TEXT CROSS WITHIN THE BOOK ONLY

TEXT CUT WITHIN THE BOOK ONLY

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_154225

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

INDUSTRIAL PEACE

VOLUME I

LONDON:
THE ST. CATHERINE PRESS
STAMFORD STREET, S.E.1

The following quotations are reprinted from the covers of the six numbers included in this volume.

1917.

SEPTEMBER.

"Then none was for a party. Then all were for the State."

Macaulay.

OCTOBER.

"If we sow the seeds of discontent and dissension in the nation we shall reap defeat." *The Prime Minister.*

NOVEMBER.

"One must call things by their names." *The Speaker.*

DECEMBER.

"'Tis good when a man loves the land,
'Tis good when he falls for his creed;
But woe to the hate that is fanned
By folly begotten of greed." *Edgar Wallace.*

1918.

JANUARY.

"The Camel driver has his thoughts, and the Camel—he has his." *Arabian Proverb.*

FEBRUARY.

"Be Britain still to Britain true,
Amang oursels united;
For never but by British hands
Maun British wrangs be righted."

Robert Burns.

INDEX

Titles of articles printed thus:—**Food For Thought.**
All papers, pamphlets, etc., thus:—*Morning Post.*
S=September; O=October; N=November; D=December;
J=January; F=February.

A.

Aberavon, N.36
Ablett, Noah, S.11
Admiralty, N.32, D.14, D.17, J.23
Africa, J.20, J.22.
Agadir, S.12
Age, The New, N.16, N.28, D.35
A.G.G., N.3, N.4
Allen, Clifford, N.26, N.28, J.27
Alsace Lorraine, J.20
Amalgamation Committee, S.12, O.6, O.15, O.31, N.23, N.30
America, S.20, S.31, S.32, O.15–O.18, O.20, N.18, N.33–N.35, N.37, N.40, J.7, J.8, J.30, F.30
American Federation of Labour, O.15, O.17, J.31.
American Labour Alliance, O.17
Ammon, A. G., J.27
Anarchists, D.32
Anarchy, Reflections on, S.36
Anderson, W. C., N.17
Angell, Norman, S.28
Antidote, The, F.3
Antwerp, S.35
Appleton, W. A., S.33, O.24, O.26
Army, N.16, N.19
A.S.E., S.12, O.7, O.8, O.32, N.4, N.24, N.29–N.32, D.16, D.17, J.20, J.23–J.25, J.30, F.23
Asquith, J.6
Australia, S.11, S.12, O.14, O.15 O.18–O.20
Austrians, N.37

B.

Balfour, A. J., N.39, J.6
Bankers' Magazine, D.22
Barker, Tom (I.W.W.), O.19
Barrow, S.32, O.8, N.4, N.30, N.32, D.14–D.18, J.23-J.26, F.22, F.24
Barrow strike (*see* STRIKES)
Bebel, J.10
Beckess, M. W. (I.W.W.), S.11
Belgian Socialists, S.33
Belgium, S.33, S.35, O.30, F.29 F.31
Berlin, O.18, J.31
Berliner Tageblatt, F.31
Berne, S.33
Bernstorff, J.30
Birmingham, S.32, O.25, O.29, N.4, N.30, F.23
Bismarck, O.30, J.11
Bissing, von, F.29
Blackpool, D.32
Blythe, Sergt.-Major, S.26
Bolsheviks, D.34, J.28
Bonus System, Premium, O.22, D.16
Bosanquet, Bernard, O.21
Bouverie Street, N.3
Bowman, Guy, S.11
Bow Street, S.9, S.12
Boy-Ed., J.30
Brace, M.P., N.36
Bradford, J.15
Brailsford, H.M., S.29
Branting, O.30
Bristol, O.28, N.30
Britain, N.25, N.27, N.35, D.27, F.3
British Socialist Party, D.31
Brockway, Fenner, S.29, N.25, N.26
Brownlie, J. T., O.24, J.24
B.S.P., O.14, N.13, N.38, N.39, D.31–D.34, J.27
Buchanan, Sir George, F.30
Bülow, F.31
Buxton, C. Roden, S.29

C.

Caillard, Sir Vincent, O.24
Call, The, S.14, O.27, N.33, D.33, D.39, J.28
Cambridge, S.29
Canterbury Times, O.19
Cappa, N.39
Cardiff, O.25
Carmelite House, N.3
Carpenter, F.15
Carson, Sir Edward, O.27
Cavell, Edith, F.29
Central Powers, S.30, O.18, O.30, J.6
Chancellor of Exchequer, N.17, D.26
Chicago, O.16, O.17
China, N.35
Clarion, The, D.32
Clark, J. W., O.32
Class war, S.13, S.14, O.15, N.5, N.15, N.23, N.34, D.3, D.4
Clegg, Sir Wm., J.25, J.26
Clootz, Citizen, S.34
Clyde, O.5, N.29, D.14, J.25, F.22, F.23
Clyde strike (*see* STRIKES)
Clyde Workers' Committee, O.5, O.6
Coal Controller, S.31
Cole, G. H. D., O.15–O.17
Collectivist Socialism, O.10, N.13
Colonial Office, J.22
Common Sense, N.38
Commonwealth, The, O.14
Comrades of the Great War, S.26
Connolly, James, O.18, *note*
Conscientious Objectors, O.28, N.27, N.28, N.40
Conscription of Wealth, N.15
Conscription of Wealth, O.3, N.15–N.18
Control of Industry (*see* INDUSTRY)
Copenhagen, F.24
Coventry, O.6, N.30, F.22–F.24
Coventry strike (*see* STRIKES)
Curzon, Lord, O.27

D.

Darlington, O.25
Davies, Langdon, J.27
Davis, W. J., O.24, O.26, N.5, N.6
Deductions from World War, F.32
Defeatism, F.13
Denmark, F.29
Detroit, O.16
Diamandi, F.27
Dickinson, C. Lowes, S.29
Discharged Soldiers, S.25
Discharged Soldiers' and Sailors' National Federation, S.26, S.27
Docker, Dudley, O.24
Docks, London, D.31
D.O.R.A., S.29, D.8, J.27
Dubery, H., O.26
Dublin Rebellion, O.18, *note*
Duckers, Scott, N.28
Duncan, Chas., M.P., O.26
Dutch Anti-war Council, S.29

E.

Economics, Alphabet of, D.22, D.35
Education, D.29
Employers' Federation, O.24
Employment Committees, Local, S.25
Employment, Remuneration of, O.11, J.13
Engels, S.15
Engineering Trades Conference, Leeds, O.30, O.31
Engineering Trades Organising Committee, O.32
Erith, J.26, J.30
Europe, The New, O.30
Evans (of Barrow), J.24
Ewer, W. N., N.34

F.

Fairchild, E. C., D.33
Fair Wages Clause, D.9
Farrow, Sam, D.34
Fawcett Association, J.27
Ferment of Revolution, O.4, N.3, N.7, N.23, N.24, N.34
Finance Act, D.9
Fineberg, J., N.39
Firth, Sir Algernon, O.24
Firth, Professor C. H., N.7
Firth Worker, D.39
Fisher, H. A. L., D.29
Food for Thought, S.31, O.27, N.33, D.35, J.28, F.27
Forward, O.5, N.5, D.21, D.25, D.26
Flag, The, F.32
France, S.30, O.30, N.25, J.8
Frankfurter Zeitung, O.30
Freytag-Loringhoven, Baron von, F.32

G.

Galen, O.30
Garber, Joseph, O.17
Geddes, Sir Auckland, N.33, N.34
Geddes, Sir Eric, O.29
German support of I.W.W., O.17
Germany, S.8, S.15, S.28–S.30, S.35, O.28, O.30, N.18, N.25, N.33, N.35, N.38, D.36, D.39, D.40, J.6–J.11, J.21, J 22, J.31, F.29, F.31, F.32
Giolitti, Signor, N.39
Glasgow, O.31, J.25
Globe, D.39
Gloucester, O.35
Gorki, Maxim, S.33
Gorle, Fred, D.33
Grayson, Victor, D.31, D.32, J.17
Grey, Sir Edward, S.28, N.25
Griffith, Ellis, M.P., S.36
Griffiths, Sir J. Norton, S.26
Grimm, Robert, S.33, D.33
Guild Socialism, O.10, N.13

H.

Hadfield, Sir Robert, O.24
Hague, S.24
Hall, Leonard, D.31–D.33
Hardie, Keir, J.15
Hargreaves, Leonard, O.8
Hartlepool, J.20
Haste Less Speed, More, D.27
Haywood, William, O.16–O.18
Health, Public, D.30
Henderson, Arthur, S.33, O.3, O.27, O.29, F.30
Herald, The, S.19, S.20, S.35, N.34, F.30
Herald League, O.18, *note*
Hindenburg, S.35, F.31
Hodge, John, J.24
Hogge, J. M., S.26
Holland, F.29
Home Office Scheme, N.27, N.28
House of Commons, D.28, J.18, J.24, F.3, F.4
House of Lords, F.3
Hudson, J. H., S.29, N.26
Human Touch, The, O.21, J.12
Huns at Home, D.21, D.23, D.24
Hunter Watts, D.32, D.33
Huth Jackson, Rt. Hon. F., O.24
Huysmann, Camille, F.29
Hyndman, H. M., D.31–D.33

I.

I.L.P., S.29, N.13, N.26, N.27, N.38, D.31–D.33, J.15–J.19, J.21
I.L.P. Conference, February 1900, J.18
Independent Labour Party, J.15
India, J.8
Industrial Army, F.25
Industrial Balance of Power, D.19
Industrial Councils, S.13, N.21, N.23, N.40, J.25 (*see also* WORKS COMMITTEES)
Industrial Syndicalist, S.11
Industrial Unionism, S.14
Industrial Unions, O.6, O.7, O.14, O.17, O.31, N.23, N.31, N.32, D.31, D.32
Industrial Worker, O.14, O.30
Industrial Workers of the World, O.14
Industry, Control of, O.9, N.11
International Socialist Conference, S.15
Ireland, J.8, F.3, F.23
Irving, Dan., D.32
Islam, J.20
Italy, O.15, N.39, J.7
I.W.W., S.13, O.14–O.20, O.30, N.23, N.37

J.

Jeffrey, Thomas, D.36
Jellicoe, Admiral, D.14
Johnstone, Thomas, D.21–D.26

Joint Standing Industrial Councils (*see* INDUSTRIAL COUNCILS)
Joint Workshop Control, S.13
Jones, T. J., O.21
Justice, D.31, D.33, J.31

K.

Kahan, Zelda, D.33
Kaiser, The, S.34, S.35, J.11, J.31, F.29
Kapital, Das, S.15
Kealey, P., O.7
Kehrhan, D.33
Kennedy, Roland, O.19
Keronsky, O.28, F.28
Killips, Bert, D.33
Kneeshaw, Councillor, N.27
Kokoshkin, F.30
Krilenko, F.27, F.28

L.

Labour and Socialist Conference, August 28, O.29
Labour and Socialist Conference, December 28, J.19, J.32
Labour Conference, Annual, J.19
Labour Gazette, J.29
Labour Leader, S.28, S.34, N.25, N.26, N.39
Labour, Minister of, D.16, D.18, J.24, J.26
Labour Party, N.11–N.13, D.29, J.15, J.19-J.22, J.30, F.4–F.8
Labour, World of, O.15
Labour Year Book, D.23, D.24
Labourers' Union, General, J.18
Labriola, N.39
Lack of Understanding, J.3
Lansbury, George, S.19, S.21–S.23, N.17, N.35
Larkin, Jim, S.11, O.18, *note*
Law, Bonar, D.16
Lawrence strike (*see* STRIKES)
Lazzari, N.39
Leaders of Socialism, S.15
League of Nations, J.22, J.31, J.32
Leaving Certificates, Abolition of, D.8
Ledockowski, O.30
Leeds, O.6, O.8, O.30, O.31, N.30
Leeds Conference, November 1916, S.14
Leeds Conference, June 1917, S.27, O.29, D.34, J.27
Leicester Conference, November 1917, D.28
Lenin, S.33, D.39, J.30, F.27, F.28
Leninites, O.18, D.33, D.39
Leon, Daniel de, S.18, O.16
Lerda, N.39
Lichnowsky, F.31
Liége, S.35
Little, Frank, O.17
Litvinoff, Maxim, F.28–F.30
Liverpool, O.6, N.30, J.25, F.23
Liverpool slow-gear strike (*see* STRIKES)
Lloyd George, S.9, O.8, O.27, N.5, N.36, D.9, F.30, F.31
London, O.6, O.8, O.14
Longuet, Jean, F.29

M.

Maccassey, Sir Lynden, D.14, D.17
Macdonald, Ramsay, S.28, S.36, O.3, O.27, N.25, N.26, N.39, D.31, D.39, J.15
Macmanus, Arthur, O.5–O.7, F.23
Magson, Leonard, O.31
Mahoney, O.19
Malay States, J.22
Mallock, W. H., S.16, S.18
Manchester, O.6, O.25, D.32, J.36
Manchester Conference, R. and F., June 1917, O.31
Manchester Guardian, S.8
Man, Islo of, O.5, O.6
Mann, Tom, S.11, S.12, O.6–O.8, O.14, O.17, O.18, J.17, F.23
Man-Power Bill, J.19
Manufacturers, National Union of, S.34
Markham, Sir Arthur, D.24
Marriott, Sir A. J., F.5
Marx, Karl, S.15
Marx, Karl, S.10, O.5, O.16, D.37, J.15, J.16, F.5, F.7, F.29
Matter, The Root of the, D.3
Maximalists, S.33, F.28
May strikes (*see* STRIKES)
Metropole, La, F.29
Military Exemptions Bill, S.26
Military Service Act, S.29, O.14, N.16, N.29, J.27, F.3
Miliukoff, D.39
Milner, Lord, O.27, J.20
Miners' Federation, D.24
Miners, Western Federation of, O.15
Morel, E. D., S.28, S.29, S.35, N.39, J.15, J.22
Morning Post, O.31, D.33, D.37, F.29
Morris, George, F.23
Morton, Thomas, J.25
Mullin, William, O.26
Munitions Board, J.25
Munitions of War Act, S.10, S.28, D.8, D.9, J.27, F.3, F.23
Murphy, J. T., O.6–O.8, O.14, N.31, N.38, D.39, J.25

N.

National Administrative Council, R. and F., J.20
National Alliance of Employers and Employed, O.24
National Council for Civil Liberties, J.27
National Food Journal, J.28
National Guilds League, N.23, N.39, N.40, D.35
National Insurance Act, N.14
National Service Ministry, N.34, F.24
Nationalists, N.38
N.C.C.L., S.29, J.21, J.27, F.14
N.C.F., S.29, N.25–N.28, J.27, F.14
Netherlands, F.29
Never Again, O.21
New Age, The (*see* AGE)
New Europe, The (*see* EUROPE)
New Statesman (*see* STATESMAN)
Newbold, J. Walton, N.33, N.34
Newcastle, O.31, O.32, N.4, J.25
No-Conscription Fellowship, N.25
Norman, C. H., N.26, J.27
Nottingham Conference, F.28, F.29
Novaya Jisn, S.33
N.S.P., D.33
N.U.R., N.5, D.38

Observer, S.34
O'Grady, J., M.P., O.24
Orage, A. R., D.35, D.36
Origin of the Great War, S.30
Osborne, Victor, J.16

P.

Pacifists, S.28, S.29, S.33, S.34, O.28, O.29, N.26, N.27, N.36, N.39, N.40, D.35, D.39, F.31
Papon, von, J.30
Pares, Professor, D.39, D.40
Paris Conference, S.35
Parliament, F.3, F.4
Pastoral Functions of Management, N.8
Patriotic Stunt, The, N.13
Paul, William, O.5
Payment by Results, J.12, F.17
Peet, George, S.11
People's Charter, The, S.19
Petrograd, O.29, F.27
Phillips, Dr. Marion, J.20
P.N.C., S.29
Podvozhski, F.27
Ponsonby, Arthur, S.28, S.36, N.36
Pope, The, O.29, O.30
Pratt, E. L., O.14, O.15
Premium Bonus System (*see* BONUS)
Prime Minister (*see* LLOYD GEORGE)
Profit Sharing, F.9
Profiteering, D.21, D.22
Profiteering and Finance, D.21
Propaganda, German, J.6, J.7
Proportional Representation, D.28
Protected Occupations Schedule, O.32
Prussia, J.11, J.31, F.31
Public Trustee, N.17
Pugh, Arthur, O.26

Q.

Quakers, N.16, N.26, N.27
Queering the Pitch, J.19
Quelch, Harry, D.32

R.

Raimando, N.39
Rank and File Movement, S.10, O.5, N.29 D.13, J.23, F.21
R. and F., S.9–S.12, O.5 O.8, O.14, O.15, O.17, O.31, N.4, N.23, N.27, N.29–N.31, N.34, N.40, D.13, D.14, J.23–J.26, J.30, F.22–F.24
R. and F. Conference, Birmingham, March 1917, N.30–N.32, F.23
Reconstruction and R. and F. Movement, S.13
Reconstruction, S.13, O.9, O.21, O.24, N.18, J.19
Red Feds, O.18
Reform Bill, 1832, D.28
Reichstag, J.10, J.31
Reinhardt, Max, S.33
Representation of People Bill, D.28
Reynolds's Newspaper, J.5
Riga, Fall of, O.28
Roberts, G. H., O.24, N.21
Roberts, Lord, N.6
Robinson, Harry, O.31
Roll, Dan, O.6, O.7, N.30
Root of the Matter, D.3
Rotherham, O.8
Round Table, The, D.23, D.24
Rountree, B. S., D.6
Rousanoff, S.33
Rumania, F.27
Russia, S.5, S.21, S.22, S.29, S.30, O.29, N.25, N.39, D.33, D.34, D.39, D.40, J.7, J.8, J.24, J.28, F.27, F.28, F.30, F.31
Russian Revolution, S.21, O.28, O.29, D.27, D.39, J.31

S.

