

WHY EUROPE WENT TO WAR

NOW WE KNOW

By E. D. Morel.

"The vital interests of Russia are as well understood by our loyal Allies as by ourselves, and that is why an agreement, which we concluded in 1915 with Great Britain and France, and to which Italy has adhered, established in the most definite fashion the right of Russia to the Straits and to Constantinople."—M. Trepoff in the Duma, Dec. 2nd, 1916.

"The extension southwards is for Russia an historical, political, and economic necessity, and the foreign power which stands in the way to this expansion is ipso facto an enemy power. . . . Hence it has become quite clear to the Russians that everything remains as it is, the road to Constantinople will have to be carried through Berlin."—Professor Mitrofanoff, in the Preussische Jahrbucher, May, 1914.

"Is it true that the St. Petersburg Cabinet imposed the adoption of the Three Years' Law upon this country, and is pressing to-day with all its weight to secure the maintenance of that law? I have not succeeded in obtaining light upon this delicate point, but it would be the graver seeing that those who direct the destinies of the Empire of the Tsars cannot be ignorant of the fact that the effort which is thus demanded of the French nation is excessive and cannot long be sustained. Is the attitude of the Cabinet of St. Petersburg based, then upon the conviction that events are so near that the tool it proposes to place in the hands of its Ally can be used?"—Dispatch to his Government from Barton Guillaume Belgian diplomatic representative in Paris, June 9, 1914. [Vide "Truth and War."]

"In Russian eyes the die is cast, and only a political miracle can avert war. A partial mobilization has already been ordered, and there is every indication that the whole of the vast military machinery will soon be set in motion. An Imperial manifesto is awarded to-night. Confident of England's support, about which doubts have mostly disappeared, the Russian public is prepared to accept war."—Reuter's telegram from Petrograd, July 29, 1914.

"The sailing of the British Fleet from Portland has created an immense impression, and coupled with Japan's pacific assurance, has more than confirmed Russia's determination to stand to her guns."—Reuter's telegram from Petrograd, July 30, 1914.

"The only thing which cannot be doubted is that Germany has been actively engaged, here as much as in Vienna in trying to find a means by which a general conflict might be avoided. . . . England at the beginning made it understood that she would not let herself be dragged into a conflict. Sir George Buchanan openly said so. This promised help is of the greatest weight and has contributed no little to give strength to the war party."—Dispatch to his Government from M. B. de l'Escaille, Belgian diplomatic representative in Petrograd, July 30, 1914.

"General Russian mobilization ordered midnight."—July 30, 1914.

"Crowds of thousands of people made demonstrations to-day before the British Embassy here. Sir George Buchanan, the Ambassador, appeared at the window and addressed the crowd. Amid frantic cheering he declared England's perfect sympathy with Russia. The Secretary of the Embassy, standing beside the Ambassador, then raised cheers for Russia."—Reuter's telegram from Petrograd, August 3, 1914.

"The existence of the agreement was already generally known, and this

knowledge probably helped to weaken the impression which otherwise the public announcement would certainly have made. As it was, it evoked virtually no open enthusiasm but the cries from the Opposition benches of 'bravo Sazonoff,' 'where's Sazonoff?' plainly indicated that members of the Duma were fully aware as to whose brilliant diplomacy Russia owes the prospective gift. . . . The progressive bloc has sent to M. Sazonoff a telegram thanking him for the agreement as to the Dardanelles and Constantinople achievement, thanks to his talent and patriotism."—Times correspondent's dispatch of the Duma's sitting of December 2, 1916.

Avowals at last, after 28 months of war! M. Sazonoff, Russia's ex-Foreign Minister, is surely entitled to the congratulations of his compatriots, or rather to the congratulations of those of his compatriots for whom the possession of Constantinople and the Straits has long been the cardinal and supreme aim of Russian foreign policy.

And to-day? What is the purpose to-day? It is to destroy the independence of Turkey. It is to undo three-quarters of a century of British foreign policy. It is to violate every canon, every precept invoked during that period to induce the British people to have faith in the perspicacity of their rulers. It is to destroy the balance of power in the Mediterranean, to revolutionize the strategic conceptions which have governed our Eastern policy for generations. It is to undo all that has been done before—accomplished with British treasure, sealed with British blood. And without one explanatory speech, without a solitary attempt at justification. The geographical conditions have not changed. Our tenure of power in India reposes upon the same basis, is open to the same dangers—only aggravated with Prussia no longer an independent State and with Russian Armenia in the hands of those who await their "prospective gift" from the immolation of British youth, from the tears of British mothers, from the mortgage of British wealth.

Bright's reply to Russell's claim to be defending the independence of Turkey, of Germany, and "of the integrity, civilization, and something else of Europe" was a claim on behalf of the blood of the nation. He claimed that the "blood of England" was "the property of the people of England," and that "the sacred treasure of the bravery, resolution, and unflinching courage of the people of England" were not to be expected save in the national interest.

Is it then a national interest that Britain should bleed to death in order that the Tsar shall ride in triumph past the Great Mosque at Constantinople? Are the bowels of Britain to be torn out in order that M. Sazonoff shall receive a second congratulatory message? Is the British working man to see a wider horizon of hope and opportunity opening for himself and his descendants because Russian Imperialism triumphs in the Near East? Does the experience of history teach us that alliances are eternal?

