

"The Suffragette," August 27, 1915.

FOR KING · FOR COUNTRY · FOR FREEDOM

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.

# The Suffragette

Edited by CHRISTABEL PANKHURST

Official Organ of the  
Women's Social and Political Union

No. 116. Vol. IV.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 27, 1915

Price 1d. Weekly (Post Free)  
1½d.

## LIBERTY.



*Allegorical Figure of Liberty by Prudhon, engraved by Copia.*

“She has overthrown the Hydra of Tyranny and broken the  
Yoke of Despotism.”

**Classified Advertisements**

SINGLE INSERTION, 1d. per word. MINIMUM, 2s.

(Four Insertions for the price of Three.)

All advertisements must be prepaid. To ensure insertion in our next issue all classified advertisements must be received not later than Saturday. Address: The Advertisement Manager, the SUFFRAGETTE, Lincoln's Inn House, Kingsway, W.C.

**SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS.**

**"MORE MONEY TO SPEND"** (Income Tax Recovery and Adjustment). Send postcard for this booklet to Mrs. AYRES PURDIE, Women Taxpayers' Agency, Hampden House, 3, Kingsway. Phone, Central 6049.

**BOARD-RESIDENCE, &c.**

**ABSOLUTE** Privacy, Quietude, and Refinement, no extras. At the Strand Imperial Hotel, opposite Gaiety Theatre, ladies will find the freshest, daintiest, cosiest quarters; sumptuous bedroom, with h. and c. water fitted; breakfast, bath, attendance, and lights, from 9s. 6d.; on pension 9s. Finest English provisions. Terrace garden lounge.—**MANAGERESS, 4788 Gerrard.**

**APARTMENTS**—Furnished Bedrooms, Bed-sitting-rooms, or Suites, with attendance, meals if required. Baths (h. and c.). Good plain cooking.—21 Lupus Street, St. George's Square.

**BOARD-RESIDENCE, SUPERIOR**, from 30s. Close Baker Street. Underground and Tube, Bed and Breakfast, 3s. 6d. per day. Telephone, 4339 Paddington.—Mrs. CAMPBELL, 5 and 7, York Street, Portman Square, W.

**BRIGHTON—TITCHFIELD HOUSE, 21**, Upper Rook Gardens, off Marine Parade. Good table, congenial society. Terms from 7s. 6d.—Mrs. GRAY, W.S.P.U.

**BRIGHTON FOR HEALTH**—Seaview, Victoria Road, for comfort. Specialities: Home-made bread, vegetarian dishes, garden bedrooms: 18s. to 28s.—Hostess, Miss TURNER. Nat. Tel.: 1702.

**DEAN FOREST, SEVERN - WYE VALLEYS**. Beautiful holiday home (600 ft. up). Spacious house, pretty grounds, bath, billiards, tennis. Boarders, 31s. 6d. Lovely forest and river scenery. Photos, prospectus.—**HALLAM**, Littledean House, Littledean, Glos.

**DELIGHTFUL HOSTEL** for lady workers in banks, offices. Beautiful garden, like country, yet only 1d. from City, 11d. West-end. Partial board 15s. to 16s. 6d.—40 Highbury Grove, Highbury, N.

**HASTINGS**.—Nicely situated on hills and town; sunny sitting-room and bedroom, suitable for one or two persons; vegetarian or otherwise; 21s. weekly. Miss HURST, 10 Clive Avenue, Mount Road.

**LONDON**—For Ladies who work. Rooms 12s. with Board. Cubicles 19s. 6d. Also by the day.—Mrs. CAMPBELL-WILKINSON, 49, Weymouth Street, Portland Place, W.

**TO LET.**

**A NICE** little BED-SITTING-ROOM, furnished, 7s. 6d. per week.—Mrs. WINTER, 32 Doughty Street, Mecklenburgh Square, W.C.

**EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL.**

**ROSA LEO**.—Lessons in Public Speaking, Lecturing, etc. Complete Voice Training. Private Lessons and Classes. 45, Ashworth Mansions, Elgin Avenue, W.—Mr. Israel Zangwill says: "Thanks to your teaching I spoke nearly an hour at Albert Hall without weariness, while my voice carried to every part of the hall."

**WANTED.**

**WANTED, CHAUFFEUR**. Member W.S.P.U., Church of England, and of social position. Good references. Apply, Miss SHARPE, 39 Waldeck Avenue, Bedford.

**PROVISIONS.**

**BUTCHER'S BEST ENGLISH MEAT**.—Lowest prices; excellent Canterbury lamb, country butter, eggs; trial solicited; satisfaction assured.—**BOWEN**, 261 King's Road, Chelsea. Phone, Western 3512.

**JEWELLERY.**

**WHY KEEP USELESS JEWELLERY?** The large London market enables **ROBINSON BROTHERS**, of 5, Hampstead Road, London, W., and 127, Fenchurch Street, E.C., to give the best prices for Gold, Silver, Platinum, Diamonds, Pearls, Emeralds, Silver Plate, Antiques, Old Teeth, etc., in any form, condition or quantity. Licensed valuers and appraisers. Telephone: 2939 North. All parcels, offer or cash by return of post.

**MOTOR INSTRUCTION.**

**LADIES' MOTOR SCHOOL**.—Efficient Instruction in Driving, Running Repairs, and Mechanism.—2, St. Mary Abbott's Place, Kensington, W. Tel., Western 2642.

**MISS ARNOTT** instructs in Motor Driving for private or business requirements. Apply, letter only, 33, Elnathan Mews, Paddington, W.

**MISCELLANEOUS.**

**DESIRÉE**.—Dressmaker, 78, Baker St., W. Terms moderate. Ladies' own materials made up—a speciality. Telephone, Paddington 4339.

**DRINK** delicious **SALUTARIS GINGER ALE**. Absolutely safe; made from distilled water.—Ask your grocer or write Salutaris Company, 23, Fulham Road, London, S.W. (mentioning this advertisement).

**PRIVATE AGENTS**.—Manager for a firm of importers of Tea, Coffee and Colonial Produce invites ladies with business or social connections to co-operate as AGENTS. Apply, in first instance, to "Ceylon," c/o THE SUFFRAGETTE, Lincoln's Inn House, Kingsway, W.C.

**TAILOR-MADE COSTUMES**.—Latest West-end and Paris styles, from 3 guineas. Highly recommended by members of the W.S.P.U. Patterns sent on application.—**H. NELISSEN**, Ladies' Tailor, 14, Great Titchfield Street, Oxford Street, W. (near Waring's).

**THE MOLINARI RESTAURANT**, 25, Frith Street, has been transferred to No. 23 (first floor) same street, and is still giving the best attention to Suffragettes.

By Special Appointment.  
"Purveyors of Milk & Cream" to  
**HIS MAJESTY THE KING.**  
**Welford's Dairies**  
FOR ABSOLUTELY PURE MILK.  
Branches in all parts of London.  
Chief Dairy and Offices—  
**ELGIN AVENUE, W.**  
Principal Phone No.—PADDINGTON 5440.

**Important War Pamphlets**  
By **CHRISTABEL PANKHURST**  
**The War. America and the War. International Militancy.**  
PRICE **ONE PENNY EACH**

Can be obtained at **Lincoln's Inn House, Kingsway, W.C.**

**Inexpensive BLOUSE**



With a view to keeping our workers employed during the Holiday Season, we are making up a large number of Blouses similar in character to the garment sketched, and shall offer them for sale at quite exceptional prices. Needless to say the quality of the materials used and the workmanship and finish will be quite up to our well-known standard of excellence.

**SMART CREPE DE CHINE BLOUSE**, daintily finished with goffered organdi frills. In mauve, sky, pink, champagne, lemon, French grey, hydrangea pink, and hydrangea blue.

**18/9**

**Debenham & Freebody**  
Wigmore Street, (overmarket entrance) (Covendish Square) London, W.

**War Service Fund.**

I enclose { Cheque : :  
Postal Order : : }

for the W.S.P.U. War Service Fund and for maintaining "The Suffragette."

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_

To the Secretary  
Lincoln's Inn House, London, W.C.

**The Suffragette**

LINCOLN'S INN HOUSE, KINGSWAY, LONDON.

Telegraphic Address: Telephone Number: "WOSPOLU, LONDON." 2724 HOLBORN.

FROM ALL BOOKSTALLS AND NEWSAGENTS. Price 4/4 per annum.