Sahara, J.20
San Francisco, O.18
Scepticism and Alarm, N.3
Schneidemann, F.29
Scientific Instrument Makers, J.27
S.D.F., D.31, J.15, J.17
S.D.P., D.32
Seamen's and Firemen's Union, S.32, O.3
Sexton, James, D.37
Shaw, Bernard, S.34
Sheffield, O.6, O.8, O.26, O.31, N.4, N.29, D.14, J.23, J.25, J.26, J.29, F.22, F.24
Sheffield strike (*see* STRIKES)
Sheffield Worker, J.29
Sheffield Workers' Committee, N.31
Shingareff, F.30
Shop Stewards, S.13, O.6, N.30, N.32, D.13, D.14, D.16, J.25, F.23
Sinn Fein, N.38, J.8
S.L.P., S.33, O.16
Smart, Russell, D.31, D.33
Smillie, Robert, O.32, J.21, J.27
Smith, Ben, D.38
Snowden, Mrs., S.32
Snowden, Philip, S.34, S.36, D.31, J.4
Socialism and Syndicalism, J.4
Socialism, Critical Examination of, S.16
Socialism Made in Germany, J.9
Socialist, The, O.5
Socialists, German, O.30, J.9–J.11, J.31
Solidarity, O.14, O.15, N.23
Soviet, O.28, O.29, D.39, F.29, F.30
Spain, O.15
Spur, The, N.26
St. John, Vincent, O.16
Statesman, The New, N.39
Stephens, Adrian, J.27
Stockholm Conference, S.33, O.3, O.27, D.39, J.11, J.31
Stop the War Committee, N.26, N.28
Strikes—
  Barrow, N.29, D.14, J.23–J.26, F.24
  Clyde, O.5, N.29
  Coventry, F.24
  Hargreaves, O.8
  Lawrence, O.16
  Liverpool "slow-gear," D.38
  May, S.8–S.10, N.3, N.4, N.24
  Sheffield, O.8, N.29, J.25
  Transport Workers, O.18
Supernational Authority, J.22
Swansea, O.26
Swanwick, Mrs. H. M., S.29
Sweeting, W., J.23, J.26
Switzerland, D.33
Sydney, O.18–O.20
Syndicalism, S.11, S.12, O.10, N.6, N.13, N.29, N.38, D.13, D.32, D.35, J.32

T.

Tanner, J. (A.S.E.), O.32
Taylor, G. R. S., S.15
Telegraaf, F.29
Terrell, George, M.P., S.34
Theosophy, F.14
Thomas, J. H., N.5, N.6, D.38
Thompson, John, O.26
Thorne, Will, O.29
Tillett, Ben, O.24, D.22
Times, S.8, O.4, O.32, N.3, N.5, N.6, N.24 N.34, D.23
Tolstoy, F.14
Trade Card Scheme, N.4, F.24

Trades and Labour Councils, J.16
Transport Workers' strike (*see* STRIKES)
Trautmann, W., O.16
Trevelyan, C. P., S.28
Tribunal, The, N.26
Trotsky, J.30, F.27, F.28
T.U.C. and The "Times," O.3
T.U.C., Blackpool, September 1917, O.3, O.4, O.27, O.28, N.11, N.12, N.22, N.23, J.19, J.20
T.U. Movement, O.9, O.10, O.14, O.16, N.11–N.14, N.29, N.40, D.35, D.37, J.15–J.17, J.19, J.27, J.30, F.18, F.23, F.24, F.30, F.31
Tyne, J.25

U.

U.D.C., S.28–S.30, O.29, N.26, N.29, J.15, J.19, J.21, F.14
Union of Democratic Control, S.28
United Socialist Council, D.34

V.

Valera, de, N.38, F.3
Veer, van de, F.29
Verderevsky, Admiral, O.28
Vickers, D.15, J.24
Volkerfriede, Der, J.31
Von Papen (*see* PAPEN)
Vorwärts, F.29

W.

Wages Fund, D.12
Wake, Egerton, F.23
Wakeling, S. A., N.30
Wales, South, S.31
Wales, South, "down tools" ballot, N.36, J.21
Wallhead, R. C., F.23
Walsh, Stephen, J.19
Walton, Cecil, O.21–O.23, J.12, J.13
War Aims Memorandum, J.19
War Cabinet, N.21, N.22, F.3
War Emergency Workers' Committee, N.17, J.20
Watson, W. F., S.12, O.6, O.7, O.15, N.30–N.32, D.13, D.32, F.23
Weekly Dispatch, D.37
Welfare Committee, J.12
Welt Politik and Corruption, J.6
Westminster Gazette, J.28
Whitley Reports, S.6, S.13, O.26, N.21–N.25, N.29, J.25
Whitman, F.14
W.I.F., S.29
Williams, Robert, J.27, F.30
Wilshire, Gaylord, O.14, *note*
Wilson, J. Havelock, O.24, O.25
Wilson, President, S.31, N.37, J.30
W.L.L., J.27
Woolwich Pioneer, O.32
Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates Councils, S.19, S.27, S.29, O.32, D.34, F.30
Workers 'and Soldiers' Delegates Councils (Russian), O.29
Workers' Union, N.4, F.23
Works Committees and Industrial Councils, N.19
Workshop Committees, O.32

Z.

Zabeo, O.30
Zambesi, J.20
Zealand, New, O.15, O.18, O.19
Zimmerwald Conference, D.33

CORRIGENDA

SEPTEMBER NUMBER.—Page 11, line 12, for "discussions" read "dissensions."
Page 14, line 14, for "rank and file" read "Rank and File."

OCTOBER NUMBER.—Page 7, line 12, for "Foster" read "Watson."
Page 11, line 11, for "Capital to Labour" read "Labour to Capital."

NOVEMBER NUMBER.—Page 37, line 28, for "affective" read "effective."

DECEMBER NUMBER.—Page 7, line 3, for "unnecessary" read "necessary."
Page 20, line 42, for "equable" read "equitable."
Page 33, line 14, for "Clara Kahan" read "Zelda Kahan."

E1651—WH

INDUSTRIAL PEACE

CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations

Foreword

Introductory Article

The Rank and File Movement. Part I

Reconstruction and the Rank and File Movement

Karl Marx. Three Points of View

The People's Charter

Discharged Soldiers

The Union of Democratic Control

Food for Thought

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

THE following abbreviations are occasionally made use of in the following pages and should be noted for future reference :—

A.S.E.	Amalgamated Society of Engineers.
B.S.P.	British Socialist Party.
B.W.L.	British Workers' League.
C.L.C.	Central Labour College.
C.O.	Conscientious Objector.
C.W.C.	Clyde Workers Committee.
D.R.R.	Defence of the Realm Regulations.
E.T.U.	Electrical Trades Union.
F.O.R.	Fellowship of Reconciliation.
I.L.P.	Independent Labour Party.
I.W.W.	Industrial Workers of the World.
M. of M.	Ministry of Munitions.
M.S.A.	Military Service Act.
M.W.A.	Munitions of War Act.
N.C.C.L.	National Council of Civil Liberties.
N.C.F.	No Conscription Fellowship.
N.U.R.	National Union of Railwaymen.
N.U.T.	National Union of Teachers.
P.N.C.	Peace by Negotiations Council.
R.F.M.	Rank and File Movement
S.L.P.	Socialist Labour Party.
S.P.Gt.B....	Socialist Party of Great Britain.
S.S.C.	Social Science Classes.
U.D.C.	Union of Democratic Control.
U.M.W.A.	United Machine Workers' Association.
W.E.A.	Workers' Educational Association.
W.I.F.	Women's International Federation.
W.L.L.	Women's Labour League.
W.S.D.C.	Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates Council.
W.S.P.U....	Women's Social and Political Union.
W.U.	Workers' Union.
W.W.U.	Women Workers' Union.

FOREWORD.

THE object of these pages is to contribute towards the maintenance of Industrial Peace. We believe that the spread of Syndicalism and the fomenting of class-antagonism is harmful to Labour as well as to Capital. We are convinced that the common national interest can best be served by the establishment of some form of co-operation between Labour, Management and Finance, which will enable this country to maintain her position as a Great Power, whilst securing a decent and prosperous standard of living to the workers, who, we strongly hold, have an inherent right to be safeguarded against all preventable poverty, unemployment and exploitation.

We shall oppose by every legitimate means in our power those disintegrating influences which are bent on setting class against class, sex against sex, youth against age, the governed against the Government, and Trade Unionists against their executives. It will be our mission to urge the necessity for preparedness, to acquaint our readers with the nature and the potentiality for mischief of the forces which threaten to undermine the stability of Society, to explain the structure of these forces and the manner in which they are interrelated.

In so far as our programme involves us in contentious argument it will always be our endeavour to be courteous to those of our opponents who are prepared to meet us in a similar spirit and to reserve our fire for those who, by their own admission, are the irreconcilable advocates of Class War.

We shall not, however, confine ourselves to criticism of

the objects and the methods of our opponents, but shall lose no opportunity of bringing to the notice of our readers any constructive measures or palliatives that appear to offer a practical solution of the difficulties that confront us. In this connection we shall welcome any suggestions that may be brought to our notice.

If it is objected that our plan is over-ambitious and that we should be better advised to keep within narrower limits than those which we have outlined, our answer would be that if a true perspective is to be maintained we cannot afford to neglect any relevant matter that bears upon our main thesis. There is a great volume of propaganda to be countered and, though we cannot expect to convince the irreconcilables that they are in error, we can at least submit the other side of the case and ask that the verdict of a larger and less prejudiced jury may be given without partiality, favour or affection.

INDUSTRIAL PEACE

INTRODUCTORY.

Effect of the War.

When a country organised for peace is plunged into the turmoil of a great war certain parts of the national machine are speeded up to their utmost capacity, other parts are scrapped and emergency adjustments have to be carried out at high pressure. At such a crisis many cherished traditions are jettisoned without compunction, the currents of old animosities are diverted by the force of the popular stream and everybody lends a willing hand in support of the Government, only asking in return that the utmost resolution shall be employed in prosecuting the war to a successful conclusion. For the moment real national unity is attained. At first the resulting disorganisation is so novel and exciting that inconveniences, inconsistencies and injustices which, under ordinary circumstances, would give rise to resentment are submitted to without complaint and, in the preoccupation of the moment, are forgotten or ignored.

Now—after three years—when all the novelty and much of the excitement has worn off, grievances which seemed trivial in 1914 are reasserting their disturbing influence and are being made the most of by people whose views have never been in full accord with the national sentiment and who consequently lack the motive for that self-abnegation in the common interest which still inspires the majority amongst their fellow-countrymen.

Revivalism in the Air.

Many causes contribute to make the present time an extremely favourable one for the spread of discontent. The outlook of the great mass of the British nation has been enlarged by the war to an unprecedented extent; men and women of all classes have been lifted out of the conventional grooves in which they used to live; the limitations, rules and customs which used to govern their thoughts and actions, and which seemed to them to be part of an organic scheme of existence, have been modified or swept away. People whose range of vision seldom strayed far from the precincts of the parish pump are now discussing the ethics of the Maximalist movement in Russia, speculating on the future relations between Kaiserdom and Mohammedanism, and essaying to analyse the psychology of the American nation. Nor has this lifting of the mental horizon of Britain been limited to the spheres of geography and ethnology; the sense of imagination in all classes and in all directions has been quickened and what may be described as a revivalist movement pervades the whole body politic.

The Demands of Labour.

This new spirit has assumed various shapes. Here is exhibited self-sacrificing patriotism, there self-seeking materialism, and these contrasts are not confined to any one class to the exclusion of the others. Amongst what are commonly called the working classes, however, it may be said that there has arisen a widespread and instinctive demand for better conditions of life; more personal liberty, less State interference; more opportunity for leisure and enjoyment, less poverty; more social equality and less affectation of superiority on the part of some of the ruling caste. Who will venture to maintain that such yearnings are illegitimate or unreasonable? What self-respecting man or woman can truthfully assert that he or she has never harboured similar aspirations?

Labour demands these things, and when Labour has made up its mind it cannot long be denied. What, then, is the attitude of the employers and of the Government to these demands?

Attitude of the Government and Employers.

We have no hesitation is saying that there is an absence of any spirit of churlishness amongst at least ninety per cent. of the large employers of Labour in this country to-day, whilst the Government is disposed to be even more generous, owing perhaps to the fact that it is easier to be open-handed with other people's money than with your own. Any reasonable demand that can possibly be granted by the industry concerned will not be refused for lack of good-will unless such demand is presented in a hostile and destructive spirit or accompained by threats.

The Reconstruction Sub-Committee's Report.

The recommendations of the Whitley Reconstruction Sub-Committee may not be universally acceptable in every detail to employers, but they represent a genuine appreciation of the spirit of the times and an honest desire to reconcile conflicting interests on the basis of mutual concessions.

Attitude of the Malcontents.

The reception given to these proposals in certain Labour quarters are referred to in an article in this issue, and it is sufficient for our present purpose to remark that the self-styled rebel element is quite frank in its uncompromising hostility to anything and everything that makes for the maintenance of industrial peace.

Necessity for Industrial Peace.

Yet industrial peace, always desirable for its own sake, is at the present crisis absolutely vital to the success of the cause for which such unparalleled sacrifices in blood, treasure and labour have been made. The continuous effort necessary to secure a victory at all commensurate with our sacrifices can only be sustained if the nation is determined not to allow any domestic quarrels to dissipate our strength or to squander our resources. "If," in the words

of the Prime Minister, " we sow the seeds of discontent and dissension in the nation we shall reap defeat."

No Valid Reason for the Continuance of Unrest.

Taking it for granted that the demands made by Labour for better conditions are not unreasonable, and admitting that the temper of the Government, endorsed by the employers, is conciliatory, there would seem, on the surface, to be no valid reason for the prevalence of industrial unrest and no sort of excuse whatever for its persistence, especially in an increasing ratio. The advent of a state of society in which every member can subscribe to the motto *Lætus sorte mea* is not yet; but the quality of much of the unrest we are confronted with to-day is something far more serious than the mere word would seem to imply. When we speak of industrial unrest we may refer only to an indefinite feeling of dissatisfaction with the existing state of affairs and at the same time have at the back of our minds something ominous, something that cuts to the root of constituted authority, something that may lose us the war if it is not scotched in time.

Need for Discrimination.

The truth of the matter is that there are two different kinds of unrest, one legitimate and innocuous, the other unlawful and deleterious. Whilst it is true that these two types have something in common and are not always clearly distinguishable from each other, there is, nevertheless, a double danger in failing to discriminate between them—viz., the folly of underestimating the latter and the injustice of misconstruing the former. It will be convenient, therefore, to confine the use of the term industrial unrest to describe the resentment felt by loyal citizens when they are subjected to adverse conditions which are remediable, and to employ the word " revolutionary " when referring to those movements which seek to attain their object at all hazards, and which are not deterred by any consideration for the law of the land. It is important to be the more precise in our terminology because the phrase " Industrial Revolution " is very generally employed in connection with sudden and drastic developments in the technique of industry, which might be more accurately described as " evolutionary."

The Problem of the Irreconcilable.

We may take it, so far as industrial unrest is concerned, that a way will be found by well-disposed and intelligent men to compose their differences to their mutual advantage; but when we come to the problem of the irreconcilable element we are face to face with a situation which at first sight seems well-nigh insoluble—How can we ever hope to arrange terms with an irreconcilable rebel? One is reminded of the time-honoured dilemma of the irresistible force and the irremovable obstacle. Not that the force in this case is physically irresistible or anything like it.

Handled with resolution and common sense the inflated bogey of the irreconcilable revolutionary would soon be reduced to more modest proportions; but resolution and common sense are the very qualities which, unfortunately, are too often conspicuously absent. There is no question of the force available for repression being insufficient for the purpose—the trouble resides in the nerveless policy of drift which refuses to face the issue and hesitates to call a spade by its proper name. The natural reluctance to use force if it can possibly be avoided is entirely laudable, and nobody can accuse the Government of over-zeal in the matter of repression.

The Force of Public Opinion.

There is, however, one force which can be exerted without danger, and that is the force of public opinion. Had it not been for the ostrich-like antics of those responsible for the Censorship it is our firm belief that the public would have found a way to silence the firebrands before they had accomplished much mischief. Certain microbes only multiply in the dark, and if the appeal for "more light," which was made by *The Times* several months ago had not been disregarded, the number of rebels would be far less considerable than it is to-day.

Majority Rule versus Minority Aggression.

It is often maintained, and with truth, that the large majority of the people are patriotic and law-abiding. So long as this is the case there is neither rhyme nor reason for tolerating the aggression of an anti-patriotic and lawless minority. Without doubt they have rights that should be respected, but they should not be permitted to advertise their unpopular and dangerous nostrums at a time when the energy of the nation ought to be concentrated on the herculean task of bringing Germany to her knees. By telling the truth the Government would automatically mobilise the patriotic element of the country and the preponderance of the majority would soon demonstrate to all beholders which of the two ends of the bar would be the first to kick the beam.

The Danger of Delay.

It must not be forgotten, however, that time and tide wait for no man, that minorities have a trick of growing into majorities, and that lost opportunities cannot be counted upon to recur just at the apex of the crisis.

Lack of Publicity.

