

**ENGLAND ON THE WITNESS
STAND: THE ANGLO-GERMAN
CASE TRIED BY A JURY OF
ENGLISHMEN. THE TWELVE
JUROS, PP.1-111**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649443871

England on the Witness Stand: The Anglo-German Case Tried by a Jury of Englishmen. The Twelve Juros, pp.1-111 by Various

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

VARIOUS

**ENGLAND ON THE WITNESS
STAND: THE ANGLO-GERMAN
CASE TRIED BY A JURY OF
ENGLISHMEN. THE TWELVE
JUROS, PP.1-111**

ENGLAND 211 ON THE WITNESS STAND

THE ANGLO-GERMAN CASE TRIED BY A
JURY OF ENGLISHMEN

THE TWELVE JURORS

ENGLAND SELF-REVEALED

BY BERNARD SHAW, SIR HENRY LUCY, "LONDON TIMES," ETC.

HOW THE WAR CAME

"THE LABOR LEADER"

BRITAIN AND THE WAR; A STUDY IN DIPLOMACY

BY C. H. NORMAN

IS BRITAIN BLAMELESS?

BY A. FENNER BROCKWAY

WHY WE ARE AT WAR

BY J. RAMSAY MACDONALD, M. P.

THE OUTBREAK OF THE WAR

BY E. D. MOREL

DREADNOUGHTS AND DIVIDENDS; AN EXPOSURE OF THE
ARMAMENT RING

BY PHILIP SNOWDEN, M. P.

NEW LIGHT ON THE CAUSES OF THE WAR

BY DR. F. C. CONYBEARE OF OXFORD

A LETTER TO LORD NORTHCLIFFE

BY A. G. GARVIN

IS GERMANY RIGHT AND BRITAIN WRONG?

BY CLIFFORD ALLEN

revelation

"This war is being supported by sham arguments and hypocritical appeals to sentiment. Its pretended cause, 'The Neutrality of Belgium,' is non-existent. Its real cause: The wish to beat the German navy."—C. H. Norman, "Britain and the War."

1915

PUBLISHED BY THE FATHERLAND
1123 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

10

"Russia can afford to wait. So can France. Germany cannot. Germany must see to its own safety, and Prince Bismarck cannot reasonably be expected to pass his declining days impotently watching the silent conspiracy for the silent growth of the power of France and the power of Russia against the Fatherland."—LONDON DAILY STANDARD, Feb. 17, 1897.

INTRODUCTION

By FREDERICK F. SCHRADER

THE English nation is composed of two strong racial elements—the Anglo-Saxon, honest, truthful, outspoken and liberty-loving; and the Norman-French, taciturn, enterprising in the cause of conquest, ruthless in the employment of brute force and expert in hypocritical subtleties.

This is a document on the war by Englishmen living in England. The implication that it may possibly be the inspiration of German-Americans cannot lie against it. The articles therein embraced, clear, authentic, fair, printed and circulated in England in editions of tens of thousands, defend the cause of Germany and Austria-Hungary more eloquently than anything that could be written by German sympathizers, or the alleged "German lobby," of which the New York papers have had so much to say. They reveal the true image of Sir Edward Grey, and trace the historic and political causes leading to the war with a clearness that has found no counterpart in anything published in the United States.

It will be contended by those who specialize in deflecting the viewpoint which seeks to place the case of Germany and Austria-Hungary in its true aspect, that sundry of the arguments in this pamphlet emanate from members of the English Independent Labor Party. But it must be borne in mind that a leader of this party sat in the Asquith cabinet until the outbreak of the war, and that without the Independent Labor Party the government of Asquith, Grey, Lloyd George and Churchill would topple to the ground. In short, the Independent Labor Party has been the bulwark of Grey's power.

It has been insolently assumed by a part of the American press, for reasons that have never been satisfactorily explained, that there is but one point of view as to the European war.

This inexplicable partisanship in behalf of England and her allies has been so pronounced from the day war was declared that the American people have become fairly indoctrinated with the sophistries about

"German militarism," "Germany's violation of Belgium's neutrality," "German atrocities" and "Germany's encroachment upon the liberty of nations." Any attempt by right-thinking Americans to form an independent opinion has been, and continues to be, ruthlessly, violently, brutally throttled by the partisan press.

