

**August 1914**

**Problems of Capitalism and Socialism no 58**

**The Moral Collapse of the British Liberal Party Press in August 1914**

**Introduction**

The *Manchester Guardian* and the *Daily News* were the major party newspapers of the Liberal Party when Britain declared war on Germany in August 1914. The Government which declared war was a Liberal Government. The Liberal Party had been in office since 1906. It was a radical reforming Government which had conducted a populist agitation against the aristocracy on the issue of a Budget and had broken the power of the House of Lords by means of the Parliament Act of 1911. And it was in the process of devolving a measure of Executive and Legislative power to Ireland by means of a Home Rule Bill, when the issue of whether to avail of a European war as an apparently favourable opportunity to make war on Germany arose in late July 1914.

Both of the major Liberal Party newspapers saw the possibility of war on Germany approaching, and both were vehemently opposed to British participation in the European war. Nevertheless the Liberal Government declared war. And the moment it did so both of the party newspapers declared their support for the war.

That was the great era of newspapers. They were the only general means of information about the world at large for the members of a body politic which was being gradually democratised, and, by their party orientation, they made possible a reasonably structured discussion of what Britain should be doing in the world.

Britain was then the major state in the world. It was saturated with a sense that it was its destiny to rule the world. It dominated the seas and the tentacles of its Empire were feeling out opportunities for advancement on every Continent. What it chose to do in the world was therefore a matter of great consequence throughout the world.

What it chose to do in 1914 was to intervene in a European war, in which it had nothing at stake, and enhance it into a World War. In the outcome, German commercial rivalry was destroyed in the short term; the Empire was greatly expanded in the short term; three other Empires were destroyed, giving rise to national antagonisms which have grown worse with time; and the internal political life of Britain as the directing centre of a state with ramifications into all Continents was fundamentally damaged.

From the moment of victory in 1918, it was evident that Britain was floundering amidst its expanded possessions, acting at certain times with a purposeless brutality and at other times with an equally purposeless sentimentality. Neither was ever seen through to a durable conclusion. Both lacked the dimension of realism that would have made it possible for them to be taken to a durable conclusion.

This floundering by the most powerful state in the world, which was still in the grip of a sense of destiny despite its floundering, led on very quickly to the Second World War.

But, although the loss of internal coherence only became plainly evident after the defeat of Germany in 1918, it had its source the collapse of the Liberal Party press in the face of arbitrary action by an inner group in the Liberal Government on 5th August, 1914.

The electoral franchise in Britain was very far short of being democratic in 1914, but it had become far too extensive for oligarchy. It was not democratic because the electorate was only a third of the adult population: but a third of the adult population was many times too large for the kind of decision-making by which the old ruling class had constructed the Empire over hundreds of years.

A hundred thousand gentry and merchants, grouped for the most part in large family units, might have independent knowledge of the world and informal means of discussing what should be done in it. The millions of the middle classes and upper working classes in the limited democracy of 1914 had no means of independent knowledge through personal experience in the world at large, and no informal Clubs or discussion forums of any political influence. The possibility of continuing, on a mass scale, the informed discussion of world affairs and the realistic decision-making through which the Empire had been built up by the oligarchy in the 18th and 19th centuries, lay entirely in the operation of party-politics, and particularly of the party press. But the party press, which was flourishing on 4th August 1914, collapsed into a war consensus on 5th August. From that point onwards the only rivalry was in the production of shibboleths of mindless warmongering. The masses were energised for war by being fed with delusions which inflamed simple passions and made realistic thought impossible. And thus, when Britain emerged triumphant after four and a quarter years—having in the meantime extended the franchise to the great majority of the adult population—it was in no fit condition to make a peace settlement that would last. The Versailles Conference of 1919 was conducted in the same medium of primitive passion and insatiable greed that had been generated for the conduct of the war.

John Buchan (author of the 'Richard Hannay' novels (*39 Steps* etc.), which formed a central part of English middle class culture until around 1960 was the semi-official historian of the War as it was happening. He described it frankly enough as England's first middle-class war, but attempted to weave it into a continuum of English Imperial history by projecting an aristocratic veneer onto it. But the veneer didn't take. The sow's ear could not be conjured into the silk purse. English middle class Imperialism made a settlement of the world in 1919 which in some of its parts lasted two or three years, and which led to a general war in twenty years. The English aristocracy in 1814 made a settlement that lasted, by and large, until 1914.

Middle-class Imperialism is not a pretty sight. It had been generating for twenty years before 1914—its generation will be shown in a future issue—but it was not until 5th August, 1914 that it took the centre of the stage in foreign policy and exposed its

delusions and inadequacies.

The years between the Boer War and the World War was the great era of the middle class intellectual. *H.G. Wells* (Item Nos. 42 & 46) and *G.B. Shaw* (No. 41) had a political standing which no mere writer could hold today. Both of them appear in these pages, as does *Thomas Hardy* (Nos. 20 & 25). Others are less well remembered today, but were very important in their time: *Thomas Beecham* (Nos. 23 and 27); *Ananda Coomaraswamy* (No. 28); *Lord Eversley* (No. 44); *Arnold Bennett* (No. 47); *Jerome K. Jerome* (Nos. 50 & 52); *Hilaire Belloc* (No. 41); *H.W. Massingham* (No. 55); and *William Archer* (Nos. 55 & 56). *Lloyd George* appears in Item 57.

An entirely new element in British warmongering in 1914 was the Irish Nationalist contribution to it, in the form of *T. M. Kettle* and *Robert Lynd* (Nos. 40 and 53).

The *Manchester Guardian* (which is now called *The Guardian*) was the classical newspaper of Manchester capitalism. Its editor for a generation before the War was *C.P. Scott*, who was an intellectual of substance in the pre-war culture of Liberalism. He found the transition to mindless warmongering personally difficult, and so he delegated the task of leader writing to his son-in-law, *C.E. Montague*, who was the son of an unfrocked Irish priest and an Irish Nationalist of the Kettle/Lynd variety.

The *Daily News* was the general newspaper of Home Counties Liberalism. It was owned by George Cadbury, of the Quaker family of chocolate makers, and was edited from 1902 to 1919 by *A.G. Gardiner*.

**Brendan Clifford**  
**May 1999**

## NOTES

*Note To No. 16*

The burning of Rheims Cathedral was a propaganda invention.

*Note To N. 23*

Thomas Beecham (1879-1961) was a famous orchestra conductor, from the family whose business was Beecham's Pills. His great mission in life was to popularise the works of Frederick Delius, the Yorkshire-born composer, whose parents were German, and whose master-work, *The Mass Of Life*, is a setting of extracts from Nietzsche's *Thus Spake Zarathustra*.

*Note To No. 28*

Ananda Coomaraswamy (1877-1947), born in Ceylon, was one of the pioneers of the Indian cultural revival in the 20th century.

*Note To No. 44*

Gilbert Murray (1866-1957), Australian-born Professor of Greek at Oxford, became an avid warmonger and predicted that the post-war Peace Settlement, being organised by democratic states, would far excel the Peace of Vienna (1815) in

fairness and durability. He spent the remainder of his life trying to explain away the failure of this to happen.

*Note To No. 44*

Lord Eversley (1831-1928) was called George John Shaw-Lefevre until 1906. In his youth he took photographs of the Crimean War. In 1868 he was brought into Gladstone's Government as Secretary to the Board of Trade, under the Presidency of John Bright. He held Office in all Gladstone's Governments until 1894, and in Roseberry's Government in 1894-5. (Roseberry was the point of transition between the classical Liberalism of Cobden and Bright and the Liberal Imperialism of Asquith, Grey, Haldane, and Churchill.) Eversley retired from active politics in 1912.

*Note To No. 47*

Enoch Arnold Bennett (1867-1931), the son of a Methodist solicitor in Staffordshire, became famous and wealthy as the novelist of the lower middle class in the Potteries. During the War he became a professional war propagandist at the Ministry of Information under Lord Beaverbrook, and he was for a time the head of the Ministry.

*Note To No. 50*

Jerome Klapka Jerome (1859-1927) was the son of a Walsall colliery owner and Nonconformist preacher who moved to London and went into the ironmongery business. He became an actor, a playwright and a journalist, and achieved enormous fame with books of light humour: *Idle Thoughts Of An Idle Fellow*, *Three Men In A Boat*, and *Three Men On A Bummel*, the latter being set in Germany. He drove a French ambulance in the Great War.

*Note To No. 54*

H.W. Massingham, son of a Methodist preacher, was an influential Liberal/Labour journalist. He published Free Trade propaganda in the Imperial Tariff controversy in 1903.

*Note To No. 56*

William Archer (1856-1924) was a uniquely influential drama critic and a writer for the Rationalist press. He was associated with G.B. Shaw in the campaign for 'serious' plays and he translated Ibsen for the London theatre. He qualified as a barrister, but took no part in the profession of the law other than joining the Inns of Court Volunteers in preparation for the war.

## MANCHESTER GUARDIAN

### 1.

#### **England's Danger.**

We wish Servia no ill; we are anxious for the peace of Europe. But Englishmen

are not the guardians of Servian well-being, or even of the peace of Europe. Their first duty is to England and to the peace of England. Let us for a moment drop solicitude for the peace of Europe and think of ourselves. We ought to feel ourselves out of danger, for, whichever way the quarrel between Austria and Serbia were settled, it would not make a scrap of difference to England. We care as little for Belgrade as Belgrade does for Manchester. But, though our neutrality ought to be assured, it is not. Mr. Asquith speaks with a brevity, natural, perhaps, if we were directly concerned, but quite unnatural if it were certain, as it ought to be, that we should not be involved. Sir Edward Grey walks deliberately past opportunities of saying that we are and will be neutral in the quarrel of Europe. From the Admiralty we have ominous rumours of naval concentrations, and the House of Commons hastens to efface itself by unanimously deciding not to discuss the political uses to which our Navy may be put, or why it should be put to any use at all in this crisis. This official reticence is in striking contrast with unofficial garrulity. The *Times*, whose influence at great crises in our foreign affairs has always been for evil, yesterday took it for granted that if the war were not localised this country ought to take the side of Serbia and Russia. It exhorts us to patch up our difficulties about Home Rule in Ireland in order that we may the better be able to see fair-play between Austria and Serbia. Who made us the arbiters of "fair play" between Austria and Serbia, and what conceivable interest have we in subordinating any British interest whatever to so entirely gratuitous a task? Having sacrificed Ireland to Serbia, the *Times* wants us to sacrifice England to Russia's eccentric notions of what is in the interests of her people. Rather than be guilty of this madness, there is no constitutional measure of revolt which Englishmen ought not to use who think more of their duty to their own country than of the real or imaginary interests of the Russian autocracy...

...We are friends with every Power in Europe. Why give preference to one friend over another? Because, says the *Times*, it is our settled interest and traditional policy to uphold the balance of power in Europe. Away with that foul idol, as *Bright* called it, which lost England the great lead in popular liberties that it had gained at the beginning of the eighteenth century and brought about the most terrible tragedy in our history, the quarrel with Revolutionary France. But if we must worship the idol, how should we serve it better by throwing our influence on the side of Russia than on the side of Germany? Why strengthen the hand which is already beating us in Persia, and which, if it triumphed over Germany, would presently be felt in Afghanistan and on our frontiers in India? Why should the Slav be so much dearer to us than the Teuton that we should tax the necessaries of the poor to famine prices and the income of the rich to extinction? For this is what our participation in a great European war must mean to England...

...Everyone professes to be anxious to "localise" the war. But only one Power can do it, namely Russia. If Russia attacks Austria, Germany is bound by treaty to join in defence of Austria; if Germany fights, France is bound to do the same; and if France goes to war, Italy, the third member of the Triple Alliance, will reluctantly, but inevitably follow suit. On the Continent of Europe there is only one free Power, namely Russia. Will it be contended that it is so vital an interest to Russia that Serbia should escape punishment for the misdeeds of her subjects that Russia must needs plunge Europe into the horrors of a general war? The proposition is manifestly absurd. On Russia, therefore, rests the primary responsibility if a war which is and could remain local without any one being much the worse becomes the scourge of civilisation...

July 30, 1914

2.

### **The Nation's Danger.**

Yesterday the Special Reserve of the Territorial Force was called out for military service in the United Kingdom. So long as we remain neutral we are safer against attack now than at any other time, for no nation wishes to provoke our enmity. What then is the meaning of all these precautionary measures, naval and military... Either the Government are bluffing or they are preparing to take an active and not merely a defensive part in the war... By "bluffing" we mean some such policy as this. For example. The Government has no intention of taking part in the war, but it thinks that by making as though it did mean to do so it may exercise an influence for peace... We are putting these calculations as plausibly as we know how... They are... excessively foolish...

...We will not now discuss the alternative explanation, namely, that the Government means to take part in a general war, because we will not attribute to it except on direct evidence a policy that would surpass folly and approach criminality... At the head of affairs is a Government which may be bluffing and is fallible. Behind it there are strong influences, social and bureaucratic, which are anxious for war. In the newspapers there is visible the working of a conspiracy to drag us into war. The House of Commons, which should be the guardian of the national interests at such a time as this, is discussing the Milk and Dairies Bill (Mr. Asquith calls that "presenting a united front to the nations of Europe"), and there are rumours that it will in a few days be adjourned as a useless encumbrance on the full freedom of the Executive, only to be called together again in case money should be required for a war already determined upon. Everywhere there is evidence of organisation for war; nowhere a sign that the forces of peace are being mobilised...

...We are free to choose, said Sir Edward Grey, and the Prime Minister. We are free as regards Europe. We are not free as regards England. Honour is not involved abroad. It is irretrievably involved at home.

July 31, 1914

3.

### **England's Duty.**

Russia has ordered a general mobilisation. Germany has proclaimed martial law throughout the Empire and may begin at any moment now to mobilise. The outlook in Europe is as bad as possible, short of being quite hopeless. Under other political conditions in England we should now be wringing our hands over the situation in Europe. We advise Englishmen that they have no sympathy to spare for Europe. Let them keep it for themselves, and think first of all for England, for English honour and English interests. For there is in our midst an organised conspiracy to drag us into the war... "Conspiracy" we say because it is disloyal to Parliament, which is the constitutional guardian of national interests in times of crisis. The conspirators prefer the confidence of selected newspaper editors to that of the representatives of the people. The objects of the conspirators are now openly avowed. We are to join in, not under certain conditions or in defence of this or that British interest which may happen to be threatened, but in any case. We are to do so for three reasons. The first is that we are bound in our own interest to maintain the balance of power in Europe. The second is that we are the protectors of the neutrality of Belgium. The third, that

we are in honour bound to stand by our friends...

The Balance of Power, as a doctrine of English policy, was responsible for the long feud with France... It lost England the great lead it had obtained in constitutional liberties, and condemned us to the worst period of reaction in our own history. After the Congress of Vienna its effects disgusted Canning, and even a Tory like Castlereagh... *Bright* pronounced its obituary... Its revival has been the work of the last seven or eight years, and, we deeply regret to think, has been coincident with the access to power of the Liberal Government—we do not say it has been its doing. The doctrine has at all times been the greatest enemy of progress... But, even if we admired this doctrine as much as we in fact detest it, it supplies no reason why we should take the side of Russia against Germany. If Russia wins there will be the greatest disturbance of the balance of power that the world has ever seen. The whole conditions of our continued existence as an Asiatic Power will have to be revised, an over all the world, wherever we come into contact with Russia, we shall have a repetition of the self-effacement which we have witnessed in Persia. The victory of Germany, on the other hand, would in effect be a victory for the principle of the balance of power. If we believed in this principle, which we do not - then we might be for intervention on the side of Germany. Because we do not believe in it we are able, without the least misgiving, to counsel neutrality as the right policy for this country.