	British		Foreign. America.	
	Inland.	Dominions.	10 frs.	\$2
By Post, One Year	6/6	6/6	10 frs.	\$2
" " Six Months	3/3	3/3	5 frs.	\$1

**CONTENTS**

CARTOON	285
REVIEW OF THE WEEK	287-288
WHAT THE WAR MEANS TO AMERICA	289
WHAT A GERMAN VICTORY WOULD MEAN. BY CHRISTABEL PANKHURST	290
TO A PACIFIST—FROM A FRIEND OF JUSTICE	291
THE GERMANS IN BELGIUM	292
SEA LAW V. TRUE HUMANITY	293-294
"A DYNASTY OF FRAUD AND FORCE"	295
"SUFFRAGETTE" ORDER FORM	296

**Review of the Week.**

**Aggression and Hypocrisy.**

**T**HE aggressive and withal hypocritical policy of the Germans is brought into high relief by the latest utterance of the Imperial German Chancellor, von Bethmann-Hollweg.

As a piece of unexampled hypocrisy take his tribute to the neighbouring neutral nations and their "practical manifestations of love and humanity." Why could not Belgium have been left in the ranks of these neutral nations instead of being overrun and ravaged and her people massacred by German hordes? Germanic compliments must be painful indeed to Belgium's sister States, who know that their destruction would follow upon a German victory. The wolf in his dealings with Red Riding Hood was simply nothing compared to Germany! The flattering words addressed to the Pope could not, one would say, be regarded as very much of a compliment.

**Preparedness versus Unpreparedness.**

The Germans, after twelve months' events that have convinced the entire world of their guilty preparedness for war, now vainly try to call that preparedness in question. The Imperial Chancellor was, however, silent as to the scheming and intrigue and treachery whereby *before* and *since* the war the Germans have tried to keep their adversaries unprepared for adequate self-defence. But the facts are coming to light, though even yet the half is not known!

**A Charge Withdrawn.**

The Germans have tried to persuade the world that Russia was meting out to Jewish populations living in territory which is

the scene of military operations treatment different from that meted out to Christian populations. This charge seems now to be abandoned by the Imperial Chancellor, who spoke of Jewish and Christian populations *alike* being transferred under Russian military orders. In any case Jews or Christians or both were from their own point of view lucky to escape the German armies, whose dealings with civilians are so appallingly cruel.

**What the World will not Tolerate.**

The Imperial Chancellor in his speech tried very hard to find in British history some precedent for Germany's treatment of Belgium, but failed to do so. The subject of Morocco he raised among others, but if he and the Kaiser and Germany as a whole imagine that the world will tolerate the presence of Germany in Morocco they are utterly mistaken. A glance at the map is enough to show that Germany's possession of Morocco is inconsistent with the liberty of nations!

**Appalling Hypocrisy!**

An appalling hypocrisy and audacity of the Von Bethmann-Hollweg speech was his disquisition upon Poland!—Poland whose griefs and successive martyrdoms have been *plotted and made in Germany!* The Germans who in their own land and through their representatives in Russia have framed and ruthlessly carried out the policy of denationalisation now protest their

"respect for the passion of patriotism and the tenacity with which the Polish people has defended its ancient Western civilisation and for the love of independence maintained during severe suffering under Russian domination and maintained during the horrors of the present war."

Who would suppose from these words that the original crimes against Poland were due to Prussia and that whenever Russia has desired to do any measure of justice whatsoever to Poland, Prusso-Germany has stepped in to prevent this! The hope of the Poles as of the rest of humanity is the defeat of Germany!

**The "Freedom" of the Seas.**

The "freedom of the seas" of course was one of the Chancellor's themes. The nature of the German conception of maritime freedom has been made so disagreeably evident during this war that the *United States for whose beguilement* the phrase has been invented (with a view to securing American connivance in a scheme to cripple British sea power and thus ensure German victory in a future war) will hardly be deceived!

**The Balkans for the Balkan Peoples.**

The Balkans for the Balkan peoples is the watchword not only of Russia, as the German Chancellor suggested in his speech, but of the whole *civilised* world. It is a red rag to Germany, who desires to substitute for it the watchword "The Balkans for the Germans!" The long-continued German intrigue to this end culminating in a German war is now on the eve of final failure.

**The Dangerous Haldane Negotiations.**

As to the Bethmann-Hollweg account of the negotiations with Lord Haldane, the main thing to be said is that those negotiations were of a kind most perilous to our own country and to Europe. In their desire for peace and harmony with Germany, the British Government, as represented by Lord Haldane, went much further than was safe in dealing with a Power notoriously and historically unfaithful to its word—a Power, moreover, that has before now *provoked* war under the false appearance of being provoked to it. If the Haldane negotiations had succeeded a terribly dangerous situation would have been created and the German ambition to defeat France and Russia first and then to overthrow this country might have been realised. To this subject we shall return in a future issue.

**The Whole British People!**

These words are written before the publication of any statement which the Government may decide to make in reply to the German Chancellor's remarks concerning the Haldane negotiations or the conversation between Sir Edward Grey and the German Ambassador on August 4, 1914, but in any case the Kaiser and Germany must be aware that they have to reckon not only with a reconstituted British Government but also with the British people as a whole—including those of the Dominions over seas—with a British Government and the British people who have now learnt to know the Germans as they are and the German peril in all its darkness.

**We Must Fight Harder than Ever!**

"Germany does not desire to dominate Europe," says the German Chancellor in a final outburst of hypocrisy, but there must, he says, be no longer a European equilibrium—in other words all the weight must be in the scale of Germany, Germany must be over all and the pan-Germanist dreams be turned into hideous fact! The previsions and warnings of past thinkers as to the German peril would then be realised. After the Bethmann-Hollweg speech we must fight harder than ever!

**Those German Socialists!!**

There has been a German Socialist petition against annexations. But those who sign it know perfectly well that the Kaiser and his Ministers will ignore it and that if the German armies are not defeated by the Allies, annexations will be made! Moreover, their petition is *cancelled by the Socialists themselves because at the same time the Socialist Party in the Reichstag decided to vote for the war credits!* It has been said who approves the end approves the means, but it is equally true that who approves the means, approves the end.

For the Socialists to vote to finance the German armies who are in possession of Belgium, part of France and Poland and are pushing their invasion further still is to give the *one indispensable form of support to the Kaiser's, the German, policy of*

aggression, conquest and annexation! Their false words are belied by their shameful deeds.

### Prison for Disloyal Cranks.

As we have maintained from the beginning legal action taken by the Government against the U.D.C., the I.L.P., or other pro-Germans in our midst will in no way disturb the public or excite sympathy with the objects of prosecution and imprisonment. Prison is a safer place and a more comfortable place for these disloyal and misguided persons than are the trenches or German prisons. While the best among British manhood are suffering unimaginable horrors at the hands of the Germans it would be ludicrous to waste a thought on the disloyal cranks whose own cranky disloyalty had brought them into British prisons. They would be in danger of worse hardships than that if the Germans were to effect a landing here—unless perhaps they expect that the invading Germans would treat them with leniency or even bestow the Iron Cross upon them in consideration of their services to the German cause!

Another point is this—these MacDonalds and others by conniving in the past at the imprisonment of the Suffragettes who were trying to serve their country, have disqualified themselves from even asking for sympathy when they in turn are imprisoned.

### Germans in the Camp.

From America, from Russia comes news of German trickery and of German-American and German-Russian treachery. The bright light of publicity is being thrown upon this subject and the result is admirable as a form of defence to the countries concerned against the German peril.

### What are the Germans Doing Here?

But what are the Germans, hyphenated and otherwise, doing in Great Britain? Common sense forbids us to believe that they have not done and are not doing anything to correspond with their base doings in the United States and in Russia. Of course they have now and have long had schemes for application in Great Britain that correspond to their schemes for the United States and Russia. We do not speak of France in this connection because that country has, owing to circumstances and to firmness been able to eliminate Germans and German influence.

Since the outbreak of the war, the danger of Germans in the camp, whether naturalised or otherwise, hyphenated or non-hyphenated, is also keenly realised in Italy.

But in our own country there is still far too much scope allowed to Germans of the various categories mentioned above. Indeed we fear that German manoeuvres in Great Britain may be of a character even more dangerous, because more specious, more subtle, than they are in Russia and the United States.