Referring to the May strikes of this year *The Manchester Guardian* said: "One of the great difficulties of the public, thanks to the Censorship, was to know what exactly were the motives of the men and the rights and wrongs of the quarrel. The lack of publicity was responsible also for much resentment on the part of the strikers, who felt that they were unable to put their case, whether it was a good or a bad one, before the public. Most important of all, while

it was quite clear that the unrest was a national danger, much remained obscure about its origin and growth, and there was the greater difficulty, therefore, in deciding on the proper measures to remedy it."

The Proceedings at Bow Street.

The arrest of the eight leaders of the May strikes focussed public attention on what was felt to be a matter of urgent importance. The situation was a delicate one: either the accused were guilty, in which case they ought not to have escaped punishment; or they were innocent, in which event they should not have been arrested. On the other hand, it might be argued that, whilst these men had technically broken the law, they represented, nevertheless, an important section of an indispensable industry which was suffering under grievances that they believed would remain unredressed unless they compelled attention to their demands by unconstitutional action. The upshot was that the accused were given the benefit of the doubt and released from custody upon their signing a somewhat vague undertaking not to do it again. Time will show to what extent the pledges then given will be honoured in their observance.

Official Enquiry into Industrial Unrest.

Admittedly the conclusion of the Bow Street proceedings was something of a fiasco, and, recognising that some further investigation was desirable, the Prime Minister, with characteristic promptitude, immediately appointed eight panels of Commissioners to enquire into the whole question of industrial unrest. The reports of these Commissioners have now been published, and, although they make no specific mention of the Rank and File Movement, under that name, reference may be found here and there to the existence of organised agitation of a revolutionary character.

Outline of Intended Programme.

In the pages which follow an attempt will be made to trace the history, to estimate the importance, to expound the aims, to expose the fallacies and to describe the activities of the various groups which, in alliance with each other, arrogate to themselves the right to foment class war, to control industry and to dictate terms of international peace in contradiction to the declared policy of the Government.

THE RANK AND FILE MOVEMENT

(PART I.)

THE strikes in the engineering trades in May, 1917, came as a surprise to people who were unfamiliar with the undercurrents of the Labour world, and there has arisen a desire for fuller information on the subject, especially with regard to the real reasons for the apparently sudden decision of the engineers to adopt a "down tools" policy without previously submitting their grievances to arbitration, in accordance with the provisions of the Munitions of War Act.

Some of the more obvious causes of the discontent which undoubtedly exists in many industrial centres have been examined and reported upon by the Commission recently appointed to enquire into the question. In their reports the Commissioners make somewhat indefinite reference to certain agitators who are said to exploit casual discontent and to influence a not insignificant minority of the skilled workmen in the engineering industries.

In this article it is proposed to explain very briefly the origin of the movement primarily responsible for fomenting unrest, leaving for subsequent treatment a more detailed account of its objects and methods. Without some knowledge of the past history and antecedent activities of the movement only an incomplete view of its present constitution can be obtained. The organisation in question is called the Rank and File Movement by its promoters, partly because it was originally started by rank and file members in opposition to the officials of their trade union and partly because its declared policy is to refer all questions to the arbitrament of the rank and file in the workshops and to ignore the authority of the executive. The belief seems to be prevalent that this movement, like many others, is a product of the war. No doubt war conditions and war legislation have stimulated its propaganda and assisted its growth, but for its inception we have to go back to the series of strikes which occurred in 1910–1912. During this period many of the younger generation of trade unionists became enamoured of the weapon of the strike and impressed with the idea that if wielded on a large enough scale there would be no limit to its effectiveness. Most of these men were Socialists who had become "class-conscious" in response to the economic gospel of the German Socialist-philosopher Karl Marx, whose doctrines they absorbed with avidity. Having satisfied themselves that the capitalists were the born enemies of the workers, they nailed the flag "no compromise" to the mast, and declared that Socialism alone could improve the status of the workers. Which of the many brands of Socialism these young men desired, the method of its establishment, and the resulting fate of the middle classes were not very apparent. They were content to let the future look after itself; all they cared about was the demolition of the existing order

of society and a free distribution of wealth on what they conceived to be a more profitable basis. They were not going to waste valuable time looking a gift horse in the mouth, and everybody knows that Utopia is a pleasant resort where the good things of life may be had in plenty for the asking. The official Labour Party fell into disfavour —political methods were too slow for ardent Marxian souls—and Members of Parliament, it was said, invariably sold themselves to the capitalists and thus obtained an unfair start against the other competitors in the race for the spoils. The extremists did not, however, have it all their own way—the elder and more sober-minded trade unionists were not educated up to the modern standard of class-consciousness—and discussions arose within the ranks of trade unionism. It was in some such atmosphere that the Labour troubles of 1910–11 came to a head. It will be remembered that one of the noteworthy features of this period of unrest was the advent of the hitherto little known " sympathetic strike," and it was this tactical development which especially appealed to some of the more imaginative leaders who were dissatisfied with the traditional methods of the " sectional strike."

The cult of the sympathetic strike owed much of its vogue to the advocacy of Tom Mann, who, on his return from Australia (where he had been in conflict with the Commonwealth Arbitration Laws), started a Syndicalist campaign in England and popularised the now familiar cry that emancipation from wage-slavery can only be secured by " direct action on the part of the workers." His lectures were well attended, especially by the Welsh miners, and in July, 1910, a monthly periodical called *The Industrial Syndicalist*, and edited by Guy Bowman, was published. Four months later a Syndicalist Conference was held in Manchester and a Syndicalist Education League was established. Amongst the delegates present at this Conference may be mentioned Noah Ablett (Plebs League), M. W. Beckess (I.W.W.), Jim Larkin (Irish Transport Workers), and George Peet, of Manchester, who was one of the eight strike leaders discharged at Bow Street in May, 1917. The following resolution was moved by Tom Mann : " That whereas the sectionalism that characterises the trade union movement to-day is utterly incapable of effectively fighting the capitalist class and securing the economic freedom of the workers, this Conference declares that the time is now ripe for the industrial organisation of all workers on the basis of class—not trade or craft—and that we hereby agree to form a Syndicalist Education League to propagate the principles of Syndicalism throughout the British Isles with a view to merging all existing unions into one compact organisation for each industry, including all labourers of every industry in the same organisation as the skilled workers." This somewhat verbose resolution was the forerunner of the " amalgamation " policy so strongly insisted upon by the present leaders of the Rank and File Movement. Nor is such insistence at

all surprising; if the sympathetic strike is the most effective club with which to batter the *corpus vile* of capitalism, it follows that the club should be as heavy as possible. Herein, it may incidentally be remarked, is to be found at least a partial explanation of the quarrel between the executive of the A.S.E. and the leadership of the Rank and File Movement; the latter is out for war at any price, the former prefers peace and relies on collective bargaining to secure the interests of the members of its society.

Following upon the Manchester Conference a vigorous Syndicalist campaign was initiated in various parts of the country, and when the Labour troubles of that period culminated in the strike of seamen and transport workers about the time of the Agadir incident (of which more anon), the theories and the methods of industrial warfare enunciated by Tom Mann and his associates were put to the test, and that on an extensive scale. The results of these strikes were, in the estimation of the agitators, sufficiently satisfactory to justify a continuation of their propaganda. It was recognised that the organisation was incomplete, and where failures had occurred the leaders were quick to note the weak spots with a view to future improvement in the "armoury of industrial solidarity"—to quote the phrase which Mann had imported from Australia.

In the Syndicalist Education League only general principles were inculcated. The next step was the application of these principles to the vital or key industries of the country. Accordingly we find the Syndicalists beginning to pay special attention to the engineering and allied trades. The organisers realised that by concentrating on the key industries not only would the effect produced by "direct action" be of an arresting character on account of the resulting disorganisation in the whole trade of the country, but also that by this manœuvre they expected to attain their object with a minimum of effort, because a strike of all the skilled workers would involve a much larger number of unskilled men who would be compelled willy-nilly to down tools owing to there being no work for them to do.

The outcome of this line of reasoning was the formation in 1912 of the organisation known as the Metal Enigneering and Shipbuilding Amalgamation Committee, with W. F. Watson (one of the Bow Street defendants) as Hon. Secretary.

From 1912 to 1914 an unobtrusive campaign was conducted by this Committee within the branches of the A.S.E. and other Labour organisations, until the wave of patriotism which swept over the country after the declaration of war submerged all minor considerations, with the result that little was heard of amalgamation and Syndicalism for the time being, and everybody who counted bent his energies to the task of getting on with the war

RECONSTRUCTION AND THE RANK AND FILE MOVEMENT.

THE proposals of the Reconstruction Sub-Committee's Report on Labour conditions after the war have attracted some attention and not a little criticism in the Labour world. As might be expected, the groups of persons interested in fomenting Labour unrest do not accept the conclusions of Mr. Whitley's Committee, and they have already condemned them as merely another device of a capital-ridden Government, assisted by what they describe as "Labour Fakirs," to deceive and mislead the proletariat.

The proposals of the Committee to attract the most attention and to be most adversely criticised are those relating to the formation of Industrial Councils and Joint Workshop Control. These proposals bring the Committee into conflict with the Rank and File Movement. In effect the Committee proposes to adopt the platform of the Shop Stewards' organisation for workshop control, but with one vital difference. The Reconstruction Committee recognises the existence of the employer, and suggests that the workshop committees shall be representative of both employers and employed.

This proposal will not appear unreasonable to those of us who believe that Capital and Labour are mutually dependent and should therefore co-operate to promote their common interests. The aim of the Committee is to reconcile the interests of Capital and Labour and to remove antagonisms. Such a policy, of course, rests on the assumption that Capital as well as Labour has certain "rights" and that the "rights" of the capitalist should be respected by the State and by the workers. This is where the Committee fundamentally disagrees with the Syndicalist point of view. The Rank and File Movement repudiates the Committee's assumption of "rights" for capitalists. It denies that such rights exist, and that, therefore, there can be no case for the reconciliation of the interests of Capital and Labour. It is not denied that capitalism has its interests, but it is affirmed in the most positive and passionate terms that these interests of Capitalism are fundamentally antagonistic to the interests of Labour, and that they cannot and should not be reconciled. This conflict of interest is sometimes stated in this way: "Whatever is beneficial to the employer is injurious to Labour, and whatever benefits Labour injures the employer." This is the "Class War."

According to this view the "rights" of Labour are absolute. This is expressed in the recent manifesto of the Industrial Workers of the World to British trade unionists, which says:—"There must be no more talk about equal rights for Capitalism and Labour; *for Capitalism has no rights.* Capitalism is the industrial highwayman, robbing the worker of the fruits of his toil, and must be dealt with as such."

In *Industrial Unionism*, issued by the Building Workers' Industrial Union, we are told that " any system that perpetuates a relationship as between employer and employed is immoral and unjust."

At conferences of the Rank and File Movement it has been made quite clear that no toleration will be given to the schemes for reconciling the interests of Capital and Labour. At the Leeds Conference of November 11th and 12th, 1916, a resolution was passed pledging the delegates " to obtain the support of all branches of the various trade unions concerned, to oppose any alliance between Capital and Labour that does not invest the control of the industries in the hands of the workers." A similar resolution was carried at Birmingham on March 4th, 1917.

The Call (July 9th), in a leading article on the Reconstruction Committee's proposals, voices the rank and file's contempt for them as follows :—

" Capitalism has run its course, served its historic purpose. Not only are they (capitalists) no longer necessary, but their continued presence is harmful. They have grievously mismanaged society and have brought the world to the verge of ruin. They are responsible for the war and all its horrors. They have done nothing during this period of the anguish of humanity but indulge in insensate plunder. *Their removal by the accomplishment of the social revolution is a necessary preliminary to genuine social reconstruction* . . . The means are ready to hand if only effectively utilised. . . . The period of social reform has gone by. The capitalist edifice is shaking at its foundations, and it is not the business of the working class to provide plasters to hold it up. *Their duty is to topple it over*, clear away the debris, and lay firm the foundations of the co-operative commonwealth. Those people, however well intentioned they may be, who are seeking to preserve the existing system are a hindrance and a menace to the workers in their struggle for emancipation. We do not want Capitalist Reconstruction, we want the Social Revolution."

The above summarises the attitude of the leaders of the Rank and File Movement, and we could go on quoting at length to the same effect from *The Labour Leader*, *The Herald*, *Solidarity* and from resolutions passed at various meetings. All sections of the revolutionary movement are determined to oppose any and every scheme of reconciliation between Capital and Labour. The industrial conflict which they are now attempting to organise is to be a bitter " Class War "—a fight to a finish, with " No Quarter " for the vanquished.

KARL MARX.

FROM THREE POINTS OF VIEW.

KARL MARX was born of Jewish parents in Germany in 1818. After leaving the university, where he studied history and philosophy, he established a revolutionary journal, which, however, was soon suppressed by the Government. Proceeding to Paris in 1844 he struck up a friendship with Engels, with whom he collaborated in the production of *The Manifesto of the Communist Party*, a work which is said to be the foundation of modern Socialism. In 1848 he returned to Germany to help the revolutionary party, and a year later arrived in London, where he lived until his death in 1883. His *magnum opus*, "*Das Kapital*," was first published in 1867. Mainly occupied with the historical and philosophical aspect of Socialism, Marx, nevertheless, played a not unimportant part in practical politics. He drew up the programme of the German Social Democrats, and he was mainly responsible for the foundation of the International Socialist Conference, which at this moment constitutes the connecting link between the Socialists of the world.

(i) In *Leaders of Socialism* Mr. G. R. S. Taylor describes Marx as the greatest figure in Socialist history. "Whether," he writes, "you think of him as a scientific economist or as practical politician, Karl Marx stands first and alone, a Colossus of thought and action." This is a measure of praise which none but Socialists will endorse, but there is no getting away from the fact that Marx is by far the most widely read of all Socialistic teachers. He swept away the vague conceptions of equality and fraternity which in his day stood for Socialism and set up in their place a definite doctrine on a definite foundation. Hitherto Socialism had been based on humanitarianism. Marx formulated the whole movement on one issue—viz., class war between Capital and Labour. For the Communist doctrine of universal brotherhood Marx substituted the alleged irreconcilability between employers and employed, as summed up in the now historic conclusion of his manifesto: "They (the Communists) say clearly that their end can only be gained by a violent overturning of all social organisation as it exists now. So let the masters tremble at the coming of the Communist revolution. The workers have nothing to lose but their chains; they have a world to win—Workers of the World, Unite."

An indication of the scope and general plan of his teaching can be given briefly under three heads:

(*a*) Having established the materialistic conception of history as demonstrating that all progress is guided by, and dependent upon, economics, and that all political problems can be stated in terms of material loss and gain, he conducted Socialism out of the realm of romance and speculation and placed it on a pedestal, as *the* controlling factor in practical affairs.

(*b*) He next proceeded to reveal Socialism as the product of evolution, and, viewing it as such, his teaching aimed at inculcating in the mind of the worker a consciousness of the inevitability of evolutionary Socialism, coupled with the desire for a scientific insight into the economic structure of society which would guide him in his efforts to assist the evolutionary process.

(*c*) In conclusion Marx propounded what he calls the arraignment of Capital. The Capitalist system is analysed and given its place in the social order. He claims to have demonstrated that Capitalism, in any form, is tantamount to theft. Labour, physical or mental, alone creates value. Capital is the "surplus value"—viz., all that remains after wages are paid—which the master takes by economic force (under the protection afforded by the wage system) from the creator and rightful possessor. The proletariat must be raised to the position of the ruling class and must utilise that position of power to wrest Capital from the grasp of "the few," and to concentrate all instruments of production in the hands of the community as a whole.

(ii) For a destructive analysis of the system of Socialism developed by Marx in his celebrated treatise on Capital the reader is referred to Mr. W. H. Mallock's *A Critical Examination of Socialism*, but the main argument on which Marx relies and which serves as a basis of nine-tenths of militant socialistic propaganda in Great Britain at the present time may be summarised as follows:

Starting with the assumption that Ricardo's theory of value is correct Marx deduces that all wealth is produced by labour. He looks upon Capital as an accumulation of implements of production, which, being the embodiments of past labour, rightfully belong to the creators of the wealth which they represent. The process by which Capital acquired its property is described as the gradual and dishonest abstraction, by a wholly unproductive class, of these implements of production from the workers who made them and who alone can use them to advantage.

The solution he offers, to meet his unfulfilled prediction that wages must continually fall under the capitalist system, is the ultimate rebellion of the workers, who will forcibly repossess themselves of their own implements and be happy ever afterwards.

(iii) Anybody who wishes to understand the point of view of the man in the street on the subject of the relations, actual and ideal, between Capital and Labour ought at least to have a slight acquaintance with the writings of Marx, because it will enable him to interpret many a prejudice that otherwise would appear meaningless. For example, one of the main tenets of the rank and file movement is that the wage system is only slavery under another name. The student of Marx will readily perceive that this often reiterated demand for the abolition of wages has its origin in the Marxian dictum that it is the wage system which legalises and protects

the action of the master when he robs the labourer of the fruits of his toil.

It will be objected that the average man in the street does not bother himself with abstract theories, and is content to make the best of the world as he finds it. Superficially this is true, but not radically so. There is a temptation to jump to the conclusion that men who ponder over the obvious inequalities of human society in the twentieth century become Socialists, whilst the remainder are satisfied with the existing order mainly because they will not take the trouble to think at all. As a matter of experience there are few individuals who, at one time or another, have not contrasted their own lot with that of their more fortunate neighbours and wondered whether some practical formula might not be found which, if put into operation, would prove a panacea for the admitted flaws in the social system as at present constituted. Left to ther own resources, they, like timid paddlers on the fringe of the ocean, quickly recognise that they are in danger of getting out of their depth and return to the comfortable security of their shoes and stockings. It is only the very few that venture into the deep waters of independent thought. This is where Karl Marx comes in. He provides the ready-made article and presents it with a plausibility which seldom fails to entrap the uninformed and the unwary.