Then we are to side with Russia against Germany because we are guarantors of the neutrality of Belgium, which, it is assumed, is in danger from Germany, and from her alone. The *Times* has quoted the authority of *Gladstone* for this proposition. Now it is quite true that during the Franco-Prussian War Lord Granville concluded treaties with both France and Germany guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium. Article 3 of both treaties declares that they are to remain in force during the continuance of the war and for twelve months afterwards. Both treaties have therefore expired. But it will be said there are the earlier treaties of the forties in which we, in common with most of the Great Powers, guaranteed Belgian neutrality. Are we not bound by those? Let the great Lord Derby answer for us. He was asked in 1867 whether we were not bound by a similar collective guarantee in the case of Luxembourg. He said No: "We were bound in honour - you cannot place a legal construction on it - to see in concert with others, that these arrangements are maintained. But if the other Powers join with us it is certain that there will be no violation of neutrality. If they, situated exactly as we are, decline to join, we are not bound single-handed to make up the deficiency. Such a guarantee has obviously rather the character of a moral sanction to the arrangements which it defends than that of a contingent liability to make war. It would no doubt give a right to make war, but would not necessarily impose the obligation." And that is the view taken by most international lawyers. We are, therefore, absolutely free; there is no entanglement with Belgium. Is any further argument needed? It is supplied by the fact that Belgium herself does not desire our interference. If we landed an army for the defence of Belgium it would be fired upon by the Belgians. Belgium does not aspire to the distinction of being the cockpit of Europe.

Then is it honour that we must fight for? No; for honours sake we must keep the peace. There are, as Mr. *Asquith* and Sir Edward *Grey* have both told us, no engagements with European Powers that would take away our perfect freedom of choice in the event of a general European war. Being free as regards Europe, we are not free as regards our own people, but must decide in favour of neutrality. For if we

decide differently, then we violate dozens of promises made to our own people \_ the promises to seek peace, to protect the poor, to husband the resources of the country, to promote peaceful progress. These promises are in honour binding, and if they are broken, then not only are our interests sacrificed but our honour is tarnished.

August 1, 1914

4.

#### **On The Brink.**

Saturday and Sunday were the fateful days of a century. On Saturday Germany declared war on Russia. Early the next morning her troops invaded Luxemburg, and in the course of the day they are alleged to have crossed the French frontier at two points not specified. The war party in England will use these facts to work up feeling against Germany as the aggressor and violator of international law; but sober Englishmen, while grieving that Germany should have thought fit to take this frightful responsibility, will not let German military opinion of what is best for Germany affect their own judgment of what is best for England. Germany was not free to choose; whether war was to come depended not so much on what she did as on what Russia meant to do. Having convinced herself, and not without cause, that Russia meant war, she conceived that her policy was one for her soldiers to determine on purely military grounds. And they held, it would seem, that as war had to come it was Germany's duty to take advantage of the initiative that her superior system of mobilisation gave to her. She seems to have begun the fighting, but not, assuredly, with a light heart. Germany's position is graver than it has been since the days of the great *Frederic*. With the genius and the brilliancy of France on the one flank and the overwhelming numbers of Russia on the other she felt herself fighting against odds for her very existence. Her only chance, she probably reflected, lay in taking her enemies in detail and in flinging herself on the one before the other was fully prepared. It was a desperate calculation, but so was her case. From Italy she will get no help, and Austria will be hard put to it to deal with Servia and maintain her own frontiers intact. Sooner or later she will bear the whole brunt of the war with France and Russia at once. And she was uncertain of the neutrality of England. Therefore she decided to strike the first blow. We deeply regret it, but we understand. Nor shall we apply a harsh judgment to what man or nation does for very life's sake.

The British Cabinet sat almost all day on Sunday discussing what the policy of this country ought to be. As we write we do not know what decision has been reached. But we are, if possible, more convinced than ever that duty and interest alike demand that this country should not make itself an accessory to the crime against reason and human happiness that is beginning... The nations of Europe have been compelled to face this death by the network of promises and counter-promises in which the folly of their statesmen has enmeshed them. England alone of the Great Powers stood quite outside the entanglements of the European system which is now breaking up. Italy was involved—how deeply we do not know—but she has managed by a great effort to extricate herself. And yet at the very moment that her Government has struggled free we are asked to put on her chains... A few weeks after we have been solemnly assured that we have no engagement on the Continent of Europe which would restrict or hamper the freedom of the Government or of Parliament to decide whether or not Great Britain should take part in a European war, we are told by the conspirators that honour bids us to go to war. Whose honour? Not that of the Government, for if what the war party say is true, then what Mr. Asquith and Sir Edward Grey said was false.

How could we be free to decide if honour compelled us to decide one way?... Whose honour then? The honour of those who have led France to hope that we would undertake responsibilities which all the time they were anxious to conceal from Englishmen? If any have been guilty of that double perfidy to England and to France, not all the blood of every English soldier and sailor, not all the tears of widows and orphans, could restore to them the honour which they have so shamelessly lost...

*A Shameless Argument.*

...It is actually said by the *Times* that Russia “will fight upon the side of European *moral*,” and that the cause of “civilised relations between peoples” and even—crowning effort of cant—the cause of “the peace of the world” would gain by our backing her. Let us keep quite clear about this. If we are jockeyed into fighting it will be for a cause supremely disreputable. Of all the smaller Powers of Europe, Serbia is, quite decidedly, the one whose name is most foully daubed with dishonour. The record of her rulers and her policy in recent years is unmatched as a tissue of cruelty, greed, hypocrisy, and ill-faith. If it were physically possible for Serbia to be towed out to sea and sunk there, the air of Europe would at once seem clearer. Disgraced in many things before, she has a disgracefully bad cause in her quarrel with Austria—the cause of a harbourer of murderers against the friends of the murdered persons. And what Serbia is among the lesser Powers, Russia, so far as regards her Government, is among the great ones. We have lately touched so much diplomatic pitch that we have all tended to become tactful and considerate of the feelings of pitch, to the point of tacit insincerity. But the blackness of the Russian government, as a dealer with men’s and women’s lives and liberties, is inky. We must not forget the brutalities practised in Finland, the wholesale baitings of Jews, the detestable barbarity and injustice with which every effort of the Russian people to gain a tolerable government has been suppressed.

We must remember that the Russian Government is now at last standing almost face to face with the peoples, Russian and other, that it has wronged, and that its best hope of staving off retribution is in foreign war. Foreign war is the lightning conductor with which every corrupt Government tries to divert from itself the fire that its crimes have called down on it... The idea of the Russian Government’s caring one straw about “European *moral*,” except perhaps as something that might become a danger to it if it came into existence, would be almost too grim as a joke. As a suggestion seriously offered for consumption by credulous people, it is a quite repulsive piece of humbug. The Russian Government, like most other despotic Governments, regards war with absolute cynicism, and any country of Western Europe which went into war of its own free will, in league with so tainted an ally would do well to forget the language of morality and Christianity until that particular association had ceased.

August 3 (Monday), 1914

**5.**

**Peace Or War.**

If and when England joins in the war it will be too late to discuss its policy. Meanwhile we hold it to be a patriotic duty for all good citizens to oppose to the utmost the participation of this country in the greatest crime of our time. Sir Edward Grey’s speech last night, for all its appearance of candour, was not fair either to the House of Commons or to the country. It showed that for years he had been keeping

back the whole truth and telling just enough to lull into a false sense of security, not enough to enable the country to form a reasoned judgment on the current of our policy... It is a mockery to throw on the House of Commons the responsibility of deciding at a moment's notice and in circumstances of great excitement on a policy that has been maturing for years. Had the House of Commons as a whole risen to the full height of its duty it would have shown itself wiser than its rulers. But a minority did protest, and nobly, against the incompetence and secretiveness in the conduct of our foreign affairs, which now threatens to wreck the moral and material progress of half a century.

The war, if it comes, will not be due to the terms of the Entente with France... The Entente would be absolutely irrelevant to the whole question of our participation in this war but for two sets of facts of which we heard for the first time last night. It appears that as long ago as 1906 Sir Edward Grey consented to conversations between French and English naval and military men as to the best means towards co-operation between the two countries which the terms of the Entente envisaged in certain circumstances. These conversations have been going on ever since; they were kept from the knowledge of the House of Commons, but, as we now know, revealed to Tory journalists in London and Paris. Sir Edward *Grey* reconciled this partial secrecy with his conscience by making the stipulation that they were not to commit us to any policy which the country might not support. They have, however, had this effect, that they have been so conducted as to give France the right to ask us exactly what we mean to do in the event of war, not merely over the subjects covered by the Entente, but apparently over any subject. The extreme form which those conversations took was in relation to the Mediterranean. As a consequence of her friendship with us France transferred her main fleet to the Mediterranean, and Sir Edward Grey appears to imply that this was done for our benefit. Sir Edward Grey argues that this act gave France the right to ask us whether we would defend her Atlantic and Channel coasts. It would only do so if the transfer were made on that understanding; but supposing it did, what then? The most that would follow is that in the absence of the French fleet we might be under some obligation to defend the northern and western coasts of France. That obligation Germany is quite prepared to respect. She has offered not to attack these coasts or the coasts of Belgium and Holland. That, says Sir Edward Grey, is not enough. We must have a promise to respect all the coasts of France. His reasons are extraordinary. If the French Fleet comes north, he says, and if Italy does not remain neutral, we shall be in great difficulties in the Mediterranean. The defence of the French coastline in the Mediterranean then is the sole cause for any breach of our neutrality so far as the Entente is concerned. That is to say, if we fight for France we shall fight for France's right to send her ships north and against Germany's right to send her ships to the Mediterranean. Is it rational? ...Can it be reconciled with any reasonable view of British interests?...

There remains the question of the neutrality of Belgium. Sir Edward Grey is prepared to go to war for this object and he quotes *Gladstone* in support. But had Gladstone really thought that it was in our interests always and under all circumstances to go to the support of Belgium in defence of her neutrality, why did he so carefully restrict our obligation under the Treaty of 1870 to the duration of the war between Germany and France and a year after? Was that not an admission that the maintenance of Belgium's neutrality was not a question of honour—the obligations of honour are immutable—but was one which might change with changing conditions? We can attach no other interpretation to it. The question of the integrity of Belgium is

one thing; its neutrality is quite another. We shall not easily be convinced, even if the neutrality of Belgium be a British interest for which we ought to go to war, that the sacrosanctity of Belgian soil from the passage of an invader is worth the sacrifice of so much that mattered so much more to Englishmen. And in that opinion we are fortified by the view of Lord Derby, who held in the case of Luxemburg, in which our treaty obligations are precisely the same, that there was no obligation on us in honour or in law to intervene with force...

August 4, 1914

6.

#### **The Declaration Of War.**

England declared war upon Germany at eleven o'clock last night. The controversy therefore is now at an end. Our front is united. A little more knowledge, a little more time on this side, more patience, and a sounder political principle on the other side would have saved us from the greatest calamity that anyone living has known. It will be a war in which we risk almost everything of which we are proud, and in which we stand to gain nothing... Some day we shall all regret it...

Our part in the war, for the present at any rate, is intended to be purely naval, and it is greatly to be desired that it should remain so. Even if the Expeditionary Force were ready to move at once and there were no political difficulties, it would not be wise to transport an army until we had assumed command of the sea. The first task of the war, therefore, will be to meet the German fleet and engage it, or, if that is impossible, to blockade it in its ports...

The strategy of the German army is exactly what it has always been expected that she would pursue in the event of war with the Dual Alliance [i.e. France and Russia]. It is to concentrate her whole offensive force against France in the hope of crushing her before Russia is ready to strike...

August 5, 1914

7.

#### **The Invasion Of Belgium.**

The German invasion of Belgium is an attempt to find a way round the formidable line of French forts which bar Germany's direct westerly advance... It has been for many years the normal assumption of the French General Staff that Germany in case of war with the Dual Alliance would violate the neutrality of Belgium, and dozens of defence plans must have been drawn up to meet the situation that has now arisen. The German Staff professed to believe that the French meant to violate the neutrality of Belgium, but whatever be the adopted plan of defence it is pretty certain it left Belgium alone. The French after the invitation of the Belgian Government, are now free to operate in Belgium...

August 6, 1914

8.

#### **The Empire's Devotion.**

There must be few people in England so cold that their hearts have not glowed as they read the wonderful succession of telegrams from every part of the Empire during the last ten days. No sooner was England's danger known than the most splendid offers of spontaneous help began to flow in on her from every continent in the world...

August 14, 1914

9.

#### **A Great Feat.**

The landing of the British Expeditionary Force on the Continent within a fortnight of the declaration of war is one of the most remarkable in the history of war, and the newspapers have not appraised it at its true value... It is, in fact, perhaps the most striking example of the use of naval power that even our history has ever afforded, and it should, if rightly understood, do more for the opening of the seas to commerce than a great victory... The Admiralty is to be heartily congratulated on a most brilliant beginning. There will, we think, be no talk at the end of this war of our “unpreparedness”, at any rate...

August 19, 1914

10.

#### **The Two Germanies.**

...The war does not change what we think *Schubert* and *Schumann*, of *Lessing* and *Hegel*, of *Helmholz* and *Siemens*. There is not even a moratorium for these debts of the mind. What we must feel... is that the greater and nobler Germany, whose real glories are the strength and courage of her intellectual heroes, has suffered a horrible entanglement in the coarse materialism of Prussian ambitions. The greater Germany cannot be disentangled now; that is the horrible part of it; her own loyalty to her betrayers makes it impossible to hope, as yet, for any appreciable division of feeling in Germany. Europe must either smash Prussian Junkerdom or be smashed by it, and Prussian Junkerdom has the power as well as the will to drag into the smash all that is better in Germany than itself. The German universities are laid idle; Germany's merchant fleet, the work of so many strong and eager organising brains, is being swept off the seas; the young Germans who might in a few years have shown themselves the heirs of the genius of *Kant* and *Goethe* and *Wagner* have marched off to be killed before their greatness could be born. And all of us have to wish it so, for the alternative to German defeat is Prussian victory and the fastening, perhaps, upon all Western Europe of the narrow and brutal domination which is ruling Germany—

August 24, 1914

11.

#### **The Outrage At Louvain.**

The destruction of Louvain, the ancient Belgian seat of learning and a city of beautiful buildings, will shock the conscience of the civilised world. The Germans say, apparently that their troops, on being driven back from Malines after the Belgian raid from Antwerp, were fired on by civilians at Louvain. This may possibly be so, though the Belgians deny it, for the frightful severities of the German troops during their march through Belgium, are only too likely to provoke a spirited people to retaliation whenever the opportunity offers. But even if that were so... the Germans were quite capable of dealing with any civilians who attacked them. Instead they shot some of the chief citizens—and to have shot them is to have murdered them—and have reduced to ashes the historic buildings of one of the most famous seats of learning in the Low Countries...

August 29, 1914

12.

### **The Rush To Enlist.**

There is infinite cause for satisfaction in the great and swiftly rising flood of eager recruits during the past week. And, though there is to be no quarrelling among us now, we cannot help finding it particularly good that Manchester has in this case shown London the way. She has raised more men for her size, and she has shown a more ready freedom from the reluctance of many fairly well-to-do young men to enlist as privates in the Regular Army. Everywhere, however, that unworthy prejudice is now breaking down fast. In London the recruiting each day is at last "beating the record". In Manchester it has been shown that, once the deterrent of money anxieties is relaxed, battalion after battalion of young men of business wish nothing better than to go to the front... Ten days ago a large number of hasty writers to the press were saying hard things about most of their younger countrymen—that they did not see what the war meant, that they cared for nothing but ease and amusement, and that they sought either to be forced into the army, like young Prussians, or else be lectured at every street corner by eminent academic authorities on Prussian history until the same effect was produced. The practical problem is now seen to be quite different.

We know now that the willing men are there; they are only complaining because the officials cannot enlist them fast enough...

