

16388

A

" THE WORD LIBRARY "

Second Series—No. 5

**SOCIALISM
AND
PARLIAMENT**

Part II.

GOVERNMENT BY LABOUR

A Record of Facts

By

GUY A. ALDRED

Second Edition, Finally Revised

PRICE

SIXPENCE

Second Series—No. 2

THE WORD LIBRARY

SOCIALISM

AND

PARLIAMENT

Part II.

GOVERNMENT BY LABOUR

A Record of Facts

by

GUY A. ALDRID

Second Edition, Finely Revised

WATSON

PRICE

SOCIALISM AND PARLIAMENT

Part II.—Government By Labour

A RECORD OF FACTS

by

GUY A. ALDRED



GLASGOW

THE STRICKLAND PRESS, 104 GEORGE STREET, C.1.

1942

CONTENTS

Foreword	3
Foreword, 1928	6
I. Labour in Office : A Record	7
II. His Majesty's Government	8
III. Ramsay MacDonald and War Recruiting	9
IV. Reparations	12
V. German Social Democracy	13
VI. The League of Governments	14
VII. Disarmament	15
VIII. Army Annual Bill	16
IX. Controlling the Armed Forces	17
X. Voters for Barbarism	20
XI. Military Strike Breaking	22
XII. The Air Ministry	23
XIII. Russia	25
XIV. The Murder Trust	27
XV. Empire Administration	28
XVI. Nationalisation of Industry and Strikes	29
XVII. Scotland Yard	32
XVIII. Poplarism and Unemployment Relief	34
XIX. Housing	36
XX. Education	37
XXI. "Victory" Programme	38
XXII. No Class Struggle	39

APPENDICES

I. Careerist "Labour's" Progress	40
II. Britain's First Labour Government	40
III. Britain's Second Labour Government	41
IV. Other 1929 Ministers	41
V. Labour (1924) Cabinet Notes	41
VI. Potted Biography : Very Incomplete	51
VII. Organisational	67
VIII. The Duke of Bedford	68

FOREWORD

The preface to the first part of *Socialism and Parliament* explains how this work becomes Part II. In revising the pamphlet issued in 1928, I have added much new material, including the "potted biography" notes. The purpose of this "biography" is not to indict personally the persons mentioned. Some of their speeches and much of their conduct would merit great praise if only they had lasted the distance, and not turned aside to pursue careerism. My real aim is to show how, growing adaptability to ideas of reformism, and a growing parliamentary sense of responsibility to capitalist institutions, transferred practising conscientious objectors of 1914-1918 into stern practising militarists in 1924, 1929-1931, and 1939—? The more convincing the parliamentary apology for such conduct under pressure of parliamentary and administrative necessity, the more thorough is the proletarian condemnation of parliamentarism, which, on the apologists' own showing, can function only in the interests of capitalist Imperialism. Nevertheless, the fact that the various Labour and I.L.P. members rose to the Treasury Benches—some passing into the National Government—owing to the first endorsement of their radical anti-militarist and seemingly-Socialist views at the polls, proves that the democracy shared their radical sentiments. As parliamentarians retreat from revolutionary views, they advance their careers as servants of capitalism, and finally pass into obscurity. John Burns did it and Snowden and Ramsay MacDonald emulated his example. One evidence of the anti-working class nature of militarism and parliamentary careerism, is the fact that, as the parliamentarians defend militarism, they attack also the workers for striking, proving that the driving force of careerism is servitude to capitalism. Who so would make the workers soldiers has the outlook that would keep them serfs.

As the present war against Fascism has developed, the imprisonment of workers for absenteeism, the claims made over the workers' lives by the Ministry of National Service, the plain industrial conscription of Fire Watching, reveal the actual servitude that war involves. Militarism is the natural enemy of working class struggle, and war is fatal to social emancipation, unless it develops into the tragedy of revolution. Such revolution is never one of thought, but the consequence of chaos and exhaustion.

This work indicts the Labour Governments of 1924 and 1929 as organised hypocrisy. Every worker knows that the speeches of 1915 to 1923 had no relation to the behaviour in office of the men who made

these speeches. They used the anti-militarist and progressive feelings of the democracy as implements with which to obtain power. The Leeds Convention was a kind of parliamentary blackmail, a threat of revolution unless the speakers became the Crown Ministers. Once in office, they evinced no desire to change the speed limit, and they kept faithfully to the old ruts.

Wheatley described his housing proposals, rightly, as "real capitalism—an attempt to patch up a capitalist ordered society." Wheatley began his career as a miner and lived in poverty. He died worth a few thousands and left his son an Advocate and his daughter a doctor. Parliamentarism gave his children a career. Notwithstanding his notorious safeguarding of his family tendencies, Wheatley had some principles. He remembered the fact of his poverty and he was not a happy apologist for capitalism. He had no wish for martyrdom but he did seek a social change. This contradiction in Wheatley's make-up explains the man. The result was that Ramsay MacDonald omitted him from the second Labour Government.

MacDonald, as Foreign Minister in the first Labour Government, had Ponsonby for his assistant. Both had been members of the Union of Democratic Control, which aimed at the abolition of secret diplomacy and the control of foreign affairs by Parliament. In office, both played at secret diplomacy. One of the four cardinal points of the Union of Democratic Control was :—

"No province shall be transferred from one Government to another without the consent, by plebiscite or otherwise, of the population of such province."

Yet, within six months of Labour being called to office, the Government agreed to give territory in Jubaland (East Africa) to the Italian Government, presumably to obtain Mussolini's support on the subject of Reparations. The East African concession was preparing the way for Italy's ambitious designs on Abyssinia and dreams of an Italian African Empire : and Reparations destroyed the progress of democracy in Europe, and replaced Kaiserism with Fascism or Hitlerism.

MacDonald's messages to the Indians and Egyptians were far from democratic. In the matter of the disgraceful bombing operations in Mesopotamia, William Leach, war-time conscientious objector and peace-time Under Secretary for Air, confessed in the House of Commons :—

"I cannot honestly say we have made any change in the policy of the late Government."

There are no small instalments of Socialism here. Only the encroachment of Imperialism and the assassination by its own leaders

of the Socialist Movement. *If parliament is the way of Labour's emancipation, the workers' movement should take office, resolved never to surrender the keys of office, until the social-economic system has been transformed.* This is not dictatorship but efficiency, democratic efficiency. Ramsay MacDonald and his Labour lieutenants, I.L.P. and otherwise, only played at democracy. They studiously and steadily outraged and mocked the working-class in its struggle towards freedom, and in its too trusting reliance on parliamentarism. Fascism did what the Socialist parliamentarians did not know how to do : used parliament to destroy all opposition whilst seizing power by force. In 1931, Ramsay MacDonald finally used Parliament to liquidate the Socialist Movement throughout Britain. He had been advancing to that achievement with the aid and the applause of the I.L.P. since before 1924. As is shown in the "Introduction" to my "life" of John MacLean (*"The Word" Library, 1st Series, No. 3*), that end was anticipated in the *Socialist Review* by Bruce Glasier. Not the attainment of Socialism, but the high capitalist honouring of MacDonald was foretold; and foretold accurately by a prophet who did not live to see his prophecy come true. The organised Labour Movement has marched the workers in circle formation round the fools' parade. It is the aim of the present writer to bring this inglorious folly to an end. Hence this work.

As a matter of curiosity, I retain the 1928 Foreword.

It is only fair to recognise the splendid stand made against this war by Lord Ponsonby. With the Duke of Bedford he is an outstanding enemy of war, militarism, and oppression. Ponsonby's *Falsehood in War Time* is a classic indictment of war propaganda and psychology.

War seriously affects the rights of colonial workers. If they are oppressed under capitalist peace conditions, they are oppressed even more under the peculiar condition of war. Creech Jones has made a tremendous stand in the House of Commons for the native worker.

In all references in this work to *S.P.*, Part I., without any other explanation, the reference is to *Socialism or Parliament*, which is Part I. of *Socialism and Parliament*.

As with Part I., so with this part, owing to the paper situation, it has been necessary to set the text in very small print.

GUY A. ALDRED.

Glasgow, July 1, 1942.

1928—FOREWORD

A portion of this work, entitled "*Labour in Office: A Record*" has been revised and enlarged from the pamphlet of that title, published in 1926. We have added two chapters.

The original pamphlet was translated and published in German, in July, 1927, by the *Kommunistische Arbeiter Zeitung*. Another German translation of this pamphlet was published at the same time by the *Proletarische Zeitgeist*. The translations are quite distinct in the matter of style, but the record of facts is the same. And the facts alone matter.

The other portions of this pamphlet are revised from the columns of *The Commune*.

We issue this booklet as a companion pamphlet to *Socialism or Parliament*. It adds to the indictment found in that work without repeating any of the facts. Actually the two pamphlets should be issued as one work.

We propose to follow up this work with a collection of *Essays in Anti-Parliamentarism*.

GUY A. ALDRED.

GLASGOW, December 1, 1927.

Government by Labour

I. "Labour" In Office : A Record

Ramsay MacDonald entered upon his career as Prime Minister of Great Britain on January 22, 1924. On that date he became the first "Labour" Premier of Great Britain. His Government lasted for 288 days. It was defeated in the House of Commons on October 8 and dissolved the next day. A General Election followed and Ramsay MacDonald resigned office on November 4. During its existence, the first "Socialist" Government proved itself to be an administration of pale pinks, conscious of the criminal folly of being too aggressively Socialistic, alive to the prestige of place, and sensitive to any suggestion that political position should be used as the jumping off ground for working class power and struggle. Every member of this administration knew that the price of place was the surrender of Socialist power and the negation of the class struggle.

It may be said that some members, like F. W. Jowett, made a stand for Socialist anti-militarism or expressed unhappiness at compromise, like Wheatley. The result was that such heretics were dropped by MacDonald in 1929.

Following upon the resignation of the first MacDonald administration, was the miners' struggle in 1925, and the General Strike of 1926. The workers were betrayed on the political field by the parliamentarians in 1924, and on the industrial field by the grand debacle of 1926. The parliamentary traitors thereupon inaugurated a campaign for a General Election and the return of a new Labour Government. The collapse of the first Labour Government was made an excuse for Industrial Action or so-called, and only so-called, direct action. The betrayal of direct action was made the excuse for establishing a second Labour Government. Such was the typical audacity of the careerists in the post-war years, in their pursuit of place and pelf, and their calculated destruction of the organised working-class movement, to which they owed their careers, and to which they paid so much lip-service. The tragic failure of the miners' struggle; its gross sabotage by the Trade Union General Council and its parliamentary allies; the organised callous wearing down and undermining by the official leadership of the semi-general strike; the deliberate arrestment of the spontaneous enthusiasm and solidarity of workers outside the mining industry: these were reasons for destroying Trade Unionism and Labour Parliamentarism. They were made grounds by the puerile Communist Party, the maudlin and ineffectual I.L.P., and the corrupt Labour Parliamentarians, for 100 per cent. Trade Unionism and intensified Parliamentarism. There were some differences as to the nature of its Reformisms, but it was agreed that what was wanted was a new Labour Government. Only the Second Labour Government was to be a Workers' Government: a Workers' Government functioning from Westminster, according to

these puerile Marxians, who chattered mystery from Marx, and answered experience with nonsense. It was pretended by the parliamentarians that the men, who had betrayed the workers in the hour of crisis, on the industrial field, would serve the workers devotedly and loyally, amid the temptations and corruptions of Capitalism, on the political field: which really means, in the parliamentary assembly or council of the ruling class.

The parliamentarians were assisted ably in this pretence by A. J. Cook, who owed his position as Miners' Secretary to the activities of the Communist Party on his behalf. At a time of supreme crisis, when Cook should have been challenged, the Communist Party defended him, and left his exposure to the Anti-Parliamentarians. Subsequently Cook denounced the Communist Party, and later, in April 1929, announced that the Prince of Wales had destroyed his Republicanism.

As a consequence of the Parliamentary and Reformist Socialist Activity, the Baldwin Government was defeated, and the Second Socialist Government was elected in May 1929. This Government resigned on August 24, 1931. Following a cleavage in the Labour Cabinet, which had been the subject of much acrimonious discussion, MacDonald had lengthy interviews with Baldwin and Sir Herbert Samuel. He then drove to Buckingham Palace and was reappointed Prime Minister. The National Government opened its Parliamentary proceedings on September 8, 1931, and was confirmed in office by an election on October 27 of that year. Ramsay MacDonald resigned the Premiership to Baldwin in June 1935, but continued in the Cabinet, occupying Baldwin's previous post of Lord President of the Council. His careerism had reduced the effectiveness of Labour Parliamentarism to zero. It was an epic of counter-revolutionary advance and working class sacrifice, a perfect study in cynicism, hypocrisy triumphant.

Such a sinister record cannot be allowed to pass into the forgiveness of oblivion. Anti-Parliamentarians have something to say on a question of such import to the workers, who, some day, somehow, must bring into existence a Free Society. The importance of Labour Governmentalism under Capitalism, its Socialist integrity, and its worth to the workers' struggle, are themes that the workers' democracy must discuss. Here, without dogmatism, but with perfect frankness, is what Anti-Parliamentarians have to say.

II. "His Majesty's Government"

Britain's first "Labour" Government was styled officially

"HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT.

"Formed by Rt. Hon. J. Ramsay MacDonald,

"January, 1924."

It functioned no differently from any other Capitalist Government. It functioned to defend Capitalism, Imperialism, Monarchism, to perpetuate the poverty and servitude of those who toil. It continued the foreign policy of the old Conservative regime, the policy of secret diplomacy, pacts, and intrigues. It made one symbolical departure, largely due to the character of one man, who was retired into obscurity subsequently.

Britain's Second Labour Government was styled officially

“HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT.

“ (Formed by Mr. James Ramsay MacDonald, June, 1929).”

Except in one small particular to be mentioned in a later chapter, a departure brought about by constant Anti-Parliamentarian criticism and agitation, the second Labour Government faithfully followed in the traditions of the “First Labour Government” and disturbed nothing. Whatever Socialist principles its members subscribed to, were sacrificed as a matter of course for the emoluments of office.

Every member of the Cabinet is, of necessity, a Privy Councillor. He either must have taken the Privy Councillor oath prior to becoming a member of the Cabinet or else following his appointment, but before receiving his seals of office. The Privy Councillor oath is reproduced on page 26 of *Socialism and Parliament*, the first part of this work. Having taken that oath, the Cabinet member is entitled to have “Rt. Hon.” written before his name. That most members of the Socialist Cabinet did not regard this as an empty honour is made clear in Chapter IV of *Socialism and Parliament*, dealing with “Labour in the Parliamentary Coach,” and detailing the relationship existing between His Majesty, George V, and his Labour Ministers.

III. Ramsay MacDonald and War Recruiting

After Ramsay MacDonald became Prime Minister of the Tory Coalition of 1931, it became the fashion of the Labour Parliamentarians to denounce him. But MacDonald was acting according to his own well defined traditions and the Labour Parliamentarians were wrong. Further, in no particular, were they superior to him in political integrity. Ramsay MacDonald was a true and consistent parliamentarian, and it is the function of parliamentarism to liquidate Socialism and to undermine and destroy the power of the organised Labour movement. The case for the Anarchist and the Anti-Parliamentarian conception of the part played by spontaneous action in the emancipatory struggle of the working class is emphasised by the experiences of the working class movement in Britain. During the great war of 1914-18, the organised Labour movement betrayed the workers to the shambles. After the Armistice, the organised Labour movement, promising social amelioration and even revolution, betrayed the workers into domestic Fascism, Militarism, and Imperialism, and saved the old world order of financial rottenness, misery, and intrigue.

In Chapter XIV of *Socialism and Parliament*, I have detailed the I.L.P. attitude towards Ramsay MacDonald during the years he was progressing towards his inevitable political conclusion. In 1917 he plumped for a Balfour Government, and met with no criticism from his tame I.L.P. admirers. And as late as May, 1925 (See Chapter 15, *Socialism and Parliament*), Thomas Johnston, then a member of the I.L.P., and with I.L.P. approval, eulogised Ramsay MacDonald as a Covenanter turned Prime Minister, the embodiment of liberty and vision of spirit. That eulogy was passed eight years after MacDonald had proclaimed his intention to flirt with Toryism. Johnston was anticipating his Churchillian future as a War Cabinet Minister.

It is hard to persuade the people to appreciate the true significance of Ramsay MacDonald's political attitude, because the Capitalist press conspired with MacDonald's I.L.P. admirers to pretend that during the war he was a pacifist. His attitude towards the war was evasive, but it was more useful to Capitalism than it was to Socialism. It was the attitude of a politician, who was looking to the future, but to the future as a servant of Capitalism, and not as a revolutionist. It was not the attitude of a Socialist. In this connection it may be interesting to recall a question that was discussed constantly at Socialist meetings before Ramsay MacDonald became Prime Minister.

MacDonald's I.L.P. admirers vied with his Conservative detractors in urging that he opposed recruiting for the war. John Burns, with all his faults, did oppose recruiting, and passed out of public life in consequence. Ramsay MacDonald did not. On the contrary, he allowed his name to be used in support of the war, contrary to all Socialist principle, at a Leicester recruiting meeting.

Here is the letter that Ramsay MacDonald sent to the Mayor of Leicester, as published in the *Daily Citizen*, the then official Labour paper, for September 12, 1914:

My dear Mr. Mayor,—I am very sorry indeed that I cannot be with you on Friday. My opinion regarding the causes of the war is pretty well known, except in so far as they have been misrepresented; but we are in it. It will work itself out now. Might and spirit will win, and incalculable political and social consequences will follow upon victory.

Victory, therefore, must be ours. England is not played out. Her mission is not accomplished. She can, if she would, take the place of esteemed honour among the democracies of the world, and if peace is to come with healing on her wings, the democracies of Europe must be her guardians. There should be no doubt about that.

Well, we cannot go back, nor can we turn to the right or to the left. We must go straight through. History will in due time apportion the praise and the blame, but the young men of the country must, for the moment, settle the immediate issue of victory. Let them do it in the spirit of the brave men who have crowned our country with honour in the times that are gone. Whoever may be in the wrong, men so inspired will be in the right. The quarrel was not of the people, but the end of it will be the lives and liberties of the people.

Should an opportunity arise to enable me to appeal to the pure love of country—which I know is a precious sentiment in all our hearts, keeping it clear of thoughts which I believe to be alien to real patriotism—I shall gladly take that opportunity. If need be, I shall make it for myself. I want the serious men of the Trade Union, the Brotherhood, and similar movements to face their duty. To such men it is enough to say, "England has need of you"; to say it in the right way. They will gather to her aid. They will protect her, and when the war is over they will see to it that the policies and conditions that made it will go like the mists of a plague and the shadows of a pestilence.—Yours very sincerely,

(Signed) J. RAMSAY MACDONALD.

When Ramsay MacDonald was questioned at the Glasgow Metropole meeting, on Sunday, January 9, 1921, he denied that he had sent a recruiting letter to the Mayor of Leicester, or had asked young men to fight for King and country. Here is his explanation, which proves that he had his letter to the Mayor of Leicester in mind, although he had not the courage to admit that he had written it:

I wrote a letter to the Leicester Pioneer declining to attend recruiting meetings. I said that if the nation really wanted men, all they had to do was to state its case; but that the way and the place its case was to be stated was not at inflamed recruiting meetings. I have nothing to withdraw. When war comes, it is the duty of every man to consider what is his attitude towards it. But behind the letter was this policy, that the people who were running the war were anti-national, and the drum-beating was to get people into an inflamed state of mind. Anyone who reads that letter intelligently cannot possibly miss the meaning I intended.

Anyone who reads MacDonald's letter intelligently cannot possibly miss the meaning he intended. That meaning fits in with his record

in office as a "Socialist" Prime Minister, his enforcement of the Dawes report which sped the triumph of Fascism and reaction in Germany, and his other little "Socialist" militarisms and Imperialisms.

As Prime Minister of a Capitalist Imperialist nation, Ramsay MacDonald had to uphold militarism. So did the members of his Cabinet. The following recruiting advertisement appeared in the Glasgow press, and of course similar advertisements appeared in the press of other cities, on January 19 and 20, 1931:

OH, WHY THE DEUCE SHOULD I REPINE,
AND BE AN ILL-FOREBODER?
I'M TWENTY-THREE AND FIVE FEET NINE,
I'LL GO AND BE A SODGER.

Thus wrote Robert Burns more than a century ago. Indifferent, indeed, was life in the Army in those days—yet Scotland's National Poet proposed joining. Now that conditions are so improved, surely you might follow his example.

If you are "Five Feet Nine," as Rabbie was, you are probably eligible for the Scots Guards, while for Scottish Infantry the standard is from Five Feet Two and upwards.

You can have full particulars from 139 BATH STREET, GLASGOW, or from any Recruiting Office or Drill Hall, also the booklet, "The Army of To-Day," from any Labour Exchange or Post Office.

It is not my contention that recruiting could have been avoided, although I do believe that even Capitalism could make an effort to overcome the menace of war. My argument is that Ramsay MacDonald, if a Socialist, had no right to be at the head of a Government that had to build up and preserve a Capitalist army. The advertisement was a typical Labour effort. It dragged in the genius and influence of Robert Burns to further an end with which the living Burns had little or nothing in common. Burns did not mean his poem to serve a recruiting purpose. It is an expression of mood, a mood of despair, a cameo of life itself. Its militaristic use is an outrage and a blasphemy against genius. Only a Labour Government could have committed such an unforgiveable sin.

Recruiting for the army is war recruiting for Capitalism. MacDonald and his Cabinet knew that this was the case. Socialist parliamentarism accepts the Imperialist fact of war and Empire. How then can this be the way of Labour struggle and emancipation and the end of that rampage of murder, called war and glory?

The lesson of the 1914-18 war period, and of the subsequent rise of parliamentary Socialism to worthless and treacherous honour, should be taken to heart by every thinking worker. Socialism has been halted by the triumph of parliamentarism. Reaction has triumphed for one knows not how long. Although, finally, the workers will free themselves, what sane man or woman wishes to see them live through years of travail? To avert the further negation of Socialism, it is necessary for all Socialists to broadcast the lesson of Labour's parliamentary experience.

Ramsay MacDonald followed in the footsteps of John Burns but outpaced him. Let the workers take stock, ere their struggle turns to a burlesque or a tragedy.

IV. Reparations

No Socialist can support the policy of reparations. It is no part of the workers' business to administer Capitalist society. Reparations is not administering even Capitalist society. It is reducing that society to a riot of reaction and an orgy of murder. It is to destroy all pretence of democracy and constitutionalism. To pursue reparations is to justify Capitalist war and to canonise its consequences. Because he was afraid to come to grips with the crime of reparations in 1924, Ramsay MacDonald had to embrace Fascism in 1931. The policy of reparations destroyed the Labour movement in Europe and finally collapsed the Labour movement in Britain. Had the parliamentary Socialists possessed the courage even to oppose reparations, the course of history would have changed completely, and Fascism would have been checked.

