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PREFATORY NOTE

THE object of this work is to enable my fellow countrymen, in the words of Sir Edward Grey, in the House of Commons on the memorable 3rd August, 1914, "to form their own judgment as to what forces were then at work which operated against Peace," and brought the British Empire into what an anonymous writer, "The Gentleman with a Duster," in his "Memoirs of Downing Street" so aptly and truthfully describes "as such a filthiness of Bedlamite carnage as no man had witnessed from the beginning of time." It is therefore in the fitting order of things that one who was the political opponent of a super-statesman of "All the Talents" should in the present work tear away a mass of daubed canvas, which for good or evil, has since July, 1919, been painted by well-feed artists and writers, in order to lead the world, into the belief, that British national
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policy has produced "the evolution of morality, the renaissance of the Twentieth century and a new birth of joy and thanksgiving," and in its place to substitute, a full and complete picture of the game which British politicians have played upon our King and country in the great betrayal of Christianity, and the destruction of civilisation in Europe; a picture "inspired" as Lord Haldane, in his book on the War, published in 1920, stipulated it should be, "by a personal study of the whole of the historical materials in the order in importance that was actually theirs, and presented in its real proportions with its proper lights and shadows."

The author's attitude towards the Great War has been consistent throughout. As a member of the English bar, he, at the outset of the War, communicated, with not only the leaders of religious thought, but with the leaders of his own profession, in the hope of enlisting their sympathy and co-operation, in making clear to the nation, the responsibility which belief in God imposed, not only upon the individual, but the Nation itself, for their joint activities in the National game which was then in full swing. In particular he wrote to Viscount Haldane, then Lord Chancellor, to the late Lord Chief Justice Viscount Alverstone (then retired), to Mr. Justice Bucknill
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(then also retired), and many others who bore the name of Christians, and whose character was "peace and goodwill towards men." With the exception of Lord Alverstone, who replied regretting that illness prevented his going into the matter, the only answer received came from Lord Haldane, and as the reply was an important one it will be as well to reproduce the correspondence.

2, Pump Court, Temple,
3rd October, 1914.

My Lord,

I feel that the wickedness of our part and share in the present terrible War is so very great that once I could convince you of it you would gladly give your valued aid and advice in assisting to bring our mad career and lust of war to an end. If you will only afford me this opportunity I should be pleased to come to you anywhere, and place you in possession of my view of the actual facts which under God's guidance I believe to be the right one, and to discuss it with you. As an old member of the Liberal party, and an erstwhile candidate, I am anxious not to adopt any hostile attitude towards the Government in existing circumstances; especially as I feel persuaded that you would be willing to reconsider the facts impartially.

I am, Yours faithfully,
E. G. JELLYCOE.

Viscount Haldane,
Lord High Chancellor.
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House of Lords,
5th October, 1914.

DEAR SIR,

The Lord Chancellor asks me to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 3rd October, and to say that at this moment, when we are in the midst of a great struggle it is useless to consider any other course than the one which has been thought out, so that an interview would serve no practical purpose.

I am, dear Sir,
Yours faithfully,
Hugh Butler.

E. G. Jellicoe, Esq.

It is an undoubted truism that those who preach peace, generally pay for their ideal with their lives, and those who preach war pay for their ideal with the lives of others and with other people's money, and this no doubt explains the failure of the author's efforts to enlist even the slightest co-operation in the interests of Peace in 1914.
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It is not our iron ships. It is not our regiments. It is not those things which have created or indeed really maintain our Empire. It is the character of the people. Now I want to know where that famous character of the English people will be if they are to be influenced and guided by a Church without any distinctive creed . . . The union of accumulated wealth and luxury with a Church without a living faith will lead to a dissolution of manners and of morals rarely equalled in the history of man, but which prepares the tomb of empires.

These prophetic words were uttered by Disraeli at the University of Oxford in November, 1863, just half a century before the destruction which he foreshadowed fell upon the British Empire, and unless we prefer to remain blind let us in the spirit of men who are neither afraid of the truth, nor of being suspected of having gone wrong under foreign influences, contrast in the light of facts instead of prejudice and prepossession, the British Nation’s position as it stood both before God and man prior to the death of England’s most revered sovereign, the late Queen Victoria of
glorious memory, with the events that rapidly followed the advent of her successors to the throne and which ended in the Great War. The feigned affection which we call "patriotism" can never be other than love for one's own country; a love that carries with it a duty to protect one's own country in its integrity as a Nation and in and above the activities of its constituted rulers and servants. It is the man who fails in this duty—the time-server—and the snob and syco-phant who lacks sufficient character to give honest expression to his opinion, who are the real traitors to their country. English-speaking peoples have from long inheritance an innate sense of truth and justice, a great desire for it, and an eagerness in search of it, and as Prime Minister Baldwin in his recent speech on the day Parliament prorogued in August, 1923, said, "Deep down in every English heart irrespective of Party, lies a profound sense of what they believe to be right." By its very nature, then, true patriotism demands that the truth shall be told, and that no citizen owes loyalty or duty to either national crime or national sin. Therefore, without perhaps, too tender a regard for the susceptibilities of those who for good or bad reasons were the authors of the Nation's sufferings in the Great War, or the
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conventional reticences and subterfuges of our public life, or the plausible and concocted motives which are the common form of our parliamentary life, the writer trusts that a reverence for truth in plain honest ink will secure for this work a serious and patient perusal, and that some future historian will by its aid be able to lead the country to a just judgment. *Magna est veritas, et prævalebit!*
I. ANGLO-GERMAN RELATIONS UNDER VICTORIA REGINA

FOR upwards of twelve years prior to the Queen's death, her Majesty who, as all the world knows, was justly proud of her German origin and spoke the German tongue in her Court (her father being a Hanoverian and her mother a Coburg) together with her beloved grandson the Emperor Wilhelm II. of Germany, jointly preserved the peace of Europe. The English-speaking world will also remember that the greatest of British statesmen, the late Lord Beaconsfield, in speaking of the Queen's Consort—the late Prince Albert of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha—the father of King Edward VII. and grandsire of England's present King George V., only gave expression to the mind of the British Nation when he said, "This German Prince governed England for twenty-one years from 1840 to December, 1861, with a wisdom and
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energy such as none of our kings have ever shown," nor shall we ever forget that the last service rendered by the Prince Consort to humanity was to avert a war between Great Britain and America, and for this act England in her gratitude named the Prince "Albert the Good," and every one to-day with honest, national pride will frankly agree that Germany and England alone, of all the great nations of the world consistently maintained the peace of Europe for forty years from 1873 to 1913, and this notwithstanding that in the days of Walpole and Pitt, France and England were continually in a contest for supremacy over half the globe, and that down to the close of the nineteenth century France and Russia had been England's natural enemies.

During the years of peace which in such abundant measure we enjoyed, both Germany and England under God's blessing, were rewarded with plenteousness, and a healthy rivalry such as was never before equalled in the world's history. The Nations had learned to distinguish excellence and character and to appreciate both, while not only Lord Salisbury, but Mr. Gladstone, looked upon Germany's colonial expansion as a natural and commendable development. Under Victoria's beneficent rule English society was a highly cultivated people whose intellectual culture was
equal to any similar class in any other country. Britain at this period was also a God-fearing nation and had not grovelled at the shrine of either Jewish plutocracy or a pot-house democracy. She, at this period, neither coveted the trade or commerce of her continental neighbours, nor the hegemony of the world. There was no petty struggle for power within her borders, although the writer is constrained to admit that believing ourselves to be the unaggressive with a sort of beatific right to develop the earth by blundering enterprise and immature officialism, Britain had within the two last decades of the Queen’s reign, added to the British Empire, whether in the shape of actual annexations or of dominions or what we called spheres of influence, 2,600,000 square miles of territory—twenty-two areas as large as the United Kingdom itself—and Lord Rosebery, speaking in 1896, said, “We are still going forward with immense annexations on the same modest lines.”

As late as November, 1899, the late Lord Salisbury, as Prime Minister of England, declared: “That Germany was the State with which we had for many years entertained relations of sympathy and friendship beyond all others.” He likewise in earlier days, hailed the Austro-German alliance as “glad tidings of great
joy," and even Mr. Joseph Chamberlain in the early days of the Boer War said it was "evident to everybody, that a natural alliance would be one between ourselves and the great German Empire," and almost the last important act of Victoria's glorious reign was the pressure which the good Queen in November and December, 1900, brought to bear upon her ministers in an endeavour to bring into being an alliance between Great Britain and Germany, and in this effort she indicated very strongly her view of what England's foreign policy should be towards the Franco-Russian alliance which had only then been recently discovered, although in fact it had existed since 1891.

In order to appreciate the history of the twentieth century events which we in this work intend to reconstruct, the writer has made a free use of a mass of relevant documents and facts which have been disclosed, in the various recent publications of Mr. Asquith, Lord Haldane, Lord Morley, Mr. Winston Churchill and the other writers referred to in the Prefatory Note, and for this valued assistance the author tenders to each of these gentlemen his sincere acknowledgements. The author also expresses his indebtedness to the American Press for the information regarding American incidents and other facts already published in
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the States which will be found recorded in the present work.

It is first necessary that we should make it clear that as Germany was always liable to aggression on her eastern frontier by Russia, and on her western frontier by France, she required to be "the strong man armed." "Militarism" was therefore the essential safeguard of her industrial and economic life, just as in France and Russia it secured the national life of the people, and just as navyism in England always assured England's commerce and sea supremacy; moreover in republican France, militarism actually possessed and still possesses as representative of the nation *droit administratif* —a whole body of special rights, privileges and prerogatives as against private citizens, the nature of which are determined on principles wholly different from the legal rights and duties of one citizen towards another.
II. THE NEW RÉGIME

QUEEN VICTORIA died in January, 1901, and was succeeded by her son, Edward of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, who came to the throne as Edward VII. With the Queen's death both the habits and character of the populace and the foreign and domestic policies of the Nation underwent a complete change. The British middle-class at this period was mainly composed of men whose wealth alone had enabled them to rise socially, "a bourgeois" who thought only of material cares and material joys, a class of purse-proud, gaudy flaunting personages who were not only obsequious to the aristocracy, but insufferably arrogant and tricky to the caste from which they sprang. They waved aside everything appertaining to the Victorian era as "extinct controversies." It was behind the times! It was too mediæval! The country must go with the times! We must be more democratic. The new King was no sooner in the saddle
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than he was surrounded in his Court by a dubious plutocracy, many of whom were largely Semitic in blood. The Nation then cast its incense and titles of nobility at the feet of the nouveaux riches. An era of wealth at any price came upon the Nation, and self interest and self advancement became the Nation's new ideal. As Ruskin wrote in 1871, "the real sources of all deadly war in Europe are the capitalists, that is to say, people who live by percentages on the labour of others instead of by fair wages for their own." Money bags, alone, now counted for respectability, and became the passport to the Court, to Parliament, to society, and titles of nobility, to all political life and religion. "Man's life consisted in the abundance of the things which he possessed," and the churches taught:

Religion never was design'd
To make our pleasures less.

The Jews, having now found favour at Court and in political circles, their marvellous characteristics soon acquired an influence in the politics and trade of the country, and becoming irresistible, they helped materially to replenish the coffers of party funds and the membership of that chief temple of Lloyd Georgian worship—the National Liberal Club. Their international
PLAYING THE GAME

political interests lay chiefly in undermining British goodwill toward the German nation, inasmuch as in Germany they suffered civil disabilities and were excluded from the centre of society, from all responsible posts of the Civil Service and from the high military ranks. The country now abandoned all respect for its old institutions and traditions. Decadence and mediocrity at Court was followed as it always has been throughout the ages, by a decadence in both national customs and manners, and an abolition of all barriers to promotion—"Men's persons were held in admiration because of advantage." A careless selfishness and a vulgar love of self now permeated the habits of the people, and all standards of excellence and perfection were scrapped. Our people, satiated with materialism, pleasure and "freedom" as they delighted to call the new régime, lived only for commercialism, to make money and more money, to accumulate wealth and "have a good time," free from all the old-fashioned proprieties and decencies of the Victorian era. The day soon became the day of the Octopus and the Jew. Every man's opinion and judgment was as good as another's, and all questions were settled by tricks of expediency, and all manner of compromises between right and wrong; while "good form," "playing the game,"
and "American pep" became part of the national educational curriculum as substitutes for honour and integrity. The nation "changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator."

It was therefore not surprising to find the Tory-Unionist party, who were the most skilful intriguers in the State, backed by the puffing and blowing of the bishops and clergy of the Established Church and their gilded patrons and opulent champions the brewers, starting in 1902 throughout the length and breadth of the kingdom, and during the following years prosecuting with énergie as part of an invented "Imperialism," a subtle and insidious political exploitation of commercialism, which had for its avowed object and propaganda the restriction by means of a tariff war of Germany's commerce and overseas trade, but which in reality was a grandiose Empiric project of utilising the peoples of the world in the development of a Pax Britannica in Europe.

Now that Victoria had died, and Edward VII. reigned in her stead, it was not even surprising to find Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the man who engineered the South African War—the idol of the Tories—now putting forward a policy of antagonism to Germany, and becoming the cacique in chief
of the "Imperialists," and under an ugly hypocrical guise of a "missioner of Empire" stump­ing the country with the declared object of "educating the masses to the viciousness of Germany's rapid and stupendous economic pro­gress," which in a decade had advanced from success to success, and made her not only Britain's most magnificent customer but her chief trade competitor. Added to this an influential sec­tion of the Tory Press now more or less under Jewish control, and possessing a powerful and widespread influence in writing "Imperially" regarding world Empire, coronation tomfoolery, Indian durbars and Oriental jamboree, sport and the prize-ring, went so far as to advance the opinion that "Great Britain would be enriched by the destruction of Germany's overseas com­merce" (which at this time was under three millions in tonnage as against seventeen millions Britain's tonnage) and "that if the German fleet were destroyed the peace of Europe would be assured for two generations"; while the vultures of commercialism openly declared that "Eng­land's future economic development could only be preserved by the extermination of Germany as a world power," in other words Great Britain was to become simply the big firm crushing competition.
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The commercial supremacy of England has ever been at the bottom of her foreign policy. She stood against a powerful France whenever France seemed to dominate Continental Europe or came into competition with her colonial trade, and in this connection it would be as well to recall the ancient historical fact that Nimrod, the accursed offspring of Cain, after the flood became the founder of war and curiously enough to found an "Empire" for himself.

This evil propaganda was truly characteristic of the Tory character. "It is curious," wrote Queen Victoria to her betrothed, "to see those, who as Tories used to pride themselves upon their excessive loyalty, doing everything they can to degrade their young Sovereign in the eyes of the people," and again on the eve of the Queen's marriage, the same champions of Church and State published as "satire" the following bestial attack upon the Prince Consort's religion:

The youngster's faith is made of easy stuff
Ready to turn and pliable enough;
No bigot he to one or t'other creed,
Saxe-Coburg owns no martyrs in her breed.

Now almost contemporaneously with Britain's fiscal agitation in the early years of the century, Germany acquired by purchase, groups of countless islands in the Western Pacific which are
included under the name of Micronesia, and which no other first-class or progressive Power deemed of any value, and these with the Marshall group, the Bismarck Archipelago and parts of New Guinea, gave Germany a wider Colonial Empire in Eastern Seas. In January, 1902, the Sultan of Turkey also entered into a convention with the German Company of the Anatolian Railways, granting an extension of their railways from Konia to the Persian Gulf. By that concession Germany was destined to obtain a commercial expansion on an enormous scale in the Near East with an outlet for her teeming population and her expanding industries. The acquisition of this concession neither created any jealousy nor misgivings on the part of the French, and France offered to lend money and her political influence to further the scheme, and French financiers actually subscribed part of the money. In 1902 again, it was also apparent from a new Naval Bill which she had recently passed, that Germany was determined to lose no time in building up a world-wide commerce. These were undoubtedly some of the reasons which animated the Government of Edward VII. in 1902 casting away all further pretence of cooperation with Christendom, and on terms of equality consummating an alliance with Japan,
and taking under Great Britain's immediate protection and patronage a subtle monopoly of Judaism having for its objectives the recognition in England of Israelitish high finance, and in the Holy Land a Jewish national home and a University of international intrigue and Propaganda at Jerusalem. In defending the Japanese Alliance in the House of Lords, Lord Lansdowne in 1902 in taking in the future, significantly said, "The country which has the good fortune to possess allies is more to be envied than the country which is without them."

Again by dogged industry and enterprise during the same period, Germany gained a supremacy over British trade in Russia, and in the South American republics, and was making formidable strides in achieving a similar result in both the Near and Far East. In every quarter of the globe evidence of German commerce and German commercial enterprise was to be found. German banks and German shipping, were the foremost factors in developing Germany's overseas commerce. On the other hand, we were obliged to admit that our moral paralysis could devise no remedy to revive our dwindling trade other than the pernicious Chamberlain imposture.
III. COMMERCIALISM

The agitation that was stirred up by the gorgeous rhetoric of our imperialistic hirelings, appealing as it did to the worst instincts and petty jealousies of commercialism, fired public imagination, and this combined with the possibility of a continuation of Germany's still greater commercial progress, created throughout Great Britain and her colonies, considerable irritation and ill-will towards the German peoples, particularly on the part of the industrial classes, as nothing ever did before in history. It is even doubtful whether Mr. Chamberlain, who had himself been a life-long Free-Trader, had any imagination or belief of his own regarding either fiscal reform, preference or protection, and Lord Salisbury apparently foreseeing the peril to which the shibboleths of his party were now exposing the country, refused to subscribe to them and resigned the premiership in July, 1902. Thereupon King Edward conferred the seal of that great office upon Mr. Arthur Balfour, who be-
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came Prime Minister and the Zionists' champion in England. One thing, however, is certain, that neither the Tory-Unionist party, nor the bishops or clergy of the Established Church, would have dared to enter upon their sordid and ignoble campaign against Germany had Queen Victoria lived, for in addition to her affection for Germany, she was ever mindful of the debt of gratitude England owed to Germany, for the valued aid she had rendered to England, not only in her wars of past centuries, but for her mediation at the Congress of Berlin, by which a war that was then threatening with Russia was averted. On that occasion Germany stood like a sentinel for British liberty against, if needed, both Russia and France. Moreover the Queen, in the forties, had personally identified herself with Peel and Cobden in their Free Trade policy, and down to the end of her illustrious reign, she always regarded that fiscal policy as the one best calculated to promote the happiness and welfare of her subjects.

The policy of France and England at this period, with regard to Morocco, is accurately stated by Mr. Morel in his work "Morocco in Diplomacy" in these terms:

France in 1901 publicly assured Morocco upon repeated occasions that she had not the least intention of threatening the independence or the integrity of that State. France formally and publicly declared
in an agreement with Great Britain that she had no intention of altering the political status of Morocco. France and Spain formally and publicly declared their attachment to the independence and integrity of Morocco. France and Spain and by implication Great Britain were therefore publicly pledged towards Morocco and towards the world at large to maintain the integrity and independence of Morocco.
THROUGHOUT this period also the French Nation always regarded the German Emperor with sympathy and respect. In 1904 the reputation which he had then already won for himself in France, was publicly manifested by a proposal made early in that year by Vacher d'la Pouge, a well-known French writer, in a series of articles in the *Européen*. He suggested a union of Germany and France, after the example of Austria-Hungary, with the Emperor William as ruler. "The Republic," he wrote, "has not given France what she expected. If the nation weary of the Republic, should for any reason turn to the Monarchist idea, William II. would be preferred as Emperor to an Orleanist without prestige or an unknown Bonaparte." In the following number of the same journal M. Henri Mazel dealt with the suggestion exhaustively. "The proposal of Vacher d' la Pouge," he said,
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"merits attention. A France-Germany based on the Austrian-Hungarian model would indeed furnish a peaceful and honourable solution of the problem of Alsace-Lorraine. What, it would be said, William German Emperor and King of France? Why not? Why cannot a great Franco-Germanic Empire be formed in imitation of Franco-Germanic countries, an Empire which in order to avoid any invidious distinction, could be called the 'Western Empire,' but can this dream be realised? Is the idea unacceptable to the Germans? Who would oppose it here? What guarantees would have to be given to the Emperor William who would certainly desire to be a ruler de facto as well as de jure. All these questions are delicate and difficult, but in my opinion they are not insoluble." These were certainly fantasies but they enabled the world to form a conclusion that there had been at this time some discussion in France of the possibility of a Franco-Germanic "understanding"; and we can contemplate the effect this had upon the minds of both French and English statesmen of the Balfour type and all British diplomats of that period.
ON the 8th April, 1904, a transaction was signed at London by Lord Lansdowne and Paul Cambon, of a far-reaching character, but which upon its face purported only to be (1) a convention regarding Newfoundland and Western Central Africa; (2) secret articles respecting Egypt and Morocco; and (3) a declaration concerning Siam and Madagascar and the New Hebrides. This transaction or “understanding” as it was called, was both secretly and personally negotiated with the French by the King, acting as his own Foreign Minister. The Nation was afterwards told that the “understanding” was an “entente cordiale” by which many colonial questions which throughout some years of animosity had arisen over the immense French colonial annexations, both in Asia and Africa, had now been settled “by the King’s strong personality and skilful handling.” The “understanding,” however, verbally or by implication and the intention of those who made it, amounted in fact not only to an affirmation

V. SECRECY

ON the 8th April, 1904, a transaction was signed at London by Lord Lansdowne and Paul Cambon, of a far-reaching character, but which upon its face purported only to be (1) a convention regarding Newfoundland and Western Central Africa; (2) secret articles respecting Egypt and Morocco; and (3) a declaration concerning Siam and Madagascar and the New Hebrides. This transaction or “understanding” as it was called, was both secretly and personally negotiated with the French by the King, acting as his own Foreign Minister. The Nation was afterwards told that the “understanding” was an “entente cordiale” by which many colonial questions which throughout some years of animosity had arisen over the immense French colonial annexations, both in Asia and Africa, had now been settled “by the King’s strong personality and skilful handling.” The “understanding,” however, verbally or by implication and the intention of those who made it, amounted in fact not only to an affirmation
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by France and England of each others' colonial expansion, but to a moral alliance of Great Britain with France, by which the British Nation through its ministers, Mr. Balfour and Lord Lansdowne, secretly and erroneously embarked upon a future which no one except the actual negotiators could by any possibility foresee. The French Minister responsible for the Treaty was M. Delcassé. Here was the British Lion joining hands with the leopard, for like the leopard and the tiger, France in disposition yields to none in ferocity, an “understanding” which brought to the world unspeakable miseries, and earned for King Edward the title of “Edward the Peacemaker.”

Now as far as Britain was concerned, secrecy was the life-blood of this unwritten “understanding” although it was neither essential to the conclusion of a final settlement of differences nor the cementing of a cordial friendship whether between individuals or nations. Had the negotiations been conducted by the Foreign Minister in the customary constitutional manner, he would have been answerable to Parliament, and the real secret aimed at must have been disclosed. Diplomacy at home and abroad, might have discovered it, and the Imperialistic move might have been countered by the rest of the world. There were, however, Coburg traditions for the King acting without the Minister, and there was possibly
the precedent of the British unwritten Constitution for not reducing either verbal promises, or matters of implication into writing. The Balfour Government, therefore, sowed the wind, and verily the Nation has reaped the whirlwind, and although we denied to the German people, the very expansion and supremacy which we, as Englishmen, claimed for our race, we welcomed the publication in our midst, of books of the class of "The Private Lives of William II. and His Consort," a "Secret History of the Court of Berlin."

Now Article 8 of the Anglo-French Treaty expressly contemplated and authorised under the "Secret Articles respecting Morocco," the making of an agreement between France and Spain, on the subject of Morocco, and provided that when made it should be communicated to the British Government, but neither France nor England notified Germany of the existence of this treaty, nor of the possibility of any secret agreement being made under it which could in any manner involve a violation of the integrity and independence of Morocco, or menace the supremacy which up to this period, with the good will of England, Germany had wielded throughout Europe during the previous thirty years. Germany was apparently ill-prepared to look coolly at this attempt to isolate her, in the sphere of
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European polity, and finding her interests in Morocco now being materially affected by things that might well make her nervous, she at once suspected the motives of not only the Franco-Russian Alliance, but the "Cordialité" of Great Britain and France, and on the 28th April, 1904, the Emperor's uneasiness and suspicion was clearly seen. He spoke at Carlsrhue and this is what he said: "Let us think of the great epoch when the German unity was created. Present events invite us to forget our domestic discords. Let us unite in preparation for the occasion when we may be compelled to intervene in the policy of the world," and seventeen days later, on the 14th May, 1904, in speaking at Saarbruck, he pointed out that "Germany sought no quarrel with any one but was ready to defend itself against all the world." It was with full knowledge of Germany's attitude and warning, as expressed in the public utterances of the German Emperor that the British Foreign Secretary and the Balfour Government acquiesced in France and Spain entering into a compact to exploit the trade of Morocco. This is how the transaction was effected. On the 3rd October, 1904, a convention was drawn up between France and Spain under Article 8 of the Anglo-Franco Treaty for partitioning the trade and resources of Morocco and the agreement was kept secret until November, 1911.
A copy of this secret convention was sent by the French Ambassador to the British Foreign Office in terms of the Treaty of the previous April, and Lord Lansdowne, in acknowledging it, said:

I need not say that the confidential character of the Convention entered into by the President of the French Republic and the King of Spain in regard to French and Spanish interests in Morocco is fully recognised by us and will be duly respected.

There was no positive law declaring such acts to be criminal or imposing a penalty, and no one in his right mind at this period of the world's history would have suggested that the wrong constituted an offence against "international morality or the sanctity of treaties."

It was apparently owing to the talk of M. Delcassé who was so inebriated by the "Entente" as to divulge some of the heroic enterprises that were contemplated under it, that Le Matin published a story of Britain's willingness to send a force in support of France into Schleswig-Holstein, and it is a tolerably safe conjecture that German diplomacy had at this time also obtained an inkling of the true nature of the secret articles of the Anglo-French Treaty regarding Morocco, and possibly also of the equally "confidential" Convention of the 3rd October, 1904, as the international situation was immediately met by the Emperor in March, 1905, suddenly disembarking at Tangier, and declaring emphatically Germany's
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intention to maintain the integrity and independence of that country. This hostile declaration came as a thunderbolt to Europe. A crisis was imminent. Thereupon Lord Rosebery sought to obtain some public statement in Parliament regarding the Anglo-French Agreement and the new development. In March, 1905, his Lordship said:

Let us take another agreement of which I am a well-known but a conspicuous heretic. The Anglo-French Agreement. I am not going to say anything here about it which will make anybody’s hair stand on end. I only wish to accentuate my own position in that matter and to say that while desiring as earnestly as any human being in these islands the inestimable boon of a good understanding with France, I have the deepest and most serious doubt as to the Treaty by which that understanding was attained.

As plain men we cannot help asking why and by whom was Lord Rosebery silenced, and why, if the Treaty as it appeared ex facie merely recorded a colonial understanding, adjusting past differences, the Oligarchy in the House of Lords should be afraid that Lord Rosebery was going to divulge, something regarding the Agreement of a startling nature. The Balfour Government’s silence in the matter, was ominous. The French on the other hand were determined that there should be no room for doubt, and in most telling language M. Delcassé, the man whom we have already seen, was the responsible Minister in
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France, for the secret "understanding" with England, on the 12th July, 1905, openly and frankly published in *Le Gaulois* France's declaration of all that the Entente actually stood for in the following words:

Of what importance would the young Navy of Germany be, in the event of war in which England, I tell you, would assuredly be with us against Germany? What would become of the German ports or her trade or her mercantile marine? They would be annihilated. That is what will be the significance of the visit of the British squadron to Brest, while the return visit of the French squadron to Portsmouth will complete the demonstration. The *Entente* between the two countries and the coalition of their navies constitutes such a formidable machine of naval warfare that Germany would not dare face such an overwhelming force at sea.

This publication by M. Delcassé ought to have conveyed to the mind of every Englishman of average intelligence in July, 1905, the true nature of the Entente, and the diplomatic subleties in regard thereto. The only excuse that can be pleaded, is, that the British people revolve in a narrow orbit around their native plane, and have no desire to deviate regarding either Continental peoples or Continental newspapers. They will always remain Thackeray's "Great Big Stupid" owing to the narrow-mindedness of the British educational authorities. It is now stated in de Schelking's book "Recollections of a Russian Diplomat," published by Macmillans, that a few
days before the disembarking of the Emperor at Tangier, King Edward VII. was in Paris, incognito receiving French statesmen, and was given a gala dinner by the President of the Republic which was followed by a reception of all the members of the Corps Diplomatique in Paris.

In Germany the publication in Le Gaulois did not pass unnoticed, and in this connection in a telegram to the Tzar dated 7th August, 1905, referring to the “Entente Naval Coalition,” and the then threatening possibility of war in the near future, in which Russia as the ally of France, would be called upon to take her part, the Kaiser said:

What do you say to the programme of festivities for your Ally at Cowes? The whole of the Crimean veterans have been invited to meet their former brothers in arms who fought against Russia. Very delicate! Indeed it shows I was right when I warned you two years ago of the reforming of old Crimean combinations. They are fast warming up again with a vengeance. I would, were I in your place, not miss the opportunity to come into close touch with your country’s feelings and wishes about peace and war, giving the peoples the long wished for opportunity to decide or take part in the decisions relating to its future which it has a positive right to.

The labelling of the Anglo-French “understanding” with all its implications a simple innocent “Entente Cordiale” was in straight British language wholly ultra vires the British Constitution, for neither the King’s Prerogative nor the
Balfour Government were in law able to enter into an understanding of alliance, either written or unwritten, express or implied, with any foreign Power, or to promise to send even a single British soldier abroad, to fight for a foreign Power, without Parliamentary sanction, and to obtain that consent, the whole truth of the case would first require to be laid bare to the British people.

Even to-day—October, 1923—history repeats itself; Mr. Lloyd George is going about America advocating as between England and the United States a similar unwritten "understanding" and emphasising that in regard thereto he "wants nothing put on paper."

The "understanding" was openly treated in France as the equivalent of a treaty of alliance in the fullest sense. This was not only established by M. Delcassé’s public utterances but also by a learned French writer, M. Andre Tardieu, First Secretary of the French Diplomatic Service, who in his work "France and the Alliances," interpreted it in these unmistakeable terms:

When political questions are dealt with, they as Talleyrand used to say, must take in the future. It’s never too early to scrutinise a probability which unforeseen circumstances might any day oblige those interested in it to change into a reality. If language has any meaning what is intended by strengthening the Entente (referring to words used by King Edward) is simply the substitution of a formal treaty for the moral agreement.
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The Balfour Government never at any time took exception to the interpretation placed by France upon the agreement, but actually adopted that construction, otherwise there could have been no justification during their last year of office for raising the annual naval expenditure to £42,431,000, as against Germany's increase of £1,165,900, and £6,360,000 more than the joint expenditure of Germany, France and Russia combined. By these means the Balfour Government in 1905, deliberately placed British armaments on a war footing, and the real nature of the "Entente Cordiale" thus became an established fact, but not until this occurred did the possibility of any war with Germany even enter the head of any English statesman outside the King in Council. Once it was a fait accompli, it became the secret mentality of all those who in high places controlled the destiny of England, and the Alpha and Omega of all future diplomacy and future British polity.

The objective of all this secret manœuvrering on the part of the British Government was naturally viewed with suspicion at Berlin. In 1905, President Roosevelt, in explaining the progress of his Peace negotiations, for terminating the Russo-Japanese War, wrote to Secretary Hay,

The Kaiser was convinced that France was trying to engineer a Congress of Nations in which Germany
was to be left out, and that he sincerely believed that
the English were planning to attack him, and smash
the German fleet, and perhaps join with France in a
war to the death against him.

Again, did Lord Rosebery return to the question
in the House of Lords, and in October, 1905, he
said:

There is another agreement which the Government
has concluded as to which there is much more unani­
mous assent in this country as far as I can gather.
I mean the agreement with France. I myself am
sworn down not to speak of that agreement. I am
sorry to say that my prophecy as to the complications
which must inevitably result, has only been too
abundantly fulfilled.

