

Liberty! Equality!! Fraternity!!!

THE WORD

To Rouse The People, To Combat Fascism, and To Speed Commonweal.

An Organ of the United Socialist Movement, Edited and Published by Guy A. Aldred, at The Strickland Press, 104 George Street, Glasgow, C.1. All unsigned matter is from the pen of the Editor. Annual Subscription. 3s. 0d.

Vol. V. No. 5.

DECEMBER, 1943

Price: TWOPENCE

OUR MARTYRED DEAD

TO THE SOCIALIST MEMORY OF OUR COMRADES

HEINRICH ERLICH and VICTOR ALTER

who died at the hand of the executioner, in a prison in Kuibishev, one day in December, 1942, because they had dedicated their lives to the cause of Human Freedom.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISTS' TRIBUTE

Tribute was paid to the life and work of our comrades Erlich and Alter by representative Socialists of the Allied countries (other than the U.S.A.) opposed to Fascism and Nazism, as follows:—

LOUIS DE BROUCKERE; CAMILLE HUYSMANS (Belgian Labour Party).

A. J. DOBBS; LINCOLN EVANS; WILLIAM GILLIES; J. S. MIDDLETON; ELEANOR STEWART; MARY E. SUTHERLAND; JAMES WALKER, M.P. (British Labour Party).

JOSEF BELINA (Czechoslovak Social Democratic Labour Party).

LOUIS LEVY (French Socialist Party).

ALF SEVERIN (Norwegian Labour Party).

BERL LOCKER (Palestine Jewish Labour Party).

The United States appreciation was expressed by the following Socialist and Anti-Fascist citizens:— WILLIAM GREEN, President, American Federation of Labour.

Professor ALBERT EINSTEIN.

Rev. HENRY SMITH LEIPER, Executive Secretary, Universal Christian Council.

DAVID DUBINSKY, President, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

Dr. ALVIN JOHNSON, Director, New School for Social Research.

ADOLPH HELD, Chairman, Jewish Labour Committee.

LEO KRZYCKI, President, American Slav Congress. Dr. FRAN KINGDON.

JOSEPH WEINBERG, President, Workmen's Circle. REINHOLD NIEBUHR, Chairman, Union for Democratic Action.

CLINTON S. GOLDEN, Assistant President, United Steelworkers of America.

Dr. B. HOFFMAN, President, Jewish Writers' Union. RAYMOND GRAM SWING.

J. B. S. HARDMAN, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, Editor Official Press.

PHILIP MURRAY, President, Congress of Industrial Organisations.

EXECUTION DEFENDED.

Litvinov admitted the execution and attempted to defend it in the following letter addressed to Mr. William Green, of the A.F.L.:—

EMBASSY OF THE SOVIET UNION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

February 23, 1943.

Dear Mr. Green,

I am informed by Mr. Molotov, People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs, of the receipt by him of a telegram signed by you concerning two Soviet citizens, Alter and Erlich.

I am instructed by Mr. Molotov to inform you of the following facts:

For active subversive work against the Soviet Union and assistance to Polish intelligence organs in armed activities, Erlich and Alter were sentenced to capital punishment in August, 1941.

At the request of the Polish Government, Erlich and Alter were released in September, 1941.

However, after they were set free, at the time of the most desperate battles of the Soviet troops against the advancing Hitler army, they resumed



[Specially drawn for "The Word," by McPhail.]

THE DESCENT OF MAN

their hostile activities including appeals to the Soviet troops to stop bloodshed and immediately to conclude peace with Germany.

For this they were rearrested and, in December, 1942, sentenced once more to capital punishment by the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court. This sentence has been carried out in regard to both of them.

Yours sincerely,
Ambassador MAXIM LITVINOV.

MASS ARRESTS OF POLISH SOCIALISTS.

Erlich and Alter were arrested by the Soviet authorities late September, 1939, a few days after the Red Army entered Eastern Poland—Erlich at the railway station of Brzesc (Brest Litovsk), Alter at Kowel.

Litvinov's letter was meant to create the impression that both Alter and Erlich had been arrested on a definite charge. The truth is

that they were detained along with thousands of other Polish citizens, especially Socialists and trade unionists.

Close upon the heels of the U.S.S.R. army which occupied Polish territory in September, 1939, followed many detachments of the N.K.W.D., the political police of Soviet Russia (formerly the "G.U.P.") Immediately mass arrests were made among all classes of the population of Poland. Especially great numbers of arrests were made among the Polish Labour leaders, belonging to the Polish Socialist Party and to the Jewish "Bund." The arrests began on September 20th, three days after the Soviet army had entered Poland. The town councillors, members of the committees of the local Socialist parties, members of the trade union executives, organisers of working-class peasant youth were arrested.

Among these were Erlich and Alter.

The way in which the arrests were made was typical. In the houses, where the arrests took place, not only the men whom the police had come to fetch were arrested, but everybody who was in the house with them. In Wilno, for instance, the police entered the house of an old active "Bund" leader, Zeleznikov, who had been exiled to Siberia in the time of the Czar, in order to arrest him. Quite accidentally they found there also a man named Rosenstein employed in the sanatorium for working-class children named Wladyslaw Medem. This man, who had fled from Warsaw and the Germans, they also arrested. He was sentenced to the labour camp where he met his death.

Also in Wilno, the Secret Soviet police came to arrest a well-known Socialist leader, a lawyer named Tajtell. But they found there a refugee from Warsaw, a well-known trade unionist and Socialist, who had spent years in Czarist prisons—H. Himelfrab. They took him along and sentenced him to eight years in the camps.

It proved quite impossible to intervene with the examining magistrate or the public prosecutor. The wife of one of the arrested men, Mrs. G., was told by the examining magistrate:—

You have funny women here. In our country, in Russia, when the husband is arrested the wife sues for divorce and looks for another one. But here you come along pleading and begging, which can, after all, only result in your being sent away also.

CONFESSIONS OF A "COMMUNIST."

(Suggested by an anonymous leaflet now circulating in London, entitled "Confessions of a British Stalinist.")

I call myself a Communist;

A skunk by any other name would smell the same,
But I know the attraction of the term,
Although its meaning puts my lies to shame.

I have renounced as crudely vain

The independence of my mind, and so opine
That black is white when tactics so demand
In loyalty to Stalin—this is the party line.

Fretting within my head are words,

A stock of undigested slogans which I shout,
Accustomed well to discipline,

My party leaders deem "the comrades" but a
throng,

To give praise unceasing, without stint

To all that Moscow stands for—"right" but
wrong.

My party is the Kremlin,

In that political machine I am a cog,
I do not pause to ask the pros and cons
Of twisting lies to form a blinding fog.

"Power to the Party" is my guide;

My strength lies chiefly in my tongue which with
a lie

Can so urge unity for doubtful ends

That all the workers' cause in knots I tie.

I am a British Stalinist,

I have to chop and change my views from left to
right,

But though the sides so very swiftly change,
For Moscow's aims, I tell you all to fight.

Printed by the Ripley (Believe It or Not) Press,
and published by the Imperial Communist Party
(affiliated to the anti-Socialist Union) in the neighbour-
hood of New Scotland Yard, London, S.W.

LET'S HONOUR THOSE WHO MAKE OUR SONGS.

Let's honour those who make our songs,
The lowly bards who know our joys,
Who know our cares, and weave a tune
To ease our hearts, and light our eyes,
A heart without a song to sing,
Oh, what a desert it would be,
And yet so many of our bards
Have wept in sorry poverty.

Shame on us that have no more soul
That starve the heart that makes our songs!
What hope for humankind to right
The many cruel, bitter wrongs
That wreck the world, if we respect
The hollow pride that wealth can show,
Yet see not in the bard a king
Whose glory we may never know?

JOE CORRIE.

SIR THOMAS MOORE M.P.

"COMMUNIST" PARTY'S NAZI APOLOGIST PET

Sir Thomas Moore, M.P. for Ayr Burghs since 1925, was exposed in "The Word" for August and September, 1940. A few copies of these issues can be obtained still and ought to be read and circulated by our readers at the present. The two papers will be sent, post-free, so long as the stock lasts, to any address for sixpence.

In the August, 1940, issue we indict Lt.-Col. Moore, M.P., as one of the Tory M.P.s who must resign. He was a member of the Anglo-German Fellowship and a supporter of the notorious Nazi "Anglo-German Review." This paper defended Hitler's claims to Lithuania, Czecho-Slovakia, and Austria.

In the September, 1940, issue we quoted at length from Sir Thomas Moore's essay in the "Daily Mail" for April 25, 1934, entitled: "The Blackshirts Have What the Conservatives Need." We also reproduced from the "Sunday Dispatch" his article urging the return of the German colonies and the strengthening and developing of German power in Africa.

Secure these two issues of "The Word," if you have not seen them, or filed them for reference. Then turn to our contemporary, "The Ayrshire Post," for October 15, 1943. We reproduce from its columns essential passages of its report of an address delivered by Sir Thomas Moore to the Old Cronies Club on Tuesday, October 13, 1943:—

STALIN: REALIST AND CYNIC.

Sir T. Moore and Red Army.

Greater Anglo-Soviet unity was stressed by Lt.-Col. Sir Thomas Moore, C.B.E., M.P. for Ayr Burghs, when he delivered the opening address for the winter session of the Prestwick Old Cronies Club in the clubhouse on Tuesday afternoon.

Sir Thomas revealed the interesting fact that he had, at the request of M. Maisky, Soviet Ambassador, become a vice-president of the National Association for Anglo-Soviet-Unity. Mr. J. B. Langlands, president of the club presided. . . .

Dealing with his subject, Sir Thomas said that he had been asked to speak on current topics, and he thought that because of the tremendous victories in Russia, the best and most interesting topic was "Russia and the Red Army." He had spent a considerable time in Russia, and he knew Russia and the Red Army.

Russia, Sir Thomas wanted to make quite clear, was not Communist, whatever else she was. From 1917, when the revolution broke out, until 1922, Communism, undoubtedly, in its purity was observed throughout Russia. Then Lenin, who was a very shrewd man, saw that, although equality was necessary immediately after the revolution, it could not work perpetually because of human nature. Every human individual had ambition and wanted to improve the conditions of those he loved. Lenin realised that they had to give reward according to merit, and so he introduced his New Economic Policy. That was the first break with Communism.

Sir Thomas went on to refer to Stalin's three five-year plans which raised Russia from the state of a vast backward agricultural community to an agricultural and industrial community. During his second plan Stalin saw the red light of danger coming from across the frontier from Germany, and he devoted this plan to making a great military power of Russia. He also realised that Communists would not fight their national brothers, and so he changed the whole theoretical policy of Communism, substituting Nationalism and love of country. That was the reason the Russians were fighting with such force and vigour to-day. He was convinced that the whole of the progress of civilisation depended on the good-will between Russia and ourselves.

NAILS IN NAZI COPPIN.

The mysterious force, the Red Army, where did it come from? asked Sir Thomas. Foreign agents had known nothing of its strength before the war. He had seen it born and had seen its gradual development in Moscow. At the beginning of the last war the Russians were forced to fight, poorly armed and clad, and for three years they progressed to certain destruction. After the war they gave voice to their grievances in the revolution, and the Red Army was born. In the revolution they fought, and held out until they conquered, thus laying the foundation of the all-conquering Red Army we knew

to-day. The Russians had two great leaders, Stalin and Lenin. Whatever was thought of their methods they were still great men.

Stalin's third five-year plan drove the first nails into the coffin of Nazism; not quite the first, however, said Sir Thomas, for Hitler himself had driven that home when he attacked Russia on June 22, 1941, starting the most amazing military campaign history recorded. Hitler decided that the Red Army must be destroyed, but Stalin decided that it should not be destroyed. . . .

Speaking of Stalin, Sir Thomas said he was a realist, if ever there was one; a cynic too; a man of great resoluteness of purpose. He had been greatly blamed for his conduct when he took time by the forelock in Finland and Rumania to gain territory to prepare the defences he needed to bring final victory. This was a great man. . . .

Sir Thomas said that before the war he had known Germans whom he thought to be upright, honest people, but when things were going their way every German would participate, and when things went wrong they would welcome our forces as an army of liberation and tell us how much they hated the Nazi regime. (Applause.) The way to deal with the German people after the war was one of the most difficult questions, and he could only tell a story of a Russian officer who had said that we would get to Berlin before the Russians because we had certain advantages in transport, but we should leave Germany to the Russians for a fortnight, and the German problem would be solved. (Laughter and applause.)

Since he praises Stalin for having destroyed Communism and Internationalism, the "Communists" applaud this Tory Blackshirt Apologist! They do not ask what he was doing in Russia, 1918-20; or in Ireland, 1916-18 and again in 1920-23? Was he serving the cause of Socialism and Labour? Was he on the side of James Connolly and Sheehy Skeffington? And why does he wear the orders of St. Anne of Russia, 2nd class and St. Vladimir of Russia, 4th class? These are Czarist orders!

What a gang the "Communists" are!

"CONCHIE."

Refuses to fight, eh? Declares he will NOT?
The fellow's a bounder, sir—ought to be shot!
Thinks bombing is barbarous, warfare a crime,
Parades and saluting and drill, waste of time?

Thinks murder is murder in just the same way,
When it's masses, and not merely one, that we slay?
Calls a man worse than beast who, when ordered to,
cuts
A fellow-man's limbs off, or bayonets his guts?

Thinks the slaughter of children is too high a price
For profitable trading in rubber and rice,
And honour and glory are not worth the tears
Of one bereaved mother, nor one sweetheart's fears?