It is surely significant, then, that Englishmen themselves should declare that "Belgium in particular, and national liberty and public law had nothing whatever to do with the *making* of the war." Herein England enjoys a peculiar distinction over Germany. Liebknecht is the only public man in Germany who has criticised his government.

We have yet to see a New York paper printed in the English language manifesting a spirit of fair play half way comparable with the impartial presentment of the case which characterizes the English writers and speakers herein quoted. They refute the sophistries, the familiar as well as favorite stock arguments of many apologists for the Allies, and incidentally put to shame such eminent men as Col. George Harvey and Prof. Eliot, who in their zeal for "the mother country" appear to have forgotten that they are Americans.

We present the Anglo-German case as tried by a jury of Englishmen, without taking editorial liberties with certain opinions and expressions censuring Germany and Austria-Hungary, for which an irrepressible national bias must charitably be held responsible.

We leave it to the American people who read it to render judgment.

New York, May 1, 1915.

ENGLAND ON THE WITNESS STAND

England Self-Revealed

PREMIER ASQUITH, SIR HENRY LUCY, BERNARD SHAW
AND THE LONDON "TIMES" TESTIFY.

"If I justify myself my own mouth shall condemn me."—Job 9: 20.

WHEN England declared war upon Germany she gave as her fundamental reason the invasion by Germany of Belgium territory. "We are fighting to fulfill a solemn international obligation," declared Mr. Asquith in the House of Commons, "to vindicate the principle that small nationalities are not to be crushed." England's publicists and diplomatists announced that not only had England no desire to make war but that the war in which she engaged was unexpected and unprepared for. While this pretext gained credence and unquestioned sympathy throughout the world, the truth concerning England's actual aims and purposes and her reasons in going to war have gradually become known. *By statements which have slipped from the mouths of certain high officials, as well as by a comparison of certain diplomatic statements and correspondence, it is now clear that England expected to make war on Germany, had further prepared for war, and went to war out of fundamentally selfish motives.*

In the early days of the conflict, George Bernard Shaw pronounced the excuse of declaring war because of the invasion of Belgium a sham. No less an authority than the *London Times* now discards the pretense asserted by Mr. Asquith, and, in addition, *Sir Henry Lucy has boasted of the fact that the English fleet before the war mobilized (with the purpose of later "bottling up the German fleet") on the pretext of an expected visit from the King.*

Perhaps the most striking statement regarding England's actual purposes and intentions is contained in an editorial, "Why We Are At War," published in the *London Times*, weekly issue, of March 12. Because of its position as the most conservative as well as official organ of Great Britain, The *Times* editorial is exceptionally significant. It begins thus:

"There are still, it seems, some Englishmen and Englishwomen who greatly err as to the reasons that have forced England to draw the sword. They know that it was Germany's flagrant violation of Bel-

gian neutrality which filled the cup of her indignation and made her people insist upon war. They do not reflect that our honor and our interest must have compelled us to join France and Russia, even if Germany had scrupulously respected the rights of her small neighbors, and had sought to hack her way into France through the Eastern fortresses. The German Chancellor has insisted more than once upon this truth. He has fancied, apparently, that he was making an argumentative point against us by establishing it. That, like so much more, only shows his complete misunderstanding of our attitude and of our character. The invasion of Belgium, and still more the abominable system of crime which followed it, have indeed very deeply moved us. Like Germany, we had given our word to uphold Belgian neutrality. Unlike Germany, we felt bound in honor to keep the word we had given. But we know very well that, in keeping it, self-interest has gone hand-in-hand with honor, with justice, and with pity. Why did we guarantee the neutrality of Belgium? For an imperious reason of self-interest, for the reason which has always made us resist the establishment of any Great Power over against our East Coast, for the reason which made us defend the Netherlands against Spain and against the France of the Bourbons and of Napoleon. We keep our word when we have given it, but we do not give it without solid, practical reasons, and we do not set up to be international Don Quixotes, ready at all times to redress wrongs which do us no hurt.

