

cally without coal or iron ore, will remain tributary to industrial countries indefinitely, and for this reason a more extensive investment of German capital in South America will not only pay, but will also accelerate recapturing eventually lost export territory. Of importance is not only the strengthening of our economic influence, but also the gaining of a certain spiritual influence. No doubt, Germany's energy and pluck is remarkable, but Latin and Anglo-Saxon people do not like to be made conscious of this fact, or have it "rubbed in." Which is very nice and considerate of Dr. Dernburg. As a foreign trade territory South America will be of special value to Germany, he added, 'because we do not know how relations to our enemies of to-day will shape themselves after the war, and for this reason we must eventually look for compensation.' This spirit of looking ahead, and of not only seizing but making opportunities, is one of those things in respect to which it would be quite permissible for the Anglo-Saxon trader to learn from the enemy.

### The Pope and Peace

Under this heading, a leading article appeared in Wednesday's *Evening Star*, criticising the Pope's recent peace utterances and his general attitude in regard to the war. The following communication, addressed to the Editor of the *Star* and posted on Friday, appeared in Monday's issue of the paper: 'Sir,—I think you will agree with me that the less we have of squabbling and contention amongst ourselves the better at a juncture like the present, when quotas cannot be made up and when we are "up against it" good and hard on practically every front. At such a crisis we have neither time nor energy to waste upon domestic quarrels, and I propose, therefore, to make my comments upon your article on the above subject as brief as the necessities of the case will allow.

'In company with some other impatient critics, you upbraid the Pope because he has not, as you say, publicly condemned what you comprehensively call "the sack of Belgium," by which I understand you to mean the violation of Belgium's neutrality and the massacres and other outrages which accompanied it. (1) The sack of Belgium, and the sheeting home of the responsibility therefor, is primarily a question of fact, or, rather, of a series of facts; and those who, like yourself, have suddenly discovered in this time of stress that the Pope is the supreme judge, not only in the sphere of faith and morals, but also in that of mundane facts, are thrusting upon the Sovereign Pontiff a claim to authority in worldly matters which the Church itself has never put forward, and which, under other circumstances, you would be amongst the first to deny.

'2. The claim that the Pope should be accorded any sort of status or recognition in international affairs has, in point of fact, been formally, officially, and expressly denied by some of the very Powers in whose interests a Papal pronouncement is now desiderated. When the Hague Peace Conference were inaugurated in 1899, the Holy Father was flatly refused recognition, on the ground that "international questions are the sole affair of the nations concerned," and the Papal representatives were voted out. Italy led the opposition to their admission; and two of the Powers which joined with her in slamming the door in the face of his Holiness were Great Britain and France.

'3. The Powers I have named have for years studiously abstained from recognising the Pope as a factor in international affairs. For years past neither Great Britain nor France has been represented at the Vatican. At a late stage of the present crisis Great Britain bestirred herself and sent Sir Henry Howard, who during his short period of service has done excellent work for the Allies. France is still unrepresented. All these considerations are absolutely relevant as showing the general attitude exhibited towards the Papacy as an arbiter in international affairs by those countries in which complaint is now made regarding the Holy Father's alleged inaction.

'4. Coming to the main point of your criticism—"Why did not the head of the Roman Catholic Church openly characterise, as only he could do, that unpardonable crime known as the Sack of Belgium?" I reply: Any decision regarding a specific act or series of acts which was not judicial would be worthless, and no judicial decision is possible until both sides to the quarrel have been fairly heard. It may be urged that the Report of Lord Bryce's Commission of Inquiry might be regarded as affording sufficiently conclusive evidence. I acknowledge that it would be difficult to conceive, within the limits of its scope, any examination of the facts more thorough, more conscientious, or more convincing. Benedict XV. could hardly, any more than any other fair-minded reader, have risen from a study of its pages with any doubt left as to the reality, the number, and the revolting character of the outrages committed. But the question is not—as you seem to think—what the Pope as an individual thinks or knows regarding the matter. However much he may be personally convinced, if he is to act officially and judicially—that is, in his capacity as Pope—it is plain that he cannot base an accusation upon what is, despite its excellence, an *ex parte* statement, emanating from one side only of the belligerent parties. A Supreme Court judge may be perfectly satisfied in his own mind that the prisoner at the bar is guilty, but unless full evidence to that effect, with ample opportunity to the accused for rebuttal and reply, is formally and officially before him, he could not and would not pronounce judgment. For the sake of illustration, let us suppose that the position was reversed, and that—*per impossibile*—our troops had been accused of similar excesses, would we not have resented it keenly if the Holy See had proceeded to launch a public denunciation against the honor of our Army, solely on the strength of a Report drawn up by our adversaries?

'5. Under the circumstances, all that was possible to the Holy Father was a general condemnation of the violations of the principles of humanity and of international law, and this has been already made. In a Consistorial Allocution of January 22 he "strongly reprobated all injustice, by whatever side and with whatever motives they have been committed," and expressed his grief that "both on land and sea methods of offence have been employed that are contrary to the dictates of humanity and international law." In the case of the violation of the neutrality of Belgium—in respect to which evidence was not required, the fact being admitted by all parties—the Holy See has specifically condemned Germany's action. In a letter sent to M. Van den Heuvel, Belgian Minister at Rome, on July 6, and authorised by the Sovereign Pontiff, the Cardinal Secretary of State states: "That the violation of the neutrality of Belgium carried out by Germany, on the admission of her own Chancellor, contrary to international law, was certainly 'one of those injustices' which the Holy Father, in the Consistorial Allocution of January 22, 'strongly reprobates.'" These protests have been accepted by the country most concerned as entirely satisfactory. "The Pope," said the Belgian Minister to the Holy See, in an interview with the Italian *Tribuna*, "did protest in his Allocution, and the Belgian Government has already expressed its gratitude for this to his Holiness. Given the character of the Holy See, the Pope's protest could not go farther." It is stated that an explanation was demanded by Germany both of the allusions in the Allocution and of the statement in the official letter to M. Van den Heuvel. These protests, presumably, do not go as far as you would desire; but seeing that they have pleased Belgium, and displeased Germany, even the *Evening Star* may fairly be expected to view the situation with reasonable composure.

'6. With regard to the peace question, I entirely agree with you that anything in the nature of a merely patched-up peace would be an unredeemed calamity, and that the time for a peace settlement is not yet. I am also, as you are aware, at one with you as to the necessary and essential conditions of a satisfactory peace, as laid down in your leading columns with con-