### A Supreme Duty.

We hold it to be a supreme duty to our Allies and especially to Russia, no less than to ourselves, to cleanse our Government departments of German influence. For us it should be easier than it is for Russia, a land that Germany has treated in some

sort as a subject province for two hundred years. When the Russians gave to their capital a Russian name, they performed an act of historic importance and expressed by an eloquent symbolism their resolve to be free to develop as a people in accordance with the Russian and not the Prussian genius. It is for us, the British people, to conduct ourselves in like manner and to realise that this war of the world in self-defence against Germanic Kultur and domination is not simply an affair of the battlefield—not a mere military tournament—but a life-and-death struggle between conflicting ideals that has to be made on every plane, by the civilians in their sphere no less than the soldiers in theirs.

### Rumours, Suggestions and Statements of German Manufacture.

To have Germanism in various forms in social life, in Government departments and so on, is simply to invite a repetition of the cotton trouble. Cotton would have been declared contraband at the beginning of the war if the counsels of British scientists rather than counsels that were really inspired by Germanism had prevailed. What the Germans do is to launch rumours, suggestions, statements in a sense helpful to their own cause. These get into the air and the very people who circulate these rumours, suggestions and statements are many of them quite unaware of their Germanic origin. Moreover, the Germans were framing the contraband situation years ago. In the making of sea law—to suit themselves—they are very adroit. A little more and they might have reduced our Navy almost if not quite to impotence, while they themselves were using their formidable army, restrained by no laws at all, for the destruction of world liberty.

### Contrary to the Public Interest.

Sir Eyre Crowe, who is half German and is also married to a German, is regarded by people who have made some study of the matter, as being largely responsible for the unsatisfactory nature of the cotton policy which has undoubtedly hindered our speedy and successful prosecution of the war. Even if this were not so we should still maintain that the employment at the Foreign Office of an official connected by blood and marriage with Germany is contrary to the public interest—an evil which ought to exist no longer!

### What Happens in Belgium—A Word to Miners and Mine-owners!

We give on page 292 an account of the suffering undergone by Belgian workers who refuse to work at the bidding of the Germans, knowing as they do that their work will contribute to the killing of their countrymen and their Allies and to the destruction of their national independence. Since this account was written has come the further news that though threatened with grave penalties and even with death, the Belgian miners at Charleroi have refused to go down into the pits and that there have been encounters between them and the German troops. How heroic are the Belgians who are thus gallantly resisting German conquest! The mine-owners and miners of South Wales must surely find the Belgian example inspiring. And surely they do not forget that the mining districts of South Wales would be among the first districts to experience German methods of plunder and assassination!

## WISE WORDS

### The Task of Parliaments in War Time

THE great Russian newspaper the *Rousskoie Slovo* writes as follows with regard to the part which the Russian Duma ought to play under present conditions:—

The Duma has a great problem to solve—It is that of helping to organise the country; to create regularity in production and distribution; to avert friction; to conciliate opposed interests; to put an end to abuses and disorders.

There arise for the consideration of the Duma a mass of purely technical questions. To solve them is not a question of eloquence, nor of ready-made phrases, but is a question of possessing a knowledge of affairs and the grasp of the practical organiser.

The Duma must be on its guard against the beaten track that great assemblies have a tendency to follow—that of electing a committee, of assembling a congress, of referring a question to the deliberation of parties. Those are expedients destined to relieve the individual of all responsibility by throwing the decision upon a collectivity.

Practical affairs are organised not by a collectivity of persons, but by individuals having the special knowledge and the original talents which are the characteristics of an organiser. To put a man who is possessed of these talents in the place for which he is suited is the best solution of all practical difficulties.

There will remain for the Duma simply the task of control, of following the progress of work, of taking measures to ensure that nothing shall be hidden; to sound the alarm in good time; to be the spokesman and the channel of all complaints, doubts and plans which are in the air; to receive suggestions and examine them attentively, to elaborate them, to reject that which is futile and wanting in weight; to calm the country by its own calm and its authority; not to allow any useful suggestion to be overlooked, nor anything to be forgotten as regards organisation; to give its attention to everything—there is the true, the indispensable function of the Duma.

It is impossible for any task to be greater and it must not pretend to do anything in addition.

The situation is in any case difficult to maintain. It is easy to criticise, to accuse, triumphantly to wash one's hands, but by doing that the Duma would not be the centre of national defence and as a consequence it is not the Duma which would have the power to determine the national renaissance.

## WHAT THE WAR MEANS TO AMERICA

A FEW weeks after war broke out a correspondent of the *New York Nation* contributed to its columns the following statement on what a German victory would mean to America. All that has happened since and the admissions as to German aims made by various sections of the German people have reinforced the contentions of this writer.

The result of triumphant German militarism upon the United States' interests and ideals would be direct and fateful.

Let me state the inexorable logic of it in four postulates:

1. **The triumph of Germany would make that country sole master on the Continent.** The plans of German dynastic imperialism, openly avowed by its champions, such as General Bernhardi, are well known. A Pan-German Union would bond together Germany (with its dependencies Belgium, Netherlands, Denmark and Poland), Austria-Hungary and the Balkan States, as a military unit. France, Russia, England and Italy would be reduced to the negligible military status which Spain now occupies. Any important policy upon which German imperialism might set its mind would be always as good as achieved.

2. **This control would be, in essence, one of force—that is, of force as the latent threat and sanction for every diplomatic demand.** Concerts, congresses, negotiations, treaties, would be more or less of a polite form. Germany would have proved that superior brute force is the final test of all disputes—not reason nor mutual debate; and the possessor of that ultimate force would be Germany. **The will of Germany—such would be the only standard for international welfare.** And that will would be always an aggressive, meddling one, as well as a self-righteous one, secure in its own conceit of ever-justness and its own mission to govern the world and intolerant of other wisdom or other fancied rights and interests.

3. **Germany would soon turn Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay and South Brazil into colonies or dependencies, flying the German flag.** This is a necessary and avowed part of its ambition to succeed England as the colonial Empire of the 1900s, as well as of its delusion that commercial world-greatness is dependent on political enlarge-

ment of territory. The German populations of those countries would effect the needed revolutions within five years after Germany's triumph in the present war.

**The Monroe Doctrine would be shattered thereby.** Whether it is a sound doctrine or not (and I believe it to have been and to be still the wisest and soundest guarantee for American peaceful living), it would have to be either defended by force or abandoned entirely by 1920.

4. **A modern republic like ours cannot be successful in war against a military despotism like Germany—especially a Germany when sole master of Europe.** Only an enormous increase of fleet and standing army could give us the slightest hope of success. But, for preparing them, there must be ample Congressional debate and an open conversion of public opinion. And the moment such preparations were publicly sanctioned, **German imperial ambition would take care to pick the necessary quarrel, before we could be ready to fight on equal terms;** and the Hohenzollern would correctly expect to dictate his terms of peace at the White House and to collect on Wall Street his ransom for not destroying New York.

What would be our situation then?

Either we must be torn, convulsed and ruined by a long defensive war, with a part of our foreign-blood citizenship taking sides for the foreign dictator and with ultimate defeat never in real doubt; or we must expect to purchase immunity, for at least a generation or two, by a humiliating subserviency to Germany's diplomatic demands. It was the haughty and insolent domineering of Gage's and Braddock's military officers which ground into the feelings of the American colonists and supplied the resentful emotional basis for our war of independence. **Prussian militaristic diplomacy will exceed anything that ever offended us in England's long past days of George III.**

**I do not care to contemplate the necessary plight of America's diplomacy after 1920, when it has to face the demands of German self-righteous imperialism,** in the inevitable clashing of interests between Germany and the United States in world-commerce and on the Monroe Doctrine. I should hope to be dead rather than be an American citizen under those conditions.

The truth is that the world, until now, was solidly on its way to the habitual

settlement of its conflicting interests through reason and mutual persuasion. Superior reasoning and moral power were coming into their rightful place as the arbiters of disputes. But now Germany, hag-ridden by militarism, would substitute brute force. And this brute force, as the instrument of a self-righteous aggressive ambition, means the doom of genuine diplomacy for other nations. And America's only real strength is in diplomacy, *i.e.*, brains and moral power. In a clash between the two, brute force will win and win brutally.

That is why the possibility of a German triumph comes directly home to us. To me, the prospect seems fateful for American destinies.

I do not say for one moment that this nation should at this time contemplate anything but official neutrality. **But I do say that no American can afford to shut his eyes to the inevitable future which one issue of this war would signify for himself and for his children.**

## A BATTLE SONG

Sons of Britain, old in fame,  
Heirs of an immortal name,  
Strike, because the danger's near,  
Strike for all ye hold most dear;  
Plunged in combat, whelmed with strife,  
Strike for liberty and life!