A capacity for mental grasp which can envelop the larger problems of applied economics on a grand scale is, in the nature of things, less common than the habit of mind which can only accommodate itself to the petty environment of the individual example. For this reason, amongst others, the outpourings of Marx are well adapted for popular consumption because his theories are actually true when applied to the case of primitive communities. It is when we reach the consideration of the more complex phenomena of industrial evolution that Marx fails us. His reasoning is still ingenious, still apparently scientific, but it will not fit in with the ascertained and accepted facts of modern industrial development, and, whilst he refuses to abate his insistence upon the necessity for demolition, he gives no logically satisfactory answer to the eternal problems:—(*a*) how to eliminate the personal factor from human affairs; (*b*) how to find a stimulus of sufficient potency to take the place of the hope of proportionate reward; (*c*) how, without such a spur, to induce men to provide, not only for their present needs, but for the future demands of an ever-increasing posterity.

Dimly apprehending these difficulties, the man in the street, if left alone, is apt to retire from the contest and accept the inevitable. Consequently there would be no question of Socialism spreading if men and women had to think out the problem for themselves, nor, conversely, is there any likelihood of Socialism dying a natural death. There will always be a plentiful crop of agitators—hardy perennials which flourish in every clime and at all seasons—who,

drawing their inspiration from Marx, add a modicum of local colour and re-state his threadbare, but still plausible, fallacies to recurring drafts of recruits in the Socialist battalions.

According to Mallock the Marxian theory is the greatest intellectual marc's-nest of the nineteenth century; according to Daniel de Leon, Marx is the wisest of all philosophers and Mallock but the ass in a lion's skin who brays out his nonsense under the disguise of scientific reasoning. The reputation of Mallock will certainly outlive that of the egregious De Leon; but, on the other hand, Marx may hold his own after Mallock is forgotten, for his doctrines have the same vitality and attraction that belong to the three-card trick and to the Spanish prisoner fraud, for they are firmly established in the fibres of human credulity and cupidity.

THE PEOPLE'S CHARTER

GEORGE LANSBURY'S paper, *The Herald*, prints what it calls "Plans for the People's Party," with the headline "A Pound a Day is the Workers' Pay," for a front page advertisement. Watching the brisk trade done by the street hawkers of *The Herald* one is tempted to reflect upon the wisdom of the old saw which advises us to look after the pence and to let the pounds look after themselves. The pennies which purchase *The Herald* will grow into pounds right enough and the author of the advertisement is a smart fellow, but one cannot help being a trifle sceptical about the ultimate and actual materialisation of those other pounds, that is to say, the daily ones.

Having parted with our penny and having rapidly visualised the particular "Castle in Spain" that our seven pounds a week will provide, we turn to the centre pages to see how the oracle is to be worked. To be quite frank we are disillusioned almost at the first glance. Like the last war loan it is not all "new money," as we hoped, and we find that our share is to come out of the pocket of somebody else. We do a mental sum in arithmetic and wonder how much we shall have to subscribe to our own emolument. We are relieved to find that there is no mention of larceny from the person, or daylight robbery, or anything of that sort—only expropriation—a five-syllable word that sounds almost respectable. We read on; for is not the author an ex-Member of Parliament and at one time the acknowledged friend of a former Chancellor of the Exchequer? We observe that the Army and Navy are to be abolished; but this causes us little concern, because we agree that they would be expensive luxuries if, as Lansbury suggests, discipline is to be improved out of existence immediately on the conclusion of peace. We like the bit about better public-houses, but not the prospect of living in a New World similar to that which, so we are told, is being built by the Soldiers' and Workers' Delegates on the banks of the Neva. It is not until we come to the foot-notes, however, that we are fairly dumbfounded. We can understand fiction, but not even Baron Munchausen had the audacity to bolster up his inexactitudes by descending to the whys and wherefores. So, being of an enquiring turn of mind, we submit the People's Charter to some of our more expert acquaintances. To our surprise they rebuke our levity and proceed to examine these foot-notes with all seriousness. The first man we approached is a journalist with some experience of social and political movements, the second a financier well-versed in high finance, and the third a level-headed student and teacher of political economy. Below we give the results of their cogitations.

THE JOURNALIST'S VIEW

It is a mistake to prejudge the effect of propaganda by its reasonableness or the reverse. Many popular causes—*e.g.*, the clamour against the revised Calendar which culminated in the battle cry of "Give us back our eleven days"—have been based on nonsense. These Plans for the People's Party bear about the same resemblance to constructive statesmanship that a child's spade and bucket sand-castle bear to Norman architecture, but they may be none the less popular on that account. The very extravagance of the demands is, in a sense, their greatest danger. The people who are out for trouble will refuse to see the ridiculous side of the question and will believe that some such programme is actually obtainable. The people who are opposed to revolution will concentrate their attention on the absurdity of the Charter and will refuse to believe that such extravagant propaganda will ever be seriously entertained. Both sides will be wrong in their estimate, but those who dismiss the whole affair as being beneath contempt will be making by far the greater blunder of the two.

THE FINANCIER'S VIEW.

It would appear that the demand for a minimum wage of a pound a day, so far as it depends on the assumption that the present war is being paid for exclusively by the workers, is either founded on a misapprehension or formulated on a wilful perversion of the true facts of the case. The words employed by *The Herald* are the following: "And although the Government may pay for its purchases by money borrowed from the capitalist, that is merely in order to preserve the capitalist system. The actual material—munitions, clothing, etc.—is made by the workers *now*, not taken by some magic from past or future stores."

We must presume that *The Herald* confines its offer of a pound a day to British workers and does not include in its scheme the inhabitants of America, India and other places whence raw material is imported. It may be true that the finished article is made chiefly by British labour, but the cash to pay for imported raw material is found mainly by British capitalists. If *The Herald* is not cognisant of the huge amount of capital invested in American securities which has been sold or lent by its owners to the Government and the proceeds invested in war loans and other British securities it is not competent to discuss the question. The possession of these securities enabled the Government to stabilise the American exchange, which means to say that it was enabled to arrest the fall of that exchange. Now the fall of every point in the exchange would have meant a corresponding increase in the cost of every commodity purchased in the U.S.A., and had these dollar securities not been in the pos-

session of the capitalist and available for the stabilisation of the exchange there is no doubt that the price of commodities, high as it is, would have been between 25 and 50 per cent. higher. War has to be paid for either by taxation or by borrowing—*i.e.*, either by present or future payment. The magnitude of our national expenditure is such that it absolutely precludes the possibility of its being met by taxation alone, and therefore the capitalist has his function in providing what taxation cannot realise.

"Who wishes to prove too much proves nothing" is an aphorism to be remembered by the author of "Plans for the People's Party." We are more than willing that workers should receive a larger share of industrial profit than has hitherto been their portion, but it is certain that if they attempt to dispense with capital and the aid it offers they will find that their experiment will spell disaster. Co-operation between Labour and Capital is essential; ruin to both is the only alternative.

THE ECONOMIST'S VIEW.

In the Russian Revolution Mr. Lansbury seems to find not only an example but also an earnest of success. He tells us that the Russian revolutionaries have reconciled the apparently divergent aims of those who strive for social reforms under the present political system and those whose social aspirations would only be satisfied in a political "Utopia." Much as one may sympathise with the leaders of the Russian revloutionary movement, it is difficult to understand or to share Mr. Lansbury's optimism. He seems to think that by one great effort all the evils of the old system have been swept away and a new and perfect order, social and political, substituted for it. He admits that the machinery is still imperfect, but he evidently takes for granted that it is in what might be called good working order.

"Before the revolution," he says, "the Russian workers were starving because of the machinations of the profiteers; the food was there, and they knew it was there, but they could not get it; they have got it now." That the Russian workers suffered great privations under the old *regime* there can be no doubt; profiteering and official corruption had much to do with this, but there were other factors which must not be overlooked. Russia is a vast country, and even at the best of times badly served with transport facilities. The war threw the whole transport system into confusion, and consequently the distribution of food and fuel was specially interfered with. Russia, moreover, is largely dependent on other countries for various articles of food and for manufactured goods generally. The war made all such supplies extremely precarious, and such as were available entered the country by ports situated at an enormous distance from many of the districts for which the goods were needed for consumption. Let us assume (though it is rather a big assump-

tion) that under the Revolutionary Government profiteering and corruption have altogether disappeared, but has the transport system been reorganised and extended and made to work without interruption? Certainly not. Even in this country we have experienced some of the difficulties of securing an even distribution of food and fuel, but our difficulties are as nothing compared with those which prevail in Russia.

A traveller recently returned from Petrograd gives the following as the prices prevailing in that city:

Chickens	10s. to 12s. each.
Beefsteak	10s. 6d. per lb.
Eggs (far from new laid)	6½d. each.
A small apple	1s. 6d.
A lemon	1s. 6d.
Flour	1s. 6d. per lb.
Cabbages	2s. per lb.
Milk	10d. per pint.

Surely this is a sufficient answer to the statement that before the revolution "the food was there but they could not get it; they have got it now."

Turning from Russia, from which he has drawn so much inspiration, to this country and its economic and political problems Mr. Lansbury puts forward his "Plans for the People's Party." The plans cover roughly the whole programme of the Socialist party, but one part, namely, the economic, is all that need be discussed here. The writer himself describes the programme as thorough, bold and practical. Thorough and bold it is, no doubt, but practical is hardly a correct description of it. It contains the usual demands for the expropriation of landowners and capitalists, for State ownership of industries and for control by the workers. It affirms also the doctrines known as the "right of work" and the "minimum wage," and it goes still further than this when it states that "equal payment for all" is to be the aim of the new industrial *régime*. These are big questions, and it is impossible in a short article even to deal with them in outline. It must suffice to point out some of the fallacies which underlie the scheme we are discussing. The fundamental error seems to lie in a misunderstanding of what may be termed the "laws of production." The production of wealth depends primarily on the incentive to effort; to be told that "the wealth is there, that it is only a question of taking it" is hardly an incentive to effort. Equal payment for all would at once deprive those of superior capacity of all inducement to use their powers to the fullest extent. Men and women differ widely in their productive capacity and the desire to improve their economic position leads them to develop their faculties and to take full advantage of their opportunities. If there were nothing to be gained by individual superiority, productive

power would remain undeveloped, ingenuity and invention would become as rare as they were before the industrial revolution. Security is another of the conditions of productive efficiency. If incomes are to be equal, though skill and capacity are unequal, there must be expropriation of the surplus produced by the more skilful, just as it is proposed to expropriate all wealth that is not immediately consumed. Such a state of things, again, is bound to result in productive inefficiency. It is a commonplace to say that the economic efficiency of the present day is due to labour, capital, invention and enterprise; diminish the incentive to individual excellence, remove all inducement to accumulate capital, concentrate all enterprise in the hands of the State, and industrial activity will tend to become stereotyped and even retrogressive.

The contention that a minimum real income of a pound per day for every worker is a practical scheme, because eight million workers are now producing not only the eight millions that the war is costing, but also all that is needed for consumption by the civil population, has no foundation whatever in fact. The war is not being paid for out of income, but it is rapidly using up the wealth accumulated by many past generations. It may appear that, because a certain amount of clothing and munitions is turned out of our factories every day, this is really a current production of wealth, but this is a very serious error. What about the raw material used in these factories? For the most part it is imported and paid for, not by current production, but out of capital. What about the machinery that is being worn out and the necessary provision for replacement? It must be met in the same way. Thus our present needs involve either the using up of the accumulated results of previous effort or the creating of a mortgage on the efforts of the future. If the contention stated above were true it would indicate that the present output of half the usual number of workers is greater than the whole production before the war, which is an absurdity. During the war the productive capacity of this country has been enormously diminished and its expenditure enormously increased. Before the war the people of this country produced more than they consumed, the surplus providing for increase of capital, but as the war goes on it gets more and more costly, while in each successive year the number of workers is less and the output consequently diminished, with the result that each year sees a greater deficit of production than the one that went before it.

We are told that "The Plans for the People's Party are possible of immediate realisation." When a nation's very existence is at stake, when the lives and the property of its subjects are in daily peril, it is not a time even to think of internal revolution. What good there is, if any, in the proposals will, there is very little doubt, be the subject of earnest enquiry after the war, but it is difficult to conceive that thoughtful men would ever introduce a system which, while

aiming at the material improvement of the lives of the people as a whole, runs counter to the fundamental principles which govern the production of wealth.

NOTE.—" Plans for the People's Party " first appeared in *The Herald* for June 23rd, 1917. Subsequently it was reprinted and circulated as a pamphlet, with a covering letter from George Lansbury, throughout the chief industrial centres.

DISCHARGED SOLDIERS.

AMONGST the many problems arising out of the war few are of greater importance or more far-reaching than those connected with the reabsorption of discharged soldiers into the industrial life of the community. The honour, not to mention the interests, of every citizen is concerned in the successful solution of this question. The more rapidly and efficiently the reabsorption takes place the speedier will be the recovery of the nation from the losses resulting from the war. This applies also to the case of arrested development of normal industry caused by the transference of large numbers of the most active workmen from commercial work to the manufacture of munitions of war.

In some parts of the Empire a separate Department of State has been set up to deal exclusively with the problem of finding employment for discharged soldiers, and it would appear advisable to follow the same course in Great Britain.

The physical condition of the soldier at the time of discharge is the all-important factor in determining the class of work he is capable of undertaking. Subsequent improvement of that condition by special treatment, by supplying mechanical appliances for limbless men and by natural process of health restoration—*vis naturæ medicatrix*—may increase the earning capacity of the few, but in the case of the majority of the wounded the kind of employment offered must be adapted to the present disabilities of the applicant. Without undue interference with hospital routine a start could be made by placing convalescents, who are unfit for further service, in appropriate categories whilst they are still under military medical control. To be effective this preliminary classification should be thorough. Name, regiment, home address, previous occupation, former employer's name and trade, desire to return to same work or otherwise, willingness of employer and wages offered must all be entered and indexed. If a man elects to follow an occupation manifestly unsuited to his physical powers no time should be lost in telling him so and advising him as to alternatives. The Local Employment Committees must keep in close touch with local employers and be kept advised as to the details of each man's classification. The State must lead the way by providing the necessary machinery, but once started it is essential that the scheme should be earnestly and promptly supported by employers throughout the country. A policy of drift will result in a state of congestion similar to that experienced in the early days of the war when the number of recruits outran the available accommodation, but with this difference, viz., that the makeshifts then resorted to could not be adopted in the case of wounded men without a scandal which would be as well founded as it would be clamant. Public sympathy would be altogether on the side of the soldier, and agitators, ever

on the alert for mischief, would be furnished with a new and invaluable weapon. Moreover, discharged soldiers with a legitimate grievance would naturally combine to obtain redress and would be in no mood to endure patiently the privations inseparable from unemployment whilst preliminaries, which ought to have been settled long before, are in process of arrangement.

Concerted action by ex-soldiers has been inaugurated, and already the movement may be said to have passed through four stages of development :—

(i) A discharged and demobilised sailors' and soldiers' conference, called by Sergeant-Major Blythe, met at Manchester, but the conference was not unanimous and resolved itself later into a National Federation of Discharged Sailors and Soldiers (Midland Branch).

(ii) In London an agitation against the Military Exemptions Bill culminated in a demonstration in Hyde Park on June 24th, and this led up to the formation of a Federation of Discharged Sailor and Soldiers with Mr. J. M. Hogge, M.P., as President and two other Members of Parliament (Messrs. Pringle and Watt) as Vice-Presidents.

(iii) A conference of delegates from the Midland and London Federations was held on July 28th, with the object of combining their forces and forming a Constitution for a United Federation, and a resolution to this effect was duly carried.

(iv) Prior to the last-mentioned conference publicity was given to an open letter from Sir John Norton Griffiths, M.P., suggesting that an association of all ex-service men should be formed to promote the moral and material interests of those who have served in the war, and also of their families and dependents. To this end he invited the co-operation of all other associations and societies with similar objects.

The present position, therefore, is that there are two surviving movements in existence that are interesting themselves in this question, viz., (*a*) The National Federation of Discharged Sailors and Soldiers (Mr. Hogge's organisation), open to discharged men but closed to officers except those who have risen from the ranks ; (*b*) Sir John Norton Griffiths' association, which goes by the name of Comrades of the Great War, which is intended to include all ex-service men, whatever their rank.

The National Federation above mentioned seeks to attain Parliamentary representation and supported an official candidate against Lord Stanley in the recent by-election at Liverpool, though without much success, and only time will show whether it will develop into a political machine of any importance.

By excluding officers, the Federation emphasises class distinctions and rejects an opportunity for creating a better feeling between all sections of the community, losing thereby a war asset of incalculable value. Discharged soldiers' associations should give a wide berth to the vortex of party politics, so that employers, trade unions,

labour exchanges, and the public at large should all work in complete harmony and with single-minded purpose of repaying, in part, the debt which the nation owes to the men who have borne the brunt of the greatest struggle in the world's history.

The Federation of Discharged Soldiers and Sailors is in no way connected with, and must not be confused with, the Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates Council of revolutionary origin, inaugurated at the Leeds Conference on June 3rd; but it must not be forgotten that any failure to understand the sentiments that inspire ex-soldiers and any delay in dealing sympathetically and effectively with their legitimate grievances will enormously strengthen the hands of the pacifist gang who count on furthering ulterior aims through the agency of general discontent.

