First Minister, who then himself chooses his colleagues; and even the right of the Crown is a mere fiction, since after the resignation of the Ministry no one except the leader

of the Opposition would venture to form a new Cabinet. The old prerogatives of the Crown fall into disuse one after the other, down to the harmless right of creating life-peers.

"The whole construction of the life of State and Court is calculated to educate those royal nonentities which parliamentary government requires. The heir to the throne grows up in a Court, the important positions of which are held by the party in office; he never fills any post in the Army or Civil Service, and becomes acquainted with public life only at the opening of bridges or railways. The English parliamentary system needs great Ministers, and has, up to now, been successful in forming them; but a King who was a really gifted ruler would either work badly, or would disturb the accustomed course of State-life in England. Parliamentary government could endure at most a Prince Consort who knew how to control his political powers carefully.

"A strict monarchist, Alpheus Todd, defines the 'division of power' in England to-day thus: 'The Lower House contains in itself the authority of the Crown, the conservative strength of the Peerage, and at the same time the motive power of the Democracy.' And James Lorimer says drily: 'The power of the Commons is supreme.' Now all the world knows what a great and free political life the aristocracy of England has secured for her people under this unnatural Monarchy; and that even the maimed Monarchy has always formed an indispensable feature of the artistic edifice of the State, nay, that in our days the example of an honourable Court has tended to refine and form the social life of the upper classes.

"But the natural purpose of political institutions is after all to live and work, and to effect their best through able workers. To set up the English Monarchy, which can harm nothing and can create nothing, as a model for us Germans, who possess a vigorous Crown unprofaned by Stuart-crimes or Guelph-follies—means to advise a healthy man to have a leg amputated in order that he

good.

may strut about with a wonderfully constructed artificial limb.

“Is the English division into two parties a necessary condition of parliamentary life, or a result of the peculiar forms which this parliamentary system has adopted at the hands of the English aristocracy? As a matter of fact the House of Commons is in possession of the highest power of the State. Parliament passes the laws, directs part of the administration directly through private bills, all the administration indirectly through the Cabinet which is the Government Committee of Parliament created by the majority of the Lower House. An English minister has, before attaining office, to undergo three tests: he must be elected to Parliament; he must next be distinguished by talent or by family connections, in the majority of the House; and finally he must be called into the Cabinet by the Crown—that is to say, by the leading statesman of his party.

“The leading Minister is necessarily at the same time the leader of the majority in the Lower House; he must either practise the arts of corruption, of ‘management,’ and ‘oil the wheels of the parliamentary machine,’ like Sir Robert Walpole, or he must control the majority by his intellect. The Government here possesses, as Macaulay well says, something of the essence of a representative body, and Parliament possesses something of the essence of a Cabinet. Parliament and Cabinet are so inseparably connected that Todd says: ‘The Ministers are the real guardians of the rights of Parliament.’

“Such a Government, equipped with all the powers of the State and with all the dignity of popular representation, would infallibly fall into despotic tyranny, were it not opposed in Parliament itself by a strong Opposition—united, led by one chief, purposely spying out and combating all the weaknesses of the Government, ready at any moment to upset the Ministers, and to take their places. In such relations a strong Opposition is really a corner-stone of liberty, ‘the proper lever of a government,’ as all Britons say, especially as large

bodies are usually more disposed to misuse power than individuals are. *owing to dispersed responsibility*

“Nothing, therefore, is more deserved than the high consideration enjoyed by the two ancient aristocratic parties, who have so long restricted, watched, and supplemented each other; but also nothing is more foolish than the attempt to introduce this aristocratic party-system into monarchical Germany. German Ministers are not made by Parliament; on the contrary they are created by the free will of the King. They do not stand in Parliament, but by the side of it as bearers of an independent power of the State, bound to seek free co-operation with the equally independent representative body. People may disapprove of this if they will not admit that the Crown of the Hohenzollerns cannot satisfy itself with the modest position of English royalty; but only a fool will endeavour to deny the fact.”

Queen Victoria's Reign.—“Queen Victoria used to speak fluently about all details of the administration: she would tell General Natzmer, who listened ironically but respectfully, of the improvements which she had introduced into the army, and liked to hear herself called a ‘second Elizabeth,’ though the Guelph had nothing in common with the less virtuous but great daughter of the Tudors except feminine obstinacy. Thus through the Prince Consort royalty learned to bear its nothingness with dignity: and in return the wearer of the Crown everywhere received the homage of words of the deepest devotion. The word ‘subject,’ the constitutional cant of the Britons, flourished as never before; if anyone was honest enough to think that the young queen was not beautiful, he ran the risk of being considered mad by good society.

