

STACK
ANNEX

5
020
367

A
0
0
0
0
3
5
0
5
1
2



Socialism for Pacifists

By
A. FENNER BROCKWAY
Editor of the "Labour Leader."


PRICE SIXPENCE.

THE NATIONAL LABOUR PRESS, LIMITED,
30, Blackfriars Street, Manchester;
And at London.





SOCIALISM FOR PACIFISTS



SOCIALISM FOR PACIFISTS

BY

A. FENNER BROCKWAY

(Editor of the "Labour Leader")

Author of "The Devil's Business," "Labour and Liberalism,"

"What the I.L.P. Wants," "Is Britain Blameless?"

&c., &c.

THE NATIONAL LABOUR PRESS, LTD.
MANCHESTER; and at LONDON

DEDICATION.

THIS ELEMENTARY INTRODUCTION
TO SOCIALISM
IS DEDICATED TO ALL MY COMRADES
WHO ARE WITNESSING IN CIVIL
AND MILITARY CUSTODY TO THEIR
SOCIALISM AND PACIFIST PRINCIPLES.

PREFACE

During last summer so many Pacifists, attracted to the I.L.P. movement by its opposition to the war, wrote to me asking for a simple statement of the case for Socialism as opposed to the case for Militarism that I decided to attempt to write a small book to meet the demand. I had written the first three chapters when I was removed to Pentonville Prison to serve a sentence imposed under the Defence of the Realm Act for attaching my signature to a leaflet denouncing Conscription. The last five chapters have been written during a week's holiday at Letchworth, previous to my arrest under the Military Service Act. I regret that I have no opportunity to revise the MS.; there are many blemishes I would like to remove. Under the circumstances I must ask the indulgence of my readers, and trust that where there is repetition it will only serve to emphasise points which have seemed to me important.

A. F. B.

November 22, 1916.

Letchworth.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER.	PAGE.
PREFACE	vii
I. THE MILITARIST AND SOCIALIST IDEALS ...	11
II. WAR AND THE ECONOMIC SYSTEM	16
III. CAPITALIST INTERESTS WHICH THRIVE ON WAR	21
IV. TRADE AND FINANCIAL RIVALRY AS A CAUSE OF WAR	26
V. THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT AND PEACE	30
VI. SOCIALISM AND THE LABOUR MOVEMENT	37
VII. THE I.L.P., THE WAR, AND PEACE	48

SOCIALISM FOR PACIFISTS

CHAPTER I.

THE MILITARIST AND SOCIALIST IDEALS.

Before the war two distinct and antagonistic tendencies were observable in the development of Western civilisation: the tendency towards Despotism and Militarism, and the tendency towards Democracy and Socialism. The majority of people were probably conscious agents of neither, but I believe history will show that beneath all the cross-currents on the surface of life these two streams flowed, surging in ceaseless conflict, one against the other.

The tendency towards Despotism and Militarism was not, perhaps, deliberately directed with a complete and definite purpose in view, though no doubt a few minds which assisted to guide it understood clearly and cunningly the development before it. It was leading to a Servile State dominated by a governing class maintained in power by military discipline. The terms Military and Industrial Conscription best suggest its characteristics.

THE MILITARIST IDEAL.

In this State the masses of the people would be the drilled and regimented servants of the ruling caste. The process of regimentation would begin at school, where every boy would be disciplined by military training. The motive of education would be, not the development of every faculty to the highest capacity, but the creation of efficient machines for industrial and

military purposes. The early years of manhood would be entirely devoted to military service. From the colleges of the upper classes the officers would be drafted; the sons of the working class would automatically become the privates. During these vital years they would be taught with military thoroughness the virtue of giving unreasoning obedience to their "superiors."

When they passed into civic employment they would be well fitted to play the servile part demanded of them. They would be mere automata—mechanical as the machines they tended. Their hours of labour might be short, they might be well paid (for good results cannot be expected from an animal which is overworked or underfed), but they would have no more voice in the control of their labour than has the horse which obeys the rein of his driver. They would be "officered" in the workshop by specially trained officials, whose pride in belonging to the "middle class" and dependence upon the favour of their masters could be relied upon to secure the necessary discipline and loyalty.

The products of the labour of the industrial army would pass into the hands of the "captains of industry" to be used at their pleasure, or, if the workshops were State establishments, would be at the disposal of the politicians of the ruling class, for whom the workers would, of course, obediently vote, to be expended lavishly on militarist development, or upon the administration of the benevolent social reforms which, in their zeal for regulating and docketing the lives of the masses, these politicians would be so generous as to enact. When this round of life became too dull, or the working class became feverishly restive, the governing class might obligingly arrange a little war to act as a purgative to (if I may adopt the phrase of Mr. Austin Harrison) "a constipated civilisation."

The women of the State would be valued as the breeders of the slaves of the industrial and military

machine, or as the playthings of the ruling class. Should there be a surplus of women, they would be welcomed in the lowest grades of industry as particularly subservient slaves, but all the avenues to positions of responsibility and initiative would be closed against them. It is a characteristic of militarism that wherever it becomes dominant women are held in low esteem.

The attitude of the State towards other peoples would be inspired by the same spirit of domination. Military expeditions would be periodically despatched to the undeveloped territories of primitive peoples to plant the flag of civilisation in their midst. The natives would be enslaved, and greedy financiers encouraged to exploit the national wealth obtainable. By tariffs and concessions monopoly privileges would be extended to them, and if conflicts occurred with States pursuing a similar policy, the diplomatic service, with the military machine behind it, would be set in operation. Should the opposing State prove intractable and the opportunity of extending the sphere of domination seem good, the method of war would be resorted to, "in order to vindicate national honour" and "to prevent the world dominion of the opposing Power."

Such would be the State to which the first tendency, if allowed free flow, would take us.

THE SOCIALIST IDEAL.

The goal to which the tendency towards Democracy and Socialism would lead would be the absolute opposite of this.

The Socialist State would be animated not by a desire to dominate but by the principle of co-operation based on a sense of equality. The community would do its utmost to give every boy and girl throughout childhood and the early years of life the opportunity to develop all their capacities to the fullest degree

possible. Education would be, not a commodity to be purchased, but the right of every young life, given gladly and freely to the furthest capacity of the State. On attaining to manhood and womanhood, every member of the community would have equal voice in the control both of the political and industrial affairs of the nation. With the mind of every citizen developed by good education, the people could be trusted to take an intelligent interest in the election of their public representatives, and in the enactment and administration of the laws of the land. A sense of equality would prevent that practice of bureaucracy to which elected persons are so prone.

This democratic principle would be applied not only to public affairs as we know them to-day, but to all communal interests. It would be embodied in every phase of industry. The national services—such as the mines, the railways, the land, shipping, and the great staple industries—would be the property not of a wealthy class, but of the whole nation. The local services, such as the bread and milk supplies and the lighting and travelling facilities, would be the communal property of the inhabitants of the towns and districts concerned. They would be owned and controlled by the public, and administered by the publicly elected authorities, in co-operation with the workers engaged in each service, in the interests of the public. The products of such industries would be distributed equitably, according to the decision of the people. There would no longer be a master class, a middle class, and a working class. Every citizen would be a worker, contributing co-operatively to the communal wealth, receiving in return all that is necessary to live a true human life.

The democratisation of industry would not be limited to such control as are given by nationalisation and municipalisation as we know them at present. In addition to the intensified interest which would be

taken in public affairs under the conditions I have described, the democratic principle would be applied directly to the industries themselves. The workers would select those responsible for the organisation of the industry. They would realise that they controlled the conditions of their labour, and would work not as servants in the interests of a master-class, but as equals, co-operating in their joint endeavour.

The principle of co-operation which permeated the internal affairs of a nation would also animate its relations with the other nations. The different States would regard one another not as competing rivals striving for domination, but as component parts of the human family, each having its special contribution to make to the general welfare. The nations advanced in the arts of civilisation would go to the primitive peoples not to exploit but to assist, not to impress upon them their particular forms of civilisation but to encourage them to develop according to their own national genius.

Between States so constructed and so inspired war would be impossible. Armies and navies would dwindle and disappear. The weapons of destruction and death would be thrown aside. Within and without the State the principle of co-operation would have triumphed.