THE UNION OF DEMOCRATIC CONTROL

ONE of the most active of the pacifist organisations and one that has been the target for a great deal of criticism is the Union of Democratic Control, commonly known as the U.D.C. This society is one of several that have been formed since war began for the purpose of criticising the Allies and opposing their reasons for going to war with the Central Powers.

The U.D.C. was formed at the end of August, 1914, by four persons who were opposed to this country's participation in the war. The famous quartette were Messrs. Ramsay Macdonald, M.P., Charles Trevelyan, M.P., Norman Angell, of *Great Illusion* fame, and E. D. Morel. Mr. Arthur Ponsonby, M.P., appears to have joined this group a little later.

These individuals were unable to support the Government and the country in this great crisis, as they could not accept the view that Germany was solely responsible for the war, and when hostilities commenced they declined to take any part in the recruiting campaign or in any other work that would help the Government to prosecute the war. Mr. Macdonald, writing in the *Labour Leader*, August 13th, 1914, said: "We are in it (the war) in consequence of Sir Edward Grey's foreign policy. . . . His short-sightedness and his blunders have brought all this upon us."

The first announcement of the formation of the Union of Democratic Control was contained in a private circular letter issued by the four persons already mentioned. Mr. E. D. Morel signed it as the secretary *pro tem.* The objects of the new society were set forth in the form of "four cardinal points" with which everyone who has read U.D.C. pamphlets is now familiar. There is nothing in these four cardinal points to which serious objection may be taken. Whether they are all practicable proposals may be questioned, but they are perfectly legitimate points for discussion. A fifth point was added in 1916 in favour of Free Trade and the policy of the "Open Door" in Colonies and Protectorates. This was added in consequence of the economic proposals contained in the Paris resolutions. But this private circular, which was really an appeal to sympathisers for financial support for the new society, also stated that one of the objects of the U.D.C. would be to prevent *the humiliation of the defeated nation.* It is obvious that the only defeated nation that the signatories to this circular could have had in mind was Germany. This conclusion is amply supported by the writings and speeches of the founders of the U.D.C., their great concern being to prevent the Allies imposing any peace terms that might humiliate the German people. The circular further stated that the promoters of this society had no intention of starting any public propaganda until the country was out of danger. This pledge has not been kept and the society has maintained, in conjunction with

other organisations, a continuous anti-war propaganda ever since its promotion in August, 1914.

Before the U.D.C. was started, and prior to its getting into working order, the Independent Labour Party (I.L.P.) was the chief organisation through which the opponents of the war conducted their agitation. In this anti-war campaign of the I.L.P. we find the names of the same persons who have since become prominent in the U.D.C. These names include, besides those already mentioned, Fenner Brockway, J. H. Hudson, C. Roden Buxton, and Mrs. H. M. Swanwick.

It has been denied that there has been any connection between the I.L.P. and the U.D.C. The fact that the leaders of the one are also the leaders of the other is said to be merely a coincidence. But the leaders of these two organisations make it a habit to stretch this coincidence until it now covers several other societies that have been formed since August, 1914, to wit, the No-Conscription Fellowship, the National Council for Civil Liberties, the Women's International League, the Peace Negotiations Committee; to which list must now be added the Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates Council. All these societies are under the direction of the leaders of the U.D.C. and I.L.P., and are intended to create opposition to the prosecution of the war to its logical conclusion, that is to say, until the enemy is defeated. War measures, such as the Military Service Act and Defence of the Realm Act and the Munitions Act, are also adversely criticised in season and out of season.

The Union of Democratic Control is closely associated with various pacifist societies abroad, and has been represented at Conferences held at the Hague and other places for the purpose of discussing peace terms. Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson, of Cambridge, has generally been the official representative of the U.D.C. at these peace conferences. The U.D.C. is also associated with the Dutch Anti-War Council. Since early in 1915 the U.D.C. has been advocating peace negotiations with the Central Powers, and it has made many efforts to force the Government to enter upon peace negotiations.

To understand the propaganda of the U.D.C. and its demand for peace negotiations before the enemy is defeated, we need to understand the U.D.C. attitude towards the war, and particularly towards the Entente Powers. The speeches and the writings of the persons who are responsible for the policy of the Union of Democtatic Control contain two main contentions regarding the war. In the first place they assert that the Allies, and Great Britain in particular, had no adequate reason for a war with Germany. It is alleged that Russia was the chief cause of the war, Germany being compelled to declare war through the Russian Government ordering a general mobilisation. This is the view of the Secretary, Mr. E. D. Morel, who states that Russia's "General Mobilisation

Order of July 31st was the precipitating cause of the war." This view is more fully stated in the U.D.C. pamphlet, the *Origin of the Great War*, by Mr. H. M. Brailsford. This pamphlet is frankly pro-German and the blame for the war is laid upon Russia, to whom it is said France and England were committed by secret agreements and understandings. Mr. Brailsford declares that the German influence is more tolerant and civilised than that of Russia, and that, for this reason, we should do nothing to promote Russian influence and power in the East. If we do, within a year of the defeat of Germany we shall be " calling out for a strong Germany to counterbalance the Russian threat."

The second point in the U.D.C. propaganda against the war is: (1) that a military victory is not possible for either group of belligerents; or (2) that if a military victory is obtained by the Allies it will so embitter the defeated nation (Germany) that a permanent and enduring peace will be impossible. Mr. Morel has stated that a militarily inconclusive ending of the war is the only way in which a satisfactory and lasting peace can be arranged. In other words, the U.D.C. is hoping and working for a " draw," and this is the reason for the U.D.C. efforts to force the Allies into immediate peace negotiations with the enemy Powers. Such negotiations, if agreed to by the Allies at any time since the U.D.C. began its peace negotiations campaign, would have been entered upon with all the material and military advantages on the side of the Central Powers. This must have been recognised by the leaders of the U.D.C., and it, therefore, makes their proposals all the more remarkable.

How widely the pacifist net has been cast may be judged from the following figures as given by the *Evening Standard:* " During the twelve months ending April, 1917, there were published by the I.L.P. (which is affiliated to Morel's U.D.C. and closely co-operates with it) 38,250 books, 304,000 pamphlets and a variety of leaflets totalling altogether to 3,852,000." These are said to be the I.L.P.'s own figures.

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

It is fashionable to give expression to the popular parrot cry that the country is being bled white by a multiplicity of unnecessary Controllers. The reorganisation of the railway transport of coal for inland consumption comes into operation on September 10th, 1917. It is estimated that the Coal Controller's scheme will effect a saving of not less than seven hundred million ton miles per annum. The ton mile is a real economic unit—pounds, shillings and pence are merely tokens. Critics of centralised control who are fond of arithmetic might profitably devote some of their surplus energy to working out the money value of the estimated saving. They might then arrive at the conclusion that there are two sides to every question.

The Coal Controller has decided to recommend the formation of local committees to see that the poorer classes get reasonable supplies without undue hardship, such as waiting about in queues for long periods in perhaps inclement weather.

Mine-owners in South Wales have decided not to apply for the reduction in miners' wages equivalent to the fall in selling prices. In coming to this decision they acted on the advice of the Coal Controller.

The American War Industries Board announces that the Allies will not be charged higher prices for munitions of war than the Americans themselves have to pay. In fixing the prices a reasonable profit will be allowed, but anything like extortion will be prohibited. Those pro-Germans whose sycophantic adulation of President Wilson has recently undergone so complete a *volte-face* and who are now accusing America of joining the Allies for commercial profit will be confronted with a surfeit of awkward facts to be explained away before peace is signed.

The march of the American troops through London on August 15th was business-like and reserved as becomes the greeting between two nations united in a great cause. The boisterous note was conspicuously absent, but there was no lack of real enthusiasm, and links were forged that, please God, will never be broken.

If physiognomy counts for anything our new Allies are likely to prove tough customers, and a man in the crowd hit the right nail on the head when he remarked: "If I were a Boche I shouldn't want to see that sort of cove going in at the ninth wicket down."

Speaking at an open-air meeting at Leicester on August 12th, Mrs. Philip Snowden had some hard things to say about American intervention in the war. She declared the entry of America was brought about by the pressure of financiers, who, having lent large sums to the Allies and fearing that they would otherwise be defeated, had decided to involve the U.S.A. in order to safeguard the money they had lent. She added that the participation of America was the greatest crime that had been committed during the whole course of the war. She concluded by urging pacifists to use their utmost endeavour to stop the war before America became thoroughly equipped.

Amongst civilians the mercantile marine has probably suffered more through the war than any other section of the community. It may be that after being torpedoed three or four times they get used to the process, it may be that their experiences encourage an antipathy to the Huns, or again it may be that contact with the realities of war has blunted their sensibilities. The fact remains that they resolutely decline to assist the peace cranks to meet enemy delegates.

The National Sailors' and Firemen's Union has no use for the Rank and File Movement, nor do we hear any talk of Workmen's and *Sailors'* Delegates Councils.

A report " On the Investigation of Industrial Fatigue by Physiological Methods " states that the acuity of vision on Monday morning is diminished at the end of a week's hard work by about 18 per cent. The sense of hearing was also found to be impaired.

The twenty-four Commissioners on industrial unrest sat for several weeks and examined over a thousand witnesses, but they failed to see the fly in the amber. Is this result due to the self-effacement of the fly or to other causes ? What the eye doesn't see the heart doesn't grieve for.

Over-fatigue was declared to be one of the causes of industrial unrest by the Commissioners. Are we to assume that fatigue impaired their own acuity of vision ?

What is there in the climatic conditions at Barrow (as compared, for example, with Birmingham) which is so especially conducive to fatigue ?

The Belgian revolutionary Socialists who recently issued an appeal to their compatriots in England to oppose militarism and to concentrate their organisation on the basis of the class-struggle are all men of military age employed in English munition factories. They are unanimous in holding that Warwickshire is healthier than Belgium and the class-struggle less strenuous than dodging German bullets.

Maxim Gorki's organ, *Novaya Jisn*, resists Russia's continuance in the war and loses no opportunity by attacking France and England. It accuses the Allies of provoking and prolonging hostilities in the interests of French and British capitalists.

As befits a revolutionary Socialist, Gorki is officially opposed to Prussian militarism and his pro-Teuton sympathies are probably accounted for by the fact that for many years he used to go to Capri for the winter and associate with the German artistic colony there. It was Max Reinhardt who produced " The Night Asylum," the play which made Gorki famous.

Some of our British pacifists are *en rapport* with Gorki and are said to be contributing articles to his newspapers.

The Russian Ministry of Justice stated on July 25th that documents in its possession prove the connection between Lenin and German agents. On the other hand, Rousanoff, one of the four delegates of the Workers' and Soldiers' Council, informed a representative of the S.L.P. that Lenin is the victim of European capitalists, whose agents and spies are anxious to discredit the Maximalists. Which are we to believe, the Ministry of Justice or Rousanoff ?

The International Pacifist Conference to be held at Stockholm in September is being run by the Hollando-Scandinavian Committee and the International Socialist Commission. The latter has its headquarters at Berne and was organised by Robert Grimm, who, it will be remembered, was expelled from Russia as a German agent.

Mr. W. A. Appleton's remarks on the Henderson-Stockholm affair should be held in remembrance in view of future developments. He says: " By insisting upon attendance at the Stockholm Conference Henderson has destroyed the unity of Allied democracy, he has jeopardised the unity of the British movement, he has affronted the Colonial and American movements, he has given his enemies the

chance for which they have always been seeking during the three years of war, he has placed the Government, of which he is a member, in a very equivocal position. One wonders why ? "

Mr. Philip Snowden's comment in *The Labour Leader* is as follows :— " The Labour Party cannot now continue to give a slavish support to the Government. They may for a little while longer continue to talk about not impairing the national unity, but they will, by the force of circumstances, be driven more and more into opposition to the Government."

The Observer draws attention to the curious similarity that certain aspects of the French Revolution bear to recent happenings on the Russian front. The pacifist movement in the trenches recalls the gospel of Citizen Clootz, who proposed that, instead of attacking their enemy, the French troops should throw down their arms and advance towards them " dancing in a friendly manner." Such a measure, he was persuaded, would strike the wretched victims of tyranny with a sentiment of affection and lead to an equally sympathetic movement in response.

The same sort of piffle is actually being preached in England at the present time. A certain well-known pacifist, and one who is particularly active in fomenting unrest, delivered himself not very long ago of the following pernicious absurdity : " If the Kaiser had landed here with his army and the workers had folded their arms and refused to defend themselves, the Kaiser would have been so frightened of the effect upon his own army that he would have hurried away before it became infected."

It is seldom that Bernard Shaw sees eye to eye with normal folk, but most of us will agree with him when he says : " You may take it from me that if the Germans beat us in this war they will skin us alive."

According to a distinguished South African Labour leader " the unity of the British Empire springs from an ability to detect any power likely to become despotic, and the genius to apply the antidote before it is too late." We would suggest that it is not too early to apply an antidote to certain aggressive minorities who seek to impose on the British people a yoke which in the end may prove more galling and more disastrous than any despotism.

The National Union of Manufacturers which has been formed under the chairmanship of Mr. George Terrell, M.P., advocates,

amongst other objects, free communications between masters and workmen with a view to the establishment of mutually amicable relations and the avoidance and settlement of strikes. Everything that makes for industrial peace is to be heartily welcomed. Let us hope that this new Union will be as active in manufacturing antidotes as other organisations are busy in distributing the poison of class-consciousness.

In an article in *The Herald* of August 18th E. D. Morel states his case against the policy of the Paris Conference and professes to do so in the interests of Belgium. He argues that the winning back of Belgian territory by military force would inflict material damage vastly exceeding that which she has already suffered, that the renewal of friendly relations between Belgium and Germany is essential to the prosperity of the smaller country, that after the war an unprotected Belgium could not defend herself against the aggression of a hostile and powerful neighbour, and that, consequently there would have to be an Entente garrison (in other words, an Anglo-French Protectorate) permanently in occupation of her territory.

Taken on its logical merits Morel's argument is not an unreasonable one; but, taken in conjunction with the whole drift of his advocacy through several years, we cannot safely accept his conclusions at their face value. Whatever the circumstances may be and to whatever part of the world his arguments apply, Morel's bias always tends to the advantage of Germany. If he is sincere Mr. Morel must be aware that, relatively speaking, the laying waste of cultivated land and the destruction of towns and villages, upon which he lays so much stress, are trifles as compared with the greater issues involved in the war. The Kaiser clings to the idea of a Germanised Antwerp, Hindenburg hopes to keep his line intact, and the Central Empires have no desire to see the policy of the Paris Conference carried into effect. If, therefore, the Allies can be persuaded to preserve the soil of Belgium from further bombardment and drop the idea of boycotting the brigand confederacy, so much the better—for Germany. Not altogether unexpectedly, Morel sheds his tears over poor little Belgium and tells the British people that their rulers, impelled by their concern for vested interests, hypocritically forced this country into war under the cloak of a quixotic regard for the oppressed.

After the fall of Liége the German Government played the very same card that Morel now produces and advised King Albert to save his country from the devastating effects of war by not delaying the German troops on their way to Paris. Perhaps the Kaiser forgot that ex-King Tino and King Albert are two very different persons.

Amongst "Reflections on Anarchy," reprinted from *The Daily Herald* (now defunct), we find the following:—"If the Army and Navy and the police were abolished to-morrow all over Europe there would not be any more criminals than there are to-day. But it is probable that there would be far fewer millionaires." We agree that the absence of the restraining influences would result in a scarcity of money and other commodities, but, having once established the principle that it is no crime to forcibly dispossess an individual of his property, why stop short at millionaires? When the scramble begins there will be some who will be modest enough to pick up sixpences.

Mr. Ellis Griffith, M.P., made a good point when he reminded the House of Commons that every Member of Parliament is constitutionally a representative of Labour, and that the claim of Messrs. Ramsay Macdonald, Philip Snowden, Arthur Ponsonby and their associates that they are especially entitled to speak for the working classes of this country arises not by *association* but by *assertion*. He asked these gentlemen the pertinent question whether it was a fact that they were against all war unless it was civil war. He received no answer.

◆ ◆ ◆

Printed by W. H. SMITH & SON, Arden Press, Stamford Street, S.E.—E. 1504

INDUSTRIAL PEACE

CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations

The T.U.C. and "The Times"

The Rank and File Movement. Part II

The Control of Industry

The Remuneration of Employment

The Industrial Workers of the World

The Human Touch

National Alliance of Employers and Employed

Food for Thought

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

THE following abbreviations are occasionally made use of in the following pages and should be noted for future reference :—

A.S.E.	... ...	Amalgamated Society of Engineers.
B.S.P.	... ...	British Socialist Party.
B.W.L.	... ...	British Workers' League.
C.L.C.	... ...	Central Labour College.
C.O.	... ...	Conscientious Objector.
C.W.C.	... ...	Clyde Workers Committee.
D.R.R.	... ...	Defence of the Realm Regulations.
E.T.U.	... ...	Electrical Trades Union.
F.O.R.	... ...	Fellowship of Reconciliation.
I.L.P.	... ...	Independent Labour Party.
I.W.W.	... ...	Industrial Workers of the World.
M. of M.	... ...	Ministry of Munitions.
M.S.A.	... ...	Military Service Act.
M.W.A.	... ...	Munitions of War Act.
N.A.C.	... ...	National Administrative Council.
N.C.C.L.	... ...	National Council of Civil Liberties.
N.C.F.	... ...	No Conscription Fellowship.
N.G.L.	... ...	National Guilds League.
N.U.R.	... ...	National Union of Railwaymen.
N.U.T.	... ...	National Union of Teachers.
P.N.C.	... ...	Peace by Negotiations Council.
R.F.M.	... ...	Rank and File Movement.
S.L.P.	... ...	Socialist Labour Party.
S.P.Gt.B.	... ...	Socialist Party of Great Britain.
S.S.C.	... ...	Social Science Classes.
T.U.C.	... ...	Trade Union Congress.
U.D.C.	... ...	Union of Democratic Control.
U.M.W.A.	... ...	United Machine Workers' Association.
W.E.A.	... ...	Workers' Educational Association.
W.I.F.	... ...	Women's International Federation.
W.L.L.	... ...	Women's Labour League.
W.P.C.	... ...	Women's Peace Crusade.
W.S.D.C.	... ...	Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates Council.
W.S.P.U.	... ...	Women's Social and Political Union.
W.U.	... ...	Workers' Union.
W.W.U.	... ...	Women Workers' Union.

INDUSTRIAL PEACE

THE T.U.C. AND "THE TIMES."

THE Trade Union Congress held at Blackpool early in September, 1917, suffered from a lack of proportion not only in respect of its own deliberations but also as regards the interest which the public took in its proceedings. Following closely as it did upon Mr. Arthur Henderson's resignation from the War Cabinet the over-discussed affair at Stockholm dominated the position to the exclusion of more important domestic topics which, in the ordinary course, would have monopolised the attention of the Congress. The "doormat" incident, the attitude of the Seamen's and Firemen's Union and the Government refusal to grant passports to Mr. Ramsay Macdonald and his friends were dwelt upon *ad nauseam*, whilst the far more urgent problems of Industrial Unrest and the Syndicalist attack on the citadel of Trade Unionism, if referred to at all, were treated as side issues. As soon as it became known that the Congress had endorsed the recommendation of the Parliamentary Committee on the subject of the Stockholm conference popular curiosity was allayed and interest subsided. Labour politics seldom excite the general public. This is not due to lack of incident nor to the unimportance of the issues involved, but arises because the stage is not set to attract the public taste, because no immediate and tangible results appear to follow upon the decisions arrived at and because people who are not primarily concerned sedulously cultivate a profound ignorance with regard to the whole matter. We are a lethargic nation and only feel currents of electricity when they are punctuated by shocks.

The Trade Union Congress is always more conservative than other Labour gatherings, and in this respect the Congress of 1917 proved no exception to the rule. For the most part the resolutions passed were standing dishes, already agreed to in former years, though this was the first time that "Conscription of Wealth" has been demanded, otherwise the inherent conservatism of the Congress was more in evidence than usual, and markedly so in contrast to recent Labour meetings at the Central Hall, Westminster, and elsewhere. It must be remembered that whereas any brand of Socialist is welcome at a Labour Party meeting only genuine Trade Unionists are allowed to attend the T.U.C. Most of the delegates at Blackpool were over military age and the young *soi disant* intellectuals, who are so busy advocating revolutionary ideas up and down the country, received no invitation on the score of their theoretical principles, and only those attended who have attained some sort of standing in the Trade Union world. In Labour politics opinion often appears to swing over suddenly from one extreme to the other, and that for no

ostensible reason. Decisions are apparently reversed and reaffirmed in the course of a few days without any new or determining factor having intervened in the interval, the explanation of this supposed phenomenon being, of course, that the affirmers and the reversers are acting as differently constituted bodies conforming to a different set of rules, even when, as often happens, the names of the same individuals are prominently connected with contradictory verdicts. For this and other reasons we must not take the Blackpool resolutions as indicating any change of opinion in the Labour world, and it remains a significant fact that the Trade Union Congress was able to retain its traditional attitude of detachment even in the midst of the turmoil which besets us in this autumn of 1917. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that this must be due to one of three reasons : either that the Congress, with full opportunity of knowing the truth, has succumbed to the prevailing lethargy, that it has capitulated to the extremists, or that it lacks the courage to defend itself against the well advertised attacks that are being made upon its rights and privileges. Whichever of these reasons is responsible the outlook for the future influence of the Congress is almost equally discouraging to those who wish to see the authority of the Parliament of Labour unimpaired.

The nature and volume of the revolutionary ferment which permeates the Labour World, and to which the T.U.C. is so indifferent or submissive, is described in a series of articles published by *The Times* on September 25th, 26th, 27th and 28th. The appearance of these outspoken articles marks, as we hope, a turning point in the attitude of the nation towards the whole question of the relations between the State and its domestic enemies. Hitherto there has been a conspiracy, if not of silence then of misrepresentation, with regard to the demands and threats which, in an ever ascending scale, certain sections of militant labour have formulated during the past fifteen months or longer. The cue, " Least said, soonest mended," has been given and the childish expectation has been cherished that the mischief would harmlessly evaporate of its own accord, if everybody looked the other way. In pursuance of this policy when inflammatory speeches are declaimed week after week, when revolutionary papers and pamphlets are circulated in hundreds of thousands we fondly imagine that we have disposed of the matter by saying that cranks will be cranks, and when persistent and unbridled agitation produces its inevitable result we industriously search in all directions but the obvious one for the originating cause ; in short, we abandon ourselves voluntarily to the mystifications of the game of blind man's bluff. The first value of *The Times* articles is that they unbandage our eyes and present a clear picture which, if examined in the light of common sense, will go far to modify our preconceived values and to correct our false perspectives.

THE RANK AND FILE MOVEMENT.
Part II.

THE first indication that the syndicalists had emerged from the retirement, to which they had been relegated during the first year of the war, was the prevalence of Labour unrest on the Clyde in December, 1915. The Clyde Workers' Committee had imbibed freely at the fountain of Karl Marx under the tuition of W. Paul, who continues to edit *The Socialist* and to evade military service by the simple expedient of leaving no address behind him when he changes his quarters.

It is unnecessary to recount in detail the story of the Clyde strikes, which terminated, it will be remembered, in the deportation of about a dozen of the leaders who were removed from the affected area and located in various districts where it was assumed that their potentiality for mischief would be reduced. In point of fact the result was very different from that intended, as will appear when we come to analyse subsequent events. It is, however, important to note that these deportees, almost without exception, were ex-pupils of the Social Science classes held by Paul.

There is abundant evidence to prove that the troubles on the Clyde were not due to any special or exclusive grievances peculiar to that district. The strikes were in no sense a spontaneous uprising of the workers against intolerable conditions; they were brought about by the calculated action of a few irreconcilable ringleaders. When these men were removed, the prevailing sentiment in the shipyards was one of relief, and the solitary advantage that can be placed to the credit side of the Government's deportation policy is the fact that industrial peace was restored for the time being. If the deportees had gone to the Isle of Man and remained there till the end of the war there might have been little to enter on the debit side of the account; but the result of locating these firebrands in the districts where there was plenty of inflammable material was inevitably to increase the damage of a general conflagration.

After the Glasgow *Forward* had been suppressed thousands of copies of the offending articles were reprinted and sent to the principal munition centres throughout the kingdom, where they were distributed in the workshops by the admirers of the Clyde heroes. So it came about that not only were the agitators conducted to new pastures, but they were able to take their literature with them, and were invested with the prestige proper to men who had been "flagrantly victimised," who had successfully rebelled against the executives of their Trade Unions and who had openly defied the Minister of Munitions.

Prominent among the above-mentioned firebrands was Arthur Macmanus. Though nominally confined under the terms

of his deportation to the Liverpool area, Macmanus appears to have found no difficulty in visiting any district that offered a promising field, and his itinerary took him to Sheffield, Coventry, Manchester, Leeds, London and other places. How little regard he had for the limitations nominally imposed upon him may be judged from the fact that notices appeared in the Labour press giving the date and place at which he was advertised to speak. During this period he co-operated both with old colleagues and with new-found kindred spirits, and generally made the most of the opportunities so conveniently afforded him. In this manner the tenets and methods of the Clyde Workers' Committee were sown broadcast, and the Shop Stewards movement got a firm footing in the north and west of England. Indications of concerted action had already become manifest early in 1916, when the annual dinner of W. F. Watson's Amalgamation Committee was celebrated, with Tom Mann as the chief guest. A meeting was held on Monday in Whitsun week, at which it was decided to hold a Rank and File Conference in London during the month of August.

Little is known about this August Conference except that it was but sparsely attended owing, it is said, to the time and place selected for the meeting being inconvenient to many of the principal supporters of the movement. It was decided therefore that future conferences should be held at Industrial Centres in the provinces. The first provincial conference took place at Leeds on Nov. 11 and 12, 1916, and the mass meeting was attended by some 1,200 persons. Dan Roll (Paddington A.S.E.) was chairman, and amongst those present were Tom Mann, W. F. Watson, J. T. Murphy and Arthur Macmanus.

The first business before the Conference was to devise a plan for the amalgamation of all the Unions in the metal, engineering and ship-building trades into one Industrial Union, and to induce the executives of the Trade Unions concerned to give official consideration to this question. So far no exception could be taken to the programme. Writers on Evolutionary Trade Unionism have long urged the necessity for the avoidance of overlapping and consequent waste of energy by simplifying the complications resultant upon the retention of a large number of Unions in the same industry. Amalgamation conducted on business-like lines might well be advantageous to all concerned and make for Industrial Peace. But such a policy was far from acceptable to the organisers of the Leeds Conference. Their intentions were the reverse of constructive, and at the very commencement of the proceedings the chairman struck the dominant note of Rank and File militancy. "We do not propose," he said, "to amalgamate for the sake of getting increased wages or shorter hours—that is not sufficient. The chief object of amalgamation must be to secure the control of industry." He went on to say that it might take some time to achieve their object, but it could be done if the workers chose to make up their minds to it.

Dan Roll's attitude was endorsed word for word by Tom Mann, and W. F. Watson (one of the "eight") emphasised the point by declaring that "the time for mere bettering of conditions is long since past, and the time is ripe to go for the control of industry. P. Kealey, of Manchester (also one of the "eight"), told the delegates "It is not more wages we want. . . . What we want is the abolition of the wage-system."

These statements are deliberate and definite enough, in all conscience, and should leave us in no doubt as to the ultimate aims of the leaders of the Rank and File Movement. It is idle in the face of these reiterated challenges to pretend (as some are prone to do) that Foster, Mann, Macmanus, Murphy, Roll, and Kealey are just the spokesmen of overwrought mechanics who are harassed by a meddlesome Government, oppressed by harsh employers, aggravated by shortage of malt liquor and all those other conventional fables which are trotted out to allay public anxiety. These men are perfectly frank in declaring their aims, and we should be well advised to be equally frank to meet them on their own ground, and not to try to obscure a clear issue with a cloud of make-believe. A child may be fobbed off with a tin soldier when he wants a Teddy bear, but that sort of thing won't do at this time of day with this kind of man. It is not the slightest use patting such people on the back and telling them that they are patriotic at heart—they know better, and draw but one conclusion from such treatment, —viz., that the country is afraid of them.

Referring, at the Leeds Conference, to the attempts of "Labour Fakirs" to promote schemes for the reconciliation of employers and employed, Macmanus said: "I tell you there should be no harmony and there can be no harmony until we secure the control of industry with workshop rule of policy and action—there is no other future outlook." He finally proposed, therefore, "that the control of policy and action shall in future be based in the workshops." This proposal was accepted by the Conference and embodied in the main resolution. The scheme of amalgamation outlined by Watson was accepted, and the A.S.E. executive was requested to call, not later than mid-February, 1917, a preliminary conference to consider the promotion of an Engineering and Shipbuilding Industrial Union—such Union to be open to every worker in the industry regardless of craft or sex, with the ultimate objects that the Union should secure complete control of industry by those engaged in it. The class-war basis of the movement and its open hostility to employers are clearly indicated in the following resolution which was carried unanimously: "That the conference pledges its members to obtain the support of all branches of the various unions concerned to oppose any alliance between Capital and Labour that does not invest control of the industries in the hands of the workers."

Having thus formulated their declaration of war, the moving spirits proceeded to make their dispositions for the opening of

their plan of campaign. About this time considerable friction had arisen between the Government and the A.S.E. over the question of the alleged taking of skilled men into the Army in contravention of the agreements on the subject. The immediate quarrel centred round the case of one Leonard Hargreaves, who had received a calling-up notice and had joined the Army. We are not concerned with the rights and wrongs of this particular incident, and will assume for the sake of argument that the Government were in the wrong. The main point is that the matter was under discussion by the proper authorities in London (A.S.E. and Government), and there was no need for any interference by Tom Mann, Jack Murphy, or any of the other self-appointed judges assembled at Leeds—but it suited their book to initiate a fighting policy, and so a threat was registered, with every accompaniment of aggression, that in the event of the non-compliance of the Government with their demands there would be a strike at Sheffield. This threat was delivered by Murphy, who threw down the gauntlet and declared that "the ultimatum expires on Thursday evening next." In strict accordance with the time-table the Sheffield engineers struck work at 5 p.m on Thursday afternoon, in spite of the fact that negotiations were still proceeding in London, and notwithstanding the receipt of a telegram from the A.S.E. executive to the effect that there must be no cessation of work. Attempts were made by the leaders at Sheffield to bring about sympathetic strikes in other districts, but their efforts were only successful at Rotherham and Barrow for reasons which need not here be enlarged upon. It is sufficient to remark that although Hargreaves would have been released from the Army on the merits of the case whether the strike had taken place or not—the *mise en scène* was stage-managed with such success that it looked as if the Government had capitulated in order to prevent the strikes from spreading. The result was that Murphy's prestige was greatly enhanced at little or no risk to himself and his followers.

The strike being unauthorised by the A.S.E., there could be no issue of strike pay, and consequently its prolongation would have been highly inconvenient to all concerned. The policy of the Rank and File Movement favours frequent strikes instead of long ones. It is calculated by this method the maximum effect is produced with a minimum of effort and expense. So the return of Hargreaves to Sheffield in the nick of time saved the situation famously from the point of view of the organisers. The rescued soldier was triumphantly exhibited before a mass meeting; the engineers were able to start work on Monday morning without loss of prestige, and Murphy took full advantage of his opportunity by sending a telegram to the Prime Minister threatening that if anyone was victimised or penalised in any way for their participation in the strike a further stoppage of work would follow immediately.

THE CONTROL OF INDUSTRY.

THERE is scarcely any problem which more vitally affects the future welfare of this country than the problem of the control of industry. From the industrial, the political and the social points of view alike it is of the first importance, and a wise and effective solution of it is one of the main conditions not only of industrial peace, but of political and social progress. It is therefore one of the most urgent of those many problems which we include under the collective term "Reconstruction."

We do not propose to deal in the present article with the employers' side of the problem, nor to investigate in any detail the workers' side of it. We merely wish to indicate one or two considerations which point clearly to the fact that any effective control of industry which will promote industrial, political and social progress must be based upon a very definite and loyally accepted measure of co-operation between capital and labour.

The phrase "co-operation between capital and labour" is not liked by the average Trade Unionist and Labour man. He dislikes and fears what it implies; and yet the fact remains that the only national policy which the Trade Union and Labour Movement has ever had with regard to the control of industry has been a policy of co-operation between capital and labour. The policy, of course, has never been so phrased, but the phrase is not inaccurately descriptive of the policy. The still prevalent idea that the responsible Trade Union leader is an agitator and that the strike is the habitual weapon of the Trade Union Movement, have no real foundation in fact. The prevailing policy of Trade Unionism has always been one of collective bargaining by negotiation. Unjustified strikes there have been, just as there have been unjustified lock-outs; but collective bargaining by negotiation is a process of co-operation; imperfect it may be, but none the less real.

But while we regard the prevailing national policy of Trade Unionism in the past with respect to the control of industry as a policy of co-operation between capital and labour, we have to acknowledge that this co-operation was exercised between two sets of interests which were more conscious of their antagonism than of the interests which they really had in common. The immediately pre-war relations between capital and labour were clear proof of that; and it is almost certain that but for the war, capital and labour would have passed, or would now be passing, through a period of extreme tension, if not of actual and bitter hostility. The main causes of this were, first, that the co-operation, such as it was, between capital and labour was played out, and that no better system has been evolved; and, secondly, that certain elements were beginning to exert a marked disruptive influence within the

Trade Union and Labour Movement. Recent events in the industrial world have made these causes more obvious, and have made clear that one of two things must happen : capital and labour must find some method of co-operation more effective than mere collective bargaining by negotiation when matters of acute difference arise, or they must rapidly drift into an attitude of perpetual suspicion, distrust and antagonism.

Any sane view of the present conditions and needs of the industrial world, as of the probable after-war needs and conditions, will show that a policy of permanent suspicion, distrust and antagonism would be fatal to both capital and labour, and would have far-reaching and disastrous effects upon the social and political life of the nation, and we believe that the great majority of employers and workers take that view. They see very clearly that the vast changes which the war has produced in the system and in the processes of industry have made any mere return to pre-war conditions impossible. These conditions could not be restored even though capital and labour deliberately endeavoured to restore them by co-operative effort. And where conditions have been changed profoundly and permanently there must be a corresponding change in the attitude and in the relations of those whom those changes affect. They see, too, that the creation of an entirely new industrial system, such as Collectivist Socialism, Syndicalism or Guild Socialism, is impossible for a long time to come for the two-fold reason that none of these systems has any wide support in the country, and that none of them has yet passed beyond the stage of vague abstraction. Each is, as yet, little more than a dissolvent influence as each is in open conflict with the others. If then there can be no possible return to pre-war conditions of capital and labour, and if an entirely new industrial system, from which capital would be eliminated, is equally out of the question, there only remains, as a practicable solution of the problem of the control of industry, the establishment of a clearer and better appreciation of the actual conditions and needs of industry and of a better understanding and more intelligent and effective co-operation between capital and labour.

The industrial system is not merely a matter of production and distribution on or of profits and wages. It is one of the largest and most vital elements of the life of the nation. According as it is organised will the national life be affected for good or for evil. That it has not been wisely organised in the past is being clearly demonstrated now ; and it is becoming increasingly clear to all thinking citizens, whether employers or workers, that just as the war crisis has called for the maximum of intelligent and loyal co-operation from all sections of the community, so will the industrial crisis after the war call up an equal measure of intelligent and loyal co-operation between capital and labour.

THE REMUNERATION OF EMPLOYMENT.

A NEW BASIS.

No bargain is a good one that does not satisfy both parties to the contract, and in considering the relative position of those twin-brethren in the family of commerce, Capital and Labour, it is quite evident that some more equitable basis than that which now obtains must be found.

As things stand Capital claims that the interests of Labour are identical with its own. This is true only so far as the ultimate existence of both is concerned. Without Capital Labour cannot thrive; without Labour Capital is unremunerative and its existence useless. The present attitude of Capital to Labour can be described, generally, as a policy of passive resistance whose passivity is in process of conversion into active hostility. Capital is apt to regard the cost of Labour as a drain upon its profits; Labour may be said to regard Capital as a greedy monster, incapable of taking any interest in Labour beyond the extent of the profits it can exact from Labour's efforts.

Neither of these assumptions is quite correct nor wholly unjustified; but there are many individual cases where they are very largely exaggerated. To include such in the argument and to state an average position, it may be suggested that, generally speaking, the profits of Capital are subject to exhaustion by the demands of Labour; whilst the aspirations of Labour are restricted by the desire of Capital to maintain and increase the profits.

We have, therefore, two forces acting in opposite directions; or, if it is admitted that a desire to pull together animates some of the more enlightened constituents of those forces, even then each is content that the other should do most of the pulling. In this respect they may be likened to two horses that jog along together fairly well on level ground, but when the gradient becomes steep, one thinks he is doing all the pulling and reminds himself that the other always looks into the nose-bag first when the time comes for a rest.

The interests of both forces should be identified to such an extent that one cannot benefit at the expense of the other; and that what influences either must affect both.

Commerce cannot flourish without the co-operation of its twin-brethren. The problem requiring solution then is—how to change the equation, which at present may be said to make:

Commerce equal to Capital plus half-Labour into *Commerce equal to Capital plus full-Labour.*

In other words, how can the two forces be made to pull with their combined power in one and the same direction?

The answer seems simple if put in this way. Prove to both

that their interests are the same by the material fact of equalising the profits *on Labour's share* in their production. The difficulty of so doing becomes evident when it is observed that Capital's profits are not always in money. If they were there would be an easy solution. Shareholders in a business invest money, wage-earners invest work. Dividends would be paid on wages at the same rate as on Capital, and Labour would receive its due proportion of profit. But the profits sometimes are found in stock, or in new machinery, or in investments outside the business, or in buying and selling which may, or may not, be remunerative, and the risks attendant on such profits do not attach to Labour. Also losses occur which Labour cannot, in any case, be asked to share.

It therefore follows that the solution of the problem does not lie in the allocation of the net profits of a business, and it must be sought elsewhere. In conducting a search for a solution it will be observed that Labour's share in a business is confined within certain definite limits.

The work performed is not in itself the whole transaction by which the profits are secured or the losses sustained. It is necessary, therefore, to decide what exact proportion of effort in the combination belongs to Labour. Labour can be said to control the process by which raw materials are converted into saleable goods. The test of Labour's efficiency is the absence of preventable waste during that process.

To reduce waste may, therefore, be said to be one of the primary functions that Labour may legitimately be asked to perform. If it were possible to apportion waste to each individual, as it may be in some businesses, it would be an easy matter to reward individual effort, but the actual result of individual effort is, in most cases, practically impossible to determine. The individual effort, therefore, must, generally speaking, be merged into a larger unit, and each would have to be based upon the lowest unit found to be practicable. In a small factory, the factory itself would probably be the most convenient unit. In a large concern the various departments might be separated. It should therefore be to the interest of Capital to provide Labour with the most efficient means obtainable for (1) avoiding waste, (2) increasing output ; and we are persuaded that it would be to the interest of Labour to concur with these objects. It may be urged that all businesses suffer periodically from shortness of demand for their goods. When this occurs Labour suffers from what is called " short time." To overcome this difficulty it is admitted that a fixed living wage is Labour's right, and that " short time " must be a debit against Capital. This seems at first sight a difficult if not an impossible proposition ; but it must be pointed out that " short time " does not necessarily mean loss to Capital as such ; it undoubtedly carries with it loss of profits, but as things stand it means dead loss to Labour ; whilst Capital, in the sense of investment, remains theoretically untouched. Therefore justice

to Labour requires that, so far as the living wage is concerned, it shall be independent of "short time." On the other hand, justice to Capital demands that when men are on "short time" they should not reduce their effort whilst at work, but that, hour for hour, the average output should be as brisk as when "full time" is in operation.

If this plan were adopted overtime and piece-work would have to be abolished, and all operatives would have to keep the same hours. Any departmental delay caused by breakdown or other adverse circumstance would, so far as possible, be eliminated by a transfer of work, and such transfers would become increasingly easier as time went on and workpeople became familiar with all the phases of employment instead of being restricted to one branch. Incidentally this arrangement would go a long way to counteract that monotony of Labour which makes repetition work so uninteresting.

The advantages that Labour receives under such a scheme are security of a living wage with certain increase in periods of full work; and leisure, without loss of income, in periods of slackness. Capital will derive advantage in security from disputes as to Labour's claims and assurance of a full product for the time employed; and both will be interested in maintaining and increasing products. In short, Capital and Labour will have the same end in view instead of occupying themselves with conflicting demands. The abolition of overtime will not be practicable with regard to every person employed in a factory—*e.g.*, a millwright or engineer, who can only approach some of his work when machinery is still and when other operatives have left. This would necessitate either special allowance for actual time so occupied (which would perhaps be the better way of dealing with such a detail) or a fixed wage which would cover such calls upon a man. In the latter case the greater share of profit would be the only tangible result for possibly long hours of overtime, and, as suggested above, the individual effort would probably be more fully met by a definite extra payment; especially as the work done would be of benefit to all the workpeople employed.

Piece-work is in some instances productive of loss. It is to the interest of the worker to turn out a maximum of work, good, bad or indifferent, and haste is so nearly allied to waste that the two words by the interchange of one letter spell the same thing. A good workman is able to earn more than an inferior one, but as the rate of pay is calculated on the labour of the kind available, or rather on the amount that is sufficient to obtain labour of the kind, the advantages to the workman are doubtful. If, therefore, a fixed wage as suggested be arranged on the basis of actual earnings, the advantages offered by such a scheme is clear, as there is no loss of wages when no work is available, and the profit earned when increased output is obtained will be clear of all deductions.

THE INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD.

THE alliance recently effected between the Left of the Rank and File Movement in England and the international organisation called "The Industrial Workers of the World" confers on the latter an importance which, so far as the future of British labour is concerned, did not previously attach to it in this country. Branches of the Society have been known to exist in the United Kingdom for some time, but their membership was inconsiderable, being recruited, for the most part, from amongst the ranks of aliens living in the East End of London. That the Military Service Act dealt a severe blow to the Society is evident from the tone of a letter reprinted in Australia by *The Commonwealth* of October 18th, 1916. "Things are rough here," writes the General Secretary of the I.W.W. in London, "we are nearly all either interned as enemies or gaoled under conscription—most of us expect to be gaoled in a week or so, as from Saturday we are soldiers. They haven't caught us yet though! Even then we shall not be soldiers—Curse them."

The British organ of the Society, *The Industrial Worker*, was suppressed by the authorities after the appearance of an article advocating sabotage, which was published in the issue of November, 1916,* and the I.W.W. members who had escaped internment and conscription were dispersed or absorbed into the B.S.P. Immediately after the suppression of *The Industrial Worker* a journal, called *Solidarity*, was restarted † under the editorship of Mr. E. L. Pratt. At first *Solidarity* was run "solely and wholly" in the interests of the Rank and File Movement, and became the medium through which Tom Mann, J. T. Murphy, and their colleagues sought to spread their doctrine of Industrial Unionism amongst the Rank and File in the engineering trades. On June 10th, 1917, a so-called "working-class convention" was held in London and "a unanimous decision arrived at to unite under the constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World" an organisation which *Solidarity* declares to be "the strongest fighting force of the proletariat now extant." At this same convention was passed the following resolution :—

That in view of the abject failure of Trade Unionism, organised on lines of craft, and involving the sectional division of the workers, to carry on the war with modern Capitalism, or even to maintain the ground already won; and believing that only by the reorganisation of Labour on the basis of Class-Conscious Industrialism can the overthrow of Capitalism and wage-slavery be accomplished; this meeting pledges itself to work for the establishment of Industrial Unionism in this country

* Publication of *The Industrial Worker* was resumed in September, 1917.
† This was a revival of a pre-war journal, with the same title, which was edited by Gaylord Wilshire.

and thereby to initiate the policy of the Industrial Workers of the World, which policy is alone capable of achieving our economic emancipation.

In its July issue *Solidarity* came out as the unabashed champion of the I.W.W. doctrine, which "knows what it is out for and stops at nothing." The connection between the two movements is not confined to their partnership in a newspaper—it goes much farther than that—and there are signs that W. F. Watson, the Secretary of the Rank and File Amalgamation Committee, is hand in glove with E. L. Pratt in an attempt to harness all British Labour to the chariot of "One Big Union." Whilst it may be true that Watson's policy of amalgamation is regarded favourably by many trade unionists it is inconceivable that any considerable section of British Labour has travelled so far from the path of sanity as to wish to adopt the standards and the methods of an organisation which is frankly anarchical and antipatriotic. The tenets of the Industrial Workers of the World may be acceptable to the unskilled and uneducated emigrants from Italy and Spain, who spend a few years in America, but the skilled British workman may always be trusted to give anarchy a wide berth, provided that he is not led into a false position by misrepresentations that conceal the real nature of the programme which he is persuaded to support. Under these circumstances our readers may be interested to hear something about the record of the I.W.W. in those countries where it has already established itself.

In *The World of Labour* Mr. G. H. D. Cole gives an account of the origin and growth of the I.W.W. in America. Himself a declared opponent of Industrial Peace, Mr. Cole appears to see in this movement a legitimate development of aggression against Capitalism, and touches as lightly as possible upon the "methods of violence" which have branded the I.W.W. with such an unenviable notoriety in Australia, New Zealand, and the United States. He admits that "these methods will, no doubt, still persist amongst the roving bands of adventurous and disappointed labourers in the Far West," but he prophesies that this state of violence will die out as the movement progresses. How far this optimistic forecast is justified by recent history will shortly appear. Mr. Cole points out that in America there are two distinct working-classes with different traditions and diverse standards of life. One class consists mainly of the native-born skilled workers and the other of unskilled European immigrants. The American Federation of Labour caters for the skilled craftsman, and the I.W.W. attracts the unskilled labourer. The former is craft-unionism and the latter industrial unionism. The I.W.W. was formed out of the embers of the Western Federation of Miners and, in chronicling this fact, Mr. Cole makes a curious admission when he declares that the exhaustion of the W.F.M. was finally brought about by continual militancy. According to the accepted standards of class-war gospel nothing succeeds

like militancy—which is the mother of class-consciousness. "Every strike," says Mr. Cole elsewhere, "every demand made by the Unions, is a contribution to the education of the workers as well as an attack on the Capitalist System."

The conference at which the I.W.W. was definitely established was held at Chicago in 1905; but it was not long before internal discussions brought about a cleavage. The followers of Daniel De Leon (the champion of Karl Marx) seceded and formed a separate organisation with headquarters at Detroit. It was this section which established the first I.W.W. branch in Great Britain and became identified with the Socialist Labour Party.

The main current of I.W.W. activity in America, directed by William Haywood, W. Trautmann, and Vincent St. John, found its way to Chicago, and it is from that centre that the I.W.W. of to-day radiates its malevolent encouragement of the Class War. The objects of the I.W.W. have been defined as follows :—

> The working class and the employing class have nothing in common. There can be no peace so long as hunger and want are found among millions of working people, and the few, who make up the employing class, have all the good things of life. Between these two classes a struggle must go on until all the toilers come together on the industrial field, and take and hold that which they produce by their labour, through an economic organisation of the working class without affiliation to any political party. The rapid gathering of wealth and the centering of the management of industries into fewer and fewer hands make the Trade Unions unable to cope with the ever-growing power of the employing class, because the Trade Unions foster a state of things which allows one set of workers to be pitted against another set of workers in the same industry, thereby helping to defeat one another in wage-wars. The Trade Unions aid the employing class to mislead the workers into the belief that the working class have interests in common with their employers. These sad conditions can be changed and the interests of the working class upheld only by an organisation formed in such a way that all its members in any one industry, or in all industries, if necessary, cease work whenever a strike or lock-out is on in any department thereof —thus making an injury to one an injury to all.

This preamble, as it is generally called, is a shining example of argument by insistence—you have only to repeat falsehood with sufficient frequency to convert it into truth. This method can defy logic, ignore history and rise superior to all economic experience. It claims an infallibility which you must accept as an article of faith or be for ever excommunicated.

Space does not admit of our following Mr. Cole's description of the Lawrence strike, which he looks upon as the most characteristic achievement of the I.W.W., but we are amused to learn that "Mr. Haywood could make himself understood by a crowd that did not understand a word he said, merely by waving his arms and shouting." Unconsciously Mr. Cole not inaptly reminds us of the type of oratory that is so popular at May Day demonstrations in Finsbury Park and elsewhere.

In 1913 the paying membership of the I.W.W. in America was estimated at between thirty and forty thousand, but if we include those whose subscriptions had not been collected the

adherents of the organisation probably reached a total membership of 250,000. The I.W.W. strives to secure solidarity by the formation of "One Big Union," to which all workers pay an initiation fee, and by which they are connected by a universal transfer card. The American Federation of Labour favours Industrial Unionism, but not on so broad a basis as that advocated by the I.W.W. Mr. Cole observes that Industrial Unionism of America is exactly similar to the Amalgamation Movement in England, and when Tom Mann toured the United States in 1913 he urged the need for co-operation between the American Federation of Labour and the I.W.W. on the lines adopted by the latter organisation. As Tom Mann is one of the leading lights in the Rank and File organisation in England it is not altogether surprising to find that movement joining hands with the British section of the I.W.W.

America's participation in the war was followed by an outburst of activity amongst the I.W.W.—one Frank Little, who claimed to be their official spokesman was reported as declaring to a crowd at Butte in July that during the next three months his organisation would "pull out" 140,000 workers in the farming, lumber, and mining districts. For the soldiers guarding detention camps he had only foul epithets, and he declared that the men "pulled out" will give the soldiers so much to do at home that it will be impossible to send an army to France. It is generally believed in America that there is German money behind this recrudescence of violence. A German Pole, Joseph Garber, of the I.W.W., was arrested at Scranton, Pennsylvania, on July 4th charged with being an enemy spy, and the Federal authorities declared that their investigations proved the existence of German financial support of the I.W.W. Movement in America. They also state that German money has been poured into the anthracite coal districts with the object of reducing output by the creation of strikes.* These and similar disclosures inflamed public opinion in America to such an extent that Frank Little was lynched by an angry mob; an American Labour Alliance has been formed to combat disloyalty, suspicious Germans are being ousted from the Trade Unions and some hundreds of the I.W.W. have been deported from their homes. So bitter was the feeling that there was great difficulty in procuring food for these deportees and the authorities had to requisition Army rations to enable them to complete their journey. More recently further plots have come to light. It is said that an extensive conspiracy to commit sabotage has been discovered, including plans to wreck harvesting and threshing machinery. William Haywood, the President of the I.W.W., has been arrested at Chicago, and tons of documents have been seized, revealing a wide-spread plot to hamper the successful prosecution of the war by fomenting strikes

* Another report is to the effect that the Galveston branch of the I.W.W. has sent $14,000 in gold to Tampico to finance a strike in the Mexican oilfields which supply fuel to the British and American Navies.

and by deeds of violence. It was this same Haywood * who appointed the General Secretary of the I.W.W. in England, and it is possible that a further scrutiny of the confiscated documents may disclose some interesting details concerning the inter-relation between the transatlantic and British sections of the I.W.W. Commenting on recent events an American writer tells us that the I.W.W. has been successful in temporarily paralysing the copper-mining industry in Montana and Arizona and the lumber industry in the Pacific north-west, and declares that this organisation, "professing devotion to industrial democracy, has succeeded in precipitating several communities into a state of chaos similar to that existing in Russia. . . Nothing can keep the masses of any country from such participation in both the political and industrial management as they are qualified to exercise to their own advantage, but the leadership of the I.W.W. in industry would be just about as effective as the leadership of the Leninites in Russia."

As we have already seen the I.W.W. has been in existence in the United States for some twelve years. The date of its migration to Australasia is uncertain, but the organisation is known to have become well-established in Sydney by the year 1909. Tom Mann absorbed his I.W.W. doctrines there, and returned to transplant them in England in 1910. In New Zealand the movement assumed alarming proportions and in the year 1913, led to Labour troubles that almost amounted to a miniature revolution. Even the police were disaffected, and order was only restored by enrolling and arming some five thousand special constables. The Transport Workers' Strike, out of which the trouble grew, was ostensibly organised by a body calling itself the Red Federation, but it is known that the I.W.W. leaders were working hand in glove with the "Red Feds." It is said that during the disturbances documents were seized which proved that the general policy of the New Zealand branches of the I.W.W. was directed from San Francisco, which city, again, was in direct communication with the Headquarters of the I.W.W. in Berlin. An interesting sidelight on the connection between the Central Powers and Labour agitation abroad is exhibited in a letter which the American Authorities have just made public. This document, which for sheer hypocrisy would be hard to beat, was written by the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador, who says :—

My impression is that we can disorganise and hold up for months, if not entirely prevent, the manufacture of munitions in Bethlehem and the Middle West, which, in the opinion of the German Military Attaché, is of the utmost importance, and amply outweighs the comparatively small expenditure of money involved ; but even if strikes do not come off probably we should extort, under pressure of circumstances, more favourable conditions of labour for our poor down-trodden fellow countrymen.