September 3, 1914

### **13.**

#### **The Right Spirit.**

The *Premier* made a great speech yesterday... We need not care if parts of his account of what led to the war be open to some correction. When a commander calls on his men for a gallant effort at a supreme moment, one does not ask of him the precision of a scientific historian... One only asks that he should stir the blood by turning the minds of his men to some few large and lofty thoughts that animate to action. This was the *Premier's* task, too, and he did it superbly.

The *Premier* marshalled with irresistible force the great considerations which make the struggle supremely worth waging and winning. The events of August have transformed the cause of Belgium from a matter of diplomatic interpretation and of political expediency into a claim on the pity and indignation of all civilised human beings, like the fates, in earlier years, of Bulgaria and America, so that no one in England can ask himself any longer whether we had at first a moral right to come to her aid; he can only rejoice to have a part in the retribution for the foul wrongs of Aerschot and Louvain. In a distant past there were questions of the Balance of Power in Europe, of French cravings for the lost Alsace and Lorraine, of Austrian anger at the murder of an Austrian Prince with Servian connivance; there was a cauldron full of Balkan hatreds, jealousies, and greeds, and behind the little snarling figures there were larger and grimmer shapes watching, ready to thrust in a paw here or a paw there. By the strangest metamorphosis, all these questions, most of them difficult, debatable, easily lending themselves to honest dispute among men of sincerity and goodwill, have disappeared from the whole foreground of life. It is occupied, and, for we know not how long, it must still be occupied, by one issue, enormously vaster and more terrible than them all—the issue of whether Europe is to be at the mercy of the spirit and the force that conceived and executed for its own ends the devastation of inoffensive Belgium, the bombardment of sleeping Antwerp with bombs, and the random sowing of the open sea with mines on the bare chance that a single British man-of-war might be sunk as well as a dozen innocent neutral ships and their crews.

Mr. *Asquith* calls it a conflict of right against might. Happily it is a conflict also of might against might. But he is right in this—that we are not waging this war in order to make our might, or the might of our friends, a law unto itself, and that this is just what the Prussian core of the German Empire is fighting to do...

That was *Napoleon's* disease. At times it has infected Englishmen. But every one of us can say most honestly that we are free from it in this war. We desire nobody's territory; the map of Europe was good enough for us; our Empire was awing and sobering most of us rather than making us drunk with power; we wanted to behave as decently to other Powers, even when we differed from them, as our seamen did the other day, when, in the midst of a battle, they were nearly lost by their own ship in their endeavour to rescue the drowning crew of the German cruiser they had sunk. It is not the sort of thing that people do whose only thought is of winning rightly or shamefully, so long as they win. But we find that there has come upon us, no matter by whose fault now, a struggle of life or death between this principle of the regulation of might by right, by voluntary concessions to reason, compassion and conscience, and that other principle of Louvain and Aerschot, the principle that might is its own justification, and right a sentimental fad... If anything on earth is worth fighting for, it is this. It was *Garibaldi's* cause in Italy, it was *Gambetta's* in France, and it would be a strange countryman of *Hampden's* whom it would not thrill... Such a cause cannot lose, in a world not yet shown to be ordered for evil. And yet every man of us must act as if it might lose but for the morsel of help that it may be in him to give. These two ideas may seem to clash, but not in the mind of anyone for whom a sense of civic duty has the mystic clearness of a faith.

September 5, 1914

#### 14.

##### **How Peace Was Destroyed.**

[The latest Foreign Office White Paper] will rank in historical importance with the previous English and German White Papers. The new document is a full narrative by Sir. M. *De Bunsen*, the British Ambassador to Austria-Hungary, of the events of the days before the war, as he saw them and took part in them, at Vienna. Its general effect is to reduce, in some measure, the responsibility of Austria, and gravely to heighten that of the German Government. We all knew before... that the German Foreign Office, while disclaiming any previous knowledge of the actual wording of the Austrian ultimatum to Servia..., had agreed beforehand to back Austria in any exercise of inflexibility which she might think fit... Encouraged by this guarantee, Austria worded her Note to Servia with a provocative harshness which shocked those of us—that is, the whole English nation—who, like our Ambassador at Vienna, “disclaimed any British lack of sympathy with Austria in the matter of her legitimate grievances against Servia.” It was difficult to suppose that the Austrian Note meant anything but that Austria wanted a war with Servia.... when the final rupture with Servia came “Vienna burst into a frenzy of delight.” [Quotation from Bunsen report.]

Austria, then, in making demands which, at first, she did not even wish Servia to accept, was responsible, at any rate, for a limited war, for a war between herself and Servia... there is this to be said in her favour, as compared with Germany: When, with Germany's approval, she launched the ultimatum, she seems to have quite persuaded herself that it would not bring on a more general European war.... And, as soon as Austria did fully realise that war with Servia would mean war between Great Powers too, her Government, according to sir. M. *de Bunsen*, tried to retrace its steps

and in a few days became conciliatory, until “as between the latter (Austria and Servia) an arrangement seemed almost in sight, announcing to... the Russian Foreign Minister that Austria would consent to mediation the points in the Note to Servia which seemed incompatible with the maintenance of Servian independence.” As Mr. *De Bunsen* says, “Austria, in fact, had finally yielded.” And it was at this moment, when the quarrel was virtually over, and European war, and even the Austro-Servian war, averted, that Germany smashed down the whole frail, painfully reconstructed edifice of peace by her double ultimatum to Russia and France. “A few days delay,” as Sir. M. *De Bunsen* writes, “might in all probability have saved Europe from one of the greatest calamities in his history.” That calamity, besides had been foreseen by Germany at a time when Austria could apparently foresee nothing but a local punitive war against Servia. For in the German White Paper the German Government says, in recording its original approval of Austria’s ultimatum to Servia, “we were fully aware in this connection that warlike moves on the part of Austria-Hungary against Servia would bring Russia into the question, and might draw us into a war in accordance with our duties as an ally.” Austria, when she saw the gulf before her, drew back; Germany, who had seen it throughout, forced her in. The result is that Austria, the less blameworthy of the two, is already ruined, almost all Europe is scourged and bereaved and impoverished, and the rise of modern Germany, the most remarkable event in modern Europe, is over—to give place to we know not what. It is the old truth over again, that men’s character is their fate. If the Prussian character had been such that peace would, at a moment of world-crisis, really interest it more than questions of military opportunity, there would have been none of this tragedy. The misery of it is that some men’s character is other men’s fate as well as their own.

September 18, 1914

## 15.

### **The Great Prussian Mistake.**

Mr. *Asquith* made the point last night that we are at war against an armed idea. Armed ideas have always been hard to beat, whether the idea itself was good or bad... But, happily, a bad idea is much less hard to beat in the field than a good one; and the idea that has for half a century possessed the Prussian mind is a bad one—exciting to those whom it possesses, but also misleading and disabling. The idea is that force, though it may prove itself wrong by failing, proves itself right by succeeding—succeeding, that is, in the sphere of force...; that any dispute as to which of two courses or causes is the right one is infallibly decided by the test of war, the justice of the verdict by battle being founded on the very nature of things—that is, on the preference of Nature herself for the animal or the State which can kill or cow its rivals; and so prove itself by survival the fittest to carry forward Nature’s own chosen process of Evolution. At first it might seem as if we, or the French, to both of whom this idea is alien, must be, in a certain sense, at a disadvantage. For we, who do not thus deify force, are putting to the test of force itself our quarrel with a State which does. And it might have been feared that in the temple of force the unbeliever might come off worse than the believer. But here comes in the sort of miracle that may well renew men’s faith in the indestructible decency and rightness of the world. For, now that the test by force has lasted for six weeks, we see already that that very fanaticism of belief in force is to the fanatic a source of countless weaknesses... they calculated that Irishmen, Canadians, Boers, and Egyptians despise our “sentimental” country and desert it; and now their own blind miscalculations are coming in, armed and horsed,

to confound them, from every part of the world. Among our reasons, and the civilised world's reasons, for desiring with all its heart the defeat of Germany is this—that it would once more publish to the world the fact that strength, even military strength, in a nation, like happiness in an individual, is not to be won by the direct pursuit of it for its own sake, but is, in its last perfection, a something added unto those whose consciousness has been at other things...

September 19, 1914

16.

### **The Burning of Rheims Cathedral.**

It has been said that man is more important than his works, and that there is some insincerity in grieving over the destruction of great works of art when men are being destroyed in thousands every day. But surely that is a false view to take. War is impossible without the death of men, and in dying men serve their country and its cause. But the destruction of great libraries and beautiful houses and churches does no manner of service to anyone. It is sheer reduction for all time of the stock of beauty and happiness in the world, and is comparable in its wickedness with the killing of women and children. In their report of yesterday the French complain that the Germans, for no discoverable military reason, have been bombarding Rheims Cathedral—one of the most beautiful examples of early Gothic architecture in Europe—and have at last succeeded in setting it on fire. We may hope that the fire has not destroyed the masonry of this great church, but it must have destroyed beyond repair a great deal of its beauty, and the vandalism of the bombardment is as disgraceful as the burning of Louvain. It is made all the worse because there is some reason to think that the German resistance on the Aisne is at last being broken down. Rheims Cathedral is one of the things that could make a victory on the Aisne sweet to a Frenchman without adding to the bitterness of defeat for the German, and there is in its bombardment on the eve of a retirement a suggestion of vengefulness and of the mere spirit of destruction and of hate which is in keeping with too much in the conduct of this surely the most atrocious as it is by far the vastest in scale of all modern wars.

September 21, 1914

17.

### **Mr. Churchill's Speech.**

...Mr. *Churchill* went on to state the impression of the aims and motives of German policy as he has received while at the Admiralty. It is, briefly, that there has been no breach in the continuity of Prussian foreign policy since the three last Prussian wars—with Denmark, Austria, and France—were undertaken, as matters of national business enterprise, each at the moment when its success was thought most likely and each on a forced or manufactured pretext. Certainly, whether this be a complete or correct explanation or not, there is no other country in Europe in which the horrible theory of war as a national industry, and normal and healthy means of self-advancement... has been preached so openly and in such important quarters as in Germany....

...It seemed as if at Rheims some malign imp had prompted the Germans to fulfil to the letter Heine's bitter prophecy of the re-barbarisation to which he felt that the German thought would one day lead. "Thor", Heine predicted, "with his giant's hammer, will at last spring up and shatter to bits the Gothic cathedrals." In shattering Rheims Cathedral to bits the German gunners have robbed the world of one of the

loveliest things that man ever made. Thousands of English people must know it, some of them without knowing its name. No foreign train is better known to English holiday-makers than that which passes direct from Calais to Bâle... Many English travellers, awakening at dawn in August, must have stared in amazement at the enormous church, that from a few miles away, looked inexplicable, seeming to rise in utter solitude out of great spaces of cornfield and vineyard. As the train drew near they saw that at this giant church's feet there was a town, growing about like grass round the pedestal of a great statue. And if they went closer they found one of those buildings which are to other buildings as "Hamlet" and "Macbeth" are to other plays. It was built at a time when France and England led all Europe in the master art of architecture. Italy only deposed us later, but nothing built in Italy in the thirteenth century is fit to compare with our own cathedrals of Lincoln, Lichfield, and Wells, or with France's cathedrals of Chartres, Amiens, and Rheims...

Izaak Walton quotes a man who said that God could doubtless make a better fruit than a strawberry, but that certainly He never did. Man may yet make richer melodies in stone than those of Rheims, but certainly he never has, and it seems that nothing of them is left. One wonders idly whether the Hun who ordered it did not know, or whether he knew but did not care. Would he have burnt the Sistine Madonna at Dresden as lightly, or was it only because Rheims was in France that he robbed the world of it? These are the puzzles put before us almost daily by the psychology of Prussian Junkerdom when it goes forth to war. They are raising the mind and heart of all the civilised world against Germany... Louvain and Aerschot strengthened our cause in the neutral world's esteem, and Rheims will strengthen it still more. But nothing will give back to mankind the wonder and the glory of a first sight of Rheims.

September 22, 1914

## 18.

### A Patriotic Duty.

One of the great costs of a great war is and must be this—that for some time after it our race, however well the war may end, has to be bred from a less good stock than before. A large proportion of the strongest and most spirited men in the prime of life—the men who would probably have made the best fathers for the next generation—are killed off. In this respect a country with a voluntary army is even harder hit than a conscriptionist country by the loss of the same proportion of its men in war. For conscription, within wide limits, takes the fit and the unfit alike; voluntary service takes the men of special vitality, energy, and love of adventure. And, the juster and more inspiring our cause, the greater the cost. For, the better the cause the higher the type of volunteer to whom it specially appeals. A war of rescue and liberation, like the war we are fighting for France and Belgium, causes a particularly large proportion of men with strong, rich, and generous mind and character, as well as good physique, to put themselves in the way to be killed. As a writer in the current *Eugenics Review* says, "the sample of those killed will not be the average of the race, but the best type of the race. The cream of the race will be taken and the skimmed milk will be left." These are facts in which the German militarist philosophers do not believe. They hold that war improves the breed. They do so partly because they think that universal military training causes an all-round improvement of physique more than sufficient to compensate for any injury done to the stock by losses in war. But they also attribute to modern warfare, in which casualties fall at least as heavily on the bravest and strongest men in the field as on others, the selective value that may really have been

possessed by the primitive warfare of single combat, in which the strongest and boldest males tended to survive, like the strongest buck in a herd. As between individuals in modern war there is, on the whole, no “survival value” in personal power and daring—rather the reverse. The war of 1870 lowered the average stature of the French race for a generation. The Bernhardian philosophy of war is at this point, as at every other, a queer combination of scientific phrasing with moral savagery—Matabele ideas expressed in tags of *Darwin* and *Herbert Spencer*.

Of course, the fact that this Bernhardian theory of war is crazy is no reason why we should not fight when we think it right to do so. Nor should it be the slightest discouragement to us as regards the present war. Whatever we are suffering biologically, our enemies are suffering more...

[But measures should be taken to keep up the national stock as much as possible. Children born to soldiers and sailors are in danger of being born into circumstances of privation. And even the families of men who before the war were well-to-do have “begun to reduce from the middle class to the lower class”, i.e. smaller professional men and businessmen, artists, journalists, actors, clerks.] ...Many married men of this class—the fairly but precariously well-off middle class—have put patriotism above everything, and enlisted, leaving their wives to live on allowances of 12s 6d a week and whatever help they may get from their countrymen. So that the proportion of births taking place under circumstances promising ill for the arriving citizen’s future serviceableness to his country is likely, on many accounts, to be extremely high...

...The Professional Classes War Relief Council, for example, and the Eugenics Education Society are organising schemes of Maternity Assistance by which it is hoped to prevent many children of people hitherto fairly well-to-do from being born, during the war, under slum conditions...

[But public action needed.]

October 6, 1914

## 19.

### **The Belgian Blue Book.**

Like the Governments of Great Britain, Russia and Germany, the Belgian Government has now published its diplomatic documents relating to the outbreak of war... they enable us to see... the criminal blunder which the German Government has caused civilised mankind, as a whole, to wish for its defeat. When Germany violated the neutrality of Belgium, she had either persuaded herself, or had tried hard to persuade herself, or was at least pretending to have absolutely persuaded herself, that if she did not do this faithless and cruel thing France would do it... she took, in her communications with Belgium, the cynical line that France was sure to attack her through Belgium, and that therefore she must attack France through Belgium first... the cynical line was simply a blunder. France had no plan of this kind. Belgium was never in France’s eyes, the weak back door of Germany. In France’s eyes the German weak spot was Alsace...

Not even through Alsace, we imagine, did French strategists ever think of penetrating into Germany; their minds ran almost wholly on the means of defending the French frontier in case of war; so enormous was Germany’s military prestige in Europe after 1870 that it could hardly be otherwise...