“Such a comedy of inward peace could not fail to fill the moderate German Liberals with admiration. Disappointed by the intrigues of the monarchy of July they began to turn away from the French theories of liberty in the thirties, and now found the constitutional ideal realised in Queen Victoria's State. Only a few

remarked how the artistocratic foundation of the old English Parliament was crumbling since the Reform Act, how the decisions of the Lower House were gradually falling into the hands of the Scots and Irish and new democratic changes were thus being prepared.

“At the same time England was going through a period of unprecedented economic growth. Her industry grew so strong that she believed that she controlled all the markets of the world, and therefore set up the banner of Free Trade. A mighty emigration conquered for her vast colonies, which, even if they would perhaps one day shake off the supremacy of the mother-country, would yet remain true to her doctrine, and would thus secure to the Anglo-Saxon race a great start ahead of the Teutonic race; and it was not long before there was in every corner of the globe a region that bore the happy names of Victoria and Albert.

“Occupied by their party-quarrels and their mutual jealousy the nations of the Continent scarcely noticed how the greatest realm in the world’s history was thus silently growing up. Nay, the German Anglomaniacs were wont to praise England as a model peaceful Power, for which in its harmlessness a small paid army sufficed; and yet this new Carthage was the only State in Europe which was continually—oftener even than Russia—carrying on wars—wars, it is true, in which gold was of more importance than iron.

“At the side of the Sovereign of such a world-empire a small German prince could not but fall into the same position as a princess married abroad; he could not maintain his nationality. Prince Albert soon became quite English, although he generally spoke German in his family-circle, and his amiable consort, to the horror of all pious British hearts, even allowed him to eat fish with a silver knife. When he revisited Germany some years after his marriage, he adopted English customs ostentatiously, and reviewed the garrison of Mainz in a grey summer overcoat, so that the Prussian generals asked angrily if this young Saxon no longer knew that

German princes were accustomed to honour their country's colours in uniform. In the cold, joyless English life he lost that friendly cheerfulness which marks the educated German, and became stiff, pedantic, harsh and unkind in his judgments, so that his labours in the education of his children, which he exercised with great zeal, were only partially successful, and with the heir to the throne not at all.

“ In 1840 the Continent was once more in that condition of skulking discord which England needed for her plans, and never did the old truth, that commercial policy is the most immoral of all, show itself more clearly than at this time. Undisturbed by the squabbling Great Powers, Palmerston was able in his cowardly way to let British insolence loose upon the weak. He began strife with Naples about the Sicilian sulphur-trade, with Portugal about the victims of the last civil war, a war which England had carefully fanned. With Servia he made a commercial treaty, and tried, at the same time, to force Prince Milosch into abolishing the constitution. In the midst of peace in 1839 the rock-nest of Aden, the key of the Red Sea, the Gibraltar of the East, was seized. Immediately after this the opium war began, the most abominable of all wars that any Christian nation ever waged ; the Chinese were compelled to put up with the smuggling of opium from India ; and while England poisoned their bodies, she sought to save their souls by the conversion-sermons of her missionaries.

“ Stronger opponents Palmerston fought with the weapons of cunning only. Everyone guessed that neutral England was secretly supporting the Circassians in their struggle against Russia ; the secret became known when the Russians seized on the Caucasian coast the ship *Vixen* laden with arms. The occupation of Algiers, the last and best legacy of the French Bourbons, caused the Court of London still greater anxiety. According to English ideas all Africa belonged to the Britons of right. Even the peaceful Lord Aberdeen

said mockingly to the Prussian ambassador: 'The French have united Algiers to France "for ever"; this "for ever" means until war is declared, until the first English battleship appears in the harbour of Algiers.' To destroy this fair and promising plantation of the French was the heart's wish of every Briton; therefore France's dangerous foe, the heroic Abdelkader, could always count on England's secret support."

curious
curious
The English Army.—"England has an army of mercenaries. That the English have no universal military service is one of the shortcomings of English culture. This fault is in some measure atoned for on the one hand by the extraordinary development of the Fleet, and on the other hand by the never-ending little wars in countless countries which occupy and keep alive the virile forces of the nation. The fact that great physical activity is still to be observed in England is partly due to the constant wars with the colonies. But a closer inspection will reveal a very serious want. The lack of chivalry in the English character, which presents so striking a contrast with the naïve loyalty of the Germans, has some connection with the English practice of seeking physical exercise in boxing, swimming, and rowing, rather than in the use of noble arms. Such exercises are no doubt useful; but no one can fail to observe that this whole system of athletics tends further to brutalise the mind of the athlete, and to set before men the superficial ideal of being always able to carry off the first prize. Since duelling was abolished in England moral coarseness in the army has been on the increase, and officers have been known to come to blows in railway carriages in the very presence of their wives.