"Herr von Bethmann Hollweg is quite right. Even had Germany not invaded Belgium, honor and interest would have united us with France. We had refused, it is true, to give her or Russia any binding pledge up to the last moment. We had, however, for many years past led both to understand that, if they were unjustly attacked, they might rely upon our aid. This understanding had been the pivot of the European policy followed by the three Powers. It had been, as Germany herself acknowledged, a powerful factor in the preservation of European peace. England had drawn advantages from it as well as her partners. She would have stained her honor for ever if, after she had acted with them in fair weather, and had countenanced the confident belief which they both held that she would support them in a just quarrel, she had slunk away from them in the hour of danger."

The claim that England entered the war out of purely humanitarian reasons, on solely moral grounds, in order "to fulfill her obligation" and defend the Belgians, is flatly contradicted by the *Times* editorial, which continues:

"We joined the Triple Entente because we realized, however late in the day, that the time of 'splendid isolation' was no more. We reverted to our historical policy of the balance of power, and we reverted to it for the reasons for which our forefathers adopted it. They were not, either for them or for us, reasons of sentiment. They were self-regarding, and even selfish, reasons. Chief amongst them, certainly, was a desire to preserve the peace of Europe, but it was the chief only because to preserve that peace was the one certain way to preserve our own. In the event of war we saw, as our fathers had seen, England's first line of attack and of defence in her Continental Alliances. When we subsidized every State in Germany, and practically all Europe, in the Great War, we did not lavish our gold from love of German or of Austrian liberty, or out of sheer altruism. No; we invested it for our own safety and our own advantage, and, on the whole, our commitments were rewarded by an adequate return.

"In this war, as we have again and again insisted in *The Times*, England is fighting for exactly the same kind of reasons for which she fought Philip II., Louis XIV., and Napoleon. She is fighting the battle of the oppressed, it is true, in Belgium and in Serbia, and she rejoices that she is standing with them against their tyrants. She is

ENGLAND SELF-REVEALED

7

helping her great Allies to fight in defence of their soil and of their homes against the aggressor, and she is proud to pour out her blood and her treasure in so sacred a cause. But she is not fighting primarily for Belgium or for Serbia, for France or for Russia. They fill a great place in her mind and in her heart. But they come second. The first place belongs, and rightly belongs, to herself. It is for her and for her Empire that her sons have been struggling and dying in the trenches and on the fields of Picardy and Artois, that her Fleet holds its ceaseless vigil in the North Sea, and that its guns have been heard from the Pacific to the Dardanelles. Our soldiers and our sailors are defending their homes and the homes of their countrymen on French soil or in Turkish waters, just as truly as though they were facing German troops in Norfolk or German ships off Harwich."

In view of such recent admissions it is interesting to recall certain statements of England's diplomatists, as well as to compare these statements with official correspondence.

On August 6, 1914, Mr. Asquith said in the House of Commons:

"We are fighting to fulfill a solemn international obligation . . . to vindicate the principle that small nationalities are not to be crushed."

Four days prior to this assertion by Mr. Asquith, and before the invasion of Belgium by the German army, Sir Edward Grey had written to the French Ambassador:

"I am authorized to give an assurance that if the German Fleet comes into the Channel or through the North Sea to undertake hostile operations against the French coast or shipping, the British Fleet will give all the protection in its power."

This is plainly an assurance that England would go to war if the German fleet should begin operations against France even if the German army should refrain from crossing Belgium.

Mr. Asquith in the House of Commons, on August 6, 1914, announced Germany's purposes as follows:

"What was the purpose of Germany? That we should have given a free license to Germany to annex the whole of the extra European dominions and possession of France."

Yet on August 1, Sir Edward Grey had sent the following dispatch to Sir E. Goschen:

"The German Ambassador pressed me as to whether I could not formulate conditions on which we would remain neutral. He even suggested that the integrity of France and her Colonies might be guaranteed."

On August 3, Sir Edward Grey declared in the House of Commons that England had no secret arrangement with any Power:

"I assured the House—and the Prime Minister has assured the House more than once—that if any crisis such as this arose, we should come before the House of Commons and be able to say to the House, that it was free to decide what the British attitude should be, that we should have no secret engagement which we should spring upon