Such is the Socialist ideal. It may seem visionary and distant, but only as we strive towards it can Despotism and Militarism be overcome.

CHAPTER II.

WAR AND THE ECONOMIC SYSTEM.

There is a more fundamental relation between War and the Economic System than is generally recognised. Secret diplomacy has often been described as the cause of war. It is not the cause; it is the means by which the causes operate.

Secret diplomacy is the veil which hides the intrigues of foreign policy from the public gaze. Before the public can appreciate these intrigues the veil must be rent, but if war is to be ended we must go a great deal further than that. We shall have to abolish the intrigues themselves and root out the motives from which they grow. *In most cases the motives have their roots in the Economic System.*

THREE CAUSES OF WAR.

The relation between War and the Economic System is threefold :

(1) The Economic System is based on the same principle of antagonism as War; the people "live and move, and have their being" in an atmosphere of conflict, and are thus schooled to respond readily to the appeal of War.

(2) One of the most powerful elements in the Economic System is the privately-owned Armaments' Industry, allied as it is to most of the great staple industries; this industry profits by, and does not hesitate to encourage, national animosities.

(3) The most potent factor in causing disputes between nations is the rivalry between traders and financiers in the exploitation of undeveloped territories. They are supported in this rivalry by their respective Governments, which grant Tariffs and concessions, inevitably leading the nations into conflict.

Each of these factors demands separate consideration. First let us note how close is the parallel between the Economic System and War.

Those who have probed deeply into the Economic System realise that the terrible conflict which is proceeding in Europe is a dramatic and extended expression of a condition of things which is continuous. So long as the present Economic System remains, there can be no such thing as Peace. There was no Peace in Europe before August 4, 1914. The conclusion of the Treaty between the belligerent Powers which will conclude the military war will not herald Peace. It seems likely that the conflict between the Powers may be maintained in another form, that the battle of arms may be followed by a deliberate and concerted battle of trade; but even if the peoples save themselves from the stupidity of an economic war between the nations the economic war within the nations, which preceded the military conflict and which has persisted, despite it, will continue. *The great fact we must realise is that modern Civilisation is Civil War.*

From top to bottom the Economic System is permeated by strife. The whole social structure is fissured by the clashing of conflicting interests. Worker competes with worker, one grade of workers with another grade, trader with trader, employer with employer, the transport interests with the manufacturing interests, the manufacturing interests with the landed interests; every section of the community struggles in self-interest against other sections.

With the evolution of industry the antagonistic interests within the social order are gradually grouping themselves under two banners—Organised Labour and Organised Capital. The labouring interests are combining in Trade Unions. The employing interests are combining in Masters' Federations. Competition between worker and worker is being regulated by Trade Union rules. Competition between employer and employer is being regulated by prices' agreements and by amalgamation and trustification. Between these two forces the middle and professional classes stand; the better paid clinging to the possessing classes upon whose goodwill they seem to depend, the lower paid complaining much of their grievances but hesitating from social prejudice to identify themselves with a movement of "common working men"—indeed, actually seeing in "the unreasonable demands of labour" the reason for the hardships of high prices and high rates from which they suffer.

Out of this social organism grows "the class war," for speaking of which Socialists are sometimes condemned. Socialists do not desire a class war. They desire to end it. It is not Socialism which represents a conflict of classes. It is Capitalism. Socialists are striving to establish a social order which shall be a harmony, in which every worker and every trade shall co-operate and be co-ordinated to serve the interests of the whole community. Socialists seek industrial peace. The opponents of Socialism are the champions of industrial war.

THE INDUSTRIAL WAR.

The suffering caused by the industrial war is little less terrible than that caused by military war. More human beings have been killed by poverty, overwork, and dangerous conditions of employment than have been killed by gun and bayonet. They are not killed

dramatically, but day by day the fate which hangs over them presses nearer and nearer, and there is no escape. Drop by drop their life-blood oozes away, tissue by tissue their bodies are starved, disease creeps closer and closer the vital organs. I need not quote figures. No one to-day can be ignorant of the loss and degradation of life caused by the wretched conditions of poverty in which thousands of people are compelled to live.

The industrial war has its atrocities, no less than military war. The enemy bayonet babies? How many babies are killed by the starvation of their mothers and by lack of food, warmth, and fresh air? The enemy outrage women? How many girls are pressed into a life of immorality by the low wages they earn? The enemy destroy works of art? Of how many works of art has the world been robbed because genius has been denied opportunity of expression? The enemy shatter cathedrals? How many human temples of the divine spirit have been shattered by social injustice?

The Socialist argues that the gifts of Nature and the inventions of man's mind would enable every human being to have the opportunity to develop his character and capacities to the fullest were they properly utilised. Beyond the fact that the possessing classes in the community, by reason of their control of the resources of Nature and the industrial machine, are able to appropriate an unjust and unnecessary share of the wealth of the nation, war is always wasteful and much energy is spent in competition which could be effectively organised if co-operation were the basis of industry. If industrial war is to be ended, the social structure must be built as a co-ordinated whole; it must not be composed of antagonistic sections, as it is now. The Socialist desires to stop the struggle between the classes and the different economic interests by placing the entire industrial machine under the control of the community. In such a social system there would no

longer be an employing class and a working class. Every man and woman would have equal voice in the ownership and administration of industry, and according to the decision of the entire community the products of industry would be distributed.

There would no longer be a clash between the different organs in the body politic, such as the landed, transport, and manufacturing interests, which, as I have pointed out, exists now. The community, as a whole, would own them, and they would function for the whole community and not for a section. I do not pretend that the competitive instinct, with self-interest as its inspiration, would die immediately this change in the economic system were made, but within a generation, with the fuller education the children would receive and the knowledge every citizen would have that in his daily work he was serving the interests of the community, I believe a revolution would occur in the entire outlook of the people.

The present Economic System fosters the attitude of antagonism of which military conflicts are the extreme expression. Socialism would foster the attitude of cooperation which would make war unthinkable.

CHAPTER III.

CAPITALIST INTERESTS WHICH THRIVE
ON WAR.*

The motive of those who control industries under Capitalism is to make profits. To this end all other considerations are subject. There are, I readily acknowledge, employers who would be prepared to sacrifice profits rather than principles of duty and honesty, but of Capitalism as a system it can be said that it has no sense of duty and no code of honesty which are permitted to interfere with its supreme function—profit-making. By the profits it makes, by the dividend it declares, the success or failure of a business is judged.

PROFITS BEFORE PATRIOTISM.

This absolute absence of any code of morality and of any principle other than profit-making is dramatically expressed in the armaments industry. Anyone who has not examined the working of Capitalism would, I suppose, take it for granted that armament firms would confine their energies to equipping the Army and Navy of their own nation, or, if they traded at all with other nations, would restrict such trading to Allied Powers. Since the purpose of these firms is to produce the most effective engines of slaughter the human mind can devise, to the innocent it would seem inconceivable that they should provide their wares to Governments which might be expected to utilise them, in the event of war, against their own nation.

* For many of the facts recorded in this chapter I am indebted to Mr. J. T. Walton Newbold—A.F.B.

But Capitalism does not allow even patriotism to come before profits.

There is a mass of evidence to show that so long as profits have been obtainable, armament firms have proved quite as ready to equip the Army and Navy of a prospective enemy as the naval and military forces of their own country. If a good price could be secured for a battleship, torpedo, or gun, the question of whose lives they would be used to destroy has not mattered one jot or tittle to the firms supplying them. To all proposals to do business, from whatever quarter they have come, the one test question of Capitalism has been applied—will these orders bring profits? If there has seemed a reasonable prospect of making a substantial profit, the thought that the weapons of death manufactured by their firms might be employed against their own kith and kin has not been allowed to weigh with them for a moment.

Perhaps the most glaring example of a firm of one country equipping the forces of an enemy country is that of Henry Whitehead and Co., a subsidiary firm of Vickers' and of Armstrong's. At Weymouth, in Dorset, it has been manufacturing torpedoes for the British Navy. At Fiume, in Hungary, it has been manufacturing torpedoes, torpedo-boat destroyers, submarines, and mines for the Austrian Navy. At the present time its works at Fiume are being used to equip the navies of the Central Powers. How many of the submarines and mines which have sent British and Neutral ships to the bottom of the sea were made at the Hungarian works of this British firm we shall never know.

In the same way, the Vickers-Armstrong group of firms has been largely responsible for equipping Turkey, and in making her defence strong in the Dardanelles. Towards the end of 1913 the Turkish Government signed a contract with these firms handing over to them the arsenal and docks on the Golden Horn, with a site for a naval base at Ismid. That arsenal, those docks,

that naval base, perfected by British firms, have been used with terrible effectiveness against the British forces in this war.

The firms of one country are not only ready to supply the armies and navies of their prospective enemies, they are quite prepared to join hands with enemy firms in exploiting the armament demands of every land. It will come as a shock to many people to know that our British firms have long been allies of that monster, Krupps. In the Harvey United Steel Co., Ltd., for instance, the foremost armament firms of Britain, Germany, France, the United States of America, and Italy were allied to control the Harvey patents for the making of armour plate. On the directorate of this Ring representatives of Vickers, Armstrong, Cammel Laird, John Brown, and William Beardmore sat side by side with the representatives of Frederick Krupp and the Dillengen Huttenwerke of Germany. Many instances of a similar kind could be given.

CREATING NATIONAL ANIMOSITIES.

But it is not sufficient for firms to ally themselves in Rings to exploit a demand for goods; if they are to make large profits and declare high dividends they must create a demand for the goods they supply. The very existence of armament firms depends upon the maintenance of enmity between Governments. Just as the manufacturer of any patent food must convince the public of its value and thus create a demand for it if he hopes to be successful, so the armament firms must develop the attitude of fear and hatred, upon which the demand for their products depends, if they are to maintain their profits.

Evidence of deliberate action to this end is naturally carefully guarded by those who take it, but some flagrant instances have come to the knowledge of the public. The best known is the scandal revealed by Dr. Karl

Liebknecht, who proved that one important German firm, a subsidiary of Krupp, schemed in the most cold-blooded way to intensify the antagonism between Germany and France upon which it profited.

This story is worth telling. The German Arms and Munitions Factory manufactures guns. It was not receiving as large orders as it desired from the German Government. So it wrote its Paris representative to secure the publication in a French newspaper of a report "that the French military administration has resolved to hasten considerably the construction of quick-firers intended for the Army, and to order twice as many of these machines as it originally intended." By circulating statements of this kind the German firm knew that its friends in high places would be able to point to them as indications of the preparations France was making against Germany, and thus secure a double or treble order of quick-firers for itself!

In this country the war scare of 1909—one of the most serious of modern times—has been proved to have resulted from secret representations to the Cabinet by the manager of an armaments' firm. The Campbell-Bannerman policy of economy following the Liberal triumph of 1906 gave the armaments' firms a severe blow. There was no hope of an increase of orders unless a war scare were created. The war scare came. On March 3, 1909, Mr. Mulliner, manager of the Coventry Ordnance Works, was received privately by the Cabinet. He told the Cabinet that he had reliable information that Germany was secretly accelerating her naval programme. The Cabinet believed his story.

Mr. Asquith and Mr. McKenna hurried to the House of Commons and announced to a breathless assembly that Germany would have seventeen Dreadnoughts in March, 1912, instead of the nine she had publicly foreshadowed. Mr. Balfour, who had also been admitted into Mr. Mulliner's confidence, declared that Germany would have twenty-five, or at the lowest estimate

twenty-one, Dreadnoughts by that date. The House of Commons, panic-stricken, immediately voted £4,603,002 increased naval expenditure, £4,409,502 of which went to the Armaments' Ring. Later in the year, owing to the continued Jingo agitation, four more Dreadnoughts were ordered.

When March, 1912 came, Mr. Mulliner's story was proved to be absolutely devoid of truth. Germany had only the nine Dreadnoughts which she had foreshadowed. But the British armaments' firms had obtained their contracts (though the Coventry Ordnance Company was inconsiderately omitted from the list of favoured firms). The naval rivalry between Germany and France, which showed signs of languishing, had revived. Dividends had shot up again.

The dictum that to prepare for war is the best safeguard of peace has been utterly exploded by the experience of the present war. We have learned that the exact opposite is the truth, that to prepare for war is to advance to war. It is impossible to say how responsible the machinations of the armament firms have been in increasing the enmity between the nations and in securing the great increases in the expenditure upon preparations for war, but that they have been one of the factors in bringing about the terrible slaughter in Europe there can be no doubt.

I do not suggest that the directors of armament firms are particularly diabolical persons. They are merely applying the principles of Capitalism to the conduct of the industries they control. It is Capitalism which is the root evil.

CHAPTER IV.

TRADE AND FINANCIAL RIVALRY AS A CAUSE OF WAR.

The third and most potent economic factor in causing war is the rivalry between traders and financiers of different nations in the exploitation of undeveloped territories. The term "Imperialism" is little more than a glorified political expression of this unlovely and greedy competition.

The private ownership of industry within a nation results in the great bulk of its wealth passing into comparatively few hands. The workers are underpaid, and the purchasing power in their possession is insufficient to maintain a constant demand on industrial capital. If the workers were well paid, they would purchase more food, more clothing, more furniture, more books. The demand for these goods would be greatly increased and more capital would be employed. As it is, the capitalists find themselves with reserves of capital which cannot be utilised profitably at home. They seek fields of exploitation in other countries.

They find them in the undeveloped territories on the fringe of civilisation. Here are vast natural resources and cheap native labour in abundance. When, accompanying these advantages, monopoly rights can be obtained or tariff concessions secured, the prospects of profits become almost limitless.

Capitalist undertakings are almost invariably followed by diplomatic representatives, and diplomatic representatives are generally followed by a military expedition, and finally by armies of occupation. The same story can be read in India, Egypt, Persia,

Morocco, and South Africa. The traders and financiers have gone first. The Government has followed to protect their interests and to consolidate their position. Annexation, the establishment of protectorates, and the creation of spheres of influence result. The exploiters are given monopoly rights. Tariffs are set up to safeguard the traders from the competition of other nations. Thus national rivalry is caused.

ROOTS OF THE PRESENT WAR.

The roots of the present war can largely be traced back to Capitalistic Imperialism. They are buried not in Blue Books describing the diplomatic events of July, 1914, but in a series of Imperialist developments extending over a period of years.

The Treaty which inaugurated the Anglo-French *Entente*, like most modern treaties, was in great part a financiers' treaty. By it France surrendered her claims on Egypt and recognised the British occupation, undertaken to protect the interests of bondholders, in return for our recognition of her supremacy in Morocco, where French financiers were pouncing upon the rich natural resources. The Anglo-Russian agreement was merely the political expression of large commercial and financial agreements, whilst the division of Persia between these two Powers was frankly based on trading considerations.

All students of foreign politics know what an important part was played by the Anglo-French agreement in respect of Morocco in hastening European relations to the climax of August, 1914. German financiers and traders, heavily interested in Morocco, were quick to complain of the French domination, resulting as it did in the imposition of tariffs against them. The crisis of 1911 followed, and Europe was saved from war by a hair's breadth.

It was from this moment that the German Government, convinced that France, Russia, and Britain were

determined to restrict her trade, began aggressively to prepare for war. To this fact the correspondence of the Belgian Ministers at Berlin and London bears impressive testimony.

On the other side, German financial interests in the Bagdad Railway and the desire of her traders and financiers to exploit Asia Minor were chiefly responsible for her provocative policy in the Near East. Austria and Turkey were obvious links in the fulfilment of this policy of interests between contending groups of exploiters. When the present war is over and the right to exploit Northern Africa and Asia-Minor is gained for the financiers of one side or the other, there is great danger that a further conflict, involving not only the European nations, but also America and Japan, will arise out of the scramble between the capitalistic interests of the world which is proceeding in the Far East. The rich resources of China constitute a prize which will be remorselessly competed for, and once more it is probable, unless the peoples awaken to the true perception of the meaning of war, that the workers of the different lands may be led to slaughter each other by the million on behalf of the profits of the rival groups of capitalists which are swooping like evil birds of prey upon the emaciated body of the Asiatic Empire. It is a realisation of facts such as these which leads Socialists to see in Capitalism the cause of war.

SOCIALISM AND UNDEVELOPED NATIONS.

Were the civilised nations of the world to become Socialist nations this wretched rivalry for profit between the financiers of different lands would cease. The industrial capital of each nation would be utilised to meet the needs of the people, and the wealth would be so distributed as to enable the people to purchase their requirements. The demand on industrial capital, which would be communally owned, would be very much greater, and when exchange of goods between nations

was necessary it would be a natural exchange without the restriction of animosity-breeding tariffs. Just as certain districts within a nation can most efficiently and economically produce certain goods so would certain nations, by reason of natural resources, climate, experience, and capacity prove best able to provide certain human needs. In such cases nations would exchange goods with no more sense of antagonism than do districts within a nation to-day.

The problem of undeveloped nations remains. The Socialist State would approach undeveloped nations not with the desire to exploit, but with the desire to encourage the peoples to develop their possessions and their capacities in their own way. The learning of its universities, the skill of its technical schools, the knowledge gained from long experience of industry would be placed freely at their disposal. Other civilised States would be invited to join with it in protecting primitive peoples from exploitation and oppression.

If rival capitalist interests are no longer to cause war the first step must be to abolish tariffs and to establish the policy of the Open Door in all countries. Thus the traders of different nations would be on an equal footing. But this can be only a preliminary step. It should be followed by State control of foreign investments and the formation of an international board representative of the civilised countries to watch and protect the interests of the more backward peoples. But we can hardly expect this to be done so long as the Governments of the civilised countries continue to reflect the capitalistic interests of the ruling classes. An international board representing such Governments would be equivalent to a committee of Dick Turpins to protect innocent travellers from highway robbery. Before the Governments of civilised countries can be expected to take common action on behalf of primitive peoples they must represent the fraternal, not the exploiting, instinct. Once more Socialism is the only hope!

CHAPTER V.

THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT AND PEACE.

From its earliest days the Socialist movement has been international in outlook. "Workers of the World, Unite!" cried Karl Marx, the father of modern Socialism. Not "Workers of Prussia," not "Workers of England," but "Workers of the *World*."

The Socialist sees the workers of every civilised country suffering from the same wrongs. He sees that in Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, America, Japan—in all lands where capitalism and landlordism have taken root—the people toil incessantly but nevertheless remain in varying degrees of poverty, whilst the few who own the land and industry grow rich by their labour. He sees the children of the working-class denied opportunity of full human growth. He sees the women of the working class broken and weary, even in early years, by the struggle for existence. He sees the men of the working class condemned to a life of constant labour, so that they become little more than beasts of burden. He sees only one salvation for the working class—a united movement of the workers in each land to gain control of the State,* and, through the State, to abolish private ownership of land and industry, replacing it by public ownership and democratic control, so that the wealth created by the workers may pass into the hands of the entire nation instead of into the hands of one class. As this movement has

*Mr. Brockway has not had an opportunity of revising proofs, but he desired this statement to be qualified by the emphasis he afterwards lays upon the importance of the industrial side of the Labour movement.

arisen in the different lands, an extraordinary sense of comradeship has sprung up between the Socialists of one country and another. They have felt that, despite all differences of race and tongue, they were brothers in a great cause destined to save humanity.

THE SOCIALIST CONTRIBUTION TO PEACE.

It is fifty-one years since the establishment of "The International," as the Congress of the Labour and Socialist Parties of the World is affectionately called by Socialists. Since then it has been disbanded and been established again; at the present time it is seemingly shattered. But, despite the tragedy of to-day, I believe it is not too much to say that the historian of the future, if he survey the story of Europe during the last fifty years with knowledge and impartiality, will see in "The International" the greatest factor making for World Peace.

When war was threatened between Norway and Sweden in 1905, it was the declaration of unity on the part of the workers of the two countries which prevented the outbreak of hostilities. In 1912, when the clouds of war hung black over Europe, the great International Congress at Basle did much to bring back the Governments to reason and moderation. During the Franco-Prussian conflict of 1870 the Socialists ceaselessly denounced the war; Bebel and William Liebknecht were imprisoned for their opposition to the Prussian Government's policy. During the Russo-Japanese War delegates from the Russian and Japanese Socialist Parties met at the International Congress at Stuttgart and shook hands on the platform, before the assembled Socialist representatives of the world, to signify the unity of the workers of the two Empires. During the Balkan conflicts of 1908 and 1911 the Socialist Parties of the Balkan States issued joint manifestoes denouncing the war, urging a federation

of the Balkan nations, and declaring the solidarity of the peoples. These facts are an indication of the service the International Socialist movement has rendered the cause of Peace.

In the present world-conflict the international solidarity of the Socialist movement appears to be shattered, but, terrible as is the spectacle of Socialists of one land taking up arms against the workers of another, the Socialist Parties of Europe can confidently claim that they did more to prevent the outbreak of the war than any other section of the European peoples. During the few critical weeks preceding August, 1914, they threw all the power of their organisations on the side of Peace. In the early dispute between Austria and Serbia, the Austrian Social Democratic Party issued a manifesto denouncing the aggressive Imperialism of the Austrian Government, whilst the Serbian Socialist Party issued a manifesto denouncing the provocative nationalism of the Serbian Government. In both countries large demonstrations were organised to protest against the threatened war.

When it appeared likely that the dispute would involve other nations, the Socialist Parties everywhere declared against war, and held mass meetings of the workers in almost every city in Europe demanding the retention of Peace. Three days before the gigantic conflict opened, the International Socialist Bureau met at Brussels, and each party pledged itself to urge the continuance of negotiations and the withholding of all provocative action. The Socialists of Europe did their utmost to prevent the outbreak of war. I do not think it too much to say that had the Christian churches of Europe acted with similar unity and earnestness the calamity could have been averted.

When war broke out a new situation had to be faced. Whilst Socialists are Internationalists they remain Nationalists, in the sense of believing in national independence. They desire to see a federation of

nations, living in harmony, each contributing to the whole; they do not desire a cosmopolitanism in which national qualities and characteristics are obliterated. This belief in nationalism led International Socialist Congresses to declare that resort to arms in national defence is justifiable. It was not foreseen that the diplomacy out of which a European conflict would arise would be so complicated that the Government of each nation, by emphasising certain features and obscuring others, would be able to make its people believe that the war was one of defence. It was not realised that as soon as coterminous nations went to war on a large scale the conflict would inevitably develop on both sides into a war of defence. It was not recognised that an absolute repudiation of war would be the surest defence a nation could have.

The result was that the German and Austrian Socialist Democratic Parties, on the one side, were led officially to support their Governments in the prosecution of the war on the ground that all sections of the people must unite against Russian aggression, whilst, on the other side, the Belgian, French, and British Parties were led officially to support their Governments in the prosecution of the war on the ground that all sections of the people must unite against German aggression!

ITALIAN, RUSSIAN, AND SERBIAN SOCIALISTS OPPOSE THE WAR.

Whilst these sections of "The International" officially supported the war, it must not be forgotten that the Socialist Parties of Serbia, Russia, and Italy heroically maintained their opposition. Six of the Socialist members of the Duma were exiled on account of their opposition to the war. Despite all that has happened in Serbia the Socialist representative in the Serbian Parliament is still pleading for international

working-class action to bring about Peace. The Italian Socialists have voted against all War Credits, and have with supreme courage denounced the Italian Government for its share of responsibility for extending the terrible carnage.

And within Germany, Austria, Belgium, France, and Great Britain there have been minorities in the Labour and Socialist Parties which have vigorously maintained the international gospel of Socialism. In Germany the Party Congress has shown that the membership is almost equally divided on the issue of the war. In Austria it is known that the anti-war minority is strong. Within the Belgian Party, even, there has been throughout the war a group which desired to see a meeting of the International Socialist Bureau, representative of all the affiliated parties, whilst in France each party conference has shown that the minority has been gaining rapidly in numbers, so that to-day a moderate estimate would place its strength at two-fifths of the entire membership. In Great Britain the Independent Labour Party, by far the largest of the British Socialist organisations, has openly opposed the war from the first day; and by an overwhelming majority the British Socialist Party has also declared its opposition. Thus it will be seen that the Socialist section of the British Labour Party is almost unanimously against the war.

Representatives of the Russian, Italian, and Serbian parties, and of the minorities in Germany, Austria, and France, have twice met in conference in Switzerland during the war. Only the refusal of the British Government to provide passports has prevented representatives of the I.L.P. and the B.S.P. from being present. At these conferences plans have been prepared to carry on a simultaneous propaganda against the war in the different countries. The most wonderful sense of solidarity has animated the gatherings.

It must not be supposed that because the Labour

and Socialist Parties of Germany, Austria, and France have supported the war they have entirely forgotten their international principles. Their spokesmen have constantly declared against all policies of annexation and aggression. The executive of the International Socialist Bureau, working from Holland, has kept in constant touch with the parties of all the belligerent nations, and has asked them to table the terms of peace they desire to be realised. The programme of almost every party has proved identical. All desire to see war superseded by arbitration. All desire to see secret diplomacy abolished. All desire to see universal free trade established. All desire to see self-government given to subject peoples. All desire to see frontiers represent nations rather than the power of conquest. All desire a reduction of armaments leading to disarmament.

The Socialist Parties of neutral nations have not been idle during the war. In their own lands they have done all they could to withstand the militarisation of civilisation, and their representatives have met in conference in Holland, under the auspices of the International Socialist Bureau, and pledged their parties to work for peace and for the realisation of Socialist principles in the relations of nations.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM AFTER THE WAR.

At first sight it seems as though the hope that the international Socialist movement will eventually establish peace permanently in the world has been shattered by the experience of this war; but a calm review of the situation, such as I have attempted to give, proves that the hope remains, and that it is well founded.

If the Socialist International is to play this great rôle in the world's history, however, it must advance beyond its present attitude towards war. If hostilities

had not broken out in August, 1914, the International Congress would that month have considered a proposal put forward by the British I.L.P. and the French Socialist Party in favour of the workers of countries threatened with war laying down their tools until their respective Governments agreed to arbitration. When it is realised that the workers in nearly all the large industries and services—the miners, the transport workers, the railwaymen, the textile workers—are organised not only nationally, but internationally, it will be seen that the proposal is not impossible of realisation.

In any case, it is to be hoped that the experience it is now undergoing will convince the international Socialist movement that never again must its affiliated parties identify themselves with Governments engaged in the prosecution of war. The British I.L.P. has decided to ask the next International Socialist Congress to declare that in future no Socialist Party should officially support war under any circumstances. Unless the I.L.P. policy be adopted, the war may conclude only to see a repetition of the present tragic division of "The International" ten years hence.

But Socialists understand that the only ultimate safeguard against war is to substitute for Governments which scheme in secret one against the other in order to secure their Imperialist ends, Governments which reflect the solidarity which Socialists themselves feel towards all peoples and races. Before that safeguard can be established, however, the workers of the different nations must be converted to Socialism and must express their Socialist faith at the ballot box.

CHAPTER VI.

SOCIALISM AND THE LABOUR MOVEMENT.

I suppose the most frequent objection raised by Pacifists against Socialism is that Socialists preach the Class War and strive to set class against class. In this chapter I propose to discuss the means by which Socialism is to be attained, and in doing so I shall consider this objection.

Ever since slavery was established there has been a master-class and a subservient class in society. The slave-owner gave place to the feudal lord. The feudal-lord has given place to the capitalist.

To-day the members of the possessing class do not own the bodies of their workers, as they did under the system of slavery. They do not tie down their workers to labour permanently in one employment in return for a pittance, as they did under the feudal system. But they own the land and the industrial system on or in which the workers must obtain employment if they are to live, and, except for the influence of Trade Union organisation and the popular will as expressed in the State, they can dictate terms on which employment is given. The conditions of labour prior to the formation of Trade Unions and the extension of the franchise illustrate the power which ownership of industry gives the possessing class.

THE PRESENT SOCIAL SYSTEM.

The present social system cannot, of course, be described in the simple terms of the propertied and the

propertyless classes. Between the wealthy landlord and capitalist, on the one hand, and the masses of workers dependent upon employment by them, on the other, there are thousands of small shopkeepers, business men, farmers, etc., and they maintain their position with remarkable insistence despite the competition of monopolists and limited liability companies. And the limited liability companies themselves represent thousands of small shareholders, who stand between the capitalist and the wage-worker.

But when full allowance has been made for these not inconsiderable factors in society, it remains true to say that each nation is broadly divided into a possessing class and a dependent class. The fact that one-ninth of the population of Great Britain is able to draw to itself one-half of the national income proves what power over wealth production a small section of the community commands.

As the years pass the peoples become more clearly organised into two antagonistic sections—the employers' federations and amalgamations on the one side, the trade unions of employees on the other. Between the two there is constant conflict, and, despite all the homilies of the press and the pulpit, despite all the goodwill in the world, the conflict will remain. Many social reformers urge that the object at which we must strive is the complete organisation of employers on the one hand, and the complete organisation of employees on the other. If their ideal were realised it is probable that many strikes and lock-outs would be averted by bargaining between the representatives of either side (though when they did occur they would be on a larger scale than ever), but such a system would only perpetuate class differences and express more clearly than ever the division of the people into employing and employed groups.

It is this division of the people which represents the class war. Class antagonisms are the fruit of Capital-

ism, not of Socialism. It is the social reformers who see a solution of the industrial problem in the thorough organisation of the employers and the employed who are advocating the class war. Socialists are working to abolish the class war by ending the division of the nation into propertied and propertyless classes. They would end it by placing the ownership of the land and industry in the hands of the entire community and by giving the workers within an industry the control of its administration. The wealth of the nation would be distributed according to the decision of the people. Every citizen would realise that in his daily task he was co-operating with his fellow-workers for the welfare of all. In a word, Socialism is the application of democracy and co-operation to industry.

SOCIALISM AND FREEDOM.

Even if the employing class were to grant the working class high wages, short hours, and good conditions generally, the demand for Socialism would remain. In the last resort Socialism is not so much a movement to secure good material conditions as to secure human equality and freedom. Slavery was no less slavery when the masters were kind to their slaves. Feudalism was no less feudalism when the feudal lords were kind to their serfs. It was the relation between master and slave, between feudal lord and serf, against which the moral sense of humanity came to revolt.

Similarly Capitalism is no less Capitalism when Capitalists are kind to their workers. The relation between employer and employed remains. It is against this relation that Socialists revolt.

When this is understood, the method by which Socialism must be attained becomes clearer. Freedom cannot be given; it must be won. It cannot be bestowed benevolently from above; it must be gained

by the conscious effort of those beneath. A subject nation cannot become free by the mere withdrawal of the armies and officials of the ruling Power. It can only become free as the desire for freedom animates its people and as by their effort the control of the sovereign State is withdrawn. Similarly the working classes cannot become free by the kindness of the employing class. They can only become free as they desire freedom and as they strive for freedom. If all employers were to hand over to the State the industries they control, Socialism would not be established. Industry would merely be conducted by bureaucratic officials and the people would remain as servile as now. Before Socialism can be established the people must understand its meaning, must have a sense of human equality, must be educated to a knowledge of the rights of democracy. It is only as the workers are imbued with the spirit of Socialism that Socialism can be attained. This is the supreme reason why the Labour movement must be the means of advance to Socialism.

TRADE UNIONISM AND SOCIALISM.

It must also be recognised that the industrial side of the Labour movement—the Trade Union organisations—is the germ of the administrative organ of the Socialist State. Socialism means not only State ownership of industry (however enlightened the democracy, if the workers within an industry had no more voice in their conditions than the periodical election of municipal and Parliamentary representatives, their freedom would be meagre indeed); Socialism means a large part of administrative control of industry by the workers within the industry.

At the present time Trade Unions are neither representative enough nor organised on a sufficiently scientific basis to serve as the medium of such control, but the Unions are now beginning to set their house in order, and are moving towards one Union for each

industry. When this is accomplished, and all the workers within the industry are enrolled as members, a great step will have been taken towards providing the effective organ of democratic control. Accompanying organisation by industry, however, there must be some kind of cross organisation by occupation; for example, the interests of clerks employed in ship-building offices are often more closely knit with those of their fellow-clerks in the education offices than with those of the boilermakers and engineers employed in their industry. This is one of the many examples of applied Socialist theory to which the thinkers in the movement must apply their minds.

THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT AND SOCIALISM.

A further working-class organisation which is destined to play a large part in the construction of the Socialist State is the Co-operative movement. In certain towns in the North of England seven-eighths of the population are members of the Co-operative Society. They democratically appoint the committee which conducts the business; obviously there is no reason why there should not ultimately be co-ordination between such enterprises and the municipal services, controlled by representatives elected by the same population. The merging of the Co-operative movement with publicly-owned industry is another problem which Socialists must think out in detail.

I hope the considerations I have put forward make it clear why Socialists organise their parties on the basis of Labour. It is not because they desire to extend class antagonism. It is because they realise that Labour is the subject class, and that Labour alone can emancipate Labour. Unless a Socialist, from whatever class he springs, is prepared to identify himself with the working class, he may be a Socialist intellectually, but he is not a Socialist in heart and in spirit.

SOCIALISM AND RELIGION.

The idea that Socialism and Atheism are twin-beliefs still lingers. Many sincere people refrain from sympathetically considering the case for Socialism because of the conviction that the acceptance of Socialism involves the surrender of religious opinions. It may be well, therefore, before concluding this little book, to discuss the relation of Socialism to religion.

It would be idle to deny that the attitude of the Church towards Socialism has done much to alienate the Socialist movement from religion. On the Continent particularly this has been the case; the same thing has occurred to a less degree in Great Britain. The alienation of Socialism from religion has also resulted from the fact that the Socialist movement and the intellectual Rationalist movement sprang up side by side, and were persecuted together. This was responsible for the agnostic tendency of the Socialist propaganda of the last part of the last century; but, so far as Great Britain is concerned, it is equally true to say that the spiritual interpretation of the universe which so many leaders of thought have urged in later years has found an instinctive response in a great section of the Socialist movement. There are many thousands of avowed Christians in the Socialist movement; there are many thousands of others who, although unconnected with the Christian Church, believe intensely in the reality of religion, and to whom spiritual experience is the inspiration of their efforts for mankind.

Some Socialists who are opposed to what they conceive to be religion have attempted to get the Socialist movement to declare officially against the Church and the Christian faith. They have always failed. The International Socialist Congress has quite clearly laid it down that religion is a personal issue. It is a matter for the individual mind and soul, and no

political party can, or should desire to, declare against it.

At the same time, Socialism almost inevitably affects the religious views of those who become its adherents. It broadens and enriches their conception of religion. Religion as interpreted by the Churches is too often exclusively individualistic. It impresses upon each individual the duty to live righteously, but it rarely emphasises in definite terms the duty of social righteousness. The Christian who becomes a Socialist sees in the Socialist movement the hope of the coming of the Kingdom of God.

The development of religious thought and conviction from the earliest times seems to have tended towards two great truths: the sanctity of human personality, and the unity of all personalities in a Universal Personality. The teaching of Jesus Christ supremely embodied these principles, but the Church, as it has gained place and power in a civilisation which has denied them, has come to deny them too. It has compromised with, and become compromised by, a condition of things which is the absolute negation of the principles for which its Master gave His life as a witness.

For if these truths are simple, they are also revolutionary. Before they can be expressed in human relationships, the social system must be reconstructed from its very basis.

The individual aspects of these truths are generally recognised, but more is involved in them than personal piety. Before they can become incarnate in humanity, they must be expressed not only in personal life but in the social order.

If it be true that human life is sacred, that with the birth of every child the divine spirit is re-incarnated, our first communal duty must be to secure that this divinity shall have full opportunity of expression. As

the Wise Men from the East took their offerings to the Babe of Bethlehem, so must we as a community, if we dare to claim the title of Christian, take our offerings of reverence to every child that comes to us. The nations should lay their all at the feet of the child. If the children of men are the children of God, then all the treasures of man and of God should be theirs. To all of them belong as a right the gifts of Nature—pure, wholesome food, the fresh air and the sunlight, the beauty of the flowers and fields and hills, the glory of the sea. To all of them belong as a right the heritage of mankind—the advantages of civilisation, the learning of the ages, the wonders of genius as expressed in literature, art, music, and architecture.

If belief in the sanctity of human life does not mean this, then it means nothing.

It is not necessary to emphasise how utterly the existing social system fails to give expression to this truth. Thousands of children are born amidst surroundings which prevent them ever becoming human in the truest sense of the word. Their bodies are crippled, their minds are dwarfed, their souls are imprisoned. They never have an opportunity of realising that which makes them divine.

Those things which make life beautiful to the man who has been refined by comfortable conditions and education are unknown to them. They grow up in sordid surroundings, they receive a wretchedly inadequate education, they are thrown into the industrial world before they have any opportunity of revealing the qualities with which they are naturally endowed. From childhood onwards many thousands of them become mere creatures of toil, labouring long hours at soul-deadening tasks, receiving low wages, and living in an environment which destroys any lingering tendencies towards a fuller life. Such is the existence

to which thousands of "Children of God" are condemned.

This sacrifice of child life is typical of the whole social order. If civilisation were based upon a realisation of the sanctity of life it would minister to life. Who can say it does so to-day? It ministers to the privileged minority who control it, and the mass of men and women are merely the instruments of such ministration. The profit of the few, not the needs of the whole, is the motive-power of the present system. Whilst a few men are masters of the machine, the machine is the master of mankind.

I sometimes conceive of Capitalism as a mountain which has fallen upon the people. Some it crushes. Others struggle in the darkness for a footing. Many succeed in clambering up its side. A few stand on its surface; but even they are bound to the struggling mass beneath. They think their own safety demands that they must with one hand resist the upward pressure of those beneath, even though they are with the other hand throwing the bread of charity to the victims.

There is no reason why all mankind should not stand erect and free on the surface of the mountain, glorying in the light of the sun, facing the fresh winds of heaven, casting their eyes over the broad expanse, stretching forward to higher and nobler things. Nature is bountiful. The inventions of man's mind have enhanced her bounty a hundredfold. Science and mechanical skill would make man the master of the earth were they utilised for man. But in the present social order they are not used for man. They are used for the few who control it.

In saying this I do not mean to imply that the possessing classes are to blame. Many employers have endeavoured to give their workers the best possible conditions, but even if all had followed their example, even if they had provided the best that

civilisation can give, the social order would still fail to express the divine status of every man and woman. If every human being be an expression of the universal spirit, each having some special purpose to fulfil, no man can claim superiority over another, and each should have an equal opportunity of making his contribution to the whole. This spiritual conception of humanity must imply democracy and equality. In the divine human family no man can claim to be master by right or to designate another servant by force.

This wrong relationship can only be abolished by every human being having an equal right in the control of the industrial system; this equality of control can only be given by the entire community owning and democratically managing the system. If the system were owned and controlled by the people, as Socialists urge, it would naturally be used in the interests of the people, to serve the needs of the people. The generosity of Nature and the gifts of civilisation would be employed to provide the fullest opportunity of self-development to every individual. All men and women would have the opportunity to realise their divine possibilities.

The communal implication of the belief in the unity of all human beings is equally revolutionary. If one universal life dwell in all men and women, to express this truth civilisation must be a harmony. The present social order, as I have previously pointed out, is fissured from base to summit by struggling and competing interests. Competition for individual and sectional gain is the heart of the industrial system.

If the social order is to be made a harmony, the conflicting interests must be united. They can only be united by the whole community owning the whole industrial system. If co-operation for service is to supplement competition for gain, every citizen must be conscious that in his daily tasks he is directly serving his fellows. Industry must be conducted for

the public welfare instead of for private profit. To secure this the public and not private individuals must own industry. Socialism must be established.

I do not suggest for a moment that communal ownership would immediately result in a recognition of either the sanctity of life or the unity of all life, but it would provide the organic mechanism for such recognition. It is the economic expression of the Kingdom of God, whilst Capitalism is the economic denial of it. I believe education and experience would evolve a new ethic and a new dynamic. I believe as time passed humanity would become conscious of its spiritual nature and its spiritual oneness. I believe men and women would come to understand that every aspect of life should be sacred, and would come to consider their work and the products of their labour as the ritual through which the Universal Spirit found expression.

It is to such a social order that humanity must advance if the great truths of religion are no longer to be divorced from life.

CHAPTER VII.

THE I.L.P., THE WAR, AND PEACE.

I am not going to describe in detail the work of the I.L.P. during the war. Every British Pacifist must be familiar with it. I believe the manifesto published by the National Council of the party on the outbreak of war will become historic, and it accurately reflects the spirit which the membership has expressed throughout this critical period. Week by week, despite the passions of the time, it has at hundreds of meetings re-emphasised the truths of internationalism, made clear the real causes of war, and resisted the growth of militarism within our own country. More than two thousand of its members have witnessed to their Socialist and Pacifist Faith by declining, even though conscription be the law of the land, to undertake military service; in their prison cells they have been preparing their minds and their souls for a life-long service in the cause of Socialism and peace. Who can doubt that the severe test through which the party has passed will prove to be anything else than a baptism of fire, strengthening and inspiring it for the great work that lies before it?

I will content myself with reproducing here two official documents which illustrate its policy. The first is the manifesto to which I have already referred. The second is the report forwarded to the International Socialist Bureau by the National Council explaining the attitude of the party, and stating the principles it desires to see embodied in the Treaty of Peace. .

MANIFESTO OF THE I.L.P.

(Issued August 11th, 1914.)

It has long been earnestly urged by the Independent Labour Party that the diplomatic policies pursued by European rulers, including our own, and supported by the force of murderous armaments, would lead inevitably to universal war or universal bankruptcy—or both. That prediction, based upon facts and tendencies, has been only too swiftly and tragically fulfilled.

THE CAUSE OF THE WAR.

Instead of striving to unite Europe in a federation of States, banded together for peace, diplomacy has deliberately aimed at dividing Europe into two armed, antagonistic camps—the Triple Entente and the Triple Alliance. Diplomacy has been underground, secret, deceitful, each Power endeavouring by wile and stratagem to get the better of its neighbour. Diplomats have breathed the very air of jealousy, deception, and distrust. Each country, in turn, largely through the influence of its Jingo Press, has been stampeded by fear and panic. Each country has tried to outstrip other countries in the vastness and costliness of its war machine. Powerful armament interests have played their sinister part, for it is they who reap rich harvest out of havoc and death. When all this has been done, any spark will start a conflagration like the present.

It is difficult and perhaps futile to try to apportion at this moment the exact measure of responsibility and blame which the various countries must bear. It is just as untrue to say that British policy has been wholly white and German policy wholly black as to say that German policy has been entirely right and British policy entirely wrong. Simple undiscriminating people in both countries may accept unreservedly one or other of these alternatives, but, as past experience shows, history will tell a different story.

SECRET DIPLOMACY.

For the present Sir Edward Grey issues his White Paper to prove Germany the aggressor, just as Germany issues a White Paper to prove Russia the aggressor, and Russia to prove Austria the aggressor. Even if every word in the British White Paper be admitted, the wider indictment remains. Let it be acknowledged that in the days immediately preceding the war Sir Edward Grey worked for peace. It was too late. Over a number of years, together with other diplomats, he had himself dug the abyss, and wise statesmanship would have foreseen, and avoided, the certain result.

It was not the Serbian question or the Belgian question that pulled this country into the deadly struggle. Great Britain is

not at war because of oppressed nationalities or Belgian neutrality. Even had Belgian neutrality not been wrongfully infringed by Germany we should still have been drawn in.

If France in defiance of treaty rights had invaded Belgium to get at Germany, who believes we should have begun hostilities against France? Behind the back of Parliament and people, the British Foreign Office gave secret understandings to France, denying their existence when challenged. That is why this country is now face to face with the red ruin and impoverishment of war. Treaties and agreements have dragged Republican France at the heels of despotic Russia, Britain at the heels of France. At the proper time all this will be made plain, and the men responsible called to account.

We desire neither the aggrandisement of German militarism nor Russian militarism, but the danger is that this war will promote one or the other. Britain has placed herself behind Russia, the most reactionary, corrupt, and oppressive Power in Europe. If Russia is permitted to gratify her territorial ambitions and extend her Cossack rule, civilisation and democracy will be gravely imperilled. Is it for this that Britain has drawn the sword?

Tens of thousands of our fellow-workers are in the front of battle, knowing not if they will ever return again. Already many have fallen, and soon the death-roll will mount appallingly and the wounded lie suffering on the battlefield, on the decks of ships, and in the hospitals. Among those who are bravely facing this fate are many of our Socialist comrades serving in the regular forces, the reserves, and the Territorials.

Hardly less dread is the position of the women and children at home who are dependent on those who are under arms, and the countless workers and their families who are plunged into unemployment and destitution by the war. Almost no conceivable effort—even if the food supply of the country holds out—will prevent the occurrence of fearful privation amongst them.

GERMAN WORKERS OUR COMRADES.

And what is true of the soldiers and the workers and their families of our own country is no less true of those of France, Belgium, Germany, and other lands. Is it not right that we should remember this?

To us who are Socialists the workers of Germany and Austria, no less than the workers of France and Russia, are comrades and brothers; in this hour of carnage and eclipse we have friendship and compassion to all victims of militarism. Our nationality and independence, which are dear to us, we are ready to defend; but we cannot rejoice in the organised murder of tens of thousands of workers of other lands who go to kill and be killed at the command of rulers to whom the People are as pawns.

The war conflagration envelops Europe; up to the last moment we laboured to prevent the blaze. The nation must now watch for the first opportunity for effective intervention.

As to the future, we must begin to prepare our minds for the difficult and dangerous complications that will arise at the conclusion of the war.

The People must everywhere resist such territorial aggression and national abasement as will pave the way for fresh wars; and, throughout Europe, the workers must press for frank and honest diplomatic policies, controlled by themselves, for the suppression of militarism and the establishment of the United States of Europe, thereby advancing toward the world's peace. Unless these steps are taken, Europe, after the present calamity, will be still more subject to the increasing domination of militarism, and liable to be drenched with blood.

SOCIALISM WILL YET TRIUMPH.

We are told that International Socialism is dead, that all our hopes and ideals are wrecked by the fire and pestilence of European war. It is not true.

Out of the darkness and the depth we hail our working-class comrades of every land. Across the roar of guns we send sympathy and greeting to the German Socialists. They have laboured unceasingly to promote good relations with Britain, as we with Germany. They are no enemies of ours, but faithful friends.

In forcing this appalling crime upon the nations, it is the rulers, the diplomats, the militarists who have sealed their doom. In tears and blood and bitterness the greater Democracy will be born. With steadfast faith we greet the future; our cause is holy and imperishable, and the labour of our hands has not been in vain.

Long live Freedom and Fraternity! Long live International Socialism!

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE INDEPENDENT LABOUR PARTY.

REPORT of the INDEPENDENT LABOUR PARTY to the Executive of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST BUREAU

in response to the Manifesto issued on May 1st, 1916.
(Forwarded October, 1916.)

COMRADES,—

The attitude of the Independent Labour Party to the European War has been the subject of considerable adverse criticism from various quarters. It may be of interest to note that during the

past two years the ranks of our Party have remained unbroken, members working together with unparalleled courage and enthusiasm. The membership has also been materially increased in practically every branch of the Party which has been fearless in its support of the general Party policy. Faced by the actual and terrible circumstances of the war, individual members of the party, in regard to military service, were left free to take the course they thought right—many joined the colours, and many others are now in prison for refusal to participate in warfare and disobedience to military law.

The Party, as a Party, has claimed the right to discuss the politics of the war, and in doing so we have tried to prevent ourselves being blinded by national passion. We have attempted to lay bare the diplomacy leading up to the war, the darkness and secrecy in which diplomatic moves and counter-moves were made, the restless aggressive sabre-rattling of rival militarists, the oppressive burdens and sacrifices imposed upon the workers who perish by the hundred thousand that the policies of their rulers may be carried out, and the ambitions of an aggressive and imperialist capitalism which made the conflict inevitable.

Further, since a prolonged war lends itself to political and industrial reaction and to the suppression of liberty of speech and writing, the Independent Labour Party has rendered all the service in its power in defence of the rights of labour and of civil liberties and in protest against those of the privileged classes who have seized the circumstances of the war in order to increase their powers of exploitation. Last, but not least in importance, though keenly conscious of the misery and cruelty of the war, and though deeply moved by the many wicked things that have been done, the Independent Labour Party has refused to throw fuel on the fire of rage and hate, and has endeavoured to maintain the sanity and restrained judgment which must widely assert themselves if Europe is to be saved from utter destruction.

The Party, by every means in its power, has formulated and put forward the terms and conditions that must accompany and govern the peace, if that peace is really to bring healing and security to the nations, and is to be something more than a brief uneasy pause in the game of war. In all this the Independent Labour Party believes itself to be acting in accordance with the Socialist policy and principles adopted at International Conferences which laid upon the Socialist organisations of the various countries the double duty of working to avert the outbreak of war, and in case of war being sprung upon the peoples, of working to arrest its scope and to bring it to an end as speedily as possible, and to insist upon peace conditions without conquest or vengeance and such as do not contain within them the seed of future wars.

These preliminary observations will help to explain the attitude of the I.L.P. towards the wider terms of peace. It is not possible at this moment to discuss in minute detail the terms that should govern the peace. So much has changed, so much is still changing. But we do feel very strongly that it will be nothing short of an International disaster and an enduring reproach to the organised working-class movement if the rulers and diplomatists who made the war are allowed without check or challenge to negotiate the peace. Such a peace, like the peace concluded by these men after past wars, will be shortsighted and inconclusive.

While, therefore, we welcome the issue of the Manifesto of the Executive of the Bureau as an indication of its desire to maintain communications with the Parties, and though we realise the difficulties of travel, we persist in demanding that the International Bureau should meet and call a Conference of all the National Sections, and that the Conference be held irrespective of the refusal of any particular section to take part in its proceedings. We suggest that the object of the Conference should be confined solely (1) to taking steps to promote an early peace, (2) the affirmation of the principles that should govern the peace settlement. It should be clearly laid down in the mandate calling the Conference that all questions relating to the respective responsibility of the belligerent nations for the outbreak of the war, all questions relating to the military conduct of the war, and all questions relating to the action of Socialist Parties in approving or disapproving the participation of their respective governments in the war, should be excluded from discussion. The consideration of these matters by the International must be postponed till peace is restored.

Respecting the immediate conditions of a Peace Settlement, on which we are asked to submit our views, we would express the opinion that the first and most urgent questions are those relating to military conquest. We need not remind you that it is a fundamental principle of International Socialism that annexation of territory and people by force of arms is robbery and oppression. Nor need we emphasise the fact that the Governments of all the belligerent nations have explicitly declared that in having recourse to arms their object was not territorial aggrandisement but solely to defend their countries and to protect the rights and liberties of nations from military aggression. While bearing fully in mind the actualities of the military situation and the dynastic and reactionary interests that will govern the policy of the chancelleries, we have endeavoured to look at the problem of the Settlement from a definitely International Socialist point of view. We therefore suggest the following as primary principles which the International should strive to have embodied in the Peace Settlement. For brevity's sake we have omitted to

introduce any arguments in support of them, believing that the Committee of the Bureau and our comrades of the various National Sections are familiar with the facts and the reasons upon which the several proposals are based :—

1. No annexation of territory invaded or seized by force of arms.
2. The restoration and indemnification of Belgium.
3. The questions of the boundaries and independence of Poland and the Balkan States, together with the readjustment of other national boundaries, to be the subject of International adjudication with the assent of the people whose national affiliation it is proposed to change.
4. Dependencies in Africa and elsewhere to be dealt with by agreement—freedom of commerce in those dependencies to be equal for all nations. The economic and political freedom of the native peoples to be fully safeguarded.

With respect to the establishment of guarantees for future peace we urge :—

1. All Treaties between nations to be public documents, submitted to and endorsed by the Parliaments of the contracting Parties. Secret Treaties to be invalid in International law.
2. An International Court and Council to be created to administer International law.
3. The manufacture and supply of armaments by private companies to be abolished, with a view to the ultimate abolition of armaments in favour of International arbitration and law.
4. International Free Trade. The policy of the open door, together with International Labour Legislation upon such matters as the eight hours' day, the age limit of child labour, and the abolition of sweated conditions.
5. The abolition of compulsory military service.

In conclusion, let us say that the war has not weakened our faith in Internationalism, but strengthened and confirmed it. Europe must get rid of her autocratic rulers who plunge their peoples into war. We must place trade and commerce on a basis that will serve the public good. If Socialism and Peace are to be attained, the people must come together, and, learning an abiding lesson from the calamity that has befallen them, unite to build a better future.

For the National Administrative Council of the Independent Labour Party.

F. W. JOWETT, M.P., Chairman.
FRANCIS JOHNSON, Secretary.

ST. BRIDE'S HOUSE, SALISBURY SQUARE,
LONDON, E.C., September, 1916.

In conclusion I want to ask those who have read this little book whether they do not feel they ought to identify themselves with the Socialist movement, the principles of which I have endeavoured to explain? Surely the war has awakened in each one of us a sense of the duty of service to mankind, a duty which we must fulfil by the consecration of the rest of our lives to the cause of social righteousness and peace. It is because I believe that Socialism is the one political expression of this cause that I invite you to join the Independent Labour Party, in whose ranks you will find not only opportunity of service, but that comradeship which makes service a joy.

THE INDEPENDENT LABOUR PARTY.

The Independent Labour Party is a Socialist organisation, part of the International Socialist Movement, and works unceasingly for International Peace.

Membership is open to all Socialists who endorse the principles and policy of the Party, and are not members of either the Liberal or Conservative Parties.

In the onrush of war passion and reactionary politics that has overswept the nation the I.L.P. has solidly maintained the principles of democracy and International peace, and formed the rallying centre for all friends of freedom and permanent peace. Its ranks are steadily growing, but the need for its work of education among the people is greater than ever if the end of the war is to see the establishment of conditions that will render war impossible in the future.

Join the Local Branch of the I.L.P., or if you are not able to do this join the National Branch, and thus assist the Party.

Write for information to—

FRANCIS JOHNSON,
General Secretary, I.L.P.,
ST. BRIDE'S HOUSE, SALISBURY SQUARE
LONDON, E.C.

The "LABOUR LEADER"

IS THE OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE I.L.P.

PACIFISTS NEED TO GET TO THE ROOTS OF THE PROBLEM OF WAR.

Why is war possible? Man in his moral and intellectual growth has gone far beyond the wish to kill—and yet he kills on a wholesale scale at the bidding of his rulers.

Secret diplomacy is evil—but it is not *all*.

Financial intrigue and commercial rivalry in the markets of the world are terrible factors.

But pacifists need to ask: Why should there be jealousy and struggle between men and nations in a world which yields in plenty all that is necessary for the life of man?

Is not the competitive basis of our life the cause of most of our antagonisms? And would not the spirit of co-operation and mutual aid put an end to the clash of arms and to the poverty and ignorance which are war's greatest assets?

PACIFISTS MUST LOOK SERIOUSLY AT THE ECONOMIC LIFE OF NATIONS.

**PURSUE THIS INQUIRY BY READING THE "LABOUR
LEADER" EACH WEEK.**

Mr. PHILIP SNOWDEN, M.P., regularly reviews the events of the week in its columns, and articles appear frequently from the pens of Mr. RAMSAY MACDONALD, M.P., Mr. W. C. ANDERSON, M.P., Mr. F. W. JOWETT, M.P., Mr. TOM RICHARDSON, M.P., Mr. J. BRUCE GLASIER, and other prominent members of the Labour and Socialist and Pacifist movements.

The "Labour Leader" is, in the enforced absence of Mr. Fenner Brockway, under the Editorship of Mrs. Katharine Bruce Glasier, B.A.

**THE "LABOUR LEADER," EVERY THURSDAY, ONE
PENNY, FROM ANY NEWSAGENT.**

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 035 051 2