...If Germany had not over-estimated in this way the supposed craft and subtlety of French generals and Ministers she might not have broken her own shins over Belgium. Indeed, perhaps there would have been no war.

October 7, 1914

20.

**Mr. Thomas Hardy & The Rheims Bombardment.**

[Letter from Thomas Hardy, the noveelist, extract:]

Everybody is able to feel in a general way the loss to the world that has resulted from the mutilation of a noble building, which was almost the finest specimen of mediaeval architecture in France...

Is there any remote chance of the devastation being accidental, or partly accidental, or contrary to the orders of a superior officer? This ought to be irrefutably established and settled, since upon it depends the question whether German civilisation shall become a byword for ever or no. Should it turn out to be a predetermined destruction—as an object lesson of the German ruling caste's will to power—it will strongly suggest that a disastrous blight upon the glory and nobility of that great nation has been wrought by the writings of Nietzsche, with his followers, Treitschke, Bernhardt etc. I should think there is no instance since history began of a country being so demoralised by a single writer, the irony being that he was a megalomaniac and not truly a philosopher at all... Yet he and his school seem to have eclipsed for the time in Germany the close-reasoned philosophers, such men as Kant and Schopenhauer.

October 7, 1914

21.

**The Dispute About Nietzsche.**

Mr. *Thomas Hardy* is being scolded by devout Nietzscheans for having put down much of the moral perversity of modern Prussianism to the inspiration of *Nietzsche*.... modern Germans of the pushing kind quite often swear by *Nietzsche*, though he swore at them. His doctrine of the superman provided a convenient philosophy with which to justify the temper of boundless complacency, confidence, and assertiveness that was encouraged in the ruling class of Germans by the intoxicating successes of the two great acts of carefully timed aggression of 1866 and 1870.... A Bismarkian, and still more a Bernhardian, politician is quite genuinely a practical illustration of what Nietzscheism means in action.

No doubt *Nietzsche* himself might have disowned them. But that would only have shown that *Nietzsche's* exposition of his own main ideas was so crude as to invite their misapplication in practice... To be the philosophy of a decently dutiful life it needs much wresting, but on a personal or natural career of violent egoism it fits like a glove. We hold with Mr. *Hardy*.

October 7, 1914

22.

**The German Spies.**

If it be not unseemly for a nation to chuckle during one of the greatest crises of its life, a vast chuckle will certainly go up from the British nation to-day when it reads the Press Bureau's report on the Government's way of dealing with the German spies in England. It is a really exhilarating story of long-continued, laborious and expensive trickery seen through by its intended victims and then quietly allowed to go on amusing itself with the illusion of its own success until the proper moment came for sweeping it all away at one stroke as a housemaid sweeps away a year's handiwork of a whole colony of spiders. Since 1911, at any rate, the German Government has taken extraordinary trouble to find out everything about the defences

of Great Britain that ought to be kept from any possible invader. Perhaps, however, we should not say “extraordinary,” for ever since the time of *Frederick the Great* the importance of spying has been a special article of faith with Prussian commanders and Governments. Howbeit, while the German Government’s employees went about their spying here, our Home Office, working with the War Office and the Admiralty, stood over them and watched their plans as an unseen adult watches children playing under a window. They were mostly left at large, but care was taken that they should do little harm if any... Then the war came, and the work of the Home Office was simple. It had already, as it came to see the needs of the case, armed itself with one new Act necessary for effectual action. In a couple of days it asked for and obtained a second. Then it instantly arrested a score of those against whom it knew most; it took care that amongst the interned prisoners of war there should be included the 200 others whom it distinctly suspected, and also the far larger number whom it did not absolutely know to be safe. The whole staff of German spies, which for three years had been utilised by the success of our detectives, was broken up—so utterly broken up that even on August 21 the German General Staff did not know that our Expeditionary Force had left England, though almost everybody in England had been talking of it under his breath, and though one English newspaper, at any rate, had been guilty of letting out the fact in print.

There is, naturally, a touch of glee about the official report of this triumph of good gamekeeping... But the report wisely adds a warning that, though the conspiracy as a whole has been stamped out, it is possible that an outlying spy may remain here and there, and also possible that new spies may make their way in by way of neutral countries... There never was, and is not now, any excuse for spy mania or for the silly and cruel proposals to make out everybody to be a spy who bears, as our *King* does, a surname of German origin. We have simply to remember... that from the military point of view much of the work of reconnoitring England must still remain to be done, and that our personal chances of detecting a spy, though not great, are still not to be neglected...

October 9, 1914

23.

### **Nietzsche And Germany.**

*Mr. Beecham On Mr. Hardy’s Attack.*

...Anything that emanates from Mr. Thomas Hardy is carefully read and welcomed with complete faith by a large number of seriously minded people who accept more or less unconditionally the assertions of celebrated men, especially those of literary reputation. All the more, then, is Mr. Hardy, by reason of his pre-eminent position, to be severely blamed for his light-minded and ill-considered attack on a writer with whose works he is obviously very slightly acquainted. For to me, an old student of Nietzsche, it is only too evident that Mr. Hardy’s criticisms of this remarkable man are founded on the most superficial basis of knowledge, and provide a deplorable example of that ignorance which has prevailed for over a generation in this country of matters concerning real German life and thought.

...I have resolutely attacked, publicly and privately, in season and out of season, the mental and moral decadence of Germany, its utter bankruptcy on the higher planes of art and philosophy. For during an entire generation Germany, which formerly occupied a fairly exalted place on the Arctic heights of spiritual life, has taken a

headlong flight downhill into the valley of the grossest materialism, and through the length and breadth of that country, which was once described by Lord Lytton as “a nation of dreamers and poets,” and which during the nineteenth century has contributed so gloriously to literature, music and philosophy, there has been found only one man to raise his voice against this terrible national tendency, to devote his whole career to arresting the final vulgarisation of all German thought, who shattered his life forces on the unbreakable rock of German Philistinism, and whose marvellously subtle brain and super-refined organism at last gave way under the strain of the splendid but hopeless task he had taken upon himself. It is Friederich Nietzsche...

When one realises that there is hardly a book of Nietzsche (the only exception, perhaps, being the “Zarathustra”) which does not contain the bitterest denunciation of Germany, one can only find an explanation of the present popular estimate of Nietzsche in the profound ignorance of those who are so loosely making use of his name. To the genuinely honest inquirer I should like to recommend the reading of such a book as “Unseasonable Thoughts,” written in 1872, just after the Franco-Prussian War. It is perhaps the most masterly pamphlet of its kind since the time of Swift, and is a crushing attack on the state of German culture in those days. He pointed out with solemn warnings to his countrymen the fatal direction in which the national swelled-headedness, born of their victories over France, was leading them. These warnings and denunciations poured from his pen ceaselessly for 18 years...

There has been urged against Nietzsche his profound antagonism to Christianity, as if this had anything to do with the modern condition of Germany and the present war. Nine-tenths of the philosophers of the last 200 years in all countries have been anti-Christian in one form or another..., and Nietzsche is certainly not more so than Voltaire, with his century-and-a-half old “Erasez l’Infame.” Again, his ideal of the superman has been denounced as one which has been mainly responsible for the apotheosis of the spirit of “blood and iron.” This is not the place to expound the Nietzschean philosophy of the superman; it is certainly a very different kind of teaching to anything I have yet seen described in an English newspaper; but in its simplest form it may be said to be a worship of the hero, or “strong man” type, and it may well be asked, What have we English got to say to that? Has this generation entirely forgotten Thomas Carlyle, who revelled and gloried in “bold, bad men,” and whose favourite hero was the real founder of Prussia, and the modern German Empire, the real originator of the doctrine of “blood and iron,” the violator of treaties, the breaker of oaths, the hardened sceptic (and profound despiser of all German culture), the “incorrigible bandit, “Frederick the Great”!—Yours &c.

October 9, 1914

## 24.

### **The Philosophy Of Savagery.**

In another column *Mr. Thomas Hardy*, the greatest of living English writers, makes a gentle but sufficient reply to those who chid him for ascribing much of the moral craziness of modern German militarism to the inspiration of *Nietzsche*. We cannot doubt that Mr. Hardy is right. During the years in which *Nietzsche* was slowly dying in a madhouse, a great many people, especially quite young men, in all parts of Europe were bitten with the idea that in his philosophy they had found at last the true wisdom of life. We have had our Nietzscheans in England; Mr. *Kipling* is just a little bit of a Nietzschean, or was till the Boer War made him serious, and there have been

others, though Nietzsche commonly used the name English as an abusive epithet. Another of his abusive epithets was the name German, and yet the Nietzschean habit of mind became a fashion, or a habit, in Germany, or at any rate in Prussia, to an extent never approached here. Those who a few years ago saw Sudermann's "Es Lebe das Leben" played here will remember the Prussian aristocrat's harangue to his son who had revolted against the national custom of duelling. The father exhorted the son to become like a mediæval Florentine blood who, when he left home in the morning, always felt there was a good chance of his coming back to it feet first, with a sword-thrust through his heart. In the father's eyes there was a mystic nobility about the precariousness, the cruelty, and the savage self-reliance of a life like that. It satisfied the father's demands for moral beauty. It did not seem to him that to relish it, with all that it meant of absorption in the elementary brutalities of primitive life, and of reckless and headlong injury to others, was to lower oneself to the moral level of a quarrelsome dog. It seemed to him to be the path of honour. And though he did not mention *Nietzsche*, he was in this the perfect Nietzschean.

*Nietzsche* was always adjuring men to live dangerously and pitilessly. They were to make life a terrific and intoxicating adventure, to raise whirlwinds and ride them... The ideal life was to be a blaze of triumphant and arrogant egoism, without fear and with complete indifference to reproach; it might mean crime, shame and disaster, as most of us call them, but from these the right man was to draw wild and sombre delights akin to the thrills that a sensitive spectator obtains from the horrors of a grand storm or from the agonies of King Lear. In short, Nietzsche was a sentimentalist. And except in the fervour and brilliance of its expression his sentimentalism was one of the oldest kinds and of a kind peculiarly liable to afflict very bookish people with poor health. It was the sentimentalism of the infirm old lady in *Smollett*, who spent her time indoors writing poems that began

What to me divine and human laws?

I court no sanction but mine own applause,

and went on to say, if we remember rightly, how she would like to

toss the sprawling infant on my spear

What time its mother's cries salute mine ear.

It was the kind of sentimental virilism, gone mad, that used to visit the dreams of *R. L. Stevenson*, the lifelong invalid, and of *Henley*, the lifelong cripple. As Mr. Desmond MacCarthy says, in this week's "New Statesman," Nietzsche took himself for a moralist, but was really an 'aesthete.' Living a poor, bare, narrow life himself, he doated on the idea of certain lurid and violent "effects" in life and history...

Usually these philosophies of incapacity or perversity only ruin the minds and lives of a few young men. But *Nietzsche's* has had a more terrible fate because at the moment of its first vogue a quickly rising militarist State, which in its rise had cut itself adrift from current standards of scruple and self-restraint in diplomacy and in conquest, was badly in want of a creed—not a formal creed, for ceremonial profession, but a system of ideas to be animated by the determination of conduct. Nietzsche stepped into the vacant place. You feel the very breath of Nietzscheism in the German Emperor's famous farewell speech to his brother at Kiel, with the "mailed fist" passage, and in the equally famous exhortation to the German contingent in China to emulate the Huns. The Nietzschean doctrine of the superman was echoed back in Prince *Henry's* responsive promise to "declare in foreign lands the gospel of your Majesty's hallowed person, to preach it to everyone who will hear it, and also to those who will not hear it". The German campaign of barbarism in Belgium is simply

*Nietzsche's* bookish dream of a conquering pitilessness put into practice... Soldiers and men of affairs sometimes despise pedants and bookmen as men of inaction, who do not "do things." One almost wishes they did not do them when one sees the written work of what Mr. *Hardy* justly calls an incoherent rhapsodist taking the field, four million men strong, with Krupps in its hand, and laying waste one of the most inoffensive countries in Europe.

October 13, 1914

25.

[Letter]

**Mr. Hardy On Nietzsche.**

"Sir—I would gladly, if at this stage of my life I could reopen what is an old subject with me, reply to your correspondents who think I have misrepresented Nietzsche (at the fag-end of a letter on an architectural subject by the way). I will only remark that I have never said he was a German, or that he loved Germany, or that he lived before Treitschke: or that he did not express such sentiments as your correspondents and others—apparently young men chiefly—quote to the avoidance of other sentiments that I could quote, *e.g.*:

"Ye shall love peace as a means to new wars, and the short peace better than the long... I do not counsel you to conclude peace but to conquer... Beware of pity."

He used to seem to me (I have not looked into his works for years) to be an incoherent rhapsodist who jumps from Machiavelli to Isaiah as the mood seizes him, and whom it is impossible to take seriously as a mentor. I may have been wrong, but he impressed me in the long run, owing to the preternatural absence of any overt sign of levity in him, with a curious suspicion (no doubt groundless) of his being a first-class Swiftian humourist in disguise.

I need hardly add that with many of his sayings I have always heartily agreed; but I feel that few men who have lived long enough to see the real colour of life, and who have suffered, can believe in Nietzsche as a thinker—Yours &c. Thomas Hardy.

October 11.

October 13, 1914

26.

**Nietzsche.**

*By Artifex.*

...Mr. Beecham declares that Nietzsche's teaching in its simplest form is simply worship of the hero, the strong man, and asks, "Has this generation forgotten Thomas Carlyle?" We may ask in reply, "Has Mr. Beecham forgotten, or possibly, as seems more likely, never read, what Nietzsche wrote on this very comparison of himself with Carlyle? In *Ecce Homo* he writes: "Some learned cattle have suspected me of Darwinism; ...even the hero cult of that great unconscious and involuntary swindler Carlyle—a cult which I repudiated with such roguish malice—was recognised as my doctrine." There is no man whom it is more necessary to read, and to read pretty thoroughly, before expounding him, than Nietzsche...

Personally, I think he was from the first essentially mad...

October 15, 1914

27.

[Letter]

### **The Dispute About Nietzsche.**

Sir,—I had intended to send you a second letter which I had written on the subject of Nietzsche and Mr. Thomas Hardy. I have refrained from doing so, however, because I understand that Mr. Hardy, for whom I have the very greatest respect, does not wish to continue the controversy... But... will you kindly permit me to take exception to some remarks made by “Artifex”...?

Touching the question of Nietzsche’s relation to Carlyle, this writer refers to my interrogative “has this nation forgotten Thomas Carlyle?” and continues “We may ask in reply has Mr. Beecham forgotten, or possibly, as seems more likely, never read, what Nietzsche himself wrote on this very comparison with himself of Carlyle.” Then follows a quotation... To begin with, I neither stated nor hinted in any possible manner that Nietzsche had been influenced by Carlyle. What I did was to give in a few words the simplest description of the Nietzschean ideal of the “Supermen” and then go on to state that in England we also had a writer who in the past had profoundly impressed the mind of this country, and who had entertained an exaggerated regard for a type of dangerous individual bearing a suspicious resemblance to the popular conception of Nietzsche’s complicated creation.

But even assuming that I had desired to make such a comparison, should I have been obliged seriously to take into consideration Nietzsche’s disclaimer of any influence exercised over him by Carlyle? It is a wise author that knows accurately his own literary heritage, and, besides, the history of the making of books, music, and other things teems with instances of men who have taken great pains to repudiate or disparage those who undoubtedly contributed to their own intellectual existence...

“Artifex” seems to insinuate that I have not read the passage... which he quotes from *Ecce Homo*... Surely “Artifex,” if he had really read my letter, would have observed that my last quotation of Nietzsche had been extracted from the same book...—Yours &c. Thomas Beecham. Ewansville... October 16.

October 17, 1914

28.