Sons of Britain, ye know well  
How the clarion trumpets swell  
When, like some tempestuous star,  
Flares the oriflamme of war!  
If it summon you to strife  
Strike for liberty and life!

Will ye bear the Teuton heel  
Crushing down your Commonweal?  
Will ye not avenge the wrong  
Europe hath endured so long?  
Stay the tyranny and strife,  
Strike for liberty and life!

Hark! they mutter in their sleep,  
All those heroes of the deep—  
Nelson, Rodney, Hawkins, Drake,  
All who fought for Britain's sake,  
Fought and died that such as we  
Might strike for life and liberty!

Ye, who answer Honour's call  
To strive, to conquer, or to fall—  
Ye who call yourselves the sons  
Of Marlboroughs and Wellingtons—  
Claim your heritage of strife,  
Strike for liberty and life.

W. L. COURTNEY.

## The Suffragette

Official Organ of the Women's Social and Political Union.

PRICE ONE PENNY WEEKLY.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 27, 1915.

### What a German Victory would Mean.

THE enemy to-day, as in the past, is the Prussian.

The enemy is that Prussia which having conquered and absorbed and corrupted Germany—a subject only too apt therefor—now attempts to conquer, absorb and corrupt all Europe.

Against Prussianisation it is worth while to fight, it is a duty to fight to the very end. It is only the materialists who doubt that. And the materialists are precisely those who have already a bit of the Prussian in them! We must not be deceived by the fact that these materialists cry out for a peace that means a German peace because of the pain and the loss of life that resistance to Prussianised Germany involves. It is because they are materialists that they have no spiritual ears to hear the Command:

"Fear not them which kill the body and are not able to kill the soul!"

How often have individuals and nations heard the materialists urging: "Save your skin and let the rest go"! The answer of the peoples who find their liberty and their ideals of civilisation menaced by Germanism is this: "Better be dead than German—better to sacrifice the life of the body than to sacrifice those things which make the soul life of man!"

It is, indeed, only those who have already been part conquered by Prusso-Germanism and are dazzled by its boastful pedantry, its heavy materialism, its Kultur, meretricious as well as barbarous, its pretence of invincibility—it is only they, we say, who even dream of any sort of compromise with the enemy.

And let it be admitted that in most countries there is a handful of spiritually anæmic persons who find modern Germanism as attractive as the moth finds the candle.

Then there are certain snobs who fall an easy prey to the calculated blandishments of the Kaiser, who has for years industriously received foreigners, especially those of self-importance (at the rate of twenty a week, it is said), with the object of winning them over to at least a qualified acceptance, conscious or unconscious, of the German programme of aggression. With snobs of all nations the Kaiser, with

his upturned moustache, thousands of uniforms, imperial pomp and all the rest of it, has had a huge prestige.

His predominant airs and his regimental fashion of government have appealed to certain British political failures who evidently experience an instinctive craving for Kaiserly "efficiency" as the alternative to their own ineptitude.

Snobbery, incompetence and servility the world over are pro-German. To this list of pro-German elements, we may add second-rateness, which is inclined to answer to its sense of affinity with the second-rate, flat-footed, heavy-treading Kultur evolved and ensued by Imperial Germany.

The Kaiser seeks to find an opportunity for Germanism wherever he sees particularism. All groups, religious or political, are approached indirectly, if not directly. That is what is happening in Great Britain to-day. For example, Roman Catholics, Jews, Socialists, trade unionists and last but not least Suffragists—each and all of these groups—are invited to put their own interests or their own cause before the country, **although the country is the hope and the means of protecting their interests and giving success to their cause!**

But the matter is very simple! It is not so much that Germanism would gain by the success of such manoeuvres as that the groups in question would lose by yielding to Kaiserly wiles disguised or undisguised.

Thus inasmuch as the Roman Catholic Church should find any possibility of spiritual or material compromise with German policy it would by so much be condemned now and hereafter.

In so far as the non-German Jews should further the purposes of the Kaiser they would harm their own interests and would lose in the eyes of the world far more than they could gain in the eyes of the Germans.

As to the Socialists, that element among British Socialists which has constituted itself the apologist of German aggression and in effect the accomplice of Germany, has already brought injury to the good fame of the Socialist movement which it will take long to undo. And, what is more, the cause of Socialism, especially in every land outside Germany, would suffer shipwreck as the result of a German victory, because the avowed German purpose is to create a gigantic system whereby the labour of non-German peoples will be exploited in the interests of the German people. This exploitation will be far more severe and resistant to all attempts to overthrow it than the class exploitation within national borders which Socialism condemns.

That trade unionists in the countries of the Allies and those who are munition-making in America shall go on strike in war time, is ardently desired in Germany. But if as a result of strikes, the Allies should want for coal or shells and Germany should win, then trade unionism and the interests for which it stands would suffer the worst possible disaster. In fact the biggest labour question humanity has ever known is this question of Germany's desire to impose

political and economic subjection upon the non-German world.

And if through the shortsightedness, whether of British trade unionists or of British employers, Germany should be allowed to win in this war, then would open the blackest and most hopeless chapter of human history—the blackest and most hopeless because it would represent a horrible retrogression sealed by the deadly efficiency of scientific barbarism.

If a German victory would be an appalling calamity for men, it would for women be infinitely worse.

**To defeat the Germans is the Woman Question of the present time.**

German Kultur means and is the supremacy of the male. It is maleness carried to the point of obscenity, as Mrs. Pankhurst expressed it the other day. It is the rejection of the principle of the equality and the political co-operation of men and women.

The Germans themselves boast that they as a people represent the male principle as distinct from the female principle. In the Allied nations the Germans discern what they regard as the female principle in excess! Let British women not be led astray by reports of much-advertised German laws concerning motherhood! which do not prevent a high infant mortality rate. Such laws do not prove anything more than a determination to have a large supply of sturdy German soldiers.

The dark and overwhelming fact remains that the Germans intend (they have said it often and clearly enough) to reduce the men—and all the more the women!—of the non-German peoples to economic and political subjection. Gone would be the newly-won votes of Danish women (for Denmark was long since marked down for conquest!). Gone would be in the other countries of Europe the very machinery of voting for men and all the more for women! Even if any European country long remained nominally independent the decisions of its electors would be subject to the will of Germany and so would not be in practical effect decisions at all!

Suffragists in general and militants in particular have once and for all realised that the Prussian is, for them as for all others intent upon liberty, the enemy—that the victory of Germanism would mean the death of Suffragism and the hope of it.

A militant Suffragist is naturally the last to ignore the hardships and difficulties that have been encountered in the course of British women's struggle for the vote, but those hardships and difficulties are literally as nothing compared to the disaster to the Suffrage cause—the deadly blow to our present liberty and to our hope of greater liberty—that would result from a German victory.

Therefore let us all, women as well as men, whatever may be our religion or our politics, unite for the sake of our particular interests and beliefs and for the sake of our common citizenship and ideals against the enemy.

CHRISTABEL PANKHURST.

## TO A PACIFIST—FROM A FRIEND OF JUSTICE

"First German militarism and will to dominate must be destroyed—then a way must be found to make Germany keep her pledged word"

PACIFIST associations formed in neutral countries have from time to time during the course of the war attempted to persuade individuals or associations in the countries of the Allies to meet in conference to discuss terms of peace. A characteristic of these "peacemakers" of neutral origin is that they profess impartiality as between the belligerents and draw no distinction between the Germans who attack and the Allies who defend themselves against attack.

One such invitation to discuss peace terms has been sent to the International League for the Right of Peoples, whose President is M. Denis, of the Sorbonne. The invitation has been declined and M. Denis as President of the League has made the following reply:

SIR,—In your letter dated June 10 last, you ask me if I should be disposed in principle to take part in a preliminary and confidential interview to be organised in the near future by your association, for the purpose of examining what ought to be the bases of the coming Treaty of Peace; and in order to try to prevent the return of events so terrible as the present war imposed by Germany and Austria, with the object of European and world domination, an object which the two aggressors do not now dissimulate.

It is evident that the right of peoples, whose defence is the object of the League of which I have the honour to be President, must be the very foundation of the future treaty.