Thinks hatred degrading, and cruelty vile,
The slaughter of men to gain ground, not worth while,
And "stern retribution" a doctrine of vice,
When all who call war's tune must pay the full price?

Thinks maltreatment of women, and torture of men,
Cannot be condoned, nor excused now and then
By phrases like "national security," or
"The steps we must take to continue the war?"

Says unthinking obedience to orders from me,
Right or wrong, without reasoning, question or plea,
Stifling all instincts to follow my plan,
Is degrading the powers that make him a man?

Thinks people like me are a lower type still,
Because we take pay to send others to kill?
I tell you, quite plainly, sir, plainly by Gad,
The fellow's a rotter, an absolute CAD!

IVAN BEUTLER.

WILL NO ONE SING A SONG?

Will no one sing a song,
Great as the hills, or the sea,
To the men of all nations,
That will shake the dulllest of heart
To its very foundations?

That will open our lust-red eyes
Now blind in ignorance,
To the grandeur and glory
Of Life, simple, wondrous and grand
As a fairy story?

JOE CORRIE.

CARLILE AND THE SURGEONS. By CHARLES WORTHAM BROOK.

Stories of The Surgeon of Dorchester Gaol; The Surgeon Who Recanted; The Surgeon Who Became a Party Leader; The Surgeon Who Became The Devil's Chaplain; The Surgeon at the Post Mortem. Illustrated. A wonderful Study of the early 19th century.

2s.

Post Free, 2s. 3d.

POST-WAR CONDITIONS

BY THE DUKE OF BEDFORD

Reports which have been reaching me from a number of independent sources, show a remarkable agreement on the following three points. (1) People are losing interest in the war and many who were once ardent in their pursuit of "victory" are now anxious only that the war should end quickly, provided, of course, that it does not end in our defeat. (2) There is anxiety extending even to political circles as to what the results of a Russian victory may be. (3) There is profound despondency with regard to post-war conditions.

I must confess that I might share in some measure the anxiety as to the possible results of a Russian victory, not, as my "Communist" critics have suggested, because I fear the spread of a movement bringing freedom and justice to the workers; but for the opposite reason, that the Soviet Government, by its political cruelty and tyranny, disregard of the rights of the individual, and tendency to military aggression where national interests have been thought to be at stake, has forsaken the principles of Communism and imitated the defects with which Fascism is usually associated.

In saying this, I do not mean to imply that I do not desire the friendliest relations with the Russian people, nor do I even mean to suggest that I do not wish to make the best of the Russian Government and deal with it in all matters honestly and fairly. It is only by making the best of a government, whether Communist or Fascist, that one can render enlightened service to its people; while if a serious crisis does ever develop by reason of the government's misconduct, you can then alienate the sympathy of the people from their government and deprive it of the power to engage in war.

Despondency with regard to post-war conditions is extremely well-founded, assuming that our present political leaders and financial masters are retained. As I pointed out in a recent speech in Glasgow, whatever its final military result may be, the war, as far as the attainment of any of the original idealistic aims is concerned, is already well and truly lost. We have no power, as that organ for the expression of Government opinion, the "Times," has virtually admitted, to prevent Russia from keeping as much Polish territory as she desires, nor, it might be added, can we prevent her, in the event of an Allied victory, from dominating to any extent she wishes other small neighbouring States.

As for the overthrow of Fascism, the ugly features characteristic of Fascism are now firmly established in our own country, and an army of political bureaucrats and planners are making it increasingly clear that, if they have any say in the matter, State tyranny is to remain, even when the war is ended, including, of course, the worst of all forms of State tyranny, military conscription.

The position in the Far East is obscure and may be distinctly awkward in more senses than one. If it should be true that Japan (doubtless in return for important trading rights) has granted independence to Burma, the Philippines, etc., Britain and America may find themselves fighting to re-impose upon those countries an alien rule in defiance of the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

The Morgenthau Plan; the defects and omissions in the Keynes Plan and Beveridge Scheme; the policy and personnel of AMGOT; the evasive answers given by Chancellors of the Exchequer when questioned by Members of the House of Commons who favour monetary reform; the sending of gold by the American Government to China; and the conversation of prominent American financiers and business men; all point to the fact that after the war

the tyranny of "sound" finance and Big Business is to be re-established, with its necessary accompaniment of poverty in the midst of potential plenty—a poverty brought about by the restriction of the money supply in the interests of money-creating money-lenders, and by interference with foreign trade in the interests of currency buyers and speculators.

The post-war economic prospects in Britain are not made too rosy by the loss of our foreign investments and most of our export trade—a loss which may make it extremely difficult to secure adequate imports for our over-populated islands. If the American Government insists on our depleting our limited supply of home products by exporting goods to pay for Lease-lend war consignments, our position may be grim indeed. Personally, if I were Prime Minister, I should not be very accommodating if such a demand were pressed after the cessation of hostilities. I am the last person to wish to defraud any ordinary American citizen or inflict hardship upon him by failure to repay a straight-forward loan; these war debts, however, are not straightforward loans and I can well remember the nonsense that was talked after the last war and the unjust resentment which financiers on the other side of the Atlantic stirred up against us in order to hide the shortcomings of their policy from their own people. Apart from the fact that the American Government was more than anxious to enter this war, and might therefore, one would have thought, very well treat as a gift all help given to a hard-pressed ally, it will be within its power, when the war has ended, to bestow upon American citizens many times the volume of goods that we could send as exports, by the simple process of reforming its money system and developing the vast natural resources of U.S.A. to the full. When the last bill for munitions has been met a few weeks or a few months after the end of the war, there is no reason why we, or the American people either, should have to continue to pay for the war either in goods or money, and if any attempt is made to force such payment, it will be by reason of another financiers' racket. If American citizens should again be tempted to resent Britain's alleged failure to repay a "debt of honour," let them look nearer home for the true source of any economic hardships that may seem to threaten them: they need not look in vain!

Yes, there is certainly cause for anxiety about post-war conditions; indeed, if things are allowed to continue on the same old lines, there would seem no hope at all. But need they so continue? The way to a brighter future is still clear, if only men would take it. A negotiated peace in which Britain, America, Russia, Germany, Italy and Japan all recognised that they had a share of war guilt, and, frankly admitting their common failings, agreed to abandon the domination of other races and pledged themselves to treat their neighbours as they themselves would like to be treated; a peace in which the Allies, in the interests of their own peoples no less than in those of the peoples of other countries, threw off the shackles of orthodox finance and really co-operated with other countries in developing to the full the world's resources, distributing them according to human need; then out of black darkness might come a new dawn and out of despair, a hope for all mankind.

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY (1793-1943)

Conway Hall, Red Lion Square
London, W.C.1

THE OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY
are the study and dissemination of ethical
principles, and the cultivation of a rational
religious sentiment.

SUNDAY MEETINGS, 11 a.m.

THE DUKE OF BEDFORD

The following news items tell their own story.

Glasgow "Bulletin," Monday, November 1, 1943:—

DUKE'S CALL TO MINERS

Addressing a working-class audience of over 700 in the Burnbank district of Hamilton last night, the Duke of Bedford who was accompanied by Mr. Guy Aldred, Glasgow, outlined the main points in his programme for a new social order after the war.

The people ought to begin now to organise themselves, he said, with a view to bringing pressure to bear on their Parliamentary representatives and they should set about agitating immediately for a reform of our existing monetary system.

Glasgow "Evening Citizen," November 2, 1943:—

TO PLEAD FOR MINERS

The Duke of Bedford is to plead in the House of Lords for better conditions for Scottish miners. He visited the Lanarkshire coalfield and discussed with the miners questions of wages, housing and holidays and promised his support in urging reforms.

In Glasgow, the duke interviewed a large number of people, particularly on pensions questions, and promised he would do everything possible to remove anomalies.

"Daily Worker," London, November, 5, 1943:—

MINERS DENY TALKS WITH DUKE

"Daily Worker" Reporter

The Lanarkshire Miners' Union have issued a denial of the Press report that conversations take place between the union and the Duke of Bedford on miners' wages, housing and holidays. "All questions of wages and working conditions will be handled by this organisation and not by the Duke of Bedford," it says.

The statement also rejects such claim by the Duke who, together with Guy Aldred, the well-known anarchist, spoke at a meeting at Burnbank, Lanarkshire, last Sunday.

Glasgow "Evening Times," November 4, 1943:—

MINERS SAY DUKE HAS NO MANDATE

Lanarkshire Mineworkers' Union issued a statement last night denying that the Duke of Bedford had any mandate to speak on behalf of local miners.

A report appeared to the effect that the Duke of Bedford is to plead in the House of Lords for better conditions for Scottish miners, said the statement.

It was stated that he visited the Lanarkshire coalfield and discussed with miners questions of wages, housing and holidays, and promised support in effecting reforms.

"We of the Lanarkshire Mineworkers' Union wish to state that at no time did any conversations take place between us and the Duke of Bedford. He has no authority from this union to make any such statement. Questions will be decided by this union and not by the Duke of Bedford."

A similar paragraph appeared in the "Daily Record," the same day. The Pearson-Moffatt clique seem worried by the Duke's activities, his mining contacts, and his visits to the proletariat of Lanarkshire.

The "Evening Times," Glasgow, November 8, 1943:—

DUKE AND MINERS

Mr. Guy A. Aldred writes:—"I was somewhat surprised to read the announcement in the "Evening Times" concerning the Mineworkers' Union alleged repudiation of the Duke of Bedford on behalf of the miners of Lanarkshire.

"The facts are simple. Last April the Duke arranged to visit some Anarchist miners in Burnbank and to stay with one. The week before last he stayed with this miner and his wife. He has arranged to go back and to meet a number of miners.

"He never pretended that he was speaking officially for the union. But he has examined and is examining miners' conditions. He has first-hand information. And he has been asked to take up the miners' case in the House of Lords. He intends to do so.

"Surely one does not need to receive a permit from the union to speak as a legislator with authority in the House of Lords."

MOTHERWELL I.L.P. OPEN FORUM.

Meeting in Lesser Town Hall, Motherwell, on Sunday, 19th December, at 6-30 p.m. Speaker, GUY A. ALDRED. Subject, "The Church, The War, and Peace." Questions and Discussion.

All Welcome.

WILLIAM JOHNSON FOX, M.P.

Dear Aldred,

In your sketch of the history of the South Place Ethical Society, you are giving a useful account of the development of an old group from supernaturalism to humanism. The first ministers were Christians of the older Biblical school; the transition period was reached under William Johnson Fox. It is by no means the least useful part of your sketch that you call attention once again to a very remarkable man whose story has been so largely forgotten.

Fox went to Parliament Court Chapel, Bishopsgate, from Chichester and the old South Place Chapel (demolished in 1927) was built for him in 1824. He had become a definite Unitarian and gradually broadened upon this basis. At first, he was a prominent figure in denominational circles and was the first secretary to the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. Later on, he withdrew from these positions and was in fact put out of the association by his fellow-ministers in London. This act of ostracism was avowedly due to his views on divorce and his separation from Mrs. Fox.

There are just two things to be said about the happening. Fox's views upon divorce were exactly the same as those sponsored by the poet, Milton, whose theological writings the older Unitarians held in high esteem. The conduct of the London ministers was censured by no less a person than James Martineau, then of Liverpool. It is impossible to avoid the feeling that their behaviour was dictated largely both by Fox's political radicalism and his widening theological views.

Fox had come to reject any concept of a specific supernatural revelation; his religion was a thesis which continued to reverence Jesus of Nazareth whilst rejecting the whole cycle of historic Christianity. To compare these views with those of the typical Unitarians of the day, nourished in the Biblicism of the XVIII century, is to see the vast advance which Fox had made in thought. He was an outstanding early exponent of the broadening process in theology of which Martineau and J. J. Hayler were to become distinguished exponents within a few years. Fox's real farewell to South Place was in 1848, when he gave the lectures, "The Religious Ideas." They presuppose by forty years the comparative method and the conclusions of the Hibbert Lectures. The series was an amazing achievement for a man who had not been trained as a pure scholar and who yet proved himself to be a pioneer in these studies.

The decline of parochial life at South Place led Fox to seek wider outside work. He abandoned pastoral visitation as impracticable in a scattered congregation and his growing humanistic views led him both to give up clerical dress and to abandon the title, "the Rev.," though he always retained an elaborate preaching gown in the South Place pulpit.

Moving to Bayswater, he took to journalism in which he made his mark as a radical publicist by such utterances as "The Letters of A Norwich Weaver Boy." As editor of "The Monthly Repository," he published the earliest poems of Tennyson and Browning. He continued to draw large congregations in his Sunday ministrations and South Place became known popularly as "Fox's Chapel." The audience was a distinguished one and many well-known city men made a weekly journey to town with their families in order to hear him.

Taking to politics, he was a prominent speaker for the Anti-Corn Law League and sided with the League against the Chartist. In popular esteem, he was a far better orator than either Cobden or Bright.

Entering the House of Commons when over sixty, and suffering from heart trouble, he yet did useful work as radical M.P. for Oldham, a town where his name is still remembered.

The local elections were fought with every filthy device of which Tories were (and still are) capable; the aid of the publicans was enlisted and Fox's Unitarian views were urged against him by the champions of church and state. Nevertheless, he retained the seat until 1863, the year before his death. When he then lost it, he retired from public life, declaring that he was too old to start again. Dying in 1864, Fox's life was so completely identified with the events of his time that within ten years of his death he was all but forgotten in the London where his name had once been a household word.

