

## THE WAR DOCUMENTS

(Continued from page 1)

powerful as her own. We forget that, while we insist upon a 60 per cent. superiority (so far as our naval strength is concerned) over Germany being essential to guarantee the integrity of our own shores—Germany herself has nothing like that superiority over France alone, and she has, of course, in addition, to reckon with Russia on her eastern frontier. Germany has nothing which approximates to a two-Power standard. She has, therefore, become alarmed by recent events, and is spending huge sums of money on the expansion of her military resources. (D. Lloyd George in the "Daily Chronicle" (London), January 1st, 1914.

But the same Lloyd George altered all that later:

What are we fighting for? To defeat the most dangerous conspiracy ever plotted against the liberty of nations, carefully, clandestinely planned in every detail with ruthless, cynical determination. (D. Lloyd George, Queens Hall, London, 4 August 1917).

The argument of the Allied governments concerning their "unpreparedness" against the "unprovoked attack" precipitated upon them by the Central Powers falls down, not only through the story of the course of diplomacy among the Powers in the eight years (more or less) immediately preceding 1914, but through an examination of the military and naval appropriations of the Powers concerned. Mr. Nock has examined these, and from 1909 to 1914 (inclusive), for naval construction Great Britain spent £92,672,524; France spent £43,152,909; Russia spent £38,477,605; and Germany spent £66,099,111. That is to say, in that period Great Britain, France and Russia combined spent for naval purposes £240,402,149 against Germany's £66,099,111. Austria and Turkey are not counted in, and possible lesser costs either in construction or upkeep on the Central Powers' side are not considered, but neither is the weight of the Japanese navy accounted, and in any case the overwhelming superiority of the Allies in this field is beyond a doubt. In the military field Germany and Austria combined spent £92,000,000 and Great Britain, France and Russia £142,000,000 in 1914 (pre war figures). Great Britain's expenditure for military purposes alone, appropriated in 1914 before war broke out, considered alone was greater by £4,000,000 than Austria's. Morel ("Tsardom's Part in the War") says:—

The combined excess of military and naval expenditure of Russia and France in combination over Germany and Austria in combination amounted in the decade 1895—1904 to £247,827,028; and in the decade 1905—14 to £229,868,853.

The "unpreparedness" argument has no foundation in fact. The late Italian Prime Minister Nitelli explains its original purpose very well:

I cannot say that Germany and her allies were solely responsible for the war which devastated Europe ..... That statement, which we all made during the war, was a weapon to be used at the time; now that the war is over it cannot be used as a serious argument. ("Peaceless Europe," by Francesco Nitelli. Cassel).

Let us go back to 1905, the year Sir E. Grey succeeded Lord Lansdowne as British Minister for Foreign Affairs, which post he held until 1916. On April 4th 1904, Lansdowne and Delcasse (French Minister for Foreign Affairs) succeeded in effecting the Anglo-French Agreement over Morocco (See "Economic Causes of War" page 91.) "The Round Table," March 1915, quotes the German historian Rachfahl in that connection as marking a definite period in the relationships of the Powers:

Under the surface of the Morocco affair lurked the deepest and most difficult problems of power, it was to be foreseen that its course would prove to be a trial of strength of the first order.

The Anglo-French rapprochement was followed in 1907 by an agreement between Great Britain and Russia concerning boundaries in Tibet and Afghanistan and the division of Persia. "This Agreement with Russia," says "The Round Table" (last quoted), "unlike the spirit of the Entente with France, carried with it no suggestion of the possibility of common action in the event of German aggression, though it was facilitated by common apprehension of German designs."

That even then the press had set itself to deal carelessly with the truth in matters concerning Germany is evident from this:—

During the years 1905—8 instructions were given to all continental correspondents of the London "Times" by Sir Valentine Chirol to suppress everything that might have a beneficial influence or effect on Anglo-German relations, and magnify and bolster up everything which will embitter it. ("Revelations of an International Spy," p. 24. By I. T. T. Lincoln, (Liberal M.P. for Darlington, 1910) New York, 1916. Robert M. McBride & Co.)

I have never seen reference made to Mr. Lincoln's book anywhere. It was written in 1916 and finished while he was in jail in New York, arrested at the instigation of the British Consul's Department there. No doubt the entry of United States into the war on the side of the Allies silenced his book. It is sufficient to note here that the course of diplomacy covering some ten years before the war as outlined by him is very well borne out by the documents published since, although it would be hard to find an author who shows more personal vanity. Sir Valentine Chirol is looked upon as an authority on questions affecting India, the Far East and the Balkans. He was Director of the Foreign Department, London "Times" 1899-1912. His instructions as given above were certainly not issued contrary to the wishes of the British Foreign Office.