In November, 1923, the I.L.P. issued "The Socialist Programme," embodying the policy of those who became later the leaders of the Labour Government. This programme declared:

Socialists [meaning the Labour Government] would immediately call an International Conference to deal with the problems of Europe and the world, not from the point of view of victors or of vanquished, but of world needs. They would forgo all claims to reparations, and would indicate their willingness to cancel the Allied debts as part of an all-round settlement.

And the official Election Programme of the Labour Party, published in the "Daily Herald" for November 19, 1923, pledged the coming Labour Government to:

The immediate calling by the British Government of an International Conference (including Germany on terms of equality) to deal with the revision of the Versailles Treaty, especially reparations and debts. . . .

Did the Labour Government repudiate the Versailles Treaty?

Within a month of becoming Premier, MacDonald published an exchange of correspondence with Poincare, the French Premier, on the subject of reparations and the occupation of the Ruhr. MacDonald said nothing against the Versailles Treaty, but only complained mildly that Poincare inclined to break it. For example:

It is widely felt in England that, contrary to the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles, France, etc.

Subsequently MacDonald disavowed an incautious statement made by Arthur Henderson, that no settlement of Europe was thinkable without a revision of the Treaty. And the matter dropped.

In May, 1924, the Exports' Report, begun under Baldwin, was published. MacDonald refused to take any action on the reparations question until it was completed. This report was merely the completed and thoroughly efficient edition of the Versailles Treaty. MacDonald endorsed it and insisted on its adoption by the Inter-Allied Conference on Reparations.

The Labour Leaders gave up talking about the Reparations crime and the need to revise the Treaty of Versailles. They were satisfied to continue the Capitalist Imperial War Reparations foreign policy of Lloyd George, Bonar Law, Stanley Baldwin, and Lord Curzon.

When German Chancellors pleaded for consideration, none was shown. And so each Chancellor fell. German Social Democracy passed

and Hindenberg paved the way for Hitler. Kaiserism had passed, to be replaced by Nazism or Fascist "Socialism!" Ramsay MacDonald's policy, unrepudiated by the Labour Parliamentarians, contributed to the inauguration of the Fascist Corporate (or Slave) State.

V. German Social Democracy

Some space has been devoted to the story of the assassination of the German Revolution in "For Communism," and it is not necessary to repeat that account in the present work. It is essential to record, however, that just as Ramsay MacDonald did not have the heart to do battle with British Imperialism, so German Social Democracy, during the same period, declined to join issue with German Imperialism. In both countries, simultaneously, parliamentarism gave Socialism a national funeral.

In December, 1924, the Social Democratic parliamentary leaders of Germany cited Hindenburg's praise of their loyalty to Capitalism and boasted of the aid they gave the Kaiser. They denied they led the workers in the war-strike of 1918, and confessed they were known as "the strike stranglers." And they did this on oath in the German High Courts. The occasion was the libel action brought by President Ebert, the Social Democrat successor to the Kaiser, against a Nationalist paper for reprinting a Bavarian Fascist attack upon him, accusing him of "high treason."

Philipp Scheidemann, one of Ebert's Majority Socialist colleagues on the Strike Committee, told how the entire executive board of the social-democratic party betrayed the workers by voting against support of the striking munitions workers in 1918, and urging the German workers not to disobey the conscription laws. Scheidemann denied that he and Ebert led the German workers in the 1918 munitions strike and declared himself an upholder of the ruling class.

He described the misery of the German people and their bitter discontent at the continuance and the failure of the Reichstag to consider the peace resolution, and added:

The strike broke out without our knowledge. When our own people asked us and not before, we joined the Strike Committee with the firm intention of putting a speedy end to the strike by negotiating with the Government. There was a great deal of opposition against us in the Strike Committee; we were known as "the strike stranglers. . . ." If we had not joined the Strike Committee something much worse would have happened. We should not be sitting here to-day.

In this country, Thomas and his treacherous colleagues of the Trade Union General Council adopted the same attitude. Parliamentarism everywhere means continued misery and perpetuated carnage for the working-class.

Gustav Bauer, ex-Social Democratic Chancellor, or Prime Minister, stated that he joined the strike committee to put an end to the strike as soon as possible.

Fritz Ebert, heard in commission at the official presidential residence, declared on oath that he, with other members of the Central Committee of the Socialist Party, joined the direction of the strike in agreement with the Government, and with the definite object of bringing about a resumption of work at the earliest possible moment.

Ebert read a letter from the Arch-War Lord, subsequent President, Von Hindenburg, addressing Ebert as :

a true German, and that you love your Fatherland above everything. . . . It is with this in mind that I have allied myself with you to save our people from the threatened catastrophe. . . .

That catastrophe was the Social Revolution. In the face of such a recommendation what more could be said in the way of testimony to the loyalty of the parliamentarians to the German plunderbund and their treachery to the German working-class? Obviously, the war-aims of these people no more mattered to labour than that of their British confreres. Obviously, alike in Germany and in Britain, parliamentarism laboured to betray Socialism, and to prepare the way for Fascism.

VI. The League of Governments

Following his elevation to the premiership, Ramsay MacDonald set aside all pretence of believing in the Labour movement, and proceeded to eulogise and to place his faith in the League of Nations. MacDonald knew that this wonderful facade but masked a League of Governments functioning on behalf of Capitalism. No one has expounded this truth more clearly than Ramsay MacDonald. The alleged Socialist and Labour members who pin their faith to the League of Nations are deceiving themselves and betraying the workers. The League of Nations is not even a League of Peace. It is a League of War, a menace to the workers as a class, and a menace to the peace of the world. Even in his role as a British statesman, Ramsay MacDonald should have left the League of Nations alone.

In 1916 Ramsay MacDonald regarded the League of Nations with suspicions. He objected to it in the "Labour Leader" for December 14 of that year. He said it would be composed of persons with diverse aims, men who ought to be in opposite camps, whose "coming together into one is not a guarantee or even a promise of effective action, but quite the opposite." Phrases like "We are opposed to war," "War is hell," he denounced as empty.

The second objection of Mr MacDonald was that :

This armed League of Nations' check (on the actions of Governments) is so simple, so accommodating to every existing interest and tradition, so acceptable on its face to militarist and pacifist, to Jingo and Little Englander, to warrior and arbitrationist, that its very all-things-to-all-men aspect is of itself enough to make it suspect to those who have any determination to strike militarism at the root, and not merely to prune it. A political order from which war issues as an inevitable offspring has to be destroyed before we have satisfactory guarantees of peace.

Quite so ; although we would prefer to say an economic rather than political order. That is why we insist on Commonweal as the only hope of the workers and proclaim parliamentarism to be an illusion. MacDonald, by playing the League of Nations game had gone back on this Socialist declaration, and found that he was not able even to prune militarism.

Consider his later attitude and these words from his former excellent article criticising the League, written when the Czar was still on his throne, and the Russian Revolution was unthought of :

If this war ends with a League of Nations to Enforce Peace—a vain and grandiloquent title which shows that, from our Socialist point of view, at any rate, the promoters and godfathers of the movement do not even know what peace means—its result in this respect is to be of a most meagrely pauper kind,

If it ends without having sown the seeds of the destruction of all the governing castes of Europe, it will be like a child's castle built on the wet sands at low tide. The waters will return, and nothing will be left to show where it was.

Is not this the case against Labour Governmentalism and Parliamentarism? Could MacDonald have refuted the logic or denied the import of his own words? If not, why did he ever become "Labour" Premier?

MacDonald's third point against the League was that :

the control of the League will be in the hands of the men who have controlled us hitherto. . . . They are not to abandon their methods, their traditions, their conceptions of policy. The logic of the League under such circumstances does not preclude alliances of States within it, rival camps within it, whereas its very essence presupposes that no such thing can happen. It supposes that the recalcitrant State will be tabooed by the others, whereas the most likely thing to happen is that one-half the League will go one way and the other the other way. Another possibility is that a League which unites governing authorities of the European States will be an anti-democratic holy alliance. America being in it would not make a particle of difference.

This brought MacDonald to his final objection that the war :

proves the necessity of ending for ever the international political system of Europe, and putting in its place a system based upon democratic control, open diplomacy, and the internationalism of our Socialism.

Instead of which—but preserve the portraits of the Labour Ministers in their Court clothes, Ramsay MacDonald and Stephen Walsh in their cocked hats, gallantly bearing their toy swords, and study the late Ramsay MacDonald's diplomatic gestures! Consider MacDonald's innumerable pacts and conferences! Consider the pressure put on the Soviet Union to compel it to enter the League of Nations! And then—hearken to the beating of the war-drums, the discordant sound that Tannahill hated!

VII. Disarmament

This subject, as also the items treated of in later chapters of this work, relating to phases of militarism and war, are discussed in "At Grips With War" (1st Ed., 1929. 2nd Ed., 1932). In Chapter VIII., a very full report is published of the debate that took place in the House of Commons on March 17, 1924, on a vote to abolish the standing army. That debate revealed with admirable clearness the mind of "Socialist" ministers on the subject. Out of place, and en route to place even, the "Socialist" enthusiasm for Capitalist militarism was less marked.

On June 28, 1923, the I.L.P. moved an official resolution at the Labour Party Conference, in favour of voting against all military and naval estimates.

In "The Socialist Programme" it was stated, officially, that British Socialists, if they had the opportunity, would :

take the initiative in making positive proposals for immediate universal disarmament.

Philip Snowden, in his "If Labour Rules," 1923, said :

A Labour Government would work for an international agreement for a general reduction of armaments, leading to universal disarmament.

The election manifesto was more cautious. It called for a policy of international co-operation through a strengthened League of Nations and the revision of the Versailles Treaty, which would :

pave the way for disarmament, the only security for the nations.

Within a month of its formation, the Labour Government announced that five cruisers and two destroyers would be laid down "*purely for purposes of replacement.*"

On March 19, 1924, Premier MacDonald said :

We have placed first and foremost the needs of the Navy and the need for replacement.

This was endorsed by Philip Snowden, the Labour Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had said in the House of Commons before he dreamt of becoming a Cabinet Minister :

June 1913.—The Army and Navy do not exist to protect working people.

March 18, 1924.—Practical proof should be given that something will be done to reduce naval expenditure.

And in February, 1915, Snowden had also declared against recruiting, with the emphatic statement :

I refuse to ask any young man to sacrifice his life for me.

The announcement concerning the five cruisers was made by C. G. Ammon, the Financial Secretary to the Admiralty, who had been a conscientious objector during the war but claimed exemption from military service on trade union grounds, *and voted for the death penalty for soldiers in April, 1924.*

VIII. Army Annual Bill

"The Labour Year Book," 1924, pp. 121-127, chapter IV., "Labour in Parliament. The House of Commons, 1922-23," says :

Army Annual Bill.—On the Committee stage of this Bill the party kept up an all-night struggle, the House rising at noon on the following day. Amendments were moved for the abolition of the death penalty, for setting up Courts of Appeal, giving a recruit a right to indicate his unwillingness to do duty in case of a trade dispute, etc.

When the Army Annual Bill was introduced by the Labour Government in 1924, the very Whips who had "told" for these amendments in 1923 now told against them. The very Labour Front Bench that had fought for these amendments, when they were in opposition, now resisted them on the ground that they would interfere with Army Discipline and so undermine the Empire. The Labour Secretary of State for War, who voted against the death penalty, for example, in 1923, 1925, and 1926, declared, in 1924, that, to resist the death penalty was to undermine military discipline, and that the death penalty was never executed in time of war and was merely a nominal business.

So shocking was this *volte face* that Thomas Johnston, then representing West Stirlingshire, said :

For the life of me, I cannot see how the attitude towards a condemned man suddenly becomes wrong when we cross the floor of the House.

An Hon. Member.—Wait till you are on the Front Bench.

T. Johnston.—If I change my views because I go on to any Front Bench, then I shall lay myself open, and justly so, to the taunt that I am making now.

It must be acknowledged that Johnston kept his word. At a later date he did sit on the Front Bench and he did vote for the abolition of the Death Penalty. That story is related in another chapter. It does not exonerate the Labour Government of 1924, the attitude of which towards the control of the Armed Forces merits a section to itself.

Nothing exposes more completely the hypocrisy of Labour Parliamentarism, in office and out, than the conduct of F. A. Broad, who sat as Labour member for Edmonton in the 1924 Parliament. In 1923 he voted to respect the right of the soldier to refuse to serve against members of his own class in an industrial dispute. He voted for it also in 1925 and 1926. But he voted against it in 1924—the same amendment and the same words—on the ground (*sic*) that it implied that soldiers should be specially enlisted for the specific purpose of being employed to aid the civil power in a trade dispute.

IX. "Controlling" the Armed Forces

The case for parliamentarism is based on the argument that "Labour" must control the armed forces, and that this can be done only through the use of the parliamentary machine. In this chapter it is seen how the first "Labour" Government controlled the Armed Forces.

On Wednesday, April 2, 1924, the House of Commons considered, in Committee, the Army and Air Force Annual Bill. Replying to Baldwin, leader of the Tory Opposition, at the commencement of the debate, Clynes in his position of Lord Privy Seal and Deputy Leader of the House of Commons, said that there was an unusually large number of amendments *and that the Government would oppose them*. Later in the night he asked that the amendments be dealt with on their merits, regardless of their source, and not to be viewed as party questions. He explained:

They are not Liberal or Labour or Conservative. We are considering the position of the National Army: this is the Army (Annual) Bill, and I suggest that all parties in the House have a joint and equal responsibility.

It is unusual that the supporters of the Government—if that is the correct term to use—have been so lavish in placing amendments on the paper, but there it is.

Note the sneer, which implied that all Labour members ought to have upheld, willy-nilly, the Government in its complacent routine attitude on this vital question of militarism—and absolute unqualified militarism at that—dull mediocre acceptance of all things established exactly as established.

The amendments of which Clynes complained were:

- (1) The abolition of the death penalty, substituting penal servitude.
- (2) The right of any member of H.M. Forces sentenced to death by Court Martial to appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal.
- (3) The right of a soldier to refuse to take duty in connection with trade disputes, unless he has signed a statement declaring his willingness to do so.
- (4) The enlistment age to be raised to twenty-one and all young persons discovered to have enlisted before that age to be discharged to their homes.
- (5) No officer, warrant officer, non-commissioned officer, or soldier to be compelled to attend church parades or religious service.

The last amendment was moved by a Liberal, E. Brown. The others were moved by Labour Members as follows :

- | | |
|-------------|--------------|
| 1. Thurtle. | 3. Lansbury. |
| 2. Maxton. | 4. Ayles. |

The Government opposed all the amendments, and put on their official tellers, B. C. Spoor and Frederick Hall. The amendments were defeated in consequence as follows :

1. For 136; Against 207.
2. For 120; Against 193.
3. For 67; Against 236.
4. Negatived without division.
5. For 114; Against 164.

Many Liberal members consistently voted for the amendments. Many Labour members consistently voted against them. Such is the farce of parliamentarism.

S. Walsh, Secretary of State for War, following Clynes, stated, at the beginning of the debate, he would not accept any of the amendments. They were of a far-reaching character, and the Government had decided to ask the Army Council, along with representatives of the other fighting forces, to go into the whole question of service and report to the Cabinet during the ensuing year.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Samuel Hoare.—Personally I am very much relieved to hear the Government are going to resist, with the Government Whips, the very subversive amendments on the paper.

Pringle reminded the Government that a year before, on April 1, 1923, a very long discussion took place on the question of employing the military in aid of the civil power at times of trade disputes. At that time many hon. members now sitting on the Government benches protested that the discussion was closed by the Ministers of that day.

Thurtle.—As there is an amendment standing in my name, I would just like to explain that I cannot possibly accept the proposed Committee as an alternative to moving my amendment. There could not be found a body less in touch with the people and the rank and file of the army than the Army Council.

Pringle was glad that Mr Thurtle had entered his protest against the constitution of the Committee. The proper people to make the enquiry were not those tied to the views held in the services, and could not bring an open mind to bear on the question.

Walsh.—When hon. Members speak of the Army Council, they seem to conceive an institution which is purely military. That is not the case. One-half of the Army Council consists of civilians—

Ayles.—Connected with the War Office.

Walsh.—There is a civil side and a military side, and it is quite wrong to refer to the Army Council as a purely military organisation, a body of obscurantists whose minds cannot possibly be open to the more democratic or progressive views that are, I suppose, specially associated with certain hon. Members of this House.

Later in the evening on the fifth amendment, this reference to the Army Council came up.

Captain Benn protested that the Army Council and the Air Council had nothing to do with a man's religious conscience and that the amendment did not affect discipline in the Army. The House of Commons had the right to decide the question.

But Walsh insisted that the clause affected discipline in the Army and must be resisted by the Labour Government.

The same subservience to ideas of discipline and militarism marked the disgraceful evasions and hypocrisy of the Labour Treasury Benches in the discussion of a proposal from Sir C. Yate, to establish an independent tribunal of three officers, either serving or retired, to consider the grievance of any officer and to report as to questions of law and fact. Walsh promised a full investigation and Duncan Graham and Neil MacLean objected to the class-attitude of the "Labour" Government in the matter.

Mr. McLean.—Will the Committee which the right hon. gentleman proposes to set up be composed entirely of officers? . . . I want to ask the Secretary of State if the privates are going to be properly and directly represented . . . by representatives of themselves?

The Chairman rose to put the question.

MacLean.—On a point of order. I want to ask the Secretary of State whether he is prepared to give an answer to this.

Walsh.—It is proposed by the hon. Member to have a person representing the private soldier. The Army Council does possess a private soldier in the Financial Secretary, the Member for Chester-le-Street (Mr. Lawson).

MacLean.—By accident.

Walsh.—He is not a private soldier by accident. He is on the Army Council, and he will represent in the fullest sense the interests of the private soldier.

This statement was *a lie*. Lawson was *not* a private soldier. He had been a private soldier. He was *not* on the Army Council *as a private soldier but as an M.P.*, and a Member of the Government. *An entirely different proposition.*

Thurtle moved the first amendment. He made the palpable hit:

In moving this new Clause I am happy to think that an amendment in precisely similar terms was moved last year by the Financial Secretary to the War Office. If the discussion is said to be academic now, it was no less academic then.

Maxton moved the second amendment. B. Turner, supporting it, maintained that people whose lives are at stake should have the right of the furthest possible appeal. This right ought to be given by a Labour Ministry. They ought not to place their supporters in the awful position of voting against them on the proposition.

Major Attlee, interrupting, said the Government could not accept the proposal because it would narrow the appeal to points of law.

T. Johnston stated that the amendment should be supported by the Government and by the whole House. Johnston added:

I trust that the Government—the Front Bench who supported this Amendment a year ago—will accept it now.

Lansbury moved the third Amendment:

I would like to say this is an Amendment to the Army Act that has been moved on a considerable number of occasions by members of the party to which I belong. I am not going to find fault with the hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Bench, who have a perfect right to consider that they must take a different line to that which they took previously. We all have that right, but I think the time ought to come when in this House we not only have the right, but the freedom to say and vote for what we actually believe. I think one of the faults of the system under which affairs are managed in this House is that men, when they accept office, are expected immediately to change their attitude towards great public questions.

Ayles moved the fourth amendment. He protested against boys being enticed in to the Army and argued that the franchise age should also be the age at which men should be deemed fit to take the tremendous judgment as to whether they desired to serve in the Army or not.

Mr Walsh said the proposal would destroy one-half of the Army recruiting material, which is gained from men between the ages of 18 and 19. Under no circumstances could the Government or any Government accept such an Amendment.

The following Labour members voted consistently against all five amendments: Rt. Hon. Wm. Adamson, Ammon, Attlee, Margaret Bondfield, James Brown, Clarke, Cluse, Clynes, Gosling, Greenall, A. Greenwood, Haden Guest, Vernon Hartshorn, Hayday, Rt. Hon. A. Henderson, Frank Hodges, Leach, Lunn, M'Entree, Romeril, J. Stewart, J. Sullivan, J. H. Thomas, J. J. Tinker, Walsh, Watts-Morgan, Sidney Webb, and the tellers, B. Spoor and F. Hall.

In addition to these, the following Labour members, whilst not resisting all five amendments, did vote against Lansbury's amendment to allow a soldier the right to refuse to take duty in industrial disputes: Alexander, Broad, Charleton, Church, Crittall, Evan Davies, R. J. Davies, J. E. Davison, Gavan Duffy, Sir P. Hastings, A. Henderson, junr., W. W. Henderson, W. Jenkins, Law, Lawson, Middleton, Nixon, Parkinson, Perry, Richards, R. Richardson, F. O. Roberts, Snell. *This means 52 Labour members voted against a soldier's right to refuse to shoot down his fellow-workers.*

Only 51 members voted consistently for all the amendments. Some of those who voted for Lansbury's amendment voted for the compulsory church parade, for death, and against the soldier's right of appeal. Some who voted sanely on these matters voted against Lansbury's amendment. Thus Labour in place had no policy and pursued the path of capitalist reaction functioning as capital interests required. "Labour" controlled the armed forces—in the interests of capitalism, priestcraft, and militarism.

If this debate meant anything at all, it was the hopeless character of parliamentarism. Before the parliamentarians move, the workers must move. The elected persons but follow the electing ones. Which means that the streets must educate the gutter. To be emancipated, Labour must agitate, organise, act, and function outside of Parliament.

X. Voters for Barbarism

"Forward," the Glasgow organ of Parliamentarism, commenced the publication of a Scottish Diary in its issue for August 14, 1926. Subsequently the entire diary was published in pamphlet form. No. 4 of this diary was published in "Forward" for September 4, 1926. We reproduce its title and one portion of the diary verbatim, as follows—that listing the M.P.'s who voted for the Death Penalty.

(Reprinted exactly from "Forward.")

UNDER THE PROFITEERS.

A SOCIALIST DIARY FOR 1926.

APRIL.

THE DEATH PENALTY.

21/4/26.—House of Commons votes by 269 to 123 in favour of retaining Death Penalty in the Army.

Among the members in favour of retaining this barbarous "punishment" were:—

Here followed a list of 26 Tory Members who had voted for the Death Penalty.

We parallel this 1926 diary with the following 1924 record :

(Compiled exactly from Hansard.)

UNDER THE ANTI-PROFITEERS.

A SOCIALIST DIARY FOR 1924.

APRIL.

THE DEATH PENALTY.

2/4/24.—House of Commons votes by 207 to 136 in favour of retaining Death Penalty in the Army.

Among the members in favour of retaining this barbarous "punishment" were :—

W. Adamson (Fife).
W. M. Adamson (Cannock).
C. G. Ammon.
Major G. R. Attlee.
Margaret Bondfield.
James Brown (Ayr and Bute).
W. S. Cluse.
J. R. Clynes.
C. Duncan.
Harry Gosling.
Vernon Hartshorn.
A. Hayday.
Tom Kennedy.