Fox is deserving of memory on two grounds. He was a pioneer in theology and his writings in this field are still worth turning over. By rejecting Biblicism and supernaturalism, he opened the way for Unitarianism to pass over into a humanistic culture, the full and lasting potentialities of which it has yet to discover. The road which he carved out was further paved by his famous successor at South Place, Dr. Moncreu D. Conway.

Fox was also an eminent radical who really believed in civil and religious liberty as meaning more than ip-service. He championed Richard Carlile and Caroline Brunswick in the name of liberty of thought and action even though disagreeing with their actions.

During the dangerous days of George IV, Fox spoke at the popular London forum in Leicester Fields and risked arrest by so doing. His later work was one long battle for freedom for the common man.

As a warrior for liberty both in religion and in politics, William Johnson Fox should be resurrected from his grave and should be presented as relevant to a very different age. The Strickland Press, through Dr. Brook's studies and your own, has done yeoman service in resurrecting Richard Carlile from oblivion. It should do the same useful service for Fox by sketching his life and reprinting from his numerous writings and sermons.

Fox's works were republished in twelve volumes after his death and the edition was on sale at South Place for some years. The only modern reissue is of his lectures on "The Religious Ideas," which the Lindsey Press reprinted with a biographical preface by Dr. Courtney Kenny of Cambridge but it is now out of print. A valuable life, also out of print, was written of him by Richard Garnett of the British Museum and the Conway Lecture for 1924 by Professor Graham Wallas dealt with his life and work.

It is good to know that, after a lapse of eighty years, Fox's name is still fresh and green at South Place. His immediate successors in the pulpit were mostly failures and the chapel came near to closing. Its work was revived by the American, Dr. Conway, an old graduate of Harvard and friend of Emerson. Conway continued the work where Fox left off; his old forerunner lived to see him in office and the causes for which he had striven continued and strengthened at South Place Chapel. At the last, he had no need to mourn lost countries.

Fox was many things in one lifetime. Preacher and journalist, he did much to assist the passing of the Anti-Corn Law legislation. He was also a prominent popular educationist and strove for early schemes for compulsory education. But an inner consistency and unity was supplied by his strong radicalism which dictated his message in religion, politics and social service. His memory needs to be recalled if only because his message is so necessary at a time when the values for which he stood are in grave danger of defeat at the hands of political reactionaries and vested interests.

Yours sincerely,

F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT.

Manchester, November 5, 1943.

David Berkingoff, 315 East 209 Street, Bronx (67), New York, U.S.A., is forming a U.S.M. Group. Local comrades please note.

ANTI-SEMITISM AND CIVIL LIBERTY

BY C. H. NORMAN

To the Editor of "Civil Liberty."
Sir,—

REGULATION 18B.

I should like to enter the strongest protest against the reactionary character of the terms of the memorandum published in the July-August (1942) issue on Regulation 18B. The whole principle of the indefinite detention of so-called "dangerous people" without trial is justified by the memorandum, which is the very principle that real believers in civil liberty deny. The laws of England (in peace-time, apart from war regulations) are wide enough to cover any real or contemplated offence committed or to be committed by anyone, as was shown noticeably in the cases of Tom Mann and George Lansbury when it was desired to prevent those gentlemen making speeches in peace-time on political subjects.

The whole purpose of Regulation 18B is to relieve the Government of the onus of proving that the persons detained have committed any offence against the law and the Regulations. Why such a power is required when anyone can be proceeded against for anything which does not smell of "patriotism" under the Defence Regulations is beyond comprehension, except on the hypothesis that the Government wish to lock up anyone who is in favour of a negotiated peace, which seems to be the only reason why Sir Oswald Mosley and his wife are being detained, unless one is to assume that anti-Semitism is a criminal offence, which is certainly news to me.

Detention without trial (which has extended over three years in some cases) is a shocking abuse of the law, because, in many cases, had these people been tried and convicted even by war panic-stricken juries and judges, their sentences would hardly have been more than eighteen months for a first offence of a purely political character, mostly only representing acts done, or words spoken, or written before the war. Anti-Semitism is an objectionable state of mind: but it is equally objectionable to uphold legally pro-Semitism as a state of mind. The Jews as a race are no better than other people; in some of their activities they are rather worse. Why people should be indefinitely detained for saying so I fail to understand as being consonant with any belief in the principles of civil liberty.

Yours faithfully,

C. H. NORMAN.

This letter, as perhaps was to be expected of an organisation which parades its faith in freedom of discussion, was not printed. It may be read with convenience in conjunction with a later letter of protest against the attempt by the Council to secure the promulgation of a Regulation designed to making the holding of anti-Semitic opinions a criminal offence, a nice project for a society concerning itself with the protection of opinion to embark upon! The second letter is as follows:—

The Secretary,
The National Council for Civil Liberties.

Dear Madam,—I enclose cheque for 15/- subscription, though I do so with some little hesitation for the following reasons. I am rather anxious at the attitude of the Council on anti-Semitism. That is an objectionable state of mind: but I do not think that pro-Semitism is any remedy for it. Why the Jews should be selected for special protection by law against criticism, I fail to understand. To introduce such a principle into legislation seems to me a retrograde step, certainly not advancing the cause of civil liberty. Anyone who has the knowledge gained in my profession of the activities of the Jews can hardly regard them as proper subjects for legal privilege, any more than Catholics or anybody else should be.

It is a pity that the Council does not consider taking steps concerning the shocking conditions in military detention prisons, civil and penal servitude prisons, internment camps and the various other places where people are detained after or without trial. On these subjects during the war the Council has been remarkably silent, quite unlike its predecessor in the last war, which was very active on these proper matters for their consideration.

Yours faithfully,

C. H. NORMAN.

This letter was sent as a protest against the agitation being promoted by the National Council of Civil Liberties to secure an amendment to the Regulations under the Defence Act for the purpose of making criticism of the Jews under the phrase "promoting racial prejudice," or one wide term of that kind, a criminal offence. This is a most reactionary proposal at bottom and entirely contrary to any principle of freedom of discussion or debate.

FREEDOM AND POST-WAR CONSCRIPTION

BY COUNCILLOR
CHARLES A. EARL

YOUR FREEDOM IS IN PERIL—DEFEND IT WITH ALL YOUR MIGHT.

Early in 1942 Dr. Temple, now Archbishop of Canterbury recommended conscription for two generations after the war. This presumably is the Archbishop's interpretation of "freedom of will," with which, the Churches insist, God endowed each of his children.

The Archbishop of course, is over the age for conscription to affect him, and he claims and receives exemption for the clergy, but he evidently thinks it is exhibiting Christian brotherly love to inflict this imposition on future generations. In a few years he will be dead, but his dreadful work may live after him, as a result of which, young people, many not yet born, will spend years of suffering in prison, because they will not tolerate State slavery. This willingness to impose conscription on youth who have never had a voice in the matter, is apparent in most of our over-age parliamentarians, these opportunists and careerists, who prating of freedom and democracy, take to themselves the right to dictate to the masses what shall be their way of life, and it is the so-called Socialists who have been in the forefront to make slaves of the people in this war, e.g., the Labour Party's support of "Vansittartism." How differently they talk now, compared with a few weeks before the outbreak of war, is shown by the following:—

I am quoting from the Labour Party's official "Notes for Labour Party Speakers" for the dates mentioned:—

March 31, 1939.

"Talk of conscription need not be taken seriously. The Labour and Trade Union movements are not prepared to consider it."

April 27th, 1939.

WILLIAM GALLACHER, "COMMUNIST," IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

"No matter what happens in any country, I will stand by the workers of this country and oppose conscription and oppose the Prime Minister."

In the House of Commons on April 27, 1939, the Labour Party moved an amendment of "NO CONFIDENCE" in opposition to the Government's motion for the approval of the conscription policy."

April 28, 1939.

TRADE UNIONS AND CONSCRIPTION, GOVERNMENT'S BROKEN PLEDGES, LABOUR'S UNCOMPRISING OPPOSITION. The National Council of Labour met on April 25th and reaffirmed its uncompromising opposition to conscription."

CONSCRIPTION.—"Decisions taken by the Special Conference of Trade Union Executives held under T.U.C. auspices last week confirm the parliamentary opposition to conscription conducted by the Labour Party in the House of Commons. The outstanding fact of the Conference was its declaration of **RESOLUTE OPPOSITION TO CONSCRIPTION.**"

The resolution of the T.U.C. adopted by an overwhelming majority, instructed the General Council in consultation with the Labour Party

"To maintain the utmost vigilance in regard to the administration of the Act and **TO OPPOSE ANY ATTEMPT TO MAKE CONSCRIPTION PERMANENT OR TO EXTEND ITS SCOPE.**"

Ernest Bevin, in "The Record," for May, 1939, made a statement, describing how he had been approached to support conscription. This declaration appeared in "The Word" for July 1941, and need not be quoted again. It is an emphatic denunciation of conscription and an exposure of the flattery employed by the reactionary members of the ruling class in an attempt to persuade Labour leaders to support the industrial, social, and moral slavery that conscription implies.

We all know what great parts in the conscription of the workers Mr. Bevin and Mr. Herbert Morrison have played and how strongly they have been supported by their Tory-Labour colleagues in Parliament. The flattery was

apparently effective. And now in view of the recent conscription of women the following statement by Mr. Bevin in December, 1941, is very interesting:

"Some women will be so absolute in their conscientious objection that they will not touch anything associated with war. They will be regarded as absolutists, and they will not be directed."

Quite so, and women, such as Dr. Kathleen Lonsdale, a mother with three young children, are sent to prison for refusing to touch anything associated with war.

Enough has now been quoted to show how very real the danger of post-war conscription is. Neither the religious leaders, nor the politicians, have learned the lesson, so plain to people with intelligence, which has been borne out so unflinchingly as history has been unfolded; viz.:—that standing fighting forces, and fighting equipment, political intrigue and a "what we have we hold" policy, are the sure breeding ground of future wars. On the other hand, they are desperately afraid that the common people may desire to live as brothers and may wish to abolish the competitive and profit-making system, which is largely responsible for war. So that in imposing the bitter pill of conscription for our good, they attempt to sweeten it with Beveridge palliatives. Mr. Herbert Morrison, conscientious objector in the last war, speaking to the Kennington Labour Party on September 30th, 1943, said

"It was obviously impossible and against the rational interest to turn the country into a Socialist Commonwealth all in one piece. It was a task of years, not a week-end picnic."

It is obvious, how extremely little, if any, reliance can be placed in the Labour Party and Trade Union leaders to put up an unswerving opposition to conscription. If our children and grandchildren are to be free citizens of the world then we must be constantly on the alert and absolutely tireless in our efforts to resist any and every attempt to take our freedom from us. All No Conscription League members and other war resisters must seize every opportunity to point out the danger that overshadows us. Every sort of excuse will be used for putting this conscription law into effect:—

"We must have strong fighting forces to prevent another great war." "We must take our part in policing the world." "We must have a large army of occupation." "It is a Christian duty to save the world from another terrible upheaval," etc., etc.

It is the avowed intention of the present coalition Government to remain in office for some years after the war ends. Tory, Liberal and Labour all insist on the necessity for this, and presumably the political truce will be observed. This coalition Government hopes that the ordinary people will be so relieved by the ending of hostilities, they will not care what happens, nor who is in power, until awareness is forced upon them by the fact that the freedom for which they had been fighting, for which so much blood had been shed and which they at least thought they had won, had been treacherously stolen from them.

Eternal vigilance is indeed the price of freedom.

COMMUNISM

THE STORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

By GUY A. ALDRED

Twenty-nine chapters, exposing Moscow Adventurism and Reaction, and giving the full story of the Communist Party in Great Britain, The United States, Russia, Germany, Holland and China. An unanswerable factual review. Price: 1/6; post free, 1/9.

Every student of Communism should obtain a copy.

Read this work as a companion work to the author's "Socialism and Parliament," Parts I and II (6d. each part); "Pioneers of Anti-Parliamentarism," 1/-; "Bakunin," 6d.; and "Dogmas Discarded," Part I (4d.) and Part II (6d.) If ordering pamphlets singly add 2d. each pamphlet for postage. If ordering the lot, add 7d. for total postage to total price of pamphlets. Order from this office.

BRIDGETON N.C.L., I.L.P. ROOMS, 548 London Road. Every Friday at 8 p.m. All invited.

CARLILE AND HIS TIMES

"Tit-Bits," founded in 1881, is one of the most orthodox and unthinking journals of our time. Such journals a century to a century-and-a-quarter ago were busy slandering Richard Carlile when they referred to him. Yet our contemporary in its issue for March 26, 1943, published an excellent small picture of Richard Carlile and a short comprehensive article on his life under the heading: "He Fought for our Press Freedom." The essay condemned the statesmen and politicians of Carlile's time but did not mention how they were applauded in the press. We reproduce the essay:

The freedom of the Press, one of the freedoms for which the United Nations are now fighting, is not even in Britain a plant of very long growth. One of the pioneers of the fight for liberty, Richard Carlile, died only a hundred years ago, worn out by poverty and illness caused by frequent imprisonments.

He defied Lord Sidmouth's Gagging Acts, and drove the Press Censor out of Fleet Street. He paid a heavy price; for he served nearly ten years in prison, and died in 1843 at the early age of fifty-two.

In the course of his tempestuous career Carlile edited and published at least eleven newspapers and twenty-four books and pamphlets. Probably most noteworthy of his achievements was his republication in 1818 of "The Rights of Man," "The Age of Reason," and other works by Tom Paine, which up to that time had been proscribed.

He was heavily fined and sentenced to two years' imprisonment, but nothing could break his spirit. He continued to sell Paine's works after his release; and finally the Government gave up the struggle. It is mainly due to Carlile's unremitting efforts that "The Rights of Man" may be bought in any bookshop to-day.

A band of loyal and devoted workers helped Carlile in his struggle against oppression. His bookshop in Fleet Street was staffed by a succession of courageous volunteer shopmen. They were committed to jail one after the other; but new fighters in the cause of freedom were continually available. Carlile's wife, Jane, helped him in his work, and was herself sent to jail, although she had a young child and bore him another while in prison. His sister, Mary Anne, took Jane's place at the shop and followed her brother and sister-in-law to jail.

Carlile, who was born in Ashburton, Devon, in 1790, was a tin-plate worker who settled in London in 1813. He began to take an active interest in reform four years later, when he started to sell illegal Radical publications. He was always an ardent defender of the "under-dog"; and among the offences for which he was imprisoned were his advocacy of the cause of the agricultural labourers who rose against "intolerable oppression" in 1831, and his attack on the Government at the time of the "Peterloo Massacre," when yeomanry in Manchester rode down the unarmed demonstrators.

A convinced materialist in his early days, Carlile later became a convert to what he called "allegorical Christianity." He took out a licence to preach, and became entitled to (and used) the designation "Reverend." But even when preaching Christianity he still maintained the right of unbelievers to the free expression of their views.

A man of unalterable fixity of purpose and a staunch individualist, whose enthusiasm could not be quelled by any measure of repression, Richard Carlile did as much as any Englishman who has ever lived to destroy Government control of the Press. His name will continue to be honoured as long as the British Press remains free.

Those who want to know more of Richard Carlile's heroic struggle should secure from The Strickland Press the following works: "Richard Carlile, Agitator" (fully illustrated) 1s. 6d., post-free 1s. 9d.; Carlile's "Jail Journal," 2s., post-free 2s. 3d.; and Dr. Brook's "Carlile and the Surgeon," illustrated, 2s., post-free, 2s. 3d. These works cover Carlile's life, struggle, thought, period and contemporaries, very well.

GROSS STREET (UNITARIAN) CHAPEL MANCHESTER

Founded: 1672. Built: 1694.

All believers in freedom of thought and conscience welcomed to this home of liberal culture and liberty of thought.

Minister: Rev. F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT, M.A. (Oxon.)

Sunday Services at 10.45 a.m. and 3.30 p.m.

A special course of sermons in December, at 3.30 p.m.
Dec. 5—Major Barbara—Is Shaw Right?

" 12—The Young Soldier—Is Joad Right?

" 19—The Roman Catholic Church—Is Wells Right?

SOUTH PLACE

A STORY OF HERESY, PROGRESS AND CULTURE.

(Continued from page 43)

Sarah Flower wrote her letter from Harlow, November 23, 1827, when she was 22 years of age.

The epistle opens with a very frank confession:—

You did not ask me to write, and perhaps will be little thankful for what you are like to receive, a regular confession of faith, or rather, the want of it, from one whom you little suspect guilty of the heinous sin of unbelief. It reads like half-jest; never was I more serious. My mind has been wandering a long time, and now it seems to have lost sight of that only invulnerable hold against the assaults of this warring world, a firm belief in the genuineness of the Scriptures.

No, not the only one. I do believe in the existence of an All-wise and Omnipotent Being—and that, involving as it does the conviction that everything is working together for good, brings with it a comfort I would not resign for worlds. Still, I would fain go to my Bible as I used to—but I cannot.

She describes how the change came over her gradually. Her mind refused to answer Robert Browning. At Norwich Musical Festival, the choruses of praise to God moved her, but the rest of the "Messiah" dwindled to mere musical enjoyment. Sitting in the room in which her mother died she realised she had lost her Christian faith. Her belief in a resurrection is doubtful. She wants to read a good ecclesiastical history but is afraid to let her father know of her infatuation for doubt. She continues:—

I would give worlds to be a sincere believer; to go to my Bible as to a friend in the hour of trouble, feeling that whatever might befall, THAT would never desert me, and defying the world to rob me of its consolations.

The letter continues, sadly and beautifully, to depict her scepticism, and is signed: "Yours affectionately, Sally."

Out of these pangs was born, thirteen years later, in November, 1840, the hymn "Nearer My God, to Thee." This hymn was sung by the South Place congregation for nearly a generation before it was taken up by the outside world. The first draft of it, a beautiful autograph, was exhibited at South Place fifty years ago. It is written for choral responses. Fox and Eliza Flower having adopted a plan, once suggested by Mrs. Bartauld, of a choral antiphone between the choir and the congregation. It is strange but the entire emotion of the Christian world has responded to this hymn born of scepticism, Theistic, but definitely Anti-Christian. This hymn is sung by Christians throughout the world in different tunes, in blissful unconsciousness of the fact that it is really a beautiful hymn of pilgrimage from the old faith to the new.

Moncure Conway considered that the history and adventures of "Nearer My God, to Thee," would make an interesting monograph. In the year of the centenary of American Independence, 1876, Conway was in the United States. He occasionally visited evangelical gatherings, and observed that their chief inspiration was this hymn. There was a great meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in Washington City, from which the Unitarian Minister, Dr. Shippen, was excluded pointedly and deliberately. Conway attended its prayer meeting and discovered that there was no fervour at all, until a blind preacher, the Rev. Thane Miller, arose and asked all to join in singing "Nearer My God, to Thee"—a hymn written by a far more unorthodox person than Dr. Shippen. Yet the mere singing of this hymn excited deep feelings.

In the New York "Truthseeker" for August 19, 1893, Ward Diehl, of Waterstown, Pennsylvania, relates an incident on a coach, in which eight men and two women accepted with awe a real revivalist story about the hymn. He declined to accept the story and was regarded with horror.

Sarah Flower's 1827 letter was in advance



SARAH FLOWER ADAMS

of Fox's opinion at that date. Her letter influenced him even as a New England young woman liberalised the Calvinism of Elhanan Winchester, the founder of the Society. And her hymn was an expression of heretical growth and unfolding.

In another aspect of religious evolution the story of South Place is strange. South Place receives no mention in the history of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. Yet this Association was founded at South Place. Fox was its first foreign secretary. And it developed an understanding of Unitarianism in which, rightly, Unitarianism was held to be something more than Christianity. This idea of Unitarianism including, but extending beyond, Christianity, is a marvellous concept of spiritual harmony and progress. It is the beginning of Humanism and world religion. It is the end of the theological strife and the beginning of world understanding. It represents the at-one-ment of all mankind. As such, it merits a chapter to itself.

(To be continued)

THE SCOURGE OF WAR

Through the annals of history people are taught
That for Freedom and Justice in wars we have fought,
It's an old British custom begun long ago,
But when will it end? That's what we want to know.

When the Great World War for "Freedom" was won,
They said that our duty was nobly done,
'Twas a "war to end war" that promised to raise
"A land fit for heroes to live in" always.

But the trumpets of battle, not yet died away,
Have blazed forth once again to our sons of to-day,
And on these "playing fields" they are asked to
redeem
The price paid for that "wreck creation" scheme.

Have the masses to "fight for their country" anew
To safeguard the land that belongs to a few?
Are these wars for our "freedom," as we have been
told,
Or a life and death struggle for oil and for gold.

War is righteous they say when we've God on our side,
And true Christians should shoulder a rifle with pride,
But the Church that puts faith in a bullet or shell
Is more Godless than countries where Atheists dwell.

What can victory bring to the workers who toil?
Are their lives worth the nickel, the ore, or the oil?
If those who made wars did the fighting, they say
No war would endure for a week or a day.

When the common people throughout every land,
Use the power they possess that is theirs to command,
Then war's bloody toil of the millions will cease,
And the world will enjoy everlasting PEACE.

W. E. CURRIE

WORD BOUND VOLUME, for three years: May 1939 to July 1942 inclusive. Green Cloth 12/6. Post Free 13/6.

U.S.M. MEETING

GUY ALDRED speaks at the Central Halls, Bath Street, Sunday, December 5, 1943.
Doors Open 6.15 p.m.

All welcome.

SLOW CALVARY: THE CUP

EDITOR'S JOURNAL OF WAR RESISTANCE

[The Duke of Bedford is calling attention in the House of Lords to the Cat and Mouse treatment of conscientious objectors. This is illustrated by the fifth court martial of the Jehovah Witness, Stanley Hilton. There has been other cases to which attention has been directed in these columns. Actually, so far as military service is concerned, under the National Service Acts, 1839-41, if a man is court-martialled at all, the fault is originally his, for accepting medical examination. If he does not accept medical examination, he is not handed over to the military machine. "Cat and Mouse" operates in other cases, such as Fire Watching, Essential Works Orders, conditional exemption, and has affected women objectors. During the last war, the issue was more direct and simple. There was no question of medical examination being accepted. One was deemed a soldier without undergoing any medical examination.

In these columns we have published various articles dealing with the Wandsworth Prison Revolt of 1919, the Cat and Mouse treatment of objectors, including myself, and the 1916 Tribunals, which were terrible mockeries. Our army discharge certificate was reproduced in "The Word" for October 1939 and in March 1940, our musings and reaction, from the time we were "handed over" by the magistrate at the West London Police Court, on May 4, 1916, to the date of our first court martial, twelve days later.

The present journal continues the record of our war-resistance and depicts the effect of Cat and Mouse treatment. The notes, letters, essays, are reprinted from the columns of "The Spur." They were addressed to our comrade, Rose Witcop, who maintained "The Spur" as a monthly journal of Socialist Anti-Militarism throughout this period of struggle, and were published by her in its columns, between July 1916 and September 1918. It is, therefore, an actual prison and camp detention journal of resistance and not some description written from memory. It is not complete as it does not tell the full story. But it is sufficient for the moment.

Comrades should obtain our 1939 and 1940 copies mentioned in this introduction. They cover four or five issues. A few sets are obtainable and will be sent post-free for 9d.—Ed.]

FOVANT CAMP JOURNAL.

Fovant, May 28, 1916.

With Christ, I pray that the cup may pass from my lips. Like him, may I endure, meekly and firmly, the agony and bloody sweat of a slow Calvary.

Sunday, June 15, 1916.

I pass to my Court Martial, which took place at Fovant camp on Wednesday, May 17th.

I denied the jurisdiction of the Court and after much argument the Court retired, whilst my point was considered. Two noticeable things in connection with this Court Martial were the determination of the authorities here to prevent me getting in touch with anybody; and, two, the fact that, at the Court Martial, everyone was supplied with a copy of the King's Regulations except myself. Virtually, I was not allowed to prepare a defence. That fact exposes the tyranny of the whole proceedings.

The actual court trying the case consisted of three persons. The chairman was very anxious to be fair but too bluff to appreciate legal niceties. On his right, sat a judge at whom I smiled whenever I looked. I could not help myself. Instinctively, I smiled. And it was fatal. When I affirmed my evidence, he objected that an Atheist could not have a conscience!

I was recalled with escort, to find ruling against me. Evidence of my refusal to go on parade was given, it being admitted, under my cross-examination, that I refused courteously and without insolence of any kind. Many charges were dropped and only this one was proceeded with. I affirmed my opposition to war and the proceedings closed.

Two days later, I was marched out on parade and faced the regiment to have my sentence read out. I was sentenced by the Court Martial to six months' military detention, but the

General Officer Commanding remitted four months of the sentence. I served twelve days, dating from date of trial, at Fovant Camp, on field punishment. On the thirteenth, I was removed to Devizes Detention Barracks to finish my sentence—and to earn another one if I wished to do so. The doctor examined me after my sentence and denounced the lightness of it, forgetting that, in thus expressing his feelings, he was guilty of a breach of discipline. He examined me again two days before I left for Devizes, and expressed the hope that they would drill me there. He said they could do what they liked with me. Thus he passed me not because of my physique, but because of his spleen.

On Friday, May 26th, I drew up a formal appeal against my sentence, which was forwarded duly to the General Officer Commanding. To show how farcical such appeals are, it should be added that no argument is permissible and that the statement of grounds of appeal must be confined to one side only of a sheet of foolscap. The Colonel said that the appeal would be turned down. And he was right. The appeal was turned down. On June 8th, I was called before the commandant at Devizes' Detention Barracks, and informed of the fact. Yet that appeal recorded my conscientious opposition to war, and on the day upon which I sent it in there was issued an Army Council Order to the following effect:

"A soldier charged with an offence against discipline who, at a Court Martial, alleges as his defence conscientious reasons, should be sentenced to imprisonment and not detention, and should be handed over to the nearest public civil prison."

Were justice intended to those conscientious objectors who were in detention already, or to one like myself who had stated a formal appeal, the sentence should have been varied to one of imprisonment. The importance of this point, at last appreciated by the government superficially at least, will appear from the following facts.

Devizes Detention Barracks seems to have been at one time an ordinary prison, but is now entirely under military control. On admission you suffer one or two indignities I need not relate. You are warned then of certain cell treatment, roughly corresponding to the lot of the hard-labour prisoner in the civil institution. You are advised also that, if refractory, you may be ironed, put on punishment diets, and, for breaches of discipline, liable to further District Court Martial. The reader will understand, readily, that, if in the ordinary camp, secrecy prevails concerning Camp Court Martial, much worse must the case prove in connection with a prison Court Martial.

I recall a time when I studied seriously the lives of the saints in order to distinguish the genuine from the counterfeit. One that amused me most was that of St. Bartholemew. It is related of this worthy that when he was roasted over a gridiron, and was well-nigh burnt to death on one side, he sweetly told his persecutors to turn the other side to the fire. I do not say that there is no moral to the story, nor that there is no truth in it. Of course, every martyr boasts the spirit that this story typifies. But the point at the moment is, that the government test for the conscientious objector whom it sends into detention is the Bartholemew test. It is not enough for the C.O. to suffer one side to rest comfortably on the gridiron. He must be willing to turn the other side as well. Indeed, he must have more sides to roast than nature gave him. And even then, the government will not credit his credentials.

Our old-time forefathers used the hot irons to test a man's honesty. But they were at least satisfied with one test. And later, when a man was made to walk the plank, it was enough that he walked the plank. But the C.O. must needs walk the plank and then dance on the side of it to an eternal strain of discord.

There are men incarcerated in our Detention Barracks to-day who have been sent there for varying terms, for disobeying orders from a conscientious objection to militarism. Some belong to the Non-Combatant Corps. Others

are riflemen.

What has been their fate? They have been sent to the Detention Barracks, fully equipped, to be drilled, or again Court Martialled. And in addition to drill, they are compelled to fill in the day with arduous prison labours. If they refuse work or drill, not only are they remanded for Court Martial, but are kept during the period of the remand on a bread-and-water diet.

This has been the fate of some twenty comrades whom I have left behind at Devizes Barracks. Their leader was Emrys Hughes, of Merthyr, a well-known writer to the local "Pioneer." [Now editor, as the reader will know, of "Forward."—1943.] Four others came from the same district. The others are from Exeter, Bristol, Reading. I wish to hail publicly the dauntless courage of these comrades. Down to the time of my unexpected release on Saturday afternoon, June 17th, they had been through the mill in silence and solitary confinement, and had enjoyed only a bread-and-water diet. This punishment carries with it, inability to receive visitors, write, etc. Hughes received one visit from his sister by special permission of the Commandant. But it was allowed in the hope that his sister would move him to repentance. On Tuesday, June 13th, they were remanded for D.C.M. Meanwhile, the government had ordered imprisonment, as distinct from military detention, for conscientious objectors and these men are on bread-and-water diet, awaiting Court Martial because they are receiving an injustice of treatment which the government acknowledges to be wrong. And in the Houses of Parliament, we have been informed officially that the C.O. is treated as well by the military as by the civil authorities, that there was no reason for civil imprisonment, etc.

Returned to Fovant, I was brought before the Colonel at 12 o'clock noon on the Saturday, and told that I must decide what to do about going on parade. I refused to give any undertaking and was taken back to cells, but shortly afterwards released. I have had a Sunday afternoon free. I refuse parade and await another Court Martial.

Monday, June 16th, 1916.

At 6 a.m. this morning, I refused to go on parade. Later, after many formalities, was remanded by the Colonel for my second Court Martial. Since May 4th, last, my maximum amount of "freedom" has been 22 hours of "open arrest," and nine hours of ordinary "Military liberty" within a radius of five miles. The Colonel seemed very weary of the struggle and was very courteous.

Tuesday, June 20th, 1916.

Was taken before the Adjutant this afternoon for details of evidence to be taken. Treated very courteously indeed. My opposition to war was brought out well in the written evidence taken down in the preliminary documents.

Thursday, June 22nd, 1916.

Visited by nonconformist Chaplain. He seemed chatty, and made no attempt to alter my views. Said I was not such a terrible fellow, but too logical in my vision of things. Later examined by doctor. This person hates me! Previously, he had visited another C.O. now here awaiting his first Court Martial, Frank Prior, of Walthamstow N.C.F. Doctor told later that I was "a bad lot," etc.

Sunday, June 25th, 1916.

Colonel visited me this morning, and handed me the minutes of evidence. This was not done last time. Am preparing my case. Heard about Sara's sentence of four months in Wormwood Scrubs. Am closely watched and unable to get letters out, in anyway. Chaps willing to do a lot for me, but afraid to help me communicate. My attitude is having a disturbing effect on the camp.

II. WINCHESTER PRISON REFLECTIONS.

Many incidents occurred at Winchester

worthy of mention. I record one. The prison chaplain visited me soon after my arrival and learned that I had no religion. I told him that I viewed Christendom as a world of pagan make-believe. His cold pious hatred knew no bounds.

"You like skulking in a prison-cell," exclaimed this reverend stay-at-home escape-all-discomfort fire-eater.

"Yes," came my reply, "and some people like skulking in pulpits."

He banged the door and never visited me again.

1. Nine Months.

Winchester Prison, July 4, 1916.

Monday, July 3rd, I left Fovant for Winchester Gaol to serve a sentence—passed upon me by a secret Court Martial which ridiculed the provisions of the Military Service Act—of nine months hard labour. Of course, I have no right of public appeal. After Devizes, Winchester. After the Devil, Satan, Lucifer assumes a different suit of black and smiles with all his old cynicism at any idea of principle or justice. He hopes, by breaking my body, to destroy my will. We shall see.

I was sentenced on Friday morning, June 27th. That morning, I understand, the newspapers contained Mr. Asquith's statement concerning just treatment for objectors. And so I got nine months' hard. Good!

I hope and trust that comrades will keep the "Spur" going. I hope its size and influences may increase, and I assure comrades that my old rebel self, surviving all persecution will return from imprisonment to the platform, and the press determined and aggressive in thought and utterance, until action calls to sterner duty. For this system, with its senile gods and its degenerate monarchies, I intend to see buried in my own time and generation.

Now to my sentence. I was charged with refusing to obey a lawful command in that I did not go on parade. One offence! And the sentence is supposed to be proportionate to the said offence. At the same C.M., Frank Prior, of the Walthamstow N.C.F., and F.O.R., was charged with the same offence. He was sentenced to six months' hard labour, but this was commuted to 112 days. This was his first offence. Which means that conscience gets worse with consistency. Thus does the Military mind reveal itself.

But I am not complaining.

I know what is before me. And I have not gone to war without counting the cost. The expense will be weariness and persecution. The reward will be knowledge of a certain testimony to peace and justice, to freedom and truth. A happy pleasure in resisting cant.

What a farce it is! The men who style us traitors, who condemn the N.C.F. as a treacherous organisation, have declared, in the Commons, that the masters of the controlled industries are forming a powerful organisation to resist government taxation of their war profits! Patriotism! Sacrifice the bodies of the workers! Yes! Sacrifice the profits made from the war! No!

Thus we see the old class war again at work. Which is good. Soon the mists of the sham fight shall pass. Soon the clouds of illusion will vanish. From the battle-plains of Europe will go up a great cry of vengeance and angry indignation. Tremble then, my masters, make the most of your power to persecute. Every day brings you nearer your doom. Every night hastens the end of your dreams of ambition and conquest. Soon your sleep will be troubled; and, finally, sleep will cease to be your solace. You will cry for it in vain.

Yes, most respected superior suits of clothes, I foresee your doom. Lessons that we have learned at your Tribunals and Court Martials will stand us in good stead. You have practiced the cynicism of power. Beware, lest you be called to account before the cynicism of revolution. It will surprise you to witness then the

wonderful flattery of imitation to which you will be treated. But the flattery will not please. And you will not imitate us so well. For, when down and out, you will do what despots ever do: whine and eringe. Then satisfied to have destroyed your sway over us, we will scornfully hearken to your whining, and see that no evil befalls you. May your children become co-operators in the great task that will follow—beautifying the great republic of social liberty.

2. "The Grace of Jesus."

Winchester Prison, July 9, 1916.

It has occurred to me, just now, as I sit in this cell, to consider how wise in their own day and generation are the children of this world of domination and cant; how much wiser they are than the children of light. That their wisdom is hypocrisy does not detract from its williness. This fact is evidenced by the way in which they turn every good thought, every gracious word, every noble sentiment to the service of evil, the advancement of degradation and the upholding of ignorance, and despotism.

My thoughts have turned to my study of Jesus Christ and his disciples. And a favourite phrase, found in the "Acts of the Apostles"—an early Christian benediction—has revealed its meaning to me for the first time, despite obvious corruption of language.

"The grace of our Lord, Jesus Christ, the Love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with you, now, and for evermore. Amen."

Is not this benediction used continually in the Church services of Christendom? And what, pray, is it imagined to mean? Why, an actual personal blessing regularly dropped down in some mysterious way from Heaven by a person dwelling there without ageing in the least, called Jesus Christ: actual love shewn to the man below by God above: and some personal fellowship with a mysterious person called the Holy Ghost, who, somehow, is Father, and Son, and himself, and is neither Father nor Son.

This benediction is uttered by priests on fixed occasions as part of their trade. It is offered in gaol churches, where no blessing is known, where love is never suspected, and where personal fellowship is denied. Beyond hypocrisy is the further humbug, that, as employed by priest and dupe, the benedictions have no meaning. It is a solemn and outrageous farce and lie to pretend that they have.

Let us apply Atheist logic and rebel understanding. Let us see if these words have any meaning. We shall find them rich in meat, and know that it is foolish to repeat them parrot-like to-day.

The earliest Christians disliked the Pagan title, Lord, though it meant but teacher or master. Let us translate in this sense. Thus the first portion of the blessing is: "The grace of our teacher or master, Jesus Christ." This did not mean that Christ was dropping prosperity down from heaven, or that he was other than dead. It meant the grace, i.e., the power influence, the patient wisdom revealed by Jesus, or other teacher.

"The love of God." Elsewhere I have shewn how Christ thought and spoke in the terms of the God superstition, but always in the Jewish prophetic sense, meaning a covenant of righteousness. The Pagan Roman Imperial use of the term God, as applied by Constantine, for example, to himself, was but the State agreement with the Mosaic view of God as a God of war and a personal being, bestowing honours and withholding justice. That is the present Christian conception. It was not Christ's, nor that of the first Christians. "The love of God" means, then, not the love bestowed by God, but the love bestowed on God. Hence "the love of God" means the love of the covenant with righteousness, experienced by the child of light, who had learned to possess the grace that characterised Jesus and his manner of preaching the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

I have explained often before that the Holy

Ghost means but the Holy spirit of Truth. Hence the fellowship of Truth.

The early Christian benediction is seen now, not to be a blasphemous and superstitious jargon of lies such as the Church makes it out to-day, but a beautiful diction of good, a farewell of comradeship.

The phrase, "for now and for evermore," means throughout life, and has no reference or relation to heaven or some life hereafter.

To-day, I would not use this benediction. Its phrasing belongs to the past. We can reverence Truth now without personification. But I do protest that the Church which uses this benediction mocks it every time. For the Church is the Synagogue of Satan, and the blessing means alliance against this institution of Imperialism and falsehood.

As an Atheist, under my second sentence, within a very short time, for refusing to kill, I say, knowing the full meaning of the words, to all my comrades in the struggle:—"The grace of the teacher, Jesus, and the love of Righteousness, and the fellowship of Truth, be with you now and for evermore. Amen."

In penning these words, I have leaped the centuries, and am at one with the heresiarchs and early iconoclasts of the Christian era, who heard and understood the message of Jesus, the message that meant but the way and the life of individual and social health.

III. WORMWOOD SCRUBS' MUSING.

Wormwood Scrubs, December 28th, 1916.

And now for a little fancy. Some idle thoughts of an idle fellow: for whoever is debarred from following his soul's passion, whoever has a mission and not a career in life, and cannot follow it, he is idle even though every moment of his life be occupied with some care, worry, or task. I do not pretend to experience so much energetic excitement as this suggests, but only to sense an idleness which neither palls nor oppresses, but incites. My brain throbs through my being the thought: "Time flies: death urges." I feel myself responding, all my nerve concentrated to live my work, and I am compelled to patient suffering. But I do not wish the hours to fly: that would be folly. I just want to lay up a store of quiet energy, to watch my wasted moments turn to a reserve of future power, and to muse smilingly on my past, my present, and my days that are to be. But I wish to know and to interpret life in my own being. For all knowledge must be assimilated and lived through oneself, if it is to become wisdom and understanding. Doing this I feel a rare contentment here, which I would not exchange for all the luxury of a palace.

The penitentiary, if not the abode of penitence, is at least the home of reflection. And the fact that it is Wormwood Scrubs that I write from, offers me much food to this end. How the place links you and I with the Mylius case: and then, by many links, with the late Charles Voysey, and Brixton! Ah yes! I have to pause when I think of Voysey, my visits to his Hampstead residence, our correspondence, and his visits to Brixton.

Dear conservative Theist Voysey, with but one iconoclast humour! Yet he believed in me as he watched me pass from Anglicanism, beyond his cherished hopes on to my present thought. He saw all my development and was disappointed sorely. And yet, he could put his hands on my shoulders, gaze into my eyes with that wonderful fervour, and say:

"Guy, my dear boy, I believe God means you to know the truth and to reveal it. Perhaps you will know a larger truth than I possess. Never doubt the revelation. Go on, in your sweet faith in liberty and human happiness. Have faith, whatever happens."

I remember his words now, his constant striking of the same note. And memory makes me grateful. I have seen Voysey explain away the future life, heard him point out there was no objective efficacy in prayer, but he never doubted that I believed in truth. Since then,

those who used like jargon of belief or creed to my own, have sneered and questioned my efforts to make known first principles of social well-being. And if bitterness has failed to consume my zeal and to render worthless all my work, it has been because Voysey's faith has counted. One day, I will try to do justice to his memory, but more than this, I yearn, as the years go by, to give to the youth of my age, that understanding Voysey gave to me.

(To be concluded.)

"DON'T BE A GULL."

The author of this pamphlet is well known. He omitted his name so that the pamphlet should be read without prejudice. He reveals himself in his style, exclaim many readers.

"Peace News," in its issue for August 27 last comments on the pamphlet as follows:—

"Don't be a Gull" is the curious title (whose appropriateness is explained in a preface) of a pamphlet which suggests "a way in which a satisfactory ending to the war might be achieved."

The plan is simple—that it is too simple is one of a score of objections to the answering of which the author devotes most of his pamphlet. It is based on the method of negotiation, but on two fundamental conditions, and with safeguards, that should make the case for a negotiated peace almost more attractive to non-pacifists than to pacifists!

Advocates of a negotiated peace would do well to keep "Don't be a Gull" handy for answering critics though they will find the "three unspoken objections," to which it refers, by no means so easily disposed of. The summary might have been better put at the end of the pamphlet, though at the beginning it serves as a rough index.

"Written for those who want lots more war and for those who don't by one of the latter," it is published by the Strickland Press, 104 George St., Glasgow, C.1, at 3d.

The pamphlet will be sent post-free for 4d.

"NOT BY NIGHT"

Mr. B. A. S. Brunskill's little booklet, "Not By Night . . ." is a very persuasively written statement of the case for Christian pacifism, which many who are pacifists on religious grounds will find a most useful addition to their equipment of helpful literature for lending to possible new converts.

Mr. Brunskill has the rather unusual "background" of twenty-two years' service in the Indian Army, before he came to the pacifist position.

—BEDFORD.

BOLSHEVIK BOGEY IN BRITAIN.

By EMRYS HUGHES (Editor, "The Forward").

Price 1/- Post Free, 1/3

The Story of British Government Policy Towards Russia from the Bolshevik Revolution to the Anglo-Russian Treaty.

80 Pages of Facts, Figures, Quotations.

A wonder factual exposure. Every Socialist should read this splendid work. Obtainable at and from The Strickland Press. We hope to review this work at an early date.

MARXISM: IS IT SCIENTIFIC? by Max Eastman.

This wonderful work of 344 pages, stiff covers, has been purchased by us from the publishers. Published at 8s. 6d., it can be secured new for 5s., post free, 5s. 6d. Supply limited. Order now direct from The Strickland Press, 104 George St., Glasgow, C.1.

The Duke of Bedford's fourth speech in the House of Lords, 'The Conscientious Objector,' ought to be read by every thinking man and woman. Price 3d., post-free 4d.

COUNCILLOR EARL'S PAMPHLET

Councillor Earl's Impressions of Wandsworth Prison with Rev. Sidney Spencer's views of Walton Prison, and the Rev. Thomas Pickering's views of Barlinnie, have been issued by Comrade Earl in pamphlet form, post-free, 4d., special terms for quantities. This pamphlet will be noticed next month. Address orders to The Strickland Press, or direct to: COUNCILLOR CHARLES A. EARL, 3 MOLYNEUX ROAD, FARNCOMBE, SURREY.

STRICKLAND'S "MARCH OF HOMICIDE."

Sir Walter Strickland's last letter, an appeal to men of science, to avert "This March of Homicide", and other Anti-Militarist and Freethought studies. 1/6d. Post free, 1/9d. Order this beautifully printed book NOW.

"Our Letter Box" will appear next month, full of interesting facts and comments.

DUKE OF BEDFORD

LANARKSHIRE MEETINGS' IMPRESSIONS

By J. TAYLOR CALDWELL

The Duke of Bedford spoke in Motherwell Empire Theatre on August 8 and in Burnbank at the Plaza Picture House, on Sunday, October 31. Both Meetings were held under the auspices of the Motherwell I.L.P. Socialist Open Forum. In Burnbank, local Anti-Parliamentarians and Anarchist comrades assisted in the advertising and organising. Guy Aldred also spoke at both meetings. I wrote my impression of each meeting immediately after leaving it.

The meetings, especially the first one, caused a great stir in Motherwell, Hamilton, Burnbank, and Blantyre; not only because of the rank of one speaker, and the revolutionary reputation of the other, but also because of the antagonistic activity of the Communist Party.

At Motherwell, the C.P. did what it could to have the meeting banned altogether. As the organisers of the meeting anticipated, the attack was a failure, and the hall was packed.

At Burnbank, the C.P. showed more wisdom. They repeated their leaflet attack, but made no attempt to get the meeting banned. They restricted their opposition to heckling. Had their statements shown some regard for truthfulness, no objection could have been taken to that. The struggle for truth demands vigorous statement of pros and cons, of point and counterpoint.

Here are my impressions.

I.—Motherwell Meeting

At the last moment, with a kind of electioneering strategy, the Communist Party issued a leaflet attacking the Duke, and accusing him with a wearisome lack of imagination, of being a Nazi agent and friend of Hitler. The last moment device was to obviate the possibility of an unanswerable rejoinder being issued in the same form.

The C.P. leaflet was distributed widely, and called on the people of Motherwell to "rally" to "protest meetings" against the Duke's visit. It was announced that these meetings would be held in the open-air at certain street corners near the Empire Theatre. The idea was to block the approaches to the theatre. "Don't Let Bedford Use the Hall" was the slogan, printed in large type, on the leaflet. This was the bold injunction that the people of Motherwell ignored. The I.L.P. chalked the streets: "Hear Bedford's Reply to His Accusers."

It is to the credit of the people of Motherwell that they were affected neither by the C.P. leaflets, nor by the libellous C.P. street chalking which augmented them. Instead, they responded to the I.L.P. invitation to "Hear Him."

The C.P. was able to hold only one of its protest meetings, so small is its influence in Motherwell these days. The common people are tired of its contradictory sensationalisms. Most of those who attended this meeting spent their time attacking the speaker, until the doors of the I.L.P. hall opened. Ten minutes later there were only two dozen people round the Communist Party platform. Soon they too dispersed, and the "great protest meeting" had to come to a close for want of an audience.

Two of "the Party" leaflet sellers were sent to the doors of the Empire to wave a pamphlet, ostensibly for sale, and to shout about "Hitler's Agents in Britain." But their cries became a little less insolent and an embarrassed self-conscious note crept into their voices when two I.L.P. supporters emerged from the Hall with bundles of "The Word" for October 1942, bearing an illustrated front page showing Stalin, Molotov and Ribbentrop at the signing of the Hitler-Stalin pact. The cry of "Hitler's Agents" seemed then to lose its force, and the vociferous ones became silent—then departed.

But, being unable to gather a meeting outside—despite their efforts—these intrepid advocates of the dungeon availed themselves of the democratic spirit of the socialist meeting by attending the meeting they had hoped to suppress, and at discussion time abusing the procedure by over-lengthy participation in discussion. Through the tolerance of the chair these people were able, probably for the first time in years, to address a full meeting in one of the largest halls in the district.

Comrade Aldred was the first speaker. He had intended to deal with "The War—and After," but the conduct of the Communist Party, in their efforts to stop the meeting, had to be dealt with.

Having "been introduced" by the Chairman he rose, and striding to the front of the stage, he stood, just behind the footlights, straddle-legged, leaning slightly forward, his hands clasped behind his back and, beginning quietly and gently, was soon pouring forth a storm of denunciation of pseudo-communism and political opportunism in a voice that filled the auditorium to its furthest walls, and overflowed into the vestibule beyond. The stewards on duty there left their posts and crowded round the doorway to hear. A policeman, passing the hall, stopped, as though he heard the voice and was reminded of something. He put his head in the door and whispered across the vestibule: "Your opposition has gone. They've given up. It's all clear now." Then he continued his slow walk down the street.

The Duke was the second speaker. With the aid of a microphone (which Aldred did not use) he addressed his audience in an even, clear voice; without emotion, and with great clarity, despite the difficult nature of the subject. The audience, most of whom were hearing an exposition of monetary reform for the first time, were obviously able to follow the speaker's arguments, for at no time did they lose interest or become restless. A silence of wrapt attention held them while the Duke spoke. This was probably because the Duke's grasp of his subject is so complete and his interest in it so keen that he can always speak on it without lapsing into clichés or using Exchequer phrases which would confuse the uninitiated.

An hour and a half was allowed for questions and discussion. Taking advantage of the leniency of the Chair the C.P. members tried to monopolise this time by keeping up a fire of questions. The speakers dealt very ably with these, and soon the opposition lost its vigour.

When the Chairman announced that discussion was in order and three minutes would be allowed each speaker the local C.P. organiser rose and spoke for nearly ten minutes.

It was possible to tell this speaker's political affiliations by the tone and manner of his speech. The raucous voice, the staccato phrases, the dogmatic tone—all true to type. "The Party" seems to appeal to a mentality whose tonal expression is the same the world over. He made no attempt to substantiate the charges made on the leaflet; and seemed quite unaware of the fascist strong-arm nature of his Party's effort to prevent the meeting being held.

Fascism, he said, was tottering before the victorious march of the Red Army. When Russia, the only Socialist country in the world, had been attacked, the phony war of 1939 had become a war against Socialism. The workers of this country should rally behind the boys in the armed forces and support the Red Army in their struggle. The Communist Party had been carrying on the fighting against Fascism long before some people in this hall... "Five hundred British lads lay dead in Spain—"

The implication was that all of these "lads" were members of the C.P. Vigorous, full-blooded members. For the Communist Party has adopted them and enshrined them as heroes; just as it has canonised every other dead leader, or outstanding figure of the Socialist movement. The object is not to immortalise these dead fighters and agitators, but to make them posthumous members of "the Party"—or rather to identify "the Party" in

the minds of the people with every dead fighter for social liberty. For they know that the people are muddy-brained and will reverence the church for its dead saints, even though it persecutes living prophets. For numbered with those who went to Spain are Robert Smillie and Daniel Mullen—both dead. One lies somewhere in Spain and the other in a London cemetery. Both were brave lads, and both had their deaths hastened by the Communist Party. And hardly had the dead fighters grown cold in their graves before "the Party" extended a hand of friendship to the alleged arch-enemy whom the "brave lads" had given their lives to destroy, and against whom another set of "brave lads" were now urged to wage war. But handshake and the bayonet thrust have but one meaning to those who seek power. Neither have any meaning in themselves; both have to submit to the test of how far they will carry "the Party" on its road to power.

Most of the other participants in discussion were in sympathy with the views expressed by the speakers.

In reply to discussions the Duke dealt very ably with the chief criticisms levelled against him.

Aldred urged his listeners to think for themselves on all questions. He reminded them of a piece of advice contained in a book, much older, and in many ways much wiser than anything yet offered by the Socialists; the words recorded by the prophet Isaiah: "Come, let us reason together."

Many of those who attended the meeting had to walk back to Glasgow, to Paisley, and even to Kirkintilloch. It was a wild, stormy night. A wild night and a long journey such as they might remember for a long time.

But after the memory of the journey has faded they will recall and relive the thoughts and feelings that accompanied them home on the night they heard the Duke and the Anarchist united in combat against aspiring despotism and desolation.

(To be continued)

Welsh Anti-War Literature

In spite of the censorship and shortage of paper several small volumes have been published in the Welsh language against the War since 1939, and some journals printed in Welsh have been equally outspoken. Indeed, it is gathered that one such weekly has increased its circulation considerably merely because of its stand against the ghastly slaughter that is now proceeding all over the world.

The biggest attempt yet made, however, in that direction is the forthcoming publication of a substantial Welsh volume entitled "Gair y Cymod" (Word of Reconciliation); published by Lewis, Gwsg Gomer, Llandyssul, Carmarthenshire; 5/- per copy post free.

It will contain twenty articles by a similar number of the leading literary men of the Principality and twenty poems composed by another twenty of the most famous Welsh poets.

It is hoped to review the book in "The Word" in due course. It is understood that orders are well in hand already to secure the success of the venture; it will be on sale just before Christmas.

SUGGESTED ENGLISH MEETINGS

It has been suggested that the Duke of Bedford and the editor should speak, under Socialist auspices, in Lancashire. It will be some time before arrangements can be made as the idea is to speak in more than one town.

The editor has been asked to speak in London at various meetings. Before agreeing he would like to hear from all London comrades so that really worthwhile meetings might be arranged and also private contacts made. He is not anxious to leave Glasgow which he regards as his field of activity. But if he is to visit the metropolis he wants the visit to be useful and he desires to meet all his various Socialist, Humanist, Ethicist and Freethought friends and comrades. One meeting is to be under Unitarian Pacifist auspices.

The visit cannot take place until after the New Year. This will give all comrades an opportunity of planning meetings and private discussions. One Labour Group has asked that he speak in company with the Duke of Bedford.

THE DEATH STRUGGLE OF MODERN CAPITALISM

By FREDERICK LOHR

On the morning of Sunday the third of September, 1939, Mr. Neville Chamberlain, then Prime Minister of Great Britain, broadcast to the world that a state of war existed between Britain and Germany. His announcement came as no surprise to people who had been for years living under the threat of war, and who were daily conditioned to its expectation. There was no shock, no outburst of incredulity, no manifestation of horror, such as we are told greeted the outbreak of war in 1914. In Parliament, all save a few pacifists registered their approval of the war decision. No prominent voice was raised against a repetition of the barbarism of the last War. Perhaps among a few people who during that fateful period between Munich and the Russo-German Pact, believed that a major conflict could be avoided, the feeling existed that still in spite of the declaration of war, the nations might yet be persuaded by sane counsels, and the reality of open warfare be avoided. But by the great majority the Prime Minister's solemn declaration was accepted with resignation, and even with relief. For it brought to an end those long years of exhausting suspense which had permeated every phase of social life with uncertainty and questioning. Those dragging months of waiting upon Hitler's speeches, those years of watching in impotent fury the aggressive policies of the European Dictators unfolding before their eyes. Those years of heavy anxiety had come to an end, the storm clouds hanging oppressively over torn and troubled Europe had broken, the veneer of a false peace had cracked, and the festering sore of political hostility once more erupted in bloody struggle.

To most people the war was unavoidable. Better, they felt, that it should come now than be protracted into the future when Germany and her Axis partners might be stronger still. To most people it was a necessary war. For long they had recognised that European affairs could not just drift along in such an unsatisfactory manner. The bluff of Hitler and Mussolini had to be called, and the position of Russia clarified. Almost one might say that in those early days of September 1939 there was an atmosphere of relief. Mr. Chamberlain had finally brought matters to a head; the tension was broken. Long years of dilatory diplomacy and vacillating policies were at an end. The country was finally done with that concealed enmity, that brooding fear beneath the outward semblance of an uneasy peace. England was at War!

September 1939. There was no ranting enthusiasm. No beating of drums: no military parades. No hysterical cheering and no patriotic demonstration. After the feeling of relief came a mood of anxious anticipation. War in 1939—what did it imply? For twenty years since Versailles platform and press had described the terrible advances in the methods of scientific warfare. China, Abyssinia and Spain had evidenced the death-dealing potentialities of the modern war-plane. So that when the first practice wailings of air-raid sirens were heard over England on that Sunday morning in September 1939, there could be sensed the fearful recognition that this would be no war on foreign battlefields only, no war merely of newspaper reports of continental campaigns. A new weapon had been forged from the crucible of the Great War, and perfected in the peaceless years between wars. The bombing plane! The dread of this paralysed enthusiasm for War in September 1939. Like a dark cloud of foreboding Storm hung the prophecy of death from the skies. War for both combatant and non-combatant; death for both soldier and civilian; terror and destruction for both guilty and innocent—TOTAL WAR! People looked up into the skies and were afraid.

From the beginning, and for months prior to the declaration, the war had been publicised as a just war. A moral crusade. It was to be a war

against aggression, against bad faith, against tyranny and persecution. Above all else it was a war for freedom, a war to make it possible for the plain and common man to live in peace and security, free from secret police, racial persecution and the domination of military conquest. Mr. Chamberlain's voice had broken when he had described the war's purposes, and generally speaking the population of the country were in agreement with his sentiments. They had not wanted war. They had tried strenuously to avoid war. Hitler would not be appeased. There was no other way.

Still, there was no enthusiasm. No determined bearing. No rush to volunteer. No eagerness to open hostilities. In spite of all propaganda from platform, press and radio, in spite of general sympathy with allied hopes and general hatred of Hitler and Nazism, the fear of War itself—*Total War*—the unknown potential of modern scientific war, stifled popular enthusiasm and made ludicrous the martial fervour of politicians and journalists. Nazi war-guilt, Hitler's wickedness, the wickedness of the German people in general, all were agreed and denounced, but all were secondary to the issue of WAR itself. The people were for the war, thought it necessary; had even at times demanded war against aggression. Now that it had come, they were not surprised; they would not have had it otherwise. And yet they could not fight it. Could not summon up the energy to proclaim it and to prosecute it. For they were very, very afraid. The dominant, overriding characteristic of England during the early winter of 1939 was fear. Fear, not of Hitler, not of Germany, but of WAR. For the first time in the history of the British people, War as a thing in itself focussed itself prominently in the public mind. All efforts to concentrate attention upon the issues, moral, economic or strategic, failed to achieve their purpose. Daily from the outbreak of war was to be observed a steady decline in the attention devoted to the attributes of this particular war, and an increase in the preoccupation with the question of War itself. War as a human experience. War and its modern implications. Now whether this attitude sprang from a cowardly fear of bombing planes, in a country which had felt but little of the terrible devastation of previous wars, or whether it originated from a sense of war futility, or from an instinctive consciousness of the inadequacy of Great Britain to fight a modern Total War, with this I am not concerned. Whatever was the reason, the feeling existed in September 1939, and exists to-day in a much more tangible shape. It presages some hope for the future, for it means that England is approaching a consciousness that modern Total War represents a greater threat to worthwhile values than do the theatrical ambitions of the European Dictators. It represents a growing awareness that the democratic way of life, the belief in the free expression of human personality, cannot be defended by Total War, but on the contrary a prerequisite of efficient war prosecution to-day, is the abandonment of such a way of life and an acceptance of totalitarianism in social organisation. It means above all that the War is being regarded not as an episode in the history of this particular age, but as an evolutionary resultant of past conditions. And the recognition of this fact is a necessary introduction to the examination of this war as the expression of a social antagonism which is inherent in modern capitalist society.

This is the second world war within the lifetime of one generation, and there are many signs that the lessons of history are slowly being learned by that vast section of the general public which is not usually given to speculation regarding world affairs, outside the limits of their daily newspapers and the nightly radio. Each year dealing expertly and scientifically with all shades there are published many hundreds of volumes of opinion concerning War in general and this war in particular, but these studies reach only a minute proportion of the population, and knowledge which is commonplace to this minority is unknown and unsuspected by the general reading public. Nevertheless, through the mediums of

press and cinema, popular periodicals and political organisations, certain tendencies in war are being noticed and questioned by people who a few years ago would not have troubled to examine them. It is being noticed that each succeeding year has a tendency quickly to outstrip the local animosities that occasioned it. That there is soon revealed a connection between the wars of small nations and the interests of large Powers. The politics of the Gran-Chaco, the Spanish Civil War, etc., are observed to link up with the ambitions of great Empires. Most people have already noticed that whilst each great conflict appears to settle issues between Governments, yet nevertheless the same issues recur again and again in ever larger perspective, and from each war a whole series of new issues are raised for succeeding generations.

Thus behind all the patriotic support for the present war policy, there can be described a growing realisation that war is not an episodic eruption due to individual or national wickedness, but an international phenomenon of social significance. Once it is perceived that a particular war originates in causes which are out of sight of the local manifestation of the outbreak, the way is prepared for the realisation that each war has a common social root. Thus to-day, more and more people are taking up a realistic attitude to the war. The propaganda devoted to the idea that wars are caused by the power hunger of megalomaniacs is losing ground. So also is the idea that any state-structure is built up solely for war purposes, unrelated to its position within a world in arms. Once it is admitted that war is not a biological phenomenon, and so cannot be regarded as a manifestation of any natural hostility between racial or national groupings, the causes of war must be sought within the internal structure of society. In other words, it is recognised that war is not a human characteristic but a social problem.

Now a modern industrial society is an exceedingly complex organisation and the human relationships within such a society tend to become increasingly complicated. So it is with war. The issues involved in a war between highly organised and technically equipped States are extremely difficult to unravel. Simplification is impossible except on broad and general lines. The scale upon which mechanised war now operates introduces with every campaign new factors and fresh issues which were outside the range of the original war purposes. The world is to-day so closely linked together, the interests of the great Powers so delicately interwoven, that it is impossible, so swiftly do the objectives broaden and conditions change, to discern clearly the ultimate policies of any warring State. As more and more of the surface of the world is brought within the sphere of military operations and nations divide themselves into hostile camps, each possessing incalculable potential for destruction, it is difficult to perceive how any end to this conflict can possibly serve the interests of any State or people. War to-day has reached such dimensions, and involves such awful implications that it is fast becoming a *raison d'être* in itself. Whatever aims or purposes it had when it started, they are fast becoming secondary to the necessities of war itself. Once the conception of Total War becomes an active reality, then the very logic of its movement takes control and creates its own purpose and destiny. Original war aims and promised peace policies become meaningless. Victory and Defeat take on the same significance. Both mean a cessation of War and both must contemplate a return to the problems of Peace. Now this War is itself, in a way, an expression of the failure to face up to these problems. War is a method of shelving social problems, but when war develops into Total War, not only is the direction of industrial production changed, but the very basis of society is shifted. No great industrial country once organised for Total War can revert back to the loose and undisciplined social organisations of capitalist democracy. To attempt such a return would immediately produce a condition of economic and political chaos. Neither can the war provide a solution to any of

the problems of Peace that contributed in large measure to its outbreak; in every case it can but exacerbate and develop them. But war can temporarily obscure these problems, and total war can provide a measure of escape from peacetime embarrassments so long as it continues, and so long as Victory or Defeat can be averted. Thus we find ourselves to-day in the tragic circumstance that war is preferable to peace; war is becoming the normal activity of our lives, and peace the abnormal eventuality to be feared.

It is an ironic comment upon our civilisation. Circumstances have plunged us into a conflict in which fear of the weapons of destruction, the possibilities of starvation, the potentialities of pestilence and disease, all conduce to a sane and reasonable rejection of war, yet on the other hand fear of the uncertainties and insecurities of peace fill us with forebodings of the cessation of war. Our world contains all that is necessary in materials, inventiveness and labour power, to provide a full and free life for all, and to satisfy all the wholesome desires of mankind, yet within this sphere of plenty and this prospect of happiness, only war can to-day provide mankind with a modicum of security and a meagre supply of material comfort. Only in Total War have we discovered an outlet for the tremendous productivity of human energy and modern technical equipment. Only in war can man find release from the drabness and frustration of his social environment. If ever there was a dilemma of absurdity, this war is one. It goes forward to ruin and despair, because it dare not return to poverty and disillusionment.

Many clever politicians and others are to-day lifting up their voices in extravagant promises of a rosy future to come after the war. One and all endeavour to maintain the childish illusion that a military victory over Germany is all that is needed to bring about the millenium. Few now pay attention to such charlatans, for most sensible people recognise that the war is supported more out of fear than hope, and that whilst the war continues, gathering each day ever increasing momentum, engulfing each week more and more of the total energies of humanity to the purposes of futility, it is idle to pretend to plans of a better world, or to promises of a more just and equitable society after the war. The war itself is in command of these pretentious ambitions. Our new society arising from the aftermath of cruel and bloody war will bear indelibly the marks of such a conflict. This war will be its foundation stone and the lives flung so uselessly into such a foundation, will prove to be a solvent that will mock its edifice. A service would be done to society if someone with a more able pen than mine, would convince these political hucksters and economic shamans that the society of to-morrow is being built to-day. There is never a clean break with history, never a new start. As we sow to-day, to-morrow we shall reap, and to pretend that a war of such magnitude as this one, with consequences so immeasurably heavy to bear, can be lightheartedly regarded as a prelude to better times, is to spit in the face of truth and reason. Such men are criminals.

So that, before all questions of social importance is this question of War, for now War assumes such proportions that it represents the total product of our civilisation. We have reached a historical phase which has no meaning outside of war. The very nature of our age is mirrored in mechanised warfare. It is the culmination of capitalist endeavours, the final expression of a system which is soulless, whose philosophy is accumulation, whose logic is frustration and whose ultimate reality is futility.

How has this system brought society to such a pass? Why has the promise of the nineteenth century failed to mature? What is there in capitalist civilisation which is so destructive of human values and Christian culture? How is it that the great advances of industrial technique and scientific invention have worked to such ignoble purposes, when so much altruistic endeavour has gone to build up our present society?

It is necessary to consider these questions,

and to form some general political and economic understanding of the situation in which we find ourselves. This war, and the historical epoch which has produced it, cannot be wholly explained in either political or economic terms. Realisation of this simple truth stresses the need for personal responsibility and personal thought, for Anarchism as well as for Socialism. If mankind is to be served, the death struggle of modern capitalism must give us, not a Communist Dictatorship for a Fascist Dictatorship—in essence they are the same combination of irresponsible despotism and bureaucracy—but a living democracy, a Free Society, a world of Anarchism and common fellowship of living.

PAUL D. ABBOTT

For the third time, Paul Douglas Abbott, chartered accountant student, Defoe Avenue, Kew, was sent to prison on Thursday, October 14, 1943, by the Mayor (Councillor J. L. Hawkins), Councillor C. E. Mills and Mrs. Reid, in Richmond police court.

Abbott has been convicted twice at Kingston for failing to attend for medical inspection and now for failing to comply with a direction of the Ministry of Labour to go to employment as an agricultural worker in Buckinghamshire at Friarage Camp, Aylesbury.

Abbott pleaded guilty.

Mr. C. E. Shelly, who prosecuted, said Abbott was registered in 1940 and he applied to be regarded as a conscientious objector. His case was considered by the local tribunal in May, 1940, and his application was rejected. He appealed, and in November the Appeal Tribunal upheld the decision. Various attempts were made to get him to attend for medical examination prior to service with the armed forces. In May, 1942, he appeared at Kingston and was fined £5, or a month's imprisonment, for non-attendance. The fine was not paid and he was detained for medical examination. In June, 1942, he again appeared at Kingston for failing to attend and was sentenced to six months' imprisonment.

Abbott again appeared before the tribunal and his plea was rejected. He could have been conscripted into the armed forces but the Ministry of Labour thought better to employ his services in another capacity.

On August 21st Abbott was directed to report to Buckingham War Agricultural Committee. He failed to comply, and on August 25th wrote and clearly invited prosecution.

On September 4th he was interviewed by a representative of the Ministry, and he repeated that he objected to being conscripted into any service for the war effort; he would be satisfied with nothing else than unconditional exemption.

"This young man," added Mr. Shelley, "is actively associated with the Richmond Conscientious Objectors' Advisory Bureau."

Abbott's Statement.

Abbott told the court that he thought the best contribution an individual could make towards the attainment of a peaceful society was to refuse utterly to submit to any conscription for war. He still had 65 days to serve under his supplemented articles, and when he had completed them he would see if there was any work more constructive and useful than accountancy he could take up. There might not be. He did not object to hard work, manual or otherwise, but the Ministry of Labour policy of trying to force him to do land work made it appear to him very doubtful whether he could honestly take that up, even voluntarily.

Abbott concluded:—

"The Ministry appears to me to have more interest in enforcing universal conscription than a genuine concern to effect food production. As a logical outcome of my rejection of conscription I shall refuse to work in goal and also as a protest against the demoralising prison system."

The Mayor, after the Bench had consulted

in private, said the justices sentenced Abbott to prison for three months with hard labour.

Paul D. Abbott was born on June 7, 1914, at Sydney, New South Wales. He came to England in 1915. His father was, at one time, Inspector-General for the Far East of L'Union Assurance Company of Paris. He is the grandson of the late Henry Abbott, J.P., of Detentham, Suffolk. Also nephew of the late Frank Morley Youngman, J.P., of Ashfield, Suffolk. Paul Abbott was largely brought up by Frank Youngman, who was a well-known pacifist.

Mr. Youngman was chairman of the Framlingham Farmers' Co-operative Society; President of the Eye and Woodbridge Division Liberal Association; a member of the Lord Chancellor's Committee for the selection of magistrates; and a pacifist member of the conscientious objector Tribunals during the first great war.

Paul Abbott was educated at Felsted Junior School and at Framlingham College. He is a linguist and keen internationalist. He has cycled all over France, Holland, Belgium, Germany and Denmark. He left the Boy Scout movement, in which he was scoutmaster, when the Chief Scout declared that all scouts must do organised national service in war emergency.

Abbott is a member of the P.P.U.

VICTORY FOR SOCIALISM

IVY MILL LANE,
GODSTONE,
SURREY.

Dear Comrade,

SURREY AND SOUTH LONDON CONFERENCE.

At 23 Wellesley Road, Croydon, on Sunday, 12th December, 1943, at 2.30 p.m.

Following on the successful conferences held at Wimbledon and in other part of London last winter for the purpose of combating "Vansittartism" in the Labour Movement, an "ad hoc" Committee of rank and file members of the Party and its affiliated organisations has been set up to carry on this activity and to conduct propaganda aimed at re-establishing a more vigorous Socialist drive in the Movement under the slogan of "VICTORY FOR SOCIALISM."

It is felt by the undersigned that all Socialists in Surrey should participate in this campaign, and we have accordingly arranged a conference similar to that held on 13th December last year at Wimbledon.

The Conference will be held at time and place stated above; Councillor W. C. Elliott will preside. Fred Messer, M.P., and Reg. Groves, Prospective Labour Candidate for Aylesbury will speak, after which the conference will be open to any delegate for invited to speak.

We will be grateful if "The Word" will make the Conference known as widely as possible among its many readers and supporters in the Labour Party and affiliated organisations.

Yours fraternally,

H.A. HASKELL (Alderman, Godalming Borough Council).

E. R. SIMMONS (Member of Surrey County Council).

W. H. BROTHERS (Chairman of Education Committee, South Suburban Co-operative Society)

W. ELLIOTT (Member of Reigate Borough Council).

H. J. DAVIES (Member of Education Committee, South Suburban Co-operative Society).

JOHN R. BATTLETT (L.C.C., Prospective Labour Candidate for Clapham).

C. A. EARL (Member of Godalming Borough Council).

ERIC MESSER (Secretary, East Surrey Divisional Labour Party), Conference Secretary.

RHYS DAVIES, M.P., TO VISIT SOUTH WALES, JANUARY 1944.

Our Comrade, Rhys Davies, M.P., will address the following meetings in South Wales during January:—

In English

Sunday afternoon, January 9th, 1944.—Carmarthen Fellowship.

Monday evening, January 10th.—Ystradgynlais.

In Welsh.

Tuesday evening.—Cwmgiedd, Swansea Valley.

Wednesday evening.—Ynysir, Rhondda.

Thursday evening.—Llanharran, Glamorgan.

Questions and Discussion invited at all meetings as time permits.

We hope that our readers in the towns and districts mentioned will make these meetings known widely. All who can do so should make a point of attending themselves.

"COMMUNISTS" AND THE WAR

In March, 1943, the Labour Party issued an unanswerable factual indictment of the Communist Party's record of hypocrisy and treachery to the workers of Europe, in relation to the war. Prior to the signing of the Soviet-German Pact at Moscow, on August 21, 1939, the Communist Party denounced appeasement and demanded a War Government, with Churchill and Eden in leading positions. Two days later, the *Daily Worker* declared that the "Axis" papers attached too much importance to the negotiations and recalled Stalin's lengthy statement to the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in March, 1939, pledging support to nations which had fallen prey to aggression and were fighting for their independence.

The Communist Party continued in this frame of mind down to September 20, 1939, even though Russian troops had entered Poland three days earlier. During this period, Willie Gallacher, in the House of Commons, Harry Pollitt in his pamphlets, and the Central Executive Committee of the Party had declared their strong opposition to Fascism.

The *Daily Worker* for September 2, 1939, published a statement by the Central Committee of the Party, declaring:—

The Communist Party has never hidden and never will hide its opinions regarding the fundamental cause of the war, namely, the capitalist system.

It has never hidden and never will hide its detestation of Fascism and its readiness to take part in any struggle, political or military, to secure the defeat of Fascism.

On the same day, Willie Gallacher declared in the House of Commons: "I will stick at no sacrifice to ensure the defeat of Nazi Aggression."

On September 14, 1939, the Communist Party issued a pamphlet, entitled "How to Win the War" by Harry Pollitt, then Secretary of the Party. This pamphlet, full of stern war commands to the British Government, was withdrawn later. Pollitt wrote:—

The Communist Party supports the War, believing it to be a just War which should be supported by the whole working class and all friends of democracy in Britain.

On September 28, 1939, the occupation and partition of Poland on a dual basis was formally agreed upon in a German-Soviet Treaty of Friendship fixing "the frontier of their interests in the former territory of Poland." Article I of the Treaty).

Two days later, the Editorial Board of the *Daily Worker* published a statement in the paper beginning:

Arising from the decision taken in Moscow and the peace declaration which has followed, an entirely new situation confronts the people of this country and of Europe.

This statement was a lie, as later events proved. The "Communists," whether for War or Peace, were merely Moscow hirelings. They were never genuine. Merely cynics, opportunists, and sycophants.

On October 7, 1939, the Communist Party published a Manifesto in the *Daily Worker* in which it declared:—

This war is not a war for democracy against Fascism . . .

The responsibility for the present Imperialist war lies equally on all the warring powers.

This war is a fight between the Imperialist powers over profits, colonies, and world domination.

The Soviet Union is leading the world fight for peace.

This Manifesto demanded an immediate Peace Conference.

On October 12 the Communist Party announced through the *Daily Worker*, that its Manifesto of October 7, denouncing the war as an Imperialist war, corrected its declaration of September 2, declaring its intention of fighting Fascism. It should be noted that, whether for the war or against it, the Communist Party

denounced in terms of violence and contempt those who anticipated its future attitude or stood by its previous attitude.

On October 11, 1939, Harry Pollitt was dismissed from the Secretaryship of the Communist Party. On November 23 both he and J. R. Campbell published in the *Daily Worker* abject recantations of their support of the war. Pollitt described his war attitude as "an impermissible infraction of our Party's discipline." Campbell described his pre-war attitude as "resisting what has been proved to be the correct line."

What hypocrisy!

From now on, until June 22, 1941, when Hitler launched his sudden attack upon the U.S.S.R., the Communist Party was not satisfied to conduct an ordinary peace or anti-war agitation, such as Socialists and men of principle have conducted in times of war, to the peril of their own lives and liberties. The Communist Party conducted a campaign of slander, bogus grievances, mean opportunism, and sabotage.

On November 1, 1939, it issued a pamphlet, *Why This War?* in which it lumped together Chamberlain, Churchill, Greenwood, Dalton, Bevin, Citrine, and declared that "without the support of organised labour" no "war government could continue in office a day."

In January, 1940, the London District Conference of the Communist Party resolved to contest every By-election on a programme of resolute opposition to the war and defence of the Soviet Union.

On February 22, 1940, Harry Pollitt contested the Silvertown By-election in opposition to the Labour Party Candidate, who upheld the war. Pollitt's slogan was: "The Communist Party fights to end this war."

The Communist Party now circulated widely, shamelessly in view of their previous pamphlets—a pamphlet by G. Dimitroff, Secretary of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, published on November 18, 1939, entitled "Communism and the War." Dimitroff accused the leaders of the Social Democratic and radical parties of "now openly supporting the imperialist war." He added:—

The Social Democratic, "democratic" and "radical" flunkies of the bourgeoisie, are brazenly distorting the anti-Fascist slogans of the Popular Front, and are using them to deceive the masses of the people and to cover up the imperialist character of the war. Under the flag of "national unity" they have, in fact, established a common front with the capitalists, a front stretching from the Conservatives to the Labour leaders in England, and from the Cagouloards to the Socialists in France. The foremost leaders of the Social Democratic Parties and the reformist trade unions shamelessly took up front rank posts in the camp of the imperialists, from the very first day of the war.

Dimitroff concluded:—

It clearly follows from the above that the Communists can have no united front whatsoever with those in a common front with the imperialists and who support the criminal anti-people's war. The working class and all working people can have no dealings with the Social Democratic, "democratic" and "radical" politicians who are betraying the vital interests of the popular masses. Between the masses of the people and these lackeys of imperialism lies the abyss of war.

On April 10, 1940, the "Communists" accused the British Labour and Trade Union leaders of responsibility for the Nazi invasion of Norway and Denmark and for extending the war. The statement in the *Daily Worker* reads:—

They (the Labour and Trade Union Leaders) demanded it. They have justified it, and now Norway and Denmark are in the inferno.

On April 27, 1940, the *Daily Worker* published the "Communists" May Day Call, in which it was stated:—

Once again the bankrupt rulers of capitalism can find no solution save a new human holocaust. Once again the millions of workers are dragged from production into uniforms to kill one another. Once again the false leaders of Labour hound on the slaughter and seek to deceive the people on the character of the war. . . .

In vain the old threadbare, lying slogans of the war for "freedom" and the "rights of small nations" are rattled anew to cover up the reality

of the bestial conflict of the giant capitalist empires for world domination.

In vain the corrupt Labour leaders seek to furbish up anew these slogans with new deceptions about "the war against Fascism," as if Chamberlain and Churchill, the worst enemies of the working class, were the champions of democracy and the rights of the people. . . .

End the political truce—the shameful alliance of Labour leaders with the leaders of Capitalism, which is preparing the way for a Coalition War Government to hold the workers in chains.

The Communist International Manifesto, according to the *Daily Worker* of May 1, 1940, said:

In answer to the gross violation by England and France of the neutrality of the Scandinavian countries, Germany led its troops into Denmark and occupied strategic positions in Norway. England and France, in their turn, landed troops. The territory of Norway became a theatre of war. . . .

The strife between the imperialists in the Pacific threatens to develop into new wars. A dispute has already begun between Japan, England and the U.S.A. over the Dutch East Indies.

The bourgeoisie of the U.S.A. are, as a beginning, stretching out their hands to Iceland, Greenland, and the possessions of Britain and France in the Caribbean Sea.

The Capitalist miscreants are dragging the peoples into a new world imperialist carnage. . . .

The British and French warmongers and their social democratic lick-spittles are furious at the fact that the Soviet Union occupies a position of neutrality towards their imperialist war. . . .

The *Daily Worker* kept up the attack. On May 10, 1940, on the morning of the German invasion of Holland and Belgium, an editorial stated:

Even a blind man can see what is happening. The Labour Party is going to enter the Government. Let's make a bargain, they say. Throw out Chamberlain and we will save Churchill for you. Then we can go to the Bournemouth Conference, claim a great victory over Chamberlain, and thus get a vote authorising us to enter a reconstructed government.

And so, what is the net result?

A new war government emerges, inclusive of the Labour leaders. If the Carlton Club wants the use of these gentlemen they are, of course, welcome to try their hand, although they will hardly find that Morrison and Bevin are much of an improvement on Chamberlain or Hoare.

When the Churchill Government was being formed, the Communist Party in a statement published in the *Daily Worker* on May 11, 1940, stated:

To their eternal shame the Labour Party leaders have offered to enter a new "National Government" in combination with the most ruthless jingo representatives of capitalism. These same leaders, who had helped to maintain Chamberlain in power through all these years, now accept the leadership of Churchill and come to the rescue of the Diehard imperialists in the intensification of the war. . . .

Fight against Labour participation in Churchill's new War Government.

The class which rules, the capitalist class, determines also the aims and purpose of the war. For them the war is no anti-Fascist war, as the Labour leaders falsely proclaim, but an imperialist war, a war against the German people to inflict a new super-Versailles, for the maintenance and extension of the British Empire, for the domination of reaction in Europe, and for war on the working class in all countries and against the Socialist Soviet Union. . . .

Again, on September 14, 1940.

The ruling class, who have betrayed the people and brought this war upon them, have nothing to offer except "Blood, toil, tears and sweat." The Labour leaders have gone over body and soul to the ruling class. From them there can be no leadership for the people of Britain. . . .

Only the Communist Party fights the Labour leaders, who have been given positions in the Tory Government in order to attack the workers and to carry through the war policy of the capitalists. . . .

Hostility to the war, denunciation of the Churchill Government and of Labour Ministers, and criticism of the Labour Party continued to be a main theme of Communist propaganda.

(To be concluded)

"WORD" DEFICIT FUND. Received from a group of workers in Albion Motor Works, Glasgow, the sum of £1 ros.