[Letter]

### **The Dispute About Nietzsche.**

Sir,—To make Nietzsche responsible for the present war—a war for ends which Nietzsche himself utterly despised—is just as if we should hold Christ responsible for all the wars of European intolerance. Nietzsche’s great and final test of the Superman is the presence in him of “Bestowing Virtue”—the giving out of abundance; and if he ever contemplated that the term should be applied to any individual past, present, or future, it is more applicable to Christ and to Krishna than to any militarist.

Nietzsche taught the duty of unswerving service rendered by the great, not to others, still less to themselves, but to the greatness in themselves; it is this obedience that is to be rendered without pity—just as even the most chivalrous soldier may be compelled to neglect a wounded companion in order to press forward to the achievement of a more essential end.

That Nietzsche’s thought has a serious limitation, I should be the last to deny, and I have written on this subject in the *Indian Review* for November 1913. But as far as his thought goes, it is surely penetrating and stimulating. He has been compared to Carlyle; but in many respects he is nearer to Blake, who divides men into the classes of the Prolific and the Devourers, and emphasises the truth that one law (one morality)

for the ox and the lion is oppression. This view is identical with the Indian theory of *sva-dharma* (own morality), which is the leading motif of all their sociology.

Nietzsche was neither a German, nor a pro-German; and had he been a German, this would but have been an increase in our debt to German culture, which the present outburst of philistine German bourgeoisie does not cancel—Yours &c. Ananda Coomaraswamy. Britford. October 14.

October 17, 1914

## DAILY NEWS

29.

### On The Brink Of War.

...If it should prove impossible at this late hour to prevent the outbreak of war between Austria and Servia, it is at least possible to isolate the struggle. If Great Britain, Germany, France and Italy, acting together in good faith, do not achieve that they will be responsible for the greatest crime in history.

July 27, 1914

30.

### Russia And The War.

...No one has ever yet dared to claim that Russia is the champion of the freedom of anybody. She has enslaved many, but she has freed none. Her claim to be the protector of the Slav peoples has no historic basis... For ourselves, it is unthinkable that we should be drawn into such a quarrel. We have done much for the advancement of Russian interests in recent years. We have remained silent while the liberties of Finland have been trodden in the dust and while Russia, in defiance of her agreement with us to preserve the independence and integrity of Persia, has made the northern half of that country a Russian province. But the suggestion that we should spend British lives and British treasure to establish Russia in the Balkans would be an inconceivable outrage to a democratic country. Our hands are free in this business and we must take care to keep them free. Let us work zealously to preserve peace; but let us remember that the most effective work for peace that we can do is to make it clear that not a British life shall be sacrificed for the sake of a Russian hegemony of the Slav world.

July 29, 1914

31.

### Localising The War.

*Can Russia Fight Only In Part? Analysis Of Powers' Strength And Tactics.*

(From A Military Correspondent.)

When we speak of localising the conflict, do we mean what we say? That is, if the five Russian Army Corps are sent to the direct assistance of the Servians in the Servian theatre of war, while the other twenty stand fast, will the war be held to be local?

This question may have the appearance of being untimely trifling. One may assert that if Russia fights, she fights; that it is legally, militarily, and politically unthinkable that part of Russia should fight and the rest be at peace. Yet, militarily, there is no

theoretical objection to the idea of a partial war, and it is only because after 1870 everyone rushed to the conclusion that all wars must be general and unlimited that the old notion of limited war has been forgotten.

Every great war since 1870 has been limited to those parties who were really moved to violence of feeling and act, save only in the case of the Russian war against Japan...

In the present case, those who are moved to violence of feeling—not yet of act—are two Great Powers and two smaller ones. And four Great Powers are looking on without desire to fight one another at this time and on this quarrel, knowing well that the war they are contemplating is a Foreign Office war of the eighteenth century kind, and that (England excepted) they do not possess the eighteenth century professional armies wherewith to wage it.

Consider, therefore, ...the possibility of merely partial action by Russia and of nothing more than mutual deadlocking action by the outside parties.

The machinery to be locked is constructed on the idea that Austria must hold up Russia, practically unaided, for thirty days, and Italy neutralises a part of the French Army, while Germany in one brief, fierce offensive destroys the main French army and its British Allies (if any).

This accomplished, the Germans are to hasten back to the East, and to join the Austrians in making head against the Russians....

Evidently the working part is Germany, and if that part cannot run the machine is locked...

Germany is too weak, without Austria's full aid and something from Italy into the bargain, to make "war on two fronts," if the people on those two fronts want to make war upon her. All she can do... is to be so far ready for war that Russia could not employ more than a fraction of her forces against Austria...

This prevention can be achieved by readiness—simple readiness unaccompanied by offensive action, for which, in fact, Germany has not the available force...

The way to localise the war, in the military sense, is to produce equilibrium and deadlock everywhere else.

July 29, 1914

**32.**

### **Hopes And Fears.**

...the free peoples of France, England and Italy should refuse to be drawn into the circle of this dynastic struggle. We must not have our Western civilisation submerged in a sea of blood in order to wash out a Servian conspiracy.

July 30, 1914

**33.**

### **Our Duty.**

...So long as the great Continental Powers have not actually come to blows the duty of British statesmanship is to devote all its energies and all its ingenuity to the preservation of peace. There is no reason to doubt that this task has been faithfully accepted by Sir Edward Grey,... But if unhappily all his efforts [i.e. Sir Edward Grey's efforts for peace] should fail, what then? To that the "Times" gives the answer: "We must take our stand by the side of Russia and France." This answer is given with an assurance which dispenses with the need of giving reasons. Yet nothing but the weightiest of reasons could drive us to launch into a struggle which would be

the greatest conflict the modern world has known, and to risk in a tremendous gamble the splendid fabric of Empire which it has required centuries to build up. Such reasons may be of three kinds—those of honour, those of principle, those of interest. We are under no treaty obligation. What Mr. Asquith said on March 24, 1913, describes accurately our position to-day: for that we have Sir Edward Grey's assurance. "If war arises between European Powers there are no unpublished agreements which will restrict or hamper the freedom of action of the Government or of Parliament to decide whether or not Great Britain should participate in a war." There is no obligation of principle to make us take up arms on behalf of Russia... If Germany and France are unhappily for themselves bound by treaty to sacrifice themselves in this miserable quarrel we happily are free.

It is suggested that interest, our interest in "the balance of power" commits us to support Russia. No man has given substance to that hollow and disastrous phrase, but nothing is more certain than that the surest way to destroy any balance of European affairs would be to help Russia to crush Germany and Austria. Such a victory would leave Russia, who already dictates to France and so seriously prejudices our own policy, the dictator of Europe. The affected concern for "the balance of power" merely covers the desire to strike a blow at Germany. That is a course dictated by no consideration for any British interest. If the venture succeeded it would bring into being a new Russia, who would turn against India after we had helped her to smash Germany. If it failed, the failure might involve the ruin of the British Empire. Honour, principle, interest all alike dictate one course—to maintain an absolute neutrality should this lamentable dispute, in which we have neither lot nor part, bring war to the great Continental Powers... By standing apart from any conflict we preserve for Europe in the worst event the precious possession of an impartial mediator.

July 31, 1914

34.

#### **Keep The Peace.**

...What is the duty of the Government? It is its duty not only to keep out of the war should war come, but to announce here and now its rigorous neutrality. That would be the greatest contribution it could make to the preservation of peace, for it is the hope of our support in arms which is encouraging Russia to draw the sword. Why does not Mr. Asquith or Sir Edward Grey make that simple announcement of our neutrality? We do not profess to understand, but we do know that their tardiness and hesitation are not only encouraging Russia to appeal to the sword, but are also stimulating our own Jingoism in their campaign. It is quite clear that the pressure on the Government of those obscure forces which make for war is heavy, and growing heavier, and that unless the friends of peace rally and concentrate the Government may slide down the slope of disaster... The full force of public opinion must be brought to bear. Upon those who control organised labour the responsibility in this hour is heaviest because their power is greatest. The time has come when from every factory, mill, and workshop should come the command to our rulers to keep the peace. It is now that they must strike for their homes. A day's delay, and the blunder and the crime may be achieved, and misery and ruin be the lot of millions.

August 1, 1914

35.

## War.

...In all probability, before these lines are read, France and Germany will be actually and formally at war. Inevitably each party to the terrible struggle now begun is endeavouring to fix upon the other the responsibility for precipitating it.

This is a natural exercise of diplomatic finessing, and it has a serious political purpose. The belligerents have their eyes upon the neutrals, in particular this country, whose sympathy or even direct aid they desire to win. That is obviously the object of the statement issued here by the French Ambassador. His case against Germany is (1) that she delivered an ultimatum to Russia while promising negotiations were still proceeding and (2) that she forced war upon France while France was doing her utmost to avoid becoming involved. This sounds plausible, but we imagine that the Germans would meet the indictment something in this fashion: The negotiations between Russia and Austria were doomed to fail. They were simply a cover to enable Russia to hurry forward her mobilisation and so deprive Germany of her strategic value of speedier mobilisation.

To save herself losing this advantage Germany was compelled to force the issue. As for the conflict with France (assuming that the French Ambassador is correct in affirming that German troops have crossed the frontier) that was an inevitable consequence of war with Russia owing to France's treaty with Russia. Whether the first move was to be taken by France or Germany was immaterial from the point of view of the preservation of peace. It really belongs only to the diplomatic game of manœuvring for position. Germany would have liked France to take the initiative so that she might have a plausible argument for inducing Italy to join in under her treaty. France wanted Germany to strike the first blow so that she might say to the world, and more especially to the English people, that she was the victim of Germany's aggression. People would be wise to pay no attention to all this special pleading on the one side or the other. The responsibility for the horrible calamity which has fallen upon Europe is not determined necessarily by the final act of launching an ultimatum or crossing a frontier. It rests upon the Power or Powers who created a situation from which war followed inevitably.

### *England And Neutrality.*

It is a very grave matter to allocate the blame for so monstrous an infamy as the war now ravaging the Continent. For our own part we would divide it, though not equally, between both sets of protagonists. The conduct of Austria towards Servia swiftly passed beyond the point at which it could be approved, but it was Russia, with her eyes upon the control of the Balkans and ultimately upon the possession of Constantinople, who deliberately converted a local into a European war.

The one immediate overriding question is—What is to be the attitude of this country during the war. The Cabinet sat yesterday to consider this... It is generally understood... that it has put a question to the German Government, and it is believed that it has asked for a guarantee of the neutrality of Belgium... We hope and believe that Germany's answer will be satisfactory; but in this connection two points must be emphasised: We are under no obligation to defend against all and sundry the neutrality of Belgium by force of arms, and if there is a political case for doing so it has not yet been presented, nor do we believe it can be made out...

Let us speak plainly. There are, clear to the eyes of every one of us, certain influences at work to drive us into the war. There must be no inventing of pretexts for falling upon Germany... This country must preserve her neutrality. Any other policy would be treason to Liberal principle. It would wreck all the work of social reform

which Liberalism has laboured at these ten years, and ruin all hope of further progress for an indefinite term. It would mean, in the long run, either revolution or the end of democracy in this country. Whatever the result of the war, should we engage in it, the Empire would be exposed to the gravest peril which has yet assailed it. A defeat of a Russo-Franco-British combination would shatter the British Empire to pieces. A victory of a Russo-Franco-British combination would make Russia mistress of Europe, certain at her leisure to seize India. Neutrality would leave us practically the one strong Power unshattered by war, free from the sin of it, and available at any moment for mediating in the cause of peace. Neutrality is imposed on us by our honour and our interests, and with the example of Italy before us any vestige of pretext for departing from it vanishes. If Italy, the ally of Germany and Austria, stands neutral, we, who are free of any obligation towards France or Russia, can rush into war only if we are determined at all costs and against all reason, decency, and calculation to do so. To a few wild men who would rather ruin England than lose an opportunity of striking at Germany that course may commend itself. But the crime and the infamy must not be perpetrated. England must stand clear, unless and until our interests are attacked. We believe that will be found to be the position of the Government. If at any stage this country were threatened, the Government would act with the whole force of public opinion behind them. But to act without provocation would be a crime that would split the country in twain.

August 3, 1914

36.

#### **Sir Edward Grey's Statement.**

Sir Edward Grey made yesterday the gravest statement which it has ever fallen to a British Foreign Secretary to make. He declared in effect that unless both of two conditions are observed we shall join Russia and France against Germany and Austria. These two conditions are (1) that Germany shall undertake to observe the neutrality of Belgium, (2) that she shall undertake to attack by sea neither the Northern and Western coasts nor the maritime commerce of France. Germany has refused to give the first of these pledges.... As to the second, Germany offered not to attack by sea the Northern coasts of France on condition that we pledged ourselves to observe neutrality, an engagement which Sir Edward Grey pronounced "far too narrow."

It would seem, therefore, that if we are not yet at war with Germany, war is a matter of hours, and the Government has taken measures in anticipation of conflict. The fleet has been mobilised, and the Army is mobilising... Sir Edward Grey suggested that so far as the economic consequences to this country are concerned, there is no appreciable difference between the loss we should suffer if we remained neutral and the loss we shall suffer by entering into the war. Sir Edward is not well versed in economics, and we fear he has gravely misapprehended this matter. If we remained neutral we should be, from the commercial point of view, in precisely the same position as the United States. We should be able to trade with all the belligerents (so far as the war allows of trade with them); we should be able to capture the bulk of their trade in neutral markets; we should keep our expenditure down; we should keep out of debt; we should have healthy finances. There can be no reasonable doubt that the economic effects of the policy of war will be of the gravest character. That quite apart from the political consequences.

...

Sir Edward Grey contends that we are bound to make a violation of the neutrality

of Belgium by Germany a *causus belli*. We shall not ask whether he would have treated a similar violation by France as a *causus belli*; but we shall point out that Sir Edward did not assert that we are bound by treaty to defend Belgium's neutrality by force of arms. It is worth noting that all the Belgian Governments asked of us was diplomatic intervention... The real argument put forward by Sir Edward in this question is that of our interests. He declared that our vital interests are bound up with the neutrality of Belgium, and he drew a picture of all the neutral States of Northern Europe—Belgium, Holland, Denmark—being absorbed by Germany. The picture does not persuade because we see no probability of its ever representing the facts, and while Sir Edward asserted our vital interest in Belgian neutrality he did not prove it, and with infinite regret we must confess ourselves unconvinced...

It is, however, what Sir Edward Grey said as to our relations with France which contained the most startling revelations. He told the House that as early as 1906, during the Morocco crisis, he told France that British public opinion would certainly demand intervention should France be attacked by Germany; that later, on the French suggestion, the military and naval experts of the two countries consulted together as to co-operation in the event of war, and that these consultations have continued ever since—always on the understanding that our Government was not bound by them to go to war; that in November, 1912, he sent a letter to the French Ambassador recording all this and adding that “if either Government had grave reason to expect an unprovoked attack by a third Power, or something that threatened the general peace of Europe, it should immediately discuss with the other whether both Governments should act together to prevent aggression and preserve peace”; that in reliance on these agreements France concentrated her fleet in the Mediterranean and left her Northern and Western coasts exposed; and that consequently we are in honour bound to protect those coasts for her.

Two comments upon this exposition at once arise. In the first place, all these undertakings... were unknown to Parliament and the country, until it was too late for Parliament and the country to examine them. In the second place, how does Sir Edward Grey reconcile them, and reconcile his suggestion that they involved a debt of honour, with his insistence that we were left perfectly free to choose our course? It is too late now to examine all that is implied in these revelations, but one moral must be drawn. We are as we are, not as a result of the events of the last week or the last months, but as a result of ten years of diplomacy. Just as their alliances have brought France and Russia into clash with Germany and Austria, so the entente with an edge and secret corollaries has brought us into war. When we departed from the traditional policy [of Gladstonian Liberalism] of splendid isolation we committed ourselves to the path which led to the precipice.