Mr. Austin Chamberlain, in the House of Commons, Feb. 8th, 1922 said, "We found ourselves on a certain Monday (Aug. 3, 1914) listening to a speech by Lord Grey at this box which brought us face to face with war, and upon which followed our declaration. That was the first public notification to the country or to anyone, by the Government of the day, of the position of the British Government, and of the obligations which it had assumed." Note that by this time there is official recognition that the Government had "assumed obligations," in spite of the repeated previous denials of Mr. Asquith, Sir E. Grey, Mr. Runciman, Mr. Harecourt, Mr. Acland and Lord Loreburn. Besides the official documents of the war (which we shall come to in time) there have been published a great many books, diaries, histories and pamphlets, good, bad and indifferent, directly bearing on the preparations for war, and on the events of the war during its progress, among them Lord Loreburn's "How the War Came," Lord Fisher's "Memories," Col. Repington's "The First World War," Lord Haldane's "Before the War," Wilfred Scawen Blunt's "Diaries,"—not to forget Sir Julian Corbett's "Official History of the War." These round out the story. In his book Lord Loreburn escapes from his innocent position of July 1, 1913, in this way:

We were tied by the relations which our Foreign Office had created, without apparently realizing that they had created them.

Such a statement as that may appear reasonable to a Lord Chancellor, but it does not fit the facts. It is an excuse.

It is not without significance that the Campbell-Bannerman Government in 1905 secured Mr. Haldane (afterwards Lord Haldane) as Minister for War. Haldane's distinction lay in his attention to all things German. He specialized in German literature and was styled a "Hegelian." He had translated Schopenhauer. By the aid of, or in spite of such equipment he (as the "Daily Mail Year Book" says): "increased the efficiency of the War Office." Perhaps to justify (even if somewhat belated) his "The Meaning of Truth in History" of 1914, his book on the war reveals that in 1906, as Minister for War, in conjunction with the French military chiefs he was set the task of finding how to mobilise, transport, and concentrate at a place "which had been settled between the staffs of Britain and France," 160,000 British troops opposite the Belgian frontier. As the "Official History of the War" says:

Amongst the many false impressions that prevailed, when after the lapse of a century we found ourselves involved in a great war, not the least erroneous is the belief that we were not prepared for it. Whether the scale on which we prepared was as large as the signs of the times called for, whether we did right to cling to our long-tried system of a small army and large navy, are questions

that will long be debated; but, given the scale which we deliberately chose to adopt, there is no doubt that the machinery for setting our forces in action had reached an ordered completeness in detail that has no parallel in our history ..... The power of armies they (the Germans) could calculate to a nicety—of the power of the sea they had no experience. All that was plain was that Great Britain was as ready as ever to play the old game, and had set the board with all the old skill.

That is devoted to naval operations. So much for "unpreparedness!"

It looks as if this article will be as long-drawn out a process as the war itself. At anyrate, this will have to do until next issue. In the meantime it is well to note that the newspapers are generally full of war talk these days. We know very well what wars are about and it is as well to know also how they come about. When that knowledge is a general possession there won't be so many good men among the dead men.

E. M.

(To be continued)

## THE CLARION MAIL BAG.

By Sid Earp.

TO those who have made a practical study of the economics of Capitalism, and who clearly understand its purpose as a social system, the gloomy faces and confused minds of its supporters and administrators appear almost comical. The industrial and financial groups now find themselves at cross purposes. Their political representatives are howling at one another in a style that marks them as chatterers devoid of any real understanding of the essential facts of social life. Among the great mass of the people, stubbornly clinging to traditional ideas and outworn customs, a merciless individual struggle for life goes on. Truly a huge social comedy and drama being enacted at once; may the curtain soon fall! However the Reds are not downcast; whatever faults may be charged up to them they are at least adaptive and cheery in their adaptation. The letters in the "Mail Bag" from week to week give ample proof of it.

Writing from Ottawa, the seat of governmental power and wisdom, Com. A. Lescaubault sends kindly greetings to Winnipeg and Vancouver comrades. He turns in one sub to the "Clarion," and says he's on the job for more. From Stratford, Ont., Com. A. M. Davis sends a short resume of conditions in that district, with a personal opinion, with which we agree, of the slaves' mind. Also wishes the Party and the Clarion success in their effort, and encloses two dollars for a sub and the Maintenance Fund. A brief and cheerful letter comes from Com. Goudie, St. Johns, with an enclosure for sub and the Maintenance Fund of \$13.50 from the comrades in that city. Bravo! Com. T. Hanwell sends sub from Brandon. Com. J. Cunningham sends kindly greetings and a renewal of his sub. from Cabrin, Sask.

From Erskine, Alta. Com. A. McNeil sends a very interesting letter along with three subs to the Clarion. Among other things relating to the condition of the farmers he says "that if a lowered standard of living and all that it implies, will only be conducive to a social change, we are fast nearing the desired goal." He favors the continuance of the "Mail Bag" column and thinks it will serve to promote more interest in the Revolutionary movement.

T. Hughes sends a short note from Hillcrest enclosing a sub, and W. S. Grott, Hanna, does likewise. Gustave Lee writes a short note with best wishes from Camrose, Alta.

British Columbia is well represented this time. Com. T. Roberts is carrying on in Sandon. He sends a sub and an order for literature with a promise of more to follow. Com. Roy Addy is doing his bit in Alhambra. He sends in a sub. and renewal. Com. H. Judd does the same thing from Brackendale. He says the "Clarion" is as necessary to him as a "fag" is to a "Tommy." The analogy needs qualifying a trifle, yes?

A bright letter comes from Com. C. F. Orchard Kamloops. He says Chas. Lestor held a good meeting on Oct. 27th and a deal of good literature was

(Continued on page 4)