W. Lunn.
J. Potts.
A. Short.
J. Sullivan.
J. H. Thomas.
J. Tinker.
C. P. Trevelyan.
Stephen Walsh.
John Wheatley.
C. H. Wilson.
W. Wright.
Fred Hall (Normanton).
Ben Spoor (Leeds).*

All "Labour" Members.

* Tellers for the Death Penalty.

So much for the Socialist Diary!

The "Forward" list contains the names of Tories who voted in favour of the Death Penalty in 1926, the Tories being in office!

Our parallel contains the names of the Labour M.P.s who voted in favour of the Death Penalty in 1924, the Labour Party being in office.

It does not exhaust the names of the Labour M.P.s who voted for the Death Penalty. It includes only the names of those members who were Johnston's colleagues in the House in 1924, and again in 1926, when he compiled his vote-catching diary.

Curiously enough, the Rt. Hon. Arthur Henderson is reported as voting in both lobbies in this division!

Frank Hodges, the "Red" Miners' leader of 1920, also voted for the death penalty!

Quite a galaxy of Labour "talent" voted for the Death Penalty!

Then where was the point of the "Forward" diary? Where the point of its black list?

When the Devil is ill,
The Devil a saint would be;
When the Devil is well,
The devil a saint is he!

Labour was out of office! Labour wanted office! Johnston had no guarantee that the next Labour Government would act as did the Labour Government of 1924—secure the passage of the Death Penalty on soldiers! It is quite true on April 3, 1930, the second Labour Government took its stand for the Abolition of the Death Penalty in certain cases. Thurtle wanted to remove the death penalty for desertion as well as for cowardice. Shaw, who was Secretary for

War, held that the death penalty ought to be inflicted on the man who deliberately does something which endangers the lives of his comrades and the welfare of the Forces in the Field. The death penalty ought *not* to be inflicted on a man whose condition owing to the circumstances in which he has been living is such that he is not responsible for his actions. Shaw's proposal for the abolition of the death penalty for cowardice in action was carried by 288 against 165. The House of Lords resisted this proposal, and the Government rejected the Lords' attitude, and maintained its position on April 16, 1930.

There can be no doubt that the incessant propaganda of the Anti-Parliamentarians made the parliamentarians ashamed of the 1924 Death Penalty voting. Even so the 1930 attitude was a very tame advance and certainly did not justify Johnston's 1926 pamphlet and indictment of Toryism. His personal attitude towards the death penalty was correct, but the attitude of his colleagues was unforgivable.

XI. Military Strike-Breaking

In August, 1924, Walsh, as Labour War Secretary, signed an Army Order, under the Royal Warrant, establishing the Transport (Army) Reserve.

After this Order had been signed, negotiations took place between the Army Authorities and certain employees in the transport industry, as a result of which "attestation" forms were drawn up by the Army Authorities. These forms definitely declared that the army reserve could be used for striking-breaking purposes under certain circumstances condition by Royal Proclamation.

The form which recruits to the Transport Reserve were asked to sign was issued in October, 1926, a month before the MacDonald Government resigned.

The binding clauses of the form read as follows:—

Are you aware that you are liable in case of imminent national danger or great emergency, when the Army Reserve or any part of it is called out by Proclamation, to be called out on permanent service under Colours in the United Kingdom, or elsewhere, until otherwise ordered?

Are you aware that if so called you will then become a soldier of the Regular Forces, and will be liable to be retained for service with the Colours for the unexpired portion of your term of service in the Supply Reserve, and for a further period not exceeding 12 months during the continuance of the emergency?

Whilst serving in the Supplementary Reserve you will not, without your consent, be called upon to perform any military duty or training, unless you are called out on permanent service with the Colours at a time when the whole, or any part, of the Army Reserve is called out by Proclamation, in which case you will then become a soldier of the Regular Forces.

In a special statement published in the *Daily Herald* for January 15, 1925, Walsh admitted that this attestation form did not appear to *him* to go outside the terms of the Royal Warrant and Army Order he had signed.

Walsh explained that, in answering Major Williams, on March 12, 1924, in the House of Commons, he had explained

the fact that skilled tradesmen are required for the Regular Army is advertised regularly in the London morning and evening newspapers and in the provincial daily, evening and weekly newspapers. In addition, copies of a leaflet, entitled Opportunities in His Majesty's Army, which sets forth the trades required by the Army, are available at post offices throughout the United Kingdom, and copies of the booklet, The Army and What It Offers to Skilled Tradesmen, can be seen in almost all working men's clubs and public libraries.

In other words, the MacDonald Government rejoiced in recruiting cannon-fodder and striking-breaking military material under the specious pretence of patriotic efficiency, in order to prove that *Labour could govern* capitalist society, in capitalism's interests.

XII. The Air Ministry

Lord Thomson was Secretary for Air in Ramsay MacDonald's 1924 Government. Subsequently he lost his life in the famous airship disaster in France.

Speaking at the London Labour Women's Summer School, at Guildford, on July 15, 1927, he expressed his opinion on the work of the Ministry of which he had charge in 1924. Thomson was very enthusiastic about the "reckless young devils" between the ages of 15 and 16 recruited for the Royal Air Force, and said, "they would break their necks on the road if they did not do it in aeroplanes." He was also very anxious about Britain's "dangerously small" Army, but thought there would elapse at least ten years of peace and hoped that Britain would turn those years to good account!

To good account! Good account for what? For preparation of war! For disaster!

Writing to the "Sunday Times" for June 19, 1927, Sir Leo Chiozza Money, anticipating the idiocy of Thomson's remarks, and answering him in anticipation, dealt with the question of the boys who are burnt to death in military aeroplanes:

For what purpose do the boys perish? . . . The main purpose is to bomb civilian populations out of their wits. Aviation means war on non-combatants; war on old men, boys, girls, women, and infants in arms. It is the nearest thing to Hell which has yet been practically invented. That gallant boys should be burned to death in peace is mournful enough. That they should be burnt in learning how to do revolting things is surely the limit of unreason.

How came it that Thomson, with his admiration for "the reckless young devils," quite a bourgeois conception, and his view of Britain's "dangerously small" Army was ever Secretary for Air in the first Labour Government?

Not long after the resignation of the First Labour Government, Lord Thomson addressed a meeting of the Central Asian Society. The exact date of his address was November 21, 1924, and the speech was reported in *The Times* the following day. Read the following excerpt:

Lord Thomson brought home to his audience the effectiveness of bombing by describing the manner in which the recent Wahibi invasion of Transjordan was crushed. "The tribesmen," he said, "had suddenly marched upon Amman. The British forces consisted solely of aeroplanes sent out at the shortest possible notice, backed by armoured cars. The effect of our air attack was appalling. Some 700 of the tribesmen were killed and the rest, seized with panic, fled into the desert, where hundreds must have perished from thirst.

Eleven years later, William Leach, who was Under-Secretary for Air in the Labour Government and a conscientious objector during the great war, endeavoured to justify the use of bombing aeroplanes by declaring that he had "the satisfaction of remembering that they achieved their purpose of intimidation without loss of a single human life."

Reference has been made in this work to Chapter VIII. of *At Grips With War*. In that chapter a report is made of the speech delivered by Under-Secretary William Leach, in his official capacity, in the House of Commons, on Tuesday, March 11, 1924. Leach's almost lyrical defence of the "cleanness" of the Air-force, and Sir Samuel Hoare's congratulations of the Labour Government on its air defence are quoted at length. Let the sincere Socialist study Leach's speech and Hoare's comments for himself.

There is no need to repeat the discussion in the present work.

Sir Samuel Hoare returned to the question later.

When Under-Secretary Leach moved the Air-Supplementary estimate on May 28, 1924, the following discussion occurred:

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Samuel Hoare.—I am sure the Committee has listened with interest to the speech of the Under-Secretary of State for Air, and at any rate on this side, we have noticed the progress that the hon. Gentleman has made and that has brought him to-day into this atmosphere of full-blooded Imperialism. . . . If we compare his first speech with his speech on the Estimates, and again his speech to-day, we see a very remarkable progress.

Lieut.-Commander Kenworthy.—Not progress!

Sir S. Hoare.—And to-day he comes before us, not only as a full-blooded Imperialist, but as a full-blooded militarist as well. He is going to do what I never should have ventured to do . . . asking hon. Members to agree to the building of a military airship by direct labour for his Government, . . . the construction of military airships . . . were abandoned at the end of the war, and until the Socialist Government came here, with the hon. Member as their spokesman, no one had any idea of reverting to it.

The Labour Government resigned on November 4, 1924, and six days later Sir Samuel Hoare spoke at the London Guildhall banquet as Air Minister. He paid this tribute to the Labour Government:

The citizens of London can rest assured that the air defence of these shores is substantially better than it was twelve months ago, and that in twelve months' time it will be better still.

Not only Leach, but MacDonald, at that time supported by the I.L.P., and Wheatley, who later led the Clyde back-benchers and was the intellect of the Clyde I.L.P., were responsible for this policy. I.L.P. ex-conscientious objectors were members of a Cabinet and Ministry that developed Britain's Capitalist air-defence—which means, also, a continuous policy of air offence.

This continuity of Imperial Defence, and of Capitalist foreign policy, implied that the Labour Government had no wish to disturb the State machinery of Capitalism.

Writing in the *Sunday Express*, for November 9, 1924, Charles G. Ammon, ex-conscientious objector, and Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty in the 1924 Labour Government, wrote:

It would not be an exaggeration to say that the relations between his Majesty and Mr. MacDonald were cordial. . . . Save for the difference likely to arise from differing social circles, so far as I can gather the relationship between the Crown and the Labour Government did not differ in any respect from that of any other Government. Turning to the more personal aspect, no one who came in touch with King George could fail to be agreeably impressed by his wide general knowledge of men and women and of current events. . . . There is not a member of the late Government who does not leave with an added respect for King George, or with greater appreciation of his value as a chief executive officer of State.

In the year of Christian grace, 1924, this sort of mock sentimental loyalty to the Capitalist state and monarchy, was termed parliamentary Socialism. The common people were asked to vote for it on the ground that, it was Labour's struggle to capture political power!

XIII. Russia

There was nothing particularly Socialist about Ramsay MacDonald's recognition of the Soviet Union. Russia received full diplomatic recognition by several avowedly Capitalist governments during MacDonald's first term of office as Labour Premier. Yet MacDonald only extended a partial recognition to the Soviet, and that under pressure, and for definite capitalist purposes.

During 1924, the Soviet Union was recognised by the following powers besides Great Britain: Italy, Norway, Austria, Sweden, Denmark, Greece, France. These powers stipulated against subversive activities and made reservations concerning property rights. None was more emphatic on this point than Britain, under the presiding genius of MacDonald.

The Socialist Programme promised that a Labour Government

Would recognise and establish friendly relations with Russia, and energetically develop trade with her ;

Would recognise the Soviet Government and give extensive credits for reopening European trade.

And the Labour Election Manifesto declared for :

Resumption of free economic and diplomatic relations with Russia.

Instead of sending an Ambassador to Moscow, as these declarations implied, the Labour Government appointed only a chargé d'affaires.

Also, at the Anglo-Soviet Conference, MacDonald declared that his object in entering the Conference was to secure justice for British traders, bondholders, and private persons with claims against Russia. He demanded: Repayment of pre-war debts, with interest since 1914; payment of war debts; compensation to all individuals who suffered loss or personal injury during the Revolution; full compensation for all former owners of property in Russia which was nationalised!

Ramsay MacDonald was still Premier when the British Foreign Office addressed the appended amazing letter to Rakovsky, subsequently exiled by Stalinism, but at that time the Soviet Representative in Britain;

Foreign Office, Oct. 24, 1924.

Sir,—I have the honour to invite your attention to the enclosed copy of a letter which has been received by the Central Committee of the British Communist Party from the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, over the signature of M. Zinoviev, its President, dated September 15. The letter contains instructions to British subjects to work for the violent overthrow of existing institutions in this country, and for the subversion of his Majesty's armed forces as a means to that end.

2. It is my duty to inform you that his Majesty's Government cannot allow this propaganda and must regard it as a direct interference from outside in British domestic affairs.

3. No one who understands the constitution and the relationships of the Communist International will doubt its intimate connexion and contact with the Soviet Government. No Government will ever tolerate an arrangement with a foreign Government by which the latter is in formal diplomatic relations of a correct kind with it, whilst at the same time a propagandist body organically connected with that foreign Government encourages and even orders subjects of the former to plot and plan revolutions for its overthrow. Such conduct is not only a grave departure from the rules of international comity, but a violation of specific and solemn undertakings repeatedly given to his Majesty's Government.

4. So recently as June 4 of last year the Soviet Government made the following solemn agreement with his Majesty's Government:—

“The Soviet Government undertakes not to support with funds or in any other form persons or bodies or agencies or institutions whose aim is to spread discontent or to foment rebellion in any part of the British Empire. . . . and to impress upon its officers and officials the full and continuous observance of these conditions.”

5. Moreover, in the Treaty which his Majesty's Government recently concluded with your Government, still further provision was made for the faithful execution of an analogous undertaking which is essential to the existence of good and friendly relations between the two countries. His Majesty's Government mean that these undertakings shall be carried out both in the letter and in the spirit, and it cannot accept the contention that whilst the Soviet Government undertakes obligations, a political body, as powerful as itself, is to be allowed to conduct a propaganda and support it with money, which is in direct violation of the official agreement. The Soviet Government either has or has not the power to make such agreements. If it has the power it is its duty to carry them out and see that the other parties are not deceived. If it has not this power and if responsibilities which belong to the State in other countries are in Russia in the keeping of private and irresponsible bodies the Soviet Government ought not to make agreements which it knows it cannot carry out.

6. I should be obliged if you would be good enough to let me have the observations of your Government on this subject without delay.

I have the honour to be, with high consideration, Sir, your obedient servant (in the absence of the Secretary of State),

(Signed) J. D. GREGORY.

M. C. RAKOVSKY.

The Zinoviev letter seems to have been a forgery, and, at least, a Socialist Government should have investigated the matter thoroughly, before concluding that it must be genuine. MacDonald's Government was overjoyed at the idea of proclaiming the letter "genuine" without the faintest suggestion of enquiry.

As opposed to the halting and vacillating recognition of the Soviet Union by MacDonald, the recognition of the Soviet extended by Mussolini, on behalf of Fascist Italy, was thorough, and agreed to immediate ambassadorial relations. Mussolini's note was dated February 7, 1924, and was described as, from the President of the Council of Ministers, and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Italy, to the People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. The text was as follows :

You know that ever since I became the head of the Government it has been my desire to bring about the re-establishment of political relations between our two countries, considering this useful both in their own interests and in the general interests of Europe.

I am, therefore, gratified that the Italo-Russian commercial treaty has been signed to-day. I am happy to inform you on this occasion that, in accordance with the declaration made in my speech of November 30, 1923, before the Chamber of Deputies, I declared at the close of the conference on the above-mentioned treaty, which took place on January 31, 1924, that since the treaty had been duly formulated, I regard the question of *de jure* recognition of the Government of the U.S.S.R. by Italy as settled.

The Italian Government will, therefore, immediately take measures to nominate a royal ambassador to the Government of the Union, and it considers that the political relations between the two countries are from this day, February 7, 1924, finally and permanently established.

Expressing the conviction that this day will mark the inauguration of a new and fruitful era of co-operation between our two countries to their mutual interest, I have, etc.

(Signed) MUSSOLINI.

The Treaty of Commerce and Navigation to which Mussolini referred was as follows :

ART. 1. Normal and consular relations are established between the Kingdom of Italy and the U.S.S.R.

The authority of each of the Contracting States is mutually recognised as the only legal and sovereign authority of the respective states with all the consequences deriving therefrom in respect of the other Party, according to international law and international usages.

Contrast this Fascist directness of recognition against MacDonald's "Socialist" hesitating and half-hearted acknowledgment of the fact of the Soviet Union's existence.

XIV. The Murder Trust

The question of armament rings, and the economic basis of glory, or murder by war, is discussed fully in *At Grips With War*. No work, however thorough, could exhaust the facts in this traffic in murder. It is a disgrace to civilisation and a standing indictment of capitalist society. Yet all the recruiting of the Labour Government, its Air Programme praised by the Tories, its Imperialist Foreign Policy, were dictated by this conspiracy of assassin finance. In that Labour Government, Arthur Ponsonby, who later became Lord Ponsonby, served as Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Whilst occupying that position, he was a member of the I.L.P. He joined the I.L.P. in the war years, under the impression that it was an anti-militarist organisation; and when he left office he returned to anti-militarist enthusiasm.

Speaking in the House of Commons on April 1, 1926, Mr Ponsonby drew attention to the report of the Temporary Mixed Commission that sat at Geneva, on the subject of the untrammelled private manufacture of armaments. The Commission reported that Armament firms have :

- (1) Fomented war-scares, and so persuaded their own countries to adopt war-like policies and to increase their armaments, *in order to supply more armaments to other countries.*
- (2) Attempted to bribe Government officials both at home and abroad.
- (3) Disseminated false reports concerning the military and naval programmes of various countries, in order to stimulate armament expenditure.
- (4) Sought to inflame public opinion through the control of newspapers in their own and foreign countries.
- (5) Organised international armament rings, through which the armaments race has been accentuated by paying off one country against another.

Ponsonby described the official document containing these statements as "a terrible indictment." He proceeded to make his own contribution to the exposure :

When I was in Constantinople, at the end of last century, there was a man who, one might almost think, was attached to the Embassy, who was one of the representatives of one of our big armament firms, and he was so successful that he received an order from the Turkish Government by which the Dardanelles was so magnificently equipped with modern armaments.

THERE IS IN BEDFORD PARK TO-DAY A GUN, CAPTURED BY THE BEDFORD REGIMENT, ON WHICH THERE IS AN INSCRIPTION DESCRIBING THE GALLANT WAY IN WHICH THIS GUN WAS CAPTURED FROM THE GERMANS, AND, ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE GUN, IS THE INSCRIPTION OF ARMSTRONG, WHITWORTH AND CO.

I do not want to delay the House, but one could give instance after instance of how this traffic is going on. We in this country are going on with it. My constituents are turning out shells, tanks and armoured cars to-day. I believe they have designed a magnificent new tank. I believe it is a tank with three guns, and can go over everything, and has got impenetrable armour. I believe another department of the same firm is devising a shell which will penetrate that armour.

My constituents support me, but they are, by economic pressure, by the screw of our present social system, kept at work on manufacturing these armaments, and they find all that the Government say to them is, "Starve, or forgo instruments for your own destruction."

But why did Ponsonby complacently accept such facts, and support Imperialism and Armaments, as a member of the Labour Government in 1924?

Thomas Johnston also took part in the debate. He said:

We cannot get away from the fact that there is a murder-profiteering trust in this country. I possess a copy of the prospectus issued by Messrs. Vickers on behalf of the Chinese Government, in which they have contracted a loan to purchase aeroplanes. There is no dispute that firms are making large profits by supplying munitions of war to the Chinese. We have also been told that French armament firms are supplying China with munitions of war.

We know that in the past arms were supplied by other countries to the Riffs, the Chinese, and the rival forces in Ireland, and these armament firms are making large profits by supplying arms all over the world. Until we take some effective steps to stop profiteering in munitions it does not seem to me that we shall get very much further in the direction we desire to travel. We have seen the Report of a celebrated court-martial in Japan in which a Japanese admiral is adjudged guilty of accepting bribes in the execution of his duty from one of the important engineering firms in this country supplying the Japanese Government with munitions of war.

Johnston was a member of the Second Labour Government. What attitude did he adopt then? Did he not subscribe tamely to the articles of war and militarism? And to-day, Johnston is a member, an enthusiast member, taking salutes from marching armies on parade, of the Churchill Government.

XV. Empire Administration

The Socialist Programme declared that the Labour Government was ready to entrust the work of

supervising the economic growth of undeveloped territories and preventing the exploitation of subject races by capitalist groups

to the League of Nations.

We are not pretending that this is Socialism or that the League of Nations is anything but a League of Capitalist Governments. For what it is worth it is the Labour Programme—prior to taking office, its election promise and policy.

In *If Labour Rules*, Philip Snowden said:

The policy of a Labour Government towards the dependencies of the British Empire will be to ensure the populations humane and just government.

Lord Wedgwood, then M.P. and about to become a member of the first Labour Government, declared on January 12, 1924, that India was "the test of a Labour Government," which must "accelerate the conversion of India into a self-governing dominion."

MacDonald appointed Sir Sydney Olivier, one-time Fabian, but for many years a tried and trusted official of the Colonial Office, to the Chief Secretaryship of State for India.

Branding all forms of passive resistance as "revolution," MacDonald cabled to India this declaration of Labour Government policy:

No Party in Great Britain will be cowed by threats of force or by politics designed to bring Government to a standstill.

And Olivier, raised to the peerage as "Labour" (*sic*) Lord, declared, on February 26, 1924:

The programme of Constitutional Democracy . . . is not native to India. . . . It is impossible for the Indian people or Indian politicians to leap at once into the saddle, and administer an ideal constitution, etc.

Which is the stock argument of Imperialism and explains MacDonald's eulogy, at a later date, of Curzon as a sort of fastidious knight of Empire.

Nothing, however, reveals more completely the absolute Imperialist outlook of the MacDonald administration than the despatch that Mr Ramsay MacDonald sent, as Foreign Secretary, to Lord Allenby, His Majesty's High Commissioner for Egypt and the Sudan, on Tuesday, October 7, 1924, respecting the position of the "Socialist" Government in regard to Egypt and the Sudan.

From this despatch, which can be consulted, the following suggestive excerpts are made:

On the 17th May, according to my information, Zaghlul Pasha stated that the fact that a foreign officer was Commander-in-Chief of the Egyptian Army and the retention in that army of British officers were inconsistent with the dignity of independent Egypt. The expression of such sentiments in an official pronouncement by the responsible head of the Egyptian Government has obviously placed not only Sir Lee Stack as Sirdar but all British officers attached to the Egyptian army in a difficult position.

It is no less true to-day than in 1922 that the security of the communications of the British Empire in Egypt remain a vital British interest, and that absolute certainty that the Suez Canal will remain open in peace as well as in war for the free passage of British ships is the foundation on which the entire defensive strategy of the British Empire rests.

So far as my conversations with Zaghlul Pasha turned on the question of the Sudan, they have only served to show his persistence in the attitude disclosed in his previous public utterances. I must adhere to the statements I made on the subject in the House of Commons. About that neither in Egypt nor in the Sudan should there be any doubt. If there is it will only lead to trouble.

In the meantime, the duty of preserving order in the Sudan rests, in fact, upon his Majesty's Government, and they will take every step necessary for this purpose. Since going there they have contracted heavy moral obligations by the creation of a good system of administration; they cannot allow that to be destroyed; they regard their responsibilities as a trust for the Sudan people.

This is undiluted Imperialism. It is an endorsement of the historic policy of British Imperialism and of the actions and attitude of innumerable Tory legislators. Someone may explain that no Government could adopt any other attitude as things are. This may be true. But if it is so, then Socialism through Parliament is impossible. If one is compelled, by the logic of conditions, to endorse the policy of Imperialism, then one must endorse the policy of Empire; and the approach to Socialism must be made *via* a kind of capitalist militaristic gradualism. There is no point in calling ourselves Socialists and Anti-Militarists, if, in point of fact, Socialism is unattainable, and Anti-Militarism is impracticable. At least let us be honest. If that is the position, let us have done with Socialism and let us make an end of the misnomer, Socialist Parliamentarism. As a Socialist, my view is that Empire is unnecessary; that militarism and war are wrong; and that Socialism is not only attainable, but urgently necessary. This is the Socialist challenge to the parliamentarians.

XVI. Nationalisation of Industry and Strikes

Government ownership, or nationalisation of industry, is not Socialism. Capitalist necessity may dictate the transfer of industries to State ownership, and of certain services to municipal ownership. It remains joint-stock administration just the same. Anti-Socialists have nationalised railways and coal mines without benefiting the workers. Strikes have been ruthlessly suppressed,

under Briand, on the State Railways of France. The same thing has occurred on the State Railways of Canada. Sweated conditions exist in the Post Office and the Mint. Municipal employees have been victimised. There is nothing radical, nothing essentially Labour, nothing fundamentally serviceable to the workers, in municipalisation and nationalisation. Socialisation, involving complete change of industrial administration, and a Labour Democracy only, is the only solution of the poverty problem. But the Labour Party, confusing the worker's mind with the parody of nationalisation for socialisation, stood for nationalisation.

In *The Socialist Programme* it declared:

After a beginning had been made with nationalisation of the import trade and then of mines and railways and electrical power, a Socialist Government would proceed as it found its policy justified by results.

In *The Labour Election Manifesto* it declared:

It will apply in a practical spirit the principle of public ownership and control to the mines, the railway service and the electrical power stations, and the development of municipal services.

Ramsay MacDonald in *Why Socialism Must Come*, December, 1923, said:

Some industries, like coal and railways, are now ripe for nationalisation. . . . We lay down as a preliminary that methods and conditions of coal production must serve the common interests and secure the mining population in a decent life, and must provide the commodity at economic prices.

On the ground that it lacked a parliamentary majority, the Labour Government dropped nationalisation.

Its temporary alternative to nationalisation was a minimum wage for miners—an absurd enough slogan. But it made no stand even for this.

In April, 1924, the Labour Government averted a national miners' strike by promising the Minimum Wage Bill. This was destroyed in the Committees of the House of Commons, and the miners were left to negotiate as well as they could.

In 1926, Cook was employed to boost the case for Labour Parliamentarism, because of the failure of Labour Industrial Action. Workers should remember that the terrible struggle of 1926 followed on the treachery of "Red Friday" in 1925, and the failure of Labour Parliamentarism in 1924.

The entire business is a see-saw of fraud and impotence.

The L.C.C. refused to grant the workers' wage demands on the plea of the competition of the privately-owned Tube-Bus-Tram trust. The London traffic strike followed, and only the refusal of the tubemen to strike averted chaos.

Did the Labour Government nationalise the traffic services, establish workers' control, etc.?

Oh dear no! It appointed a "Chief Civil Commissioner" to administer the Emergency Powers Act, and made active preparations for running the services by military and naval labour. A Traffic Bill was introduced, which, without transferring ownership, provided for the control of London traffic by a Board in which the workers' *alleged* representatives even would have been completely outnumbered by the avowed capitalist delegates.

However, the General Council of the Trade Union Congress patched up the conflict and saved the Labour Government's face. And the Traffic Bill was rendered harmless in Committee. Traffic capitalism remained as usual.

But the fact is on record: MacDonald obtained the King's signature to an Order in Council under the Emergency Powers Act. He promised police and military protection for strike-breakers in the following terms:

The Government must give protection to those engaged in legal occupations.

Naval ratings were already under orders for the Lots Road power station when the strike ended.

Prior to the traffic strike, MacDonald had declared (February, 1924) that he would employ State strike-breaking against the dockers. Here are his exact words:

The Government will not fail to take what steps are necessary to secure transport of necessary food supplies, and has already set up the nucleus of an organisation.

In relation to these strikes, the "Socialist" Government took the side of property. But what are the facts concerning the strikes? Here they are:

1. *Railway Engineers' Strike. Period, January 21 to 29, 1924.*—With the Socialist Government about to take office, Arthur Henderson, seconded by the Trade Union Congress, endeavoured to avert this strike. This was on January 16 and 17. He failed. It was a strike against a reduction of wages. In the end, the reduction was modified over a period of a year. *The Labour Government took no heroic stand by the men.* Its desire was to maintain office at any price, and to sacrifice the workers to its own sense of place.

2. *Dock Strike. Period, February 16 to 25.*—This was a wages dispute. On January 16, the employers received the men's representatives and turned down the demand *without consideration*. The strike took place on February 16, and the Labour Government appointed a Committee of Enquiry. As a result, the dockers obtained their demands.

3 *London Traffic Strike. Period, March 22 to 31.*—*Tramway men* struck on a wages demand. Busmen came out in sympathy. Tram drivers received only 58 shillings as a commencing wage, compared with 80 shillings as a commencing wage of the busmen; and a maximum wage of 67 shillings compared with 86 shillings and sixpence.

4. *Southampton Strike.*—Unofficial Strike, on February 19, demanding *rates equal to those paid in London*. On April 12., the employers declared a lock-out, and looked to "Socialist" Government support.

5. *London Tube Strike.*—Unofficial strike of the railway shopmen and workers in the power departments of the Great Western and London Electric Railways.

The *Times* said of this strike, in its issue for June 2:

"It is euphemistically called an 'all grades' movement, but it depends on the Communists for its life and energy. The following demands have been formulated:—

(1) 10s. a week increase in wages with an immediate minimum of £3 a week.

(2) The remaining 16s 6d of the war bonus to be merged in the basic wage.

(3) A week's holiday each year with pay.

(4) A guaranteed day and a guaranteed week for all shopmen.

These demands are preferred also on behalf of the men in the power departments who, like the shopmen, are subject to the conditions of the Industrial Courts Award, No. 728."

It is for the worker to estimate the value of the Labour Government's reaction to these strike movements and the daily struggles of the working-class.

XVII. Scotland Yard

On March, 1924, Arthur Henderson presided at a dinner given by the C.I.D., the notorious department which has rendered and does render such magnificent yet contemptible services to the capitalist system. Henderson said:

The relationship between the Government and the police would be of trust, confidence and real friendship.

On April 13, 1924, two detectives were found hidden beneath the platform at a London District Conference of the Communist Party, and their captured notebooks showed that the police had supplied the *Morning Post* with material for publication against the "Reds" (*sic*).

From *The Socialist Programme* :—

The policy for which the Independent Labour Party claims support is a Socialist policy.

Philip Snowden in *If Labour Rules* :—

I am confident that a Labour Government will be less of a class Government than any Government of the past has been.

Which explains the Labour Government alliance with Scotland Yard.

On June 27, 1924, *Freedom*, the London Anarchist Communist journal, received a registered letter from a correspondent in San Francisco. On opening it, the editor, T. H. Keel, found, folded up in the letter, a sheet of notepaper bearing the following message:

N.W.D.O.
25-6-24.

The Secretary.

Regd. letter San Francisco No. 41679 submitted.

T. J. FREAIL,
For PMR.

The editor realised that the letter had been opened by the Post Office, and that the official who had the job of reading such correspondence had been careless enough, when resealing the letter, to enclose in it the note to the Secretary of the Post Office written by the official of the North-Western District Office when forwarding the letter.

Of course Keel wanted to know more about the matter, so he wrote to the Postmaster of the N.W.D.O. and asked him on whose authority letters addressed to him were opened before delivery as he was anxious

to know who and for what purpose. On July 1, he received a formal printed acknowledgment of the receipt of his letter informing him that the matter was receiving attention. After sending another letter pressing for an early reply, Keel received the following communication :

General Post Office, London, E.C.1.

14th July, 1924.

Sir,

I am directed by the Postmaster-General to refer to your letter of the 28th of June, to the Postmaster of the North-Western District, and to inform you that certain letters addressed to you have been opened in pursuance of a Warrant issued by the Secretary of State for the Home Department.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

L. SIMON,
For the Secretary.

Mr. T. H. KEEL.

There was no reason to be surprised at this incident. It proved that the Labour Government continued the traditions of all previous governments, that, indeed, all governments act alike. Not only Henderson, as Home Secretary, but the Miners' Leader, Vernon Hartshorn, as Postmaster General, was on terms of "trust, confidence and real friendship" with the Spy Department of Scotland Yard! But what a situation for Socialists!

In the Second Labour Government, Arthur Henderson became Foreign Secretary, and J. R. Clynes succeeded to the Home Office.

Reynold's Illustrated News, in its news columns for July 27, 1930, summarised very fully a circular letter that Mr Clynes, as Home Secretary, had addressed to Chief Constables throughout England. The report was headed as follows :

JUDGES REFUSE TO HAMPER POLICE IN THEIR WORK

Drastic Recommendations of a Royal Commission Toned Down by Authorities

Underneath these headings the letter-press explained :

The police are not to be handcuffed in investigating crimes.

That, in short, is the effect of a document sent by the Home Office to every police force in the country.

The Home Secretary (Mr. J. R. Clynes), in consultation with the High Court judges, has made it clear what can, and what cannot be done, in their routine work by the police.

The Royal Commission on Police Powers and Procedure recently reported in favour of a very marked curtailment of present powers.

What has now happened is that the recommendations have been toned down.

The Home Secretary has addressed a circular letter to chief constables with the object of removing difficulties on divergencies of opinion as to the meaning of the Judges' rules for the taking of statements by the police.

It was felt in police circles that the adoption of certain recommendations made by the recent Royal Commission regarding the taking of statements would seriously hamper them in their inquiries.

In adhering to the procedure laid down in the Judges' rules, and rejecting the Commission's suggestions that all witnesses and suspects should be elaborately "cautioned" and questions and answers put in writing, the Home Secretary has definitely strengthened the hands of the police and removed all doubt that might have hitherto existed.

The Royal Commission on Police Powers and Procedure drew attention to the marked divergencies of opinion among police officers as to the proper construction to be placed upon the Judges' rules.

It was suggested that the matter should be brought to the notice of the judges for any action which they might deem advisable. The Home Secretary communicated with the Judges, and the present circular is issued with their approval.

In a leading article, headed "POLICE AND PUBLIC," the same issue of *Reynolds* commented:

We confess to a feeling of disquietude at the Memorandum which the Home Secretary has circulated to police authorities containing a new addition to what is known as the Judges' Rules which regulate the interrogation of suspects. . . .

When, as a result of the public indignation aroused over the Savidge case, the Royal Commission on Police Procedure was set up, it was understood that its business was to see what could be done to prevent the repetition of what was felt to be Third Degree methods. . . .

The Commission recommended that means should be taken to prevent this. It was to be open to any person being questioned by the police to have somebody present for his protection. And recommendations as to cautioning were set forth which would be a real protection.

What has become of these recommendations? Is all the work of the Commission to be disregarded, so far as suspected persons are concerned? . . .

We do not want to see undue obstacles placed in the way of the police in the detection of crime. But experience has shown that, unless strict safeguards are laid down, innocent persons may be subjected to the Third Degree. So far as we can see, the making of a charge can be kept back until all the questioning is finished, when the caution, which no longer matters, may be solemnly given.

If the authorities want to scrap the recommendations of the Commission so far as persons not charged are concerned, let them be clear about it, and not do so while bamboozling the public.

No one will charge *Reynolds's*, the organ of the Co-operative Movement, and of the Labour Party, with being an extremist paper, or the enemy of the Labour Government. In the main, it is a staunch Labour Parliamentary organ, with some traditions of democracy to defend and uphold. Its summary of Clynes' circular, and its comment on its trend and purpose, speak far better than any comment an Anti-Parliamentarian could make, as to the amicable relations existing between Scotland Yard and the Labour Governmentalists, and the danger of such trusting intimacy to the Socialist movement and the struggle of the working-class.

XVIII. "Poplarism" and Unemployment Relief

John Wheatley, as Minister for Health, staged a little bye-play, by granting a "free pardon" to the Poplar Guardians for their "excessive relief" and defending his action by declaring that he was only regularising what, in effect, the Tory Government had itself accepted.

Wheatley's statement was correct. The Poplar Board of Guardians exceeded a scale of relief laid down by Sir Alfred Mond. No action was taken by Mond, and his successors at the Ministry of Health. Sir Arthur Griffiths-Boscawen and Sir William Joynson-Hicks consistently ignored the order. His conduct was correct although it was attacked by Asquith as "calculated to encourage illegality and extravagance."

The *Manchester Guardian*, for February 14, 1924, commented rightly:

Mr. Asquith has caused the sensation of the day by challenging the action of the Minister of Health in wiping out the surcharges upon the Poplar Guardians. The surprise was the greater because the Mond Order against which the Poplar Guardians erred or revolted, according as we like to put it, was never enforced by two or three Ministers of Health.

It is noted that the Poplar Guardians have regularly reported their expenditure and scales of relief, so that successive Ministers of Health were not deceived, and might have stepped in at any other time and enforced the Mond Order. It is argued that Mr. Wheatley, faced with surcharges that are reckoned at £100,000, and knowing that this amount could never be paid by the guardians and that there was no serious question of selling them up, decided to cut the farce and make an end of the Order that had never been enforced under two Governments. If one is going to surcharge—surcharge quickly.

Wheatley's action was constitutional and sound. Only the screaming hysteria of reaction made it appear revolutionary. The decision of the Court of Appeal, rescinding a surcharge on *legal* grounds, in the case of the Poplar Councillors was identical with that of the Poplar Guardians. The pretence that Wheatley's "poplarism" was revolutionary both compelled and enabled him to cut down the unemployed relief in Sheffield and elsewhere in June, 1924.

Wheatley was interviewed in London, on June 5, 1924, by a Sheffield deputation that included the President of the Trades Council, Leader of the Sheffield Guardians' Labour Group, member of Eccleshall Guardians' Labour Group. Wheatley agreed to meet a deputation from the Sheffield Guardians should they desire to interview him, and again consider the questions of loans and relief. He insisted that this deputation must submit to him an alternative scale of relief, and it must be *a reduced scale to operate from the man with a wife and three children downwards*.

About a fortnight later a deputation from the Guardians interviewed Wheatley in London, and a little later the Chairman and Clerk of the Guardians met Wheatley, with some of his permanent officials, and discussed the whole question again. Wheatley insisted on a reduction all round.

After much discussion and excitement, the Guardians were compelled to adopt a decrease of practically 2s all round on the scale that had been paid previous to Wheatley's interference.

In 1930, because Wheatley was attacking the Second Labour Government, Thurtle and others recalled the 1924 dealings with the Sheffield Board of Guardians. Writing in *Forward*, for March 1, 1930, Wheatley stated the facts were as follows:

The Sheffield Board required to borrow a large sum of money and decided to approach for this purpose a Treasury Committee called the Goschen Committee. During a preliminary discussion with the Officials of the Ministry of Health it was pointed out to them that the Goschen Committee would be sure to ask why Sheffield paid as they did, a higher scale than Leeds, Hull, Rotherham and other Yorkshire towns. Following on this they revised their scale of relief, and then Sheffield Trades Council protested to me.

This is a distinct admission that the Ministry of Health insisted on a reduction in the scale of relief.

Wheatley claims that, following upon the protest of the Sheffield Trades Council, his department pressed the Board of Guardians to increase the benefits. In support, he quotes the following letter:

Ministry of Health,
Whitehall, S.W.1,
16th June, 1924.

Sir,—I am directed by the Minister of Health to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 7th June, with reference to the scales of relief recently approved by your Board.

As regards the letters from Mr. Alexander and Councillor Rowlinson, of which you enclosed copies, I am to say that the Minister informed the deputation from the Sheffield Trade and Labour Council that he could not deal with them direct as to scales of relief for the City, and added that, in view of the repre-

sentations they made regarding the destitute state of many families in Sheffield owing to prolonged unemployment, he would be prepared to consider any fresh proposals your Board might wish to put forward particularly with a view to increasing the relief to be provided for the larger families. The Minister intimated that he would put this point to your Board, and that if they cared to approach him with regard to it, he would be prepared to receive a deputation from them on the subject. I am to enquire whether your Board wish to send a deputation to the Minister accordingly.

I am, Sir,

Your Obedient Servant,

(Sgd.) W. A. ROBINSON.

Wheatley commented: "*They didn't send a deputation, but improved the scale.*"

This statement does not deal with the question as to what relief the Sheffield Guardians paid before the discussion with the Ministry of Health, and what relief they paid after receiving the final letter from the Ministry. That is the practical test.

It is not suggested that Wheatley found any pleasure in making war on the poor. Wheatley was primarily a parliamentarian and wanted success for himself and for his family, and perhaps more for his family than himself. Having secured himself, it is most likely, as his later conduct suggested, he did give some thought to the poor. But it was too late. One must be either a complete Socialist, or else an enemy of the struggle. Wheatley wanted to enjoy ease and power, and to be distinguished in the struggle also. He aimed at Utopia much more than any extreme Socialist, much more even than the immortal John MacLean.

XIX. Housing

Socialism implies a most distinct interest in town planning. Every Socialist should have some interest in architecture and in the social organisation of beauty and of hygiene. The parliamentarians' interest in housing, however, is that of a jerrybuilder and an opportunist.

The Socialist Programme announced:—

Socialists should strictly limit all luxury building until the housing needs of the people were met.

As an immediate measure to relieve the existing appalling conditions, Socialists would, if necessary, ration surplus housing accommodation.

The Labour Election Manifesto declared:—

The Labour Government will abolish the slums, promptly build an adequate supply of decent homes, and resist decontrol till the shortage is satisfied.

What did the Labour Government do?

Neville Chamberlain's Act of 1923 *did not touch houses for renting purposes at all.* The Labour Government proposed to remedy this defect.

On March 31 it introduced a Bill to prohibit the eviction of the unemployed. By a series of retreats, it reached the stage, on April 7, of declaring that no one should be evicted until he had "reasonable time" to apply for relief. As this was the position hitherto, it proposed no change, and the Bill was thrown out.

So far from "rationing surplus housing accommodation," the Labour Government did not even defend the unemployed.

In place of measures for *immediate* relief, Wheatley introduced his Housing Bill providing for the building of two million houses in the space of *fifteen years*, IF

- (1) the bankers give the necessary credits;
- (2) the building employers loyally keep their obligation to maintain decent conditions in the industry;
- (3) private and luxury building (*which was to be limited*, according to election promises, but was not restricted in any way) does not attract the most skilled labour away from the national schemes;
- (4) a Government does not come into power for 15 years which will reverse the whole policy of the scheme.

This scheme was to reach its completion in 1980, fifty-six years from the date of its introduction, and its total cost was to be something over a thousand million pounds. Wheatley entertained his admirers by scrupulously estimating the cost for each successive year, as if he could calculate what would be the cost of land, materials, labour sixty years hence. This rubbishy humbug was called Labour statesmanship!

These two absurdities—the evictions fiasco and the Wheatley Housing Scheme—represented the Labour Government's contribution to the Housing Problem.

XX. Education

The Socialist Programme declared:—

Socialists would consider the provision of the fullest education for every child to be their supreme task.

The Labour Election Manifesto said:—

The flow of young workers from the schools must be regulated to relieve the pressure on the labour market, and full educational training, with maintenance, must be provided for the young people who are now exposed to the perils and temptations of the streets.

The I.L.P. Weekly Speakers' Notes, June 17, 1924, explains what the Labour Government did:—

The Minister for Education has already intimated his desire to receive proposals from local authorities for bye-laws raising the school attendance age to 15.

Without raising the school age, the Labour Government introduced a Bill providing for the payment of unemployment insurance from 14 instead of from 16 as hitherto! Since the Tories opposed the proposal on the ground of expense, it was withdrawn. But what did the proposal mean, except an inducement to harassed parents to withdraw their children from school and throw their unskilled labour on the market?

The Manchester Guardian, in its issue of February 22, 1924, said:

No finer monument to a Labour Government could well be imagined than the lifting up of the whole standard of education for the mass of the people of this country.

This may well be the case. But where is the uplift in the programme analysed?

XXI. "Victory" Programme

Ramsay MacDonald outlined the Labour Government programme at the "Victory Demonstration" at the London Albert Hall on January 8, 1924. Here are some points:—

European peace is to be the first aim of the Labour Government.

The "pompous folly" of standing aloof from the Russian Government will be ended.

I want trade. I want negotiations. I want a settlement from the coasts of Japan to the coasts of Ireland.

Unemployment will be one of the first considerations. . . . For the first time a Labour Government and a Labour staff will consider the matter from the human instead of from the wage-earning point of view.

Housing will be an essential part of the solution of the unemployment problem. Labour will give a guarantee to provide the maximum production, and if trusts, monopolies, or corners in any essentials stand in the way, Labour will break them.

The London *Star*, the Liberal organ, the following day, published many comments on MacDonald's speech and the Labour programme. Thus:—

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and Miss Bondfield made the best speeches. There was little in either to which a sound Radical could not subscribe.

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's speech last night was not a programme but a policy. . . . It will be impossible for any Liberal—even if he desired—to refuse him support.

An impression of the meeting, written by Thomas Dickson, M.P., was published in the Glasgow *Forward* for January 19, 1924. Here is Dickson's opening description:

Not without reason, London City has been described as the home of reaction and political blindness, and yet on the evening of the day on which Parliament assembled ten thousand people, thrilling with the thought of Labour's dawn, met to acclaim Ramsay MacDonald, and his lieutenants, in the great Albert Hall. A sea of humanity spread out over the circular area, and up into the circling tiers, until faces grew dim in the twilight that seemed to hang on the edges of the great dome. However, there was light and colour, and a hum of conversation that went still for a moment as MacDonald appeared and then burst into a tornado of applause that broke like thunder, and broke again. In that shout one seemed to hear the note of triumph in which Edward Carpenter closes his greatest poem: "England is risen and the day is here." The flush of victory at the polls, the early promise of governmental power to a Party but yesterday despised and rejected, the realisation of long cherished and almost hopeless dreams—all combined to give an emotional tremor to the air.

MacDonald was the first to speak. . . . It was the speech of a man at once of action and of idealism—of one who knew that the taking of office was as the grasping of thistles, but who was prepared to grasp them.

"Under the Labour Government," he said, "the House of Commons shall become a workshop for the people." For the future, and the tasks of the future—1924 was not to be the last year of God's programme of creation. When we had passed, men and women would still search for the Holy Grail.

Dickson quotes the following piece of slobber from MacDonald's speech:

I see no end, thank God!! to those things. I see my own horizon. I see my own skyline, but I am convinced that when my children or my children's children get there, there will be another sky line, another horizon, another dawning, another glorious beckoning from Heaven itself. That is my faith, and in that faith I go on, and my colleagues go on doing in their own lives what they can to make their addition, to contribute something substantial to the well-being, the happiness and the holiness of human life.

Dickson proceeds to refer to the speeches of and reception accorded Clynes, Thomas, Margaret Bondfield, Herbert Morrison, Robert Smillie, Arthur Henderson, and George Lansbury. He cites the view of an American observer, that all the speakers were liked and respected, but that Smillie, Lansbury, and Margaret Bondfield were loved. Time has shown that the respect and the love alike were misplaced.

Dickson describes the conclusion of the meeting :

The great organ pealed out the opening bars of "The Red Flag," and, led by the Deptford comrades, a thousand-throated choir took up the rebel song, while high up under the dome an old comrade threw out the folds of a scarlet banner, and swung it to and fro till the song had faded into the thunder of the closing cheers.

Let the same Dickson reveal how thoroughly deceived the common people were by the parade of empty words at this "Victory" meeting. Writing in *Forward* for July 5, 1930, that is, over six and a half years later, Dickson described an incident in the House of Commons under the Second Labour Government :

MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING

One day last week, Mr. Jack Hayes, M.P., formerly a member of the Police Force, and a splendid physical type, got out of his ordinary tweed suit, and got into uniform, trousers with gold braid, a braided jacket with epaulettes, a hat gorgeous with feathers, a sword, and a white wand. All this in order to walk up to the table of the House of Commons, and speak the following from the King :—

I have received your Address praying that I will make an Order of Council under the Military Manoeuvres Acts, 1897 and 1911, a draft of which was presented to your House on the 27th March last. I will comply with your advice.

After which Jack Hayes, who had acted in his capacity of Vice-Chamberlain of the Household, bowed himself out of the Commons, divested himself of his braid and feathers, sword and wand, and got back into ordinary, sane dress again.

All this flummery for a formal message of less than fifty words that might as well have been typed and handed by an attendant to the Speaker!

"Much Ado About Nothing" would seem to describe the Albert Hall Victory meeting, the rousing singing of "The Red Flag," and MacDonald's oration about the skyline.

What mummery! What blasphemy! What outrage against the memory of the workers' glorious dead, of the pioneers immortal. And this is parliamentarism, mocking hunger and integrity, suffering and struggle.

XXII. No Class Struggle

In *Socialism and Society*, 1908, J. Ramsay MacDonald said :

Socialism marks the growth of Society, not the uprising of a class. The consciousness which it seeks to quicken is not one of economic class solidarity, but one of social unity and growth towards organic wholeness. The watchword of Socialism, therefore, is not class consciousness, but community consciousness.

The miners' misery was exploited to enable this man and his satellites to enjoy "community conscious" place on the Treasury Benches and at Buckingham Palace levees!

APPENDICES

I. Careerist "Labour's" Progress

This record ends with 1924 because I consider the subsequent elections as being of no consequence. In any case the reader can obtain the particulars easily enough for himself.

General Election.	Members Returned.	Labour Vote.
1900	2	62,698
1906	29	323,195
1910 (January)	40	505,690
1910 (December)	42	370,802
1918	57	2,244,945
1922	142	4,251,011
1923	195	4,508,504
1924	151	5,525,072

II. Britain's First Labour Government

In the first edition of this work, not only the names of the members of the Cabinet were published, but also those of the leading members of the Ministry without the Cabinet. The I.L.P. Under-Secretaries, Parliamentary Secretaries, etc., were published in the 1934 edition of "Socialism and Parliament," Part I., "Socialism or Parliament," Chapter XIV, and do not require to be reprinted here. Hence I confine this list to the names of Cabinet members only.

Prime Minister, First Lord of the Treasury, and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs—J. Ramsay MacDonald.

Lord Privy Seal and Deputy Leader of the House of Commons—J. R. Clynes.

*Lord President of the Council—Lord Parmoor, K.C.V.O.

Lord Chancellor—Lord Haldane, K.T., O.M.

*Chancellor of the Exchequer—Philip Snowden.

Secretary of State for Home Affairs—Arthur Henderson.

Secretary of State for the Colonies—J. H. Thomas.

Secretary of State for War—Stephen Walsh.

Secretary of State for India—Lord Olivier, K.C.M.G., C.B.

*Secretary of State for Air—Lord Thomson.

First Lord of the Admiralty—Viscount Chelmsford, G.C.S.I., G.C.M.G., G.C.I.E., G.B.E.

President of the Board Trade—Sidney Webb.

Minister of Health—John Wheatley.

*Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries—Noel Buxton.

*Secretary for Scotland—William Adamson.

*President of the Board of Education—Charles Philips Trevelyan.

Minister of Labour—Thomas Shaw.

Postmaster General—Vernon Hartshorn.

*Occupied the same position in the 1929 Cabinet.

III. Britain's Second Labour Government

Here also are appended the names of the Cabinet members only. The names are those of the members as appointed in June, 1929, and not as altered subsequently. Offices (*) have been omitted from this appendix for the obvious reason that they are included in the previous appendix.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister, First Lord of the Treasury and Leader of the House of Commons—Rt. Hon. James Ramsay MacDonald, M.P.

Lord Chancellor—Rt. Hon. Lord Sankey, G.B.E.

Lord Privy Seal—Rt. Hon. James Henry Thomas, M.P.

Secretary of State for Home Affairs—Rt. Hon. John Robert Clynes, M.P.

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs—Rt. Hon. Arthur Henderson, M.P.

Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs and Secretary of State for the Colonies—Rt. Hon. Lord Passfield.

Secretary of State for War—Rt. Hon. Thomas Shaw, C.B.E., M.P.

Secretary of State for India—Rt. Hon. William Wedgwood Benn, D.S.O., D.F.C., M.P.

First Lord of the Admiralty—Rt. Hon. Albert Victor Alexander, M.P.

President of the Board of Trade—Rt. Hon. William Graham, M.P.

Minister of Health—Rt. Hon. Arthur Greenwood, M.P.

Minister of Labour—Rt. Hon. Margaret Grace Bondfield, M.P.

First Commissioner of Works—Rt. Hon. George Lansbury, M.P.

IV. Other 1929 Ministers

The following June, 1929, appointments merit record for propaganda purposes :

Dominion Affairs—

Under-Secretary of State—Arthur A. W. H. Ponsonby, Esq., M.P.

Colonial Office—

Under-Secretary of State—William Lunn, Esq., M.P.

War Office—

Financial Secretary—Emanuel Shinwell, Esq., M.P.

Scotland—

Under-Secretary of State—Thomas Johnston, Esq., M.P.

Lord Advocate—Craigie Mason Aitchison, Esq., M.P.

Subsequently, Thomas Johnston entered the Cabinet.

V. Labour (1924) Cabinet Notes

Writing on August 9, 1902, Keir Hardie stated :—

With J. Ramsay MacDonald, George N. Barnes, Philip Snowden, and Fred Jowett working together in the House of Commons, the future of Socialism in Great Britain would be assured.

Barnes "distinguished" himself as a member of a War Cabinet. Snowden became the Bankers' pet. Jowett alone remained true to his Socialist understanding. Consequently, he was not included in the shining lights of His Majesty's Government as formed in 1929 by Ramsay MacDonald. Workers know how this administration assured the future of Socialism in Great Britain.

The following were the annual salaries received by members of the Labour Cabinet:—

Haldane	£10,000
MacDonald, Clynes, Thomas, Parmoor, Snowden, Henderson, Walsh, Olivier, Chelmsford, Webb, Wheatley—each	£5,000
Thomson	£3,000
Adamson	£2,500
Buxton, Trevelyan, Wedgwood, Jowett—each	£2,000

Haldane's appointment as Lord Chancellor in the Labour Government was anticipated by Sylvia Pankhurst in an excellent article that she wrote in *The Workers' Dreadnought*, for February 14, 1920.

Sylvia Pankhurst pointed out that the *Daily Herald* was to all intents and purposes the organ of Arthur Henderson and the Labour Party "centre." In its issue for February 5, 1920, it adopted Lord Haldane as an exponent of the ideals and policy of the Labour Party, both in a two-column interview on the front page and also in a leading article. In the interview, Haldane said that the Labour Party must take care to make its roof so wide that it would take in "*all the best people.*" He added:

There was a time when the very name of the Labour Party was almost a disadvantage . . . but that time is passing—it has already passed. . . .

There have been crudities. . . . But . . . contact . . . with realities is bringing an increasing wisdom. . . .

The organisation of the Party is such that it gives the best opportunity we possess in this country for bringing the soul of the nation into the legislature. . . .

Sylvia Pankhurst commented:

There have been crudities in the past; yes, crudities like Keir Hardie, crudities like the opposition to the war, . . . But Lord Haldane hopes these crudities are now finished with; we shall have no more of such things in the Labour Party if Lord Haldane, and such as he, control the Party!

Pointing out that the *Daily Herald* had suggested Lord Fisher as "Labour First Sea Lord," Sylvia Pankhurst commented further:

Still more sinister and serious is the Herald's latest adoption of Lord Haldane for the Labour Party. . . . As a matter of fact, Lord Haldane is one of the most callously hardened capitalist politicians. He belonged to the Whig Liberals and Imperialists, but was equally acceptable to the Tory Imperialists. Karl Liebknecht, in his *Militarism and Anti-Militarism*, quotes Haldane's evident appreciation of the pomp and German Militarism as a means of gulling the workers when he visited Germany. Keir Hardie, discussing with me in the early part of 1913, the coming world war of capitalism, which he foresaw steadily approaching, spoke of Haldane as one of the most sinister and dangerous figures in the chain of circumstances preparing the war. Haldane was one of the inner circle of the Governments that made the war. . . . Was it for services to Labour that he was made Lord Haldane?

At the 16th Annual Conference of the I.L.P., held at Derby, April 1 and 2, 1907, Ramsay MacDonald being in the chair, Bruce Glaister moved a resolution condemning militarism *in every shape and form*, directed specifically against Haldane's Territorial Army.

Keir Hardie, in seconding the resolution, stressed the condemnation of Haldane's scheme on the following grounds:—

Mr. Haldane had declared, frankly, that what he was seeking was an armed nation, and to secure it, he started with the schools and finished with the men. The Socialist Party was bound to protest against a system of that kind. (Hear, hear.) . . . Children were to be taught that the flag was the great thing to value in days to come. . . . Let them give no uncertain sound on that point. Patriotism was one of the weapons used by the enemies of the people to blind them to facts. Patriotism, which meant love of motherland, was but a means to induce them to hate their fellows and shoot them down when called upon to do so. (Applause.)

Haldane associated with the Fabian Society as far back as 1893 and was friendly with Sydney Webb over the entire period that he was rising from R. B. Haldane, Esq., to the Woolsack. It is significant that Webb was a jingo to the last gasp during the Great War. Ammon, who became a Minister for the Admiralty, was a conscientious objector!!!

Clynes was born in Oldham in 1869. Started work at 10. Gasworker. President of the National Union of General Workers, and Chairman of the Federation of General Workers. Became a prolific writer for the Sunday newspapers during the war and changed the opinion he held in August, 1914, that the diplomats and war-lords were responsible for the Great War. As Assistant Food Controller in the Coalition Government expressed disbelief in the existence of the Food Profiteer, and declared that such an animal enjoyed only an occasional existence. Clynes defended the Government subsidy to farmers and excused the low wages of the agricultural labourer. He defended the profiteering system and his own position in the *Daily Herald* for February 9, 1918. George Lansbury answered him in a signed comment as follows:—

Whether Clynes and his friends like it or not, the working class of this country are not going to allow profiteering, not even small profiteering to continue. Rent, profit, interests, have all got to go, and if men like Clynes are not going to put their backs into helping us get rid of these evils in a constitutional manner, then they also will have to go.

As President of the Gas Workers' Union, Mr J. R. Clynes, ordinary Labour M.P., contributed to the *Labour Leader* for 27th August, 1914, an article headed as follows: "How Wars are Made. The Crime of Secret Treaties: The Way Out." In this he said:—

The Diplomats and War Lords have hurried us to the blood-stained fields of Europe, where the Devil's work is being done on a scale greater than the half-blind eyes of mankind have ever seen before. The life and treasure of peoples are being offered up as sacrifices for reasons and treaties which the masses of any nation had never the chance to discuss or understand. Each nation led into war is invoked to defend its honour against the other, and the faith and fatherland of men assembled for the work of massacre are paraded for foul achievements. Reason resigns and the rifle becomes the least savage of the instruments with which Christians, now flung into states of barbarism, must settle their affairs. Who will jeer at the Socialist now for his unheeded warnings?

Clynes declared that diplomatic theories were disproven by the way people had been swept into combat, and declared that their amazing confidence in a diplomatic fetish was drowned in blood. Declaring "Our part made for us," he stated that the workers were driven into the war by the "unrevealed promises and bargains" of the Government. He then asked, "What will it settle?" and answered as follows:—

The forces of these mighty armies of men may push the lines of the map this way or that, but the men who return will find when peace is restored, that the state of the people will remain unchanged, and the task of millions of drudges must be faced and performed as before. Hopes, as always in war, are high as to what this war will settle. It will settle very little for long.

Clynes became Food Controller in a Government that sent men to gaol and kept them there for stating and acting on these beliefs. He defended his conduct in the public press and wrote for as many as three national Sunday papers on the same Sunday. On Sunday, September 1, 1918, he wrote in *Reynolds' Weekly Newspaper* that no diplomacy could have prevented the war, and added:—

Substantially, organised Labour is ranged, and will, I hope, to the last day of the fight be ranged, with the Government in relentless resistance to the German military machine.

At the Labour Party Conference in November, 1918, the resolution was carried withdrawing Labour members from the Government. Clynes endeavoured to carry an amendment declaring that "the Coalition Government should be supported until the end of the war." He argued that the Coalition Government had won the war and had made peace. It was popular; and if Labour left the Coalition it would be unpopular and defeated.

After the General Election of 1918, Clynes declared in the *Daily Mail* for December 30 that the vast majority of the millions of electors had given their verdict against the Labour Party. Clynes knew that the 1918 election was a fraud, and that on the actual voting the Labour Party was entitled to 150 seats instead of the 60 seats actually secured.

Sir Leo Chiozza Money, explaining in *The Herald*, for January 11, 1919, why he left the Cabinet of which Clynes was a member, declared:—

Unfortunately I have myself been witness in this war of many occasions in which the Government has denied or ignored the merits of a Labour case until there was a strike, or the threat of a strike.

And on September 19, 1918, Money, while still a member of the Government, submitted to the Cabinet, in the presence of Clynes, the following observation:—

We have only to consider the level of wages even to-day in classes of the community which are not organised, or which have no power to strike. Hundreds of thousands of poor people have still to be content with wages which they have no power to raise or to gain consideration for.

But Money's protest was ignored, naturally and inevitably.

Clynes was present in the House of Commons on the Government Benches when his Coalition colleague, the then Home Secretary, was indicted on November 12, 1917, by Philip Snowden, later Chancellor of the Exchequer, and his "Labour" Government colleague. Snowden declared:—

What about the notorious case of Alec Gordon? The Government have spies to try and find evidence, which is a pure fabrication, against those who are called Pacifists, so that they may condemn innocent people to imprisonment on the evidence of men they dare not produce in Court.

And Clynes knew that Snowden was right!!!

As a member of the Coalition Cabinet, Clynes objected to encouraging those elements in Russia who wanted to humiliate Great Britain, meaning the British ruling class. He had no objection to encouraging those elements in Britain who aimed consistently at the humiliation

of the British working class. In November, 1918, about the time he was fighting to remain in the Labour movement and the Coalition Government at the same time, Clynes sat on the Treasury Benches with Lord Robert Cecil when the latter was questioned by Joseph King.

Lord R. Cecil: "The Bolsheviks killed without justification one of our naval officers in Petrograd who was doing his duty protecting the Embassy from the entry of unauthorised persons."

Mr. Joseph King: "We had no Embassy."

Lord R. Cecil: "That is a perfectly irrelevant observation."

And Clynes gravely supported this lying nonsense of Imperial statesmanship.

To-day Lord Robert Cecil sits in the House of Lords as Viscount Cecil of Chelwood.

Culled from the *Freethinker*, March 7, 1920:—

The Right Hon. J. R. Clynes, M.P., and Mr. Jack Edwards, M.P., were the speakers at a Brotherhood Church demonstration at Southend-on-Sea. The chairman was a Conservative magistrate and a Deputy Mayor, and the singing was led by the Salvation Army Band. . . . No one can complain of the "Brotherhood" of such a delightful mixture, but the fraternity is very unlikely to stand a severe strain. "General" Booth's bandsmen playing the "Marseillaise" does not herald the millennium.

It was concerning Clynes and Walsh, the men whom he was to call to office in his "Labour" Cabinet, as well as Barnes, who was doomed to obscurity, that Ramsay MacDonald wrote in *Forward*, for September 1, 1917:—

When we fell, we were deserted. When notorious blackguards attacked us and a whole tribe of liars were busy twisting and contorting our opinions, the men by whose side we had stood in many a battle, and who were then in clover amongst their enemies, never responded to a generous or a chivalrous motive.

Writing in *Forward*, for July 5, 1919, Ramsay MacDonald said:—

Mr. Clynes is the Hobbes of Representative Government, and is more servile to authority than the Whigs.

Philip Snowden, writing in the *Labour Leader*, said, with reference to Clynes:—

Mr. Clynes argued in favour of the abolition of political parties, the unity of all on a common programme and for a purpose. . . . Does Mr. Clynes imagine that landlords and capitalists . . . are ready to set their economic interests aside? . . . Mr. Clynes's own experience as Food Controller is a conclusive answer to such a Utopian hope as that.—November 18, 1918.

It is not for Mr. Clynes surely to complain that we take our reports of his speeches from the capitalist Press, which, in almost every issue, is reporting Mr. Clynes to the extent of half a column. If Mr. Clynes were not serving their interests he would not be given this prominence. . . . Every time that Mr. Clynes speaks nowadays he shows how far he has drifted from the position he once occupied in the Labour Movement.—May 22, 1919.

The following is the report of Mr. Clynes's speech taken from the Morning Post. The reports in The Times and Daily Telegraph are substantially the same:—
"Mr. J. R. Clynes said . . . the poor had no right to rob the rich of what was theirs, as the rich had no right to rob the poor." . . .—May 22, 1919.

Troelsa was not allowed to land in this country because he was bringing Scheidmann's reply to the British Labour War Aims Manifesto. This was after Arthur Henderson had asked the consent of the Foreign Office and had received a definite reply "on War Cabinet Authority" that there would be no difficulties raised. The War Cabinet backed down, and the well-known International Comrade

of Clynes was referred to by Lord Robert Cecil as "this person." Clynes remained in the Cabinet although Troelsa had responded to the special invitation of the party of which Clynes was a leader. Clynes remained in the Cabinet that denied a passport to Margaret Bondfield, representing Labour, and gave one to Mrs Pankhurst, representing war and reaction. He remained in the Cabinet that prosecuted, in June, 1918, his comrade Huysman, the Secretary of the International Socialist Bureau, under the Aliens Act! So conscious was Clynes of this record that when he addressed the Anti-Coalition meeting in St Andrew's Hall, Glasgow, in March, 1920, no questions were allowed. The result was he was refused a hearing. And the boss press, which had rejoiced at the smashing up of Socialist meetings the while Clynes was in the Coalition Government, denounced the Socialist attack on "free speech" for denying Clynes' right to speak unless he answered questions.

Concerning these events in which Clynes played such a prominent part, Ramsay MacDonald wrote in *Forward* :—

Trade Unionism has Ministers and it has high officials, but it cannot send Margaret Bondfield to America nor bring Troelsa to London. When it obeys it is honoured; when it thinks and acts for itself it is thwarted. And it is not always the Government that is to blame; it is often Labour itself.—August 31, 1918.

Labour is going to do its own work in its own way; it is to solve its own problems in accord with its own mind. It is beginning to know that no compromise or alliance with the "powers that now be" are in the interests of Labour.—September 14, 1918.

In these notes and comments, illustrating the Anti-Socialist and Anti-Labour character of the MacDonald administration, we are not pretending that Socialism has anything in common with capitalist peace terms, or that Scheidemann's reply to the British Labour War Aims Manifesto mattered. Neither British nor German Labour should have had anything to do with capitalist war aims, and Scheidemann played the same role in Germany that Clynes played in Britain.

As Home Secretary in the Second Labour Government, Clynes maintained his reputation for reaction. In June, 1931, correspondence was published between him, as Home Secretary, and the Secretary of the National Council for the Abolition of the Death Penalty. Clynes emphasised the fact that he had no intention of acting on the recommendations of the Select Committee, which reported in January, 1931, for the abolition of capital punishment. The Secretary of the National Council commented :—

The continued delay encourages in many quarters the belief that the Labour Government is opposed to abolition and is not anxious to give effect to the policy of the Labour Party Conference in regard to capital punishment.

Refusing to act on the Committee's recommendation, Clynes made this curious statement :—

I feel sure that the question of using or making an opportunity of bringing before Parliament the report of the Select Committee can safely be left in the hands of supporters of the abolition of capital punishment.

The entire parliamentary movement of the working-class remained absolutely indifferent to this shameful evasion of responsibility.

Arthur Henderson became M.P. in 1903. Prior to his parliamentary career, he was a member of the Newcastle City Council and Darlington Borough Council, and became Mayor of Darlington in 1903. He was a magistrate and served on the selection of Justices of the Peace.

Henderson was President of the Labour Party from 1908-10, and again from 1914-17, Chief Whip from 1921-24, and then from 1925-27. During the war he was included in those Cabinets of all the talents that were so obsessed by jealousies and self-seekings. He identified himself with Tory politicians who had slandered Socialists before the war and who returned to their slanders after the war; the same Tories who took Ramsay MacDonald for a leader in 1931.

The character of his war-time associates will be understood if we turn to the correspondence that passed between Arthur Henderson, as the sitting member, and Ian Fairbairn, the defeated Tory candidate, in June, 1929. This correspondence was published in full in the *Burnley News*, for June 29, 1929. In his letter to Fairbairn, dated June 20, 1929, Henderson complained:—

As regards Tory Party propaganda against the Labour Party and its candidates in all parts of the country, Leaflet No. 2,407, entitled "Communism and the Churches," stated: "Communism, which is advanced Socialism under another name, would mean an end of the churches. Communism means Death to Religion!" Tory Leaflet No. 2,512, entitled "Religious Teaching Banned," stated that "the teaching of religious beliefs in State or private educational establishments and schools to children of tender age and to minors is punishable by forced labour for a period not exceeding one year." Then follows: "This is what happens in Russia. Do you want it here?" Then Tory Leaflet No. 2,408 was addressed "To Parents," and said "Communists Corrupt Children. Knowing that the best time to start shaping a man's or woman's belief is in childhood, the Communists, who are Socialists under another name, are trying now to corrupt the children. . . . The best Way to Smash Communism—Vote Conservative and Unionist." Tory Leaflet No. 2,409 was addressed "To Women," and declared that "Communism Destroys Marriage." They were told that "Under Communism the Monarchy will be ended and a Bolshevik Republic set up; Religion will be stamped out; The Home will be destroyed. Marriage will be only a matter of civil contract; Divorce will be obtainable at will; Children will be taken from their mothers and made the property of the State. . . ."

These are examples of official Tory leaflets on religion and child life and marriage which were scattered broadcast throughout the land with the definite object of creating popular hostility to the Labour Party. I might go on detailing similar misrepresentations of the party of which I was secretary, but it would be to no useful purpose for you appear to think the Tory Party and its representatives—Cabinet Ministers and candidates—are entitled to say just what they please so long as it is calculated to further the Tory cause and do harm to the Labour Party.

Henderson raised no objection to Tory misrepresentations of Socialism and Anti-Militarism during the war, when he was in the Cabinet, and in receipt of murder-income and Tory applause.

Arthur Henderson was appointed a Privy Councillor in January, 1915, and joined the Coalition Cabinet in May of that year, as President of the Board of Education. In December, 1916, he found himself in the new War Cabinet. He was the first Labour member to receive Cabinet rank, whilst retaining his Labour status. John Burns, who had received Cabinet status in 1907, sacrificed his "Labour" status, as everyone knows. In July, 1917, Henderson resumed his friendship with MacDonald, and resigned office on August 11 following. In his letter to Prime Minister Lloyd George, Henderson wrote:—

I gather you had reached the conclusion that my retention of the post of secretary to the Labour Party was no longer compatible with my membership of the War Cabinet. Recent experiences have impressed me with the embarrassing complications arising from this duality of office. . . . I continue to share your desire that the war should be carried to a successful conclusion.

At the I.L.P. Annual Conference, Huddersfield, April, 1919, a report was presented showing the persecution that had been experienced during the war by the I.L.P. Press. Between August, 1915, and April, 1918, both the London and Manchester Offices of the press were raided, type seized, machinery dismantled, pamphlets destroyed, heavy fines imposed. F. W. Jowett, later Henderson's colleague in the MacDonald Cabinet, signed the report that rejoiced in this struggle. Yet it was not constitutional, since all the seizures and prosecutions were constitutional. And it made the repute of the men who, later, being in office, thought and spoke as Imperially as those who once persecuted them. It is curious to note that during most of this period of persecution Arthur Henderson was in the persecuting Cabinet.

Jowett, as pointed out in Appendix VII., *S.P., Part I., Page 75*, used his post-war Cabinet office to advance anti-militarism and the stand against war and its hatred.

Early in 1917 a Special Committee of Enquiry into the responsibility of Arthur Henderson for the deportation without trial of ten Clyde members of the A.S.E. was appointed. The Committee reported to the Labour Party Executive in November and the report was printed at a cost of £600. It exonerated Henderson on the ground that, although Labour representative in the Cabinet, he was not consulted about the deportations!!!

David Kirkwood commented on the report:—

When Mr. Henderson visited Glasgow in December 1915, he came as the representative of a Capitalist Government, and I repudiated his claim while appearing in that capacity to pose as the representative of Labour.

In *Forward*, for September 11, 1920, Henderson defended his membership of the Government that executed James Connolly, on the following ground:—

The Labour movement actively participated in the war, not at the instance of its leaders, but because it believed—and rightly believed as the German Socialists now acknowledge—that German militarism was a menace to liberty and democracy.

Henderson added that

nothing of what I said or did when these matters (the execution of Connolly) were before the Cabinet was known, and I certainly do not propose to violate Ministerial confidences.

Which was probably the only safe thing Henderson could do under the circumstances. To Labour he was responsible for the death, in struggle, of one of its martyrs.

Arthur Henderson was a member of the War Cabinet when conscription was forced on the Russian workers in Britain and elemental Russian Trade Union rights were invaded by the Coalition Government. The Conscription Convention was prepared before the fall of the Tsar but was signed by the Government of Kerensky without any sort of mandate from the Russian people. The defence of the liberties of poor Russians was taken up by the late Lords Parmoor, Sheffield, and Lord Courney of Penwith. Sheffield stands out as one of the most honourable names in war years, and Lord Parmoor, an ex-Tory, was, except for Jowett, the only honourable name in the Labour Cabinet.

In May, 1917, whilst Henderson was still in the Government, the following clause, decreeing industrial conscription, was added to the Defence of the Realm Act:—

42 C. If any person, male or female (not being a member of any of His Majesty's naval or military forces) enrolled after the 10th day of May for employment by the Army Council—

- (a) Without lawful excuse absents himself from any work which it is his duty to perform, or from any place where it is his duty to be, or
- (b) Refuses or wilfully neglects to perform any of his duties, or
- (c) Wilfully impedes or delays the due performance of any work on or in connection with which he may be employed,

he shall be guilty of a summary offence against these regulations.

Henderson could not leave the Cabinet over matters like this or Connolly's murder. He left it ten days after the doormat squabble, or a personal quarrel with Lloyd George.

His view that this squabble was all-important was shared by Ramsay MacDonald, who urged a Balfour Government, in order to avenge the insult, and referred to the matter in the following terms:—

I return to l'affaire Henderson. . . . There is one incident in that affair which stands up from the rest like a great landmark. I wish I could draw it pictorially, so that it might be sent broadcast over the country and help to bring work-people back to a sense of self-respect. I refer to the "door-mat" episode. . . .

The rest of MacDonald's suggestions will be found on pages 61 and 57 S.P., Part I.

J. H. Thomas was exposed thoroughly in the *Commune* for August, 1925. At that time the official Labour movement was busy deceiving the rank-and-file as to the nature and extent of Thomas's services to the workers. Cramp made a hireling apology for this place-hunter in the *Railway Review* for August 21, 1925. The same issue of that trade union journal published other defences of Thomas. These apologies were answered in the *Commune* for September, 1925. It would not be possible to reprint the indictment in this pamphlet, although this record of Thomas's career and also the similar studies of Wheatley's career that were published in the *Commune* should be reprinted. Fortunately Thomas has exposed himself and it is no longer of moment to the working class movement to discuss his record. Facts are instanced below that are not included in the *Commune* because their purpose is not to establish the treachery of Thomas but to bring home to the working class mind an understanding of the fact that that treachery was pursued by Thomas with the consent and even the applause of the official Labour movement.

In the great 1924 debate leading to place, Thomas was patted on the back by Lloyd George and congratulated the Duches of Atholl on her Anti-Socialist speech. On the eve of office he stood by organised scabbing on the railroad and redefined blacklegging as disloyalty to leaders' signatures. In 1926, he collapsed the miners' strike and the General Strike, as he promised, *on oath*, in the London Law Courts to do, in December, 1921.

Wrote Thomas Johnston, in *Forward*, for January 26, 1924:—

Mr. J. H. Thomas's statement in the House of Commons last week that he was a recipient of Russian gold, because he got £2,000 damages in his libel action against the Communist newspaper cannot be allowed to pass. . . . The £2,000 he got, and he must know it, came from the National Labour Press, a venture of the I.L.P. . . . It was the I.L.P. he skinned of the £2,000, and it is rather shabby to make a cheap score of it as "Russian gold."

Are not such creatures the normal product of "parleyism"? Was Ramsay MacDonald himself one whit superior? Did he not eulogise Thomas for his "loyalty" as "the greatest man I know"?

Stephen Walsh, MacDonald's War Minister, who died in the spring of 1929, was Parliamentary Secretary of the Local Government Board in the Coalition Government. Speaking in the Ince division during the General Election of 1918, he said, according to the *Manchester Guardian* of Monday, December 9, of that year:—

I am supporting the Coalition programme—the Labour Party programme is one that, in my opinion, is making for bloodshed and revolution. I have stated this with great distinctness to my own Miners' Federation, and I, for one, will not be associated with it.

The fact that this man was asked to be War Minister in a Labour Party Cabinet, and a colleague of Wheatley and MacDonald, indicts these persons individually and the entire Cabinet collectively. It shows how parliamentarism deceives and betrays the working class; what a huge hypocrisy the thing is. Imperialism was Walsh's strong point.

In April, 1912, Stephen Walsh, in the House of Commons, made an amazing declaration of Imperialist patriotism. Not content with this House of Commons performance, he proceeded to tell the Lancashire miners at Hindley that citizenship was higher than trade unionism, that the capitalist state was greater than any trade union! He also spoke about the equal rights of capital and labour, and concluded his address as follows:—

Were they not proud of their citizenship? Would they lightly barter it? The British citizen in any part of the world knew that wherever he went he could look to the strong arm of the mighty Empire to which he belonged to protect him. Was not that something to be proud of? He had nothing to retract. The words he used in Parliament he should repeat. He was proud of his citizenship. (Cheers.)

The Hull capitalist Press made quite a lot of this speech. In this it was not alone. The Press of the country applauded. The governing class always fawn on traitors to Labour. And a Labour M.P. who is proud of the Empire—! But Walsh anticipated MacDonald's 1924 performances.

Philip Snowden defined the Coalition, supported by Clynes and Walsh and other of his Labour Cabinet colleagues, in the *Labour Leader*, in 1918, as follows:—

"Democracy in Practice!" . . . While British Ministers utter hypocritical platitudes about this being a war for democracy they secretly encourage the most militarist and imperialist country in the world to attack, and to endeavour to overthrow the newly established democracy of Russia. . . . The purpose of both is to crush the Russian Revolution and to make the world still safe for autocracy. —March 14.

Facts like these make it necessary to enquire once more what justification there is for the Labour Party putting forward Labour candidates in opposition to Liberal and Tory at the next General Election.—April 18.

Nothing has been more discreditable to the official Labour Party during the last three years than its silence while the Government has been relentlessly suppressing popular liberties.—May 23.

The following excerpts relate the services rendered to Socialism and Labour during war-time by Adamson:—

The appointment of Mr. William Adamson, M.P., for West Fife, as Chairman of the Parliamentary Labour Party is hailed with glee by the capitalist press, one of those organs claims that the new chairman "is heart and soul for the vigorous prosecution of the war" until Prussianism is crushed.—Labour Leader, November 1, 1917.

I have the greatest sympathy with those who resent some of the recent decisions of Labour Party Conferences, come to, it must not be forgotten, in the teeth of the opposition of the Labour Party Executive itself . . . by the operation of the bloc vote largely cast by a few officials and in no way representative of the wishes of the rank and file. The most fatal of those decisions was that moved by Mr. Adamson, which sought to deprive the Socialist sections of their direct contact with the Socialist International.—Ramsay MacDonald, in Forward, April 18, 1918.

More men who wear the livery. Wm. Adamson, M.P., takes a Privy Councillorship. . . . We waste no sympathy upon them. The Government dragged its net wide this time. Thousands of jokers have been ennobled, including three already ennobled Highnesses, but only five Labour men appear to have fallen.—Thomas Johnston, in Forward, June 5, 1918.

Adamson's feeble criticism. . . . Mr. Adamson rose from the front Opposition Bench. . . . Adamson found the Premier's speech "eloquent, interesting and instructive," but he was not at all sure it would satisfy all the Prime Minister's friends.—Labour Leader, April 24, 1919.

VI. Potted Biography : Very Incomplete

In the pre-parliamentary, or, at least, pre-governmental careers of the Socialist parliamentarians, a strong light is thrown on the actual belief of the rank-and-file or storm troops of the parliamentary Labour movement. Even during the war years, there was a strong anti-militarist feeling existing among the working-class factions in Great Britain. From 1918 to 1923, the tide of anti-militarism was rising and in order to command position in the Labour movement it was necessary to think and speak in terms of pacifism. To know what the Socialist parliamentarism taught, en route to place, and to know the nominal purpose of the organisations to which they belonged, is to understand whether parliamentary Socialism has served or betrayed the workers in their struggle towards emancipation. The workers' need is not to be persuaded to join this or that small group, however useful membership of it may be to the working-class struggle, but to know broadly what policy is in line with working-class objective. It is hoped that this very incomplete appendix, which does not profess to be up to date but has the merit of being restricted to a certain period, devoted to parliamentary Socialist biography, will help the workers to understand the imperative need for Socialism and what the struggle for Socialism entails.

AMMON, C. G., I.L.P., U.D.C. Born 1873. In Post Office service, 26 years, beginning as telegraph messenger. Chairman, Post Office Sorters' Association, 8 years, until its amalgamation with the Union of Post Office Workers (U.P.W.). Represented British Trade Union Congress, American Labour Convention, 1915. British delegate, International Brotherhood Congress, Washington, 1920. Leader, Labour Party, L.C.C., representing North Camberwell, 1919 and 1922. One of the 36 signatories who sent a letter to Sir John Simon in January, 1916, expressing "whole-hearted appreciation" of his opposition to conscription, and promising support of themselves and organisations they represented in any further opposition. *Took an active part in the Leeds Conference of June 3, 1917, which was called for the*

purpose of establishing Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils throughout the country, in opposition to the existing Parliamentary administration, for the purposes of compelling peace. Ammon was made Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty in the 1924 Socialist Government.

Speaking at the Scarborough Trades Union Congress on Friday, September 11, 1925, Ammon spoke on the subject of closing the dockyards at Pembroke and Rosyth. He pointed out that disarmament meant a good deal of hurt for dockyard workers, and asked the congress to call on the Government to scrap the naval programme and keep the yards going for repairs and maintenance.

A nice study in the economies of navalism and the evolution of an anti-militarist through parliamentary contacts and elevation.

ARNOT R. PAGE. Born, Greenock, 1890. Became M.A., Glasgow University, 1912. Joined I.L.P. same year. Chairman, University Socialist Federation. From 1915 to 1920, wrote regularly for *Labour Leader*, under pen-name "Jack Cade." Edited *Labour Year Book*, 1916. Imprisoned during war as conscientious objector. His anti-militarist sentiments were endorsed by Snowden and circulated at MacDonald's meetings as Socialist thought more or less endorsed by MacDonald. Joined the Communist Party in 1925. One of the twelve C.P. leaders imprisoned for "seditious conspiracy" in 1925. The Attorney-General pointed out, at this trial, that Arnot was one of the three persons who signed the C.P. cheques. The other two were Albert Inkpin and J. G. Murphy.

Writing in the *Labour Monthly*, June, 1923, Arnot said: "Gradually, the Labour Party as a whole, is bound to develop in a direction of a mere electoral caucus; at the last, it will be like the National Liberal Federation."

In 1924, Thomas Johnston declared in *Forward* that Socialists did not advocate the break-up of Empire. Arnot replied in the *Workers' Weekly*, August 1, 1924, as follows:—

The readers of his (Johnston's) paper are not allowed to know, first, that the International Socialist Congress (at Stuttgart, 1907) decided definitely against Empire; and, second, that any Socialist fighter for the working class must, of necessity, be a fighter also against Empire, against the Capitalists, against the whole of the apparatus of Free States, and Dependencies and Protectorates, etc., etc.

ATTLEE, CLEMENT RICHARD. I.L.P. Born, 1884. Under Secretary of State for War in the 1924 Socialist Government. Barrister-at-law and lecturer in economics. First Labour Mayor of Stepney.

BONDFIELD, MISS MARGARET, I.L.P., U.D.C., N.C.C.L. Parliamentary Secretary to Ministry of Labour, 1924 Government. Assistant Secretary, Shops Assistants' Union, 1898-1908. Member of the Executive of the National Council of Civil Liberties, which was raided by the police in November, 1917, in connection with the activities against the Military Service Acts.

BRAILSFORD, HENRY NOEL. I.L.P. Born, Yorkshire, 1873. Graduated M.A., Glasgow University. Served Greek Foreign Legion, Turco-Greek War, 1897. During Great War joined U.D.C. and I.L.P. Also, Peace Negotiations Committee. Socialist candidate for Montrose Burghs, 1918. Editor, *New Leader*, 1922-26.

In September, 1914, Brailsford commenced to condemn Britain's participation in the war. The authorities seized, and the court ordered to be destroyed, his pamphlet, "Belgium and a 'Scrap of Paper'," published by the I.L.P. in its series of "Labour and War Pamphlets."

In an article entitled "God's Englishmen," published in *New Leader*, December 2, 1927, Brailsford wrote:—

The Labour Party, under Mr. MacDonald's guidance, has taken its stand against the Indian people as an Imperialist Party, and the consequences of its action will pursue us.

In this matter of immense moment, the Labour Party, it seems to me, under Mr. MacDonald's guidance, has become the complacent partner with the Tory Party in a policy of Imperialism. It has betrayed Socialist principles and forfeited its claim to the confidence of the Indian people.

BROCKWAY, ARCHIBALD FENNER. I.L.P. Born, 1888, Calcutta. Son of a missionary. Educated Ethan College. Sub-editor, *Christian Commonwealth*. Editor, *Labour Leader*, 1911-1916. Conscientious objector, 1917-1919. Founder of the N.C.F.

In his pre-war book, "Labour and Liberalism," Brockway declared: "*The object of the Labour Party is the complete overthrow of capitalism.*"

In the same work he attacked the Liberal Government for isolating Germany, and for forming an alliance with the Tsar, and wrote of Russia's "deadly dungeons" and "scaffold."

Sir Leo Chiozza Money, questioning the Attorney-General, on June 28, 1915, described the *Labour Leader*, then edited by Brockway, as follows:—

The Labour Leader, has, ever since the war began, deliberately pursued, week by week, a policy of misrepresenting the present and past motives and actions of the British Government, of discouraging recruiting, of suggesting that the war was provoked by British diplomacy and aggression, of publishing (and republishing as a pamphlet) an article charging the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary with deliberately deceiving the House of Commons, and in various other ways seeking to make it difficult for the United Kingdom to prosecute the war with success.

Charged with being an absentee under the Military Service Acts, Brockway told the Bow Street magistrate in November, 1916:—

Acts of Parliament may deem me a soldier; tribunals may decide that I must be a soldier; you, sir, may hand me over to the military to become a soldier; officers may order me to fulfil the duties of a soldier; but no power on earth can make me do what I believe to be wrong. I can only trust that my actions in the immediate future may prove the sincerity of the views I have so often expressed. I count it a privilege that I have been called upon to witness to my faith in Internationalism and Peace.

Brockway was released from prison in 1919.

In 1922 he published a pamphlet, "How To End War," in which he said:—

The workers of the so-called civilised nations are content to see their Governments spend hundreds of millions of pounds on preparation for wars in which they are called upon to shoot each other down. . . . They do not realise that they have one common enemy that keeps them in poverty, which enslaves their weaker brothers, and which sets them periodically at each other's throats. That common enemy is Capitalism.

The *Birmingham Town Crier*, October 8, 1926, reported Brockway's presidential address to the annual conference of the "No More War" Movement, held in that town. Brockway urged the Labour Movement to make it clear to the Government that any threat of war would be met by organised refusal to work in the industries and services essential to war, and that immediate steps should be taken to prepare concerted Labour resistance to war in all countries.

BUXTON, CHARLES RODEN. Born, 1875. Educated, Harrow and Cambridge. First President, South London Branch, W.E.A. Rejected by the Hackney Liberal Association on account of his anti-war views, February, 1916. In 1917 joined the I.L.P., and became member, executive of the U.D.C. In 1918, adopted as Labour candidate for Accrington. Won seat, 1922, and defeated again in 1923.

On the eve of the war, wrote in *Manchester Guardian*, August 1, 1914:—

Now is the time for every Liberal to declare that he protests against the idea of this country being drawn into war in order to support Russia and France against Austria and Germany.

The *South London Press*, April 2, 1915, reported Buxton's speech in the Browning Hall, Walworth, appealing for a moderate peace. Buxton said with great vision:—

It will have been absolutely futile to have fought this war if, at the end of it, we so humiliate and crush any nation that it is resolved from that day forward to build up its strength for a second war.

Buxton was a delegate to the Leeds Convention, 1917. The previous year he supported Taylor, the Peace by Negotiation candidate, in the Rossendale by-election, January, 1916. The candidate was a "conscientious objector," and was arrested by the military authorities at the outset of the election campaign.

In a manifesto on the Peace Treaty issued by the Executive Committee of the U.D.C. (*Manchester Guardian*, 12th May, 1919), signed by Charles Roden Buxton, A. Ponsonby, Philip Snowden, Ramsay MacDonald, E. D. Morel, H. B. Lees-Smith, and other members of the Executive, it was stated that the Peace Terms violated the conditions on which the Germans laid down their arms. The Treaty is not a Peace of justice, but a Peace of violence.

In the *Labour Leader*, 10th January, 1918, he urged the Allies to accept the Bolshevik invitation to join in the peace negotiations at Brest-Litovsk.

After a visit to Ireland he charged England with hypocrisy, and said that the British Government employed "convicted criminals" as "agents provocateurs." "The recognition of Ireland's complete right to complete independence, if she desires it, is ultimately inevitable." (*Labour Leader*, 30th September, 1920.)

During 1921 Buxton wrote and spoke against the Allied treatment of Germany, and denounced the French insistence on "sanctions"—a term that hypocrisy welcomes as "a seemingly honourable description for a fundamentally disreputable thing."—(*Daily News*, 27th March, 1921.)

COOK, ARTHUR JAMES, I.L.P., born 1884. Educated Army and elementary schools, and Labour College, London. Preached in Baptist pulpit when 17. Joined I.L.P. in 1905. Took an active part in the Syndicalist movement among miners; and was joint author, with Noah Abblett, of "The Miners' Next Step," published in 1913. Became Secretary of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain in 1924. Member of the T.U.C. General Council, 1928.

Cook was imprisoned for intimidation in 1918 and 1921. Cook's 1921 trial was reported fully, *Western Mail*, June 16. The prosecution

quoted a speech in which Cook said "the police and soldiers are hired assassins of the capitalist class." He also described the safety-men as blacklegs, and declared "they should be inside the boilers and not outside."

On July 29, 1921, Cook was charged at Glamorgan Assizes with unlawful assembly, and sentenced to two months' imprisonment with hard labour. Released, September, 1921.

After the settlement of the 1921 strike, Cook resigned from the Communist Party, but published articles in the *Workers' Weekly*, August, 1923, and also November 9, and December 21, 1923, and February, 1924.

Labour war enthusiasts should note that Cook was denied permission to enter Poland because of his alleged Socialism and working-class bias.

In April, 1927, Cook urged all workers to support the Labour Party and its policy.

Cook died on November 2, 1931.

DAVIES, RHYS JOHN, I.L.P. Born 1877. Under-Secretary of State for Home Affairs in the 1924 Government. He has been farm labourer, coal miner, co-operative employee, and trade union official.

Davies contributed an account of his life in November, 1926, to *T.P.'s and Cassell's Weekly* "In the Days of My Youth" series. He said:—

We were eleven children. I was the last; and within two years after I peeped on the world for the first time, about fifty years ago, my mother died, at thirty-three years of age. My father was then an iron-ore refiner, and we lived in a three-up-and-two-down on the Station Road of the small industrial village of Llangenech, Carmarthenshire, on the muddy banks of the tidal river Loughor, which flows out to Carmarthen Bay three miles farther down. . . .

My father was a giant of a workman, with hands so used to hard toil that they were like patches of a blacksmith's leather apron.

After six months' work in a sawmill, I was bound at thirteen years of age to a twelve months' agreement as a farm lad, and all my remuneration for that year consisted of food and lodging and a cast-off suit of clothes. A second year's contract was somewhat more advantageous, for it brought me £1 salary, payable in gold at the close of the term! For the third and last year I was paid £3, including, of course, my keep. I soon left farm labouring for good.

With 7s. 6d. in my pocket, a working suit and some underclothing in a tin box, I landed in Ferndale, Glamorganshire, and commenced work at the "face" as a miner's "butty." . . .

The local co-operative stores deputation waited upon me and asked me to take the job of cashier. And so after ten years of coal hewing I left the pit, never to return. . . . In four years I was appointed a full-time officer for my society. This appointment took me to Manchester. . . .

In October, 1921, a vacancy occurred in the Westhoughton Division of Lancashire by the death of the Labour member. I was asked to fight for my Party, and in November of that year I entered the House of Commons, a position which, I must confess, had attracted me for some years.

Rhys Davies was an anti-militarist during the first Great War and has made a splendid stand against war during the present conflict. His essay, *The Christian and War*, translated from the Welsh, with a brief account of his career, appeared in *The Word*, January, 1924.

HENDERSON, RT. HON. ARTHUR. Born Glasgow, 1862; apprenticed as moulder; Wesleyan; abstainer; Mayor of Newcastle, 1903; Chairman Parliamentary Labour Party 1908-10 and 1914-17; Secretary of Labour Party; President Board of Education 1915-16; Government Mission to Russia, 1917.

Speaking at Burnley (*Yorkshire Post*, 18th October, 1927). Henderson said in reference to James Maxton, chairman of the I.L.P., "I know of very little difference between the Chairman of the I.L.P. and the Secretary of the Labour Party, or between the opinions of the Left Wing and the Right. The aims and purposes of the Labour Movement are the same amongst all its representatives.

Arthur Henderson was exposed in *The Commune* in January, 1929. That exposure led to the famous Shettleston Prosecution and my Bill of Advocation appeal.

Henderson died on October 20, 1935.

Arthur Henderson's cremation at Golders' Green, London, at 12-15 p.m. on October 24, 1935, was an occasion for the expression of much political hypocrisy, so typical of the falsehood of capitalist "democracy." The Methodist Church services, and even the Westminster Abbey memorial service may be passed by. In Glasgow, George Lansbury paid a tribute at a special Sunday service in St John's Methodist Church. In view of the attacks made on Arthur Henderson during his life by the Communist Party, the outstanding hypocrisy was the telegram sent from Moscow by M. Litvinov, the Soviet Foreign Commissar, to W. W. Henderson, son of Arthur Henderson. Litvinov wired:—

"I learnt the news of your great loss on my way back from Geneva. Please accept my profound sympathy.

"Arthur Henderson will always be remembered in the Soviet Union for the prominent part he displayed in the Disarmament Conference and in re-establishing Anglo-Soviet relations."

Disarmament Conference! Look at the world to-day and consider the part played by Labour Parliamentarism during the first Great War and during the peace interlude. What damnable hypocrisy!

JOWETT, RT. HON. F. W., I.L.P., U.D.C., N.P.C. First Commissioner of Works in 1924 Government, was chairman of I.L.P. when war was declared and signed a manifesto against the war and against recruiting. In the *Labour Leader* of 3rd September, 1914, he wrote: "In accordance with its principles the I.L.P. has declined to join in the campaign for recruiting to which the Labour Party has committed itself. . . . We must keep on holding our meetings; there is almost unlimited scope for useful propaganda."

With other Executive members of the I.L.P., Jowett was a director of the "National Labour Press." The various offices of the National Labour Press were raided by the police on ten different occasions from August, 1915, up to April, 1918, with a number of visits of inspection in addition. The "Labour Press" issued propaganda for the encouragement of conscientious objectors, and the advocacy of the aims of the *No-Conscription Fellowship*.

Jowett was on the General Council of the U.D.C. He voted against the Registration Bill, July, 1915; the Military Service Bill, January 1916; Labour M.P.s remaining in Ministry, January, 1916; Military Service Bill, May, 1916, following the Irish Rebellion. He supported the "Peace by Negotiation" resolution of Lees Smith, November, 1917. Promoted Leeds Conference.

Presiding at the Labour Party Conference at Edinburgh, in June, 1922, Jowett said :—

The Treaty of Versailles is founded on a lie—the most deadly destructive lie in the history of the world—the lie that Germany alone was responsible for the war. The whole policy of punishment embodied in that Treaty. . . . is the spawn of that lie.

He demanded self-determination for Ireland, India, and Egypt. His membership of the 1924 Government was not consistent with these demands, nor yet with his criticism of the Versailles Treaty. He was not happy over these inconsistencies, and so was omitted from the Second Labour Government.

In Appendix VII. to *S.P. Part I.*, and in the columns of *The Word*, I have paid tribute to Jowett for his splendid stand against war. In office in 1924, he immortalised Nurse Cavell's famous words against war. To-day he is the bravest Socialist voice in Britain. Jowett hoped to achieve something in 1924 that was impossible.

LANSBURY, GEORGE. Born 1859. Son, George Lansbury, of Oxford, railway sub-contractor. Teetotaller, non-smoker, Church of England, twice in prison. Mayor of Poplar, 1919. From Radicalism progressed to Communism. Styled by his critics "The Crimson Christian," Lansbury defended vigorously, during 1917, the principle of the class war.

From his speeches we make these extracts :—

December, 1919.—"The Labour Movement will always have the difficulty of benevolence to fight. The erection of health centres, certain admiration from the unthinking, especially as in the case of many of the people, it is sheer good nature which makes them spend their money in this way, coupled with a firm belief that God made some people rich and others poor. When the rich and the poor realise that the poor are poor because they are robbed, robbed because they are poor, we shall not need the charity of anybody."

30th June, 1920.—"We believe that man has been on the wrong road ever since the dawn of that thing we call civilisation."

The *Daily Herald*, then under the control of George Lansbury, supported the police strike of 1919.

Lansbury was appointed Mayor of Poplar in 1919, at a salary of £300, and refused to levy rates.

He assisted the "Hunger March" on Downing Street in 1921, and was reported in the *Daily Herald*, for July 29, 1921, as saying :—

We have got nothing by being passive and quiet, and we are going to be passive and quiet no longer. If we choose between contempt of the poor and contempt of court, it will be contempt of court.

Lansbury was charged with contempt of court, and the Lord Chief Justice declared that the behaviour of Lansbury was "pure anarchism."

Released on October 4, 1921, Lansbury participated in the Poplar "victory" procession, headed by the Red Flag and the Seinn Fein colours. Lansbury cried: "Here we are. We were sent to prison, and they were compelled to let us out."

On Armistice Day, 1921, Lansbury organised a Poplar procession as a protest against the two minutes' silence at the Cenotaph.

On June 16, 1923, the *Daily Herald* printed information from Government dockyards which the Admiralty had ordered should be concealed, and the office was raided by the police six days later. Lansbury admitted his responsibility for this publication.

In 1924, as Labour Lord Chancellor, Lord Haldane removed a Liberal from the Bench of Magistrates because he was a Passive Resister. The *Daily Herald*, for November 6, 1924, announced:—

Mr. George Lansbury, M.P., who was recently appointed a Justice of the Peace for London, made an affirmation at London Sessions yesterday, and subsequently took a seat on the Bench.

The *New Leader*, for July, 1927, published an article from the pen of Lansbury, headed:

REFUSE TO FIGHT!

THE WAY TO END WAR

The editor wrote this introduction to Lansbury's article:—

This week-end War Resistance Demonstrations are to be held throughout Britain and in many other countries. George Lansbury gives a lead.

Lansbury's article was an excellent essay against war and a magnificent appeal to common-sense. He wrote, in fact, as follows:

PAY AND FIGHT AND DIE

Having entirely smashed the German military machine, which in solemn treaty we are told was alone responsible for that war; having disarmed and dismembered Germany and Austria and banished their warships from the seas—the friendly allied nations—who fought side by side in the late war against what was said to be the only obstacle to peace in the world—now spend their substance making ready for more terrific slaughter at some not far distant date. Nobody is able to tell us why such things should be. We are told that experts, diplomats, statesmen connected with all parties, and most churches say it must be so. I am glad to say at least one religious body, the Primitive Methodists, with the Quakers, now say it should not be so. Ordinary people, however, are not allowed a say in such matters: theirs only to pay and fight and die.

The ex-Air Minister in the Labour Government talks of a ten years truce, and speaks approvingly of the dash and vim of the Air Service—as if learning how to bomb towns, destroy homes, churches and other buildings, killing women and children, were a very desirable job, when what is styled national honour or national interests demand it. I think the whole business of air warfare is the most criminal, tragic thing in the history of war, and prepares good, clean, healthy-minded boys to do work which in the past we have associated with the word "barbarism." . . .

General Foch tells us that in thirteen years' time, men, women and young children will all be engaged in the horrible work of assisting in the business of universal slaughter. He speaks of these happenings as if mankind, having lost its reason, must set about the task of universal mutual annihilation.

ARE WE STUPID?

Those who stand for total abolition of all armaments are told they are unpractical and stupid. Some of our military friends think and speak of us as fanatics who would lead our respective countries to ruin. To me these so-called practical people are simply blind leaders of the blind. They repeat their formulas of preparedness as if quoting from the Word of God, unmindful of the fact that all history proves beyond a doubt that no single war or collection of wars has ever settled anything. . . . Always after each war the wise and prudent of the world—that is, those who, as against people like myself, consider themselves wise and prudent—have talked and preached about the limitation of armaments and a gradual cessation of war; and all the time they have practised the policy, "Trust in God, but keep your powder dry." The late Czar of Russia started a crusade for peace, which ended in war with Japan and the Great War which cost him his life and dynasty. . . .

Comrades, it is high time the whole Labour Movement was awakened on this issue. Whenever the next war between white peoples takes place, it will end in the ruin of this we call civilisation. All our toil and labour for Socialism, or even social reform, will be of no effect if once again millions of men face one another in an orgy of bestial slaughter.

International Socialism is our only hope: a realisation that the world of men is now divided into classes, not races; that wars are the result of greed, of the desire to exploit and to grow rich at the expense of others. Those who desire No More War must refuse to fight in any war by whomsoever it is undertaken, and together work to establish Peace by means of national and international co-operation.

I have no doubt as to the absolutely sincerity of George Lansbury's appeal in this matter. His article is reproduced with complete endorsement on my part.

Readers should note General Foch's war prophecy which proved absolutely true in time.

At the Fulham by-election, October, 1933, the Labour Party fought on the anti-war issue. George Lansbury gave an interview to the *Star*, which was published in that journal on October 23, in connection with the election. Lansbury said:—

I would like to see the workers of every country refuse to make the foul weapons of modern warfare and risk starving rather than lend a finger to this devil's work.

What I do ask is: For how much of this devil's work was George Lansbury, the parliamentarian, responsible? He supported in the division lobby, when his party was in office, three series of service estimates totalling over £450 millions—all voted for this "devil's work." He asked the workers, in his speeches outside of parliament, to starve for the anti-militarist ideal, whilst he would not risk resignation for that same ideal, when voting in the House of Commons.

It is interesting to note, by way of contrast to George Lansbury's anti-militarism, that his *Weekly*, for July 3, 1925, was an "Empire" number, and included an article from his pen on the subject of colonial preference.

Defenders of the Labour Government have explained that the Anomalies Act—styled officially "Unemployment Insurance (No. 3) Act, 1931"—was a measure to safeguard the interests of the unemployed. The Bill was a real expression of parliamentarism, and was introduced to enable the Labour Government to borrow more money to pay unemployment insurance benefit. When the Labour Party took office in 1929, the deficit in the Unemployment Fund was £36,520,000; on October 25, 1930, it was £53,220,000! and on October 31, 1931, the deficit was £108,110,000. A series of unemployment finance bills were introduced, the last of which raised the borrowing powers to £115 millions. As a concession to the Opposition, a Royal Commission on Unemployment Insurance was appointed on December 9, 1930. The Commission reported on June 1, 1931, and recommended increased contributions and decreased benefits. The Government rejected this suggestion but introduced the Anomalies Act, to end "wangling on the dole." Labour back-benchers defended this attitude, and Jack Mills, who made the last speech during the Committee stages of the bill, bitterly attacked Maxton and Brockway and the I.L.P. for opposing the measure.

In 1931, George Lansbury wrote to the then Secretary of the Cambuslang I.L.P. as follows:—

Mr. Wm. Tait,
4 Graham's Buildings,
Halfway, Cambuslang.

30/11/31.

Dear Comrade,

Mr. Thomas Johnston tells me that you want to know more about my views on the Means Test, and the position of the late Labour Government in connection therewith.

I am not able to speak with regard to the latter, and even if I were there is a sort of honourable understanding (which I am afraid none of us has kept very well) that we should not discuss business that took place inside the Cabinet.

But you may accept my word on this one fact: that at no time did the Cabinet, as a Cabinet, agree to the imposition of a Means' Test to be operated through the Public Assistance Committees. The only Means' Test that was at all favourably discussed was a test regarding the means of an individual person, which is an entirely different test from that which is operated through the Poor Law. But this was never settled because the Cabinet broke up before any decision was reached.

My own view is very simple. If a person having exhausted statutory benefit applies for transitional benefit and is found to be in the possession of means sufficient for his own maintenance and comfort, and that of those dependent upon him, I am not in favour of giving such a person public money. This was the attitude we adopted at Poplar. We never considered that we existed to give people money who did not need it.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE LANSBURY.

P.S.—NEVER AT ANY TIME did the Cabinet agree to place any unemployed person under the Poor Law, or to take into account any income other than the income of the person applying for transitional benefit.—G. L.

Writing in the *Socialist Star*, for June 14, 1933, John M'Govern said:—

The Means Test was drawn up during the Labour Government's term of office and has been defended by Geo. Lansbury and most of the leaders of the Labour Party from time to time. The best that one could get from them by way of repudiation was a statement that they were in favour of a Means Test, but not a Poor Law test. This was only another cute and evasive dodge and lacked the political honesty which we are entitled to expect from the leaders of a working class movement.

In the same article M'Govern stated:—

The Anomalies Act was the final quarrel between the Labour Party and the I.L.P. . . .

The Anomalies Act was defended by most of the present Labour M.P.s. . . .

The present Labour members who voted for the second reading on July 8, 1931, include: C. R. Attlee, J. Batey, Sir S. Cripps, Duncan Graham, Arthur Greenwood, D. R. Grenfell, T. E. Groves, T. W. Grundy, G. H. Hall, George Hicks, William John, George Lansbury, Wm. Leonard, G. Macdonald, V. L. McEntee, J. A. Parkinson, M. P. Price, Dr. A. Salter, Will Thorne, J. J. Tinker, E. J. Williams and Tom Williams—a total of 22. . . .

On July 5, 1931, the following extra names of M.P.s can be added as supporting the Labour Government in the Anomalies Act: Thos. Cape, Jack Jones, Morgan Jones, Jack Lawson, David G. Logan, Neil Maclean, F. E. Cocks, Tom Groves—a total of eight.

This makes 30 M.P.s who at present are in the House and supporters of the Labour Policy plus those who were too cowardly to vote either way.

Speaking at the Shoreditch Town Hall, on January 5, 1924, Mr Lansbury—who was to say later many nice things about the king, as a result of his developed parliamentary education—declared:—

A few centuries ago one King who stood up against the common people of that day, lost his head—lost it really. Later on one of his descendants was told to get out as quickly as he could. Since that day Kings and Queens had been what they ought to be. They never interfered with ordinary politics, and George the Fifth would be well advised to keep his finger out of the pie now.

In 1928, Mr Lansbury became chairman of the Labour Party and leader of the Labour Opposition in the House of Commons. He resigned his leadership because of his opposition to war and militarism.

During Guy Aldred's imprisonment for resisting military service, 1916-1919, George Lansbury defended and applauded him consistently in the columns of the *Herald*; and in 1921, on the occasion of Aldred spending his birthday in Barlinnie Prison, Glasgow, invited the readers of the *Daily Herald* to send messages of congratulation to him. On that occasion Lansbury attacked the idea of persons being imprisoned for "sedition," and identified himself with Aldred's public work as an agitator.

George Lansbury died on May 7, 1940. I paid a small tribute to his memory, and overlooked the errors of his parliamentarism, in *The Word* for October, 1940.

MAXTON, JAMES, M.A., I.L.P. Born at Pollokshaws, Glasgow, 1885, son of a schoolmaster. Educated at his father's school, and later at Hutcheson Grammar School and Glasgow University. Teacher by profession. Was imprisoned for one year, 1916-17, for a seditious speech on Glasgow Green, April, 1916. From 1919 to 1920 was a member of the "Labour" Party executive Committee. Since 1922 has been M.P. for Bridgeton. From 1918 to 1922 was a member of the Glasgow Education Authority.

Speaking at Clydebank, May 23, 1926, Maxton stated:—

The British Constitution was a matter for jest, for not only was it unwritten, but it was always changing. He would change it to the extent of abolishing the Monarchy, the House of Lords, and also the House of Commons.

Speaking at the Albert Hall, London, demonstration to protest against the British policy in China, on February 6, 1927, Maxton demanded that the Margate Conference resolution of the Labour Party against war be put into effect. He defined the resolution as follows:—

In any future war, the Labour Movement shall at once organise resistance to that war, organise men to refuse to go, organise mothers to refuse to let their sons go, organise wives to refuse to allow their husbands to go, organise men in the workshops to refuse to make munitions for war, organise the workers to say to the capitalists, "If you are going to have a war, then you are going to pay for the war."

Maxton maintains his opposition to war and so finds himself in a Socialist minority with F. W. Jowett.

PONSONBY, ARTHUR A. W. H. (Since Lord) I.L.P., U.D.C. Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the 1924 Government. Born 1871. Liberal M.P., 1908-1918. Defeated, 1918. Elected "Labour" M.P. in 1922 and December, 1923. In Parliament, immediately before the English declaration of war, he boasted of having "protested every year against the growth in expenditure upon our armaments."

May, 1916.—Ponsonby was one of the minority of thirty-six in Parliament who voted against the new Military Service Act, for which the Government secured a majority of 292.

Ponsonby has been criticised in the main body of this pamphlet. He left the Labour Party to stand for peace and is to-day an uncompromising anti-militarist.

Ponsonby's great work, *Falsehood In War-Time*, is one of the most powerful indictments of the cowardly and criminal folly of war ever published.

SAKLATVALA, SHAPURJI. Born at Bombay, 1874; educated at Bombay University; came to England in 1905 as a member of the firm Tata Ltd. Married an English woman, joined the Liberal Party, but later became a member of the I.L.P., from which he resigned in 1921 and joined the Communist Party. In his letter to the secretary of the City of London branch of the I.L.P., written in June, 1921, announcing his resignation, he wrote:—"Looking back at the entire proceedings of the Southport Conference, I fail to see any resolution carried there has any measure of Socialism, and even in several of them I painfully discover a spirit not at all creditable to Socialism or Communism."

In the 1922 General Election Saklatvala stood as Labour Party candidate for North Battersea, and was returned, but lost the seat in the 1923 election, regaining it in the election of 1924 as a Communist. In the 1922 election J. R. Clynes wrote a very complimentary letter in support of Saklatvala's candidature and recommended him to electors.

Clynes was a member of the 1929 Labour Government that refused to allow Saklatvala to return to India, either to transact private business or to speak. This was maintaining the worst traditions of Toryism against a man whom he had commended to the electors for holding views that substantially were the same in 1922 as they were in 1929.

Saklatvala died on January 16, 1936. I questioned his political integrity and consistency in *The Commune*.

SHINWELL, EMANUEL. Born, 1884, London. Secretary, Mines Department, Board of Trade, in the Government of 1924, and Financial Secretary to the War Office, in the 1929 Government. During the Great War he was a conscientious objector but secured exemption on the grounds that his work was of national importance. When it was proposed to conscript him for military service, his case was taken up by the Glasgow Trades Council, and the following correspondence was published and put before the Tribunal:—

Copy of letter from Ministry of Shipping.

Ministry of Shipping,
5th September, 1917.

Sir,

With reference to the question of the exemption of Mr. E. Shinwell from military service, I am directed by the Shipping Controller to state for the information of the Local Tribunal that Mr. Shinwell is doing important work in connection with the engagement and supervision of crews for merchant ships, both requisitioned and unrequisitioned, and that the Controller is of opinion that it is desirable in the national interests that he should be exempted from military service.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed) GRAEME THOMSON.

T. Lewis, Esq., British Seafarer's Union,
Unity Chambers, Latimer Street,
Southampton.

Copy of letter from Admiralty.

Admiralty, 9th January, 1917.

Sir,

With reference to your letter of the 23rd ult., addressed to Dr. Macnamara relative to the exemption of Mr. E. Shinwell from military service, I have to state that Mr. Shinwell does important work in connection with the engagement and supervision of crews for Admiralty transports as well as for merchant vessels, and that this Department is of opinion that it is desirable in the national interests that he should be exempted from military service.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed) E. FOLEY,

Director of Transports.

T. Lewis, Esq., British Seafarers' Union,
Unity Chambers, Latimer Street,
Southampton.

This was the typical parliamentary method of having a foot in each camp. To-day, Shinwell opposes the Churchill Government on the ground of its alleged inefficiency in the pursuit of war and Imperialism.

Of Jewish descent, Shinwell was a tailor's machinist; then official of the National Sailors' and Firemen's Union. Secretary of British Seafarers' Union. Served on Glasgow Town Council in 1916.

6 February, 1919.—Charged at Glasgow Central Police Court with "inciting to riotous conduct" in connection with the Glasgow strike, and sentenced to five months' imprisonment.

SNOWDEN, VISCOUNT. Born 1864.

Speaking in House of Commons, June 20, 1918. Snowden asked what would be the effect of military defeat in Germany. He answered his own question thus :—

It would be the same as the defeat of France by Prussia fifty years ago. It would teach them that military power could be used effectively to secure national aims. Thus, instead of defeating militarism, it would give militarism its highest justification.

Snowden wrote just before the Leeds conference :—

This convention on Sunday is to be the beginning of doing things in this country. . . . This next week-end we shall see Britain painted red. . . . We must have a thousand similar conventions of the people held at the same time throughout the country. . . . Now is the time to realise the International call, "Workers of all lands, unite!"

Snowden specialised in finance. Yet no Labourist proved such an efficient tool of the banking interests. He died on May 15, 1937, despised by the class that had mobbed him in earlier days for his anti-war integrity.

THOMAS, RT. HON. J. H., P.C. Born 1878. For many years General Secretary, N.U.R.

Thomas voted against the Military Service Bill, that is, conscription, in January, 1916. Appeared on the platform of the National Council for Civil Liberties, November, 1916, at Cardiff, with Ramsay MacDonald, Mrs Swanwick, and others. This meeting was broken up, and Thomas moved an adjournment of the House of Commons, Nov. 14, 1916, to call attention to the failure of the Home Secretary to protect the meeting. The Home Secretary replied, denouncing the meeting :—

The underlying purpose, in my opinion, was such as would undoubtedly give offence to the great majority of the population of Cardiff, as it would, I believe, to people of any other locality in this country.

Actually, the purpose of the meeting was more useful to the British people and to humanity and human progress than the stereotyped attitude of the Home Secretary.

Thomas was appointed to the Privy Council in 1917, not for being useful to the people, but for his war servitude.

In August, 1920, Thomas played an active part in the Council of Direct Action, which was organised to compel the Government to change its policy towards Ireland and the Soviet Union. Thomas described the organisation of the Council as a challenge to the whole constitution of the country.

In connection with the coal strike of 1921, Thomas, as an active member of the Triple Alliance, signed a manifesto which contained the following passage :—

The Government, in addition to calling up the Reserves, has adopted the new and odious expedient of forming a volunteer force as an instrument to be used against organised labour. In view of the obvious, calculated, and persistent hostility of the Government to the working classes shown by these facts, the Triple Alliance, while still desiring an honourable peace, has decided to throw its full weight on the side of the miners.

The other signatories were Smith, Hodges, Abraham, Cramp, Gosling, and Williams.

The Triple Alliance was defeated and betrayed in April, 1921. On December 1 of that year, the *Daily Telegraph* reported Thomas as saying.

If we are driven to a National Strike, make no mistake about it—it will mean a new Government in the country, and not Parliamentary Government.

Thomas brought a libel action against the *Communist*, organ of the C.P.G.B. During his cross-examination, the following dialogue occurred:—

Q.—Are you a Socialist?

A.—No.

Asked about the probable effect of the Triple Alliance Strike, Thomas said that it meant the end of the constitutional position.

Justice Darling: That is to say, the country would no longer be ruled by a King and Parliament, but by what?

Thomas: I visualised a Soviet.

A gem fell from the lips of the counsel for Thomas. This learned gentleman stated that Thomas

has no sympathy with the cause of the Communists, which has now passed far beyond the tolerant, philosophical, and idealist doctrines of Karl Marx.

When the negotiations with the Government broke down during the General Strike of 1926, Thomas said to Cook, as they left Downing Street: "*We must now, Cook, fight for our lives.*"

Writing in the *Daily Mail*, December 7, 1926, on the quarrel between Thomas and Cook, the late F. H. Rose, then Labour M.P., averred:—

Five or six years ago, the name of Mr. A. J. Cook was not known outside the street he lived in. The idea that he created something is preposterous. He may have been a humble disciple of Lenin, but he was so humble that he was unknown and unheard.

On the other hand, Mr. Thomas was already a notoriety, sedulously engaged with his henchmen, Mr. Cramp, in promulgating the gospel of direct action, presiding over councils of action, moving or seconding resolutions of purely syndicalist inspiration and generally operating militant trade unionism to secure political advantages.

As responsible as any living man for the evil he has lately been denouncing, Mr. Thomas falls foul of the man who took up the weapon which he threw away because it was no longer expedient to use it. . . . It is a mistake to regard these people seriously: a worse mistake to accept Mr. Thomas's profusely expressed enthusiasm for the cause of industrial peace as anything likely to last an hour longer than industrial developments and popular tendencies justify it. . . . Mr. A. J. Cook is a mere incident, nay, little more than an accident. Mr. J. H. Thomas is more than either; he is a circumstance. Far more than Cook, he is responsible for the dire calamity we have to deplore this year of our disgrace.

Six months after the strike, on 9th November, 1926, J. H. Thomas was given the honorary degree of D.C.L. of Oxford University. A few hours later at the Guildhall, Baldwin, according to *The Times*, emphatically said that the general strike "*will remain for ever a stain upon the annals of our country.*" Later Thomas served in the Baldwin Cabinet! He resigned in 1936 over the Budget Secrets scandal.

THURTLÉ, ERNEST. Born in New York State, 1884. British parents. Came to England when two years of age. Steel worker in Monmouthshire. Joined the Labour Movement at 19, and in 1908 he settled in London. Is a member of the National Union of Clerks. Married Miss Dorothy Lansbury, daughter of George Lansbury. Was in the Army during the War, and gained a commission. On leaving the Army he became an active anti-militarist, and was the (unsuccessful) candidate of the ex-Service men at South-West Bethnal Green in 1918.

Writing on the "Pageantry of the Cenotaph" in the *Daily Herald*, 31st October, 1921, Thurtle condemned military ceremonial on Armistice Day, and said:

Men did not die in Flanders in order that the spirit of Potsdam might be brought to Whitehall.

Thurtle voted against the Army Estimates and also the Labour Government's five cruisers in 1924.

Writing in *Lansbury's Labour Weekly*, April 11, 1925, Thurtle declared:—

the parents who would hate to see their children trained for human slaughter ought never to assist the recruitment of the children of others for this purpose. . . . Our attitude must be: "Not a man, not a gun, not a bomb."

Writing in the *Daily News*, June 20, 1925, Thurtle, speaking of the Labour Party, said:

We still believe that the British Empire in the main "is the product of capitalist aggression, and has been built up by force, rapine, and plunder."

The *Daily Herald*, for August 25, 1925, reported Thurtle's speech at the I.L.P. Summer School, Easton Lodge, Essex. Thurtle said:

An Empire which had to be held together by means of armed forces was not one in which Socialists could be consistently interested. . . . If I were a Russian I would disband the Red Army.

The *Financial Times*, October 28, 1927, pointed out that Mr Thurtle's wife was an employee of Arcos, being accountant to the Russian Bristle Export Co., a trading concern of Arcos, at a salary of £38 per month, income-tax paid.

Thurtle enjoys a minor position in the present War Government. I have detailed his political history and anti-militarist record in *The Word*.

TREVELYAN, CHARLES PHILIPS, M.A., I.L.P., U.D.C. Born 1887. Educated Harrow and Cambridge. *Liberal* M.P. 1899-1918. *Labour* M.P. 1922 and 1923 elections. Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education at outbreak of war, and resigned as protest against the declaration of war by Great Britain. One of the founders of U.D.C., and participated in the war-time activities of U.D.C. and I.L.P. Condemned the Peace terms in *Daily Herald* of 3rd June, 1919, and protested against Labour Party participating in any Peace celebrations if terms were forced upon Germany by the Allies.

In February, 1918, Trevelyan spoke after Mr Morel, who had just been released from prison, at a Leicester U.D.C. meeting. Ponsonby was in the chair. Mrs Philip Snowden moved a resolution demanding a new Government, one that secured "an immediate peace, based on no annexations and the self-determination of peoples." Roden Buxton seconded, and the resolution was carried.

WHEATLEY, RT. HON. I.L.P. Minister of Health, 1924 Government. Back-bencher and critic of the 1929 Labour Government. Claimed that his greatest achievement was the foundation of the "Catholic Socialist Society." *Forward*, February 9, 1924, stated that Catholic Anti-Socialists burned Mr Wheatley "in effigy before his own house, and might cheerfully have burned him if they could have laid hands on him."

At the I.L.P. annual conference, 1923, Wheatley moved the resolution:—

That this Conference recommends that Labour M.P.s shall not accept the hospitality of political opponents at public dinners and society functions.

Wheatley's career and 1929 lawsuit were discussed in the *Commune* and need not be commented upon in this pamphlet.

The I.L.P. attitude towards Ramsay MacDonald was defined by Wheatley in a speech that he made at the annual aggregate meeting of the Glasgow I.L.P. Federation, on April 4, 1924. The *Glasgow Herald* reported the speech the next day. Here is an essential excerpt:—

He had been reading in the newspapers about the extraordinary dissension that prevailed in the Cabinet. He had had press cuttings sent to him showing that he was an intriguing person who had somehow or other found himself pitchforked into the forefront of politics, and who spent his time in scheming to oust Mr. Ramsay MacDonald from the leadership of the Labour Party. . . . He wanted to answer his Glasgow comrades that that was a great tribute to the imagination of the press. . . .

He wanted to say about Mr. MacDonald that the nearer one got to him the bigger he appeared (applause), that even his opponents recognised him as head and shoulders above all the members of the House of Commons (applause), that his loss to the Labour Movement, if it were to occur, would be a disaster to the Party and a disaster to the nation, that he had never worked under a more helpful chief, that he had never been attached to a man whose companionship had effected in him a stronger spirit of loyalty and comradeship. And if he had ever had any ambition to be a leader in public life—which he had never had—the more he had seen of the work and worry Mr. MacDonald had to undertake the more he saw the folly of anyone desiring to be a Prime Minister—(laughter). He wished to express his testimony publicly to Mr. MacDonald's greatness and to the friendship and assistance he had got from him as his leader.

This speech certainly registers I.L.P. responsibility for MacDonald's careerism, and endorsement of its essential phases and stages.

How completely foul Wheatley fell of the Labour Government of 1929 is shown by the letter Thomas Johnston published in *Forward*, for December 28, 1929, with reference to "Mid-Scotland Ship Canal," complaining of "Mr Wheatley's misrepresentation." The letter reads as follows:—

Dear Hughes,—My attention has been drawn to a rather wicked misrepresentation by Mr. John Wheatley, M.P., in his speech in the House of Commons (20/12/29). I send you herewith "Hansard" with the objectionable passage, and I shall be glad if you will publish it side by side with my disclaimer, so that the Movement may have the facts, and appreciate the lengths to which the vendetta campaign is being carried.

MR. WHEATLEY

I should like to know what happened to the Mid-Scotland Canal. I remember that during the election some of my hon. Friends, one of whom is now a prominent member of the Government, had a cut and dried scheme which they put before the electors for the making of that canal. I have not heard anything about it since. **HAS THAT CANAL SERVED ITS PURPOSE, or is the scheme to fructify, and are we to benefit from it, JUST AS THE HON. GENTLEMAN BENEFITED WHEN HE APPEALED TO THE ELECTORS?** I want to know when the Committee on this canal is likely to report, because we are told that considerable employment would be given to the labouring classes of Scotland in the making of such a canal.

THE FACTS

No one of his "hon. friends" ever had any "cut and dried scheme" for a mid-Scotland Ship Canal. No one ever said they had such a scheme. All they asked for in their speeches and writings was for an enquiry—a geophysical enquiry—without which no estimate of cost could be made.

Mr. Wheatley has, therefore, invented the story about the "cut and dried scheme" for the purpose of having a slap at the Government.

I might add that within a fortnight of the Government being formed the "prominent member" (I presume he means me) had put in memoranda and appeals for the appointment of a Committee of Enquiry. This Committee is now sitting taking evidence.

Yours aye,

THOMAS JOHNSTON.

"The facts," to my mind, justify all that Wheatley said. What became of the ship canal anyway? And what a hit at parliamentarism!

In this connection, it is interesting to reflect that, in *Forward*, for November 24, 1924, Thomas Johnston wrote and published an "In Memoriam" to Edmond D. Morel, M.P. Johnston wrote:—

Last week there died with tragic suddenness a man who had left the impress of his character, his personality and his energy not only upon the public affairs of his own country, but upon the affairs of the world. The passing of Edmond D. Morel was a shock to the adherents of every great human Cause by which decent, kindly folk on every Continent lay store, but to those who knew him intimately and had worked with him in close association and personal friendship, the news of his death came as a stunning blow. I can scarcely write about it even yet.

Johnston describes Morel's campaign against Red Rubber slavery in the Congo, and continues:—

That was Mr. Morel's brief hour of popularity. But when the war came in 1914 and he breasted the seas of national passion: when he riddled the current fictions about the origins of the struggle; when he exposed the part that Tsardom had played in the initiation of the carnage; when he founded the Union of Democratic Control and urged a negotiated Peace as against the policy of the Knock-Out Blow—then all his previous services to Humanity were forgotten and he was cursed with ferocity and malignity by the Press and the Platform and consigned to perdition by the Church. War-crazed men called aloud that he should be hanged. And finally the Government of the day organised, or permitted against him, the meanest, most contemptible and most cowardly persecution.

Even in a period of shameful infamy and lying that trial and imprisonment of Mr. E. D. Morel stands out conspicuous. He had given a lady friend—a neice of Lord Balfour, by the way—a copy of his pamphlet "Tsardom's Part in the War," with a request that she would give it to M. Romain Rolland, the famous French author, when next she visited France. The pamphlet itself was quite legal: it had been publicly reviewed and was openly sold: it was quite legal to send it to France; there was, however, a prohibition against sending literature to Switzerland (a neutral country adjacent to Germany), and M. Rolland was then living in Switzerland—a fact quite unknown to Mr. Morel. For this trivial, technical, and wholly unconscious transgression of the D.O.R.A. Mr. Morel was sent six months to prison as a common felon. The occupant of the cell on his right was a thief and on his left was a man who had raped a child of tender years!

That Labour men should have served in a Government which perpetrated such a crime upon a great and disinterested citizen, was always, to me, a black discredit that not even the excuse of war frenzy could wipe out. One word of protest with a threat of resignation attached to it and Mr. Morel would not have been compelled to serve that six months of humiliation.

Yet Johnston served in the 1929 Cabinet with a Labour man who had served in the Cabinet that was responsible for Morel's imprisonment and the execution of James Connolly. That man was—Arthur Henderson!

Johnston's anti-war writings, and a study of his parliamentary careerism and inconsistencies were published in *The Word* during 1941. This matter, with other parliamentary musings and biographies, will be published in separate pamphlet form.

VII. Organisational

In the previous appendix, reference is made to certain organisations by letters. An explanation of the organisations and abbreviations may help the reader. The accounts do not express my critical attitude towards the bodies in question. My summaries are intended to be explanatory and not critical.

I.L.P. (Independent Labour Party), formed in 1893, under the inspiration of Karl Marx's friend, Friedrich Engels, and of Marx's daughter, by a group of followers of Keir Hardie. Object: "To establish a Socialist State, when land and capital will be held by the community." Members of the I.L.P. resisted every movement towards conscription, or towards increasing the output of munition workers.

During the last two years of the war the I.L.P. printed 33,000 books, 300,000 pamphlets, and about 4,000,000 leaflets against militarism and in favour of negotiated peace.

U.D.C. (Union of Democratic Control), formed in August, 1914, by Ramsay MacDonald, Charles Trevelyan, Norman Angell (Ralph Norman Angell Lane), and E. D. Morel, joined by Arthur Ponsonby. Object: Anti-war agitation, "to open direct and deliberate negotiations with democratic parties and influences on the Continent, when peace returns, so as to form an international understanding depending on popular parties rather than on Governments," and to prevent either humiliation of the defeated nation or artificial rearrangement of frontiers.

N.C.F. (No Conscription Fellowship), formed in May, 1915, as "a fellowship of common counsel and action of men of enlistment age who are not prepared to bear arms in the event of Conscription, whatever the penalties for refusal." Officials: A. Fenner Brockway, Clifford Allen, Percy Redfern, Rev. Leyton Richards, C. H. Norman, J. H. Hudson, M.A.; A. Sutherland Campbell.

N.C.P. (National Peace Council). Officials: H. N. Brailsford, Norman Angell, E. D. Morel, Carl Heath, Sir Daniel Stevenson. Afterwards National Council for the Prevention of War.

N.C.C.L. (National Council of Civil Liberties), formed to advocate repeal of Military Service Act, to safeguard freedom of speech, civil trial, and civil liberty during war-time.

VIII. The Duke of Bedford

Appendix IX of Part I. discusses the Duke of Bedford's views of militarism and parliamentarism and his manner of taking his seat in the House of Lords on Wednesday, December 3, 1941. He is the first duke to affirm.

In the House of Lords on Tuesday, May 19, Lord Vansittart moved for papers to call attention to Herbert Morrison's speech at Blackpool relating to post-war policy towards Germany. The debate was continued on Thursday, May 21, when Lord Nathan spoke for Herbert Morrison and the Government; the Duke of Bedford made his maiden speech; Lord Rankeillour followed the Duke and expressed his opposition to both the Duke and Lord Ponsonby; Lord Ponsonby followed Rankeillour and had a clash of arms with Lord Vansittart; The Marquess of Donegall, after being seventeen years a silent member of the House, made his maiden speech in support of Lord Vansittart; Lord Wedgwood made a vigorous speech, replying to Vansittart, and ending on a note of revolution; Viscount Cranborne replied for the Government; Earl Mansfield spoke of dismembering the German Empire; and Lord Vansittart closed the debate with the gibe that he most certainly did not wish to involve the Home Secretary in being defended by the Duke of Bedford.

The Duke's maiden speech was clear and direct. The speaker exposed the crime and folly of Lord Vansittart's policy of revenge and post-war militarist planning. He indicted Vansittart's pre-war diplomacy. The Duke concluded a powerful and closely reasoned

speech by reminding the Labour Movement of its pioneer ideas and ideals. From the House of Lords' platform he addressed himself to the common people of Britain and the world.

On Tuesday, June 2, the Duke delivered his second speech in the House of Lords, when he addressed himself to the subject of "Peace and Reconstruction" and declared that the pursuit of peace and justice was the one sane policy of mankind. This also was a bold and direct speech ending on a note of clear and emphatic Anti-Militarism.

The Duke of Bedford links himself with Eugene Debs and the great Socialist, Free-thinking, and Christian Anti-Militarists of the world. He is hated and slandered even as Morel was hated and slandered during the first World War. By his bold stand he is aiding the world in its struggle against war towards the realisation of Thomas Paine's great vision: "The world is my country; mankind are my brethren; to do good is my religion."

The Duke has no faith in the parliamentary system and stands for an occupational franchise.



Are you reading **THE WORD**, published monthly by the Strickland Press? Annual subscription, 3s. 0d. post free.

Biographical Studies

— BY —

GUY A. ALDRED

RICHARD CARLILE. 160 pages. 28 chapters and appendices. 12 illustrations. A complete record of Carlile's struggle and the battle for the Free Press. 1s. 6d. Post Free, 1s. 9d.

THE DEVIL'S CHAPLAIN (Rev. ROBERT TAYLOR). Carlile's Colleague. Founder of Christian Evidence. 32 pages. Price, 4d. Post Free, 6d.

BAKUNIN. 72 pages. 15 chapters. The history of Russian Communism and Anarchism. Chapters on Marx and Proudhon. Only popular "Life," and invaluable to the student. Price, 6d. Post Free, 8d.

JOHN MacLEAN. 72 pages. 9 chapters. 4 appendices. 6 illustrations. Contains verbatim report MacLean's great speech from the dock at Edinburgh. Good paper. Well printed. Price, 4d. Post Free, 6d.

PIONEERS OF ANTI-PARLIAMENTARISM. 112 pages. Biographies of Bakunin, Morris, Malatesta, Most, Dietzgen, De Leon, Karl Liebknecht, the Chicago Martyrs, Kotoku, etc. A great Anti-Militarist record. Price, 1s. 0d. Post Free, 1s. 2d.

DOGMAS DISCARDED

In two parts. 140 pages, well illustrated, record of the author's evolution from Boy Preacher to Anarchist and Anti-Militarist agitator. Studies in theology and politics. A record of Heresy and political "under-world" personalities.

Part I, 4d. Post Free, 6d. Part II, 6d. Post Free, 8d.

Comrades should purchase both parts together. Post Free, 1s. 2d.

Part I deals with theology. Part II deals with politics mainly.

Christian Studies

— BY —

GUY A. ALDRED

THE REBEL AND HIS DISCIPLES. 11 chapters relating the birth and teaching of the man, Jesus of Nazareth, and the early developments of Christian thought. Four appendices dealing with the Church and War, and the Marian Martyrs. 54 pages. Price, 4d. Post Free, 6d.

HISTORICAL AND TRADITIONAL CHRISTIANITY. 48 pages dealing with Christianity, Man, and Jesus; summarising Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, and dealing with John Ball. Price, 4d. Post Free, 6d.

SOCIALISM AND THE POPE. 9 chapters. 3 appendices, and notes, defining the Papal attitude towards war and the workers. 72 pages. Price, 4d. Post Free, 6d.

WHY JESUS WEPT. 12 essays, considering why Jesus wept and must weep, until civilisation is changed, and war is ended. 72 pages. Price, 6d. Post Free, 8d.

ARMAGEDDON INCORPORATED. The True Story of the Jehovah Witnesses. 36 pages. Price, 3d. Post Free, 4d.

SOCIALISM or PARLIAMENT

If this booklet interests you, order Part I, sub-titled **SOCIALISM OR PARLIAMENT.** 84 pages of clear but closely-printed text. 17 chapters. 9 appendices. Covers the entire history of parliamentarism. 3rd Finally Revised Edition. Author's 36 years' study of Parliamentary Socialism. Well-printed. A volume of history and politics necessary to every student and to every worker. Factual. Simple. Logical. Unanswerable.

Price, 6d.

Post Free, 8d.

- Bedford Pamphlets -

The Strickland Press has published several pamphlets from the pen of the Duke of Bedford. A selection will be sent post free for 2s. 6d. Special attention is directed to the pamphlets listed on this page.

THE WAY OUT

By The Duke of Bedford

Discusses the horror of war and violence and urges that reason can find a way out agreeable to liberty, justice, democracy, and common-sense. The author states his way out and invites criticism and consideration to ease the agony of mankind and to speed the new social dawn.

24 pages.

Price, 2d.

Post Free, 3d.

WHY BLUNDER ON?

DUKE OF BEDFORD'S EMERGENCY PROGRAMME. First Steps Towards Peace, Freedom, Happiness for All Mankind.

Introduction—Freedom—The War—Disarmament—Finance—Foreign Policy—Coloured Peoples—Finance—Taxation, Revenue, and National Debt—Demobilization—Parliament and Government—Local Government—Industry and Agriculture—Public Health—Inventions and Discoveries—Education—Relation of Church and State—The Press.

48 Pages.

Price, 6d.

Post Free, 8d.

WHEN GERMANY IS DEFEATED—?

Duke of Bedford's maiden speech, House of Lords, May 21, 1942, replying to Vansittart.

16 Pages.

Price, 2d.

Post Free, 3d.

POVERTY AND OVER-TAXATION

This exposition of social credit may be obtained direct from the author. Price, 8d, post free.

Address: The Duke of Bedford, Cairnsmore, Newton Stewart, Wigtownshire, Scotland.

KIRKWOOD
(PRINTERS) LTD.
152 CLYDE ST., GLASGOW