*The Work Before Us.*

With yesterday's statement the hope for which we have fought through these fateful days vanishes. We shall not in this dark hour labour criticism or indulge in any harsh comment. This is not the place and this is not the time to pass judgments. We have only to deal with the accomplished fact and that flows from it. Our country is faced with a peril that no man can measure and in the presence of that peril it becomes us all to remember that we are Englishmen and to meet the common danger with a united front and a bold heart. We shall not forget that this thing might not have come upon us and we shall look to the Labour and Radical section of the House to keep alive the spirit of a happier time. It will not be their task or ours to make difficulties for the Government in the dread enterprise that is before them; but it will be their task

and ours to keep alight the flame of Liberalism and democracy, and to look forward with steady hope and courage to a better day...

August 4, 1914

37.

### **Belgian Neutrality.**

*Why England Is Not Bound To Fight.*

By P.J. Baker. (Senior Whewell Scholar Of International Law, University Of Cambridge, 1911).

...The treaty of 1839 left obligations of the guarantor States entirely undefined. There was no provision made for putting the guarantee into effective application against violators. When, therefore, the British Government were faced with the possibility of violations of Belgian neutrality in the war of 1870, they made treaties with both Germany and France to define exactly the measure of assistance they would give to Belgium in co-operation with either of the belligerents, were the other to commit a violation of Belgian territory. Britain's obligation was defined thus by those treaties:

"The Queen on her part declares that if during the said hostilities the armies of France should violate that neutrality (Belgian), she will be prepared to co-operate with his Prussian Majesty for the defence of the same in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon, employing for that purpose her naval and military forces to insure its observance, and to maintain in conjunction with his Prussian Majesty, then and thereafter, the independence and neutrality of Belgium.

But this proviso was added—and it embodies the reason for which the Treaty was made—

It is clearly understood that her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom does not engage herself by this Treaty to take part in any of the general operations of the war now carried on between the North German Confederation and France, beyond the limits of Belgium.

These two treaties of 1870, of course, expired. But that does not affect the fundamental point that they are the only precedent for the interpretation of the Treaty of 1839. In 1872 Mr. Gladstone described them as "a more stringent measure for the protection of Belgian neutrality" than the "general guarantee" of 1839. That is to say, they defined the very maximum of Britain's obligation under the earlier treaty. She would recognise in 1870 no obligation "to take part in the general operations of the war... beyond the limits of Belgium"; she has therefore no obligation to do so...

Limited participation, the maximum to which we are obliged, is impossible... Britain cannot by taking part in the war save Belgium from becoming the theatre of operations. She will merely add another to the armies that will be fighting on neutralised soil. She will, indeed, merely precipitate and incalculably magnify misfortunes which there is hope that Belgium may otherwise avoid.

And if we look to the spirit rather than to the letter of the guarantee, as in the interpretation of international treaties we are bound to do, it is clear that the main object... which we undertook to secure and preserve, was the existence of Belgium as a separate and independent unit in the European State system. To that central object neutralisation was subsidiary—a device to achieve the desired result. And Britain can thus best save the independence of Belgium to-day, not by plunging into a general European war which she has no obligation to undertake, but by accepting the guarantee of Belgian integrity which Germany has offered. If Britain remains neutral

she will be strong enough at the conclusion of the war to insist that Germany lives up to her promise. It is certain, that is to say, that by remaining neutral Britain can achieve the main object of the guarantee of 1839... If she enters on a general European war she will be risking her existence to achieve a doubtful result...

August 4, 1914

**38.**

#### **The Character Of The War.**

...There are some who think it will be brief because Germany will soon exhaust her resources. Much as we should like to think so we cannot believe it. Seldom, if ever, has a great State been stopped in war from lack of funds, and a nation of the temper of the Germans engaged in what they believe to be a life and death struggle will assuredly fight so long as fighting is possible.

For us, too, this war is now a question of life and death... Being in we must win, but we must endeavour at no moment in the struggle to lose our command of the situation or our power to determine that the reorganised Europe which will follow on our victory shall be one which fortifies British security and does not ruin European civilization and European liberty. The gravity of the struggle allows no room for incompetence or recklessness in our rulers or frivolity in our masses. The heady vapours of Jingoism must be foregone in the stern tasks that lie before the country...

August 5, 1914

**39.**

#### **The Crime And The Criminal.**

The Speech of Mr. Asquith yesterday—a speech unexampled in living memory for the magnitude of its subject and the flaming indignation with which it was fused—will unite the nation as one man in the supreme task before it. Whatever doubts had remained, not as to the policy of years, but as to the circumstances that led to the horror that has overspread Europe, they disappeared with the publication yesterday of the White Paper of the Foreign Office. No one can read that paper without sharing the passion with which Mr. Asquith denounced a crime so infamous and shocking as to leave the civilised world aghast. Which is the greater criminal, Austria or Germany, it is not easy to say. It is clear that Austria resolved to rush the situation... But the attitude of Germany when once she became involved assumed a brutality that left no room for hope. Throughout the negotiations she adopted the role of a dictator laying down his terms to Europe. There has been no such spectacle of arrogant power since Napoleon had Europe under his heel. The difference is that Napoleon had Europe at his mercy; but this, as Mr. Bonar Law admirably put it, is Napoleonism without Napoleon. It is difficult to rid one's mind of the feeling that we are in the presence not merely of unspeakable criminality, but of insanity—that in a moment compounded perhaps of panic born of fear of Russia and of uncalculating pride of power the German Emperor plunged over the precipice in blind frenzy. The appalling fact is that he has swept his own unhappy people and the nations of Europe over the precipice with him. It is the apotheosis of despotism. It is also its doom. Civilisation can never tolerate it again....

August 7, 1914

**40.**

#### **Europe Against The Barbarians.**

*Some Things At Stake.*

*By T.M. Kettle.*

...As for Servia, it seems probable that nobody will have time to go to war with her. Her function has been that of the electric button which discharges the great gun of a fortress. And now that the lightnings have been released what is the stake for which we are playing? It is as simple as it is colossal. It is Europe against the barbarians... The 'big blonde brute' has stepped from the pages of Nietzsche out on to the plains about Liège. Brought suddenly to think of it one realises the corruption of moral standards for which Germany has in our time been responsible. Since Schopenhauer died nothing has come from her in the region of philosophy except that gospel of domination.

And now we understand that the Immoralists meant what they said. We were reading, not as we thought a string of drawing-room paradoxes, but the advance proof sheets of a veritable Bullies' Bible. The General Bernhardtis who had been teaching Germany to desire war, to provoke it, to regard it as a creative and not a destructive act, to accept it merely as the inevitable prologue to German domination have proved to be not only brutal but formidable. Since Belgium, and its protecting Treaty, barred the way both had to go. "Nothing is true, everything is permitted to the strong." Afterwards it will be the turn of the others. And at the end of the process a monster, gorged with blood and with the torn limbs of civilisation, is to lie sprawled over all Central Europe, while some new metaphysician from Berlin booms heavily into his self-intoxicated brain some new fable of pre-ordination.

*Corrupt.*

I do not wish in any way to exaggerate. France has her corruptions. But the whole set of her thought even when it abjured Christian "illusions" was towards solidarity, towards reasonableness, and co-operation. Russia has her vile tyrannies. But from all Russian literature there comes an immense and desolating sob of humility and self-reproach. Great Britain has not yet liquidated her account with Ireland, nor altogether purified her relations with India and Egypt. But Great Britain does not, at any rate, throw aside all plain, pedestrian Christian standards as rubbish. In the Rhineland, too, and in the south there are millions of hearty men and women who are not yet Prussianified, and who still think there may exist a Being greater in some respects than the Imperial Kaiser. But all the central thought of Germany has been for a generation corrupt. It has been foul with the odour of desired shambles.

...Belgium... The courage and anguish of this glorious little nation, fighting now for its very life, stir one to something like the clear mood of its own heroism... ... Prisoners arrive, too simple of aspect, one would think, to be the instruments by which Europe is to be tortured to the pattern of a new devilry.... This German assault on civilisation has got to be repelled and utterly shattered once and for all.

*The Plan Of Campaign.*

Had Belgium consented to a free passage across her territory so that the French forts might be evaded, the problem was simply to profit by the slow mobilisation of France, and to strike straight and hard at Paris. On her refusal the problem was to hamstring Belgium... Both gambits have been countered...

*Liberty And 'Junkerdom'*

The great outstanding pinnacle of a fact is, perhaps, the definitive entrance of England into the comity of Europe. Regret it or not, there can be no more isolation. And the other fact, noted here also as of man importance, is the attitude of Ireland. Mr. Redmond's proffer of friendship, in return for justice, had been made often

before, but never in such dramatic circumstances. I am appalled to hear rumours to the effect that Sir Edward Carson proposes at this moment to force Mr. Bonar Law to bedevil the whole situation by a political trick. He actually proposes, one hears, that a course should be followed depriving Ireland of the Home Rule Bill, which is coming to her automatically by the mere efflux of a few weeks. Can such madness still be possible? Is there any imagination left in England?

...A reconciled Ireland is ready to march with her to any desperate trial. And suddenly the lawyer, with the Dublin accent, who had been the chief architect of destruction in the whole Empire, and who was thought to have come to reason, proposes for Ireland what I can only call a Prussian program [sic]. England goes to fight for liberty in Europe, and for Junkerdom in Ireland. It is incredible. Were it to come true it would become utterly impossible to act on Mr. Redmond's speech. Another dream would have gone down into the abyss. Ireland, wounded anew, would turn sullenly away from you. Is that what a sound Tory ought to desire? Will Tory England, enlightened at last as to the real attitude of Ireland, allow such a fatal crime to be committed?

August 10, 1914

41.

### **The Peril Of Potsdam.**

*Our Business Now.*

*By Bernard Shaw.*

...To begin with, we are not at war because Germany made 'an infamous proposal' that we should allow her to violate Belgian neutrality. If it had suited us to accept that proposal we could have found plenty of reasons for accepting it... no more infamous than the diplomatic reasons we have given in the past for courses which happened to be convenient to us. Let us therefore drop it. Our national trick of virtuous indignation is tiresome enough in peaceful party strife at home. At war it is ungentlemanly and unpardonable. Let us take our pugnacity to the field, and leave our hypocrisy and our bad blood at home. they weaken the heroic fighter and encourage only the blackguard.

This war is a Balance of Power war and nothing else. And the fact we all have to face is that if our side is victorious, the result will be an Overbalance of Power in favour of Russia far more dangerous to all the other combatants than the one we are fighting to redress. Mr. C.P. Trevelyan's resignation shows how strongly an Englishman with a cultivated historical sense of the Balance of Civilisation in Europe could regard Germany as so important a bulwark of that civilisation that even when we are at war with her we must finally aim at the conservation of her power to defend its eastern frontier. This need not discourage us in the field; on the contrary, we shall punch Prussia's head all the more gloriously if we do it for honour and not for malice, meaning to let her up we we have knocked the militarism out of her and taught her to respect us. Prussian militarism has bullied us for 40 years; and a month ago neither Germany nor France believed that we would fight when it came to the point...

Why was it that Mr. Asquith and Sir Edward Grey did not dare to tell the House of Commons that we had entered into a fighting alliance with France against Germany? ...Solely because they were afraid that if they told the whole truth, both the Labour members and the non-interventionist, anti-armament Liberals would have revolted and abandoned them to Ulster. The mischief of this was that it encouraged the Continental conviction that we would not fight... Had the Government or the Liberal Party had a

real modern foreign policy, Mr. Asquith might have said fearlessly to Prussian militarism: "If you attempt to smash France, we two will smash you if we can. We have had enough of the Germany of Bismarck, which all the world loathes, and we will see whether we cannot revive the world of Goethe and Beethoven, which has not an enemy on earth..." Can it be doubted that if this had been said resolutely and with the vigorous support of all sections of the House, Potsdam would have thought twice or thrice before declaring war?...

This is not a time for recrimination; but it is a time for showing that there is such a thing as an intelligent and patriotic foreign policy...

August 11, 1914

42.

**The War That Will End War.**  
*Concerning Mr. Maximilian Craft.*  
*By H.G. Wells.*

I find myself enthusiastic for this war against Prussian militarism. We are, I believe, assisting at the end of a vast, intolerable oppression upon civilisation. We are fighting to release Germany and all the world from the superstition that brutality and cynicism are the methods of success, that Imperialism is better than free citizenship and conscripts better soldiers than free men.

And I found another writer who is also being, he declares, patriotically British. Indeed, he waves the Union Jack about to an extent from which my natural modesty recoiled. Because you see I am English-cum-Irish, and save for the cross of St. Andrew that flag is mine. To wave it about would, I feel, be just vulgar self-assertion. He, however, is not English. He assumes a variety of names, and some are quite lovely old English names. But his favourite name is Craft, Maximilian Craft—and I understand he was born a Kraft. He shoves himself into the affairs of this country with an extraordinary energy; he takes possession of my Union Jack as if St. George was his father. At present he is advising me very actively how to conduct this war, and telling me exactly, what I ought to think about it. He is, in fact, the English equivalent of those professors of Welt Politik who have guided the German mind to its present magnificent display of shrewd, triumphant statecraft. I suspect him of a distant cousinship with Professor Delbruk. And he is urging upon our attention now a magnificent coup, with which I will shortly deal.

In appearance Kraft is by no means anglicised himself. He is a large-faced creature with enormous long features and a woolly head; he is heavy in build and with a back slightly hunched; he lisps slightly and his manner is either insolently contemptuous or aggressively familiar. He thinks all born Englishmen, as distinguished from naturalised Englishmen, are also born fools. Always his manner is pervaded by a faint flavour of astonishment at the born foolishness of the born Englishman. But he thinks their Empire a marvellous accident, a wonderful opportunity—for cleverer people.

So, with a kind of disinterested energy, he has been doing his best to educate Englishmen up to their Imperial opportunities, to show them how to change luck into cunning, take the wall [sic] of every other breed and swagger foremost in the world. He cannot understand that English blood does not warm to such ambitions. When he has wealth it is his nature to show it in watch-chains and studs and signet rings; if he had a wife she would dazzle in diamonds; the furniture of his flat is wonderfully "good", all picked English pieces and worth no end; he thinks it is just dulness [sic] and poorness of spirit that disregards these things. He came to England to instruct us

in the arts of Empire, when he found that already there was a glut of his kind of wisdom in the German Universities. For years until this present outbreak I have followed his career with silent interest rather than affection. And the first thing he undertook to teach us was, I remember, Tariff Reform, "taxing the foreigner." Limitless wealth you get, and you pay nothing. You get a huge national income in imported goods and also, as your tariff proposal prevents importation, you develop a tremendous internal trade. Two birds (in quite opposite directions) with the same stone. It seemed just plain common-sense to him. Anyhow, he felt sure it was good enough for the born English . . . .

*Swagger.*

He is still a little incredulous of our refusal to accept that delightful idea. Meanwhile his kind have dominated the more docile German intelligence altogether. They have listened to the whisper of Welt Politik, or at least their rulers have attended; they have sown exasperation on every frontier, taken the wall, done all the showily aggressive and successful things. They were the pupils he should have taught. A people at once teachable and spirited. Almost tearfully Kraft has asked us to mark that glorious progress of a once philosophical, civilised, and kindly people. And indeed we have had to mark it and polish our weapons, and with a deepening resentment get more and more weapons and keep our powder dry, when we would have been far rather occupied with other things.

But amazingly enough we would not listen to his suggestions of universal service. Kraft and his kind believe in numbers. Even the Boer war could not shake his natural aptitude for political arithmetic. He has tried to bring the situation to us by diagrams, showing us enormous figures, colossal soldiers to represent the German forces and tiny little British men, smaller than the army figures for Bulgaria and for Servia. He does not understand that there can be too many soldiers on a field of battle; he could as soon believe one could have too much money. And so he thinks the armies of Russia must be more powerful than the French. When I deny that superiority as I do — he simply notices the fact that I am unable to count . . . .

