

which they all signed. What is the use of creating peace-making machinery if you never make use of it?

LABOR AND WAR

The most interesting utterance on the subject of war that was made last month was Herr Bebel's address to the Socialist Congress at Jena. In France, the anti-militarists advocate the proclamation of a general strike as labor's checkmate to a declaration of war. Herr Bebel ridiculed the notion as impracticable. A great war would produce such inconceivable misery that "the masses would not discuss the general strike, they would merely cry for work and bread." War itself would bring about the paralysis of industry, which is the aim of the Syndicalists. Herr Bebel said, quite truly, that war would imperil the very existence of the existing social structure:

Millions of workmen would be called away from their families, who would have nothing to eat and to live upon. Hundreds of thousands of small manufacturers would be rendered bankrupt through lack of means to carry on their business. Stocks and shares would sustain a fall, of which we have just experienced a very slight foretaste, and through which tens of thousands of families in comfortable circumstances would be reduced to beggary. The enormous export trade with the outside world would be interrupted, innumerable factories and industrial undertakings would stand still, the loss of work and wages would assert themselves in every quarter. The import of foodstuffs would cease completely, prices would reach an unattainable height, and that would mean an actual general famine.

General Famine is the most formidable of all the generals who take the field in case of modern war. M. Bloch was not so far out after all.

WHAT WAR WOULD HAVE MEANT IN CASH

Herr Bebel calculated that every day of mobilization would cost Germany from £2,250,000 to £2,500,000. As it would cost France at least as much, the two combatants would be launched upon an expenditure of five millions a day, or £150,000,000 a month. But France and Germany would not have been the only combatants. The cost of mobilization in Austria, Russia, Great Britain and Belgium would cost as much more. That is to say, Europe would have been plunged into an expenditure of £10,000,000 per day in order to decide whether Germany, which has only 9 per cent. of the Moroccan trade, the whole of which only amounts to £5,500,000 per annum, has a right to insist upon a privileged position in Morocco, to which Britain, who has 39 per cent. of the trade, lays no claim. These war costs, be it remembered, are direct payments out of pocket. They do not include the indirect loss in the stoppage of trade and other consequences of war. According to Colonel Boucher's book, "*La France Victorieuse dans la Guerre de Demain*," France would put 1,400,000 troops into the first line of defence, opposing 20 army corps to the 23 German army corps which would cross the frontier ten days after the declaration of war. Russia would in twenty-five days despatch 27 army corps in five armies to the frontier, and in ten days later 13 Russian army corps would be on German soil. The war of 1870 would be mere child's-play to that which France and Germany risked in their Morocco squabble.

SEQUELÆ OF THE ATTACK

As in many other maladies, the *sequelæ* of this attack of insanity promises to be more dangerous than the malady itself. France is launched upon an adventure for which she has no adequate military equipment. Germany has in the Congo given another hostage to whatever Power commands the seas. Belgium has had a nightmare of invasion, entailing fresh fortifications and armaments. But the most serious result has been the renewal of the agitation in Germany for the creation of a fleet strong enough to deprive Great Britain of the command of the seas. Although the British Government from the first fell in with Germany's desire to come to terms with France, and consistently urged France to make every possible concession to Germany, the Pan-German press has throughout treated Great Britain as a much more serious enemy than France. Every hitch in the negotiations has been laid at our door, and the Navy League is clamoring for a new and more extended naval programme. It is all very deplorable. But it cannot be helped. All that we can do is to build steadily two keels