"So far as physical capacity goes the English soldiers are very efficient; they are trained to box, and are fed on an incredibly liberal scale. But even people in England are realising more and more strongly that there is something wrong with their army, and that it cannot be compared with a national army because the moral

energies of the people are excluded from it. The world is not as materialistic as Wellington supposed. Wellington used to say that enthusiasm in an army could only produce confusion and other ill effects.

"Never was any son of Britain so imbued with the old national idea: '*My country, right or wrong*' as Wellington. When he undertook the chief command in Portugal, he was from the first full of quiet confidence in his success. 'I shall maintain my position,' he said dryly. The theatrical display of the new French mastery in war made no impression on this sober head. He never doubted of the fall of Napoleon.

"During the six years of the Peninsular War he trained his hirelings into masters of the arts of old traditional war. Of innovations and sweeping improvements he thought nothing. He never favoured merit, never suggested a promotion outside the seniority list. Independent, thoughtful generals he disliked, though his broad-minded brother, the Marquess Wellesley, allowed gifted subordinates to rule in undisturbed freedom; he needed reliable, clever tools, and he found them with unerring knowledge of men. His aides-de-camp were mostly young lords who punctually delivered the orders of the Commander-in-chief, on the best horses in the world, and dutifully abstained from all opinions of their own.

"He knew his own value, and said openly to his friends in the Tory Cabinet: 'You have no one except me,' and he had himself equipped with extraordinary (never abused) full powers, so that he could suspend and send home any officer without enquiry. His generals might do whatever they thought good in their assigned positions during a battle, but the nearest obstacle in their front was their limit under penalty of loss of rank. His officers had little love for the strict leader, who never thawed into hearty comradeship, never betrayed a sign of goodwill or generosity, not even when the Service could lose nothing by it. The piercing look of the cold eyes, the haughty features with the

eagle-nose, the immovable firmly-shut lips, and the sharply commanding tone of the voice forbade any approach to friendliness. But all obeyed, all felt proud to satisfy one who was hard to please. Censure—or even an opinion—of the measures of the commander, his officers never ventured to utter even in the most intimate conversation. They followed his orders blindly as the inscrutable decrees of Fate. Rarely did he even deign to address them; and when he did, he explained his views in slow, heavy and awkward, but distinct and clear language.”

The English Navy.—Long before the German Naval League, a Von Koester, a Von Tirpitz induced the German nation to believe in their Emperor’s dicta: “Germany’s future lies upon the water” and “The trident must be in Michel’s hands”; long before that time Treitschke in a letter to his friend Freytag wrote, “I hope to see in my life-time the breakdown of the English naval predominance which obviously belongs to the last century.”

“The really national weapon of England is the Fleet. The martial enthusiasm of the country—and it is far stronger than is usually supposed on the Continent, because *the idea of a British Universal Empire is very general among the people—must be sought on the men-of-war.*”

Although he graciously acknowledges so much, Treitschke never wearies of pointing out “the disastrous influence of English naval power on universal culture and justice.”

“We have not as yet obtained a ‘balance of power’ at sea, and Schiller’s melancholy dictum, therefore, still holds good :

‘Among the waves is chaos,
And nothing can be owned upon the sea.’

“England alone is to blame, for England is so immensely pre-eminent at sea that she can do whatever she

likes. All the other powers would be prepared to allow free circulation, under certain conditions, to merchant ships in the time of war. England alone maintains the principle that no distinction is to be made at sea between the property of the State and that of private persons. And as long as this one Power insists on carrying out this principle all other nations must travel on the same barbarous road."

"At the beginning of the Congress of Chatillon (1814) England used the financial needs of her Allies to carry out a masterstroke of her commercial policy. If any of Napoleon's schemes were justified, it was certainly his struggle for the freedom of the seas. That Balance of Power which the exhausted world required was not secured as long as a single State ruled over all seas at its own will and caprice, and as long as naval war, to the shame of mankind, bore the character of privileged robbery. Prussia and Russia had ever since the League of the Armed Neutrality represented the principles of a humane Law of the Sea that should not injure the trade of neutrals: they now hoped to see these ideas of Frederick and Catherine recognised by a resolution of united Europe.

"But England felt herself threatened in the foundations of her power by this. Lord Cathcart roundly declared: 'If we had ever recognised the principles of the Armed Neutrality, French commerce would not have been destroyed, and Napoleon would be still reigning over the world. Great Britain will never recognise any other law on the seas than the universal rules of the Law of Nations.' As matters stood, other questions were for the moment of more importance for the three continental Powers; in addition they all needed further sums of money for the war, and the wealthy ally (Great Britain) was ready to pay another five millions sterling in the form of subsidies. Hence England in the first sitting of February 5 carried a resolution that no discussion of matters relating to the Law of the Seas would be allowed. Caulaincourt raised no objection: