

16303
A

PEACE NOW—
AND FOR EVER

By

GUY A. ALDRED

1918

194—

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

Threepence

PEACE NOW— AND FOR EVER.

By

GUY A. ALDRED



THE STRICKLAND PRESS
104 GEORGE STREET, GLASGOW, C.I.

1945

PEACE NOW—and FOR EVER

The Federation of the Russian Anarchist-Communist Groups of U.S.A. and Canada met in convention at Chicago on September 2-3, 1934, and adopted several resolutions on the questions of War, Fascism, Bolshevism, United Front and Political Prisoners. These resolutions were published in pamphlet form in English in 1936 by the American Anarchists under the title of *Our Position*. This pamphlet was such a simple and accurate statement of the working-class position that I make no apology for adapting it to the use of the United Socialist Movement in Great Britain. Unfortunately, many of those who endorsed its conclusions in peace time changed their attitude when war came. I suggest that this manifesto should be accepted not only by the U.S.M. comrades and sympathisers throughout Britain, but by all Anti-Parliamentary Communists and all Anarchist groups and all Socialist Pacifist groups existing in the English-speaking world. The text has been corrected by experience and has been modified and endorsed by events, which are the true schoolmasters.

1. SOCIALIST POSITION TOWARDS WAR.

During the interlude between the first and second world wars, it was the custom of most parliamentary Socialists to make a distinction between the possibility of war by the Imperialist Powers against the U.S.S.R. and the question of war in general. The question of war, and the attitude of Socialists towards war, ought to have been no different in 1939 onwards from what it ought to have been in August, 1914 to November, 1918.

With her entrance into the circle of Capitalist States, the U.S.S.R. commenced to play the same Imperialist role as the other States. This fact explains the changed attitude of the Soviet Union towards the League of Nations. Whereas the XIV Party Conference of the C.P. of Russia,

which was opened in the Kremlin, Moscow, on December 18, 1925, denounced the League of Nations as "an instrument not of peace but of war, not of liberation but of oppression," in 1936 the C.P. of the Soviet Union and its subsidiary parties in other countries accepted the League of Nations as an instrument of peace, and supported the dangerous militarist policy of Capitalist sanctions. In other words the League of Nations superseded the 3rd International as the machinery of Soviet diplomacy. Communist Party apologists abandoned shamelessly all pretence of proletarian internationalism and openly avowed their acceptance of bourgeois bureaucratism and intrigue.

It is admitted, with various apologies, that the foundation of the U.S.S.R. social economy is a system of hired labour and commodity production. Consequently, the Soviet Union, like the rest of the capitalist states, needs foreign markets and spheres of political and economic influence. Foreign markets and spheres of influence make for an imperialist policy and militarism. Georgia and Mongolia and the vast increase in Soviet armaments established the accuracy of this deduction beyond question. It was urged that Soviet armaments were for "defence purposes" only; but it is a known fact of war that mere "defending" nations are often the aggressors, and the so-called "offensive" nations are actually the aggrieved or resisting nations. This argument did not necessarily apply to the Soviet Union, but it has applied, and it does apply, to nations at war, or making for war. As capitalism developed in Russia, even if a second world war had not intervened it was only a question of time for this assertion to have become true Soviet diplomacy.

The regime of the U.S.S.R. from 1919 to 1939 developed despotism to the highest degree, and destroyed the political freedom of the toiling masses in the Soviet Union. When the Anarchists and the Anti-Parliamentary Communists urged this from 1919 to 1921, they were accused of favouring counter-revolution. There is on record Trotsky's letter to the French Anarchist-Syndicalist, Michel, who was so mysteriously drowned during his visit to Soviet Russia. In this letter Trotsky justifies the persecution of the Anarchists on the ground of their counter-revolution. Later, Trotsky was exiled, denounced, and finally assassinated for the same flippant reason. Zinoviev, Kamenev and Rykov agreed that Trotsky was a counter-revolutionist. They in turn walked the same weary path, with the result that the world knew that Bolshevism established state slavery, perpetuated capitalist diplomacy

and converted the vast territory of the Soviet Union into a hard labour prison. Capitalist interests have agreed to forget these facts for purposes of war alliances and world devastation. The facts are on imperishable record.

Because of this the United Socialists identify themselves with the Russian Anarchist-Communists of U.S.A. and Canada, and decline to conceive that it is possible, from any point of view, to differentiate the U.S.S.R. from the general run of capitalist countries. The United Socialists do not apply a special gage to the Soviet Union, as do the alleged Communists and many of the parliamentary (and capitalist militarist) Socialists. These latter consider the U.S.S.R., despite its internal militarism, wage labour and political despotism, not to mention its foreign policy, as a country which builds Socialism. They style it the Workers' Fatherland. To United Socialists, the Soviet Union is only a "Step-Fatherland," and the step is away from Socialism. The fact that the present war has involved the Soviet Union does not alter the realisation of the truth about war by United Socialists. Their opposition to war remains; and since war cannot be transformed into a social struggle for world citizenship and peace, indubitably witness against war as pacifists and war resisters. Their aim is Anarchist or Communist world society.

The international policy of the United Socialists is that of all true Socialists. It follows the course of Anarchism and Anti-Parliamentarism. But it unites with all war-resisters and upholds the stand made by all pacifist socialist parliamentarians.

The United Socialists, like the Anti-Parliamentarians and Anarchists, declined to pursue the path of the defence of the "right-side," of League of Nations "sanctions" as did the parliamentary militarist "Socialists," the 3rd International renegades, the titled Trade Union leaders, and all such opportunists and careerist elements.

Memories of the Great War of 1914-1918, and its treacherous peace has established beyond question the folly of the common people taking the side of this or that government in time of war. The workers ought to have opposed war in general by direct refusal to participate. They failed to do so and the United Socialists are in a minority of war-resisting individuals. Witnessing by their integrity and courage directly against the criminal folly of war. One cannot talk about class struggle. One must be content to practise individual resistance. The contrary theory as to the necessity of defending the U.S.S.R.

has destroyed utterly the idea of international Socialism, and gives a new lease of life to the parliamentarism that has betrayed the working-class struggle by re-establishing capitalist militarism in all its crude folly. The working-class movement has become through this error of militarist Socialism, the national and international victim of capitalist diplomacy. The theory of siding with the U.S.S.R. has proven the last working hypothesis of the anti-socialist reaction and the assassins of labour.

The business of the international proletariat was not to take sides in world war but to convert it into a world struggle against war and exploitation. Even in Soviet Russia the purpose of the Red Army was to maintain the Soviet bureaucracy. To this end it became a professional army and assumed all the evil aspects of the old Czarist armies.

Every worker, every proletarian man and woman, every true Socialist must know, in the light of such facts, that his real enemy is the ruling-class of his own country and must regulate his revolutionary tactics accordingly. This position has been well defined in the past by Domela Nieuwenhuis, Malatesta and the immortal Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. Socialism involves Pacifism and complete Anti-Militarism or uncompromising war-resistance.

Concretely stated, the conduct of the class-conscious worker must be one of an individual refusal of military service, leading to mass resistance, and strenuous well-disciplined anti-militarist propaganda wherever and however possible; of individual leading to mass refusal to work on munitions; of individual leading to collective refusal to load, unload, and transport military provisions and equipment; the whole resulting in boycott and starvation of war, as the first step of the direct popular liquidation of subject and territorial national society in world society and world equal citizenship.

The United Socialists recognise only one war—the war of creative production against parasitism, the economic war against poverty, the war of freedom against oppression. The participants in this war must include finally every toiler irrespective of race, colour, sex, politics, or religion, because only by the world one-ness in common struggle of the proletariat against capitalism will be established the conquest of bread and freedom. To the united workers of the world belongs the task of ushering in an era of peace and commonweal.

2. SOCIALIST POSITION TOWARDS UNITED FRONT.

The so-called "dictatorship of the proletariat" in the U.S.S.R. deprived the working-class movement in that country of all political freedom and established a state slavery, behind which the elements of the counter-revolution entrenched themselves. As this counter-revolution advanced the international diplomacy of the Soviet Union retreated, and the Communist Parties in all countries, from first making war upon the capitalist opportunism and hypocrisy of the 2nd International, turned aside to urge the theory of the United Front. As the world moved towards the Second Great War, the argument of the United Front was advanced most enthusiastically whilst the parliamentary Socialists showed themselves more incapable than ever before in their history of giving any expression to the class struggle, or saving the world from the debacle of military sadism. This hopeless paralysis of the United Front; the part it played in building up the power of the Trades Union General Council that betrayed the General Strike in 1926, and leading to the more definite conscription of 1939; the attitude of servile lackeyism adopted by the present Communist member of the House of Commons; all prove that the United Front urged by the Communist Party was a united front of capitalist opportunism; of political careerism, and not of working-class struggle. In point of fact, the workers need not a united front but a united movement, a living movement on the industrial field, a living movement of nation-wide insurrection in every country, a movement of social upheaval and protest, a movement of dynamic pacifism and anti-militarism, and not of disciplined party domination from above. The part played by the United Front in Italy in 1920 when the workers endeavoured to seize the factories; the demands of the United Front policy that nothing should be said about the Socialist and Anarchist prisoners in the Soviet Union during the years of Stalinist degeneration; all require that the workers should repudiate this programme of the United Front in favour of a definite building of a United Workers' Movement. The history of the parliamentary Socialist and Moscow Communist movements from 1919 to 1939 prove that the parties of Social Democracy and dictatorial Communism were the spiritual forebears of Fascism. To them, their political ineptitude, their cowardice, their want of faith, is due the terrible war disaster of 1939 that has brought civilization to ruins.

In the Soviet Union, the dictatorship of the Communist

Party established Capitalism and destroyed Sovietism. Politically it established bureaucracy and destroyed democracy. It is not possible to speak of a united front with those who defend such a regime. Only after the re-establishment of political rights in the U.S.S.R., the release of all political prisoners and exiles by the Bolsheviks, and the establishment of a Socialist and Workers' United Front in the Soviet Union itself, the evolution of freedom of speech and of unity, would it be possible to speak about an international United Front in other countries. Until these preliminary conditions are fulfilled, and a definite radicalism of liberty is established in the Soviet Union, and the right of propaganda secured to all sections of the Soviet people, the Communist Party talk of a United Front against Fascism is but a cloak, covering up the realities of anti-socialist despotism in the Soviet Union itself.

The phrase, "United Front," if it means anything at all, should imply not the mere agreement of a few political party chiefs, of Communist and Socialist parliamentarians in Britain or any other country, but a deep-seated unity of the workers in the actual economic struggle, and a common ground for discussion of their varying political approaches towards the strategy of the class struggle. There can be no United Front without a United Movement; and a united movement means, not just one party organ, one set of phrases, conspiracy for position of the rival factions within the movement or constituting the United Front, but a bending of all party purposes and of all factional propaganda to the common needs of the struggle of the people as a whole. This is the true social struggle. This is the struggle for the conquest of bread and freedom. And this struggle demands that we shall not cover up the exploitation of the Soviet proletariat; the shocking imprisonments and exilings of the Socialists in the Soviet Union, and defend as "Socialism in One Country" the most obnoxious kind of Capitalism, State Capitalism. The United Front must mean either world-wide democracy, with the most complete right of communication between all groups and factions of the Socialist movement, or else it becomes a most menacing political lie, involving the sacrifice of the workers' movement finally to the principles of Fascism. This fact explains the collapse of the Chinese revolutionary movement and the triumph of the Kuo Min Tang, the triumph of Fascism in Italy, the defeat of the British General Strike, and the triumph of Nazism in Germany. In every country, the Communist Party United Front spelt success for reaction and defeat for revolution. Having exhausted the working-

class movement, having treated the international proletariat like a sucked orange, Soviet diplomacy cast aside the proletarian rind and definitely allied itself with bureaucratic diplomacy through the medium of military pacts and the League of Nations. So-called Revolutionary Socialists succeeded to the traditions of Czarist statesmanship and have established beyond all question their fitness for the job. The logic of this evolution is seen in the meetings of Stalin, Churchill and Roosevelt, and the Beaverbrook press eulogies and reportings of Harry Pollitt.

The United Socialists stand for a united movement and will not quibble if that movement is termed a United Front so long as it is understood that by that is meant militant working-class action, direct and revolutionary, against the Capitalist system. That movement must stand against all war, and not only war against some phase of Fascism. That movement in every country must stand against its own government if necessary, even though that government be allied with the Soviet Union. That movement must be in fact the United Front of world citizenship and the liquidation of nations in a world social and political economy. And it must bear in mind the slogan of Bakunin, as it denounces the political prisoners of Capitalism, whether they are jailed in Britain, France, Germany, Italy or the Soviet Union: "*Liberty without Socialism is privilege and injustice; Socialism without Liberty—slavery and bestiality.*"

The use of this word Socialism has become objectionable only because the term is used constantly by the apologists for the Soviet Union to describe a system under which workers are imprisoned and exiled without trial. In the same way, the Pagan Christian Church reduced Christianity to a slogan of certain hypocrisy.

3. SOCIALIST POSITION TOWARDS POLITICAL PRISONERS.

When the Anarchists were persecuted in the Soviet Union in 1919, it was felt that the surrounding conditions of civil war were a justification for the policy of terror pursued by the Bolshevik domination. Looking back it is now perfectly clear that the years of terror represented a definite reactionary tendency and that the purpose of the dictatorship was not the imprisonment of "white" enemies of Sovietism but of red defenders of the proletarian

struggle. Two facts established the truth of this argument :

(1) The evolution of the arrests : the anti-Bolshevik Socialist movement suffered first. After the extinction of the external Socialist critics of the Bolshevik party, the extreme and most definitely Socialist section of the Bolsheviks were arrested and joined their former victims in prison and exile.

(2) The evolution of Soviet diplomacy which paralleled these imprisonments. Rykov, who had signed so many decrees for the arrest of Anarchists and Maximalists in the year 1922, but who was one of the last leading C.P. members to denounce the League of Nations, six years later shared the fate of the persons he had formerly denounced as counter-revolutionists. As the imprisonments increased, the ruling dictatorship turned more and more from the world proletariat to the world capitalist class. This proves that the terror represented a progressive reactionary terror. It can no longer be pretended that it was the means of defence of the revolution. It but represented the growing and corrupt monopolistic domination over the industrial life of the common people of a political party, the Bolshevik party. This meant establishing and preserving the political and economic privileges of a new class—a "Socialist" Bureaucracy. It meant immortalising internationally political despotism and economic slavery in the name of Socialism. Therefore, the United Socialists whilst demanding the release of political prisoners in all countries cannot omit from this demand the resolute request for the inclusion of all Socialist prisoners in the U.S.S.R., and the re-establishment of full political and civil rights in all countries, Soviet Russia included.

In the *Commune* for June 1924, I raised the question of persecution in Russia. Although as an Anti-Parliamentarian I had found it impossible to accept the vacillations of Leninism, and the varied and most unsatisfactory policy of the 3rd International, I was unwilling to believe the allegations of despotism and imprisonments of revolutionists. This scepticism was most unjust to the imprisoned and persecuted comrades in Soviet Russia. At last, in September 1924, I published some details of the Anarchist and Left Social Revolutionists who were arrested in 1923; of the Left Social Revolutionists, Anarchists and Kronstadt sailors who were imprisoned in the Solovetsky Monastery, in the Lefortov and Moscow prisons, exiled to Archangel and other wild malarial districts, or banished abroad under threat of execution if they returned.

In November 1925, the imprisonment of the Communist Workers' Groups or the Anti-Parliamentary Communists of the Soviet Union was exposed in the *Commune*. This article gave the history of these groups which were formed in March 1923. They were originally the left-wing of the Communist Party. The details show how the arrests of these groups commenced in October 1924, the circumstances of the arrests being similar to those which had been experienced previously by the Anarchists. These arrests brought us nearer to the Communist Party itself and some of the persons arrested were better known internationally than the Anarchists who were arrested earlier. These groups issued a manifesto (1925) which read as follows :

"If we can force the Bourgeois governments to release comrades of the struggle, surely we can demand their release a hundred times more from the Soviet government. Demand then, comrades, in all your meetings, from the Communist Party speakers, from the C.P. of Russia, the Soviet government and the 3rd International, the release of our imprisoned Anti-Parliamentary comrades and the immediate cessation of repressive measures against the revolutionary proletarians of the Workers' Groups. . . ."

"We must insist that the Russian statesmen free also the hundreds of comrades who fight with all their energy and hearts to maintain the achievements of the October Revolution. Among these we must mention Comrades Svorin, Tiyanov, Ilyin, Michailov, Moisseiv and Polossov."

"Only by means of international proletarian solidarity can we free the Communist prisoners, who think as we do, from the anti-Communist repression directed against them."

"LET US UNITEDLY DEMAND HANDS OFF THOSE WORKERS STRUGGLING TOWARDS COMMUNISM."

This same year 1925, the International Committee for Political Prisoners, established in New York, of which Roger N. Baldwin was chairman, published letters and documents from Soviet prisons, and the statement of 44 persons who had been banished for ever from the Soviet Union. These included G. Maximov, who after issuing many revolutionary pamphlets in America, lost his sense of balance and turned pro-war, thereby repudiating all his past anti-militarist activity. He then joined hands with his persecutors in promoting world debacle.

In March 1927, the suicide by burning alive of the Anarchist Grigoryep, caused Alexander Berkman to issue an appeal to the international proletariat in which he drew attention to the sufferings of the Russian Socialists and the honour paid to Chicherin and Kamenev in the American Chamber of Commerce and directed attention to the pictures of Chicherin, silk hat in hand, bowing before the king

of Italy, and presenting gifts of gold and silver cigarette cases to the chiefs of the Italian police and secret service, whilst Mussolini declared his great admiration for the Soviet government. At a later date Chicherin disappeared mysteriously.

It is not necessary to go into the story of the conspiracy against Trotsky which resulted in his exile and assassination; of the arrest, exile, mock trial and terrible end of Christian Georgyeich Rakovsky, the founder of the 3rd International, sometime Bolshevik president of the Council of People's Commissaries for the Ukraine, the Soviet Ambassador to Great Britain and afterwards France. Rakovsky's great pioneer status in the Socialist movement cannot be denied although those of us who are Anarchists and Anti-Parliamentarians regret his silence during the early years of Bolshevik persecution. When Rakovsky was Ambassador to Britain the *Sunday Worker*, the *Workers' Weekly*, and the various Bolshevik publications throughout the world, made great play of Rakovsky's record of "thirty years continuous service for Socialism, undaunted by police, prison or victimisation."

Zinoviev and Kamenev are not heroic figures but the Communist Party eulogised them for years and Zinoviev's speeches enjoyed world circulation and were cheered subserviently. In January 1935, the former president of the 3rd International was sentenced to ten and five years imprisonment and exile, and falsely accused of having some vague connection with the Kirov assassination. Kamenev, the former vice-premier of the Soviet Republic, received five years. They were hustled secretly away to their doom by Red Guards just as Anarchists had been in other years whilst the lackeys cheered Zinoviev. Subsequently they were further tried and executed. Actually, the offence of Zinoviev and Kamenev was that of believing in some form of Socialism and attempting to save the Soviet Union from making too rapid a progress towards the morass of Capitalism. Their execution after persecution established the real purpose of all the executions and imprisonments in Soviet Russia. Such facts compel those of us who are Socialists to direct attention to this Soviet orgy of persecution, all ending in a great military alliance with the Capitalist powers.

The Communist Party in all countries, with the 3rd International at its head to the time of its liquidation, defended and justified this terror in the U.S.S.R.. After the war alliance, capitalist statesmen eulogised and accepted

the red terrorism. "Communist" apology was necessary no longer. Consequently the Communists, and all who unite with them, bear the responsibility for the persecution of the Socialists in the Soviet Union as much as the Russian Bolsheviks. Therefore the United Socialists protest not only against the Bolshevik government but oppose the Communist Party and its capitalist militarist alliances.

The Socialist struggle for the release of political prisoners must demand the release of political prisoners and the cessation of terror in the Soviet Union, and the countries now placed under the Soviet dominion. It must remember the denunciation and betrayal of Marinus Van Der Lubbe who, on trial for his life, was at pains to save the lives of the men who stood by his side in the dock and denounced him. The Socialist struggle must vindicate the memory of the imprisoned Anarchists of 1919 and the Trotskyists of 1927 and direct attention to the later political imprisonments in Russia. Only then can it secure the freedom of thought and struggle throughout the Capitalist world.

4. "PEACE NOW—AND FOR EVER!"

The title of this work calls for explanation. "Peace Now" could have been a slogan of compromise and despair. A militarist critic might have suggested that the author wanted peace at any price. This kind of sneer is expressed continuously by stupid unthinking folk who are prepared to suffer war at any cost—and, finally, to no purpose other than that of utter misery and ruin. "Peace Now" would have been opened to the more serious criticism that the author wanted an immediate but not an enduring peace: a mere pause in the hostilities and hatreds of the world. This is not so. I want what the title says in all its fulness: *PEACE NOW—AND FOR EVER!* I want security and happiness, true richness of life, peace in prosperity, complete sanity of living for all mankind, for the countless generations of humans yet to be born. In this pamphlet I discuss the contribution that my contemporaries *must* make to ensure this well-being for their posterity and to capture a glimpse of it for themselves. We must not be content to gaze into the promised land. We must lay the foundations.

Many Pacifists will wonder at the way the issue is approached. Actually what is written is designed as a manifesto for peace to be considered by my comrades of the

United Socialist Movement. Since this is but a small group, the form of writing is not one of popular appeal. Yet the call to peace must be popular, must be common to all mankind. Then I have admittedly based it on a manifesto drawn up by non-English-speaking Anarchists living in exile from Europe in the United States of America. Many who want peace in the world still suffer from arid conventional minds and are shocked at the term, "Anarchism." The Anarchist manifesto is adopted, thoroughly revised and altered, in order to shock such timid souls. If the world is to conquer violence for ever, timidity of approach to philosophies, the ruling out from human rights and from the human family of this and that heretic, must cease. Democracy means that all mankind shall think, that each human being shall enjoy the unquestioned right to express himself or herself. Anarchism has a right to be heard. It has no need to stand on apology for its ideas. The need to apologise is imperative only from those who have defended governments and have sought to operate through governments for the regimentation of mankind. Every statesman, every politician, every pettifogging Trade Union careerist seeking a place in Labour politics under Capitalism, every opportunist slanderer of the odd "propagandist by deed" who threw some poor bomb from despair of social change, needs to confess and to atone. But not the apostle, when he is an apostle, of Anarchist idealism. Unfortunately, every self-styled Anarchist is not an idealist. In many cases, he is not even an Anarchist at all. Like most Christians, he is wanting alike in faith and works. When there was no war, and few rumblings of the coming Second World War, the foreign-born Anarchists met in the United States and drafted an Anti-War manifesto. When war came, many of them hastened to serve in the glorious cause of human destruction. Poor, miserable, pretentious, commonplace conventional mortals. Poor worthless souls.

If peace is to be established in the world, we must have a living democracy. Men and women of all creeds and races must mingle without fear or opposition. Transformation of ideas must be natural and spontaneous and result easily from the community of democracy. We must fear no phrases and no discussions and we must intrude no discussions. But we must be aware of the intellectual forces at work. For this reason I base this work on an Anarchist manifesto long since cast aside by those who outlined it. As a Humanist I do this deliberately as a challenge to thought and understanding. It is a direct contribution to

the foundation of world peace. Anarchist philosophy has a definite place in a world of peace.

Other considerations inspired my writing and compiling.

As World War No. II pursued its disastrous course, the Capitalist world hatred of Soviet Russia declined. The murder of the Czar was forgotten and forgiven. The crimes of Stalinism were condoned. Socialists, so-called, and Conservative reactionaries, now a little to the Left of the "Communists," tumbled over each other to pay tribute to the Red Army and to Marshal Stalin. Churchill and his admirers forgot his denunciations of Soviet Russia—denunciations they had applauded once, such as the following:—

Speaking at Sunderland, on Friday, January 2, 1920, Winston Churchill said (*Times* report, January 3, 1920):—

If they (the Bolsheviks) had their way (they) would destroy the democratic Parliaments on which the liberties of free peoples depend.

A few months later—in the *Evening News*, London, for July 28, 1920, he wrote—prophetically of an agreement which he made twenty-five years later with Roosevelt and Stalin:—

The ruin and collapse of Poland, either from external violence or internal subversion, and the incorporation of Poland as a whole in the Russian Bolshevik system, would sweep away the barrier on which so much depends, and would bring Russia and Germany into direct and immediate contact.

In September 1924, he opposed a loan to Soviet Russia, at that time less guilty of political crime than later when Churchill eulogised the Soviet Regime. The *Times*, September 20, 1924, reported Churchill's speech:—

It was not only a question of money—it was a question of honour. Russia was a tyranny, the vilest tyranny that ever existed. The great mass of the Russian people were gripped by a gang of cosmopolitan adventurers who had settled down on the country like vultures and were tearing it to pieces.

The Soviet rulers were *not* cosmopolitan adventurers. This statement was a lie. They were mostly former exiled Russian Socialists, or ex-prisoners for Socialism under the Czar, whom power had transformed into opportunists and tyrants or dictators. A very easy but fatal transformation.

Churchill repeated the "cosmopolitan" libel a year later to emphasise his hatred of international one-ness of the common people. Speaking at Tunbridge Wells on November 28, 1925, the 1945-colleague-to-be of Stalin said:—

There (in Moscow) we had what we had never before, a

band of cosmopolitan conspirators gathered from the underworld of the great cities of Europe and America in the despotic possession of the resources of what was once the mighty and famous Empire of Russia. These men were ceaseless in their endeavours to spread revolution through every land. There was no country more the object of their malignity than this island home of ours, than this ancient race and Government, which had so long known how to preserve democratic freedom with order and responsibility in all classes.

The "cosmopolitan adventurers" have been accepted for war purposes. For this reason, the present work traces the evolution of the Russian Revolution, linking the First World War of 1914-1918 with the Second World War that started in September, 1939, as an introduction to the discussion of absolute Pacifism. We base the writing on the Anarchist Manifesto because it is necessary to depart from it. The Anarchists pinned their faith to mass direct action—an Anarchist fallacy. There is no machinery in existence for mass direct action. Resistance to war, faith in the ways of peace, is a question of direct individual action. Minority witnessing is beyond the mass as a mass. Individual resistance may grow into a mass resistance but cannot be expressed through mass resistance. Anarchism degenerates into a Syndicalism of subservience when it substitutes mass individual action for individual resistance action. It sacrifices morality, conscience and integrity to a dubious expediency of wilted moral cowardice. It becomes hopelessly confusionist and utopian. It suggests a definite action without believing in the individual integrity that alone can make such action possible, and suggests such action precisely because it believes that individual integrity is impossible. It proposes a definite industrial policy without attempting to evolve the machinery essential to the achievement of its purpose. "Anarchist Direct Action" of this description is a meaningless smoke of words, without fire and without flame. It is a substitute for action, dope for the soul, and so prepares the mind for mass surrender. In the end it denies Anarchism and sacrifices Socialism to the cause of militarism.

In this work, we urge the integrity of direct refusal to participate in war, the responsibility of the individual to himself and to mankind. We place the world community and the immediate local communities of which the world is composed above the State organisation. We deny political territorial sovereignty over the individual. We challenge the League of Nations idea as being a League of Governments. We believe in world citizenship and propose the organisation of world citizenship. We would substitute

direct world jurisprudence for the International Police Force fallacy. We propose a machinery of total disarmament. We assert a spiritual and moral concept of the oneness of mankind and of world citizenship in living local and universal democracy of the individual that makes the concept of war impossible. We propose no narrowness of creed but would have every centre of every creed a unit of world citizenship and pacifism. We propose a machinery of civil aviation and world contact. In other words, we continue the assertion of the individual stand against militarism—a very decided negation of wrong—with a very practical and very aggressive organisation of collective movement towards constructing a sound machinery of a world based on peace. We reject all narrowness of vision and all exploitative interest of collective organisation. We mean to build *Peace Now—and For Ever*, individually and socially, in the light of genius, and by the power of mediocrity. Commonsense, commonplace organisation and evolution—a sound structure of idealism, radicalism and conservatism.

We have heard Christians say that no man can be a pacifist unless he is a Christian. This is nonsense and it is bad Christianity, bad citizenship. First of all, if Christianity is orthodoxy, Christians have not made a success of heaven on earth. Their chaplains have blessed the troops of hell. Secondly, if the Christians had bothered less about conferring a mysterious ridiculous divine status on Jesus and concerned themselves more with his intense living humanity and message of integrity and peace, they would have made the world a better habitation for mankind. The essential thing is not that a man shall call himself a Theist or a Christian but that he shall be a Pacifist. The militarists make no bones about Atheist soldiers. Why not have a few Atheist war-resisters. Anyway, the Atheist war-resister is a fact, and he has his place in the social economy of world peace. He has a democratic right to be an Atheist and to be welcomed as such.

We have heard Anarchists say that no man can be a Pacifist unless he is an Anarchist. This also is nonsense and bad Anarchism. Actually, Anarchism is not the pet dogma of a narrow, stupid, violent sect. It is the genius of living in the spirit of liberty. It is the passion for harmony and integrity. It does not matter whether a man calls himself an Anarchist if he acts liberty and opposes murder. His Pacifism is urgent and imperative, not his lip-service to Anarchism. Very few Anarchists merit esteem

as Anarchists. Like Christians, they desert their cause in time of crisis; and on many moral issues, such as the question of mating and marriage, in which Anarchism is in direct conflict with the State, they are incapable of remaining loyal to its principles. Whereas Anarchism has a severe morality, many who call themselves Anarchists approach the sex question without moral principles, and merely use the phrase as implying some form of adultery. Which is a travesty and a falsehood. Anarchism is, to my mind, the true philosophy of living. But Anarchism does not mean a dictatorship of dogma and sectarian persecution of the orthodox by the radically heterodox. Anarchism means the mutual toleration of expression and variety of thought that belongs to democracy. Dictatorship is not Anarchism. Dogmatic hearsay is merely perverted orthodoxy and militarism. It is the Anti-Anarchist spirit of violence.

We dedicate this work, therefore, to the creation of a world secure for ever in peace; in variety of institution and thought; in mutual toleration of living; a world rich in heresies and maybe orthodoxies, but richer still in the happiness of non-violence; a world of peace and commonwealth secured by the individual determination and goodwill of all its citizens.

5. BLUE PRINT FOR PEACE.

The purpose of this chapter is to evolve a machinery of peace. The persistence of war demonstrates how well the Devil thinks and organises. He is a positive philosopher. But God has no capacity for organisation. He does not know how to put his inspiration towards goodwill across. The Devil reasons inductively, positively. God wastes himself in platitudes. He argues deductively and confuses humanity with his abstraction. Our business is to turn God into a positive philosopher. We must make him a realist.

In the opening chapters of *At Grips with War*, published first in 1929, I define my programme as follows:—

All nationalisms must go.

All patriotisms must go.

All alienisms and antagonistic sovereignties must go.

Passports must vanish.

Political society must be liquidated.

The world must become a single nation, a single brotherhood, merging or retaining its several languages, but

moved by a common economic impulse and social integrity.

Sovereignty must belong to each individual. Allegiance must be recaptured from states, churches, and creeds, and returned to each individual's own conscience. Society must be a merging of desires, not a dictatorship of subjection.

The opposition to militarism must be prosaic, practical, and concrete. Idealism must find expression in realism. Nations must be reduced to parishes. As science conquers distance, the mind of man must widen, whereas to-day it narrows. War by air is the perversion of science. It is the cannibalism of knowledge, the parochial pauperism of the universe. It is not glorious but inglorious to murder from the air; for it is war on your immediate neighbour. It is not world war but a village scandal. The conquest of distance renders statesmen petty diplomats, tea-cup chatterers, and mischief-makers; war is contemptible. World war is now but a parish feud that workers must stamp out of society.

This passage opens with five concrete demands. The problem is how to realise these demands. The realisation must be positive and not negative only.

Nationalisation must go, in the sense of political and military rivalry. We must think as humans and not as race-units.

Patriotism must go, in the sense of military struggle for power and domination. We must think as world-citizens, even within the proud limitations of our parish.

All sense of alienism must go. We are all God's children, or, at least, the common children of our good common mother—Earth!

Passports must be abolished. The world must be free to every child of earth, to wander or to settle where he or she will, and there to enjoy full suffrage of social living, irrespective of place of birth.

All this is commonsense. We must embody it in our charter of equal living. How?

The answer is simple. By developing everywhere the cultural principle of world citizenship. By transforming our educational systems into centres of Humanist culture. By developing world airways. By by-passing all abstract metaphysical discussion and substituting definite principles of positive humanist philosophy; the one-ness of humanity: world citizenship.

The educational system must be humanised and become a modernized system of international-cooperative-life

education different in 3 ways from the traditional type of college :

1. *International emphasis*: The school and the university must seek to unite the peoples of the world into an intellectual and cultural brotherhood. It must show an equal concern for the welfare of all men everywhere, without prejudice against sex, race, color, or religion.

2. *Administrative technique*: Complete utilization must be made of the "Cooperative System," under which the student divides his time equally between the classroom itself and the practical use in everyday life of what he learns in the classroom. This means cooperation between scholars, the university and the various enterprises of the community, where the work of the student counts as laboratory experience. In that sense the community enterprise is an actual part of the university school and the university.

3. *Academic organization*: School and university uses the life-situation technique instead of the departmentalized subject-matter technique. The school curriculum must be organized around the five basic life situations: *life vocation; life avocation; family life; community life; life philosophy.*

In Canada early in December, 1944, world government became, for the first time anywhere, a plank in the platform of a major political party. Canada's Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, convening in Montreal, voted this clause for its election manifesto :

Future wars cannot be avoided without the establishment of government at the international level, democratically representative of all the peoples great and small, and endowed with the paramount powers necessary to maintain the peace and to provide economic justice and equality of opportunity among the peoples of the world.

The C.C.F. Convention also passed the following resolution :—

Whereas alliances, the League of Nations, and the attempts to maintain the balance of power have failed to preserve world peace; be it resolved that the Canadian Government should take the initiative in promoting the idea of an international government representative of all the peoples, and work towards the establishment of a world authority which shall have jurisdiction over:

- (a) Vital natural resources and their utilisation for the benefit of all the peoples.
- (b) International labour standards.
- (c) World currency and the organisation of international trade and investment.

- (d) The establishment of minimum international standards of education.
- (e) The administration of backward areas with a view to educating them for self-government as soon as possible.
- (f) An international police force for the purpose of the enforcement of international law.
- (g) World postal and communicating systems.

We are somewhat suspicious of (e); and (f) gives no guarantee of international disarmament. Without the surrender of the concept of national sovereignties, and the citizenship by birth or adoption of states, that is the political idea of subjects, there can be no world citizenship and no genuine international police force. The Duke of Bedford deals with this issue very well in his various discussions of the peace issue in the future world.

World government discussion and the question of peace is assured of a prominent place in Canadian political discussion. But it must occupy the same place in the political discussion of all the English-speaking countries. Thus it will become the vital world-issue. The economic issue must be faced also. Politics turn on economics. But economic discussions must not be substituted for the consideration of anti-militarism. The starvation of war is the most vital issue of our time.

In mid-December, 1944, a six-point Declaration of Human Rights, signed by 1326 distinguished Americans of all faiths, was made public by the American Jewish Committee. It first called for an

"International Bill of Rights . . . to guarantee for every man, woman and child, 'of every race and creed and in every country,' the fundamental rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

As a second point, the statement declared :

"No plea of sovereignty shall ever again be allowed to permit any nation to deprive those within its borders of these fundamental rights on the claim that these are matters of internal concern."

The statement was reported to have the President's "full sympathy" and was signed by the then Vice-President Wallace, Supreme Court Justices, and many other notables in all walks of United States public life. The signing was merely so much ceremony for it was without solid purpose.

The President of the American Jewish Committee, former Justice Joseph M. Proskauer, said in issuing the Declaration :

"It is a statement of general principles, not the formulation of . . . machinery. . . ."

"Every race and creed" surely includes the Negro as well as the Jew. What are the signers of this declaration doing for the Negro?

The failure to formulate machinery was the defect in the Declaration—it failed to point out how its common-sense ends of simple justice might be achieved. It failed to remark, as the American Declaration of Independence does so cogently,

"that to secure these rights (life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness) governments are instituted among men."

We suggest that most of its signers obviously failed to recognise that the only way its guarantee of world citizenship and immediate local citizenship of use and practice and enjoyment could be made effective was through supra-national or world government exercising direct authority over (and controlled individually by) citizens in all countries.

How is world citizenship to be established?

The Earl of Huntingdon, in the House of Lords, October 11, 1944, said:—

There is only one device which has been found efficacious in stopping war between communities and it is along that line that I suggest, though I may be in a minority of one, the possibilities should be explored. The only device which so far has worked is that of federation . . . It is not easy to establish; it is extremely difficult.

We must remember that in the United States of America there was a very calamitous war before nearly all the States of the Union settled down and federation was consolidated. But as a result there is no danger at all of war breaking out between these States. There is no prospect of war between Nevada and Idaho or between Massachusetts and Maine. The idea of it, to any American, would be ridiculous.

In the same way wherever States have federated, or in other words, have given up their sovereignty, as in the case of the Soviet Socialist Republics, the Swiss Republic, and the commonwealth of Australia, or the United States of Mexico, the danger of war between those States has been eliminated. But you must have real union, and no closed frontiers; both peoples and goods must be able to pass freely; and supreme force must lie in the hands of the Central Federal Government which must be representative of all the States.

The Earl of Huntingdon did not need to be in a minority of one. He could have supported the pleas for peace and conscience made by the Duke of Bedford and so have formed a natural alliance.

Federal News (London), November, 1944, said:

A league is an organisation of governments. A federation

is an organisation of peoples. A confederation is a league under another name.

The governing body of a league is an assembly of government delegations. It has no executive power. All its decisions have to be ratified by the separate governments of the member states. The governing body of a federation is a parliament elected by the federating peoples, to which they have handed over certain functions of government. . . . It has executive authority in its own sphere.

The representatives of the states at the league assembly, because they represent their governments, think nationally and act as national blocs. The members elected by the federating peoples to the federal parliament come from all parties in their states. As a result like-minded members from all countries come together and form federal parties. The divisions in the federal parliament are therefore political, not national, divisions. . . .

A league has no contact with the citizens of the member states. A federation has direct jurisdiction over them, since every citizen of a federating state is also a citizen of the federation.

This is excellent defining. It is a pity that those who support the policy of *Federal News* don't think a little more in the terms of such internationalism and a little less in the terms of power politics.

The New Yorker, December 9, 1944, in "The Talk of the Town," stated:

There is now a demand that Nazi leaders be "tried and punished" for all crimes back as far as 1933. Yet the cold truth is there is not a Nazi living who can be tried or brought to justice for anything he has done, because we have no justice to bring him to. To talk of justice as though it were something you pull out of a hat, as occasion requires, is to talk idly and badly. . . .

The only way you can try and punish an individual who has committed an anti-social act on international level is by setting up shop on that level, creating the courts on that level, writing the laws on that level, and supporting the enforcement on that level. Whether people want to set up shop on that level, whether people are capable of it, whether it is wise to attempt it—these are questions still unanswered by the democratic nations. Our private hope is that the answer will be Yes, but until the people make up their minds they ought to keep the record clean and not kid themselves about jurisdiction and crime. You can't have your anarchical society and eat it too.

Forgiving the use of the term "anarchy" to mean chaos, which it does not, this comment contains truth. The idea of punishing Germans is merely the old theory of "spoils to the victor." It is gangster politics, not democracy. The aim of democracy should be the equal well-being of every survivor of the present debacle in the world that we should combine to rebuild. This can be brought about by practical

planning. We must develop world courts and world jurisprudence. Quite a simple practical matter.

There ought to be no passports. This could be secured by formal international agreements, by definite Acts of Parliaments passed by the legislatures of the various countries. This would be a complete guarantee of freedom of world movement and world settlement for every person irrespective of race, creed, or sex. Just as such formal international agreement would establish equality of world citizenship and of conscience; just as there should be world courts established to decide questions, if such arise, of jurisdiction, etc.; so there should be established world airways, as part of the world unity movement. All this is practical and not theoretical. It argues positively and factually, not abstractly and negatively. It captures every pulpit, every cultural association, for world oneness.

The Freethinker used to argue: no Christian can be an Internationalist. The Humanist says: Every Christian must be an Internationalist.

The Christian used to say: Every Atheist is a man without a conscience. He cannot be an Internationalist. The Humanist says: Every Atheist must be an Internationalist since he believes that all mankind are equally children of nature.

In this way, a Blue Print for Peace can be evolved. Practical details can be formulated. We can come together as humans, determined to plan and to live in a world of peace. We can organise society for peace as easily as it has been organised hitherto for war. We can make goodwill an accepted commonplace asset in the everyday life of humanity. War and violence can be practically and concretely blocked out of the life of man for ever.