Now, why was Lord Rosebery sworn to secrecy
in a matter involving the most vital interests
of the country, and that, at a time when a General
Election was at hand and the electorate would
have had an opportunity of deciding such momen­
tous questions as Peace or War? No Privy
Councillor’s oath could possibly afford a justi­
fication for the suppression of the facts in the
serious “complications” then threatening the
Nation. Not even that professed Radical, Mr.
Lloyd George, showed the slightest desire to help
his country to a knowledge of the truth. There
were at this time undoubtedly strong and powerful
forces at work in England all making for war.
Mr. Balfour and Lord Lansdowne maintained a
rigid silence. The nation was kept in ignorance
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and Mr. Balfour's sophistry and the Super Syndicated Press did the rest, and in recognition of his journalistic services in the cause of "Imperialism" Mr. Alfred Harmsworth was at this period first created a baronet, and afterwards a peer, under the title of Baron Northcliffe. The powerful journalistic forces of Baron Burnham's *Daily Telegraph* and the combined forces of the Syndicated Press were now all engaged in writing "Imperially!"

In the autumn of 1905, a few weeks before the expiry of the British Parliament by effluxion of time, the Balfour Government resigned office, and Lord Percy, the Conservative Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs, in delivering the Ministerial funeral oration, said that he did not see how anyone could doubt that the Liberal party if it came into office would fulfil the obligations which the late Government had already entered into with various countries "particularly the spirit and letter of the 'understanding' which they had made with France."

With the fall of the Balfour Government, fell also the attempted Tariff War against Germany. King Edward then sent for, not Lord Rosebery who had been Queen Victoria's last Liberal Prime Minister, but Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman, to form a Liberal administration. The new Prime Minister in the opening speech of the
General Election at the Albert Hall, again unfurled the old Liberal flag that bore the motto "Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform," and he defined the policy of his party in these words:

As to our general policy to our neighbours, our general foreign policy, it will remain the same in Government as it was in Opposition. It will be opposed to aggression and to adventure. It will be animated by a desire to be on the best terms with all nationalities and to co-operate with them in the common work of civilisation . . . We want relief from the pressure of excessive taxation and at the same time we want money to meet our domestic needs at home, which has been too long starved and neglected owing to the demands on the taxpayer for military purposes abroad. How are these desirable things to be secured, if in the time of peace our armaments are maintained on a war footing? Remember we are spending at this moment, I think, twice as much on the Army and Navy as we spent ten years ago . . . I hold that the growth of armaments is a great danger to the peace of the world.

"Reduction in expenditure on armaments" therefore became a most important plank in the Liberal programme and every Liberal candidate at the General Election, including the writer, preached a gospel of peace and goodwill among nations. The Nation in January, 1906, endorsed the Liberal programme by overthrowing for ever the Balfour group and the Chamberlain shibboleths, and returning the Liberals to power by the largest majority in the Nation's history. It would be well to recall that at this epoch the
policy of Count Witte in Russia coincided with the policy of the British Premier. Count Witte detailed it in these terms:

Russia must pursue a peaceful policy in order to increase her economic wellbeing. We can get on perfectly well with Germany by recognising her rightful interests, and forcing her to respect ours. We must follow the same policy where England is concerned. As against her we can always count on having Germany at our disposal. The antagonism which exists between them is our trump card.

As soon as the British Elections were over and the disturbance to trade occasioned thereby came to an end, our comfort loving bourgeois became again absorbed in what Bacon called "the sabbathless pursuit of fortune." The churches now canonised the individual and put the love of money in the place of God. The country was content to pin its faith to the ministerial pronouncement as laid down by the new Prime Minister in his Albert Hall speech, and gave little, if any heed to politics and certainly none to any activities in foreign affairs, or the British policy in diplomacy, and no one coveted or bothered himself about the Baghdad Railway being built by the Germans with French money. On the other hand experts and interested financiers whispered into the ears of Liberal politicians that the best way to avoid unemployment, was to go
one better than the Chamberlain shibboleths, and smash Germany altogether.

Now one of the legacies left to the new Government was the Algeciras Conference which had been convened to adjust the international complications that had arisen out of the German Emperor's declaration at Tangier, and the secret trafficking between France, Spain and England in regard to Morocco, and this Conference brought the new Government face to face with all the details of the diplomatic aspects of the policy then pervading the Entente, together with the gravity of the obligations which had been imposed upon the nation by the secret alliance with France, and the equally secret agreement for partitioning the trade and resources of Morocco between France and Spain, and it is equally certain that by a new departure in the Foreign Office—the action of the British delegates to the Algeciras Conference and the policy of Sir Edward Grey, the new Foreign Minister, were notwithstanding the Government's pledge that its foreign policy would be "animated by a desire to be upon the best terms with all nationalities and to co-operate with them in the common work of civilisation, and to oppose both aggression and adventure" henceforth dominated by a continuity of the Entente policy. Not the slightest information, however, was given to the country or
to Parliament regarding any of these Imperial obligations, or the enterprises contemplated by the Moroccan Agreement, and the Algeciras Conference was allowed to proceed in blissful ignorance of their existence; and although the Conference devised means of conciliating Germany, and avoided war by passing on the 7th April, 1906, an Act confirming the pledges of the Powers to uphold the independence of Morocco, the Entente policy in diplomacy effected an entirely new grouping of Powers, which Germany not unnaturally suspected was aiming at curtailing her supremacy in European polity, and when in January, 1906, Sir Edward Grey, arranged with the French Ambassador for conversations to take place between British and French military and naval experts, no one in England outside the Foreign and War Offices, could have connected even this concerted united action, with any implied or moral obligation on the Nation's part, in the event of war occurring between France and Germany, whether for the recovery of Alsace Lorraine or any other project, to fight for France, either on the Continent, or at all. Some light is thrown upon the nature of the "co-ordination" that was already taking place in the deliberations of the men, who in England had secured power upon the specious promise of "Peace," contained in the great Liberal manifesto. Here is a letter
written by John Morley, the Secretary of State for India, in the Bannerman Cabinet, to Lord Minto, the Viceroy of India. It is dated 25th April, 1906—only 18 days after the making of the Algercias Treaty:—

Last night was one of a *partie carré* at Grey's, Asquith and Sir Arthur Nicholson being the other two. Sir A. N. told us all about Algeciras and he will soon be at St. Petersburg. *We talked Entente in and out, up and down.* He will be sympathetic with his instructions. Of course there is the chance of the Anglophobe party in Russia getting the upper hand. But the Czar favours Entente.

This *partie carré* was followed by a Coalition of the British and French naval and military staffs and military experts with their strategical "conversations" and plans for which Sir Edward Grey's twin ministerial brother, Lord Haldane, as War Minister, was equally responsible with the Foreign Office, and these military "conversations" as they were called, also involved a corresponding "co-ordination" on the part of the Belgian military authorities, and as we have seen from Lord Morley's letter diplomatic action was at the same time being taken under "instructions" to secure another "understanding" for Entente objectives, this time with Russia, and possibly also, as part of a grandiose scheme to exploit the resources of Persia and erect in the East, in conjunction with India, such an Anglo-
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Mussulman Empire as would force upon Eastern countries a better appreciation of what is called Western civilisation, i.e., oil, rubber, and cotton industries, railways, and telegraph wires.

Another letter of John Morley's, written on the 6th July, to the Viceroy of India, again confirms the Russian enterprise. He wrote:

I do not expect that the Cabinet will change Nicholson's instructions or reverse its policy in any respect. We shall persevere as long as Russia goes on.

Lord Haldane, who of course, executed his functions as War Minister, in a spirit of unity with the plans of the French and British military staffs and experts, announced in July, that there had been a re-organisation of the military forces upon a mobilisation basis for service abroad of 150,000 men. Our forces for war were now re-organised on a two-line basis! An expeditionary army was ready to the last button. Lord Haldane, in his published book "Before the War," has since lifted the veil of secrecy and told us something of his part in the game that brought England to war. He says:

I was instructed in January, 1906, a month after assuming office, to go into the question of guarding the French frontier of Belgium in case the German army should seek to enter France in that way. I summoned the heads of the British General Staff and saw the French military attache—a man of sense and
ability. I became aware at once that there was a new army problem. It was how to mobilise and concentrate at a place of assembly to be opposite the Belgium frontier, a force calculated as adequate (with the assistance of Russian pressure in the East) to make up for the inadequacy of the French armies for their great task of defending the entire French frontier from Dunkirk down to Belfort, or even farther south if Italy should join the Triple Alliance in an attack . . . The difficulties, etc., were these, we had never contemplated the preparation of armies for warfare of the Continental type. The older generals had not been trained for this problem . . . Investigation disclosed that it was not possible under existing circumstances to put in the field more than about 80,000 men . . . . The French naturally thought that a machine so slow moving would be of little use to them. Both they and the Germans had organised on the basis that modern Continental warfare had become a high science . . . There was therefore nothing for it but to attempt a complete revolution in the organisation of the British Army at home.

The nascent General Staff was finally organised in September, 1906, and its organisation was shortly afterwards developed so as to extend to the entire Empire, as soon as a conference had taken place with the Ministers of the Dominions early in the following year. The outcome was a complete re-casting, which after three years' work made it practicable rapidly to mobilise, not only 100,000, but 160,000 men, to transport them, with the aid of the Navy, to a place of concentration, which had been settled between the staffs of France and Britain, and to have them at their appointed place within twelve days, an interval based on what the German army required on its side for a corresponding concentration . . . All the arrangements for this were worked out by the end of 1910. Sir John French and Sir Douglas Haig took an active part in the work. Its primary function was home defence,
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but its members were encouraged to undertake for service abroad if necessary. To say, therefore, that we were caught unprepared is not accurate . . . Anyhow we fulfilled our contract, for at 11 a.m. on August 3rd, 1914, we mobilised without a hitch the whole of the Expeditionary Force amounting to six divisions and nearly two cavalry divisions and began its transport over the Channel thirty-six hours later.

Now the important admissions to be extracted from Lord Haldane's belated confession are (1) that immediately after the Liberal Government succeeded to office in January, 1906, he, as Minister of War, was expressly "instructed" to go into the question of providing British troops for service abroad in defence of the French frontier of Belgium, and the question arising on this admission is, by whom in the absence of Cabinet authority, was this instruction given? It is certain, from the Prime Minister's speeches that it could not have been Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman who gave the "instruction," and in his absence no other Minister of the Bannerman Cabinet had authority to give it, and (2) that the "instruction" when given was contingent upon "the assistance of Russian pressure on the Eastern frontier of Germany" in a war in which Britain, France and Russia, were to engage on the one hand, and Germany on the other, and that thenceforward a complete recasting of the British Army for home defence must be effected not only in Great Britain but her self-governing
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dominions upon a distinct and secret understanding that the troops which Parliament annually authorised should by means of some arrangement with the troops themselves *ultra vires* the policy of the annual Army Acts, and without either Cabinet authorisation, or the sanction of Parliament, evolve into an army for service on the Continent of Europe as the ally of France.

Now, a few weeks after Lord Haldane’s announcement of the Army re-organisation, Sir Edward Grey informed the French and German Ambassadors, that “in the event of war occurring between France and Germany, British public opinion would rally to the material support of France.”

These war-like preparations and promises to France, were immediately met in Germany by substantial alterations being made in the German Naval Law. The Liberal Cabinet, with full knowledge of these activities for a European war, nevertheless made a pretence of giving effect to the policy laid down in the Prime Minister’s Albert Hall speech, and ostensibly proceeded to reduce the expenditure on armaments, and in the next following two years of office, in furtherance of what must have been a mere camouflage policy, they did reduce the Naval Estimates by over £2,000,000. Mr. Balfour professed to severely criticise this reduction and
charged that the Prime Minister's attitude was wholly hypocritical. He said:

I notice with amazement that Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, in his Albert Hall speech to which I have just referred, announced that he meant to cut down the cost, and as I understand him, with the cost the number and magnitude of the Navy as the case may be. I wonder whether he consulted the present Secretary of State for War, Lord Haldane, before giving that pledge? I doubt whether he did. His pledge to reduce the cost and magnitude of our armaments, is a pledge not given in consequence of a study of our Imperial responsibilities.

One thing, however, is certain, that the secret continuity of the equally secret policy of Imperial implications and verbal understandings and now the joint activities of Lord Haldane and Sir Edward Grey, making as they were for a fratricidal war, were wholly and entirely without the knowledge and mandate of Parliament, and were proceeding in positive defiance of the pledges the Government had given the country in the Prime Minister's Albert Hall speech, and the pretences to the contrary which during the years 1906–1907 the Government, by implication, made in the reduction of armaments.

It was, therefore, appalling to find that the great British people during these years were so absorbed in their love of trade, and so blinded by caring only for money, and a greed of gain, and the taking of the broad-castings of the Daily
Mail and other Northcliffe journals for gospel, that they gave no attention to the affairs of the country, or anything the Government or the Jews were doing in national politics, only to find as they unhappily have now done, that by the frigid and calculated action of the very men who, while professing Peace, were actually engaged in making War, their golden national God has been swept away and become "the abomination of desolation" throughout the world. How differently the Nation would have acted if only the truth had been told!!

There was, of course, at this time always a possibility that Mr. Balfour's attack upon Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, might bring a response from the country, demanding that the Bannerman Government should give effect to their pledges, and this possibility was foreseen and promptly met by the same old ill-starred section of the Press which will always be found trailing behind wealth and armament rings, now whipping up a scare of a German peril and the terrors of a German invasion, and throughout the latter half of 1906, and the years 1907-8, this scare was seized upon with avidity, and worked for all it was worth by political wire-pullers, our specialised secret Imperialist thinkers:—self-seeking men, avaricious schemers and getters, wary rascals devoted to and concentrated upon
gain, exploiters and destroyers of not only creation itself but the souls of men, "corner" and combine makers, armament rings, army contractors and profiteers of every description; the pillars of our "economic development" whom British autocracy delighted to honour!

The military and naval prophets at this time also pretended to definitely foresee that war was being forced upon us by Germany, although no one can name in history any war which was definitely foreseen, except by those who deliberately planned it. The commercial spirit of the country, and a fear of Germany rapidly developed and grew into a dominating sentiment of the English nation, and the goodwill, which, during the Victorian era, existed in England towards Germany, was by these discreditable means, gradually turned into a hatred until the name "German" became in England an opprobrious epithet for all individuals and things of German origin, always excepting the reigning house of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, and the other German royalties whom the Nation maintained and supported. It was the relativity of things German which caused the commercial sting, and we must remember that "hatred is always born of fear," but neither the journalistic scares, nor the tub-thumping of Lord Roberts or Lord Beresford, or the thousand other jingoes, great
and small, who then stumped the country, succeeded in jockeying the Nation into conscription or militarism, which was the real aim and objective of these scheming Imperialists, and in the absence of its success, Lord Haldane could not bring down any measure of conscription, without disclosing the nation's war obligations to France, and the real objective of the Expeditionary Force which he had organised. That he would not do, although in 1907, while the agitation was going forward, he often stated in regard to his Expeditionary Force "we are only at the beginning of the work."

The plans for establishing an Anglo-Mussulman Empire on the lines of the dream of Disraeli's "Tancred" and exploiting the mythical natural wealth of Persia, and completing an alliance between Britain and Russia, nevertheless, proceeded apace. Persia at this time by her geographical situation, was at the confluence of British influences from India and Russian interests on the North. In 1906, while the "instructions" given to Sir Arthur Nicholson, referred to in John Morley's letter were being "sympathetically" followed at St. Petersburg, some violent influences provoked a revolution at Teheran, and this immediately strengthened the hands of Russian and British diplomats, and afforded them a pretext for agreeing the terms
of still another "understanding," which following in the spirit of the Anglo-French precedent was intended either verbally or by implication, to secure, in Lord Haldane's words, "the assistance of Russian pressure" on the "eastern" frontier of Germany, and which, while affirming the integrity and independence of Persia, expressly divided that country into three zones. The meridional zone, assured England communication between England and Mesopotamia, as well as the domination of the Persian Gulf... The zone septentrionate come under Russian influence, and an intermediate zone of practically desert country was treated as a neutral zone under cover of Persian independence. Except as part of the policy of a great military enterprise, there never could have been any necessity to negotiate with Russia to secure British interests in the Persian Gulf or for bribing Russia in order to secure the peace of Asia, and it is interesting to find John Morley, who at this time represented India, in these very inspiring proceedings, actually appointed Chairman of a series of secret deliberations to which the Nation was now becoming rapidly accustomed. On the 25th January, 1907, John Morley reported to the Viceroy of India:

I have been rather immersed in K.'s (Kitchener's) military policy. We have got to work. Esher, Haldane, Lyttleton, Ewart and French are the W.O. (War
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Office) men. I am in the chair. I enjoy it immensely. H.M. (His Majesty) agrees with the notion that I am telegraphing to you about the pupils whom the Amir proposes to send to Lord K. Is it a little odd that Mahometans should come to a Christian Government, to be taught not the Sermon on the Mount, but the noble arts of human slaughter?

Again, on the 23rd August, 1907, John Morley wrote:

Edward Grey came into my room. We have had rather an anxious week for there has been some quarrelling in the Russian Cabinet on other grounds than the Entente but disturbing our negotiations, and last Monday it looked gloomy. To-day the sun shines again and the three Conventions will pretty certainly be signed before many weeks are over.

The Anglo-Russian Agreements were in fact signed seven days later on the 31st August, 1907. With Persia in the hands of England and Russia, Britain’s Military Staff training Afghans, and Lord Kitchener’s military policy behind the Entente, there seemed no ending to the jeopardy and peril to which the Nation was being hourly exposed, by the men who now controlled her destinies, and who were secretly reversing all the usual ideas which had inspired British Foreign policy since the time of the Great Commoner Pitt. Nevertheless Parliament still maintained an attitude of silence, or as Lord Rosebery would say, “the men were dull and the lights were dim.” Germany alone stood in the way of our foreign policy in diplomacy. The
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Baghdad Railway was the stumbling-block to the development of Persia on the lines of both Lord Curzon's book and Disraeli's "Tancred."

In November, 1907, the German Emperor visited England. The visit was a great event. "I saw much of him at Windsor," said John Morley in his letter to the Viceroy of India dated 22nd November, 1907. "In your most private ear I confide to you that important talks took place about the Baghdad Railway."

On the 20th December, 1907, Morley again wrote to the Viceroy:

Persia and its Gulf are our prime pre-occupation this week. About the Emperor's personality... one impression and in my eyes it is a golden impression, he appears to have left in the mind of everybody namely, that he does really desire and intend Peace. You may laugh at this in view of the fine brand new naval programme which the Germans have launched at a moment supremely inconvenient to H.M.'s Government.

On the 19th February, 1909, John Morley again wrote to the Viceroy:

The Anglo-Russian Agreement is now well over the bar in Parliament, the Press, and in the country. Percy differs altogether from Lansdowne's more experienced and responsible views of the Agreement but, of course, he could not give full cry against the Convention when Lansdowne had blessed it.... When a treaty has once been concluded the H. of C. is not keenly interested in what may be said against it unless it be made the ground of a hot Party fight.
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Balfour made no attempt whatever to deal with the subject so he only talked a lot of skimble-skamble stuff . . . I follow the military doings with lively interest and we have people in the office who know the ground, so, by the way, does Winston Churchill. I should like to draw the contrast between professional politicians of this new breed, and the breed of patrician Whig with which you are not unacquainted.

I have begun in the Defence Committee the operations of which I spoke to you upon the Persian Gulf and the numerous complexities arising from the prospect of a Baghdad Railway, and other matters. The whole proceeding will be very interesting for when we have done with the waters of the Gulf, I am to take the Committee on to the dry land of Persia.
VI. THE TRIUMPH OF IMPERIALISM

SIR Henry Campbell-Bannerman died in April, 1908, and Mr. Asquith succeeded him in the Premiership. The Imperialists now got control of the Cabinet. Liberalism became a mere bubble and was blown to the winds. The cant of reducing expenditure in armaments, of reducing taxation and of opposing everything in the way of "aggression and adventure" was scrapped, and John Morley in the same month received his peerage. The mummy-like effemteness of the Oligarchy in the House of Lords, in 1911, under a threatened exercise of the King's prerogative to swamp the House with a new and ludicrous creation of Peers, capitulated to Asquithism, and abdicated their legislative powers of veto. The Commons immediately voted themselves virtute officii salaries at the rate of £400 a year, and turned the House of Commons for all practical purposes into a mere voting machine to record in the Division Lobbies the dictates of the Asquithian Cabinet,
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while the future Government of England by Cabinet became the worst form of despotism that the country has ever known. The breed that once carried our glory so high can never be restored. If nations, like individuals, be travelling downhill, the Devil is always conveniently at hand to give the vehicle they occupy a shove. The Liberal party, having deliberately delivered Liberalism into the hands of the Philistines, richly deserved the disaster, which, as we shall presently see, within ten short years, at the hands of a trusted disciple, brought about their doom.

In June, 1908, within the first two months of the Asquith Administration, both King Edward and the President of the French Republic, in toasting each other at a State Banquet, publicly re-affirmed the obligations created by the Anglo-French Entente, in language which the speakers themselves well understood, but which still conveyed to the British Nation no suggestion or even hint of a suggestion that any alliance, moral or otherwise, existed between the two countries, or, that Britain was under any liability to provide as much as a single battalion for service in France, or that any coalition existed or "conversations" were taking place between the General Staffs and experts of the French and British Naval and Military forces. His Majesty immediately after-
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wards went on to Russia on a State visit to his other nephew, Czar Nicholas II., whom, as we have seen, had since his accession been the Ally of France, and in the toasts which were proposed when the Czar alluded to the confirmation of the series of Anglo-Russian Asiatic Agreements which Sir Edward Grey had in the previous year concluded with Iswolsky, the Russian Foreign Minister, for the delimitation of the zones of Russian-Anglo influence in the Empire of the Shah of Persia and which constituted the Anglo-Russian "understanding," King Edward said:

I believe that the Convention recently made will contribute to tighten the bonds uniting the peoples of our two countries. I am sure that it will lead to a satisfactory amicable settlement of some important questions in the future.

On the same day, a semi-official Notetelegraphed from Reval, emphasised the meaning of this declaration of King Edward: the "pourparlers" it said, "which have been carried on for some time past between the two governments concerning Macedonian affairs, may be considered as about to result in a complete understanding. Nothing now is wanting but a definite form to be given to the agreement which it may be hoped will serve as a basis for a general understanding between the Powers interested in the work of
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reform in Macedonia." How a convention despoiling Persia without her sanction, and bribing Russia, could be calculated to "tighten" the bonds uniting the British Lion with the Russian Bear, or serve as a basis for the work of reform in Macedonia, only a British diplomat or a British Foreign Secretary can possibly explain.

The Foreign policy of the Russian Empire under Iswolsky, now changed completely. Russia was openly in British waters, and Iswolsky became the founder of Russia's new policy; a policy which was subsequently continued by Sazonof, his successor in office. Thus came to pass the heterogeneous, and unnatural union of Russia and England with the Radical Republic of France, as a distinct and open challenge, not only to the Triple Alliance, but any and every other combination of European Powers.

When the Anglo-Russian agreement reached Parliament, Lord Curzon, who had in recent years, filled the office of Viceroy of India, described the Agreement as "pregnant with inexpressible influence upon the future," Lord Lansdowne adding, that "the time had come when agreements of this kind were really inevitable, and that the Convention marked the beginning of a new era, in our relations with Russia, and that he trusted Russia to observe it with absolute
"loyalty"; while Sir Edward Grey attributed the Agreement to an "Anglo-Russian understanding." Of the Note telegraphed from Reval, M. Andre Tardieu, in "France and the Alliances," says: "This Note in reality announced that the Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1907, relative to the Far East, had given birth to a new one relative to the Near East, between Russia and England."

The following uncontradicated story, published by Lord Northcliffe's Daily Mail, throws considerable light upon the events of this period, as they were being worked out under the one and indivisible policy.

In April, 1908, Clemenceau, then, as now, Prime Minister, attended in London the funeral of a British Prime Minister, Campbell-Bannerman. After the funeral he asked Sir Edward Grey what England would do when the Germans should bolt through Belgium into France and seek to seize the Channel ports and capture Paris before resistance could be organised. "It would make a great stir in England," was the answer. "Stir! We shall want help, not a stir," returned Clemenceau. "One hundred thousand British soldiers across the Channel within a week would not stop the rush. 250,000 would stop it. 500,000 would help us to turn it back. You have not got even 250,000. You must get them, and remember that if men can be improvised, you cannot improvise rifles, ammunition and artillery."

In the following August, Clemenceau lunched with King Edward on the balcony of the Hotel Weimar at
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Marienbad. German journalists watched the scene from below and reported that Clemenceau "engaged the King in lively conversation, accompanying his remarks by forcible gestures." The whole German Press speculated upon the subject of that talk, but failed to guess the truth. Clemenceau was repeating to King Edward his conversation with Sir Edward Grey and adding, "I am convinced that the confiding insularity of British statesmen will one day involve Europe in a catastrophe."

To return to Persia, the Persian Government refused at first to recognise the Anglo-Russian Agreement, but as Britain and Russia were now in the same interests, what could Persia do? Russia favoured a counter-revolution, and under pretext of protecting her menaced interests occupied Tabrez et l’ Azerbeidzan, that is to say, the richest part of the country. The patriot Government of Persia was then replaced by one more favourably disposed towards Russia and England.

In 1909–10 Britain’s activities for war were evidenced by a Naval Expenditure in those years for British, French and Russian new construction of £38,696,000 as against Germany’s £21,500,000, and strange to say, the only note of warning to the British Nation came not from the House of Commons but from the House of Lords. Again it was the voice of Lord Rosebery and this is what he said:

When I see the absolutely unprecedented sacrifices which are asked from us for warlike preparations I
do begin to feel uneasy at the outcome of it all, and wonder where it will stop, or if it is going to bring back Europe into a state of barbarism, or whether it will cause a catastrophe in which the working men of the world will say "We will have no more of this madness, this foolery, which is grinding us to powder."

Lord Rosebery's words fell on stoney ground. At this period the political strategy of the Asquithian Government was schooling the country in more important things, and diverting the public mind from the line of thought Lord Rosebery's observations suggested, by an agitation of an entirely different character which the Chancellor of the Exchequer was actively directing all over the country, ostensibly against the dukes and the great feudal landowners with the object of getting at their unimproved land-values by means of an increment value duty, and other forms of direct taxation. So violent did this campaign become, that a fictitious Bolshevik attempt to set class against class, and foment a social upheaval, by depicting the hands of British Peers as "dripping with the blood of sacrilege," completely blinded the Electorate to the designs of the Government's foreign policy in diplomacy, and the activities that were rapidly precipitating the Nation into a great European cauldron. Even the "terrors of a German peril"
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became altogether submerged in (1) the horror of the classes regarding the proposed "increment" taxation, and (2) the intoxication of the masses over a promise of 9d. for 4d. This agitation resulted in the Chancellor of the Exchequer placing on the Statute Book, as an off-shoot of what was termed "The People's Budget," and a land song chanted by Radical assemblies, "The Finance Act, 1910," by which the unimproved values of land and profits on re-sales were rendered liable to heavy duties, but there the Statute, since 1910, has remained an obsolete piece of legislative bunkum. No taxation or assessments have proceeded under it. The Act, hitherto, has been a dead letter, and the great landowners of the country have so far not really been a penny the worse. It apparently fulfilled its function by going on the Statute Book. The promise to the masses of the 9d. for 4d. subsequently turned out to be unmitigated political trash, and Mr. Lloyd George has since publicly boasted that "political strategy" is something that he does well understand!

Now to return to the festivities at St. Petersburg, and the important results that were there achieved, it is necessary for the reader to understand, that the term "Macedonian Reform" meant the future administration of the then
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Turkish villayets of Monastir, Korsova and Salonica. In these villayets a war of extermination was continually raging between rival political "Christian" Churches who hate each other and perpetrate atrocities on each other as vile and inhuman as ever the Turk in punishing them for their anarchy, at any time perpetrated on either. What, then, was the immediate development of this new-born Anglo-Russian "understanding" in its proposals for the reform of Macedonia? England and France agreed to allow Russia the privilege of resuming the moral direction of Macedonian reforms. This cold-blooded pretext of the Imperialist Cabinet to again leave to the wisdom and justice of the despotic Government of the Czar, the promulgation of reforms which were in future to relieve Monastir, Korsova and Salonica from oppression and misrule, as well as settle the racial rivalries of the different religious nationalities in Macedonia, and at the same time ignore Turkey and isolate the German Empire in the Balkan Councils, inevitably created conditions which made peace in the Balkans an impossibility. It was, however, what allied "civilisation" and British "Peacemakers" dictated for the protection of little States! It was, in truth and in fact, a political device to cover nothing short of
the establishment of the hegemony of Russia in Europe, although it must never be forgotten, that when in 1853 the proposal was made that Russia should take over the protection of the Balkan Christians, it was regarded with scorn by both England and France, and rather than yield a single inch of that claim, the Crimean War with all its horrors was the result. The price of the Anglo-Russian Alliance, was apparently Britain’s reversal of the policy that kept Russia out of Europe in 1853. The deliberate continuation and renewal of the old policy of making these struggling little Nationalities the cock pit of future struggles for World Empire marks, at this epoch, the causa causans of the dreadful calamity that came to Europe six years after King Edward’s State visit to Russia, for every European diplomat knew, that neither Germany nor Austria, would be likely to submit to Russian domination in the Balkans. It was, therefore, no surprise to Europe to find revolution immediately breaking out at Monastir and Constantinople, that in October, 1908, Prince Ferdinand of Coburg, proclaimed the independence of Bulgaria and assumed the title of Czar, and that on the 4th October, Austria-Hungary annexed Bosnia and Herzogoveina, of which Austria-Hungary had been in occupation for upwards of forty years under the Treaty of
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Berlin, which in terms expressly authorised annexation of these provinces at the end of thirty years administration, an annexation, which, in March, 1909, was officially recognised by Russia, without any reservation. Sir Edward Grey, at this time, himself said that the annexation was not a very material change, although the manner in which it had been brought about was "somewhat" abrupt, an expression, which in other words, meant that it took place without consulting the British Foreign Office.

In February, 1909, King Edward and Queen Alexandra paid a State visit to Berlin, and at a gala banquet given at the Castle in their honour, King Edward, in replying to the German Emperor's speech:

Assured the Kaiser that his visit aimed at the strengthening of friendly relations between England and Germany.

That which Charles Lamb wrote of himself, might, merely altering the pronoun, be said about the Kaiser:

Those who did not like him hated him, and some who once liked him, afterwards became his bitterest haters. *Acerrima proximorum odia.*

The return of the King and Queen, was followed in England, by the Imperialist Prime Minister,
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Mr. Asquith, secretly initiating active steps in the development of Dominion and Colonial sentiment regarding a subtle scheme of correlated and organised Army expansion on the basis of a mobilisation in the Colonies and Overseas Dominions for war. With a master mind he availed himself of the presence in London of certain Colonial Prime Ministers attending the Colonial Conference of 1909, and in particular, he invited the Prime Ministers of New Zealand, Newfoundland and Natal, and certain Ministers of Defence and Marine of other Colonies, to confer with him and a Committee of Imperial Defence, regarding the development of this Empiric spirit of Imperialism, which he impressed upon his Colonial foundlings, was "a single one common to every part of the Empire." What compact these men entered into or what pledges they gave to subject local conditions and local sentiment to the furtherance of their objectives, we know not, and there are probably no records in existence to show. The war-mongers were probably all sworn members of the King's Most Honourable Privy Council. We only know (1) that the British and Colonial Prime Ministers well kept their secret, and gave no hint of its existence to the peoples whom they severally represented, or the Home or Colonial Parliaments to which they directly owed responsi-
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bility for absolute frankness and straightforward dealing; (2) that the cultivation of a bellicose Colonial "sentiment" rapidly produced fruition, New Zealand leading the way by Sir Joseph Ward, on 22nd March, 1909, splashing into our Empiric eye at a cost of a trifling two millions sterling a gift from New Zealand to the British Navy of a Dreadnought. This warship was built at the charge of the Colonial Government out of loan money which our Colonial financial genius raised on the credit of his Colony in the London market, by which piece of high finance, in addition to "enthusing," as the Americans say, colonial jingoism, the dear old Motherland herself provided the means to defray the cost of her patriotic daughter's noble contribution to Empire warfare, and (3) we now learn from Mr. Asquith's book, "Genesis of the War,"

"the years, 1909-1911, were a period of continuous though quiet activity, both at home and in the Dominions, in the development of this local sentiment and local conditions."

In other words all that was once good and great in patriotism, now worked in close conspiracy with the Imperialist schemes of designing politicians.

The end and purpose of this vain Imperialism was immediately followed in England by a gang
of Imperialist scaremongers tormenting the country by attacks upon the British Navy, and demands for increased armaments, by which they endeavoured to create a sort of monomania of German plots. They seemed to love to slander in print, to malign, to menace and to hint dubious innuendoes through the channel of their syndicated journals, and so outrageous had these attacks become that the genius of Mr. Winston Churchill was brought into play. On 27th January, 1910, Mr. Winston Churchill gave expression to these memorable words:

The attitude of the Conservative party with regard to the Navy is a disgrace. It is the most contemptible policy pursued by a great political party. It is a policy of trying to raise a panic without reason. It is a policy of trying to make ill-will between two great nations without cause;—a policy of belittling the Fleet and trying to get money out of the pockets of the weak and poor. It is the lowest depths to which any great party has ever sunk.

