

that the former Emperor does not consider his stay in Holland a temporary episode. Quite the contrary. He no longer expresses the desire ever to return to Germany. That is all over. He considers Germany lost. The idea has become fixed with him that he was deceived, tricked, and deserted by his advisers and by the whole nation. He lets no opportunity pass to prove this in great detail. Simultaneously, he has developed an abnormal suspicion of other people.

Probably the plan is to enlarge the family circle by having some of the other relatives reside with him. At present the group is very small. Although the Crown Prince is in rather serious financial straits, he will not live with the Kaiser permanently. He remains at Wieriengen. The former Emperor's companions are General von Winterfeld — the former military attaché, not the general who was chairman of the Armistice Commission — Captain von Ilsemann, one or two younger officers, and now, very frequently, Mr. Kriege, formerly an official in the Foreign Office, a man well known during his official life as a pedantic stickler for the observance of international law down to the smallest letter. The former Empress is in much better health. Her companion is Countess Keller. In addition to these, there are the servants — not many of them. Probably the whole personnel of the establishment counts a scant forty people. To all outward appearances, life passes on this estate much as it does at the neighboring country seats of this idyllic region.

Every visitor at Amerongen has to present an admission card from which a coupon is detached when he enters and another when he departs. All the former Emperor's letters, as well as those of his companions, are subject to censorship. The Kaiser himself is

interned. Dutch officialdom is not harsh, but scrupulously exacting in these matters.

[*Germania* (Clerical Daily),
January 9]

IV. *A Royal Traitor*

'THE French Prime Minister, driven into a corner, seeks to escape from the net of lies which he has woven about himself, and does not hesitate to have recourse to the absolutely false and untruthful assertion that I have recognized, either directly or indirectly, the justice of France's claim for the return of Alsace-Lorraine. I repudiate this lying assertion with indignation.'

This is the telegram which Emperor Charles sent when Clemenceau made public the first information which the world received concerning the peace mission of Prince Sixtus, the brother of the Empress Zita. Compare this telegram with the letter which the last of the Hapsburgs wrote on March 24, 1917, and which he transmitted to President Poincaré. We see that Mr. Clemenceau's statement was not false; for we have a facsimile of the letter in the *Daily Telegraph*.

It was no secret that Austria-Hungary was an unstable ally, even before the death of Francis Joseph. The economic condition of the old Empire was rapidly growing worse. The sacrifice of life it was called upon to make continued to mount. Its constituent nationalities were striving to sunder the political ties that united them under the Hapsburg crown. Under such circumstances who would blame Emperor Charles for exerting all the influence in his power upon German headquarters to terminate the war? But even if his wishes found no hearing, he was not justified in taking the steps he did at Paris. Quite possibly, the former Emperor at first planned

merely to prepare the world for a general peace. But the revelations recently made prove that in the course of the negotiations through Prince Sixtus with the leading men of France, he made the decision to sacrifice Germany to his own interests.

Poincaré wrote the Emperor: 'It is for the interest of France, not only to preserve Austria-Hungary, but to enlarge that country if necessary at the cost of Germany by adding to it Bavaria or Silesia.' Among the four points which the Prince transmitted to Vienna as France's conditions, the first was that Austria-Hungary should recognize the right of France to Alsace-Lorraine and do everything in its power to support those claims. Emperor Charles accepted this condition in his letter of March 24. He made no objection to the suggested enlargement of his own territories at the expense of Germany. He stated in an interview with his brother-in-law that he would even consent to have the left bank of the Rhine neutralized. A Catholic newspaper in Vienna is quite justified in commenting upon this dishonorable and faithless proceeding as follows: 'The former Emperor Charles was a traitor to the German nation. He betrayed the nation both in the German Empire and in the Austro-Hungarian Empire: for Austrian Germans would never have supported him in such a treason.'