It seems, then, that I ought readily to accept your invitation, but from the indications that you give me as to the conditions in which your association is arranging meetings and a congress, that if at the present moment and in a preliminary confidential interview, your French guests would not find themselves in direct contact with your German guests, it is none the less certain that at subsequent assemblies the French whom you have invited would meet with Germans who have answered your appeal.

Now there is not one Frenchman, even of the most pacific opinions, who would now or during this war consent voluntarily to collaborate with Germans whoever they may be.

A part of France is occupied by the Germans, who burn, pillage, steal and assassinate in violation of international law.

But if that part of France is thus in the power of the Germans it is not as the result of loyally fought battles. This fact has not been sufficiently brought into relief. The German invasion could not have been accomplished over the frontiers where France had the right to establish her defensive fortifications. Herr von Jagow admitted this in his interview with the English Ambassador on August 4, 1914. The aggression took place across the northern frontier, whose inviolability was assured to France by treaty and which for that reason had not been fortified.

The German occupation of part of French territory which has lasted for a year, the death of defenceless civilians—men, women and children—all the ruin and destruction are due to German treachery.

Now, the German nation has approved

and made its own the abominable work of its Government and of its Army. All Germans, without distinction, are responsible for the conduct of their political and military leaders. It is the whole nation which is responsible for these acts that are denounced by the conscience of the world. How then can a Frenchman accept an invitation to take part in any work in which a German collaborates?

There is there an insurmountable obstacle to my acceptance of your invitation, however cordial it may be.

I confess—and I say this in passing—that I do not well understand the confidential character of your invitation and the proposal of reunions not publicly avowed. As to that I am of the opinion that "If you do not want people to know what you do, do not do it."

In declining your invitation I obey, in the first place, the very legitimate feeling of repulsion and contempt felt by the victim with regard to his felon-aggressor. But I respond also to an imperious motive of good-sense.

You know what is the object of the League for the Defence of the Right of Peoples—its title is enough clearly to indicate it.

The peace to come, if it is to be durable, must be founded upon the recognition of nationalities and their rights and in the first place of their rights to dispose of themselves. In establishing those rights and justifying them as to this, that or the other race, or this, that or the other group of populations, great difficulties may be encountered. It will be the work of the patriots of the countries in question to secure that their rights shall be recognised, proclaimed and respected by diplomats and Governments.

But before accomplishing this work, essential to the duration of the future peace and before establishing right and discussing its bases and determining their consequences, we must first secure respect for the pledged word. What is the good of studying the principles upon which the conditions of a contract are to be based, if one of those who has signed the contract and become bound by it professes contempt for treaties and proclaims that necessity knowing no law, he is not bound by his engagements if they are contrary to his interests?

Germany for months past has respected none of the international agreements to which she is a party. It is superfluous to enumerate them because the greatest of all was her first crime—that which she has publicly avowed—the violation of Belgian neutrality.

One cannot remember too clearly—above all when it is a question of the principles of right whose observance must be exacted from the Germans—the words spoken by the Chancellor von Bethmann Hollweg in the Reichstag, at the sitting of October 4, 1914:

Gentlemen, we are under the necessity of defending ourselves and necessity knows no law. Our troops have occupied Luxembourg and perhaps have already entered upon Belgian Territory. That is contrary to the rules of international law. A French attack upon our flanks over the Lower Rhine might have been fatal to us. Thus we were forced to ignore the justified protests of the Government of Luxembourg and the Government of Belgium. The illegality—I speak openly—that we thus commit we shall seek to repair as soon as our military object has been achieved. When one is menaced as we are and when one fights for a supreme good, one does as one can.

The whole of Germany approved these cynical words and the state of mind that they reveal. The German intellectuals, in their celebrated manifesto, did not suggest the slightest restriction upon the theory of their Government.

Before discussing the principles of right

which must serve as the basis of the future Congress, in order to assure a durable peace, it is therefore indispensable to consider by what means we shall be able to constrain Germany not to break the conditions of the treaty of peace. That is the most urgent task. But one does not see how one would accept the collaboration of a subject of that Empire upon which the civilised world must impose respect for right and impose it by force and by dismemberment if necessary.

At this point I must recall to you the reply made by M. Maurice Millioud, Professor of Sociology at the University of Lausanne, to the inquiry made by the *Voix de l'Humanité* as to the conditions of the treaty of future peace and the possibility of disintegration of territory:

"I render homage to the generosity of your intentions," answered Professor Millioud; "but it seems to me that you shut your eyes to the terrible lesson of this war—a lesson more tragic than the war itself—that there is no reciprocity of good faith between the nations and that before asking what treaty one shall make, it is necessary to know what one can do to ensure that the treaty shall not be a mockery.

"Perhaps there are efficacious means of doing that other than the breaking up of territory; I should wish it. Yet if no other way is found, I say that we must not shrink from that one because the arrangement that has to be made before everything is that which will render other arrangements possible!"

If the logic of the reasoning of Professor Millioud seems to you as clear and irrefutable as it seems to us, the first question, that which transcends every other to be considered and resolved by your association, is then the question of the means to be employed to ensure in an absolute fashion the observance by the Germans of the conditions of the treaty of peace. . . .

In conclusion, I can assure you that the League for the Defence of the Right of Peoples is not indifferent to the ideas of justice which inspire your work. It is these ideas which are the *raison d'être* of the League. I cannot take part in your work, either publicly or confidentially:

(1) Because Germans are invited to take part in it and no Frenchman can accept any participation whatever with any one of them so long as one German occupies the soil of France which they have been able to invade only thanks to one of their felonies—the violation of Luxembourg and of Belgium.

(2) Because before determining the basis of right upon which must be established the future treaty of peace, it is necessary by the destruction of Prussian militarism and of the pan-Germanist will to dominate to create a general and an absolute need of equity and of liberty, an atmosphere of respect for the rights of all.

(3) Because also it is necessary before everything to find a means of imposing upon Germany the obligation to respect treaties—a respect which is absent in her and against which she revolts, not recognising any other authority than that of force.

(Signed) E. DENIS,  
Professor at the Sorbonne, President of the International League for the Right of Peoples.

## THE GERMANS IN BELGIUM

### Belgian workers on strike—against the Germans!

The following account of German oppression of the people and especially the workers of invaded Belgium is given by a correspondent of the French Socialist newspaper "L'Humanité":

WHEN in the month of September last the German Socialist deputies, Noske and Koster, came to visit us at the Socialist headquarters at Brussels to give to us Belgian Socialists an assurance of the excellent intentions of the German authorities with regard to our co-operative work, we all had the impression, as I told you in the account that I have already given of that memorable interview, that they were charged with an official mission.

Their mission was to persuade Belgian workmen—principally the railway men—to work to supply the needs of the German army. Just think, there are in Belgium sixty to seventy thousand railwaymen, postal workers and telegraphists who had to be replaced, as far as possible, by German workers! If they could succeed in bringing back to work these Belgian workers, that meant a whole German army corps set free to fight!

Now, in spite of the checks they have sustained and in spite of the resistance which they have met everywhere during the last twelve months, the Germans continue to pursue their plan with that tenacity which is perhaps their most characteristic quality. Persuasion, cunning manoeuvres, mild methods not having succeeded, they have had recourse to pressure and to violence.

I have informed you on several occasions of the admirable resistance which our workers have opposed to them, at Charleroi, at Malines, at Ghent, at Luttre. The *Twentieth Century*, the Belgian newspaper which is published at Havre, has received on the subject of the attitude of the workers at Luttre, some new and truly moving information. I will sum it up as well as I can.

As the result of the refusal of the Belgian workers to resume work in conformity with the requisitions of the German authority at Luttre-Pont-à-Celles, they have tried to starve them into submission. The communal authorities have been forbidden to give them any help in the way of either food or money. With the object of depriving them of all resources, the German authorities proceeded to arrest and imprison nearly all the officials and agents of the Belgian Government who have been co-operating in the distribution of relief, as well as notable persons who have been giving voluntary help in this work. In addition, the workers are the objects of various threats. They are threatened that they will see their houses burnt down, that they will be sent them-

selves with their families as prisoners into Germany, that German workers shall be quartered upon them. They are requisitioned at their house by soldiers with fixed bayonets. If they happen to be out of their homes, the Germans take as hostages, to be held until they make their appearance at the factory, a member of their family, father, mother, wife, or child. That was notably the case with regard to a young girl of fourteen years old.

The arrest of the wives of workmen was an everyday affair at the epoch of the requisition. German officers grossly insulted the workers who refused to work because of their patriotic feeling, or because they had a son, a brother or friend at the front.