What are we fighting for now, gentlemen of the House of Commons? "For our lives?" How so when our adversary proclaims month after month, and week after week, his willingness to treat? "For Belgium?" How so, when our adversary proclaims that he has no desire to retain Belgium? For the liberties of the smaller nations? But what do the smaller nations think about it? Are they on our side?

Let it be well understood; let it sink into the minds of every man and woman of this country that the Russian flag can be hoisted over Constantinople only through the spilling of torrents of British blood, the death of hundreds of thousands of British youths, the expenditure of further enormous sums of British capital, and the prolongation of the war for an indefinite period.

If you endorse this bargain, concluded behind your backs, concluded without even an attempt at public justification, it is you who are ordering the spilling of that blood, it is you who are responsible for the unfathomable misery which will ensue, it is you who are signing the death warrant of countless numbers of your countrymen. It is you who are allowing the country to be hurried by rapid steps to national suicide.—Labor Leader.

CLIP AND COMMENT

Northcliffe runs a paper called Answers, which means when you travel by the train, he hopes you will stick to night and main.

The history of the war you get in Answers differs in some respects from the history you get in the Times, which is in some respects unfortunate, but at any rate it ensures that we get variety in our entertainment. Thus Answers on the 25th November:

It is known that the Kaiser never signed the mobilisation decree; the Crown Prince forged his father's signature.

Shame upon the lad with the big nose! Shame upon him! And you remember how the Financial News told us about his 150 wives!

Now in order to thoroughly expose the blackguardism of the Forger with the big nose (see our lower strata of cartoonists, passim) who has committed Mormonism 149 times (we have the authority of the Financial News for the statement it is necessary for Answers to boost the Kaiser in a fashion that must raise the patriotic hair on the bald heads of the British Workers' National League:

The Kaiser has never been popular in Germany. He was always regarded as pro-British. He's the eldest son of Queen Victoria's eldest child, you know! He spoke English before he could speak German, and he speaks English now better than he does German! My firm belief is—and, of course, you can disagree with me—that the Kaiser is not a man of war. He dropped Bismarck because the latter wanted another go at France. He has kept the peace for thirty years, and that's a pretty long time! If he had wanted war he had heaps of chances, but he didn't take them. What about when Russia was on her knees after the war with Japan? And what about when you were busy in South Africa? And what about when France lay like a little lamb, waiting for an eagle to come along?

If that doesn't get Northcliffe himself denounced as a pro-German, there's no justice in Europe.

Robert Blatchford blames Fred the Great for the war, and Will Crooks has had a natural animosity towards the Hun since he heard that the Kaiser as a little boy had bitten a British Ambassador in the leg.

The Bishop of London has more sense:

It is perfectly monstrous that nation should fight against nation and class against class because we have made such a miserable hash in distributing God's gift.—Glasgow Forward.

Here is a quotation from the Toronto World of October 2 to this effect: "And did these rather flippant apolo-

gists of Canadian politics ever read what the Labor Party has done in England; and what it has done for social uplift? . . . If it had not been for the Labor Party and its independence England would have been in a much worse position."

Declaring that anyone who takes up the cause of Labor is considered a crank by either of the old political parties, it asked this question:

"Why should labor of the country—why should not Toronto and the County of York, have four or five Labor men seats; another in Hamilton; another in London, and at least one in Winnipeg and one in Vancouver; several in Montreal, and two or three in the Maritime Provinces, and in that way by real force, secure better government and more progressive government for the country."

Let us remind the World that if it had the cause of the workers at heart, as it now pretends, it had a chance a few weeks ago, in the recent Toronto bye-election of supporting a working man. But it didn't. The support it gave was to one of the old party candidates, whom it now declares views every one as cranks who takes up the cause of the workingman.

THE SOLDIER'S WIFE.

I lie alone and dream, forever dream
Of war and you. . . .
Yet sometimes just a little fitting gleam
Of Hope slips through.

You may come home at last, some happy day,
To laugh at me—
You may return to kiss my fears away,
Alive and freeh

It may be so, and yet, this sullen day,
The Winter rain
Falls like a curtain, shutting Joy away
Beyond the pane.

I work all day, but the night I pray
That we may win. . . .
And sometimes I can hear the things
• you say
Through all the din.

I hear your boyish laugh, so unafraid,
Your whisper low
In answer to the frightened prayers
I've prayed. . . .
It makes me glow
Our love seems then so strong and pure a tie,
And doubt a sin.

Such love the very Furies must defy
And Heaven win!

Ah! Thus my spirit. But the flesh is frail.
This Devil, War,
Can make a lonely woman faint and quail—
Its flame and roar. . . .

It is not for her body that she fears,
'Tis for her Love. . . .
Could she but fight, dried all her futile tears!
Ah, God above!

For Us the festered horror of that Hell,
The blaze of Hate;
Not theirs the final pang—who fight so well—
But ours, who wait!
—Elizebeth N. Hepburn,
in N. Y. Times.

Every man is entitled to all he needs and no man is entitled to more than he needs. No man needs a million dollars. No man can use a million dollars on himself. So say Socialists. Are we right?

It is because Socialism is practicable and workable that capitalists object to it.