It was not until the year 1911 that any member of the House of Commons deemed it either right or prudent to make any inquiry regarding the nature of the "bonds" which the Sovereign in 1908 had divulged then united Great Britain to both France and Russia. Surely there must have been some members who had not like Lord Rosebery bowed the knee to Baal, regarding the dangers to which the country was being rapidly
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driven. On the 8th March, 1911, however, Mr. Jowett asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the House of Commons:

If during his term of office any undertaking, promise, or understanding had been given to France that in certain eventualities British troops would be sent to assist the operations of the French army?

The Government by Mr. McKinnon Wood, the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, replied:

The answer is in the negative.

Later Mr. Dillon said:

Some of us have had very uneasy feelings. The other day we read that M. Pichon, the French Foreign Minister, spoke of "constant military conversations going on with England." I say that there is a very uncomfortable feeling among many honourable members that there is a secret alliance with France or some "understanding" which is not known to the Members of the House.

Then Mr. Jowett put another question in Parliament. He asked, a fortnight later:

If, when the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs came into office, there was in existence any "understanding" or undertaking *express or implied* in virtue of which Great Britain would be under an obligation to send troops to France in certain eventualities to assist the operations of the French army?
PLAYING THE GAME

Sir Edward Grey's studied reply was that:

The extent of the obligations to which Great Britain was committed was expressed or implied in the Anglo-French Convention laid before Parliament. There was no other engagement bearing on the subject.

Now, the papers laid before Parliament were altogether silent regarding the verbal or "implied" promises and conditions of the Convention. In Parliamentary language this reply will be said to be a masterpiece of high diplomacy!

Many other events of momentous importance occurred in the same year. Under the secret articles of the Anglo-French Convention, to which as we have seen, Britain in October, 1904, assented, France had now actually entered into occupation of Fez with the intention of staying there, while Spain had occupied El-Kasr and Larash, and French and Spanish armies were spread over the northern districts of the country. When this violation of the sovereignty of Morocco, which France, England and Germany, by the Treaty of Algeciras of 1906, had pledged themselves to protect, became known to the world, Germany, as a party to the Algeciras act, refused to permit Northern Africa to be turned into a second Congo, in the hands, this time, of, not
PLAYING THE GAME

Belgium, but other international concessionaires, syndicates, land-grabbers and financial sharks, and in July, 1911, she sent a small gunboat "The Panther" to Agadir, and we all remember with what consternation and haste the British Cabinet hastened to satisfy Germany that all that had taken place was without any hostile intention or thought of isolating Germany in the field of European Councils or menacing her commercial interests in Morocco. At the same time the Prime Minister practically vetoed all discussion in Parliament regarding the Agadir incident by a strong appeal to the House, on the 27th July, "not to open up controversial ground." France was apparently unable to understand Great Britain's double point professing goodwill towards Germany and the complete innocence of her action in regard to what had taken place in Morocco, and it looks as if France had at this time determined to end the policy of perfidy, and compel her Ally to walk the plank, as in the autumn of 1911 two Parisian newspapers, *Le Temps* and *Le Matin*, published the secret articles for the partition of Morocco, and after that *exposé*, Germany could have had no further illusions regarding either the nature of British diplomacy, or the real designs and objectives of the Triple Entente.
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The publication of the secret articles regarding Morocco led to a debate in the House of Commons, and this is what Mr. Dillon said:

I do not believe any representative assembly in the history of the world has ever been called upon to discuss a matter so vital and so far-reaching as that which the House of Commons has before it to-day to consider and with so absolute a lack of information. This present discussion in this respect beats all records. The House was summoned to-day without any papers whatever. What is it that the House ought to have had before we were asked to embark upon this discussion? We ought to have had a Blue Book containing the diplomatic history of the Moroccan question, including the secret Treaty with Spain. The Algeciras Act has already been published. I refer to the secret Treaty with Spain published for the first time the other day in which the Foreign Minister declared three weeks ago he had never heard of, and was not aware of the existence of, a Treaty to which his country was a party. We should have had the text of the German Agreement of 1909 with an explanation of how it came about that France jockeyed Germany in regard to that Agreement and withdrew from carrying into effect—a matter that was one of the immediate causes of the recent friction. We ought at all events to have had an account of the diplomatic correspondence between the four great Powers intimately interested in the question of Morocco as is customary to be given to the House of Commons on such an occasion.

We have heard a good deal to-night of the secrecy of the foreign policy of this country. It is no use attempting to deny it. Those of us who have been a long time in this House and can remember the methods of the Foreign Office twenty-five years ago, know as a
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fact, which cannot be denied, that the Foreign Office has become, during the last ten years, progressively more secret every year. Until this present year this has gone on, when the intense pressure of foreign affairs and the danger of war has forced the hands of the Minister to give some time for the discussion of Foreign Office Affairs. For ten years (i.e., 1901–1911) the foreign policy of this country has been conducted behind an elaborate scheme of secrecy. Some of us pointed out years ago that the secrecy of foreign affairs was the inevitable and logical result of that new departure which was heralded about ten years ago. I refer to what is known as the policy of the continuity of the foreign policy of this country and of the withdrawal of the foreign policy of this country from the sphere of party politics.

The British Government now had no alternative but to let the House of Commons see the secret articles regarding Morocco, and Parliament was then afforded a golden opportunity of protecting the Nation from at least the peril of all future secret diplomacy, and demanding the fullest information regarding every detail of Britain's war obligations, and the true nature and objectives of Britain's military co-ordination and activities with the French; but Members refused to do anything that was likely to jeopardise the receipt of the comfortable income, which Mr. Asquith had brought into their Parliamentary life, and they remained dumb. What should have been every Member's business
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was apparently nobody's business—the ignorance of Parliament on this occasion being interpreted by Mr. Asquith in the following words:

The House has heard from the Foreign Secretary and I believe has heard with universal satisfaction that the world is now in possession of the whole of our Treaty obligations on this subject. There is no secret arrangement of any sort or kind which has not been disclosed and fully disclosed to the public and we ask, from that point of view, that our conduct should be judged by the measure of our Treaty obligations which Members of the House are able to ascertain precisely for themselves.

Mr. Gordon Harvey nevertheless took the Prime Minister at his word and sought to “ascertain precisely” the measure of our Treaty obligations. The Prime Minister replied on December 6th, 1911:

As has been stated, there are no secret engagements with France other than those that have now been published, and there are no secret engagements with any foreign government that entail upon us any obligation to render military or naval assistance to any other Power.

If Mr. Asquith’s words meant anything at all his positive assurance as Prime Minister was sufficient to dispel any fears that may have existed in England regarding the allegation that
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the Nation was under war obligations to France. The Keep-it-dark policy of the Big Five of the Cabinet proved victorious. An Absolute Cabinet had now replaced Constitutional Monarchy and a once powerful House of Lords, and on the 12th and 13th days of December, 1911, as an additional force in the development of their Empiric spirit of Imperialism they put through the House of Commons in all its material legislative stages, without explanation, debate, amendment, or discussion, a Bill bringing under the Imperial Naval Discipline Acts, any Naval forces already raised or contemplated in *futuro* by the newly created “Dominion sentiment.” The solidarity and co-ordination of the political game, with Asquith as Prime Minister, Haldane as War Minister, Sir Edward Grey at the Foreign Office, Lloyd George as Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Winston Churchill at the Admiralty, welded as they were into one force, and left as they were by the apathy of the Nation with absolute political power contributed, as we shall presently see, in making an abattoir of Europe.

We will now turn from the Cabinet’s professions of virtue to their secret and formidable movements on the European chess-board.

Mr. Lloyd George has recently described the
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Agadir incident, as a piece of "arrogance and arbitrary action of the German Government," but in doing so, he divulged an important circumstance that had not previously been made public, viz., "that in 1911 Sir Henry Wilson (under the direction of Lord Haldane) entered into specific arrangements with Marshal Foch (then General Foch) for the Expeditionary Force that the British Government actually sent to France in 1914."

Mr. Winston Churchill has also told us, how and why, in 1911, he became First Lord of the Admiralty. "I was sent to the Admiralty," he said, "in 1911, after the Agadir crisis, and I was sent with the express duty laid upon me by the Prime Minister, to put the Fleet in a state of instant and constant readiness for war." How well he performed the duty laid upon him by the Prime Minister, and how well he conserved the interests of the "poor and weak" taxpayer appears from the following figures which speak for themselves, and show how the sacred taxpayers' pocket during the years 1911-14 was in due form of law, unceasingly picked for war preparations while he slumbered and slept. In 1911, Great Britain, France and Russia, expended on naval new construction 24½ millions sterling, as against Germany's 11⅔ millions, in 1912 the Allied expenditure was £30,145,000, against
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Germany’s 11½ millions, in 1913 the Entente expended £37,859,000 against Germany’s 11 millions, while in 1914 the Entente expended £43,500,000 against Germany’s £10,250,000. In these six years of the Asquith Administration, the Entente expended on new Naval Construction alone, £108,450,000 more than Germany.

Mr. Asquith’s reassuring statement in Parliament of 6th December, 1911, paved the way for sending a camouflage envoy to Germany, ostensibly to allay the fears of the Germans as to our naval and military activities, and to assure them that “we wished them well from the bottom of our hearts.” Lord Haldane was the Cabinet’s choice, and no better selection could have been made. He had been educated at Bonn. His “spiritual home” he said “was Germany.” He professed affection for the Germans; while on the other hand, he was the man who in the spirit and letter of the Entente’s “understandings” both expressed and implied, had during the years 1906–1910 in collaboration with General Foch, created our Expeditionary Army for service in France, and, to quote his own words, “whose highly developed military mind could see only his own bit.”

Again, in 1911, Lord Kitchener’s military policy in Persia and Afghanistan, as shadowed by John Morley’s letter to the Viceroy of India,
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of 25th January, 1907, was by no means neglected. It now included the founding in London of a Persian Society with the object as it was stated of "watching over the liberties, and promoting the interests of the Persian Kingdom." On the 15th November, 1911, the inauguration of this purely philanthropic institution was celebrated with great éclat by a dinner at the Savoy Hotel with Lord Lamington in the chair, and Lord Curzon as the principal guest and speaker, and Lord Curzon on that occasion said:

One of the functions of the Society is to promote sympathy with Persia. Sympathy is the greatest gift short of material assistance that one nation can give to another. No one realises more clearly than I do that it is for Persian statesmen and Persian ministers to work out their own salvation. They know the circumstances of their own country, and they do not want gratuitous advice from us. Still I may be permitted to put myself in their place and to say that if I were a Persian statesman I would speak to myself in the following terms at the present juncture. The first condition which my country wants is tranquillity and confidence. Now that form of security can only be obtained by the possession by the Government of an organised and disciplined force . . . . with the aid of those who are competent and trained to discipline that force and still more by the security of regular pay. That brings us to the financial question. If I were the Persian statesman whom I have imagined I would not hesitate if the present resources of my country were inadequate to obtain financial assistance upon
suitable conditions elsewhere. I would not mind going abroad for financial help, for guidance, for experience, for anything that might be useful to my country short of control. All that I would demand in pursuing this policy would be that any assistance I might receive should be absolutely disinterested in character . . . nothing but the most hearty support would be received from those great Powers whose possessions are contiguous to those of Persia. The first British interest in Persia is a strong Persian Government.

In other words, if words mean anything, Lord Curzon advocated for Persia (1) mercenary forces trained by those who were competent and trained to discipline them, and (2) the financing of the Persian Government by financiers personâ grâta to British interests, and the making of this financial assistance dependent upon an acceptance by Persia of the Powers' "guidance, experience, and everything else that they might deem to be useful."

The Imperialist Cabinet without scruple and no shame, still continued to maintain the extravagant fiction of "strengthening friendly relations between England and Germany." Accordingly, in February, 1912, Lord Haldane went to Berlin, and in common parlance was given the time of his life. In the Reichstag, the German Chancellor gave his version of Lord Haldane's visit in these words:

When the English War Minister was here he talked over with us—without authorisation to enter into
binding agreements, but nevertheless at the instance of the British Cabinet—the points in which the interests of the two countries come into contact with the object of establishing a basis for relations of greater confidence. The exchange of views, which was heartily welcomed on our side, took place in numerous conversations of an exhaustive and frank description, and will be continued.

Upon Lord Haldane's return from Germany the Nation was led to believe that he had well and truly laid the foundation of a rapprochement between England and Germany, and that there was no real danger of war at all. Lord Haldane in his book, in describing his official interview with the Imperial Chancellor, Herr von Bethman Hollweg, states:

I told him that I felt there had been a great deal of drifting away between Germany and England, and that it was important to ask what was the cause. The present seemed to me to be a favourable moment for a new departure . . . The Morocco question was now out of the way, and we had no agreements with France or Russia except those that were in writing and published to the world. The Chancellor here interrupted and asked whether this was really so, I said it was so, and that in the situation which now existed I saw no reason why it should not be possible for us to enter into a new and cordial friendship. He replied that he had no reason to differ from this view.

The sincerity of Lord Haldane's professions of goodwill and the British Government's desire...
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“to bring about a better understanding” can best be judged by Lord Haldane’s subsequent utterances in England. In June, 1912, within six months of his visit to Berlin, this egregious nobleman said:

Keep up a fleet and secure command of the sea, and then the problem was a simple one. At no distant time we ought to be the most powerful military and naval nation combined which the world had ever seen.

While during the great European War Lord Haldane told us that the real object of his visit to Germany was a strategical one “to thwart Germany and find out what the Germans were really doing.” Lord Haldane at this juncture, in secretly and without parliamentary sanction giving effect to the secret Anglo-French and Russian moral Alliances, and delivering the Nation’s fate into the hands of Generals Foch and Kitchener and the Military and Naval Staffs of the British and French Coalition, and in going to Germany camouflaged as a Peacemaker, had gone about as far as a man could go. He, according to his own showing, knew that his activities with the French military and naval experts might at any moment produce a European conflagration, and that when this happened the Nation would have to foot the bill whether it liked it or not, that Lord Kitchener would almost
certainly step into supreme control at the War Office, and that then Conscription must inevitably follow. He knew that without a mobilisation of the whole resources of the Empire no such war as the Alliances contemplated could be successfully carried on, that the Voluntary System and the Expeditionary Force could not possibly bear the strain, and that it was in these circumstances positively crimeful for the Government not to consult both the British Electorate and the Dominions upon the question of adopting Compulsory Military Service. But neither Lord Haldane nor the Cabinet dared to take the Nation into their confidence, or afford to Parliament any opportunity of taking the whole question of Peace or War into its own hands, or discovering in any way the political jugglery that had been practised during the previous decade. Lord Haldane accordingly stepped out of the War Office, and by another Cabinet move on the political chess-board, Colonel Seely stepped in, and for a very short period proved an excellent stop-gap; while Lord Haldane went to adorn the Woolsack as Viscount Haldane of Cloan, at a modest £10,000 a year, and after some two years' service in this new capacity retired on a handsome pension of some thousands a year. Thus was virtue rewarded by an unsuspecting and grateful country!
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Meanwhile, Mr. Attorney-General Isaacs was taken into the Cabinet "unofficially." He was the first Attorney-General who in the history of England had been so honored.

On the 4th July, 1912, Mr. Amery said in the House of Commons:

Let me remind the Committee that since the crisis of last year Germany has added very considerably to her navy. We have responded by a substantial increase and since the same crisis Germany has added 80,000 men to her army for the express purpose of strengthening the force that is to march through Belgium to crush the French left. It is upon our Expeditionary Force that the brunt of that march would fall.

Sir Reginald Pole-Carew, in following Mr. Amery, also said:

I want to say a word about the Expeditionary Force. Is it that the people of this country are to be kept in the dark and hoodwinked and not to be allowed to know what the preparations are which are necessary for their own safety? Is it that our enemies are not to know? I venture to think that the most probable enemy we have at this moment (meaning Germany) can give the Right Hon. gentleman points in information. I say it is a most dangerous proceeding.

The Government still maintained the strictest silence. Again, they dare not even refer to the matter of the Nation being pledged to send the organised Expeditionary Force to fight for France.
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in France in a war with Germany. But, France recognizing the jeopardy in which this double dealing was calculated to place the Anglo-French Entente, the *Nouvelle Revue*, a Parisian review published this statement:

We intend to have war. France is ready to strike and to conquer as she was not ready forty years ago, and she will not be in four or five years to come, owing to the annual divergent numbers of the birth-rate in each country. We the attacking party will have arranged with England that their fleet . . . . will have followed . . . the remains of the whole German navy into German waters.

On the 24th July, 1912, Mr. Middlemore in questioning in Parliament, said:

We must remember that we have an Entente, and that if the Three Powers (meaning the Central Powers) attack France, we shall have to defend France, or else the Entente is a sham which ought never to have been made. It is perfidious Albion again.

Thereupon Mr. Asquith on the following day, the 25th July, replied:

Our relations with the great German Empire are, I am glad to say at this moment, and I feel sure are likely to remain, relations of amity and goodwill. My noble friend, Lord Haldane, paid a visit to Berlin early in the year. He entered upon conversations and an interchange of views there which have been continued since in a spirit of *perfect frankness and friendship* both on one side and on the other and in which I am glad to say, we now have the advantage
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of the participation of a very distinguished diplomatist in the person of the German Ambassador. I say, and I say this deliberately, we have no cause and so far as I know no occasion for quarrel with any country in any part of the world.

It will be observed that Mr. Asquith in this statement referred to Prince Lichnowsky, the then new German Ambassador to the Court of St. James. He was a man of generous hospitality, which at once assured him the entrée to English society. Mr. Asquith, Sir Edward Grey, Lord Haldane, Mr. Balfour, the Tory politicians and le beau monde received the Prince with open arms and rivalled with each other in kindness towards him, and nothing would ever have induced the Prince to doubt the bona fides in all things of Sir Edward Grey, Lord Haldane, or the Asquith family, who one and all professed to the Ambassador the most profound esteem and respect for Germany, and an abhorrence of lies, intrigue, and deceit of every description. The Prince was convinced that they were all down right good fellows. When the War came and he was handed his passports the King sent regrets at his departure. The Asquith family attended and took their last farewell, and the British Government treated this Ambassador with the dignity and goodwill of a departing sovereign.
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On the 14th November, 1912, Lord Percy, at the Queen's Hall, London, said:

It would require courage to tell the country the truth, that we were living in a fool's paradise, and that it would be a base betrayal of our obligations not to be able to support France with an adequate military force of its own.

What, at this time, was happening to call forth the exceedingly grave allegations of Lord Percy, seeing, that on the 25th July Mr. Asquith had, in answer to Mr. Middlemore, given the Nation the assurance of his high office and that of the War Minister, that there was not only no international friction in Europe, but that upon the Continental horizon there was not so much as a speck of any war cloud? Nothing of a public or diplomatic nature had been disclosed to warrant the statements of either Mr. Middlemore or Lord Percy, the former Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, except that England and Russia, by a common ultimatum had now forced Persia to recognise the Agreement of 1907, and to conform to its terms. The only logical inference is, that France, in following up the article in the Nouvelle Revue had brought some pressure to bear upon the Balfour Group in the House of Commons, and, that as the result of that pressure the statements of Mr. Middlemore and Lord Percy were made, and apparently succeeded,
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in again drawing the teeth of the Government. First of all, Mr. Winston Churchill, in confirming the pacific assurances of his chief, said:

Britain and Germany, Italy and France are at peace. They desire peace; they need peace; there is no ground of quarrel between them—absolutely none.

Secondly, a remarkable correspondence passed between Sir Edward Grey and the French Ambassador, which clearly shows that the Nation was being further rendered liable to be forced into war, whenever the Big Five of the Asquith Cabinet chose to say that in their opinion, which really meant the Cabinet's opinion, "an event," the "something" had happened that threatened the general Peace. Sir Edward Grey's letter to the French Ambassador, dated 22nd November, 1912, was in the following words:

MY DEAR AMBASSADOR,

From time to time in recent years the French and British military and naval experts have consulted together. It has always been understood that such consultation does not restrict the freedom of either Government to decide at any future time whether or not to assist the other by armed force. We have agreed that consultation between experts is not and ought not to be regarded as an engagement that commits either Government to action in a contingency that has not yet arisen and may never arise. The disposition, for instance, of the French and British
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Fleets respectively at the present moment is not based upon an engagement to co-operate in war.

You have, however, pointed out that if either Government have grave reason to expect an unprovoked attack by a third Power, it might become essential to know whether it could in that event depend upon the armed resistance of the other. I agree that if either Government have grave reason to expect an unprovoked attack by a third Power or something that threatened the general Peace, it should immediately discuss with the other whether both Governments should not act together to prevent aggression and to preserve Peace, and if so, what measures they would be prepared to take in common. If these measures involved action, the plans of General Staffs would at once be taken into consideration, and the Governments would then decide what effect should be given to them.

The French Ambassador's reply was in these unmistakable terms:

23rd November, 1912.

DEAR SIR EDWARD,

You remind me in your letter of yesterday, 22nd Novr., that during the last few years the Military and Naval authorities of France and Great Britain have consulted with each other from time to time, that it had always been understood that these consultations should not restrict the liberty of either Government to decide in the future whether they should lend each other the support of their armed forces, that on either side these consultations between experts were not and could not be considered as engagements binding our Governments to take action in certain eventualities—that however I remarked to you if one or other of the two Governments had grave reason to fear an unprovoked attack on the part of a third Power it would become essential to know whether
it could count on the armed support of the other. Your letter answers that point, and I am authorised to state that in the event of one of our two Governments having grave reasons to fear an attack from a third Power or some event threatening the general Peace, that Government would immediately examine with the other the question whether both Governments should act together in order to prevent aggression or preserve Peace, and if so the Governments would deliberate as to the measures they would be prepared to take in common. If these measures involved action the two Governments would take into immediate consideration the plans of the General Staffs and would then decide as to the effect to be given to those plans.

PAUL CAMBON.

It is almost superfluous to say that not one word of this unhallowed inter-Allied correspondence was communicated to Parliament, to the Press, or the country, although one result of the written pledge of Britain's troth was the State visit of the President of the French Republic to King George in England, in the following year.

Now, in the first Session of Parliament, in 1913, Lord Hugh Cecil again raised the question of Britain's obligations for war, in the debate on the Address, and said:

There is a very general belief that this country is under an obligation to send a very large armed force out of this country to co-operate in Europe. That is the general belief, it would be very presumptuous of anyone who had not access to all the facts in the possession of the Government . . .
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Prime Minister Asquith here interjected: "I ought to say that it is not true."

Lord Hugh Cecil continued:

I am very glad to have elicited that explanation. It is certainly widely believed that the Government have engaged in a military policy of an adventurous kind, and I certainly think, if that is right that it would involve very important considerations when you come to consider what are the military resources of this country.

On the 24th March, the question was again raised. The Prime Minister was again asked in the House of Commons, if the country was under any, and if so, what obligation to France to send an armed force "in certain contingencies" to operate in Europe. Mr. Asquith replied:

As has been repeatedly stated, this country is not under any obligation not public and known to Parliament which compels it to take part in any war. If war arises between European Powers there are no unpublished Agreements which will restrict or hamper the freedom of the Government or of Parliament to decide whether or not Great Britain should participate in a war.

And Mr. Harcourt, the Colonial Secretary, on the 3rd May, 1913, in addressing his constituents, said:

I can conceive no circumstances in which continental operations by our troops would not be a crime against the people of this country.
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When these statements were made by the Prime Minister and the Colonial Secretary respectively, the ink was hardly six months dry on the written pledge given to the French Ambassador by the Foreign Secretary, on the 22nd November, 1912, agreeing, that whenever the Cabinets of France and England feared that "something threatened the general Peace," they would not only immediately discuss the measures to be taken in common, but actually decide the effect to be given to the plans of the French and British General Staffs, and Military and Naval experts!
VII. WAR IN THE MAKING

NOW prior to the year 1909, the Belgian Army numbered 100,000 men, and was recruited by voluntary enlistments. In 1912 Belgium adopted a military programme raising the war strength of the Belgian army to 340,000 men, and they did this, notwithstanding, that three of the signatories of the Belgian Treaty of 1839, guaranteeing Belgium’s neutrality, were England, France and Russia, and the fourth was Germany. Then, in 1913 a Bill was passed, by the Belgian Parliament, affirming the principle of universal compulsory service, so that at the outbreak of war in 1914, the Belgian army numbered some 200,000 soldiers and 4,500 officers, and Belgium at all events, did what the British Government feared to do, she, legally, prepared herself for all her obligations and responsibilities.

It was at this epoch, that Mr. Attorney-General Rufus Isaacs, the unofficial Cabinet Minister, was appointed by the Imperialist Government, to preside over the administration of all Christian Justice, in England, as Lord Chief Justice, and Mr.
PLAYING THE GAME

Israel Symmons became the first Jewish London Magistrate.

Although Germany had not, since 1905, hoisted the German flag in any part of the New World, and had apparently reconciled herself to an open-door policy for her commerce, on the most favoured nation basis, the year 1913 proved one of great commercial activity for Germany, a factor which it is admitted, was not conducive to stabilising Lord Haldane's alleged rapprochement. In this year, German and Austrian commerce, actually dominated over the trade of all the British Mediterranean ports, and also the Dutch East Indian Islands. Germany's trade with Russia, Belgium, Italy and Roumania, in the same year, also exceeded that of Great Britain with those countries, by at least 62 millions sterling, i.e., Russia, £37,106,047; Belgium, £10,300,000; Italy, £9,000,000; Roumania, £5,550,000. There was, in addition, every prospect of Germany's enormous trade continuing by leaps and bounds. It was in these circumstances, that the subtlety of the Lord Chancellor and that master of "political strategy," Mr. Lloyd George, apparently again came into play. On the 1st December, 1913, Lord Haldane told the Royal Scottish Corporation:

Our relations with Germany are twice as good as they were two years ago.
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And on the 1st January, 1914, Mr. Lloyd George published in the *Daily Chronicle*, as a New Year's letter, the following statement, suggesting disarmament in Great Britain:

The German army is vital, not merely to the existence of the German Empire, but to the very life and independence of the nation itself, surrounded as Germany is by other nations, each of which possesses armies almost as powerful as her own. We forget, that while we insist upon a 60 per cent. superiority (so far as our naval strength is concerned) over Germany being essential to guarantee the integrity of our shores—Germany herself has nothing like that superiority over France alone and has, of course, in addition, to reckon with Russia which approximates to a two-Power standard. She has therefore become alarmed by recent events and is spending huge sums of money on the expansion of her military resources . . . I think this is the most favourable moment that has presented itself during the last twenty years to overhaul our expenditure in armaments,

and five days later, on the 6th January, 1914, the *Daily Chronicle*, followed up Mr. Lloyd George's New Year's message, by announcing:

Preparations are being made for a campaign in the country for a reduction in the expenditure of armaments.

It would be extremely interesting to learn upon whose authority this statement was inspired. *Ex facie* the fair utterances of these men
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had their influence upon the German people as well as upon those whom they were intended to influence at home. They were messages of "Peace and Goodwill" with a vengeance! As Ministers of the Crown, drawing between them £15,000 a year, these great and good men might at least have confided to their own unsuspecting people the fact that at this precise period—the opening of the New Year, 1914—the British and French naval co-ordination had reached such an advanced state of perfection that Admiral Fisher had actually been able to describe to the Government such a condition of naval warfare with Germany as would result in such a British disaster as that which came to the "Lusitania" in 1915. The Admiral recently, in a letter to the Times, told the world that he did this "seven months before the War."

Britain's first Jewish Lord Chief Justice was now created a Peer of the realm, under the title of Baron Reading, and was thus freed from the restraint which his judicial appointment imposed upon any interference in the politics of the country. He was thenceforth able to assist the Government politically and to take an important part in the Imperialism of the day.

The British Parliament met on the 10th February, 1914, and the King's Speech, following
on the lines of Lloyd George's New Year's greet­ing, stated:

My relations with Foreign Powers continue to be friendly. I am happy to say that my negotiations both with the German Government and the Ottoman Government as regards matters of importance to the commercial and industrial interests of this country in Mesopotamia, are rapidly approaching a satisfactory issue, while questions which have long been pending with the Turkish Empire in respect to regions border­ing on the Persian Gulf, are in a fair way towards an amicable settlement.

On the 10th March, 1914, the new Minister for War, Colonel Seely, in the House of Commons said: "We stand well for the purposes of immediate war on any basis which you may con­sider," and on the 18th March, Sir Edward Grey said he "was sure the good 'understandings' which had existed and which exist between our­selves and France and Russia, have undoubtedly during the last troublesome times, contributed to the Peace of Europe. We consider that they make for Peace."

Thus were the thoughts of the British people again diverted into different channels from the policy which the Government continued to pursue. They cried "Peace" where there was no peace, and at the same time they assured the fire-eaters that everything in the garden was lovely.
country at this period was wholly in the hands of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde!

The King's Speech, in opening Parliament, having made it perfectly clear that there was no international friction in Europe, Parliament was left to deal with a number of measures which were all calculated to more than occupy the public and political mind, and divert both from the now fast approaching European storm. There was Home Rule for Ireland, Disestablishment of the Welsh Church, and the Land Question. In dealing with Home Rule, the Imperialist strategists staged not only a brawl in the Commons, but a comic extravaganza in Ireland. The *dramatis personae* succeeded one another as in a moving picture-play. In the first act were Sir Edward Carson and ex-Lord Chancellor Birkenhead—then "Galloper" Smith—aided by dummy guns and an alleged and much advertised gun-running exploit. In the second act was the "Wait and See" Prime Minister talking largely of treason and sedition, while in the third and last act, two excellent friends, both consummate actors and Tory renegadoes—Mr. Winston Churchill and Colonel Seely—having arrived before the footlights at the crucial moment, accompanied by units of the British Army and the British Navy, the curtain fell to the strains of
"Rule Britannia" and the National Anthem, and the Army refusing to fight Old Ireland. Comrade Lloyd George, who was not to be outflanked in the political game, then went about the country making political capital out of organised Labour's demands for higher wages and shorter hours, and declaring that the Nation was then on the eve of a great industrial revolution which might at any time end in civil war. Again the Super Syndicated section of the Imperialistic Press, so beautifully worked up these word pictures, that the peaceful confiding, comfort-loving and overfed British citizen, was successfully hoodwinked, and simple-minded Prince Lichnowsky really believed that the revolutionary pictures were genuine, and no doubt, reported them to his country, as evidence of the disintegration of the British Empire. Neither Prince Lichnowsky, nor the British bourgeois could believe that such pillars of the Constitution and Church, and State, as Asquith, tilting-knight Smith, Carson, Winston Churchill and Lloyd George, would ever do otherwise than play the game.

Now while these movie and theatrical performances were going on, great events, which were happening in Europe, almost passed unnoticed by the masses of the British people, even although the moment was rapidly approaching when the
bureaucracy would finally determine the equilibrium of Europe. In April, 1914, King George went to Paris to pay a return State visit to the French President, and he was accompanied by Sir Edward Grey, and on the 21st April the British people were told, by a leading article in the *Times* newspaper:

The presence of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs as Minister in attendance upon the King, is of course, an indication that the questions which concern the Powers of the Triple Entente will be discussed during the visit, and as some of these questions are of deep importance no conversations which may take place about them can be without interest.

In February, the King’s Speech had told the nation, that there was no international friction in Europe. What, then, were the questions of “deep importance” that had arisen in April? What decisions or conclusions *dehors* the plans of the British and French naval and military coalition were then in contemplation? Neither Parliament nor the British people have ever been told, although plain men may find some light thrown upon the nature of the “questions” and their objectives, by the public utterances of King George and President Poincaré at the State banquet, and the *Times* leading article of April 23rd.
"It is to-day ten years," said the President, "since the two Governments (meaning France and England) settled as friends the questions which separated them. The agreement there made naturally gave birth to a more general 'understanding' which is now and will henceforth be one of the surest pledges of European equilibrium."

King George's reply was in these terms:

I subscribe, with my whole heart, to your eloquent definition of the noble and exalted ends which our two countries pursue in common. Their attainment will be a boon to the two nations.

The Times article of April 23rd, also told us Russia's part in the attainment of these "noble and exalted ends." In commenting upon the Royal visit, the Times said:

Our friendship in the President's admirable phrase corresponds to the considered will of two powerful nations, and expanded by our friendly understanding with France's great Ally, it has become one of the surest pledges of European equilibrium.