Belgian workmen before being sent into Germany are kept prisoners for nine days in a third-class railway compartment, or in waggons designed for animals, in such numbers that they are obliged to sleep sitting or in a squatting posture. They are not allowed to get out of the compartment to satisfy their natural needs. They suffer from want of air and from heat, the railway carriages being left standing all day in the rays of the sun. Finally, in the waggons for animals which have not been cleaned arise nauseating smells of excrement and urine.

The German authorities had first of all authorised the feeding of prisoners by their families; but on the sixth day, exasperated by their resistance, they put them on dry bread and water.

As a coercive measure against the population of Pont-à-Celles, the threat was made that 150 Uhlans should be sent for to be lodged and fed by and at the expense of the inhabitants. This threat was put into execution, except that the Uhlans did not remain with the inhabitants longer than a day and a night.

The Uhlans patrolled the streets in order to intimidate the population. In the course of these patrols they go as far as to charge with their lances peaceable inhabitants talking on the threshold of their homes. Two persons were wounded in one of these charges. They escort, lance in hand, workers requisitioned in the villages in the neighbourhood of Pont-à-Celles, with the object of terrorising others.

In spite of all their brutalities and vexations of every kind, the population maintained their calm and dignified attitude, their energy and their coldness with regard to the Germans.

The peace-at-any-price pro-Germans who profess to be Socialists and Democrats talk of the solidarity of the workers of the world as a reason why they should not help to defeat the Kaiser and his "horde of slaves." The martyrdom of the Belgian workers should stir the workers of all other lands to fight until Belgium is free and German aggression smashed.

## WHERE SERBIA LEADS

IF the civilisation and moral progress of a nation are to be measured by the happiness and prosperity of its people, then indeed our Ally Serbia takes a high place among the nations. For Serbian laws and customs are such as to make it the only country in Europe which has no pauper class and consequently no need for a poor-law system or workhouses.

One of the glorious results of this war will be the re-establishment in Serbia of the well-being which existed before the war period; and the bringing into the Serbian national family, those others of the same race who have been under alien rule. It is because in their daily life the Serbs have given practical expression to the principles of Christianity and because the system of class exploitation is rejected by them, that the twin curses of poverty and enormous riches, of demoralising penury and demoralising luxury, are unknown in their land.

Long may Serbia—the greater and united Serbia—live and flourish; and soon may other nations realise how much can be learnt from Serbia, where social organisation is concerned!

### Patriotism is the Politics of Serbia

As Mr. G. M. Trevelyan, in a recent article in the *Atlantic Monthly*, after referring to the victory of the Serbs last December, "when they drove an Austrian host of four hundred thousand, twice as numerous as themselves, in headlong rout from the Serbian soil and captured all their artillery"; and describing it as the most thrilling feat of arms that this war has anywhere witnessed and as a triumph of the human spirit against material odds, says:

The Serbians won because they were free men—accustomed to freedom, fighting to save their country from a host of war-slaves who spoke six different languages and were for the most part lukewarm or hostile to the cause in which they were compelled to fight.

The patriotism of the Serbians surpasses the patriotism of any nation engaged in this war. For they are free and equal at home and they have no class divisions. There is no *arriviste gensie* in their devotion to their country's cause. They have no politics except patriotism, no loyalty except to their country. There is no nation in Europe so much at one with itself and with its Government.

### What British Socialists should Do

If certain British Socialists, instead of acting as special pleaders for Germany from a brief prepared in Berlin, would devote themselves to a study of the means whereby a form of practical Socialism is carried into effect by the Serbian people; and if they would consider how the Serbian system might in some of its aspects at least be applied as a cure of social ills in our own and other countries, they would be better employed.

### The Importance of Small States

We would draw their attention to these further statements by Mr. G. M. Trevelyan. Having spoken of the oppression under which the South Slavs, subjects of Austria-Hungary, have long suffered, Mr. Trevelyan says that "the terrorism existing in the South Slav provinces of Austria-Hungary since the war began is as bad as anything in the annals of oppression."

Alluding to the inclusion in the Austrian army of the Slavs under Austrian rule, Mr. Trevelyan says:

We are told that the time for small States has gone by. But if the big Empires that devour them deny all racial, cultural and political liberty within their borders and turn all their subjects irrespective of personal or racial differences into so many pieces of a grinding military machine, then the extinction of little democracies like Serbia and others elsewhere would mean the extinction of human freedom and of all that is noblest in the spirit of man.

In these words is summed up one of the main reasons why the Germans and their Allies must be defeated finally and irrevocably in this present war. Any realisation, however small in extent, of German aims would mean the living death of those people brought under German rule and would mean another German onslaught upon the remainder of Europe in fifteen or twenty years' time. The additional resources conquered by Germany under a compromise peace at the close of this war would be used to ensure a complete Prussian victory over Europe in the future war. And as for the time for small States having gone by—who says such a thing unless they are Germans or pro-Germans? On the contrary, this war is teaching us the value and the necessity for their own people and for Europe of the *small States!*

## SEA LAW v. TRUE HUMANITY

THE manifesto which appears below was addressed in May 1874 to the Right Hon. Benjamin Disraeli by various associations of working men in Birmingham. It is an argument against the restriction imposed by the Declaration of Paris, 1856, upon the right of a belligerent to make war on his enemy's commerce. The effect of the Declaration of Paris, so the signatories of the manifesto contended, was to "make property more sacred than life" and to deprive a maritime Power of the right possessed by Continental Powers fighting primarily on land to levy contributions from an enemy's country. The manifesto is interesting for the account it gives of history and law relating to naval warfare. It throws light upon the fact that to give protection at sea to the commerce of a militaristic land Power encourages wars and prolongs them and increases the destruction of property on land and what is worse increases the destruction of human life! True humanity consists in restricting land warfare against life rather than in restricting sea warfare against commerce. War upon commerce at sea actually shortens war upon life on land!

To the Right Hon. Benjamin Disraeli, M.P.

Great Britain, surrounded by the sea, with a larger population than she grows food for, depends even for the necessities of life on the waters which wash her shores. Her mineral riches and manufacturing capabilities give employment to her dense population and the products of their labour provide the means of purchasing necessities in the markets of the world, while her extensive coast line and many ports and harbours furnish ships and seamen, the vehicles of communication and exchange. The liberty of the seas and the enjoyment of maritime rights are consequently for England at once a source of greatness and a condition of existence even in time of peace.

The sea, which is her highway in peace, lies between her and her enemy. In war it affords the means of enforcing justice from, or defence against, an aggressor and thus becomes her battlefield.

It is one on which she can act inexpensively and the only one on which she can act effectually. If beaten there she is helpless everywhere and the enemy, even without landing, could cut off her supplies and reduce her by famine. Naval supremacy and the exercise of belligerent rights at sea are, therefore, for England an indispensable element of independence and a guarantee of victory in the event of war.

For Englishmen there cannot then be a subject of graver interest, or better worth attention, than maritime law or

law applied to the sea and defining the rights and duties to be there enjoyed and performed in peace or war.

In peace "the right of navigating and fishing in the open sea being a right common to all men, the nation which attempts to exclude another from that advantage does it an injury and gives a sufficient cause for war; but war introduces other rights and those have been carefully laid down from earliest times. They consist in the right of forcing the enemy to do justice by cutting off his resources and capturing or killing him if he resists and include the right of—  
"1st. Seizing his ships and goods;  
"2nd. Seizing his goods on board neutral ships;  
"3rd. Blockading his ports;  
"4th. Preventing neutrals supplying him with contraband goods;  
"5th. Searching all ships to enforce these rights;  
"6th. Commissioning the mercantile marine to aid the ordinary warships in this duty." (Vattel, B. i., c. xxiii., s. 282.)

The *Consolato Del Mare*, compiled in the twelfth century by St. Louis, King of France, from the codes of the then Maritime States, provides:

If the captured vessel is neutral property and the cargo the property of enemies, the captain may compel the merchant vessel to carry the enemy's cargo to a place of safety, where the prize may be secure from all danger of recapture, paying to the vessel the whole freight which she would have earned at her delivering port and this freight shall be ascertained by the ship's papers, or in default of necessary documents, the oath of the master shall be received as to the amount of the freight.

If the ship should belong to the enemy, the cargo being the whole or in part neutral property, some reasonable agreement should be entered into on account of the ship now become lawful prize, between the captain and the merchant owning the cargo.