And when it comes to schemes of warfare then a kind of delirium of cunning descends upon Kraft. He is full of devices such as we poor fools cannot invent; sudden attacks without a declaration of war, vast schemes for spy systems and assassin-like disguises, the cowering of a country by the whole-sale shooting of uncivil non-combatants, breaches of neutrality, national treacheries, altered dispatches, forged letters, diplomatic lies, a perfect world organisation of Super-sneaks. Our poor cousin Michael, the German, has listened to such wisdom only too meekly. Poor Michael, with his honest blue eyes wonder-lit, has tried his best to be a very devil, and go where Kraft's cousin, Bernhardt, the military "expert," has led him. (So far it has led him into the ditches of Liège and the gorges of the Ardennes and much hunger and dirt and blood.) And Kraft over here has watched with an intolerably envy Berlin lying and bullying and being the very Superman of Welt Politik. He has been talking, writing, praying us to do likewise, to strike suddenly before war was declared at the German fleet, to outrage the neutrality of Denmark, to seize Holland, to do something nationally dishonest and disgraceful. Daily he has raged at our milk and water methods. At times we have seemed to him more like a lot of Woodrow Wilsons than responsible sane men.

And he is still at it.

Only a few days ago I took up the paper that has at last moved me to the very plain declarations of this article. It was an English daily paper, and Kraft was telling us, as

usual, and with his usual despairful sense of our stupidity, how to conduct this war. And what he said was this—that we have to starve Germany—not realising that with her choked railways and her wasted crops Germany may be trusted very rapidly to starve herself—and that, if we do not prevent them, foodstuffs will go into Germany by way of Holland and Italy. So he wants us to begin at once a hostile blockade of Holland and Italy, or better, perhaps, to send each of these innocent and friendly countries an ultimatum forthwith. He wants it done at once, because otherwise the Berlin Krafts, some Delbruck or Bernhardt, or that egregious young statesman, the Crown Prince, may persuade the Prussians to get in their ultimatum first. Then we should have no chance of doing anything internationally idiotic at all, unless, perhaps, we seized a port in Norway. It might be rather a fine thing, he thinks upon reflection, to seize a port in Norway . . . .

*A Fight To A Finish.*

Now let us English make it clear, once for all, to the Krafts and other kindred gentlemen from abroad who are showing us the really artful way to o things, that this is not our way of doing things. Into this war we have gone with clean hands—to end the reign of brutal and artful internationalism for ever. Our hearts are heavy at the task before us, but our intention is grim. We mean to conquer. We are prepared for every disaster, for intolerable stresses, for bankruptcy, for hunger, for anything but defeat. Now that we have begun to fight we will fight if needful until the children die of famine in our homes, we will fight though every ship we have is at the bottom of the sea. We mean to fight this war to its very finish, and that finish we are absolutely resolved must be the end of Kraftism in the world. And we will come out of this war with hands as clean as they are now, unstained by any dirty tricks in field or council chamber, neutralities respected and treaties kept. Then we will reckon once for all with Kraft and his friends and supporters, the private dealers in armaments, and with all this monstrous, stupid brood of villainy that has brought this vast catastrophe upon the world.

I say this plainly now for myself and for thousands of silent plain men, because the sooner Kraft realises how we feel in this matter the better for him. He betrays at times a remarkable persuasion that at the final settling up of things he will make himself invaluable to us. At dipolomacy he knows he shines. Thus the lisping whisper has its use, and the studied insolence. Finish the fighting, and then leave it to him. He really believes the born English will. He does not understand in the slightest degree the still passion of our streets. There never was less shouting and less demonstration in England, and never was England so quietly intent. This war is not going to end in diplomacy; it is going to end diplomacy. It is quite a different sort of war from any that have gone before it. At the end there will be no Conference of Europe on the old lines at all, but a Conference of the World. It will be a Conference for Kraft to laugh at. He will run about button-holing people about it; almost spitting in their faces with the eagerness of his derisive whispers. It will conduct its affairs with scandalous publicity and a deliberate simplicity. It will be worse than Woodrow Wilson. And it will make a peace that will put an end to Kraft and the spirit of Kraft and Kraftism and the private armament firms behind him for ever more.

At which I imagine the head of Kraft going down between his shoulders and his large hands going out like the wings of a cherub. “Englishmen! Liberals! Fools! Incurable! How can such things be? it is not how things are done.”

It is how they are going to be done if this world is to be worth living in at all after this war. When we fight Berlin, Kraft, we fight you . . . . An absolute end to you.

Yes.

August 14, 1914

43.

[Letter]

**The War That Will End War.**

*Prof. Gilbert Murray & Mr. H.G. Wells....*

Sir,—I think Mr. Wells has succeeded in saying one of the cardinal truths that we ought to remember. It is well to state it clearly now, because it will be much harder to remember these things at the end of the war, when we have really suffered and lost some of those we love, and are in danger of getting embittered and brutalised by the struggle. Beyond the war there is the settlement, and, as far as in us lies, we must see that “Mr. Maximilian Craft” has not one word to say in it.

Gilbert Murray.

Oxford, August 14.

August 17, 1914

44.

[Letter]

**What We Are Fighting For.**

*Lord Eversley Replies To Mr. Shaw And Mr. Well*

Sir,—Two eminent literary men, Mr. Bernard Shaw and Mr. H.G. Wells, have within the last few days expressed their views in your columns, with the object of defining the issues of the war...; and of presenting them to the public in a popular form, so as to rouse the most enthusiasm for it. They differ much from one another. Mr. Shaw maintains, with great emphasis, that the war is “a balance of power war and nothing else.” “Even when fighting Germany (he says) we should bear in mind that, if we win, the result will be an overbalance of power to Russia, and we must aim at the conservation of Germany’s power to defend her eastern frontier.” “We are to punch Prussian heads till we have knocked militarism out of them and have compelled respect for ourselves.” Having defeated Germany, with the aid of Russia, we are then I presume, to change sides, and with such aid as the beaten Germans can give us to perform the same operation on Russia. Indeed, Mr. Shaw seems to be more afraid of the overbalance of Russia than of Germany.

Mr. Shaw admits towards the end of his article that this is not the time for recrimination, but for prosecuting the war to our best: but he sets a bad example in this respect, for the greater part of what he writes is devoted to a provocative attack on those who, in the past, have been in favour of peace and the limitation of armaments. Their writings he describes “as exasperating platitudes about the wickedness of war and the extravagance of armaments, the splintered planks of an extinguished party.” He attributes the war largely to their baneful influence. Nor is the Government spared his lash. He accuses Mr. Asquith and Sir Edward Grey of having wilfully deceived the House of Commons, when they alleged that England was under no obligation not known to Parliament to take part in a war in Europe. He alleges that “the official prevarication by which the peace party was duped encouraged Germany to believe that we would back out, and thereby precipitated the war.”

If all this is not recrimination, I do not know the meaning of the word. I will not follow his example by dwelling on these topics. As regards his scheme of policy of punching the heads of the great military Powers in succession, it does not seem to me

to be practical politics; nor is it likely to rouse popular enthusiasm for the war. I would suggest that the popular writer of plays is not a bad illustration of the “sutor ultra crepidam.”

Mr. Wells, on his part, is even more enthusiastic for the war. His explanation is that it is directed against Prussian militarism... Elsewhere Mr. Wells is reported as saying that our quarrel is not with Germany, but with its Empire! “We are fighting to release Germany and all the world from the superstition and brutality are the methods of progress, that Imperialism is better than citizenship, and conscripts better than soldiers.” “We are going to war with clean hands to put an end forever to the reign of brutal and artful internationalism.” “What we are fighting for is a new map of Europe, if we are fighting for anything at all”...

Let me suggest to Mr. Wells that his argument about the militant imperialism of Germany would apply equally to Russia, if not more so. A war commenced with such objects would necessarily be a very long one. It would be more likely to end in the increase of militancy and imperialism than in the reduction of these evils. It does not seem to be in the interest of England to roam about the Continent reforming its map and tilting against militarism in the manner suggested.

\*

What then are we really at war for?... I take it that the main and sufficient cause of war is the action of Germany against Belgium. Germany has committed a crime of the greatest magnitude by invading Belgium with the intention of making it the base for a further invasion of France.... We are fully justified by our treaty with Belgium, if not actually bound by it, and by our own interest in the maintenance of her integrity, a principle on behalf of which we have fought for centuries, to go to her assistance. We mean and intend to use all the force of the Empire to roll back the invaders and to free Belgium. In doing so we shall also help to save France from invasion and further dismemberment. I hold this to be a sufficient cause of war.

Whether we might have secured the inviolability of Belgium and the ultimate integrity of France and her Colonies by negotiation on the basis suggested in the last interview between the German Ambassador and Sir Edward Grey the present is not the time to discuss. This may be open to question. In any case the crime of Germany is not the less. I hold it to be important to bear in mind this main cause; for in the event of success, in the event of our being able, as we all hope, in concert with French and Belgian armies to effect this purpose of defeating and driving back the German armies, the question will arise whether we are then to take part in a counter attack on Germany through Belgium or elsewhere, and whether we are to join with France and Russia in dismembering Germany and Austria. I will not now discuss this. I merely wish to indicate the question which will arise....

Eversley.

Abbotsworthy House... Winchester. August 17.

August 20, 1914

45.

**Business War On Germany.**  
*Great Activity at the Intelligence Bureau.*  
*Exhibition Of Trade Samples.*

One of the busiest places in London yesterday was the Commercial Intelligence Bureau of the Board of Trade, in Basinghall-street. In the ordinary way it has an air of academic calm, and its peace is not disturbed by more than about twenty callers a

day, but since war has been declared on German trade the number of callers has leapt up to hundreds, and the harassed officials are experiencing for the first time the sensation of having only half-an-hour for lunch.

Representatives of manufacturers in all parts of the country were inquiring yesterday how their trades could be pushed in the markets previously exploited by Germany. The demands for the pamphlets giving details of the commerce that may be captured has been so great that a rule has had to be made that, for the present, only one copy may be given to each inquirer...

A manufacturer of hosiery wanted to know, how he could best "have a cut at the Germans." At once he was handed a pamphlet giving names of likely buyers in various parts of the world, most of whom have previously done the greater part of their business with German firms.

Thrusting a pamphlet into the manufacturer's hand, and explaining hastily that he would find all the particulars he needed of the kind of hosiery the Germans has supplied, the official turned to another inquirer who had vainly been trying to catch someone's eye for ten minutes. "Cutlery? This pamphlet will give you all the information you require."

Others stepped forward. "Much to be done with furniture"?

"Certainly," said the official; "we're just getting out a pamphlet. It will be ready tomorrow..." And so on.

#### *Business War Council.*

Mr. H.E. Morgan, who is one of the leaders of the campaign to keep trade normal, expresses the hope that the Board of Trade will sanction the appointment of an Advisory Committee of experienced business men, who would stimulate manufacturers to capture Germany's enormous trade in neutral markets, and give detailed information as to means of transport, freights, duties, business customs, terms of credit, selling agents, etc. which are exactly the points a manufacturer must be acquainted with before he can profitably enter a new market...

#### *All British Toys.*

That British Toy manufacturers will ultimately reap the benefit of the industrial situation created by the war is the conviction of Mr. Scales of Messrs. Wisbey, the well-known Houndsditch toy dealers....

The all-English doll is no figment of the imagination, but the average doll that gladdens the heart of the children of humble life is an alien in ever so many respects. If its head comes not from Germany its eyes are certainly Bohemian.

Big English dealers are already being bombarded with inquiries for English toys.

August 21, 1914

46.

[Letter]

#### **The Object Of The War.**

*Mr. H.G. Wells Replies To Lord Eversley.*

Sir,—Lord Eversley's letter seems to me to express with the greatest clearness and ability just that attitude of mind which is most likely to render Liberalism feeble and futile in the present crisis. He objects apparently to such low people as Mr. Shaw and myself, "a popular writer of plays", and a nobody, from expressing any views at all about the outcome of this war... The idea of "The Daily News" seems, indeed, to be that we Liberals should leave those questions to our "betters," that we should drift along with blank minds, closed eyes, and open mouths, ready for any Peace that may

be presently thrust upon us. It is no longer to be “Peace at any Price;” it is to be “Any Peace at any Price”. I found myself, with amazement, for the first time in my life, invoking the name of Gladstone. He at any rate had no delusions about the dangerous artificiality of the Austrian Empire, no panic-fear of Russia, and no foolish idea that the East of Europe was no business of ours.

Surely it is still in Liberalism to resolve that the settlement of this vast upheaval is to be a people’s settlement, understood by the people and willed by the people...

Things are on the move now, as for a century they may never be again. A sane settlement of Europe may wipe out a hundred festreing wrongs, reduce the reasons for armaments to a minimum, open a new and cleaner page in the history of mankind. Surely there is life in Liberalism than thatit should play the part of a drag, and no other part, in these tremendous happenings.

H.G. Wells  
August 21, 1914

47.

### **What The German Conscript Thinks.**

*By Arnold Bennett.*

Some hold that this is a war of Prussian militarism and not a war of the German people. Others warn us not to be misled by such sentimentalists, and assert that the heart of the German people is in the war...

I do myself believe that the heart of the German people is in the war, and that that heart is governed by two motives—the motive of self-defence against Russia and the motive of overbearing self-aggrandisement... I base my opinion on general principles. In a highly educated and civilised country, such as Germany (the word “civilised” must soon take on a new significance) it is impossible that an autocracy, even a military autocracy, could exist unrooted in the people. “Prussian militarism” may annoy many Germans, but it pleases more than it annoys, and there can be few Germans who are not flattered by it. That the lower classes have an even more tremendous grievance against the upper classes in Germany than in England or France is a certitude. But the existence and power of the army is their reward, their sole reward, for all that they have suffered in hardship and humiliation at the hands of the autocracy. It is the autocracy’s bribe and sweetmeat to them.

The Germans are a great nation; they have admirable qualities, but they hav also defects, and among their defects is a clumsy arrogance, which may be noted in any international hotel frequented by Germans. It is a racial defect, and to try to limit it to the military autocracy is absurd. An educated and civilised nation has roughly the Government that it wants and deserves.... The war may be autocratic, dynastic, what you will; but it is also national, and it symbolises the national defect.

The German conscript must know what everybody knows—that in almost every bully there is a coward. And he must know that he is led by bullies... And the million little things that are wrong in the system he also knows out of his own daily life as a conscript. Further, he must be aware that there is a dearth of really great men in his system

August 24, 1914

48.

### **Japan’s “Mailed Fist.”**

Japan has formally declared war on Germany, as was expected; and news of the

fall of Kiao-chau may be expected hourly. The Japanese are not in the habit of leaving much to chance; and as a matter of fact it is known that all the necessary dispositions have been made by them for seizing their helpless prize. Kiao-chau is, of course, helpless; and the German Governor's reported resolution to obey the Kaiser's order and resist to the uttermost can only lead to a perfectly useless effusion of blood, which is not less deplorable because by comparison with the impending massacres in Europe it becomes relatively insignificant. The whole incident, assuming Japan's action to be confined to the occupation of Kiao-chau, is simply Japan's vengeance for Germany's share in depriving her of the fruits of her victory over China in 1895. It is as natural a "revanche" as the French; and it would be plainly hypocritical on our part to examine too censoriously the motives more or less decently veiled in the quaint language of the Mikado's manifesto.

None the less the intervention of Japan must be a source of more or less serious embarrassment to her European ally... The immediate gravity of the entry of the Japan is the moral effect of it on American public opinion. But assuming Japan's action to be limited in accordance with her pledges there is no sensible American who will hold this country to blame for an event which she is clearly quite powerless to prevent. What the British Government can do is to use its influence steadily to restrain within strict limits the forward policy of its ally.