A fair and safe inference to be made from this Press notice is that no "conversations" took place at Paris in the absence of the Russian representative, and that these had reference to the "pledges of equilibrium," and as British land forces could not without Parliamentary sanction cooperate with Russian military forces the discussion
as far as Russia was concerned must have been limited to Naval matters, and that the Press notice was diplomatically communicated, with the approval of M. Cambon, Sir Edward Grey, M. Doumergue and the Russian representative.

Still the question of our military obligations to France was again raised in the House of Commons. On the 28th of April, 1914, Mr. King asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs:

Whether he is aware that demands have been recently put forward for a further military understanding between the Powers of the Triple Entente with a view to concerted action on the Continent in case of certain eventualities, and whether the policy of this country still remains one of freedom from all obligations to engage in military operations on the Continent.

Sir Edward Grey replied:

The answer to the first part of the question is in the negative, and as regards the latter part the position now remains the same as stated by the Prime Minister in answer to a question in this House on 24th March, 1913.

Now, in spite of the most skilful secrecy, German newspapers got hold of this naval story and published a flaming account of "these new proofs of the encircling policy of the Entente." The Russian Government flatly denied the allegations and informed the German Ambassador.
at St. Petersburg that there was nothing in the story, and Sir Edward Grey assured the German Ambassador in London that "the matter of the Straits had not been discussed by the two Powers in five years," and also "that between England, France and Russia there existed neither an alliance nor a convention."

Sir Edward Grey, however, could not escape even another question in the House of Commons. On the 11th June, 1914, he was asked point blank:

whether any Naval Agreement had been recently entered into between Russia and Great Britain and whether any negotiations with a view to a Naval Agreement had recently taken place or were then pending between Russia and Great Britain. Whether he could then make any statement with regard to an alleged new Naval Agreement between Great Britain and Russia, and how far such agreement would affect our relations with Germany?

Sir Edward Grey's reply was:

Similar questions were asked last year and the Prime Minister had then answered that there were no unpublished agreements which would restrict or hamper the freedom of the Government or of Parliament to decide whether or not Great Britain should participate in a war. That answer covers both the questions on the paper. It remains as true to-day as it was a year ago. No negotiations have since been concluded with any Power, that will make the statement less true. No such negotiations are in progress and none are likely to be entered upon as far as I can judge.
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This reply gave the world to distinctly understand that the rumours to the contrary were all false. It is clear the German Government so understood it for we find the German Chancellor in a dispatch to the German Ambassador at London saying:

It is thoroughly gratifying to learn that Sir Edward Grey has challenged with decision in the Lower House the rumours of an Anglo-Russian naval conversation and has also allowed his Dementi to be emphasised in the Westminster Gazette. Had these rumours been confirmed, and in fact only to the effect that the English and Russian navies were preparing for cooperation in case common war should be fought against Germany, an arrangement similar to the agreement which England had made with France at the time of the Moroccan crisis, had this been true, then not only would Russian and French Chauvinism have been strongly excited, but there would have arisen with us a not unjustified disturbance of public opinion which would have found its expression in a navy "scare," and in another poisoning of the slowly improving relations with England . . . I earnestly beg Your Highness to convey to Sir Edward Grey my special thanks for his open and straightforward declarations, and thereupon bring to his attention in a prudent and informal way the general considerations which I have indicated above.

There was yet another Power in the State which at this period might well be comprised in the "Auxiliary Forces" of the Crown, viz., the Press. Sir Edward Grey, at a dinner of the
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Foreign Press Association in May, 1914, consequently defined the part and share of the Press in the political game then being played on the European political chess-board in these concise and unambiguous terms:

The Press controlled the atmosphere, and the temperature of the atmosphere would decide what policy it might be possible for Governments to carry out.

The Press and the Government were now to coalesce, and it was no doubt to assist the atmospheric pressure that the *Times* published a "Russian Supplement" of twenty pages reviewing in glowing terms the commerce and industries of Russia, and, what best appealed to British commercialism, the full details of Germany's trade with Russia. The body politic as well as the destiny of the Nation were now entirely in the uncontrolled power of the Imperialist Cabinet, and their Colonial henchmen, and a Press that was to control public opinion!

On the 1st June, 1914, Czar Nicholas II. had an interview with King Charles of Roumania at Constanza, and following that diplomatic event a Military Convention with Austria-Hungary, which had been in force twenty years, was not renewed and Austria-Hungary in consequence
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lost a very strong support in the Balkans. On the 28th June, 1914, the Crown Prince and Crown Princess of Austria were foully murdered at Serajevo, in Bosnia, as the overt act of a conspiracy which Austria-Hungary rightly or wrongly suspected had its origin in Serbia. At this time Russia was on the brink of revolution. The Czar, the Grand Dukes, the exploiting financiers and capitalists were all with the Entente, and hoped to avert revolution and anglophobia by aiming at a dissolution of Austria-Hungary, and the realisation of the Muscovich Pan-Slav and Pan-Serb dream with the assistance of France and England.

On the 29th June, Mr. Swift Macneill availed himself of an opportunity of dealing in Parliament with the attitude of the British Foreign Office, and the peril in which the Nation then stood. He said:

If we are not to know the reality of things it would be better if we had no debates in this House on Foreign policy . . . The House allows itself to be treated as a child in matters which create wars. I say that the Houses of Parliament so far as Foreign policy is concerned, are absolutely impotent. This House has no power to declare war or to make peace. These prerogatives of the Crown are practically invested in the Ministers and exercised by them . . . The Ministry can declare war to-day without consulting the House of Commons. Perhaps it will be said that this is all
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right, and that the House has the power of stopping supplies. Yes; but no House of Commons with ordinary patriotic feeling would dream of stopping supplies when that means the maintenance and protection of soldiers abroad, whatever may be the facts of the war. Therefore the Cabinet has power to make peace and to declare war, to make this country enter into the very highest and most momentous international transactions and has a power which it has not in connection with the narrowest turnpike bill.

We will now strictly follow the course of the transactions that within a few days directly brought the British Nation into the greatest war in history.

It appears from Lord Haldane's book, that in July, he and Sir Edward Grey, were living together, and were in the closest collaboration at Lord Haldane's London residence, and were engaged in a joint "passionate earnestness of purpose." At the same time, their colleague, Mr. Winston Churchill, was First Lord of the Admiralty.

On the 13th July the special British Fleet was mobilised, and on the 18th was reviewed by King George.

On the 20th July, after a diplomatic silence following upon the Serajevo crime, of three weeks on the part of the British Foreign Office, although much had taken place in the Chancelleries of other nations, Sir Edward Grey sent a first dispatch to the British Ambassador at Berlin, and
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also held a conversation with the German Ambassador regarding the possibility of the dispute between Austria-Hungary and Serbia, developing into a war between the great Powers.

On the 23rd July, Sir Edward Grey saw the Austrian Ambassador, and ascertained from him that "all would depend upon Russia" and that the Austrian Ambassador was under the impression that the "atmosphere" in St. Petersburg had not been favourable recently. On the same day the famous Austrian Note was delivered to the Serbian Government. The Note demanded that the Government of Serbia should "put a stop to a movement which threatened the safety and integrity of Austria-Hungary, and bring to justice the sponsors of the Serajevo murders."

This Note required a reply within forty-eight hours, which expired at six o'clock on Saturday, 25th July. On the same day Sir Edward Grey sent the following dispatch to the British Ambassador at Paris:

M. Cambon said that if there was a chance of mediation by the four Powers he had no doubt that his Government would be glad to join in it; but he pointed out that we could not say anything in St. Petersburg till Russia had expressed some opinion or taken some action. I said that I had not contemplated anything being said in St. Petersburg until after it was clear that there must be trouble between Austria and Russia.
It therefore clearly appears that Sir Edward Grey agreed "that all must depend upon Russia." He had not long to wait. Both the President and Premier of the French Republic were already in Russia in the interest of the Entente "atmosphere." On that day, 23rd July, the President and the Czar, reviewed at Krasnoe Selo, sixty-nine battalions of infantry, sixty-eight squadrons of cavalry, 112 pieces of field artillery, 24 guns of the artillery of the Guard and the cadets of the Military School, and in the evening the President entertained the Czar and the Imperial family, and in toasting the Czar the President said:

In these marks of attention which have been showered on me, my country will see a fresh guarantee of the splendid consecration of the indissoluble alliance which unites Russia and France on all questions which arise each day before the two Governments, and which demand the concerted activity of their diplomacy.

The Czar's reply was as follows:

The concerted action of our two diplomacies and the fraternity which exists between our land and sea forces will facilitate the task of our two Governments which have been called upon to watch over the interests of our Allied peoples. The two Allies have bound themselves by close ties for the end of safeguarding their interests by working together for equilibrium.

The Czar and the French President, according to a Russian telegram to the Times dated 23rd
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July, did not part company before ten o'clock in the evening of that eventful day; while the Times, on the same evening before going to press with its next morning issue received a telegram from Belgrade, dated 23rd July, giving in extenso the terms of the Austrian Note which the Times accordingly published in its columns on the 24th July.

On the morning of the 24th July, Sir Edward Grey was likewise in possession of the full text of the Austrian Note. The Note, as we have seen, demanded a reply within forty-eight hours, so that before Serbia had even time to consider the Note the Russian "Land and Sea Forces" were pledged to facilitate the task of the two Governments, and the Times in controlling the atmosphere on the morning of the 25th July published in its columns the view which France, Russia and England severally held regarding "the question of the day," and a possibility of not being able to localise the threatened conflict. On going to press in the early hours of the 25th July, this was the Times memorable summary of the previous day's events:

Little is known of the impression produced at Belgrade by the Austro-Hungarian Ultimatum. The messages received from Belgrade during the last twenty-four hours are few and insignificant.
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At St. Petersburg the impression is profound, a Council of Ministers sat for several hours and is stated to have taken grave resolutions. A message has been received from Serbia imploring help.

In France considerable irritation and much anxiety is shown. The Note is described as unprecedented in its arrogance and in the extravagance of its demands. Doubt is expressed as to the possibility of localising the dispute.

In competent diplomatic circles in London the situation is regarded as graver than those which existed during the Annexation crisis of 1908–9 or during the Balkan Wars of 1912–13.

The "grave resolutions" taken by Russia undoubtedly involved war preparations. President Poincaré had made France's solidarity a reality, and as a condition precedent to the actual issue of Russia's order for mobilisation both Russia and France required only to be fully satisfied that there should be no perfidy regarding Britain's corresponding solidarity. Accordingly on the same day, the 24th July, the British Ambassador at St. Petersburg, reported (Dispatch No. 6 White Book) that:

Sazonof, the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs, said some of Austria's demands were quite impossible of acceptance, and that he hoped that the British Government would not fail to proclaim their solidarity with Russia and France, that Britain must not forget that the general European question was involved, and that both Sazonof and the French representative at S. Petersburg continued to press him for a declaration of complete solidarity.
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Friday, the 24th July, was the blackest Friday in the history of England. The position on that day was this: only war could save Russia from an immediate anarchial crisis or the Anglophiles in Russia getting the upper hand with possibly a resultant permeation of the Russian Empire commercially by Germans. A great strike had already broken out at St. Petersburg and Warsaw, fighting in different parts was going on lasting until midnight, barricades had been erected, a general lock-out had been decided upon, and in consequence of fighting having taken place between the Cossacks and the strikers an Extraordinary Meeting of the Council of Ministers had been summoned for the following day. In France also there was an almost certain risk of the anti-bellum propaganda of her ex-Premier Joseph Caillaux laying the foundation of a rapprochement between France and Germany. If, then, the Czar and his Government were now forced to abdicate, the life of the Anglo-French and Russian unwritten "understandings" and all that they stood for would come to an abrupt end, and all the secret confabulations of the British and French military and naval experts with their strategical plans and economic co-ordination under Britain's policy of Imperialism in diplomacy, extending over some
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ten years, and the millions of money France and England had advanced to Russia would fall with it. Without Russia the schemes of the Entente were impotent. The one and only hope of the Government of the Czar was that as Germany did not want war a declaration at this time of Britain's solidarity with Russia and France might secure for Russia such a measure of her Slav ambitions in Central Europe as would avert the impending revolution or if war came, it would at all events rally the country to the flag of the Czar of all the Russians and rid the Empire of possibly its revolutionary element. This, then, was the psychological moment for Britain's action. If the unwritten "understandings" were to be saved, and Germany's commercial expansion arrested, Britain must, without a moment's delay comply with the demands of France and Russia and proclaim her "complete solidarity." There was now no escape from her secret obligations. Her fateful hour had struck. Britain's responsible Minister accordingly took the momentous plunge, and the necessary orders were issued to the First Fleet, and upon these orders being given the Czar's Government immediately determined upon partial mobilisation. Sazonof then gave instructions to the Russian Ambassador at Paris, to express to the French Government Russia's
sincere thanks for the French declaration that Russia could count completely on the assistance of France; while it also appears from Dispatch No. 66 of the French Yellow Book, that M. de Fleurian, French Charge d’Affairs, at London, informed the French Government:

The *attitude* of Great Britain is confirmed by the postponement of the demobilisation of the fleet. The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Winston Churchill) took this measure *quietly* on Friday on his own initiative.

Friday was the 24th July. The word “quietly” in this connection must consistently with the all round policy of the Asquith Government be interpreted as “secretly.” Raymond Recouly, in his book “Les Heures Trajiques D’Avant Guerre,” says in this connection:

M. Cambon told me that it was Winston Churchill who himself gave the order and assumed the responsibility.

The Czar’s telegram to the Kaiser of the 30th July, read:

“The military measures coming into operation were *decided* upon five days ago,” that is to say, on the 25th July.

The Austrian Minister now left Belgrade. With knowledge that the British Fleet stood behind France and Russia, M. Sazonof now took a firmer
PLAYING THE GAME

stand with Austria. He now required Austria to guarantee the integrity of Serbia and respect her rights as a sovereign State.

The Belgian Government on the same day—24th July—issued a Mobilisation Circular and an undated Instruction to Ambassadors announcing that:

The Belgian Army had been mobilised and was taking up such strategic positions as had been chosen to secure the defence of the country and the respect of its neutrality and that the forts of Antwerp and on the Meuse had been put in a state of defence.

It is thus made plain that the area to be protected was that through which the Meuse ran—Liege, Namur, and Dinant, that the French frontier was to be left open, and that the Belgian military strength was to concentrate on the Meuse and that these preparations were against Germany only.

It was on the 25th July, Sir Edward Grey sent his first communication to Russia, and instructed the British Ambassador that Austria had explained that the Note to Serbia was not an ultimatum but a step with a time limit. The British Ambassador replied the same day, No. 17:

On my expressing the earnest hope that Russia would not precipitate war by mobilising until you (Sir Edward Grey) had had time to use your influence
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in favour of peace, His Excellency (the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs) assured me that Russia had no aggressive intentions, and she would take no action until it was forced on her. Austria's action was in reality directed against Russia. She aimed at overthrowing the present status quo in the Balkans, and establishing her own hegemony there. He did not believe that Germany really wanted war, but her attitude was decided by ours (Great Britain). If we took our stand firmly with France and Russia there would be no war. If we failed them now rivers of blood would flow and we would in the end be dragged into the War. I said that England would play the role of mediator at Berlin and Vienna to better purpose as friend who, if her counsels of moderation were disregarded, might one day be converted into an Ally. He said that unfortunately Germany was convinced that she could count on our neutrality. I said all I could to impress prudence on the Minister for Foreign Affairs, and warned him that if Russia mobilised, Germany would not be content with mere mobilisation, or give Russia time to carry on hers but would probably declare war at once.

On the 26th July, the French Foreign Minister communicated to the French Ambassadors at London, St. Petersburg, Vienna and Rome:

The German Ambassador came this afternoon to make a communication to me relating to an intervention by France and Russia in a pacific sense. Austria, he said to me, has declared to Russia that she was not pursuing any territorial aggrandisement, nor any attack on the integrity of the Kingdom of Serbia. Her only intention is to ensure her own tranquility, and to take police measures. The prevention of war depends on the decision of Russia.
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Germany feels herself identified with France in the ardent desire that peace may be maintained and has the firm hope that France will use her influence in this sense with St. Petersburg.

Intervention by a Conference of the Ambassadors of the Four Powers was Sir Edward Grey's diplomatic move, but whether it was put forward before or after the German Ambassador's call upon the French Minister is immaterial, as all that was really wanted to suspend hostilities was for France and England to firmly assert their influence with Russia in that behalf.

Germany, on the 27th July, accepted the principle of mediation, while the British Ambassador at St. Petersburg sent word that Russia rejected the proposal altogether. Direct conversation between Vienna and St. Petersburg was Russia's way of dealing with the question. On the same day, probably before the receipt of Russia's decision rejecting the conference proposal, Sir Edward Grey sent a dispatch to the British Ambassador at Berlin, saying:

German Ambassador has informed me that German Government accepted in principle mediation between Austria and Russia by the Four Powers, reserving of course their right as an Ally to help Austria if attacked. He has also been instructed to request me to use influence in St. Petersburg to localise the war and to keep the peace of Europe.
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And yet almost before the ink of the latter dispatch was dry Sir Edward Grey sent the following dispatch to the British Ambassador at St. Petersburg:

I have been told by the Russian Ambassador that in German and Austrian circles impression prevails that in any event we (Britain) would stand aside. His Excellency deplored the effect that such an impression must produce. This impression ought, as I have pointed out, to be dispelled by the orders we have given to the First Fleet which is concentrated, as it happens, at Portland, not to disperse for manoeuvre leave. But I explained to the Russian Ambassador that my reference to it must not be taken to mean that anything more than diplomatic action was promised.

Two things are manifest from the latter dispatch, first that the naval orders were given to make Britain’s solidarity an act of part performance—an earnest—of her obligations with France and Russia, and secondly, that Sir Edward Grey, and apparently also Lord Haldane, must have known, that both the demand and performance were of armed solidarity, from which there could be no turning back, and not diplomatic action. There is no greater truth than that he who knowing what is right, does it not, loses all knowledge of what is right, and he who would not do well when he could, loses the power when he would. The fact remains that the mobilisation of the First, Second and Third
Fleets was complete and available for any purpose on July 27th, and sailed from Portland, and that on that day the usual official "Disposition of Ships" was altogether withdrawn from publication: "A welcome earnest of our intention."

It was therefore no surprise to find the German Emperor, who had some days previously gone North on a yachting trip to Scandinavia, suddenly, on the 27th July, returning to Berlin, or that the German Ambassador immediately afterwards asked Sir Edward Grey "why Britain was taking military measures on land and sea?" But it does stagger the old school of traditional British character to learn that Sir Edward Grey, in the language apparently of Britain's new diplomacy, replied:

"That these measures had no aggressive character."

It was on the 27th July that the first reference was made in Parliament by Sir Edward Grey to Austria and Serbia, and as on that day, the Navy estimates for 1914–15 were actually being debated in the House of Commons, one would reasonably have expected Parliament to be informed, with absolute frankness and candour something regarding the declaration of solidarity demanded by Russia and France on the 24th July,
and the circumstances under which the demand was made, of the orders given by the Crown to the British Fleet on the 24th and 27th July, and the action Russia had taken in mobilising consequent thereon; all these matters were of vital importance to the Nation, but not one word did Sir Edward Grey say about them. He simply informed the House of Commons of his proposal of a conference of the Ambassadors of the Four Powers. He was asked by Mr. Lawson if it were true that the German Emperor had that morning accepted the principle of mediation. Sir Edward Grey replied:

I understand that the German Government are favourable to the idea of mediation in principle as between Austria-Hungary and Russia, but that as to the particular proposal of applying that principle by means of a conference which I have described to the House, the reply of the German Government has not yet been received.

As we have already seen, Russia rejected the proposal of conference. Later, Germany refused "a court of arbitration of the Four Powers," and supported the Russian way of dealing with the dispute. Great Britain's declaration of her "attitude" and solidarity had let loose the Russian dogs of war, and no power on earth could hold

*N.B.—Corfu has recently taught us the precise value of a Conference of Ambassadors.*
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them back. The crisis was, however, met by the Cabinet drawing the blinds, and sitting down to a typical Asquithian game of chess.

Now observe the next move in the game. On July 28th the Prime Minister told the House of Commons:

There are no new developments sufficiently definite to enable any further statement to be made, but we hope that no unfavourable inference will be drawn from this. I cannot say more.

Yet war was declared by Austria against Serbia on that very day, and Sir Edward Grey on the same day telegraphed to the British Ambassador at Berlin, that:

As long as there is a prospect of a direct exchange of views between Austria and Russia, I would suspend every other suggestion as I entirely agree that it is the most preferable method of all,

but as neither Britain nor France would join with Germany in putting pressure upon Russia at St. Petersburg to suspend hostilities, the Government of the Czar on the following day, 29th July, signed the formal Ukase for army mobilisation, and on that day Sir Edward Grey telegraphed the British Ambassador at Paris (see Dispatch No. 87) that he was:

About to warn the German Ambassador at London that Germany must not count on Britain standing aside.
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Let us pause here to summarise how matters now stood as between the Cabinet and the House of Commons. On Monday, 27th July, the House was informed of Sir Edward Grey's proposal for a conference of Ambassadors. On Tuesday, 28th July, Mr. Asquith had nothing to add. On Wednesday, 29th July, Sir Edward Grey had suspended his proposal of a conference and as far as Berlin was concerned, he "entirely agreed" with the Russian-German method of dealing with the Austro-Serbian dispute. Meanwhile in Russia a Ukase for mobilisation was signed by the Czar, and France was promised that the German Ambassador at London would be at once warned that Germany could not count on Britain’s neutrality. Not one word of information concerning any of these vital developments was vouchsafed to Parliament on the 29th July.

Now, Dispatch No. 90 shows that Sir Edward Grey saw the German Ambassador twice on the 29th July, and it is clear that notwithstanding the promise given to France, Sir Edward Grey did not warn the German Ambassador at the earlier interview nor did he in his Dispatch No. 88 to Sir E. Goschen at Berlin, on the same day say one word about his intention of warning the German Ambassador, although he had already
deemed it expedient to telegraph his intention in that behalf to the British Ambassador at Paris. The British Ambassador at Berlin was consequently allowed to proceed in complete ignorance of Sir Edward Grey's intentions as expressed to both the French Ambassador at London and the British Ambassador at Paris. Accordingly, Sir E. Goschen at Berlin, interviewed the German Chancellor late in the evening of the 29th July, and at once reported the interview to the British Foreign Office in these words (No. 85 in White Book):

I was asked to call upon the Chancellor to-night—His Excellency had just returned from Potsdam. He said that should Austria be attacked by Russia a European conflagration might, he feared, become inevitable, owing to Germany's obligations as Austria's Ally, in spite of his continued efforts to maintain peace. He then proceeded to make the following strong bid for British neutrality. He said it was clear so far as he was able to judge the main principle which governed British policy, that Great Britain would never stand by and allow France to be crushed in any conflict there might be. That, however, was not the object at which Germany aimed. Provided that neutrality of Great Britain was certain, every assurance would be given to the British Government that the Imperial Government aimed at no territorial acquisition at the expense of France should they prove victorious in any war that might ensue. I questioned His Excellency about the French Colonies, and he said
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that he was unable to give a similar undertaking in that respect.

As regards Holland, however, His Excellency said, that as long as Germany's adversaries respected the integrity and neutrality of the Netherlands, Germany was ready to give His Majesty's Government an assurance that she would do likewise. It depended upon the action of France what operations Germany might be forced to enter upon in Belgium, but when the war was over, Belgian integrity would be respected if she had not sided against Germany. His Excellency ended by saying that ever since he had been Chancellor the object of his policy had been, as you were aware, to bring about an understanding with England; he trusted that these assurances might form a basis of that understanding which he so much desired. He had in mind a general Neutrality Agreement between England and Germany. In reply to His Excellency's inquiry how I thought his request would appeal to you, I said that I did not think it probable that at this stage of events you would care to bind yourself to any course of action and that I was of opinion that you would desire to retain full liberty.

Ex-American Ambassador Gerard has told us in his book on Germany:

That in the afternoon of the 30th July, he, at Berlin, had a long conversation with Baron Beyens, Minister of Belgium, and Jules Cambon, the French Ambassador, in the garden of the French Embassy, and they both agreed that nothing could then prevent war, except the intervention of the United States of America.

And as Sir Edward Grey, the chief actor in
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all that was taking place, must be assumed to have had cognisance of the operations which his colleague, Mr. Churchill, as First Lord of the Admiralty was then directing, and the orders sent by the Admiralty on the 30th July to Admiral Sir A. Berkeley Milne, G.C.V.O., the Commander-in-Chief of the Mediterranean Fleet, in the following words:

Your first task should be to aid the French in the transportation of their African army by covering and if possible, bringing into action individual fast German ships, particularly “Goeben”, which may interfere in that transaction,

it seems difficult to find any words in the English language strong enough to condemn the political strategy that was practised upon the British Parliament on this 30th July to keep the country in the dark, when in answer to a demand for information, Sir Edward Grey, with a bland ease on that day replied:

There is very little that I can say. I regret I cannot say that the situation is less grave than it was yesterday. The outstanding facts are the same. Austria has begun war against Serbia, and Russia has ordered a partial mobilisation which has not hitherto led to any corresponding step by other Powers, so far as our information goes. We continue to pursue the one great object to preserve European peace, and for this purpose are keeping in close touch with each of the
other Powers. (Oh, Grey! Grey! Grey! a simple protest to Russia would, in all human probability, have averted or delayed further mobilisation, and that you could not send.)

Not one word did he tell the House of Commons on that day of the grave warning he had given to Prince Lichnowsky on the previous afternoon, or of the corresponding notification in that behalf which he had sent to Paris, and least of all did he refer to the absence of any notification of that warning to the British Nation, or of the contents of Sir Edward Goschen’s Dispatch (No. 85) which eight days later, after war had been declared, Prime Minister Asquith said contained “an infamous proposal,” and of which, lawyer-like, he made so much forensic play in his defence of Britain’s declaration of war. If the truth had been disclosed on the 30th July, what a different world we might all be living in to-day.

Again, on the same day, July 30th, the German Secretary of State requested the British Ambassador, at Berlin:

To impress upon Sir Edward Grey the difficulty of Germany’s position in view of Russia’s mobilisation and the military measures which he heard were being taken in France,

and at the same time he told the British Ambassador that:
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The warning Sir Edward Grey had given the German Ambassador at London as to Britain's neutrality, had not reached the German Chancellor until after their interview in the evening of the previous day.

and Sir Edward Goschen, in his dispatch went on to say:

His Excellency added that the telegram received from Prince Lichnowsky last night, contained matter which he had heard with regret, but not exactly with surprise, and that at all events he thoroughly appreciated the frankness and loyalty with which you (Sir Edward Grey) had spoken. He also told me that this telegram had only reached Berlin very late last night, had it been received earlier, the Chancellor would, of course, not have spoken to me in the way he had done.

Now, notwithstanding Britain's Naval Orders and the presence of the British Fleet in the North Sea as an earnest of Britain's "attitude" Sir Edward Grey's double statements (1) to Germany that the measures Britain was taking on land and sea had no aggressive character; (2) to Russia, that his reference to the fleet must not be taken to mean anything more than a promise of "diplo­matic" action; and (3) to France, that he was about to warn Prince Lichnowsky, that Germany must not count on Britain's standing aside, seemed to have hopelessly mystified M. Cambon, and occasioned some uneasiness on the part of the
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French Government, for on the 30th July we find M. Cambon beseeching Sir Edward Grey to come out with an official and unequivocal specific promise of Entente military and naval aid. Thereupon M. Cambon formally wrote to Sir Edward Grey dealing with the engagements entered into in January, 1906, and enclosing copies of the letters they had exchanged on the subject in November, 1912.—Plain words and no shuffle, was the French way of dealing with the case.

On the same day, 30th July, a direct appeal to Britain’s Sovereign was despatched by telegram by Prince Henry of Prussia, brother of the Kaiser and cousin of George V. It ran as follows:

If you seriously and earnestly desire to prevent the terrible misfortune, a European War, may I propose to you to use your influence on France and also on Russia that they should remain neutral. In my view this would be of the greatest use. I consider that this is a certain and perhaps the only possible way of maintaining the peace of Europe. I might add that Germany and England should now more than ever, give each other mutual support in order to prevent a terrible disaster, which otherwise appears inevitable. Believe me that William is inspired by the greatest sincerity in his efforts for the maintenance of peace.

The world, would, of course, like to know what reply was made to Prince Henry. Of course
there must have been a reply. There are no official public records in England of the Sovereign's official correspondence, consequently we had to wait for this information until the 1st December, 1919, when the *Daily Telegraph* published, as part of a memorandum sent by the German Emperor to the German Chancellor the detail of the reply in these so far uncontradicted words:

The King's message for me through Henry. "We shall remain neutral, and try to keep out of this as long as possible."

We may, perhaps, assume and ought to assume that the King constitutionally communicated the nature of this correspondence to his Ministers, and that Prince Henry's proposal had no part in Sir Edward Grey's declaration that: "the Cabinet continued to pursue the one great object to preserve European Peace," or in restraining any of the activities of the Asquithian Government. Germany being unable to stay the Russian mobilisation or to enjoin neutrality upon either Russia or France, now directly mediated with Russia, and on 30th July succeeded in tentatively concluding with Russia the terms of a formula for settling the Austro-Serbian difficulties, which, but for Sir Edward Grey's subsequent interference
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would apparently have proved acceptable to Austria-Hungary. M. Sazonof accordingly drew up and handed to the German Ambassador at St. Petersburg a formula in French, of which the following is a free translation:

If Austria, recognising that the Austro-Serbian question has acquired the character of a European question, declares herself ready to remove from her ultimatum the points that infringe the Sovereign rights of Serbia, Russia will engage herself to stop her military preparations,

and Count Pourtales promised to support this proposal with his Government. Sir G. Buchanan, the British Ambassador at St. Petersburg, on the 31st July, by telegraph, communicated the language of this formula to Sir Edward Grey, and also pointed out that “its rejection would inevitably result in a European War.” The telegram reached Sir Edward Grey on the day of its despatch. On the same day M. Paleologue, the French Ambassador at St. Petersburg also communicated to M. Rene Viviani, the French Minister, the contents of the Sazonof formula.

British diplomacy, however, was not content to leave well alone. The formula which Sazonof had dictated, and which satisfied Germany, and as we shall also see, satisfied Austria-Hungary,
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was not the policy of the Asquith Government, It was not calculated to save either Russia from revolution, or the life of the Alliances, or their Inter-Allied "pledges of European equilibrium."

As the formula stood Britain and France were out of the settlement, and why not? The dispute which had arisen owing to the murder of the Crown Prince and Crown Princess of Austria, was no concern of Britain. She had not the smallest interest, moral or otherwise, in Serbia. What had Britain to do with Serbia or the Balkans? On the other hand the terms of settlement were the immediate concern of Austria-Hungary, and of Russia as the protector of Serbia and Slav interests. Sir Edward Grey now telegraphed to Sir G. Buchanan, altering the terms of the Sazonof formula as to read thus:

If Austria will consent to check the advance of her troops on Serbian territory and if recognising that the dispute between Austria and Servia has assumed a character of European interest, she will allow the Great Powers to look into the matter and determine whether Servia could satisfy the Austro-Hungarian Government without impairing her rights as a Sovereign State, Russia will undertake herself to maintain her waiting attitude,

and then after imposing the new terms, which it will be observed substituted for Russia's engagement to "cease military preparations" an
undertaking to "maintain a waiting attitude" which involved no suspension of the mobilisation of the Russian forces, and continued the coordination and unity of the activities of the Entente Alliances, Sir Edward Grey informed the German Ambassador, that "if Germany could get any proposal put forward which made it clear that Germany and Austria were trying to preserve European peace, and that Russia and France would be unreasonable if they rejected it, he would support it at St. Petersburg and Paris, and go the length of saying that if Russia and France would not accept it his Government would have nothing more to do with the consequences." Were it not that the things at stake were too vital, and too awful for merriment, the world would laugh at this diplomatic attempt at camouflage. The amendment seriously put amounted to this, that it should be left to Britain, France, Russia, Germany and possibly Italy, by a majority decision to determine practically the future destiny of Austria-Hungary. It was probably Sir Edward Grey’s faith in the rule of Parliamentary majorities, that led him in this particular piece of diplomacy into seeking to introduce the same impartial justice into the settlement of the Austrian-Serbian dispute. The alternative offered was, that Germany and Austria should formulate such
other proposals as in the opinion of Sir Edward Grey, Russia and France would be unreasonable in rejecting. There can only be one interpretation of this intervention, this pursuit of "the one great object to preserve European peace." No responsible statesman could reasonably have imagined that the Governments of Germany and Austria-Hungary would, in the first place listen to any material alteration being imposed by a rank outsider, upon terms which had in fact been dictated by Russia, and practically accepted by both Germany and Austria-Hungary, or that either Government would consent to place Sir Edward Grey, of all men, in the position of arbiter of the reasonableness of any counter proposal which Germany or Austria-Hungary might put forward. We must give Sir Edward Grey credit for not anticipating anything so ridiculous.

Nevertheless, as the result of Sir Edward Grey's refusal to approve the Russian formula, the Czar ordered complete mobilisation of the entire Russian armies and fleet, and the world was told that the Czar would place himself at the head of his troops in Russia's determination not to allow Serbia to be crushed, and Sir G. Buchanan, later on the 31st July, telegraphed to Sir Edward Grey "it has been decided to issue orders for general mobilisation."
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On the 31st July, the German Emperor sent the following telegram to the Czar:

In answer to your appeal to my friendship and your prayer for my help I undertook mediatory action between the Austro-Hungarian Government and yours. While this action was in progress your troops were mobilised against my Ally, Austria-Hungary, in consequence of which, as I have already informed you, my mediation was rendered illusory. Nevertheless I have continued it. Now, however, I receive trustworthy news of your serious preparations for war, even on my Eastern frontier. The responsibility for the safety of my kingdom compels me to take definite counter measures. The efforts to maintain the peace of the world have now reached their utmost possible limit. It will not be I who am responsible for the calamity which threatens the whole civilised world. Even at this moment it lies in your power to avert it. Nobody threatens the honour and power of Russia which could well have waited for the result of my mediation.

On the same day, Sir Edward Grey received the following telegraphic dispatch from Sir E. Goschen:

Berlin,  
July 31st, 1914.

Chancellor informs me that his efforts to preach peace and moderation at Vienna have been seriously handicapped by the Russian mobilisation against Austria. He has done everything possible to attain his object at Vienna, perhaps even rather more than was altogether palatable at the Ball-platz. He could
not, however, leave his country defenceless while
time was being utilised by other Powers, and if, as he
learns, is the case, military measures are now being
taken by Russia against Germany also, it would be
impossible for him to remain quiet. He wished to
tell me that it was quite possible that in a very short
time, to-day perhaps, the German Government would
take some very serious step; he was, in fact, just on
the point of going to have an audience with the Emperor.
His Excellency added that the news of the active
preparation on the Russo-German Frontiers has
reached him just when the Czar had appealed to the
Emperor in the name of their old friendship to mediate
at Vienna.

On the same 31st July, the Belgian Minister
for War issued his mobilisation order to carry
into effect the military operations that had been
decided upon.

In the evening of the 31st July, Sir Edward Grey
received from the British Ambassador at Paris
this telegraphic dispatch:

The German Ambassador informed Minister of
Foreign Affairs that in view of the fact that orders
had been given for the total mobilisation of Russia's
army and fleet, German Government have in an Ultima-
tum which they have addressed to the Russian Govern-
ment, required that the Russian forces should be
demobilised. The German Government will consider
it necessary to order the total mobilisation of the
German army on the Russian and French Frontiers,
if, within twelve hours, the Russian Government
do not give an undertaking to comply with Germany's
demand. The Minister for Foreign Affairs (meaning
the French Minister) asks me to communicate this to you, and inquire what, in these circumstances, will be the attitude of England.

In view of the great urgency of the case, the French President, M. Poincaré himself addressed a personal appeal to King George, and caused it to be delivered by the French Ambassador at Buckingham Palace on the night of the 31st. In it the President said:

That if Germany were convinced that the Entente would be confirmed in case of need, even to the extent of taking the field side by side, there would be the greatest chance that peace would remain unbroken. It is, I consider, on the language and the action of the British Government that henceforward the last chance of a peaceful settlement depends.

It will be recalled that Russia had in substance previously pressed a similar appeal upon the British Government.

Sir Edward Grey’s reply to M. Cambon, of 31st July, stated that he

Had definitely decided not to agree that England would remain neutral, and that morning gone so far as to say to the German Ambassador that if France and Germany became involved in war, England would necessarily be drawn into the conflict.

and upon receipt of that reply on the 1st August, and not until that day, did France issue her order for general mobilisation.
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Thanks to the Parisian Press, we also now know the terms of the reply made on the advice of Ministers, to President Poincaré on the 1st August. It was so far as is material, in these words:

As to the attitude of My Country, events are changing so rapidly, that it is difficult to forecast future developments; but you may be assured that My Government will continue to discuss freely and frankly any point which might arise of interest to Our two Nations with M. Cambon. . . . I am personally using My best endeavours with the Emperors of Russia and Germany, towards finding some solution by which actual military operations may at any rate be postponed and time thus given for calm discussion between the Powers.

Having now established beyond all controversy that the orders for mobilisation, both in Russia and France, were only issued after Britain’s “attitude” had become a reality, the one and only loophole in the Entente armour was a possibility of the British Parliament over-ruling the Cabinet, and deciding for neutrality, and so we find the “atmosphere” again invoked and the Times on the 1st August, describing the situation in Russia in these words:

About 11.30 a concourse numbering 50,000 surrounded the British Embassy! “God Save the King” alternated “Bozhe tzara khraine” and even “Rule Britannia”! The procession also visited the French Embassy. Truth compels me to say that
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Russian high and low, awaited with the intensest anxiety to learn Great Britain's decision. The articles in the *Times* have done much to inspire hope, but, if contrary to reasonable expectation the British Parliament insists on neutrality there will be a terrible revulsion of feeling here.

It would, indeed, be interesting to learn how and by whom and with what object and cost this demonstration was engineered, and how it came about that the Northcliffe Press series of *Times* articles, to which the paragraph referred, published in a London paper "inspired hope" in Russia that there would be no turning back from the besotting lust of war.

On the 31st July, the Prime Minister at 5 p.m. moved, and carried, an adjournment of the House of Commons, upon this statement:

We have just heard—not from St. Petersburg, but from Germany, that Russia has proclaimed a general mobilisation of her army and fleet, and that in consequence of this, martial law was to be proclaimed for Germany. We understand this to mean that mobilisation will follow in Germany, if the Russian mobilisation is general and is proceeded with. In the circumstances I should prefer *not to answer* any questions till Monday next.

Not a word did Mr. Asquith say regarding the alleged German "infamous proposal," or the terms which Germany, Russia and Austria had
been able to agree for the settlement of the Austrian-Serbian differences, or the nature and effect of Sir Edward Grey's intervention in that behalf. Like his friend Grey, he maintained a strict silence regarding Britain's naval action and "attitude," on the faith of which both the Russian and French mobilisation had, as we have seen, in fact proceeded.

The Kaiser's mediation and the Russian-Austrian formula having both failed to stay the hand of the Czar, Germany at midnight, on 31st July, issued her Note peremptorily demanding that Russia should within twelve hours stop her mobilisation. On the following day, M. de Etter, the Counsellor of the Russian Embassy in London, communicated to Sir Edward Grey and five other Powers, the contents of a telegram from M. Sazonof, dated 31st July, in the following words:

The Austro-Hungarian Ambassador has declared the readiness of his Government to discuss the substance of the Austrian Ultimatum to Serbia. M. Sazonof replied by expressing his satisfaction and said it was desirable that the discussions should take place in London with the participation of the Great Powers. M. Sazonof hoped that the British Government would assume the direction of these discussions.

It was in these circumstances that the Times on the following morning—the 1st August—
under the special headline "A Democratic Duty," came out with a guileful article in these words:

The Five Nations of Europe stand upon the brink of war—the action demanded of the Empire in these conditions is clear. If France and Russia are involved in war the Empire must support them with all its strength—the reason is three-fold: (1) we must stand by our friends; (2) we have a vital interest in seeing that France is not overwhelmed by Germany; and (3) we must fight for the cause of higher civilisation by the force of arms, or our standards, and our civilisation with them will disappear.

After the foregoing recital, what a shocking tragedy the rest of the story becomes. On the 1st August, the German Ambassador asked Sir Edward Grey whether, if Germany gave a promise not to violate Belgian neutrality Great Britain would remain neutral, and Sir Edward Grey replied that he could not say that, that he did not think Great Britain could give a promise of neutrality on that condition alone. Furthermore, this now ennobled Asquithian statesman has told us, that the Ambassador pressed him as to whether he could not formulate conditions on which Great Britain would remain neutral, and even suggested that the integrity of France and her Colonies might be guaranteed, and that he replied refusing definitely any promise to remain neutral on any similar terms, and would
only say that Great Britain "would keep her hands free."

To avoid any possibility of controversy regarding Sir Edward Grey's statement on this 1st August, we will set out a verbatim copy of his own summary of them in his dispatch of that date to the British Ambassador at Berlin.

Dispatch No. 123.

Foreign Office, August 1st, 1914.

SIR,

I told the German Ambassador to-day that the reply of the German Government with regard to the neutrality of Belgium was a matter of very great regret, because the neutrality of Belgium affected feeling in this country. If Germany could see her way to give the same assurance as that which had been given by France, it would materially contribute to relieve anxiety and tension here. On the other hand, if there were a violation of the neutrality of Belgium by one combatant while the other respected it, it would be extremely difficult to restrain public feeling in this country. I said that we had been discussing this question at a Cabinet Meeting, and as I was authorised to tell him this, I gave him a memorandum of it.

He asked me whether, if Germany gave a promise not to violate Belgian neutrality, we would engage to remain neutral. I replied that I could not say that; our hands were still free and we were considering what our attitude should be (Oh, Grey! Grey! Grey!) All I could say was that our attitude would be determined largely by public opinion here, and that the neutrality of Belgium would appeal very strongly to public opinion here. I did not think that I could give a promise of neutrality on that condition alone. The Ambassador
pressed me as to whether I would not formulate conditions on which we would remain neutral. He even suggested that the integrity of France and her Colonies might be guaranteed. I said that I felt obliged to refuse definitely any promise to remain neutral on similar terms, and I could only say that we must keep our hands free.

I am, etc.,

E. GREY.

Moreover, on the 1st August the German Emperor likewise telegraphed to London agreeing not to attack France if England remained neutral.

A more realistic picture of at least sublime folly surely never could have been painted! It ought to be exhibited throughout the film world as an object lesson in the refinements of twentieth century political chicanery. The first reel depicted (1) the British Government on the 1st August, utterly powerless to remain neutral, utterly powerless to stay either the Russian or the French mobilisation which they, by their declared "attitude" had set in motion, forced into hostilities by the Nemesis which their secret Imperialistic entanglements had brought to the nation. The Fleet in the North Sea, her Expeditionary Army, and her Allies, all standing ready to strike in carrying out the combined plans of the allied joint Military and Naval Staffs,
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Russia is telling Sir Edward Grey that Austria had declared her readiness to discuss with the Great Powers the Austrian-Serbian ultimatum, and this notwithstanding that M. Sazonof apparently still adhered to the formula which he had dictated, provided its acceptance could be obtained before any frontier were crossed. Germany is inquiring on what terms Great Britain would or could remain neutral. The political twins, Lord Haldane and Sir Edward Grey, are together in the foreground, and Sir Edward Grey, with a winning tenderness in both tone and manner, is replying: "Our hands are still free—we must keep them free—Britain's attitude will be determined largely by British public opinion." Secondly, a public opinion without the faintest conception of the peril that ten years of secret traffickings on the part of Imperialist paragons of plain dealing had now brought to the nation; and thirdly, the absolutism of the "Wait and See" autocrat on Friday afternoon, decreeing not to answer any further questions, and adjourning the House of Commons until the 3rd August, and that within twenty-four hours all diplomatic words came to an end, and the most awful calamity in history was completely unchained.

The second reel of this picture film showed Britain being pressed by France and Russia to
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directly make it clear to Germany, that in the event of war she will stand shoulder to shoulder with them, and that failure to give this declaration was inducing Germany to believe in the certainty of Britain remaining neutral, and rendering war inevitable, and although France is reasonably and significantly seeking to ascertain Britain's attitude in regard to Germany's ultimatum demanding Russian demobilisation; for reasons alone known to His Majesty's Ministers, they throw away, to use President Poincaré's words, "the last chance of a peaceful settlement."

On that Saturday night the situation became exceedingly grave. News had been received from the British Ambassador at Berlin. The dispatch was as follows:

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said that Austria's readiness to discuss was the result of German influence at Vienna, and had not Russia mobilised against Germany all would have been well. But Russia, by abstaining from answering Germany's demand that she should demobilise had caused Germany to mobilise also. Russia had said that her mobilisation did not necessarily imply war, and that she could perfectly well remain mobilised for months without making war (this was evidently the waiting attitude suggestion of Sir Edward Grey). This was not the case with Germany. She had the speed and Russia had the numbers, and the safety of the German Empire forbade that Germany should allow Russia time to bring up masses of troops from all
parts of her wide Dominions. The situation now was that, though the Imperial Government had allowed her several hours beyond the specified time, Russia had sent no answer, Germany had therefore ordered mobilisation, and the German representative at St. Petersburg had been instructed within a certain time, to inform the Russian Government that the Imperial Government must regard their refusal to answer as creating a state of war.

Cabinet had met, as we have seen, on Saturday morning. There had been some talk about the neutrality of Belgium, but that apparently did not then appeal to all the Members of the Cabinet a sufficient justification for declaring war, and consequently, late on Saturday, the Tory leaders gave their opinion, and Lord Chief Justice Isaacs, doubtless, added his quota of political wisdom. Lord Lansdowne and Mr. Bonar Law, with probably Sir Edward Carson, were all for solidarity, and as the decision of the Cabinet hung in the balance, to stiffen the flabby backs of the dissentients, and following the lead given by the atmospheric article in the *Times* of the previous day, a letter was sent to the Prime Minister on the joint authority of Lord Lansdowne and Mr. Bonar Law; it ran as follows:

2nd August, 1914.

Dear Mr. Asquith,

Lord Lansdowne and I feel it our duty to inform you that in our opinion, as well as in that of the col-
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leagues whom we have been able to consult, it would be fatal to the honour and security of the United Kingdom to hesitate in supporting France and Russia at the present juncture; and we offer our unhesitating support to the Government in any measures they may consider necessary for that object.

Yours very truly,

A. BONAR LAW.

Some light has since been thrown upon the real motive power underlying the "honour and security" to which the writer of the letter refers, by a speech made by Mr. Bonar Law on 2nd January, 1923, in which he said:

If an earthquake were suddenly to swallow up the whole of Germany, we ought to gain materially and not lose, because Germany was a rival—a competitor to a greater extent than she was a customer.

It will be observed that the Tory letter makes no mention of Belgium's neutrality! It was our obligations to France and Russia alone, that bound Britain to provide military and naval support at the present juncture! But the Government could not assign that as a ground for entering the war. The truth could not be told. Public opinion—the "atmosphere"—must be rallied by something savouring of a just and righteous
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cause. It was the history of all Britain’s wars that it should be a war of ideas, with the holiness of something like a crusade for justice and freedom about it. Serbia appears ex facie, to have been considered rather outside the pale of both righteousness and justice! It was not until 5 p.m. on 1st August, that Germany’s order for mobilisation was given, and 7.10 p.m. that war was declared upon Russia. British Ministers met in solemn conclave on Sunday morning, August 2nd, and again in the evening, and while these Cabinet Meetings were assembling, the Haldane-Foch Expeditionary Army was tramping London streets and throughout the kingdom for continental operations. The “crime” the Colonial Minister professed to denounce in May, 1913, was now in full swing “against the people of Great Britain.” The Cabinet at the morning sitting, authorised immediate naval aid to France, and the lawyer-members of the Cabinet then cast about to constitute Belgium the legal fiction that was to provide the sacred and righteous cause for declaring war. With the exception of Lord Morley, Mr. John Burns and Mr. Trevelyan, the consciences of the dissentients were appeased, they stood to their jobs and their £5,000 a year, and Lord Haldane stuck to his Woolsack and his £10,000 a year. Sir Edward Grey then
gave the French Ambassador the following memorandum:

I am authorised to give an assurance that, if the German fleet comes into the Channel, or through the North Sea, to undertake hostile operations against the French coast or shipping, the British fleet will give all the protection in its power. This assurance is of course subject to the policy of His Majesty's Government receiving the support of Parliament, and must not be taken as binding His Majesty's Government to take any action until the above contingency of action by the German fleet takes place.

I pointed out that we had very large questions and most difficult questions to consider and that the Government felt that they could not bind themselves to declare war upon Germany necessarily, if war broke out between France and Germany to-morrow, but it was essential to the French Government, whose fleet had long been concentrated in the Mediterranean, to know how to make their dispositions with their North coast entirely undefended. We therefore thought it necessary to give them this assurance. It did not bind us to go to war with Germany unless the German fleet took the action indicated, but it did give a security to France that would enable her to settle the disposition of her own Mediterranean fleet.

M. Cambon asked me about the violation of Luxemburg. I told him the doctrine laid down by Lord Derby and Lord Clarendon in 1867 applied. He asked me what would we say about the violation of the neutrality of Belgium. I said that was a much more important matter, we were considering what statement we should make in Parliament to-morrow; —in effect, whether we should declare the violation of Belgian neutrality to be a casus belli. I told him what had been said to the German Ambassador on this point.
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While Sir Edward Grey was citing precedents to M. Cambon in regard to Luxemburg, he might have disposed of the Belgium question also by citing the statement of Lord Palmerston, who not only made, but signed the Belgian Treaty of 1839 on behalf of England. When, in 1855, Disraeli proposed the neutrality of the Danube Principalities, Lord Palmerston said:

There certainly are instances in Europe of such propositions, and it has been agreed by Treaty that Belgium and Switzerland should be declared neutral, but I am not disposed to attach very much importance to such engagements, for the history of the world shows that when a quarrel arises and a nation makes war and thinks it advantageous to traverse with its army such neutral territory, the declarations of neutrality are not apt to be very religiously respected.

Lord Palmerston's opinion might have been a good and sufficient answer to M. Cambon, equal, at all events, to that of Lord Derby in regard to Luxemburg, but it would not have provided the casus belli for which the Cabinet was hunting. "Belgium," said Sir Edward Grey on 31st July, "will appeal very strongly to British public opinion." He had no difficulty in gauging the "temperature of the atmosphere" which the Parliamentary Division Lobby, at the instance of the joint Government and Opposition Whips
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would be likely to register. Lord Haldane then, at the request of the Cabinet, descended from the Woolsack and went back to the War Office and mobilised the military machine which he in 1906 had brought into being. "This," he says in his published book of 1920, "was done at eleven o'clock on Monday, August 3rd, and the giving of the orders took only a few minutes, everything having been prepared years before." And pending the arrival of Lord Kitchener, he continued in charge of the War Office.

Having thus successfully reached the goal of Britain's policy of Imperialism, the Cabinet at its second meeting with Belgium as a causa de jure, and Serbia and commercialism the causa de facto, officially labelled the war, a war for "righteousness," for the protection of little States, for liberty, the freedom of humanity, for the destruction of militarism, and all the rest of the common cant of Ministers. Now, what was meant by "righteousness"? There is only one answer known to man, and that is the righteousness which is of God, by faith in Christ Jesus; the Kingdom of God. We, therefore, placed upon the Nation's head, a superscription of blasphemy. On August the 3rd and 4th the free and independent British House of Commons duly assembled, the illusion of submitting the policy of the Government
to Parliament for its approval, and leaving the representatives of the people in their collective wisdom and freedom to decide the destiny of the country, and perchance of the World, was ceremoniously kept up, and Ministers having placidly assigned Germany’s *casus necessitatis* as the *casus belli*, and explained their official label, Sir Edward Grey, with finished solemnity apostrophised the House of Commons with the Cabinet’s assurance, that:

In this present crisis up *till yesterday* we had given no promise of anything more than diplomatic support, up till yesterday no promise of more than diplomatic support . . . We worked for peace up to the last moment, and beyond the last moment. How hard, how persistently, and how earnestly we strove for peace last week, the House would see from the papers that will be before it. * * * As far as the forces of the Crown are concerned, we are ready, and the efficiency of these forces were never at a higher mark than they are to-day.

Not one word of information was vouchsafed to the House, concerning President Poincaré’s personal appeal of the 31st July, and no explanation was offered of the Government’s decision thereon, upon which the President had said, “the last chance of a peaceful settlement depended.”

One could have heard a “beetle sneeze” all
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over the House, and after eight years of strict principles of honour and virtue we seem also to see "the beetle wink!" Now was it true that the Government had worked for Peace, and that until the previous day no promise had been given to France or Russia, of anything more than diplomatic support? That was the supreme question. Sir Edward Grey said so. Parliament, influenced thereto, by every appearance of political rectitude believed him, and the conscience of the Nation as represented in Parliament by the £400 a year dumb legislators, finding the country so hopelessly involved by the situation into which the Entente policy in diplomacy had plunged it, rallied as Sir Edward Grey predicted it would rally, to the "righteousness" of "the cause." "It was," as Lord Rosebery would say, "a strange and instructive spectacle. This political flock receiving its instructions in 'righteousness' from the Whips."

Can we marvel then at what followed. The British Parliament by its decision, both in law and in fact, irrevocably ratified the war which began by the orders issued to the Fleet on the 24th, 25th and 27th July, and upon the faith of which both Russia and France had mobilised, and under which as we have seen, every vessel of
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the line of battle was at Scapa Flow when this decision was reached, and Parliament thereby committed the Nation to all the obligations of war resulting from the secret engagements made by the British oligarchy with France and Russia, during the decade ending 1st August, 1914.
VIII. THE CASUS BELLII

In a preface which Sir Edward Grey wrote for a pamphlet entitled "Freedom," published in America in October, 1917, he, with perfect equanimity, said:

The British people had not, at the outset, time to consider where their interests lay. Had it not been so, they would have taken time to consider, and to argue, but as things were honour was so clearly and peremptorily challenged, and sympathy so deeply outraged, by the initial action of Germany, that there was no time for consideration and no place for argument.

Now even had there been no British policy of Imperialism or world hegemony, and Britain had been free from all alliances, and "honour and interest" had not "bound her to France and Russia" the pretext of Belgium's neutrality would have been the flimsiest, of reasons for involving our country in the greatest war in history, first, because it is a well-established doctrine, not only of English law, but Inter-
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national Law, as well as a Natural Law, which has been acted upon on very many occasions during the past hundred years, in Britain’s dealings with native races, and was affirmed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in many decisions, that in all extreme cases acts may be justified on the plea of necessity, if they are done to avoid inevitable and irreparable evil, either to individuals or those whom nations are bound to protect, though of course the act must not be disproportionate to the end to be attained. "Necessity knows no law" was the maxim on which, in quite recent years Lord Halsbury relied, in justifying the shooting down of Zulus in Natal in 1906, 1907 and 1908. Secondly, the very point was raised and settled by public opinion in 1887. In that year the official organ of the Tory Government, the Standard, on the 4th February, in a leading article stated in the following words conclusions and grounds that were as conclusive in 1914 as in 1887:

Would the violation of Belgian territory, whether by Germany or France, be an injury to our honour and a blow to our interests? It might be so in certain circumstances, and it would be so if it involved a permanent violation of the independence of Belgium. But there is all the difference in the world between the momentary use of a "right of way," even if the use of the right of way be in a sense wrongful, and the appropriation of the ground covered by the

162
right of way. We trust that both Germany and France would refrain even from this minor trespass. But if they did not? If one or other were to say to England "All the military approaches to France and Germany have been closed and only neutral approaches lie open to us. This state of things is not only detrimental but fatal to our military success, and it has arisen since the Treaty guaranteed the sacredness of the only roads of which we can now avail ourselves. We will as a fact respect the independence of Belgium, and we will give you the most solemn and binding guarantees that at the end of the conflict Belgium shall be as free and independent as before." If Germany (and of course our hypothesis applies also to France) were to use this language, we cannot doubt what would be the wise and proper course for England to pursue, and what would be the answer of the English Government. England does not wish to shirk its true responsibilities. But it would be madness for us to incur or to assume responsibilities unnecessarily when to do so would manifestly involve our participation in a tremendous war.

Can there be a doubt, is there any doubt what the British Government's answer would have been in 1914, had they not been forced by their own secret traffickings with other nations, into pursuing the course, which in Lord Haldane's words, "had been thought out."

The Germans entered Belgian territory on the morning of August 4th, demanding a right of way of necessity to the French frontier and guaranteeing Belgium's Sovereignty and independence unless she sided with and aided Germany's enemies.
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The French Minister at Brussels then sent to the French Government this Note:

The chief du Cabinet of the Belgian Ministry of War has asked the French Military Attaché to prepare at once for the co-operation and contact of French troops with the Belgian army, pending results of the appeal to the Guaranteeing Powers now being made. Orders have therefore been given to Belgian Provincial Governors not to regard movements of French troops as a violation of the frontier.

Great Britain then declared war on Germany, and instructed the British Minister at Brussels:

To inform the Belgian Government that if pressure should be applied to Belgium by Germany to induce Belgium to depart from neutrality, His Majesty's Government expected that they would resist by every means in their power, and that His Majesty's Government would support them in offering such resistance.

The Asquithian Government then sent the Haldane-Foch Expeditionary Army to France, to fight in France, as an Ally of France and Russia, leaving the Belgian Nation as a whole to look after herself as best she could. The Government not only failed to carry out its pledge to Belgium; but it failed to keep the military understandings of the inter-allied General Staffs. Nevertheless Belgium ultimately recovered from her deadly wound, and lived as one of the Entente heads.
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There was no difficulty in nationalising the War, when it was made clear to the populace, that in entering the War Britain in no way sought or thought of, any territorial aggrandisement or other economic or pecuniary advantage—*populus vult decipi!*
IX. RIGHTeousness

The Archbishops led the way, his holiness of Canterbury proclaiming it to be “a diabolical thing that the War should be thrust upon us by the Kaiser and his myrmidons.” Our towns were at once placarded with recruiting posters. Here is a verbatim copy of one of the gems:

MEN OF SUSSEX
JOIN THE ARMY NOW!

Do you realise the serious Truth, that
Your own homes may be smashed up,
Your own women and children maimed or murdered
The girls you know, and the one you love
Insulted, and worse than killed by
Loathsome German beasts and devils?

THEN JOIN THE ARMY NOW!

Men, just think a minute. Isn’t it wiser and better to fight this

MAD DOG KAISER IN GERMANY
rather than in England?
Then join the Army now!

V. T. Sumfield, Printer, Station Street, Eastbourne
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The whole country then impulsively ostracised all reason and clamoured for war. With the mouths of lions we sounded a bold roar of defiance and, like lions, as soon as one roared, we all roared together. The fire was quickly kindled. *Viresque acquirit eundo.* Commercialism now became a "sacred" cause, and was instantly voiced by the old glory band of the Boer War, our Tariff Reformers, our palavering profiteers—crafty, freedom loving souls, patriots to their finger tips, who have grown boundlessly rich out of the horrors of the War, and the misery and suffering of millions of their fellow creatures, our Jingo newspaper men with their pots of "atmospheric" vitriol, our politicians glued to their £400 a year, and the poison gases of the Division Lobbies, our food adulterators, our "trusts and combines," our slum landlords, our jerry-builders and so-called intellectuals. "Professing ourselves to be wise we became fools," and entered the arena with a wild whoop for "Democracy." It was the winning word, and it was used for all it was worth in urging the "righteousness" of our cause. With this *brutum fulmen* cry we created the stiffest kind of despotism.

The Churches, guided by the wisdom of the serpent, successfully subordinated all religion
to the purposes of the War. "It was to come," was the verdict of the Churches. "It was bound to come sooner or later," they said, and everyone who tried to avert it they venomously branded a traitor to his country. They sanctified "the thrill and glamour" of war, they put "no difference between holy and profane things," nor "between the unclean and the clean." They alere flamman sowed hatred in the hearts of the people, and joined hands with the scientific infidels of the day. They made the concentration of all human savagery a consistent attribute of Christianity, and canonised perfection in the slaughter of our enemies an exalted profession, and repudiating everything which Christ had commanded and blessed as set out in the Gospels, they openly taught the way to reconcile God with the Devil, Christ with anti-Christ, Light with Darkness, and Good with Evil, and with a hypocritical pretension of Christianity far more deadly to soul and body than any honest heathenism, they succeeded in permeating the Nation's devotions with a lust of war. Heu pietas! Heu prisca fides! They dignified collective egotism into the virtue of that patriotism that is so generally applauded in the heathen world and our nationality and love of self in its
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highest phase they glorified into a principle, a duty. In a word, their doctrine was:

One to destroy is murder by the law;
And gibbets keep the lifted hand in awe;
To murder thousands takes a specious name,
War's glorious art, and gives immortal fame.

Pulpits were turned into recruiting stands, and hymns were sung at war demonstrations. Having grown rotten with riches we exalted our money above everything; the Chancellor of the Exchequer declaring that nothing could stand against Britain's billions. A spirit of Jingoism pervaded the gullibles and the man in the street, while the female of the species, always more deadly than the male, became practically the backbone of the war hysteria. They yelled the loudest for killing. They served on committees in uniform. They took up smoking, and fell into masculine ways psychologically.

Dancing then became epidemic, and the Trans-Atlantic forms it took, were both shameless and degrading while the Nation as a whole followed the maxim "Let us drink and be merry if tomorrow we die."

It had ever been the policy of Great Britain to indoctrinate the populace with a spirit of hostility and hatred of everything connected with an enemy. It was so throughout our old wars with
the French, and throughout the Boer War, and in this respect it was only natural that in fighting a fratricidal war against Germany, we should follow the traditions of our race. Conservatives, who previously opposed democracy by every means in their power, now spoke of Germany as a danger to Democracy, as an Autocracy that must be smashed, and because they found their powers of resistance endangered, they had the bare-facedness to talk of making the world safe for Democracy, and to declare, that it was their love for Democracy that caused them to hate Germany. This spirit not only triumphed, but its consuming flame swept the whole Nation, and although in Germany throughout the War, that nation allowed unrestricted utterance of every opinion, and tolerated the reproduction in their newspapers of even enemy army reports, and the speeches of enemy statesmen, Great Britain and her Colonies, in common with another professed champion of Liberty, Freedom and Democracy—the United States of America—dictated to its subjects what opinions they were to form on all questions regarding the War, and enforced their views upon them by the severest measures.

We had not the courage of our forefathers, who declined to have their opinions and beliefs dictated
to them by governmental authority, and by that means secured for England the only freedom she has ever enjoyed. The glorious and inestimable safeguard of the liberty of the subject, which the Common Law of England, strengthened by Magna Charta, gave us, which had stood the test of seven centuries and secured to the subject an immunity from arbitrary imprisonment, now became a mere scrap of musty paper, and the Petition of Rights nothing but empty words. We hailed this as progress in the government of Man by Man! Commercialism proved the undoing of our race. Our glory had now gone, our character had gone, our sense had gone, and as an eminent French writer has well put it, our "religious ideal became wholly transformed into the sportive ideal."

The Supreme Pontiff of the Established Church vetoed the proposal to set apart a day for national "humiliation" as distinguished from "intercession" for the Nation's burden of sin, a ruling to which the bishops and clergy, with all reverence and meekness, obsequiously bowed their only too ready submission. "God gave us over to a reprobate mind," and there rang out from every altar, every editorial chair, the Universities, and every money-grubber's counting-house, the resurgence of the savage in the civilised State, in a
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gallop to Hades, and like Cain we "went out from the presence of the Lord."

Then came to pass that which had never before happened in the history of mankind. Almighty God "took Peace from the Earth that men should kill one another" and "power was given unto Death and Hell over the fourth part of the Earth to kill with the sword, and with hunger and with death" (see vi. Revelation, verses 4 and 8). "Hell enlarged herself and opened her mouth without measure" (v. Isaiah, i4). Now in this connection let it be remembered that the Almighty's four judgments on the Earth are (i) the Sword, i.e., nations rising against nations; (2) Famine, the consequence of the Sword; (3) Pestilence, the consequence of Famine; and (4) Noisome beasts, i.e., Men who have become brutish when severed from God.

Our Mr. Britlings were won over to the War point of view by Mr. H. G. Wells, Mrs. Humphry Ward, Lord Northcliffe, Mr. Horatio Bottomley and a tribe of other writers approved by the Government and the Censor. If only the truth could even then have been told!!

Lord Kitchener now became Minister of War. The dream of the Liberal Imperialist Triumvirate was fast approaching realisation. They were soon to see universal Compulsory Military Service
imposed upon the Nation, and their policy in Persia unfolded by Lord Curzon. England and Russia, first of all, secured the neutrality of Persia, but that did not prevent Russia holding l'Azerbaijan.

Britain's declaration of war was almost immediately followed by two Red Letter events (1) The great solemn Non-Conformist and Free Church conclave in London, attended by Mr. Lloyd George, when it was declared by self-righteous filibustering Puritans, all bitter men, mostly old men who had never shouldered a gun, and always remained far from the roar of battle "the Devil would have counselled neutrality, but Christ has put His sword into our hands," and although we had here our Saviour's Sacred Name profaned in an appeal to the lowest instincts of human nature thousands of hypocrites of all shapes, sizes and dimensions bordering on frenzy, with the aid of the uplifted hands of a truly precious set of Empiric episcopal and clerical Cossacks, suitably responded throughout the Empire in one grand "Amen," and (2) by what was called the great Allied Economic Conference at Paris, which declared an anti-German post bellum trade war having for its purpose the making of Germans and German-made goods a hissing and a byword in all countries, and the institution of such a
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boycott against her as would reduce her to com-
parative industrial impotence; while Britain
maintained a complete lordship of the oceans
of the world. It was not possible to conceive
anything more childish or ridiculous, inasmuch
as no one could then foresee or foretell, that
within six months of the conclusion of Peace, the
British War Minister would at Sunderland on
3rd January, 1920, be making frantic efforts to
counteract the policy of annihilation in these
words, "We owe it to our people that in
the race for commercial supremacy we are
not deprived of a share in that great German
market which was of such enormous importance
to our prosperity before the War," or that three
years afterwards the marvellous industrial reha-
bilitation of Germany, would compel Sir Robert
Horne, the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the
War Cabinet, to state in the House of Commons
on the 1st August, 1923, "if you wipe out Ger-
many's reparations to-morrow Germany will
renew her competition in the world's markets
with far more forcible effect than before the War.
She stands to-day with all her industrial organisa-
tions re-organised and with conditions of efficiency
such as we have nothing to compare with." It
was worthy of British commercialism run mad,
and the political Antipodian who came from
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Australia to tell the Nation what in fact almost every schoolboy knew, that “the War aimed at teaching us how to avert industrial annihilation and that without it Germany would have had in less than a generation, all the world under her economic control”; a pronouncement which, indeed, President Wilson confirmed at Rome in December, 1918, in the following historical words:

If Germany had waited a single generation, she would have held the commercial empire of the world.

Nevertheless, this petty trade and industrial policy, failing as it did, to recognise any connection between foreign affairs and the trade prosperity of the country, was solemnly approved by the House of Commons and can only be explained by the introduction into England, in recent years, of the American system of Newspaper, Tobacco and Food Trusts, and Soap and other Combines; “the big eating up the small”—by certain recently ennobled Peers, who have succeeded in interpreting the golden rule of “live and let live” by reference to a devout and pious trade smartness—lupus est homo homini,—and secondly, by the fact that it was more than avarice could stand, that while Britain in fourteen years increased her tonnage 49 per cent., from 14 to 21 millions, Germany’s increase although none of the Allied
PLAYING THE GAME

nations were giving Germany any favour, actually presumed to reach 78 per cent.; from a little over 2½ millions in 1900 to something under 14½ millions in 1914, and this, notwithstanding, that nobody in the British Empire was obliged to buy from Germans or to sell to them. If we bought German goods, it was because we wanted them. If we bought German dyes, for instance, it was not because we were obliging Germans, it was because we were too ignorant to make the dyes, and were obliging ourselves.

On the 4th August, 1914, this Confederacy of Imperialism, Judaism and Paganism allied as one common belligerent, and as Mr. Asquith has since said in "a common adventure" entered upon war. Britain's "ten horns" the power and might of her sovereignty and strength, were ten non-sovereign nationalities, each receiving sovereign power from the British Crown, i.e., Canada, Newfoundland, Australia, South Africa, India, New Zealand, British West Indies, British East Indies, Hong Kong and Ceylon, all of whom possessing one will, as expressed in popular assemblies, in some shape or form, became active belligerents in the War. It was the most powerful combine of "peoples and multitudes, and nations and tongues" the world had ever seen "rise up out of the sea." The rest of the world
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marvelled at its power. Great Britain sat a Queen as Mistress of the Seas. She was likewise the Money Market of the world, the centre of all finance. There was no end to her glorification. Her wealth and riches were beyond the dreams of avarice. The merchants of all the earth traded with her, and she bought their "merchandise of gold, silver, precious stones, and of pearls and fine linen, and purple and silk, and scarlet, and all thyme wood, and all manner of vessels of ivory and of most precious woods and of brass and iron and marble, and cinnamon, and odours, and ointments, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, chariots, and slaves, and souls of men." No other nation on earth had ever possessed such power, such wealth or such commerce.

The "heads of hate" allied to this mighty Confederation, always numbered six, at the outset they were France, Russia, Belgium, Japan, Serbia and Portugal. When, in 1915, Belgium, as it were, was wounded to death, Italy was led to the same Goddess of liberty. When, in 1916, Serbia was crushed, Roumania came in and took her place, and when Roumania in her turn was also crushed, Greece came into her place, and each of these allied "heads of hate" in self-deifying
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pride, placed on its head the Confederation halo of "righteousness." The continuity of seven heads of hate, which included the British Empire, existed exactly "forty-and-two months" until February, 1918, when Russia, having buried over three million of her sons and brothers, fathers and husbands, and suffered another four million casualties out of the fourteen million men whom she called to the Colours, repudiated her part in the alliances and her obligations for further war.

France, Russia, Italy, Serbia, Roumania, Japan, Portugal, Greece and Belgium, during those forty-two months drank of the wine of Britain's fountain of "righteousness" in respect of their participation in the "common adventure" in financial credits called loans, sums of money amounting to upwards of £1,500,000,000, viz., Russia, £570,000,000; France, £402,000,000; Italy, £313,000,000; and the other Allies, £119,000,000; and the British Colonies received upwards of another £250,000,000. Greece, for some time, was severely tempted by Allied offers and for a long period, by reason of her refusal of these offers elected to suffer even the horrors of revolution and the Allies' starvation blockade, but as we have seen, in 1917 she was compelled to succumb and under pressure of revolution, threw in her lot with the Allies.
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Italy's reward in point of territory was a secret Treaty signed by France and England on 26th April, 1915, by which Italy as her reward for breaking her thirty-two years' alliance with Germany and Austria and entering the War against her former Allies, was to receive the Trentino, the Istrian Peninsula, parts of Zara and Senbenico, with the territory around them on the Dalmatian coast and certain of the Dalmatian Islands that were entirely Greek and had been Greek since the days of Herodotus. This would give Italy the absolute control of the Adriatic and Northern Dalmatia although the majority of the population were 96 per cent. Serbians and Croats who had no voice in the Treaty and whose lands that never were Italian and never will be Italian were thus to be disposed of over their heads and without their consent. This Treaty was likewise kept secret from the Serbian nation.

Japan's reward was likewise a secret Treaty signed by Great Britain, France, Russia and Italy in February, 1917, under which Japan was to obtain as her share of the "common adventure" the Chinese Province of Shangtung, and the Port of Kiachow, from which Germany had been ousted, and the German Pacific Islands north of the Equator, while Japan on her part agreed
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that Australia should have all the German Islands south of the Equator. This agreement was made by diplomatic Notes, written by the British Ambassador at Tokio, dated 16th February, 1917, the Japanese Foreign Minister's reply, dated 21st February, 1917, the Japanese Minister's Note to the Russian and French Ambassadors at Tokio, dated 19th February, 1917, the Russian Ambassador's reply of 20th February, 1917, and the French Ambassador's reply of 2nd March, 1917.

These secret Treaties with Italy and Japan were confirmed by the "Big Four" sitting as the Peace Conference at Paris in May, 1919, who then affirmed by International compact, the very secret compacts which they, by the League of Nations Covenant pretended to oppose.

Another secret Treaty signed on 17th August, 1916, between Roumania, Great Britain, France, Russia and Italy, embodied the conditions under which Roumania entered the War, and the reward she was to obtain by doing so. The following were its main provisions:

Roumania engages to declare war on and attack Austria-Hungary on the following conditions, (1) to attack on 20th August, 1916 (eight days after the Salonica offensive); (2) Roumania to receive from the Allies by way of Russia, munitions and war material;
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(3) the principal object of Roumanian action will be in the direction of Budapest through Transylvania;
(4) France, Great Britain, Italy and Russia recognised Roumania's right to annex the territories in the Austro-Hungarian monarchy stipulated by Article 4;
(5) engages Roumania and the Quadruple Entente not to make a separate peace. The Quadruple Entente engaging that the aforesaid territories in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy shall be annexed by the Treaty of Peace; (6) the present Treaty to be kept secret until the conclusion of a general peace.

In September, 1914, the British war prophets official and unofficial, announced that taking into account the season of the year and its natural concomitants, the "Russian steam roller" should reach Berlin within two months. Then followed in the garb of righteousness Britain's starvation blockade, a blockade that deprived our fellow men of the food which the Creator provided for them as well as ourselves to satisfy the cravings of nature; a blockade that was made more and more cruelly effective as month succeeded month, and which destroyed millions of innocent non-combatants and helpless little children and old people who fell victims to it, and notwithstanding Britain's sea domination in order to prevent even the remote possibility of any neutral country supplying food or raw material of any description to these starving populations from overseas, British diplomacy never rested until nearly every
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part of the inhabited globe had been brought into the War and leagued with Britain as either Allies or associates of the Triple Entente to drink of the "righteousness" that then exalted nations. No one of us, perhaps, save under very exceptional circumstances, has any idea of that hunger, which borders on and precedes starvation, and yet with the approval and apparent delight of the Chief Priests of all the Churches, we wilfully imposed it in playing the game.

Lord Chief Justice Isaacs, with gorgeous pageantry at Westminster Abbey, was in 1915 installed a Knight Grand Cross of the Order of the Bath, and according to the oath then carried before the Sovereign "to steadfastly maintain the Faith of Christ." He also became, first, the President of the British Loan Commission to the United States of America, then Special Envoy to the United States, and afterwards High Commissioner and Special Ambassador to work out, with the gilded financiers of the greatest Jewish city in the world, the financial problems of obtaining the sinews for carrying on the War and Lord Northcliffe was entrusted with the conduct of British propaganda and the chairmanship of the British War Mission to the United States, and under this exalted leadership and guidance the
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British Government covered the cost of War by raising loans, instead of taxation. Had they resorted to taxation the people might have grown weary of the War! By these means they succeeded in casting into the American melting pot some £400,000,000 in bullion of the British people, and £1,000,000,000 of gilt-edged securities of the British public which the Government had commandeered. It was no doubt in recognition of these valued Israelitish services to Imperialism, that Lord Reading's brow was first graced with a coronet, and afterwards rewarded with an Earldom of the United Kingdom.

Disaster upon disaster soon followed British arms everywhere. The ill-starred Expeditionary gambles first to force the Dardanelles by ships without the aid of troops, and subsequently in landing troops at Gallipoli on grim calculations and without adequate equipment, and later in Mesopotamia and Macedonia, proved ghastly failures, and cost the Allies in blood alone over half a million men. The British losses at Gallipoli were upwards of 150,000. That mattered little to the Asquith Administration. "I recommended" the Dardanelles expedition "as a legitimate War gamble," said Mr. Winston Churchill in the House of Commons on 15th November, 1915. A legitimate war gamble indeed! Yes, a gamble
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with the lives and souls of men; a gamble that has completely destroyed Britain's prestige throughout the East for all time! It was the same breed, that subsequently publicly boasted, that "in a single fortnight 10,000 tons of shells," made by noble angels, clad in white, full of exquisite tenderness, and purity of soul, had been "unloaded" upon our Teutonic brothers. Patriotic recruiting incitement continued apace. Mr. Lloyd George, of course, lent a hand. In his political ardour at the Queen's Hall, London, on 19th September, 1914, he said to the "children of men":

I envy you young people your opportunity. They have put up the age limit for the Army. But I have marched, I am sorry to say, a good many years even beyond that. But still, our turn will come. It is a great opportunity! It only comes once in many centuries to the "children of men." For most generations sacrifice comes in drab weariness of spirit to men. It has come to-day to you in the form of glory and thrill of a great movement for Liberty.

Ten days later, at Cardiff, on 29th September, he said:

We have escaped Conscription, and are not liable to the military tyranny which dominates the Continent. We have the protection of the Seas . . . the vast majority return from a war to tell the tale, and they will have accumulated experiences which will illumine
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their lives for ever after. For most people lives are
dull, grey and monotonous, and these men will come
back with a fund of recollection to draw upon which
should cheer and brighten their lives at the dreariest
moment, and if you went to one of them afterwards
and said "What will you sell your memories for?" they
would not barter them for all the gold in the Bank
of England.

These were typical speeches of British patriots! The
War still went on, and still British highly
placed persons at different times fixed dates for
the celebration of final victory over Germany
only to raise equally false hopes amongst their
believers. "You might as well attempt to reason
with mad dogs," said Richard Cobden, in 1862,
"as with men after they have once begun to
spill their brother's blood in mortal combat."

The Allied policy of 1914, enabled Germany
to obtain Britain's old Ally, Turkey, as her
Ally; in 1915 it gave Germany complete control
over the Balkans and all Moslem power, and
opened her way to Constantinople, and as far as
Germany was concerned, it materially destroyed
the effectiveness of Britain's economic blockade
and has finally enabled the Turks to emerge as
the true victors of the world war, and unreservedly
subjected all Christian elements in Turkey to
the protection of the Crescent. In 1916, the same
Allied policy wrought the ruin of Serbia and
Roumania, while the blackest feature of Britain's
blockade was the shadow of imminent famine which the "land of freedom and humanity" had then succeeded in bringing, not only to her own doors, but to the civilised world.

Again, the Nation was assured by Mr. Asquith throughout the period August, 1914, to the end of 1915, that Britain's splendid young men would not be conscripted, and that he would resign the Government rather than inflict, by compulsion, that sacrifice of the Nation's youth. The country, in its simplicity, relied upon his word of honour. Labour believed the Government, and even Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, who was at the time Chairman of the Labour League, wrote to the author "I am not inclined to put much reliance in the rumours about Conscription." Yet in January, 1916, the Government of which Mr. Asquith remained the leader, brought down and forced through Parliament a measure imposing compulsory Military Service upon all males between the ages of 18 and 41, and afterwards extended it to 52, whether married or single. Mr. Asquith personally supported the Bill, and at his behest Parliament thereby compulsorily sacrificed Great Britain's sons on her altar of "righteousness." Thus were the sins of the fathers visited upon their children.
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The Asquith Government then enforced against the citizen laws and regulations, which it was impossible for Christians to obey, without a deliberate and wilful sacrifice, of the elementary principles of their Faith, and the Churches crowned this betrayal of Christianity with a halo of Glory, even although both the Prime Minister and the Established Church well knew that the law laid down in 1 Blackstone's Commentaries 43, cited 2 B. and C. 470, where Blackstone clearly states that "if any human law should enjoin us to commit an offence against the Divine law we are bound to transgress the human Law" was still the Common law of England.
X. "ROBESPIERRE" AND "LIMEHOUSE"

In the autumn of 1916, Mr. Lloyd George, whom the Tories by their henchman—the present Lord Birkenhead, then Mr. F. E. Smith—only a few years previously had in the House of Commons in glowing colours, vividly portrayed as "Robespierre," now became the protégé of the Northcliffe Press, and the idol of the Imperialists, and thanks to his attachment to the "maker and unmaker" of Cabinets and Ministers, Mr. Lloyd George succeeded the late Lord Kitchener in the office of Secretary of State for War. He then in genuine Limehouse rhetoric proclaimed to the world, that "the fight must be to a finish, to a knock-out," and that he would see that the lot of the Conscientious Objector, was not made a happy one. Later, this Magnus Apollo, succeeded in creating a diversion in the British Coalition Cabinet, and in ousting Mr. Asquith and the Liberals from power. He then became the Chief War Lord of the Tory Warmongers; the successor to Chatham, Beaconsfield, Salisbury, and a host of other Conservative
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giants, and Lord Birkenhead became the Lord High Chancellor of the Georgian Cabinet!

The scheming Imperialists, and the "men whose hands," Lloyd George said, "were dripping with the fat of sacrilege" discovered in their revilement a man after their own heart, and with Tory pride, and Tory instincts, to use the latest descriptive words of their Georgian portraitist, they acclaimed Lloyd George "the greatest living Englishman," and when a few weeks later, after the fall of Roumania, Germany offered Peace by negotiation, and on the 12th December, 1916, an opportunity presented itself of stopping for Europe's sake, as well as our own, the heedless, needless and resultless massacre of millions of our fellow men, as well as the bloody chaos and destructive anarchy which has since reigned throughout Europe and Russia, the offer was received with jeers, and "by the unscrewing of cylinders of carefully distilled hatred, ill-will, suspicion and anger."

The Lloyd George Government, apparently aided by the propaganda of Lord Northcliffe and his powerfully effective Press Combine, by way of a counterblast to the German offer, now officially announced another "understanding" which they had then effected with France and Russia, whereby the Triple Entente
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agreed with one another that their Allied War aims, for the destruction of German greatness, should be limited to the following trifling details, and that Britain would never sheathe the sword until those aims were attained, viz.:

(1) That Constantinople should become a free port.

(2) That Britain's rights over Asiatic Turkey should be recognised.

(3) That the Neutral Zone of Persia should be included in the sphere of British activities so that the economic life of Asia Minor and Mesopotamia should be always regarded as a field for British enterprise.

(4) That the Provinces of Alsace-Lorraine should be ceded to France, together with the iron ore and coal districts and wooded regions on the left bank of the Rhine.

(5) That other territories should be separated from Germany and made into a free Neutral State, to be occupied by Russian troops until certain conditions and guarantees were fulfilled and peace concluded.

Russia's participation in this "understanding of War aims" was, that she should get:

The Western Coast of the Bosphorous, the Sea of Marmora, and the Dardanelles, Southern Thrace up to a defined line, the Islands of the Sea of Marmora and also those of Iuros and Tenedos.
At this time, Persia was firmly under Anglo-Russian control, and all her resistance was now completely at an end; while all reference to the War aims of Italy and Roumania, were adroitly omitted from the Allied Declaration; they having been honourably adjusted by the secret compacts to which we have already alluded and which still remained allied secrets.
XI. TRANSATLANTICISM

LORD KITCHENER, on taking office as War Minister, always said that the Allies could not win the War without that incongruous nationality called the United States of America, even although the peoples of the States with their tongues in their cheek, and laughing at neutrality, were energetically and feverishly supplying the Allies not only with huge shipments of foodstuffs and raw materials, but with munitions of war and financial credits running into millions; and were hourly building up for themselves colossal fortunes and had then, in fact, already increased their number of millionaires by an additional 20,000.

America, with her 186 religious denominations, her Jews and Antichrists, and countless creeds, but having no God, and recognising no Faith other than "America" and her Dollar, the Rev. Cupid Sparkes, and Billy Sunday was now to become Britain's salvation!!
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America, 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of Liberty:
Inventor of the airplane, the machine-gun, the
submarine, the telegraph and telephone;
And a National Divorce Rate aggregating 160,000
decrees annually,
Of thee, and Ellis Island, alone I sing!

(With apologies to the Bishop of London and
the singing of the American Battle Hymn to the
tune of "John Brown's Body," on her entry
into the War at St. Paul's Cathedral on 20th
April, 1917.)

It was, consequently, not surprising that
throughout the years 1915 and 1916, stupendous
efforts were made and every influence was
brought to bear to induce the United States of
America to come into the War as an Ally. The
Presidential Election Campaign took place in
1916. Woodrow Wilson, on the 24th August,
1916, in a speech delivered at Washington,
said:

That the American peoples were too proud to fight
and had no concern with the causes and objects of
the War,

and he secured election upon a promise to
"keep the nation out of War," nevertheless,
he took pains at the same time to ascertain,
that if the United States entered the War "to
destroy Kaiserism and autocracy" and "to
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bring Liberty and American ideals of Democracy to the German people "the German-Americans, and German emigrés, and the five million international Jews in America, would when the evil "Tag" arrived, surge to the crest of a wave against everything tainted with Prussianism.

Immediately Mr. Wilson was secure in the Presidency, he made it publicly known that the difficulty of the United States in participating in the War as a belligerent, was that the great Republic would not fight for any autocracy. To secure America's military and naval aid Russia and Great Britain first required to be converted into Democracies after American ideals in which every attribute of caste, rank, and social position is root and branch eliminated, and everyone is allowed to do what he likes, think what he likes, and say what he likes, save only that he must not also take what he likes.

Now as regards Russia. In January, 1917, it being suspected that the Czar's Government, after the terrible defeats and losses, and the complete economic exhaustion Russia had sustained, contemplated making Peace with Germany, the Lloyd George Government sent Lord Milner, a Member of the British War Council to Petrograd, on a special mission. He returned, as we were told, "with an indefinable feeling
that revolution was in the air.” In March, 1917, followed the Russian Revolution in esse, the Czar, on March 15th, was forced to abdicate, and Great Britain hailed with delight and enthusiasm the revolution as “the dawn of democracy, civilisation, and progress in Russia.” The House of Commons voted a resolution of congratulation and sympathy. British Labour followed suit, and the Nation having thus expressed its national sympathy and concurrence with the objectives of the Russian Revolution, Kerensky became another idol of the Allies, and was described by the British Press as the “Lloyd George of Russia.” How revolution was sown, and how the thing was done, was graphically told on 6th March, 1919, by Raymond Robbins, the former head of the American Red Cross in Russia, in his evidence before a Senate Committee sitting at Washington. He deposed:

Before Russia failed as an Ally propaganda of Allied Nations, and the United States, aided largely to bring about the downfall of Russian morale.

A wounded Russia thus became a poisoned Russia!

Kerensky, having secured the abdication of the Czar, sent him with the Imperial family to Siberia. By the destruction of the Czar, and the Czar’s
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Government, our Ally’s national life was-effectually killed.

Now, a few days after the Czar’s abdication, President Wilson was personally addressing the United States Congress and Senate, seeking powers to declare war on Germany, and after a short delay, occasioned by the opposition of a few legislators, the United States, on Good Friday, the 6th April, 1917, entered the War as an independent belligerent. There was not in the United States, a single instance of any German-American community or German Jew attempting to obstruct America’s war programme. The majority of both Americans of German and Austrian origin, and the German immigrants, with the aid of International Jewry, worked to win the War; the minority who cherished other feelings, kept them for business and other reasons of their own under a thick coat of camouflage. And even the districts in the Middle West, which one might reasonably have suspected would be safe for Germany, were among the very first to sweep the teaching of German from the schools.
XII. THE PASSING OF IMPERIALISM

THE Transatlanticism of Great Britain, the most bitter pill the Nation has ever swallowed, was the next move on the Asquithian chess-board. We took it with jazz, and the middle of the year 1917, saw the past glory of the British Constitution relegated to the scrap-heap, and Monarchy and Royalty become terms of reproach among men. The authors of the great "Imperialist" legend of World Empire and World hegemony, finding it expedient to bend our national Sovereignty to the democratic requirements of the United States of America, and desiring with the aid of America, to apply to the Central Empires the same revolutionary propaganda that had brought about the Russian downfall, now diplomatically executed a volte face and gathered into their councils the Colonial Premiers. This regeneration of statesmanship, this infusion of colonial forces of destructive Radicalism in order to capture the groundlings, undertook
with the same facility and sense of responsibility, as they have in past years enjoyed the spending of borrowed millions, and the conversion of colonial loans when they fall due, the task of converting monarchy and British commercialism, in thought and purpose, into what was to be labelled a British Democracy. In the summer of 1917, the collaboration of all this collective wisdom and statecraft, in profound ignorance of the destructive nature of the ideals they were proclaiming, and the cult of incompetence and despotism which will inevitably emerge from their torch, professed to discover that Great Britain and her Overseas possessions were already both _de facto_ and _de jure_ an existing Royal democracy; "a world federation of English-speaking nations, and that the ruling Monarch was _ipso facto_ the first President of a Royal British World Republic."

"No Imperialism" now became, _pro tem_ at all events, the brilliant slogan of the electric spark of Britain's Council of Empire. The propaganda of this so-called "Democratisation" worked marvels. It tainted the very sources of news, played upon the most sacred of human emotions, engrafted itself upon the holiest aspirations of mankind, and became the life and soul of our public bodies, civic and commercial associations, our male and female clubs, the Press and the
pulpit alike. The Isaacs, the Samuels, and the Swaythling Montagues have shared between them all British Christian rule over India and Palestine, Sir Matthew Nathan has become Governor of Queensland, Sir Alfred Mond, and certain Labour leaders, are now all sworn of the Privy Council. Our Soap King, our Yankee Astors, and other distinguished dollar-reekers are to-day Earls, Viscounts, or Barons, and British Aristocrats.

Nevertheless, ample proof of a contemporaneous continuation of the activity of the heavenly ways of Imperialism without the slightest deflection can be easily found by a perusal of the Imperialist literature of the Royal Colonial Institute for the years 1919-23. Meanwhile, all our revered institutions, our traditions and precedents of past generations are in process of being "democratised," everything that was once noble and good has already become a subject of sport, derision and low vulgarity. The race-course and book-making, the degradation of the prize-ring and pugilism, Transatlantic negro fox-trotting and jazzing, and the Charlie Chaplins have all found royal or ecclesiastical patronage; while the sex novel, blasphemous novels, blasphemous and sex stage plays and movie-pictures, are now part of our daily life, and to secure the Devil's
triumph on this earth, it only remains for us to repeal the blasphemy laws altogether. Titles of nobility, like present day British dukes and peers who cross the Atlantic, find a ready sale in the open market, and any artificial manure—king, hog-dealer, or sewer inspector possessing wealth—can, by purchase through our party managers or other dubious sources, or the employment of Society touts, acquire a knighthood, a baronetcy, or a safe seat in Parliament, the question whether he speaks the King's English, or through his nasal organ, being wholly immaterial. Every jumped-up parvenu or yahoo who boasts himself a self-made man, is to-day fully persuaded that he and his filthy gold have evolved into a little tin-god, and to make the transformation of Britannicus wholly complete, but without prejudice to a revival from time to time of the feudal pageantry of a long dead and buried past, on the Seventeenth day of the Seventh month of 1917, during the reign of Lloyd George, our Sovereign, on the advice of his Lloyd Georgian Ministers, as a democratic step, and "to satisfy the patriotic sentiments of the British people," officially declared to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Privy Councillor Smuts, Privy Councillor Schreiner, and Privy Councillor Barnes in his Privy Council, his determination to relin-
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quish the "House and name of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha"; being the House and Name of his dead father Edward VII., and that of King Edward’s late brother Prince, Alfred, Duke of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, and that of England’s greatest Monarch, the late Queen Victoria of Blessed Memory, and her late Majesty’s Beloved Consort Prince "Albert the Good," and thenceforth to assume the name of "Windsor" as and for that of his House and Family, to the end and intent that his male descendants in the fourth generation shall become "plain Mr. Windsor." One cannot refrain from asking oneself what would be Queen Victoria’s feelings were she to return to the world, to find the House which she and her husband created with all its Christian greatness, obliterated as far as possible from the annals of her posterity, by not Bolshevism or Revolution, but by the Lloyd George Government, and that within the short space of seventeen years from her demise, and that the England she loved and served so well should silently acquiesce in this political desecration upon the sole ground that to secure American support in the War, all British caste, rank and convention, must be made to conform to the socialistic susceptibilities of the Peoples of the United States, drawn as they are from every conceivable European and Asiatic
source, with their diverse hatreds and prejudices, and be free from all suspicion of Teutonic origin. The Germans at the British Court, in common with the German Jews in England, excepting of course that British patriot, the Right Hon. Sir Alfred Mond, P.C., K.C.M.G., M.P., now assumed to themselves British names, the Battenburgs became Mountbattens, Carisbrookes and Milfordhavens, the Tecks became Cambridges and Athlones, and so on. "Righteousness" was now taken out of the shop-window and the Nation was told that the War was henceforth being prosecuted "to end all War" and to make the world safe for Democracy.

In July, 1917, in an attempt to perpetuate democratic strategy, as distinguished from Imperial strategy, the first Prime Minister of the House of Windsor conferred upon "le Chevalier de bataille" of the War Cabinet, the portfolio of Minister of Munitions, and within a few days after making that appointment this now idolised leader of democratised dukes and peers, Northcliffe's "Man of the Hour" on the 3rd anniversary of the War, at the Queen's Hall, said:

The Prince of Darkness would not be a bad Minister of Munitions.

No one, perhaps, was better qualified to truthfully and aptly describe the sulphuric qualifica-
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tions, and attributes of the Minister of Munitions, seeing that the speaker had himself served an apprenticeship in the same office.

On the same day at a great intercession service at Westminster Abbey the form of words recited, in the Order of Service and intercessional prayers included this passage:

“Our record is clean before God and man: we sought not the War; the necessity for it found us unprepared for such a task as lay before us. We had laboured for Peace, but the choice was between peace, and the honouring of our national obligations.”

In the autumn of the year 1917, our hill-top and “no worry” bard in an endeavour to steer evenly between the extremes of timorousness and temerity, glibly told the British Nation, possibly as a sorry ode to Comrade Kerensky:

Russia is still on the ropes, * * *
Together we shall reach
The summit of our hopes!

Again, the Priesthood of the new democracy, notwithstanding that the Allies’ slain children, then numbered according to the figures, some 4,500,000, responded with another, and even louder “Amen.” Then, on the 22nd October, 1917, as the cause of the people still wanted further strengthening,
the same Sir Oracles with a sweet air of simplicity, delivered himself of the following homily of unadulterated Georgian breakfast bits:

Peace is impossible until the shrine of the War Satan at Potsdam is entirely destroyed, and its priests scattered. Time is on our side. The more Great Britain saves, the more she can lend.

How little it takes to fool the multitude! Great Britain, as we have seen, had at this period, out of the savings of her people, advanced to her Allies some £1,500,000,000, and to her Colonies some £250,000,000, in the "common adventure," and since that time, true to their cult of finance and waste, the Lloyd George Government further financed of the people’s savings, to the Allies, to the Colonies, and to stimulate concerted action, both Civil and otherwise, in Russia, at least another £750,000,000, so that "to keep things in the family" as Lloyd George cheerfully put it at the Lord Mayor’s Banquet in 1919, something like £2,500,000,000 of hard earned British money has gone to Allied Foreign nations, small and great, and British Colonies and the British lenders hold in exchange for their money War Bonds and securities of a like nature.

Next in point of time, followed Sir Edward Carson, who, in speaking at Portsmouth on the
24th October, 1917, restated the ethics of *Civilisation* in Christendom in these "democratic" words:

Not only ought we to take care to destroy in every country every German business and operation, but we ought to take care that we got that business for ourselves.

The Northcliffe Press, in giving point to Sir Edward Carson's utterances, published in the *Daily Mail* the following inspiring editorial:

We have suggested that at the earliest moment the Allies should commence a fifty years' boycott of German trade and shipping, that would mean and would be intended to mean, that Germany could not raise her head again commercially, during the present generation. It would mean that her export trade would be killed, and that she would be cut off from all raw materials, that are vital to her industrial existence. It would be a sentence of commercial ruin and annihilation that would shatter every vestige of German finance, shipping and manufacture.

Now, British progress in Transatlanticism seems at this time to have impressed itself upon American diplomats. Colonel E. M. House, President Wilson's unofficial emissary and adviser upon war matters, on the 15th December, 1917, upon his return to America from the Inter-allied War
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Council, informed the United States Press, that not only had Great Britain submitted to place her military forces under the control of the French Republic, but that the Prime Ministers of Great Britain, France and Italy, and "myself with our respective Military aides" were the only participants in the supreme War Council, and that "in France and England the influence of the United States was paramount." This supreme fact was announced throughout the States under Press headlines in half inch letters, reading thus: "American influence now dominates the European Allies." Not only was this an absolutely true description, but Colonel House might also have said with equal truth that the stabilised purpose of modern American high finance (which now held all the Allies to financial ransom) was to overthrow in all countries the monarchial form of government and indeed every government which Judaism and Americanism does not approve.

The National disaster which in the writer's opinion will undoubtedly overtake our trifling with this spurious democracy must necessarily involve a worship of incompetence, inasmuch as American Democracy recognises no superiority, and therefore has no sympathy with either respect, personal devotion, character or efficiency. Polite-
ness will become with us, as in the great Republic, anti-democratic, our failings will be assumed to be virtues, and rudeness democratic. The dominant idea of both the United States and Russian democrat is that the people shall be restrained by nothing, and limited by nothing in their sovereign power, and as God is a limit, God is a restraint, and just as the democrat of to-day will not submit to be governed by any ancient body of law which would check the people, so in the same way, the democrat does not admit of a God who sets his limit on the sovereignty of the people.
XIII. MAKING THE WORLD SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY.

On the 20th December, 1917, Mr. Lloyd George officially included in the British War aims "the democratisation of Germany."

The Russian Armies, having collapsed from economic exhaustion, loss of morale and overwhelming defeat, had no other alternative than to enter into negotiations with their adversaries at Brest Litovsk, and owing to Russia's pledge to her Allies not to make a separate Peace, the Russian Delegation on Christmas Day, 1917, invited the Germans to take part in general Peace negotiations, and asked for a ten days' adjournment to enable Russia to extend to her Allies an invitation and opportunity of joining with Russia in making a general Peace. Germany assented to that request, and when, on the Conference at Brest Litovsk resuming on 11th January, 1918, Russia was without any reply from the Allies, and left to work out her own salvation,
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the question then resolved itself entirely into a separate Peace between Russia and the Central Powers only. The way in which the British Cabinet and the United States treated Russia's efforts to bring about a General Peace, and to act with loyalty to her Allies, and her urgent cry to them for guidance and assistance in the agony of her fateful hour, may have been worthy of the combined "righteousness" and sense of fair play of Lloyd George and President Wilson. It was certainly not cricket!

On the 5th January, 1918, Lloyd George, in addressing Labour Delegates, declared *dorer la pilule* that Britain was fighting only to bring genuine self-government to the German people, and then on the same day he delivered a new War speech, the substance of which he had previously communicated to the other Allies and associates restating Britain's War aims in the following terms: (inter alia)

African Colonies to be placed under an administration acceptable to themselves.

Russia, having elected to act out of concert with the Allies, to be permitted to work out her own salvation.

Restoration of Belgium with reparation.

Evacuation of Northern France, with reparation.

Restoration to France of Alsace and Lorraine.

Evacuation of Roumania, Serbia and Montenegro, with reparation.
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Neutralisation and Internationalisation of the Dardanelles.
Arabia, Mesopotamia, Palestine, Armenia, Syria, to be restored to their separate rights of Government.
Establishment of an independent Polish nation, comprehending all genuine Polish elements.
Full guarantee to all peoples of the right of self-determination and self-government.

Now on the evening of the Saturday when Lloyd George's new War speech was actually delivered, Colonel House, having as we have seen now returned to Washington from London, by a coincidence, of course, was at the White House spending a week-end with President Wilson. No inkling was given by the President to any outside person that he contemplated delivering an address defining the War aims of the United States. Even some of those who ordinarily would have known of this work, were apparently kept in the dark. The manuscript of the address was sent to the Government Printing Office on Monday, 7th January, and when the Senate and Congress assembled on the following morning, the Vice-President and Speaker were notified that the President desired to address the two Houses in joint session at noon.

The President spoke as follows:

Gentlemen of the Congress,
Once more, as repeatedly before, the spokesmen of the Central Empires have indicated their desire
PLAYING THE GAME

to discuss the objects of the War and the possible basis of a general peace, parleys have been in progress at Brest Litovsk between Russian representatives and representatives of the Central Powers to which the attention of all the belligerents has been invited for the purpose of ascertaining whether it may be possible to extend these parleys into a general Conference with regard to terms of Peace and settlement. The Russian representatives presented not only a perfectly definite statement of the principles upon which they would be willing to conclude peace, but also an equally definite programme of the concrete application of those principles. The representatives of the Central Powers on their part, presented an outline of settlement which, if much less definite, seemed susceptible of liberal interpretation until their specific programme of practical terms were added. That programme proposed no concessions at all either to the Sovereignty of Russia or to the preferences of the population with whose fortunes it dealt, but meant in a word that the Central Empires were to keep every foot of territory their armed forces had occupied, every province, every city, every point of vantage, as a permanent addition to their territories and their power. It is a reasonable conjecture that the general principles of settlement which they at first suggested originated with the more liberal statesmen of Germany and Austria, the men who have begun to feel the force of their own people's thought and purpose, while the concrete terms of actual settlement come from the military leaders who have no thought but to keep what they have got. The negotiations have been broken off. The Russian representatives were sincere and in earnest. They cannot entertain such proposals of conquest and domination. The whole incident is full of significance. It is full of perplexity. With whom are the Russian representatives
dealing? For whom are the representatives of the Central Powers speaking? Are they speaking for the majorities of their respective Parliaments, or for the minority parties, that military and Imperialistic minority which has so far dominated their whole policy and controlled the affairs of Turkey and of the Balkan States which have felt obliged to become their associates in this War? The Russian Representatives have insisted very justly, very wisely, and in the true spirit of modern democracy that the Conferences they have been holding with the Teutonic and Turkish statesmen should be held with open not closed doors, and all the world has been audience as was desired. To whom have we been listening, then? To those who speak the spirit and intention of the resolutions of the German Reichstag of the 9th July last, the spirit and intention of the Liberal leaders and parties of Germany, or to those who resist and defy that spirit and intention and insist upon conquest and subjugation? Or are we listening in fact to both unreconciled and in open and hopeless contradiction? These are very serious and pregnant questions. Upon the answer to them depends the peace of the world. But whatever the results of the parleys at Brest Litovsk, whatever the confusions of counsel and of purpose in the utterances of the spokesmen of the Central Empires, they have again attempted to acquaint the world with their objects in the War, and have again challenged their adversaries to say what their objects are and what sort of settlement they would deem just and satisfactory. There is no good reason why the challenge should not be responded to and responded to with the utmost candour. We did not wait for it. Not once, but again and again, we have laid our whole thought and purpose before the world, not in general terms only, but each time with sufficient definition to make it clear what sort
of definite terms of settlement must necessarily spring out of them. Within the last week Mr. Lloyd George has spoken with admirable candour and in admirable spirit for the people and Government of Great Britain. There is no confusion of counsel among the adversaries of the Central Powers, no uncertainty of principle, no vagueness of detail. The only secrecy of counsel, the only lack of fearless frankness, the only failure to make definite statement of the objects of the War lies with Germany and her Allies. The issues of life and death hang upon these definitions. No statesman who has the least conception of his responsibilities, ought for a moment to permit himself to continue this tragical and appalling outpouring of blood and treasure unless he is sure beyond a peradventure that the objects of the vital sacrifice are part and parcel of the very life of society, and that the people for whom he speaks think them right and imperative as he does.

There is, moreover, a voice calling for these definitions of principle and of purpose which is, it seems to me, more thrilling and more compelling than any of the many voices with which the troubled air of the world is filled. It is the voice of the Russian people. They are prostrate and all but helpless, it would seem, before the grim power of Germany which has hitherto known no relenting and no pity. Their power is apparently shattered and yet their soul is not subservient. They will not yield either in principle or in action. Their conception of what is right, of what is humane andhonourable for them to accept, has been stated with a frankness, a largeness of view, a generosity of spirit, and a universal human sympathy which must challenge the admiration of every friend of mankind; and they have refused to compound their ideals or desert others that they themselves may be safe. They call to us to say what it is that we desire, in
what, if anything, our purpose and our spirit differ from theirs; and I believe that the people of the United States would wish me to respond with utter simplicity and frankness. Whether their present leaders believe it or not, it is our heartfelt desire and hope that some way may be opened whereby we may be privileged to assist the people of Russia to attain their utmost hope of liberty and ordered peace.

It will be our wish and purpose that the processes of peace, when they are begun, shall be absolutely open and that they shall involve and permit henceforth no secret understandings of any kind. The day of conquest and aggrandisement is gone by, so is also the day of secret covenants entered into in the interests of particular Governments and likely at some unlooked for moment to upset the peace of the world. It is this happy fact now clear to the view of every public man whose thoughts do not still linger in an age that is dead and gone which makes it possible for every nation whose purposes are consistent with justice and the peace of the world, to avow now, or at any other time, the objects it has in view. We entered this War because violation of right had occurred which touched us to the quick and made the life of our people impossible unless they were corrected and the world secured once for all against their recurrence. What we demand in this War is nothing peculiar to ourselves. It is that the world be made fit and safe to live in; and particularly that it be made safe for every peace-loving nation which, like our own, wishes to live its own life, determine its own institutions, be assured of justice and fair dealings by the other peoples of the world as against force and selfish aggression. All the peoples of the world are in effect partners in this interest and for our own part we see very clearly that unless justice be done to others it will not be done to us. The programme of the World's peace, therefore,
PLAYING THE GAME

is our programme, and that programme, the only possible programme as we see it is this:

(1) Open convenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private "understanding" of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

(2) Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by International action for the enforcement of International Covenants.

(3) The removal so far as possible of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

(4) Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will reduce to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

(5) Free, open-minded and absolutely impartial adjustment of all Colonial claims based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty, the interests of the population concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the Government whose title is to be determined.

(6) The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest co-operation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need, and may herself desire. The treatment accorded to Russia by
her sister nations in the months to come, will be the acid test of their goodwill, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

(7) Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of International Law is for ever impaired.

(8) All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly fifty years should be righted, in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interests of all.

(9) A re-adjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognisable lines of nationality.

(10) The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safe-guarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.

(11) Roumania, Serbia and Montenegro should be evacuated, occupied territories restored, Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea; and the relations of the several Balkan States to one another determined by friendly counsel along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and International guarantees of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan States should be entered into.
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(12) The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under International guarantees.

(13) An independent Polish State should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by International covenant.

(14) A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small States alike.

President Wilson, having, like the Chinese, diplomatically we will say, wrapped up his fourteen rubrics as well as his real objectives with the double purpose of influencing the Russian Revolutionaries to hold out, and to induce revolution in Germany, now made it perfectly plain that the United States would never be a party to any negotiation for Peace with the Emperor William as head of the German Empire. Great Britain likewise demanded that Germany should repudiate the Hohenzollern dynasty, and what President Wilson and the Lloyd George Government by implication now put forward was, that
if the German Nation wanted Peace, she must first renounce her rulers;—the source of all German greatness,—and upon this being done Peace would be easily obtainable. The Revolution that forced the Czar’s abdication had provided an excellent precedent for the destruction of Germany from within! President Wilson’s address was distributed to every news centre in the civilised world through the same publicity machinery which was utilised in sending broadcast the President’s address at the opening of Congress on December 4th, while the entire American Press openly proclaimed that members of both Houses professed to believe that Germany might find the terms laid down acceptable as a basis of negotiation; “a light for the German people themselves when they want to see it.”

It was also authoritatively stated “that in the opinion of President Wilson the psychological moment had arrived for the presentation of this address as it was necessary to prevent a resumption of the Brest-Litovsk negotiations.” On the following day the British Press hailed the President’s message as the “World’s New Charter,” and the United States then claimed a superiority in benevolence, and in the eyes and faith of the world’s multitudes President Wilson by this new charter and governmental promises, was not
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only looked upon as the saviour of mankind, but as able by the great Republic's superiority in science as in everything else, to work miracles, and to bring scientifically fire down from Heaven.

As an additional light to the peoples of the Central Powers, on the 10th January, 1918, Secretary Baker told the United States Congress, and through Congress the world, that Uncle Sam had broken the World's War Record, that in nine months the United States had trained and equipped an army from 9,524 officers to 110,856 officers, and from 202,510 men to 1,428,650 men, and this statement by the same publicity machinery was also distributed to the same news centres, including both Russia and Germany. Now, no such attempt at camouflage had ever before been attempted in the history of war records, nor is it ever likely to be repeated again by civilised nations. Truthful Uncle Sam "to buck up the French" eclipsed himself, at a moment when certainly nothing like 50,000 men had in fact been sent to the Western Front, and even those men were actually at that time being supplied by France and England with both guns and winter clothing. All that the United States had in fact done up to January, 1918, beyond promising to "stake their all in saving mankind from German barbarism" and to send
an armada of "thousands of aeroplanes to destroy German towns from the air" was this:—on the 6th September, 1917—five months after America's declaration of war and about two months after King George's democratic proclama-
tion, the United States Government called to the Colours and sent into camp with her National Guard, her first draft of conscripted men. The United States, at this time, possessed 200 aero-
planes only. In October, 1917, they despatched to France as "an instalment of the millions to follow" a few thousand of her Standing Army, and these men, as we have seen, were practically sent without ordnance or equipment. It was January, 1918, before even the conscripted men were furnished with rifles. On the 26th January, Surgeon-General Corgas reported to the United States Senate, that hospital construction had been stopped to enable the workmen to go on with barrack construction, and that hospital facilities in many of the training camps, were both incomplete and inadequate; while early in January, 1918, French Generals were telegraphing to the United States, that "if they did not send troops quickly, the French would all be dead," and General Pershing was cabling his Government "to buck up the French." Of the much advertised 2,000 wooden ships that
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the United States in May, 1917, promised to construct to carry food to Europe, one had been launched up to February, 1918. It reminds the writer of the boastings which he, in America, both heard and read of the great Republic's humanitarian commission for the relief of Belgium and its self-sacrifice in that behalf; but there was one fact the boasters quite omitted to state, and that was, that the expense of the relief administered by Mr. Hoover, was met by loans to the Belgian Government, i.e., the £500,000 monthly contributed by England, £400,000 monthly contributed by France, and £100,000 monthly contributed by Holland, and that the outside contribution of the United States, was a mere drop in the bucket, in comparison with the millions of dollars the Americans spend monthly on pork, candies, ice-cream, and chewing-gum, and ranking per capita, far behind the annual sum, which little New Zealand, with a population a hundred times below that of the great Republic, and even poor war-ridden Italy, each contributed to the Belgian Relief Fund.

Whatever influence President Wilson's action and Secretary Baker's camouflage may have had upon the German people, it is certain that the "sincere and earnest" men referred to by the President, as on the 8th January, 1918, controll-
playing the Russian Government, knew more of the diplomatic and altruistic pronouncements of President Wilson, than the Germans appear to have known. The Russians were neither deceived nor intimidated. They concluded a separate Peace with Germany, and in February, 1918, they renounced and declared void the Entente Alliances, the Entente War aims, and the Anglo-Russian Accord, of 1907, they disclaimed all designs upon Persia, and refused to recognise the National debts contracted by the Czar's Government, or the validity of the industrial contracts and concessions accorded by that Government to foreigners, including the £570,000,000 which Great Britain had advanced the Government of the Czar in the "common adventure," and the £1,040,000,000 lent by the French under the Franco-Russian Alliance, and also the $188,000,000 dollars advanced by the United States of America. Thereupon the attitude of the Governments of Great Britain, France and America towards Russia completely changed. President Wilson's "sincere and earnest" men were now denounced as the enemies of mankind, and the Lloyd George Government then set to work to wreck the Russian Revolution which they had previously blessed.

Since setting about the work of "democratisation" which we call the handing over to
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the imperfectly educated masses, the whole and sole control of the Nation's destinies, free from even the right which Democracy in the United States reserves to the judicature to pronounce a judgment upon any ill-considered and revolutionary change, Great Britain, by the aid of Trans-Atlantic science and humanitarian poise, has developed and organised air forces and with advantage used them not only in dropping bombs on our German enemies, but as effective factors of military superiority in the annihilation of defeated and retreating Turks; in Palestine, in 1918, the bombing of defeated and retreating Bulgarians from Salonika, and against uncivilised enemies, such as the Afghans, in 1919, against the Mahsuds, the Waziris and the Moplahs in India, during the years 1919 to 1921, and more recently against a small tribe of Bondelzwart Hottentots in South-West Africa, and with the blessing of all the Churches, she is in secret co-ordination with her Overseas dominions, still going forward with unabating intensity, spending millions annually in equipping and organising colossal air, and naval and military forces, for the destruction at Armageddon, of all potential enemies. The future of British militarism is for political reasons gradually passing from Britain, to the Overseas dominions.
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On the 2nd May, 1918, following upon Russia's repudiation of the Entente, the Persian Government in its turn, declared null and void, all the benefits accruing to Russia, by reason of her participation in the Anglo-Russian Agreement, of 1907, and officially terminated Russia's interests in Persia, which left Britain practically the master of Persia. Then, in order to assist Russia's democratic enlightenment, Expeditionary Armies of Britain and the United States, invaded Northern Russia, via Archangel, Siberia and Vladivostock in order to link up with Russian Whites against Russian Bolsheviks, somewhere in Siberia. The Russian Soviet Government declared these educational invasions an act of war, with the result that British and American Armies during the years 1918 and 1919 fought in Russia their former suffering comrades in arms. The Lloyd George Government, with a keen sense of justice, also extended to the Russian peoples, the same starvation blockade which Britain had for four years sought to enforce against Germany, even although it could not be said that Russia had been guilty of any crime, against the Allies either on land or sea. This humane and generous treatment evidently made itself felt as early as the winter of 1918. Mr. Herbert Hoover, then the American Director General of Relief Work in Europe, in a
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statement which he issued on the 14th April, 1919, regarding Russia, reported:

That the gravity of the situation could not be over-estimated, and that a very conservative estimate showed that upwards of 200,000 people were then directly or indirectly dying from a shortage of food monthly, and that the situation was growing in intensity.

Nevertheless, "justice" continued to be made more and more severe. "Man's inhumanity to man" knew no bounds, and as the result, Bolshevism grew rapidly apace. In President Wilson's words "the treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months following the 8th January, 1918, will ever remain a monument of the acid test of their goodwill, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy."

Since the Armistice of 1918, and throughout 1919, the Cabinet Spenders of other people's money, for futile and lunatic reasons, gambled away and melted into thin air to disappear for ever only some £118,000,000 in financing civil warfare and military aggression, in Russia. Various factions of the Russian peoples generalled by Judenitch, Denikin, Kolchack and Wrangel, including sections of the old reactionary
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autocracy, and Czecho-Slavs;—enemy prisoners of war in Russia,—were not only financed but equipped with munitions, tanks, battleships, aeroplanes, and poison gases, and even with attached British officers, British soldiers, to kill and destroy their brothers, and in rendering all life in Siberia, the Don, and the Ukraine, unendurable. It is true that Wrangel's army was not directly aided as a fighting force, by the British War Office, although France's retainer of General Wrangel was diplomatically acquiesced in by Great Britain on moral grounds, and his forces were largely financed by the aid of British money, and yet when the armies of Generals Judenitch, Denikin, Kolchack and Wrangel suffered defeat at the hands of the Soviet troops, the Lloyd George Government, following the precedents of Belgium, Serbia, Greece, Roumania and Poland, not only left them to their fate, but in June, 1920, actually grovelled before Bolshevik gold, and declared in the House of Commons, that "there was no precedent that you should not trade with a country because you abhorred its Government." Is it any wonder, then, that the Russians regard Western Civilisation, principles and methods, as un-Russian, and our revolutionary tactics and aggressions, as the greatest crime ever committed against their
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nation, or that they hate the Anglo-Saxon race, with a renewed hatred of past centuries, when they recall the way in which they, as a nation, entered the War, and the sacrifices they made for "righteousness" during the years 1914, 1915 and 1916.

Now, the Soviet Government of Russia, having in February, 1918, abandoned, as we have already seen, all Russian interests in Persia, a military expedition of British and Colonial troops was subsequently despatched on board the P. and O. liner "Malwa," camouflaged by dockyard artists, to make common cause with Armenians, Georgians, and Tartars, and raise and train local native levies for another "legitimate war gamble," and although we had beyond all other nations, expressed so much horror of the German violation of Belgium's neutrality, we now flagrantly invaded Persian territory, and ignored all Persian protests as well as the protests and warnings of Sir Charles Marling, the British Minister at Teheran. It is, of course, true that when the Crusaders reached Persian territory they made it perfectly clear to the Persian nation that they had no thought of grabbing anything Persian, that nothing was further from their intentions, and that the military measures were attributable only to a solicitude to protect and defend Persia's right
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to self-determination, only to find that the advance agents of this "solicitude" in providing supplies for the armies of the invaders, had cornered all available Persian wheat and grain to sell it to the dogs of war at war prices, with the result, as Major Donohoe, in his book "With the Persian Expedition," has told us, the Crusaders found from the ravages of famine "an elf-like people in whom months of semi-starvation with poor bread, at a price equivalent to ten shillings for a 7 lb. loaf had bred something of the sullen ferocity of a pack of famishing wolves," and "a hunger mortality at Hamaden totalling, according to the figures of the British Consul, at a modest estimate 200 corpses daily, and foodless people, driven crazy by their sufferings, resorting to eating the flesh of their own little children." This horrible thing was only another episode, in the main design, of "playing the game."

For his propaganda work in America the "Prince of Journalism" duly received his fitting reward, and became a fully fledged Viscount, and on the 23rd January, 1918, the Associated Press telegraphed to the United States Press as published in the United States journals:

Lord Northcliffe has constantly refused to accept office on the Supreme War Council, holding that he
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can be of greater service to his country in his private capacity as publisher.

He then became Britain’s High Disseminator of evil belief in enemy countries. A “Propaganda” which in good old English is defined to be “the trail of the serpent,” and on 17th September, 1920, was described by Lord Burnham’s Daily Telegraph, as “lying suggestion, subornation of conspiracy, and calculated deceit.”
The now bloody history of the European coalition, was the direct evolution of the British Government's liaison with France and Russia, as the same obligations were brought into being under a policy of political secrecy, diplomatic subtleties, and evasion, and worked out in the interests of a vain Imperialism, and those selfish ambitions which always spell death in the affairs of men. All this occurred through my fellow countrymen and their representatives in Parliament allowing themselves to be lulled into a sense of self-complacency, inertia, and over-confidence in Government by subterfuge, and what has proved to be the tortuous scheming of a bellicose diplomacy. My countrymen are not, perhaps, altogether entirely to blame for their ignorance of the Foreign Policy of the Nation, or for not examining from time to time the Nation's position and its traffickings with its neighbours. Ignoratione rerum bonarum et...
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malarum maxime hominum vita vexatur! Still the Nation as a whole cannot escape its individual responsibility, for since Queen Victoria's death in January, 1901, we have allowed, not only the body politic to drift, but the union of accumulated wealth, and a luxury which rivalled even that wealth, aided by an opulent, selfish, covetous hierarchy, and a Church without a Faith using a form of godliness and a cloak of expediency, to lead not only to the dissolution of our National character, but even the loss of the Nation's soul. Because darkness blinded our eyes, we hated our Teutonic brothers, and left the conscience of mankind to (1) a Czardom of soulless lawyers and Jews, or friends of the Law and the Profits who to-day dominate Britain's national life; and (2) a political caste of Bailey-Martins, dabbling in politics in the intervals of golf and sport, whose chief zeal, in the sphere of politics, was in steadily "playing the game."

We were a simple, boastful, ignorant people, easily deluded, who, once fear reigned, went mad and turned away from Truth, and being apt too readily to believe the thing to be that which we desired, we became enthralled in the fatuous talk and braggadocio of Cabinet Ministers, and such Lloyd George balderdash and claptrap
as "Victory as Usual," "Business as Usual," "Victory Loans," "Silver Bullets," and the "moral turpitude" of our American cousins. We submitted to be spoon-fed as children upon fiction and lies which were stamped with a label as Truth, lies about battlefield visions, journalistic lies about atrocities, printed lies about the motives for the War, its objects and sequences, camouflaged victories, and lies appealing to our vain desires about that which was, and is, and would be. Indeed, no people thrive on camouflage so well as the Anglo-Saxon race and their newspapers. It is porridge to them, and the Jews know it. We are ever ready to swallow caravans of camels, when laden with falsehood, mean suspicion, and gross deceits.

We, from the outset, looked at the War with commercial minds only. We regarded the accumulation of wealth, and a vain taste for ostentation and display, as the first principles and foundation of civilisation, and while we waxed strong on the persecution of Catholics in Belgium where Cardinal Mercier was given a free hand, we deemed it inexpedient to protest against the persecution by our Ally Russia of the Catholics of Galicia, or the exile, or throwing into prison of the Archbishop of Lemburg. As self-righteous Pharisees, we not only betrayed and
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dethroned Christianity, but in "playing the game," and in conforming to the ideals of Transatlanticism, we relapsed into virtual heathenism. We enthroned in the place of Christianity, and Christian character, *amor nummi*, and Anti-Christ; what we call "Reason," the "first-class brains" of those who pass examinations and take glittering prizes;—"the great whore that sitteth on many waters"; *i.e.*, that which in the Greek is symbolised as Babylon, the "great city"—the place that should be the tabernacle of God, with men (xvii. Revelations, verses 1, 2, 15 and 18). In this connection we may well recall that when King Nebuchadnezzar in his self-pride forgot, that "the most High ruleth in the Kingdom of men," he became both in form and character, a "noisome beast."

We sacrificed all the blessings of life, and even our wealth, in dealing death to our own race, our neighbours, our trade competitors, and worse than all for this purpose, we used and profaned the Word of God.

Truly, did the *Morning Post*, on 7th October, 1920, proudly boast, that "in spite of all the suffering and all the loss of life, all the cruelties and violent deaths of the Great War, it will remain in the minds of our working classes, as that golden time, when wages were high, and no one
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was out of work," and well did Ruskin paint in living colours, the true condition of the British Nation, at the present day, "Worldliness," he wrote: "changes into heathenism, vice into blasphemy, the environment of the natural man which has turned away from God, which does not know God—this is both moral and spiritual Death—unbelief, which is Sin, which disobeys God, which cannot in that state know God—this is Hell!"

Again, in furtherance of our objectives, and in direct defiance of our Creator's injunction to the contrary, we not only consorted with the heathen races of the world, but having allied ourselves to them, we used every power we possessed, to make them the equals of professed Christians to destroy Christians. Not even foreign mission fields, the Chinese, the Siamese, the South Sea Islanders, or the Lamas of Thibet, or the savage races of Central Africa, did we allow to escape our recruiting attentions, or the power of our money, or the pernicious influence in the Far East of the Opium Jews of Hong Kong and Shanghai, until the whole earth now staggers under its burden of agonies. According to the best analysis of the conflict during the first three years of the War, the Entente Allies lost in slain on land and sea $4\frac{1}{2}$ millions, in permanently wounded, $3\frac{1}{2}$ millions,
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the number of those languishing in prison as prisoners of war, was at least another 4 millions; some 12 million casualties, and still our patriotism was not ashamed to flaunt its utter disregard of the continued widespread suffering and misery of millions of people, or to brand as traitors and criminals, every Christian soul who earnestly strove for Peace, and we dared to advance the sophistry that we wrought this thing, as we did the horrors of the war against the two little South African Republics, in order "that good might come" and "to make the world fit for Democracy to live in," in short we followed Evil, and deceived ourselves that it was Good. Be not deceived, God is not mocked. The wages of Sin is Death, to nations and individuals alike. We are already reaping an abundant harvest of the woes and human suffering, which we have sown and which under the stroke of the everlasting law always follows the sin of a Nation. Since their invasion of Western Europe, the Jews are now in a position to dictate terms, not only in every Christian capital, but in London. The national blockade which we ordained and cruelly strove to enforce against our fellow man, will as surely as the sun shines and Night follows Day, Malgré nous, recoil upon our own heads. Already, the British industrial
system and International credit, which were the envy of the world, are utterly shattered. Commercialism lies in ruins. Financial tuberculosis has eaten itself into our souls. Every kind of coercion, vice and immorality flourishes rampantly in the land. The sanctity of the home and family life has been blotted out, and we have substituted for it Transatlantic and Israelitish licence, true American morals, and American "pep," while only a miracle will prevent the terrible scourges of Asiatic leprosy, pneumonic plague and cancer from becoming endemic in Britain.

France's post-war sufferings were depicted by President Poincaré, at Brevannes on the 3rd November, 1919, in these agonising words:

The endemic terrible plague of tuberculosis from which France suffered always so cruelly before the War, has been fatally aggravated by it. How many young people prior to the War were in good health, are now condemned to become victims to tuberculosis. It has taken exceptional proportions in the canteens, the depots and the trenches, and it will spread when the men return to their homes. From a national point of view, as well as from a social point of view, there is no question more angoissant. Of what use was the courage, or our arms on the battlefield if our race is to be little by little destroyed by tuberculosis.

The coloured races of the world have acquired
a supreme contempt for the "foreign devil" as they are still pleased to call Western Civilisation, and notwithstanding Anglo-American beseechings and pressure of various qualities, even the Japanese refused to send either troops to Europe, or ships to the Atlantic, to aid us in what, in the autumn of 1917, had become our War of desperation; Japanese opinion being thus expressed in the Japan Times of 2nd November, 1917:

Japan's soldiers are not to be hired. The great ideal of the War, as explained by President Wilson, is to separate the German people from the rulers of Germany. Japan should not be permitted to join in any war aimed at changing the Government of any other nation. Even if Germany and Austria were destroyed Militarism and Autocracy cannot be destroyed. The greatest autocrats in the world at the present day are Lloyd George and President Wilson. . . . Britain expects the East to open its doors to exploitation by the white race, and reserve the right to slam the doors of its Dominions in the face of Orientals . . . In Shanghai there exists to this day a foreign park at the entrance to which is posted this British sign "Chinese and dogs are not allowed."

The author frequently witnessed in the Far East the most intense amusement on the part of the Japanese, at the efforts of Britain, to procure China as an Ally in the War, and when on 25th October, 1917, Mr. Balfour, then British Foreign
PLAYING THE GAME

Minister, announced in the House of Commons that China was a belligerent with Great Britain, and that in the sense of an Ally was taking "such action to support us in the West, as it seemed possible to the Chinese Government," and Viscount Bryce, in proposing at a dinner at the Women's Lyceum Club, London, four days later, Britain's welcome to China in the following words:

It was China's glory that she had felt the lofty call to the men of all nations, to take her stand on the side of righteousness and justice, and that now the most ancient people in the East, and the greatest Republic in the West were with us, we were confident of victory,

the applause, which in England followed these observations, proved too much for a Japanese sense of humour, and Japan broke her record for solemnity, and greeted the news with roars of laughter. The cause of the Japanese merriment, however, was not far to seek as the facts subsequently revealed themselves. In the previous month of August, the Four Powers Consortium, engaged to make in equal proportions, a loan to China of £10,000,000. It was signed on 29th August, at Peking, between Odagiri, of the Yokahama Specie Bank, representing the Entente Group, and Liang Chichao representing the Chinese Minister of Finance, and an immediate payment
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in advance of £1,000,000 was made to China at the request of the Group by the Yokohama Specie Bank. It was expected when this payment was made, as stated in both Chinese and Japanese newspapers, that the Chinese Government would support the allies in the West with an army of 300,000 fighting men, but after receiving the million sterling and the British adulations as voiced by our two capital B’s, the Chinese Government regretfully explained that China unfortunately found it impossible to furnish a force of more than 30,000 men, and immediately after even that modified promise was made, Civil War broke out between the Northern and Southern Provinces, and China then found herself at war, on her own soil, with her own people, and unable to spare any forces for Western “righteousness and justice.” When the two opposing Chinese armies met, some months afterwards, and had looked at each other, they immediately agreed to an armistice, and the forces returned to their respective ancient and happy homes, while China was financially better off by a million sterling, and an allied contract to provide another nine millions. In its deal with Western Civilisation, all the honours were apparently with “the most ancient people in the East” and not with the British Foreign Office!
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The late Lord Beresford was not far wrong in saying that many British Peers were toddling towards Museums. Think of the once powerful and Christian British Nation, imploring the Shintoists and Buddhists of Japan and China, to come and save her Empire, and the Shintoists, if you please, contemptuously replying "our soldiers are not for hire; your embryonic war ideals are not our ideals of righteousness or justice!" How every Christian's blood must boil with indignation at the depths to which twentieth century diplomacy had now brought his country. Moreover, in shame, the writer recalls the fact that he personally witnessed in Southern Seas, Cook Islanders and Rarotongans, wearing around their necks little sea-shells and native beads recruited and marched into camp to learn from British instructors the Christian "arts of human slaughter." At the end of the fourth year of the War, the number of these Islanders recruited was 398 Rarotongans, 148 Nine Islanders, 25 Gilbert Islanders, and 2,268 Maoris. It was no wonder then that in handling the "Word of God deceitfully" no words were too sacred to be profaned for either political or war purposes. That popular hero, the Devil, has ever been credited with an intimate acquaintance with the Scriptures, so much so, that he is understood to be able always
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to justify himself and his acts by a quotation from Holy Writ.

Mr. Lloyd George, speaking at the City Temple, on Sunday, March 13th, 1918, said:

There has been only one successful food controller in the history of the world, the One who made five loaves and two small fishes feed a multitude. Then you would have faced the War, and in the services with which the fourth anniversary of the War was observed, the Bishop of London, at St. Paul's Cathedral, said:

"Instead of blaming God, let us fight God's battles" while the Archbishop of Canterbury at Westminster Abbey, preached from the same standpoint, on the text

"Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain."