VATTEL, in his *Law of Nations*, says:

Effects belonging to an enemy found on board a neutral ship are seizable by the rights of war, but by the law of nations the master is to be paid his freight and not to suffer by the seizure. (B. iii., c. vii., s. 115.)

The effects of neutrals found in an enemy's ship are to be restored to the owners, against whom there is no right of confiscation, but without any allowance for detention, decay, &c.; the loss sustained by the neutral on this occasion is an accident to which they expose themselves by sending them in an enemy's ship. (s. 116.)

All commerce is entirely prohibited within a besieged town. If I lay siege to a place, or only form the blockade, I have a right to hinder anyone from entering and to treat as an enemy whoever attempts to enter the place, or carry anything to the besieged without my leave. (s. 117.)

So early as the time of Henry III. England's strength was shown to reside in her ships. Frederick, asking for help against the then Tartar invasion, spoke of "Fertile England, valorous in its men and protected by its fleets. . . ."

The Treaty of 1667, between England and Holland, stipulated "Free ships, free goods," but this was a grant of a privilege, not an alteration of law, as the Treaty between England and Sweden of 1661 is to this effect: "If the goods of an enemy are found in the ship of the confederate, that part only which belongs to the enemy shall be made prize and what belongs to the confederate shall be immediately restored. The same rule shall likewise be observed if the goods of the confederate are found on board a ship of the enemy. . . ."

In 1752, Frederick the Great of Prussia attempted to induce England to surrender the right of search. The matter was referred to the law officers of the Crown and the answer drawn up by Mr. W. Murray (afterwards Lord Mansfield) contained these words:

When two Powers are at war they have a right to make prizes of the ships, goods and effects of each other upon the high seas. Whatever is the property of the enemy may be acquired by capture at sea, but the property of a friend cannot be taken, provided he has observed his neutrality. Hence, the law of nations (that is the law of all nations) has established that the goods of an enemy on board the ship of a friend can be taken; that the lawful goods of a friend on board the ship of an enemy are to be restored; that contraband goods going to the enemy, though the property of a friend, may be taken as prize, because they supply the enemy with what enables him to carry on the war, which is a departure from neutrality.

Frederick the Great abandoned his claims. . . .

When England and France were at war, France having signed a treaty with the United States in the sense of free ships, free goods, while England had not, the Americans allowed the English to seize French goods in their ships, but did not allow the French to seize English goods. The French threatened.

The Americans replied in the Note of 1798:

Before the Treaty with Great Britain, the Treaty with France existed. It follows then that the rights of England, being neither increased nor diminished by compact, remain precisely in their natural state, which is to seize enemies' property wherever found and this is the received and allowed practice where no treaty has intervened.

The Convention of 1801 between England and Russia stipulated that goods on board neutral vessels shall be free with the exception of "contraband goods and enemy's property." Russia, however, obtained a clause that the right of visiting vessels under convoy shall be "exercised by men-of-war only and not by privateers."

Lord NELSON, in the House of Lords on November 13, 1801, speaking of this Convention, said:

The Convention had put an end to the principle endeavoured to be enforced by the Armed Neutrality in 1780 and by the late combination

(Continued on next page.)

## SEA LAW v. TRUE HUMANITY (continued).

of the Northern Powers, that free ships make free goods—a proposition so monstrous in itself and so injurious to the maritime interests of this country, that if it had been persisted in, we ought not to have concluded the war with these Powers while a single man, a single shilling, or a single drop of blood remained in the country.

On January 1, 1802, Lord HAWKESBURY wrote to the English Plenipotentiary at Amiens:

His Majesty will never consent to place out of his hands in a treaty of peace those means which may be necessary for the security of his dominions in time of war. (Lord Cornwallis's *Memoirs*, vol. iii., p. 430.)

In 1807 the English Declaration against Russia said:

His Majesty proclaims anew those principles of maritime law against which the Armed Neutrality under the auspices of the Empress Catherine were originally directed and against which the present hostilities of Russia are determined. Those principles have been recognised and acted on in the best periods of the history of Europe and acted upon by no Power with more strictness and severity than Russia herself in the reign of the Empress Catherine. Those principles it is the right and duty of His Majesty to maintain against every confederacy. His Majesty, under the blessing of Providence, is determined to maintain them. They have at all times contributed essentially to the support of the maritime power of Great Britain.

In 1807 the Armed Neutrality was a repetition of the former one, but Russia soon turned round and declared on May 14, 1809:

As we have learned by experience during the last year that the enemy found means through the medium of neutral vessels of obtaining the produce he required and of exchanging his own, we command:

1st. That ships arriving in our ports shall prove the neutrality of the property.

2nd. Ships loaded in port with goods which shall be proved to be the produce or manufacture of an enemy's country shall be detained, the goods shall be confiscated and sold by public sale for the benefit of the Crown. If more than half of the cargo consists of such goods then not only the cargo, but the ship also shall be confiscated.

BONAPARTE'S "Milan Decree," Art. 3, said:

The British Isles are enclosed in a state of blockade, every vessel to whatever nation it may belong and whatever may be its cargo, despatched from ports of England or of English colonies, or of countries occupied by English troops, or going to England or into the English colonies, or into countries occupied by English troops, is good prize, as contravening the present decree; it shall be captured by our vessels of war or by our cruisers and adjudged to the captor.

The English Declaration against France, 1812, said:

The enemy requires that we should recognise as a principle that the goods of an enemy under a neutral flag should be treated as neutral goods and that the goods of a neutral under a hostile flag should be treated as enemy's goods. By these demands the enemy requires that Great Britain and all civilised nations shall at his pleasure renounce the natural and incontestable rights of war; that Great Britain in particular

shall surrender all the advantages of her naval superiority.

THIBAudeau's "Congress of Châtillon" tells us that in 1814 the instructions of the British Government are to the effect that all discussions relative to the maritime code would be contrary to the usages observed in negotiations such as the present. That the Cabinet of London neither will grant nor require any concession bearing upon rights which it considers obligatory and capable of being regulated only by the laws of nations—a declaration to which the other Courts agreed.

From the middle of the seventeenth century to the Treaty of Vienna there were 115 Treaties among the nations of Europe, twenty-two of them limiting the right of search between certain Powers, but not affecting themselves when becoming reciprocally belligerent. These Treaties were not renewed, but intentionally dropped, the English Government not so much as allowing the subject to be discussed, but simply returning to the law as laid down by the *Consolato Del Mare* and *Vattel*.

Thus England overcame all opposition by understanding and enforcing her rights. It was not that she made a great effort to support the law, but the law supported her and enabled her to make the effort.

On April 16, 1856, the Plenipotentiaries at Paris signed a declaration:

"1st. That privateering is and remains abolished.

"2nd. The neutral flag covers enemies' goods, with the exception of contraband of war."

This declaration was not a treaty, or part of a treaty, or an agreement, as it contains no reciprocal or equivalent obligations or engagements, but is simply a falsehood contained in an annex to a protocol of the Conference of Paris. It pretends to abolish the natural advantages and destroy the prosperity and independence of England without consulting the nation; affects to change and reverse the law and practice of England without the authority of the Crown; and it seeks to make property more sacred than life and is therefore an invasion of the liberties of the people, an infraction of the privileges of Parliament, an usurpation of the prerogative of the Crown, and a violation of the law of nations.

It has not been ratified by the Queen, assented to by Parliament, or approved by the people of England and has been repeatedly broken by the principal parties to it when it suited their convenience. It is consequently not binding in any legal sense, but because it has not been formally disavowed it is said by some to be morally binding and its extension is contended for mainly on the grounds of the evils arising from it. To extend an evil is not to remedy it and the proper thing to do is to remove the cause and disavow the declaration.

On May 22, 1856, Lord COLCHESTER moved in the House of Lords:

"That the most eminent jurists of all ages have accepted as a principle of international law that the right of capturing an enemy's goods on board neutral vessels is inherent in all belligerent Powers. That the maintenance of the right is of essential importance and its abandonment of serious injury to a Power whose main reliance is on her naval superiority. That this House deeply regrets that a principle so long and so strenuously maintained should in the recent Congress at Paris have been suddenly abandoned, without previous sanction or knowledge of Parliament, by plenipotentiaries assembled for the purpose of discussing the terms in which peace with Russia might be concluded and the affairs of the East satisfactorily adjusted."