August 24, 1914

49.

**Japan & Germany At War—**  
*Text Of The Mikado's Declaration.*

The following is the text of Japan's declaration of war against Germany.

"...We hereby declare war against Germany, and we command our Army and Navy to carry on hostilities against that Empire with all their strength, and we also command all our competent authorities to make every effort in pursuance of their respective duties to attain the national aim within the limit of the law of nations.

"Since the outbreak of the present war in Europe, the calamitous effect of which we view with grave concern, we, on our part, have entertained hopes of preserving the peace of the Far East by the maintenance of strict neutrality, but the action of Germany has at length compelled Great Britain, our Ally, to open hostilities against that country, and Germany is, at Kiao-Chau, its leased territory in China, busy with warlike preparations, while her armed vessels, cruising seas of Eastern Asia, are threatening our commerce and that of our Ally.

"Peace of the Far East is thus in jeopardy. Accordingly our Government and that of his Britannic Majesty, after a full and frank communication with each other, agreed to take such measures as may be necessary for the protection of the general interests contemplated in the Agreement of Alliance; and we, on our part, being desirous to attain that object by peaceful means, commanded our Government to offer with sincerity an advice to the Imperial German Government.

"By the last day appointed for the purpose, however, our Government failed to receive an answer accepting their advice.

"It is with profound regret that we, in spite of our ardent devotion to the cause of peace, are thus compelled to declare war, specially at this early period of our reign, and while we are still in mourning for our lamented Mother.

"It is our earnest wish that by the loyalty and valour of our faithful subjects peace may soon be restored, and the glory of the Empire be enhanced."

It is an interesting fact that the terms of the ultimatum presented to Germany are, in many respects, intentionally similar to the demand made by Germany to Japan in 1895 with regard to Port Arthur after the Chino-Japanese War...

August 24, 1914

50.

### **Our Business Now — And Later.**

*By Jerome K. Jerome.*

...

And so I found it everywhere I went. Sword and sabre striding through the land; driving kindness, humanity cowering into corners, brutalising, degrading.

Germany has fashioned for itself a god of blood and iron. They thought to breed a watchdog that should guard them. It has grown into a monster to devour them. They do not love it. It is not their true God. It is not a god made in their own image. Simple, kindly, sentimental Hans, lover of weak beer and strong music, singer of sentimental songs while the tears roll down his bearded face—Hans, builder of shelters where the birds may feed in winter, make of *spielplätze* for the children—Hans and Gretchen with loving hands decorating the Christmas-tree while the kinder sleep expectant! What have they to do with this Frankenstein's monster of blood and iron they are called upon to worship?

It is a battle of the gods we are engaged in. It is a battle of sanity, of progress, of civilisation, against the dying force of barbarism. It is a battle of democracy against the forces of blood and iron that would enslave it. It is the *Götterdämmerung* of the old gods. Thor and his hammer have not been without their uses to mankind, but the day of their service is passing. The new gods shall take their place. Reason and Brotherhood shall wrest the sceptre from Violence and Hate.

But it will not be just yet...

I would see this war fought to a finish—fought till we have conquered, not the kindly German people, but the cunning devil that has taken possession of them—driven it out of them. I would have it fought without anger and without hatred. It will be a hard task. It will take longer than some among us are imagining. More blood will flow than one cares to think of before that mastery of the conquerors in Berlin...

One hears much wild talk concerning new maps of Europe. The lion's skin is being divided methinks, a little too previously. The German Empire is to be broken back into its original hotch-potch of warring Kingdoms. The European timepiece is to be put back to the middle ages. Provinces are to be handed back to their former owners. It would be interesting to know what period of history is to be selected before the process commences. Are we to hunt up the map of Europe prepared by Charlemagne, or by Charles V, or whom?—

The less the map of Europe is altered the less of human suffering, the less of human passion and hatred we shall bequeath to the generations that are to come after us. Personally, were I a Pole, I should prefer to live under the influence of Germany—Germany cleansed and sober—than under Russia— When I was a young man it was Russia that was the God-appointed enemy of England. It was the Russian war that was "inevitable." I am glad to see jealousy and prejudice against Russia dying out from among us. Russia is a country of ideals and wonderful possibilities, but she is in the making. For a long time to come no one but a madman would wish to see Russian influence substituted for German as the dominant factor in Europe.

To kill Germany is impossible. One might as well talk of levelling the Swiss

mountains. Germany will remain to rise up again healed of her wounds. To humiliate and insult her when she is down would only be to leave a heritage of hatred and revenge that would menace Europe for yet another century.

This is to be, it is said, a war against war. I am not very sanguine of wars against war. I have lived through the bloodiest period of the world's history, the last half-century. I have seen too often the result of what has been called this "insurance against war;" these vast armies and navies, all of them got together solely for "the preservation of peace." I have seen a good many "last wars"—have heard more than once those words, "Never again." I see human nature behind all this talk, in essentials not so very much changed since the days of Attila the Hun.

But there has been progress. The world moves slowly, but it moves. To move it, if possible, a little faster we want the help of every sane man in every land. We have got to finish this war, and we have got to win it. If Germany—that is, if the Prussian military staff were to emerge victorious from this struggle, Europe would be handed over, bound hand and foot, to the mercies of the war-god. Conscription would suck the life-blood of every country, all human energy would be converted into a mere machine for destruction. We have got to fight Militarism in Germany, and when that is done we have got to face and fight it in other countries, including England. We shall want the help of our brother Hans! Hans, the thinker, the dreamer, the worker... with his worship of blood and iron driven out from him to his soul's salvation, with the fear of God returned to them.

August 26, 1914

51.

### **The Sack Of Louvain.**

...

Your poet-king, who loved Voltaire,  
Who spared no lives and salved no heart,  
Frederick at least vouchsafed to spare  
The storied monuments of art.

Recall ye how the Moslem rout  
Set Alexandria's pile aflame  
Invoking with triumphant shout  
The Prophet's Book Allah's Name?

These and the hordes that ravaged Rome,  
Moslem and heathen fiends were they,  
For deeds like theirs the curse comes home:  
Ye Goths and Vandals of to-day.

H.B.

September 2, 1914

52.

### **How Not To Be Useful In Wartime.**

*By Jerome K. Jerome.*

...There are... young fellows who in their thousands are pressing round the door of the recruiting offices. They are throwing up, many of them, good jobs... Their reward will be certain hardship, their share of sickness and wounds, the probability of

lying ten deep in a forgotten grave, their chance of glory a name printed in small type among a thousand others on a War Office report... To the best of their judgment they have formed an opinion on this important matter. They are going to argue it out in quite a serious manner, with Death as umpire.

There are mothers and wives and children who are encouraging them to go: to whom their going means semi-starvation... The young women know only too well what is before them—the selling of the home just got together...; the weary tramping of the streets looking for work. The children awestruck and wandering. They have heard the words before and know what follows: “Father out of a job.” And this time father may never come back; and if he does there may be no job to be found, not even with much searching.

But there is a certain noisy and, to me, particularly offensive man... very much to the fore just now with whose services the country could very well dispense. He is the man who does his fighting with his mouth. He oozes with patriotism... Unable for reasons of his own to get at the foe in the field he thirsts for the blood of the unfortunate, unarmed, and helpless Germans that the fortunes of war have left stranded in England... He has spies on the brain. Two quite harmless English citizens have already been shot in consequence of the funk this spy mania has created among us. The vast majority of Germans in England have come to live in England because they dislike Germany. That a certain number of spies are among us I take to be highly probable. I take it that if the Allies know their business, a certain number of English spies are doing what they can for us at great personal risk to themselves in Germany. Until the German Army has landed on our shores the German spy can do little or no harm to us...

...A country that cannot sleep nights for fear of a few spies in its midst had best not go to war...

...The men and women who are shrieking for vicarious vengeance upon all the Germans remaining in our midst must remember that there are thousands of English families at the present moment residing in Germany and Austria... I shall, until I receive convincing proof to the contrary, continue to believe that they are living amongst their German neighbours unmolested...

We are fighting for an idea—an idea of some importance to the generations that will come after us. We are fighting to teach the Prussian military staff that other laws have come to stay—laws superseding those of Atilla the Hun. We are fighting to teach the German people that, free men with brains to think with, they have no right to hand themselves over body and soul to their rulers to be used as mere devil’s instruments; that if they do so they shall pay the penalty and the punishment shall go hard. We are fighting to teach the German nation respect for God. Our weapons have got to be hard blows, not hard words... The soldiers are fighting in grim silence. When one of them does talk it is generally to express admiration of German bravery. It is our valiant stay-at-homes... who would have us fight like some drunken fish hag, shrieking and spitting while she claws.

Half of these stories of atrocities I do not believe. I remember when I was living in Germany at the time of the Boer War the German papers were full of accounts of Tommy Atkin’s brutality. He spent his leisure time in tossing babies on bayonets. There were photographs of them doing it...

September 4, 1914

**World Power Or Downfall.**  
*Germany's War Of Conquest.*  
By Robert Lynd.

[Bernhardi's book] ...is an impressive statement of Germany's fifth gospel—the gospel of conquest. St. Paul did not believe more vehemently in the redemption of the world through Christianity than Bernhardi believes in the redemption of the world through the sword. He believes in war, not as a hateful necessity, but as a sacred duty. He has translated the Manchester faith that mankind will be saved by competition in commerce into the Prussian faith that mankind will be saved by competition in bloodshed. He preaches this creed with an idealism which is not the less amazing because it is idealism in perversion. He fulminates against peace as though it were one of the sins of Aholah and Aholibah... There you have the insane gospel of Imperialism at its most muddled—the gospel of Nietzsche and Kipling seen through the mind of a Prussian man of action—the gospel that is now transforming Europe into the likeness of a madhouse on fire. It is the gospel of national selfishness—of cutting the throat of humanity for humanity's good. It is simply barbarism cloaking itself as the cause of civilisation. "The efforts directed towards the abolition of war," he writes, "must not only be termed foolish, but absolutely immoral, and must be stigmatised as unworthy of the human race;" and he speaks with loathing of "the aspirations for peace, which seem to dominate our age, and threaten to poison the soul of the German people." "We can, fortunately," he concludes—

assert the impossibility of these efforts after peace ever attaining their ultimate object in a world bristling with arms, where a healthy egotism still directs the policy of most countries. "God will see to it," says Treitschke, "that war always recurs as a drastic medicine for the human race!"

*"Might Is Right."*

It would be foolish to pretend that Prussia is the only country in which theories of this sort have been cherished. On the other hand, almost everywhere in Europe outside the circle of Prussian militarism, they seem to be parts of a dying creed. Prussia has reformulated the old detestable Bible-and-gun Imperialism just at the moment when it seemed to be losing its hold on civilised peoples. It has out-Kiplinged Kipling in her belief that the strong must inherit the earth. "Might," says Bernhardi, writing of territorial conquest, "is at once the supreme right, and the dispute of what is right is decided by the arbitrament of war. War gives a biologically just decision, since its decisions rest on the very nature of things." Power, he believes, is, so far as the State is concerned, the ultimate righteousness. "The end-all and be-all of a State is power." This justifies the big nations in blotting out the little ones and seizing their territories.

Strong, healthy, and flourishing nations increase in numbers. From a given moment they require a continual expansion of their frontiers, they require a new territory for the accommodation of their surplus population. Since almost every part of the globe is inhabited, new territory must, as a rule, be obtained at the cost of its possessors—they is to say, by conquest, which thus becomes a law of necessity.

"The only course left," the author drives home his point, "is to acquire the necessary territory by war. Thus the instinct of self-preservation leads inevitably to war and the conquest of fertile soil. It is not the possessor, but the victor, who then has the right." It may be argued that Bernhardi is here speaking of the conquest of primitive peoples—that he is merely repeating the ancient humbug of the White

Men's Burden. But the whole tenor of his book makes it clear that his contempt for the rights of the weaker nations is unlimited by climate or race. He speaks of "the pitiable existence of all small states," and his objection to universal peace is that it would give the weak nation "the same right to live as the powerful and vigorous nation." He is the extreme anti-Nationalist of modern Europe. He is so extreme that it is to be hoped that he will disgust anti-Nationalists in other countries with their creed.

Bernhardi, then, believes that it is not merely the right, but the duty of Germany to wage a war of conquest which will extend the territorial boundaries of her civilisation. He believes that such a war will be good for Germany and good for the world

September 10, 1914

54.

### **The Principle Of Nationality.**

*Not As In 1870.*

*By H.W. Massingham.*

There are two great human forces which have sprung into their highest activity during the war. The first is nationality, asserting itself in terms of Empire indeed, but powerfully leavening the armed masses which Imperialism has assembled and used...

[Germany is allied with] the Empire which rests the least of all on nationality, and exercises the smallest degree of moral force...

The British Empire proved to be all the stronger for the absence of formal bonds...

Nationalism alone may not save Europe. It may destroy it.

September 14, 1914

55.

### **What Is Civilisation?**

*By William Archer.*

...Germany has convinced herself that war is an eternal and beneficent necessity for the world. Britain and Greater Britain are equally assured that if civilisation does not ultimately spell "peace" it is indistinguishable from barbarism. That is the issue which is being fought out in France, and will soon, we hope, be fought out in Germany. There may be individuals in Britain who hold the German theory; and the issue may not be as clear to some of our Allies as it is to us. But what we are all out to do is to disprove the great German illusion of the wisdom and beneficence of truculence. It is that creed which we all feel to be irreconcilable with civilisation...

September 18, 1914

56.

### **Reservoirs Of Hell.**

*By William Archer.*

...At bottom, when we look into it, we see that the German theory is based upon the tacit assumption that Germany is the only nation which has the will and the power to convert herself into a consummate fighting machine, and that therefore the world is one day destined to be prostrate at her feet. But her pundits... are only occasionally candid on the point. As a rule, they declare it to be a universal law, applicable to all nations, that spiritual health demands the complete militarising of the body politic, and that, on a planet organised according to the will of God, every people ought to be constantly ready to fly at the throat of every other people, with all the strength of

manhood and with all the engines of destruction that it can either devise itself or (better) buy from Herr Krupp von Bohlen. You will find it deliberately laid down in more than one authoritative quarter as an eternal verity, and that [not] even a German defeat would [not] alter it...

September 25, 1914

57.

**“We Are Fighting Against Barbarism.”**

*Mr. Lloyd George On The Road Hogs Of Europe...*

[Recruiting Speech at London Welsh Rally at Queen’s Hall on Saturday, Sept. 19.]

...the new philosophy of Germany is to destroy Christianity—sickly sentimentalism about sacrifice for others, poor pap for German mouths. We will have the new diet, we will force it on the world. It will be made in Germany—(laughter)—a diet of blood and iron. What remains? Treaties have gone; the honour of nations has gone, liberty gone; what is left? Germany! Germany is left—Deutschland Uber Alles!

That is what we are fighting—that claim of the predominancy of a civilisation, a material one, a hard one, a civilisation which at once rules and enslaves the world. Liberty goes, democracy vanishes, and unless Britain comes to the rescue with her sons, it will be a dark day for humanity!

*The Junker Road-Hog.*

Have you followed the Prussian Junker and his doings? We are not fighting the Germans. The German people are just as much under the heel of this Prussian military caste, and more so, thank God, than any other nation in Europe. It will be a day of rejoicing for the German peasant and artisan and trader when the military caste is broken...

The Prussian junker is the road-hog of Europe... All I can say is this. If the old British spirit is alive in British hearts, that bully will be torn from his seat. (Great cheering.) Were he to win it would be the greatest catastrophe that had befallen democracy since the days of the Holy Alliance and its ascendancy.

*Through Terror To Triumph.*

They think we cannot beat them. It will not be easy. It will be a long job. It will be a terrible war. But in the end we shall march through terror to triumph. (Applause.)

September 21, 1914