The next question is, what rôle did Count Czernin play in this attempt to obtain a separate peace? In the *War Memoirs* which he has recently published, he asserts that in spite of his opposition to the political views of the German military leaders, he always rejected the idea of a separate peace and strove only for a general peace. The mission of Prince Sixtus appears to have been entirely an affair of the former Emperor. In reporting an interview

which Prince Sixtus had on March 23, 1917, in Laxenburg, with the Emperor — where Czernin also was present later, the Prince says that the latter gentleman was very frosty and blunt; but that he did say that the Germans would never in his opinion give up Alsace-Lorraine and it might eventually be necessary to separate from them. This statement makes us infer that Czernin did not share fully the attitude of the Emperor. The next question is whether he knew the contents and wording of the Emperor's letter of March 24, 1917, where the latter speaks of 'the just claims of France to Alsace-Lorraine.' These words, it will be recalled, were the subject of a bitter controversy between Clemenceau and Czernin. They were repudiated by the latter. In a note which the Count appended to the letter of Emperor Charles, dated May 9, 1917, the former demanded that Austria should not be called upon to cede any territories except in exchange for other territories, but asserted that Austria was always ready to conclude an honorable peace with the Entente. Since the compensations were never named, one cannot reproach Graf Czernin with betraying his ally in demanding them.

These revelations affect not only Germany and Austria but also Italy. The Italian press is foaming at the mouth with indignation because England and France conducted these negotiations in March and April, 1917, without consulting Italy. The statement of the Emperor to Prince Sixtus, that a representative of General Cadorna had been in Bern early in May to offer Austria peace in return for the cession of Trent, has been vigorously denied by the former Italian commander. He says he would never have approved a settlement on that basis. The Italian newspapers back up this

statement by asserting that no Italian would have consented to a separate peace, but that every member of that nation was determined to fight until Italy's war aims were attained.

In any case, the Italian Government was informed in May of the Anglo-French plans for a separate peace with Austria. *Le Temps* has published two letters dated that month, indicating that Ribot proposed that the King of Italy, the King of England, and President Poincaré, accompanied by their ministers, should meet at some point behind the French front to discuss the question of a separate peace with Austria. England accepted the proposal; but the meeting never took place, because King Victor Emmanuel refused. Sonino was Minister of Foreign Affairs at that time, and we can easily understand why he is being so praised to-day by the Italian newspapers.

Another question suggests itself. Why have the English and French newspapers chosen to publish these revelations, at a moment when they are well calculated to disturb the good relations of the Allies to Italy? The answer is easily discovered. Just at present, Nitti and Scialoja are in London trying to bring the negotiations upon the Adriatic question to a conclusion. The real reason for publishing this account of Austria's appeal for a separate peace just now is to show the Italians that the Western Powers rejected these favorable terms solely out of consideration for Italy.

[*London Chronicle* (Lloyd George Daily),
February 10]

WAR CRIMES: THE AVERAGE POINT OF VIEW

BY PHILIP GIBBS

It would be interesting to know what the people of this country really think about the rigorous prosecution

of the 'Black List' demanding the surrender of many German Princes, Generals, Admirals, and officers for offenses against humanity. We have had newspaper views, some of them raising the old war cries, and some of them urging moderation, but it is difficult to know the feeling of the nation.

In private conversation with many types of men and women I have not met a single individual who did not think that a trial of the Kaiser and his subordinates by a Court of Allied Judges would be a mockery of justice and an act of international folly. Doubtless, there are thousands of people in our own country (and undoubtedly the mass of people in France) who think precisely the opposite, and will not be satisfied until large numbers of eminent personages and their human instruments in Germany have been sentenced to death, prison, or exile, but if that is so I have not met them.

I had a conversation on the way back from Vienna with a distinguished member of our diplomatic service who is, of all men, free from any suspicion of being a 'pro-German.' Talking about the subject, he said, 'I do not see how the Kaiser, or any of his officers can be brought to trial by an Allied Court. Apart from the difficulty of obtaining direct evidence of guilt, or of formulating a charge which would have any legal weight, such a trial would be a travesty of justice, as the elementary ethics accusers may not bring judges in their own cause. Also, failure to convict would make us the laughing stock of history.'

That is the point of view of a man learned in international law, and imagine it represents the conviction of most English lawyers who are able to look at this question in the cold light of legal tradition. Nor can I see Lord Haig or any of our generals giving ev