The defeat of Germany was not by the arms of the Allies. It was not owing to those who conducted the War, but to the actions and intrigue of International Jews and German revolutionaries, incited and aided by outside influences and propaganda born in the United States and in England, which were brought to bear on the German Nation, by German Royalties at Foreign Courts, and German Americans, all of whom, being bent upon destroying the house of Hohenzollern, ultimately succeeded in stabbing their Nation's
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national honour, in the back. The following reprint from an American journal of 6th May, 1919, gives a very good insight into the way in which, at all events, the propaganda game was played in co-ordination with Britain’s propaganda Goliath:

There was one powerful weapon which was used by the American army with startling and visible success in the closing campaign of the War, which was never so much as mentioned; there was one section of the Service which no letter was permitted to describe, and the very existence of which, the War Correspondents were under stern orders to ignore. But now the ban is lifted. So it may be said that while the artillery was pounding the German troops with shells, and the infantry was shooting and slashing at them from somewhat closer range, the Propaganda Section was silently bombarding them with arguments, busily unsettling them by suggestion.

It had the boundless satisfaction of seeing its suggestions followed. When the Propaganda Section would pelt the enemy areas with leaflets that broadly hinted at the wisdom of surrender, and when, perhaps days, perhaps weeks later, these leaflets were found upon countless prisoners in our cages, the Propaganda Section was entitled to a little glow of complacency.

Of the thousands of prisoners who passed through the Examination Cage of a single American Corps during the first fortnight of the Meuse-Argonne campaign, it was found upon examination that one out of every three had our propaganda in his pocket, and this despite the fact that the German High Command had decreed it a treasonable offence for any soldier so much as to have the accursed stuff in his possession,
which decree, by the way, also gave the Propaganda Section a little glow of complacency.

Our Propaganda Section may be conceived of as having started something like this. A Colonel, say—his name was probably Legion—exasperated by the Germans’ blissful ignorance of the forces massing against them and the lies their Government was feeding them on every hour, sighed deeply. “If only they knew the truth,” said Colonel Legion. “Then why not tell them,” someone suggested brightly. “Propaganda is nothing but a fancy war name for publicity, and who knows the publicity game better than the Yanks!” Now the difference between the Boche and a Yank is just this—that a Boche is someone who believes everything that’s told him, and a Yank is someone who disbelieves everything that is told him. That gives us a good start. “Boy, bring me a printing-press and four aeroplanes,” and so they began. Trucks continuously supplied with the latest arguments done into neat bundles would scout along the front, often somewhat painfully within reach of the German guns, and also supplied with the latest news as to wind and enemy movements. Thus equipped they could direct their balloons to the places where they would do the most good, reaching Alsatian troops or the Czecho-Slavak forces with appropriate arguments.

As soon as President Wilson would give an utterance intended for the world (which included the German army) the Propaganda Section would translate it into German and deliver it by the air route to all areas within reach. All the news of the German disasters, the steadily rising totals of German prisoners in the Allied pen, these were done into leaflets and delivered to the German front.

There were really two phases of the Propaganda—the general arguments designed to weaken the enemy’s will to fight and addressed to all the troops as far back
as the aeroplanes could go, and the specific arguments intended to persuade a soldier in the front line to throw up his hands and come over:

The arguments of the first class may be illustrated by such an insidious little questionnaire as this—questionnaires for him to think over in his bunk at night.

Several Questions for German Soldiers:—

1. Will you ever again be as strong as you were in July, 1918?
2. Will your opponents grow daily stronger or weaker?
3. Have your grievous losses suffered in 1918 brought you the victorious Peace which your leaders promised?
4. Have you still the final hope of victory?
5. Do you want to give up your life in a hopeless cause?

The effect of these arguments, aimed at the German soldier in his rest area, could never be measured. The effect of the arguments directly calculated to induce surrender could be measured by the number of Germans who, having obviously read and pondered over our suggestions did actually surrender. Of this class, two of the leaflets sent over worked tremendous havoc in the enemy morale. One was a simple translation of the General Order on the treatment of Prisoners, with such telling paragraphs as this in it: “The law of Nature and of Nations will be sacredly heeded in the treatment of prisoners of war. They will be accorded every consideration, dictated by the principles of humanity. The behaviour of a generous and chivalrous people toward enemy prisoners of war will be punctiliously observed.”

Another—and this really became famous in every prison cage from the Meuse to Grand Pre—was just
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an invitation to breakfast. It was typographically an exact reproduction of the official German field post card, its instructions began:

"Write the address of your family upon this card, and if you are captured by the Americans give it to the first officer who questions you. He will make it his business to forward it in order that your family may be reassured concerning your situation."

The reverse side—the message side—had this greeting to the home folks already for the prisoner to sign:

"Do not worry about me—the War is over for me—I have good food—the American army gives its prisoners the same food as its own soldiers, beef, white bread, potatoes, beans, prunes, coffee, butter, tobacco, etc."

And in every attack launched in the Argonne, Germans came forward through the fog sometimes by twos and threes clamouring for an American officer and an American breakfast as advertised. And they got it.

It was therefore not surprising that a starving Germany, to end the new and indescribable horrors, which another year or two of War would have brought to all the belligerents, should have declared herself in the fall of 1918, as ready to accept Peace, upon the terms and principles laid down by President Wilson in his Fourteen Points, and with that object requested an Armistice.
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On the 5th November, 1918, President Wilson replied to the German Note as follows:

Department of State,

Nov. 5th, 1918.

SIR,

I have the honour to request you to transmit the following communication to the German Government.

"In my note of October 23rd, 1918, I advised you that the President had transmitted his correspondence with the German Authorities to the Governments with which the Government of the United States is associated as a belligerent, with the suggestion that if those Governments were disposed to effect Peace upon the terms and principles indicated, their military advisers and the military advisers of the United States would be ready to submit to the Governments associated against Germany, the necessary terms of such an Armistice as would fully protect the interests of the peoples involved, and ensure to the associated Governments the unrestricted powers to safeguard and enforce the details of the Peace to which the German Government had agreed, provided they deemed such an Armistice possible from the military point of view.

"The President is now in receipt of a Memorandum of Observations by the Allied Governments on this correspondence which is as follows:

"The Allied Governments have given careful consideration to the correspondence which has passed between the President of the United States and the German Government. Subject to the qualifications which follow, they declare their willingness to make peace with the Government of Germany on the terms of Peace laid down..."
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in the President's address to Congress of January 8th, 1918, and the principles of settlement enunciated in his subsequent addresses. They must point out, however, that Clause 2 relating to what is usually described as "The Freedom of the Seas," is open to various interpretations, some of which they could not accept. They must therefore reserve to themselves complete freedom on this subject when they enter the Peace Conference.

"'Further, in the conditions of Peace laid down in his address to Congress of January 8th, 1918, the President declared that invaded territories must be restored as well as evacuated and freed, and the Allied Governments feel that no doubt ought to be allowed to exist as to what this provision implies. By it they understand that compensation will be made by Germany for all damage done to the civilian population of the Allies and their property by the aggression of Germany by land, by sea, and from the air.'"

I am instructed by the President to say that he is in agreement with the interpretation set forth in the last paragraph of the Memorandum above quoted.

I am further instructed by the President to request you to notify the German Government that Marshal Foch has been authorised by the Government of the United States and the Allied Governments, to receive properly accredited representatives of the German Government and to communicate to them the terms of an Armistice.

Accept, Sir, the renewed assurance of my highest consideration.

ROBERT LANSING.

To Mr. Hands Sulzer,
Minister of Switzerland, in Charge of German Interests in the United States.
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The Allies, and the United States, thus solemnly and distinctly contracted with Germany, that peace should be on the basis of President Wilson’s Fourteen Points, with a reservation concerning the dominion of the seas, and a specific interpretation in regard to compensation for injuries caused to the Allies’ subjects. The Central Powers, accordingly, laid down their arms on those conditions, while Lloyd George, on the day following the Armistice, ascribed the victory to Britain’s Idol of Propaganda, Lord Northcliffe, in the following letter of testimonial:

I have many direct evidences of the extent of your invaluable work, and of the extent to which it has contributed to the dramatic collapse of the enemy strength in Austria and Germany.

The Armistice was shortly afterwards followed, in the United States, by a General Election. President Wilson, at this Election, appealed to the States, to give him in both Congress and Senate a “democratic” majority, in order, as he said, that he might be America’s “unembarrassed” Minister of Foreign Affairs. The Nation, however, repudiated both the “democratic” Mr. Wilson, and the Democrats, and gave the Republicans complete control in both Houses. President Wilson, nevertheless, pro-
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cceeded to Europe, and became the presidin
genius of the Big Four at the Peace Conference
and ignoring the Republican majority and the
will of the American people, and following the
precedent of another Royal personage in the
purple, acted as his own "unembarrassed Minis-
ter of Foreign Affairs," and throughout the Peace
Conference and the duration of his arrogant
orations and royal progresses in Europe, he with
a thirst for self-advertisement, and *cacæthes
scribendi*, arrogated to himself, some of the highest
attributes of the Deity.

Everyone who was in England before the Paris
Conference knows that no effort large or small
was neglected by the British to associate them-
selves with America, and America with them-
selves in an Anglo-Saxon compact to control
and regulate the affairs of the world in accordance
with British conceptions, and within a few weeks
after President Wilson's arrival at Buckingham
Palace, as the result of skilful diplomacy, it
became manifest that no one of the issues, on
which British ambitions might be curtailed, under
the famous Fourteen Points would be raised by
President Wilson, and that in return he would
have British support for his abstract ideals,
and for the curtailment of all other countries,
whenever they conflicted with those ideals. In
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justice to President Wilson, it should be said that the existence of the Allies' secret Treaties was not only withheld from him, but kept a close secret until the Peace Conference actually sat.

A direct admission of President Wilson's claim to divinity is to be found in a letter which he sent to the great Jackson Day Dinner at Washington, on 8th January, 1920, in which he declared that "the United States enjoyed the spiritual leadership of the world, until the Senate failed to ratify the Treaty."

The Allied Nations, in all the proceedings at the Versailles Conference, had full notice of President Wilson's lack of authority to bind the American peoples, and deliberately accepted the risk of the American Senate refusing to ratify the President's action, and it was wholly dishonorable of Lord Birkenhead to say, at Montreal, in September, 1923, as reported in the Press,

If we had at the Versailles Conference only realised that the United States intended to live their own lives we would have been much ahead. If at Versailles we had known that the United States would remain out, many matters which have caused endless trouble in the world might have been spared. We should have known and been prepared for what the United States did with Armenia, and what happened in Greece, and in that case the Ruhr crisis might have been avoided.
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It was "first class brains" that then winked at President Wilson's want of authority!

Whatever the world may think of the German surrender of all her national honour, and all Germany's greatness, her action to secure Peace certainly entitled the Central Powers to at least some generous treatment in, at all events, a liberal interpretation of the Peace contract. As the Conference developed, it became more and more an Anglo-Saxon affair. The Big Four, under the Presidency of the world's spiritual leader, behind closed doors, completely gave the go-by to Articles 1 to 6 and Article 9, of President Wilson's World Peace Programme, which had become the basis of the Peace contract, and without any pretension to either valour or moderation, they evolved their own violent dreams of world adjustment, and the re-adjustment of racial groups, wholly regardless of any obligation arising out of the promise to make a just Peace, on the footing of the Wilsonian Fourteen Points, or any knowledge of the economic maps of Middle Europe. How they arrived at their decisions nobody knows, but enough leaked out during the four months these four men were ignorantly spinning the web of fate, to convince the world that the high moral principles which they each professed, were used to promote quite material
practical bargains, and "understandings," in other words the stupendous game they played, turned out a pure lottery, in which there were no blanks and only prizes or forfeits, spelling the complete destruction of Middle Europe.

By the Treaty the amount to be paid by Germany was indeterminate, and left capable of being fixed at a sum Germany never could pay. The crushing reparations schedule was subsequently in May, 1921, under instructions, fixed at one hundred and thirty-two billion gold marks (£6,600,000,000), a sum which cannot be reduced, without the free consent of all the allied Governments, and which is far in excess of half the value of the entire property owned by Germans individually as well as by the Government. Germany's ability to produce and hence to pay was next crippled by territorial annexations which took from her 15 per cent. of her agricultural land, 30 per cent. of her coal, 74 per cent. of her iron ore, and more than a million square miles of her Colonies—five times the area of the German Empire in Europe. What British Statesmen obviously aimed at, was not German payments, but the obliteration of German competition in trade and commerce upon the lines of Lord Carson's speech at Portsmouth on 24th October, 1917, the Daily Mail article of the following day, and the
electioneering pledges given by the Lloyd George Government to the Nation in November and December, 1918. If any confirmation of this statement be needed it is to be found in a recent admission of Lord Birkenhead, in an address which he delivered at a joint meeting of the Canadian and Rotary Clubs at Vancouver, on 22nd September, 1923, in which he declared:

It is vital for Great Britain that Germany should be saddled with the burden of these payments otherwise her competition might well bring about the end of the British Empire.

Again, this spoliatory Peace took from Austria tracts of country, in area three times as large as Serbia, together with all the fruits and glamour of centuries of Austrian civilisation, and awarded them to Serbia.

Even while the Peace Conference was proceeding at Paris, British diplomacy, by means of a British loan of £2,000,000 at modest interest of 7 per cent., succeeded in spreading over Persia the blessedness of what was termed a "single British sphere" conterminous with the whole of the country, with British and Indian troops in Persia to secure "internal tranquility" or in the more picturesque words of Lord Curzon, at the Guildhall banquet, given to the Shah, on 1st November, 1919, "the British Lion standing forth
as the proud and vigilant champion of the rights and liberties of Persia, and over his shoulder rising the orb of the steadily increasing progress and prosperity of Persia.” To-day, Persia stands a living monument of the colossal failure of Britain’s grandiose Imperial Policy, and the exploits of her oil and other financial sharks, in that unhappy country.

None of President Wilson’s Fourteen Points, were as much as discussed at the Peace Conference as was proved by Secretary Lansing’s evidence before the U.S. Senate Foreign Affairs Committee. On 6th April, 1919, the delegates of associated nations were called together at Paris the to meet the representatives of the Five Great Powers, and in its course the Peace terms which had taken four months to propound, were disclosed to the delegates, and they were informed that the Allied Governments had decided not to wait beyond May 18th for an answer as to whether Germany would sign the Treaty. The Continental nations stood helpless in the presence of the combined financial, military, and naval resources of the two Western nations which had emerged from the War with unshaken strength.

By the express terms of the Treaty, the world’s “spiritual leader” succeeded in superseding the old principle of balancing the Powers, by a
consecration (under the name of a League of Nations) of the hegemony of World Power that had brought victory to the Allies, into an image of the allied Confederation of "righteousness." The policy being to end the neutrality of nations, and apply if need be, (1) both starvation and the sword, against any member State refusing to obey the mandate of the League, (2) the use of the armed forces of all member nations as any two-thirds of the Assembly may from time to time direct, and (3) permitting at will, only the nationals of incorporated States to trade or possibly even work or live in leagued markets on any basis of equality of parties; the conception of the authors of this image being that the League should be dominated by the Powers assembled as a Supreme Council—M. Clemenceau being only converted to Wilsonism when he realised that the League was capable of being forged into the French military policy. Here, then, was a nation which had risen out of the earth having two horns, the Phillipines and Porto Rico, professing "the most sacred trust of civilisation in the interest of the well-being and development of backward peoples" combining with Judaism and the Empiric politicians of Great Britain, and likewise with Britain's Allies, to stabilise their joint national power as the soul of the world, and the source of Life itself. By the
light of all the foregoing summarised facts, read, dear reader, Chapter xiii. of the Revelation of Our Lord, as contained in the prophecy of St. John, and note that the "dragon" mentioned in the 2nd and 4th verses, symbolises the power of Satan, the power of an evil spirit, and the power of a material nature as distinct from God (see Ezekiel xxix. ver. 3; Jeremiah li. ver. 34), and then try and realise what has happened! Moreover, consider, in the same connection, whether there be any significance in the following additional facts: (1) that by the tenth century Christianity had emerged from State persecution, and under Alfred the Great, in 900 A.D. it became, and for the thousand years preceding the opening of the twentieth century, it continued to be, in common with other World Powers, the religion of England; (2) that during these thousand years, Christianity, and a reverence of the Word of God, was not only the universal religion, but under a dispensation of the Holy Spirit and the richest outpourings of His grace, it dominated and ruled over the whole world of human knowledge, and Satan was so bound that he could not deceive the Christian nations and bring them to idols; (3) that in the 666th year after the final destruction of Jerusalem and 666 years after the birth of England's first Constitutional King, Edward I.,
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Christian England by Treaty allied herself with not only the Shintoists of Japan but with the Jews, the enemies of Christianity; (4) that Judaism, revolution, and the destruction of Christianity are synonymous; (5) that Edward VII. was born in the 666th year of the British Constitution, counting the years from the period when Henry II. established the permanent principles of that Constitution which Edward I. subsequently linked together as a means to an end in setting up Britain’s Parliamentary Estates; and (6) that with the great betrayal of Christianity and the making of the Word of God into a lie, Satan—as the Word of God proclaimed he would (see Revelations xx. 7 and 8) has been “loosed from his bonds,” and since the death of Victoria the Good, he has been “deceiving the nations which are now in the four quarters of the earth. Gog and Magog (a perversion of the Deity) to gather them to battle.” The countries lying within the Australasian quarter of the globe, where militarism was wholly unknown, and the Bible has been excluded from the schools, for a quarter of a century, were in 1916 constituted Nations, and to-day, both in New Zealand and Australia, every baby boy from eight years of age, is being compulsorily educated and trained, not in any faith or love of the Creator, but in the
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glorious "arts of human slaughter," while even in the schools of the London Missionary Society at Bangalore, India, our Saviour's name has been deliberately banned from the hymns and prayers used in the schools.

The hypocrisy of the objective "to end all war," was established within four months of the signing of the League's Covenant, first by President Wilson, who, upon his return to America, publicly admitted that no League of Nations will ever prevent war, and (2) the British War Minister's speech at the Lord Mayor's Banquet, on 8th November, 1919, in which he said:

I would say, do not be too hard on the army now that the War is over. You may want it again some day in spite of the League of Nations.

Sixteen days later, on 24th November, 1919, at a banquet given to the Government Services, Mr. Churchill also said:

The state of the world to-day in no way betokens the endurance of peace, except from the point of view that the fighters are very much exhausted. People talk about the World on the morrow of the World War as if somehow or other we had all been transformed into a higher sphere. It is the greatest mistake. We have been transformed into a sphere which is definitely lower from almost every point of view than
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that to which we had attained in the regenerate days before the War. You may make what test you like. Take human nature. Never was there a time when people were more disposed to turn to courses of violence, to show scant respect for law and justice, tradition and procedure than the present. Never was there a time when more complete callousness and indifference to human life and to suffering—if you do not see it under your nose, was exhibited by the great communities all over the World—cast your eyes over the great expanse of Europe and you will see a scene of misery, or a torment, and of a malevolence which is not for the moment dangerous, only because it proceeds on a basis of exhaustion, such as the World has never recorded in all its history.
XV. THE CENOTAPH

As regards Germany, the Peace of La Revanche was far from being a "knock-out." There is no humiliation in defeat against overpowering deceit, a world of enmity, the treachery of one's friends and kinsmen, or the duress of an economic blockade forcing millions of starving people into practically signing anything, and yet at what a cost was this International Cenotaph of folly achieved. France's dead soldiers number 1,358,872, one million of whom were young men between the ages of twenty and forty years, and to-day 1,393,000 French families are dependent upon the State for daily bread. Great Britain's killed count another million, while the number of missing officers and other ranks, about whom Mr. Churchill significantly stated there was "no definite information and could be counted as dead," are now officially stated at 99,868, and it now also appears
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that upwards of 3,000 British soldiers were sentenced to death for "failure of duty" of whom 346 men and officers were executed. Italy's dead number 500,000; Roumania's, 400,000; Serbia, 369,000; Russia's, 3,000,000; Belgium, 44,000; United States, 110,000; Greece, 12,000; and these figures, without including Portugal and the Associated Powers, give a total of seven millions, although in the Allied Note to Holland of 16th February, 1920, the Allies stated the total deaths at approximately 10,000,000. The National War Debt which Britain contracted amounts to no less a sum than £8,000,000,000, and the annual interest on that debt alone will cost the British taxpayer some £400,000,000 annually; and since 1918 hundreds of millions have been spent in aiding and abetting every kind of revolution and warfare in Russia, in order to destroy the Government of Russia, in maintaining a war atmosphere, and military enterprises in Mesopotamia, in Persia, in Palestine and Macedonia, in Turkey, and in Peace junketings on the Continent of Europe, and according to a statement made by Mr. Lloyd George on 19th October, 1923: "1,300,000 of Britain's best workmen are eating the bread of charity because we went to help France in 1914."
PLAYING THE GAME

Truly has the “Great Babylon,” that deserted the worship of the true God, for that of the love of Self and the power of Money, brought “the times of the Gentiles to an end”; and “the spirits of devils issuing out of the mouth of Satan, and out of the mouth of every Anti-Christ and working miracles,” have gone forth unto the whole world gathering the nations into Armageddon to the battle of the great day of God Almighty described in the Revelation of St. John, chap. xvi., 13, 14 and 16. In this connection the author begs those of his readers who still remain Christian, to carefully peruse the excellent report, published in the *Daily Telegraph*, on 8th November, 1923, of the Rectorial address labelled “Imperial destiny” delivered by the Lord Rector of Glasgow University to British Youth, of gross and brutal idolatry blind heathen teach regarding “self interest, self advancement, and sharp swords.”

To-day, with the full consent of the Nation, the once Christian Abbey Church of Westminster has been converted into a National Pagan Cinerarium, and every conscience can hear the Lord saying “Where are your gods, your Rock in whom you trusted? Let them rise up and help you and be your protection” (Deuteronomy xxxii. 37, 38) and “the greatest living English-
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man" replying in words which he used at Barnsley on 27th August, 1921:

We cannot expect a country that spent—I want you to remember this figure, 50,000 millions—spent in murder, in destruction, and five years industry of the world, not arrested but concentrated on ruin; you cannot have that and expect everything to go on as if nothing had happened. . . . We are the Shop of the World, and we are suffering accordingly.

"Abashed, the devil stood
and felt how awful goodness is."
—Milton.
XVI. "THE EX-KAISER"

This work would not be complete without a final reference to the Monarch whom all London enthusiastically welcomed to Britain's shores in November, 1907.

From the moment when Great Britain declared war upon Germany, a systematic Press and Clerical propaganda of traducing the German Kaiser was unceasingly prosecuted throughout the British Empire. He was held up to derision and contumely as the Beast of Berlin. He was held personally responsible for every calamity of the War. It was even charged against him that he regarded Almighty God as being under his special patronage, and that he used that power as an over-reaching weapon against the liberty of the world, and that his hands were stained with every abomination and every crime.

During 1918, demonstrations in Australia to raise locally a Liberty War Loan were heralded by the streets of Sydney and Melbourne being
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disgraced with placards exhibiting a libellous portrait of the Emperor, and advertising a patriotic picture film dramatisation of Gerard's book—a book which a Tammany Boodle Alderman would have been ashamed to publish—in these bestial words:

THE KAISER—THE BEAST OF BERLIN.

See the inside life of this degenerate, cancerous viper. Get the confidential opinion of his own Court that shudders when his passion-trembling hand insinuatingly caresses the arm of a Court lady. Be there and witness the tremendous scene with Capt. Von Wohlbold.

Hear him openly insult the Captain, and then grip your seat for the next scene.

Von Wohlbold, goaded to fury, sends the Beast of Berlin mad with a reference to "his distorted mind, his withered soul."

"Withered soul." He hangs his withered arm, and hurls further abuse at Von Wohlbold.

Now watch Von Wohlbold measure his man, and hang on the jaw.

YOU'LL YELL with the crowd when you see this MAD DOG OF EUROPE SENSELESS ON THE FLOOR.

Then hold tight again, for the Kaiser has given Captain Von Hancke full licence to act and Von Hancke has broken into the home of the blacksmith of Louvain.

Hurling the mother aside, he has the daughter at his mercy, for her sweetheart has been clubbed into insensibility.
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Do you know what this licence to act means? YOU SHALL!

Now see the mighty arm of the blacksmith come from the curtain, watch it twine like a snake, round the neck of Von Hancke. See the swelling neck veins. Hear the death rattle, and the cracking bones! And there is nothing lying at your feet but lifeless flesh and bone.

BELGIUM BLASTED! RUSSIA SEDUCED! FRANCE BLEEDING! BRITAIN HARD PRESSED, BUT THANK GOD CALM AND STUB-BORN AS A BULLDOG. WILL AUSTRALIA HELP?

You shall now follow each and every one of the Mad Dog's unspeakable abominations, and when his black and bloody course has been arrested you shall say if the picture does not give this lust-madden wolf hound of Potsdam his just deserts.

On an adjoining placard were these words:

BRITAIN SAYS, SEND HIM TO ST. HELENA.
FRANCE SAYS, SEND HIM TO ALGERIA.
AMERICA SAYS, HANG HIM.
BUT THE AUSSIES SAY,
    TO HELL
    with the
    KAISER.

The words in the foregoing inset were copied from the placards in question by the author personally, while they hung on the walls of the City of Sydney.

The same abuse went on during all the period of the War in practically every corner of the
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Empire. The signing of the Armistice, in November, 1918, was followed in England by a dissolution of Parliament, and in December by a General Election. Bentham, in his theory of Legislation once truly said "Governments and peoples are like tamed lions: Let them taste a drop of blood and their natural ferocity revives." Mr. Lloyd George, therefore, in appealing to the country at this crucial period, must have known that the passions of the multitude after four years of the bloodiest of all wars, would at the bidding of the Coalition Whips, with the aid of Tennyson's "fierce and careless looseners of the Faith" positively roar for the Kaiser's blood, and so it proved. The British Lion and her Colonial Whelps, as with one mouth, simply yelled; not for a trial, but for "the punishment of the Kaiser." Lloyd George made it the cardinal plank in his political platform, and in a statement of policy which he issued on 5th December, 1918, he said:

The Kaiser must be prosecuted. He is responsible for deliberately provoking the War and the invasion of Belgium. A body of British jurists who are Crown Law Officers, has been consulted and has unanimously recommended that the Kaiser and his accomplices ought to be tried by International Law. The Government at the Peace Conference will press for the execution of justice.
Again, Earl Curzon, as the Government’s mouthpiece, in the House of Lords, in moving the Second Reading of the Treaty of Peace Bill, on the 24th July, 1919, said:

Although the trial of the Kaiser figured prominently on the Election platform, it had been decided upon by the Allies at Paris long before the Election. The Englishman was, I think, keen for punishment, in the case of the Kaiser, but punishment only as the result of a trial, and it seems foreign to our ideas that we should concentrate upon the punishment, without providing for a trial, by which that punishment would be justified.

Now, it had always been the proud boast of Great Britain that the brightest jewel in her Imperial Crown was that she meted out to high and low, rich and poor alike, impartial and unbiased justice, and that her Courts would reach out with a long arm to prevent the fountain of Justice being in any way unduly influenced or subverted. It now clearly appears from Lord Curzon’s statement, that long before the General Election of 1918, the Allies at Paris had determined upon the trial of the Kaiser by International Law for a criminal offence—there was then no suggestion of a trial for a political offence, or that International Law would have any jurisdiction to deal with a political offence—and
yet the Government deliberately sought re-election by appealing to the passions of the multitude.

Now, let us assume for a moment (1) that the Government could not concentrate upon punishment without providing for a trial; and (2) that some crime or offence could, in fact, be charged under International Law, as the Georgian jurists advised, and that for this offence the Emperor could be arraigned before some tribunal of justice. What a mockery such a trial would necessarily become if it took place before men who, to use Lord Curzon's words, would be "keen for punishment," and whose country at the Ballot Box, had practically already not only affirmed the guilt of the accused, but given a national mandate to the Government to proceed to "execution of justice." What possibility could there be that any such accused person would receive an impartial and unprejudiced trial, or that, in fact, any impartial and unbiased tribunal could be found in that country, or in any country that was a party to such a loading of its political dice.

The Election cry served its Election purpose. It secured the return of the Coalition Government. The Government having thus secured the votes, was now required to deliver the goods. The question then arose how this could be done. The Prime Minister, in his official statement
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of 5th December, 1918, had said "a body of British Jurists has been consulted and has unanimously recommended the Kaiser and his accomplices ought to be tried by International Law." It will be observed that no one but the Prime Minister seems to have had any knowledge of the "unanimous opinions" given by the so-called Jurists as apparently they were not disclosed to Parliament. Possibly the interests of justice forbade their publication. In their absence, the author as a Jurist consult of some experience in his profession, emphatically traverses every word which Mr. Lloyd George said these Jurists advised. In the first place, such a recommendation in December, 1918, assumed that there existed in Great Britain or some Allied Country, some tribunal capable of trying and punishing a foreigner for some crime or offence alleged to have been committed outside the territory of those countries, i.e., that of "provoking war." There, in fact, existed, and exists, no such tribunal. It next assumed that there existed, or ran in England, or some Allied Country, some International Law which could punish the Sovereign of a neighbouring State for provoking war. There was no such law; and the Jurists, if they were worth the gowns they wore, must have known it. But upon the
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assumption that such an International Law as these Jurists represented, really existed, there should have been no difficulty in putting it in force, or in obtaining the extradition of the offender. Why was this not done? Why, because the opinions of the Jurists were electioneering bunkum. For even if a violation of some International Law could be assigned there would arise an irrefutable presumption of law which would be a complete answer to any such charge. Under both British Law, and the Law of Nations, it is a maxim of Law, as well as sound commonsense that a monarch of a Sovereign State qua monarch "can do no wrong," and if a wrong be committed by a ruling authority, it is the minister on whose cachet and advice the monarch acts, who is alone responsible, and to such an extent is this doctrine extended, that even an Ambassador to a Foreign Court who commits a crime or offence in the country to which he is accredited, is immune from prosecution in that country. He can only be brought to answer for it in his own country. It was in these circumstances that when the Prime Minister came to provide in the Peace Treaty "for the execution of justice" he found that his "justice" had got herself into difficulties. He could not openly break faith with
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those who had given him his triumph at the Ballot Box. What could he say to the "*devout and honourable" distraught female voters who had so largely contributed to his majority. He was attorney enough to know that if a charge were made and extradition were in fact granted and the Emperor were brought before any International or other "High tribunal of Justice" the Law would instantly acquit him, and that no partiality, no incurable bias, no prejudice, and no legal fiction could secure even the mockery of a trial or a conviction, that in law and reason there would be nothing to try, nor indeed any charge of which any Court of Law international or otherwise, in the wide world would or could take cognisance, and moreover, "justice" might after all find herself discomfited as it would be open to the person accused in defence to show that the offence alleged, and on which the Election of 1918 was fought and won, viz., that of "provoking war" was in reality the act of some one or more of his accusers. The political tacticians thus found themselves on the horns of a dilemma, and we can now well understand how they came to fall back upon their political strategy, the horn of least resistance, and in keeping their election pledges, by the Peace Treaty, constituted the Allied and

*See xiii. Acts, 50.
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Associated Powers a law unto themselves, and provided for the surrender of the Emperor upon their joint request, in order that he should be judged, not by any Court of legal Justice, but by some tribunal of political power to be set up by his accusers, not for any crime or offence cognisable by any law, but for anything which the requisitioning Powers might, from the viewpoint of their own political polity, allege to be "a supreme offence against International morality and Treaty sanctity"; a perfectly meaningless provision, worthy only of a "crew of third-class tinkers or mariners" boasting of "first-class brains." Such a charge had never before been heard of in the history of any nation, great or small, nor indeed in the history of mankind. Such a charge would be laughed out of Court, by any and every International forum that might be asked to grant extradition. Under it no extradition could by any possibility be obtained in any country. The Government must have seen this or they hardly would have sent to America within the first three months of the Peace Treaty, on 20th September, 1919, their chief witness, Viscount Grey as High Commissioner to the United States "under arrangements made by Lord Haldane."

By Article 227 of the Treaty Mr. Lloyd George
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thus dexterously succeeded in shifting the onus which the General Election had placed upon his shoulders, on to the Netherlands Government. We called this:

"PLAYING THE GAME."

Well did Carlyle describe us as being "mostly fools!"

THE END