On March 1, 1857, Lord JOHN RUSSELL called attention to the Declaration of Paris. He said:

"The rules that free bottoms make free goods and the goods of a belligerent are safe in neutral vessels have always been regarded as injurious to the supremacy of maritime countries and especially to the maritime Power of England. I hope no Minister will set his seal to a treaty containing any stipulation of this kind without the most cautious deliberation."

Mr. J. S. PHILLIMORE said the abandonment of our maritime rights was the abandonment of that which Continental nations must always possess—the levying of contributions from an enemy country. This was Napoleon's mode of carrying on war. That great man always maintained that the most deadly blow which could be struck at England's power was to force her to give up these maritime rights.

The subject dropped. From the above recital of facts and authorities it appears: That the maritime power of England consists in the ability derived from her natural advantages of exercising on the high seas the natural right of all nations at war of seizing the enemy's goods, which compels the enemy to employ his navy in defending its trade and so exposes it to be attacked and defeated and prevents it making descents on her shores. That the Declaration of Paris was not a treaty, but a false declaration, injurious to England if acted upon, contrary to the law of England, of nations in both matter and manner, was not authorised, has not been sanctioned or ratified, has been repeatedly broken and is not legally binding and ought not to be extended, but disavowed and declared null and void. The time seems favourable. The object of Her Majesty's present Ministers has been avowed to be to restore England to a position of respect in the Councils of Europe. This would be the means. The undersigned therefore earnestly implore you to take the necessary steps to have the Declaration of Paris of 1856 declared null and not binding on this country; and further to make inquiry as to the means by which the Declaration of March 28, 1854 and that of April 16, 1856, were falsely made to appear as Acts emanating from Her Majesty the Queen.

## "A DYNASTY OF FRAUD AND FORCE"

A German historian's indictment of the Hohenzollerns

(Continued from last week.)

Under the title "Who is the Real Enemy of Germany?" the historian ONNO KLOPP, an old-time non-Prussian and non-Prussianised German, wrote in 1868 an indictment of the Hohenzollerns and Prussianism which was veritably and tragically prophetic. We here reproduce a third instalment.\*

HAS the Hohenzollern dynasty ever employed its enormous military power, squeezed out of the blood and the sweat of its unfortunate people, for the protection of Germany? Perhaps in the wars of the French Revolution?

The French contemporaries most emphatically assert that the conduct of the Prussian Government and especially the bragging Manifesto of 1782, was one of the chief levers used by the Jacobins to force the offended national pride into the unhappy paths of these days; whilst afterwards, when the Revolution was foaming and boiling over, the Prussian Government neglected to do their part of the duty to prevent an exploding discharge over the frontier.

They kept aloof in order to allow the work of the destruction of the German Constitution, which had been already commenced by them, to be achieved by the Jacobins, by abandoning to them the left shore of the Rhine as a recompense, the reversion of the possessions of the German neighbours. And that not only of the clerical Princes alone.

At the time of the treaty of peace of Basel in 1795, the secret articles already betrayed the craving of the Hohenzollerns after the possession of Hanover, which during a period of eleven years formed the chief point which determined their policy towards the Western Powers.

The State of the Hohenzollern has never once drawn the sword for Germany. Whatever may have been the sentiments of these Germans who served under their standard, the policy of that House was in 1814 as well as afterwards decided solely towards carrying on a war of conquest for its own selfish interest. . . .

The natural and just wishes of the German nation were not realised at the Congress of Vienna.

The German Confederation was formed nevertheless and the Hohenzollern dynasty joined it. This was done, as all subsequent acts have shown, not in order to advance the German federative principle, but to thwart its development and at the first occasion to rend asunder, in a similar way as formerly the Empire, the Confederation and to turn the German countries into materials for annexation for themselves.

\* Previous instalments appeared in the issues of August 13 and 20.

The real position of the Powers had unfortunately become obscured. First by their ephemeral relation from 1813 to 1815; then by the creation of the so-called Holy Alliance, a compact which was entirely untrue and unnatural in its object and essence and lastly by the necessity of the State of the Hohenzollerns to assimilate the newly acquired provinces to its own principles.

Thus, it came to pass that Germany, France and the whole of Europe, during the long peace of fifty years, almost forgot upon what principles that State of the Hohenzollerns was based. They forgot the point of view according to which the Empress Maria Theresa addressed such seriously warning words to the Queen of France. These words ought to form for Austria as well as for France, for each of the German Governments and the neighbouring countries, the starting-point from which their political views and considerations should be drawn.

There are volcanoes which repose during scores of years, nay, even during centuries. The injury sustained by our forefathers becomes less vivid in the recollection of succeeding generations. They build their peaceful cottages upon the cooled-down lava, trusting that the fires of the earth have become extinguished. The summit of the mountain glitters from the light falling upon the snow and ice, which from having lain there scores of years is considered eternal and yet these forces work unceasingly and the mountains only slumber.

A similar anxiety might have presented itself from time to time in the mind of the Empress Maria Theresa, when she gave utterance to the words in 1778. But people consoled themselves with the idea that one half of the military power of the Hohenzollern State, that is the Landwehr (militia), was incapable of being employed in an aggressive war or a war of conquest.

That idea was so deeply rooted that in the minds of the people it was not even abandoned, when that man, in whom in our times, the principle of the Hohenzollerns was concentrated in a like manner as that of a century ago in King Frederick II., declared before the whole world that his system would be one of "Blood and Iron." Nor was that idea relinquished when at the same time the reorganisation of the Prussian army tended to the clearly perceptible aim of transforming the Landwehr into an army of aggression.

It is true Prussian policy has at the same time not neglected to employ those other means, which Maria Theresa pointed out in her words of 1778 as one of its characteristics; namely, to make use of untruths in every shape and form.

In the year 1860, King William was heard to address in Baden-Baden the Princes there assembled in terms which were becoming to a straightforward, honest and well-intentioned man.

He pledged his kingly word not to break up the Bund, nor to menace the rights of the other Princes, but to guard and protect them. . . .

The number of these persons was as yet very small indeed, who at that time, having a thorough knowledge of the Hohenzollern dynasty and policy, declared their sincere conviction that these words were but vain lies and sham. . . .

The year 1866 produced this crisis. The policy of the Hohenzollern dynasty—for it was only to this that my attention was paid and not to the will of the people under its sway—showed itself in its full light exactly as ninety years before the Empress Maria Theresa had predicted it, as an active and vigorous military despotism caring neither for right, truth, nor honour, utterly regardless of everything save the furtherance of its own selfish interests, only with this difference, that in place of its former cynicism in religious matters there was now substituted—it is difficult to say which is the more despicable—dissimulating hypocrisy. The difference, however, is merely of a personal nature. It does not alter the features of the case. The facts are patent before our eyes.

But there is another danger which has arisen from the rapid and great success of that policy.

This danger lies in the inclination which many Germans have, to accept the apparently accomplished fact of the victory of the Prussian system of force.

We say apparently accomplished fact. The victory of Königgrätz, as well as the treaty of peace of Prague, are undoubtedly accomplished facts, but not on that account a final triumph of the Prussian violence in general. The former facts do not form the basis of a durable state of things; for they are irreconcilable with all the political views till now common in Europe. They challenge contradiction from the latter. They are not the last acts of the terrible drama, which the insatiable appetite of the Hohenzollern dynasty for swallowing up the countries, has brought about in Europe, but they are the prelude of others that will follow. The mistake of confounding the one with the other is often made in Germany; we are desirous to prevent its spreading further.

We do not address those who already before the catastrophe of 1866 professed to believe in the fiction that the Hohenzollern State represented a national German principle, as it is useless to attempt to reason with those who knowingly profess an untruth.

But we address those who, by reviewing the present state of affairs, endeavour to effect the result, that Prussia should be absorbed and transformed by Germany. They say that the state of affairs at the present is only a period of transition and that from it will come forth a united and free Germany.

(To be continued.)

**ORDER FORM.**

**“THE SUFFRAGETTE.”**

*The Weekly Newspaper of the Women's Social and Political Union.*

PRICE

**1d. Weekly.**

Edited by

CHRISTABEL PANKHURST.

PRICE

**1d. Weekly.**

By post, one year . . . . .	Inland	6s. 6d.	British Dominions	6s. 6d.	Foreign	10 fr.	America	\$2
“ “ six months . . . . .		3s. 3d.		3s. 3d.		5 fr.		\$1

Please send me by post each week \_\_\_\_\_ copies of “The Suffragette.”

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

All orders by post should be sent direct to the CIRCULATION MANAGER, Lincoln's Inn House, Kingsway, W.C.