* Haywood came to England in 1910, and again in 1913, when he toured in company with Tom Mann, Jim Larkin, and the late James Connolly. Their public meetings were organised by the *Herald* League. Connolly was executed for his complicity in the Dublin Rebellion, and Larkin, refused permission to land in New Zealand, is temporarily marooned somewhere in the South Sea Islands.

In Australia matters came to a head about twelve months ago. The full story was published in the Commonwealth Press, and it is from this source that the following summary is compiled. It appears that in October, 1916, two men, Frank Franz and Roland Kennedy, were convicted of murdering, in cold blood, a police constable named Duncan, who was shot through a window whilst typing in his office. The Crown Solicitor stated that there was abundant evidence to prove that the crime was traceable to the I.W.W., to which organisation the convicted men belonged. In the same month twelve members of the I.W.W. were charged with treason, and with attempting to burn down buildings in Sydney and elsewhere in order to intimidate and overawe the State Government. In outlining his case the Crown Prosecutor (Mr. Lamb, K.C.) said that a series of fires calculated to cause damage to the extent of a million sterling had been organised by the I.W.W., who had adopted a campaign of arson and sabotage to procure the release of one of their members (Tom Barker), and with the further object of defeating the conscription proposals of the Government. Counsel stated that the accused were associated with an Austrian, who, having escaped from an internment camp, concealed his nationality under the assumed name of Mahoney, and forced a chemist to remove his tattooed identification marks by threatening him with a revolver. Mahoney, who appears to be a ruffian of an extremely sensational make-up, is said to have conducted a secret ballot by placing one red and two black discs in a cigar box and inducing three conspirators to draw lots—the man who got the red disc became the "fire bug," and was given a supply of incendiary material called "biter," and instructed as to the buildings selected for destruction. Steps were also taken to place difficulties in the way of the fire brigades by interfering with the telephones, etc. The Austrian disappeared, but twelve of his comrades were arrested, tried and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment. The international character of the I.W.W. is indicated by the variety of countries from which the conspirators are alleged to have come, three being English, two Irish, two Scottish and two Russian, whilst of the remainder Canada, New Zealand, Tasmania, and Australia claimed one each. In passing sentence Judge Pring said: "the revelations afforded by the evidence demonstrated that the Industrial Workers of the World was an association of criminals of the worst type, and was a hotbed of crime. He hoped that strong and drastic measures would be taken to uproot the association."

Commenting on the case, *The Canterbury Times* of October 25th, 1916, says of the I.W.W.: "Talking Solidarity, its purpose in life is to rend society and to wreck institutions that have been erected out of the persistent progressive labours of the world's social reformers. It has no country, no flag, no purpose but to destroy. If these criminals want 'direct action' they are now in a fair way to get it—from the Government. Some

of these call themselves International socialists, but they are nothing of the sort. They are anti-socialists of the worst possible description for whom the people of Australasia have nothing but detestation."

In July, 1917, the Commonwealth Parliament passed a Bill suppressing the Industrial Workers of the World, which thereafter became an illegal organisation, and on September 6th the police raided and locked up the I.W.W. Headquarters in Sydney.

We are convinced that British Labour only needs to be fully informed as to the criminal record of the I.W.W. " in foreign parts " to protest very effectively and to act very forcibly against the introduction into this country of propaganda which has been repudiated as infamous and intolerable by their fellow-workers in America and in the Colonies. The agitators, however, who are attempting to engraft this exotic and poisonous fungus upon British industry can be under no delusion as to its criminal antecedents and tendencies ; in the absence, therefore, of any disclaimer to the contrary, we are justified in assuming that they approve of the methods employed by the I.W.W. in other lands, and do not scruple to invoke its disintegrating influence at the very height of the greatest crisis in our history.

THE HUMAN TOUCH.

In an illuminating pamphlet entitled "Never Again" Mr. Cecil Walton emphasizes the necessity for tackling the problem of industrial reconstruction without a moment's delay. He suggests that the questions which cry out for consideration are too weighty and too complicated to be handled in bulk, they must be taken in detail; if we wait until after the war there will be accumulations which might well dishearten the boldest reconstructionist. After the war all our energies will be more than occupied in liquidating our armies, both military and industrial, and in reinstating the workers; we must design and build our bridges before the rush of traffic overtakes us.

We are in entire agreement with Mr. Walton when he pleads for the obliteration of the old provocative labels before we start on our journey—Capital and Labour! alias Montague and Capulet! alias Cat and Dog! If, to quote Mr. T. J. Jones, Capital has become "a soulless, dehumanised commercial machine for the extraction of gold out of Labour, is it not also fair to say that organised labour has become a machine of similar character for the extraction of wages out of Capital?" In a previous article we have referred to Labour, Management and Finance as the three vital components of industry, but this does not rid us of one of the offending terms. Mr. Bernard Bosanquet speaks of invention, production and consumption, but this combination omits all reference to the money side of the question. We invite our readers to supply the missing words, but, whatever terminology we adopt, let us, whenever possible, avoid anything that has no other function than to stimulate controversy. There is a virtue in hard hitting, but none when it is indulged in for its own sake.

"The problem before us," says Mr. Walton, "is to combine these (components of industry) in such a way that they can never become dissociated except by mutual consent. It is a great problem. But tackled with courage, with such knowledge of production as will establish confidence, it is the most fascinating study upon which man has ever been called to concentrate his mind. Approached in deadly earnest, with skill and foresight, with a determination to do what is right and just without fear or favour—above all, without internal political consideration," he believes that the problem can be solved by "the Human Touch." Speaking of the present system of payment for production, he says: "There is too great a tendency to exploit the human means of production on the one hand and too great a suspicion on the other that every proposal put forward is a trap for still further exploitation." According to Mr. Walton piecework is an abomination; it neither encourages individual effort nor protects the good worker: on

the contrary, it encourages laziness and indifference, it produces fatigue and discourages invention. The management says, "We will allow you to earn 30 or 50 per cent. above your time rate, but beyond that you must not go." "What a fallacy!" replies our author. "Why should the rate be reduced? Because the worker is making too much money? But surely if the man earns it for his employer he is entitled to it, or at least some of it. . . . You expect a man to put his heart and hand into your invention—without him you could not carry on—then he should come into the benefit. Let the cry be 'Efficiency.' Let every man from the employer down realise that by management, design, construction, labour and, above all, reduced fatigue, all are contributing and proportionately benefiting. There will be no necessity for piecework, and the difficulty of securing large expert staffs to fix rates will disappear."

After condemning the complexity and injustice of many of the Premium Bonus Systems now in operation, Mr. Walton stigmatises combinations of piecework and time rates as being conducive to dishonesty as well as to mutual distrust, nor does he favour profit-sharing schemes: what he advocates is the abolition of all complicated systems of payment and the substitution of a good minimum wage per hour plus a percentage of wage on output. This percentage should be calculated not on the basis of the individual but per works or per department, so that each worker, whatever his or her occupation may be, receives the same percentage on time rate. He looks upon such bonus as an investment in a new form of business goodwill —viz., the goodwill of the workers. "Remember," he says, "that there is no limit of output within the vision of any living being." If you admit a limit and reach it progress would stop, but progress never stops.

We venture to hold the opinion that Mr. Walton is not sufficiently informed as to the full facts of the case when he gives credence to the allegation that a certain great strike was due, in the first instance, to the cutting of premium bonus time allowance; but nevertheless there is force in his contention that the premium bonus system, whatever its advantage, does in point of fact give rise to suspicion and misunderstanding. In answer to the assumed objection that high wages plus percentage on output would be a ruinous burden on industry, he declares that a high wage coupled with high horse power and scientific management is the greatest incentive to cheap production. "Create," says Mr. Walton, "a contented workman, pay him well, give *him* a profit on his hands and head, and I do not think he will care a button how much profit you make. But if you allow him to think that you are sweating him to make your profit he will take good care you do not do it, and it is not only you, and he, who suffer, but the nation generally." Therefore, he repeats, pay on output, not on profits.

We have not the space to follow Mr. Walton through the examples which he quotes in support of his arguments, and we would advise our readers to study the pamphlet *in extenso.* Not everybody will agree with all his conclusions, but whether his solution is right or whether it is wrong his buoyant optimism and his steadfast belief in an inherent virtue in human nature are very refreshing. This is especially the case when we contrast his attitude with that of the hymns of hate which defile the Syndicalist papers and pamphlets and which breathe nothing but envy, hatred, malice, all uncharitableness, and that Mephistophelean, and most damnable, attribute—the spirit of negation.

We shall hope to return to a second dose of Mr. Walton's tonic, and will conclude this notice with one more quotation: "The British working man, properly handled, is the finest unit of production the world has known or ever will know. The British employer is, at heart, the finest organiser, the most energetic, and the greatest pioneer in history. If, then, we have two such glorious assets, let us, if only out of our common sorrow, if only for the love of those who have fought and died for us, take up our heritage again, bring into industry the joy of living, let our men come home to see that we have put our house in order, that we have had our Spring Clean. While they have been fighting and struggling in the mud and filth for us, we, too, have been doing something for them, that their lives will be brighter in the home-coming."

*

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYED.

[NOTE.—*The following article only deals with the earlier stages of the growth of the N.A.E.E., and we hope to give an account of its development on a future occasion.*]

WAR between Capital and Labour in this country when peace is declared in Europe would be a calamity only less terrible in its consequences than victory by Germany.

Nevertheless, industrial conflict is certain to follow peace in Europe unless adequate measures are taken to prevent it. Not only is there a deep and widespread determination among workpeople of every grade that any return to pre-war labour conditions is out of the question, and that employers must give workers a larger share of profits and shorter hours of work, but it is the conviction of many shrewd and forceful Trade Unionists that by industrial strife alone will workers come to their own. On the other side there are Employers' Federations who are confident that, given a sufficient accumulation of money for fighting purposes and a strong enough organisation, they can force Labour to its knees after the war; and even where this feeling is absent the view is widely held that to admit the principle of partnership of Labour in Industrial Reconstruction would cut at the root of all authority, discipline and order.

Happily for the future of British industry, there are men on both sides sufficiently far-sighted and patriotic to feel that a determined effort must be made to overcome the prejudice, narrowness of view, self-interest and ignorance on which those on either side who predict industrial war rest their case, and, moreover, that in spite of all evidence to the contrary the mass of employers and workpeople in this country, through their mutual sacrifices, are nearer together as men and comrades than they have ever been before.

It is men with this faith who formed the National Alliance of Employers and Employed. On December 7th, 1916, at an informal conference at the Hotel Cecil, twenty-five employers and fourteen Trade Unionists, presided over by the Rt. Hon. Frederick Huth Jackson, P.C., who had brought them together, opened their hearts to one another on the industrial problems of the present and future. There was no lack of plain speaking. Among those who did so on the Employers' side were Mr. F. Dudley Docker, C.B., Sir Algernon Firth, Sir Vincent Caillard and Sir Robert Hadfield; and from Labour, Mr. J. T. Brownlie, Mr. Ben Tillett, Mr. James O'Grady, M.P., Mr. J. Havelock Wilson, Mr. George H. Roberts, Mr. W. J. Davis and Mr. W. A. Appleton. The Conference, therefore, heard the subject dealt

with from many points of view. As a result the following resolutions were unanimously agreed to :—

" 1. That the cordial and whole-hearted co-operation of employers and employed will be the most important element in the success of any scheme for dealing with the reinstatement of the men of the forces and munitions in civil employment and the general redistribution of labour after the war, and for handling any subsequent problem of unemployment or labour dislocation."

" 2. That no machinery now in existence can adequately deal with the reinstatement in civil employment of the present forces."

" 3. That powers should be obtained from Parliament to set up without delay a Central Statutory Board to regulate and supervise (a) the reinstatement in civil employment of the present forces ; (b) the settlement in normal employment of civilian workers now in Government or controlled establishments ; (c) any general redistribution of labour arising out of the war. Appropriate transfers of existing powers and duties will have to be made by the various Government Departments to the Central Statutory Board, so that complete authority shall be vested in the new Board."

" 4. That not less than two-thirds of the members of this Central Statutory Board should be representatives of employers and employed in equal numbers, such members being appointed by the Crown from Associations of Employers and from the Trade Unions of the United Kingdom respectively, the remaining members of the Board to include representatives of Government Departments, etc."

" 5. That where a Trade Union, by arrangement with the Employers' Association, is capable of placing its members in employment, it should be competent for the Central Board, if it deems it to be in the national interest, to delegate to the Trade Union in question the responsibility of dealing with the reinstatement of its own members."

" 6. That Local Boards should be established wherever necessary to assist the Central Board. Such Local Boards to have the same proportionate representation as is provided for the Central Board."

" 7. All expenses properly incurred by the Central and Local Boards should be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament."

" 8. That the representatives of employers and workmen who are present form themselves into a committee for the purpose of giving effect to the proposals contained in the resolution just adopted. In order to preserve equal balance the committee shall have the power of co-opting other representatives of employers and workmen, each section of the committee nominating members to make the balance complete and to fill its own vacancies."

The Conference also appointed an Executive Committee of Employers and of Trade Unionists in equal numbers, and

resolved that its proceedings, with the names of all present, should be published in the press.

Thus the foundation-stone was laid for a movement which means that men who have spent their lives in business organisation and the control of Labour are joining hands for a national object with Labour leaders whose main purpose in life is to promote the independence of Labour and its right to a living wage and reasonable hours of work.

The Alliance has now been in existence nine months. It has established offices at 64, Victoria Street, London, S.W.1. The original General Committee of thirty-nine members has increased to sixty-three. Out of the twenty-four Trade Unionists now members of this Committee nine officially represent their Societies. These are Mr. W. A. Appleton, General Federation of Trade Unions; Mr. Charles Duncan, M.P., The Workers' Union; Mr. Wm. Mullin, Amalgamated Card and Blowing Room Operatives; Mr. Arthur Pugh, Iron and Steel Trades Confederation; Mr. J. Havelock Wilson, National Sailors' and Firemen's Union; Mr. W. J. Davis, Brassworkers and Metal Mechanics; Mr. H. Dubery, Joint Committee of Post Office Associations; Mr. Ivor Gwynne, Tin and Steel Millmen's Union; and Mr. John Thompson, Associated Blacksmiths' and Ironworkers' Society.

A number of employers are members of the Committee, while the Associated Chambers of Commerce, the Federation of British Industries and the Drapers' Chamber of Trade are officially represented.

There are formed, or in course of formation, District Committees of the Alliance at Birmingham, Manchester, Cardiff, Swansea, Sheffield, Darlington and Gloucester. All District Committees consist of Employers and Employed in equal numbers, and are represented upon the Central General Committee by an Employer and a Workman.

The Alliance has now a Constitution to be finally determined upon in October next, and has issued a Memorandum on the Report of the Whitley Committee. This will be followed by a statement of policy and principles for the furtherance of the objects of the Alliance, which are as follows:—

(1) To promote active co-operation of employers and employed in the treatment of questions generally affecting Labour and employment in all trades and industrial occupations.

(2) To promote the welfare of the industrial workers of the country and efficiency of its industries.

(3) To promote arrangements for the reinstatement in civil employment at the end of the war of men serving with the forces and munition workers.

NOTE.—The Alliance will not, unless especially requested to do so, interfere with arrangements existing between Employers' Associations and Trade Unions for the settlement of questions affecting wages, hours, and conditions of labour.

FOOD FOR THOUGHT.

THE medical profession is more than fully occupied just now with the task of repairing the ravages of war, and has no time to devote to research work that has no immediate bearing on the alleviation of suffering. This being the case an interesting field of investigation has perforce to be neglected. We refer to that much-needed inquiry into the pathological symptoms and predispositions of the disease which is affecting the mentality of so considerable a section of the revolutionary brotherhood. It has been observed that, during the last three years, a new species of bacillus, evincing a marked affinity for the muscles which control the reasoning faculties, has made its appearance; and scientists are of the opinion that unless prompt measures are taken to eradicate this pest the intelligence of the nation as a whole is likely to suffer. Well-defined symptoms of this too-prevalent disease are to be found in several "organs." The following is a striking example of the virulent nature of the epidemic.

Discussing the attitude of the Government towards the proposed Stockholm Conference, *The Call* declares that if the British people have a shred of self-respect the Lloyd George, Curzon, Milner, Carson quartette will be driven from office by an outburst of popular indignation. But how are the British people to express their alleged indignation? We must look deeper into this matter before we discover the mysterious workings of the bacillus. Are the Government to resign and go to the country? Certainly not! Such a suggestion is ruled out of court as "sheer impudence." On what will they appeal to the country? asks *The Call.* Why should they be permitted to go to the country? The country did not appoint them! "Any minister," says Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, "who advises a general election at the present moment ought to be impeached." Failing the arbitrament of a General Election, are we to accept the verdict of Fleet Street? Never! shouts the revolutionary chorus, for the whole daily Press is nothing but an appanage of capitalists! Are we then to act upon the resolution of the Trades Union Congress? Not a bit of it, for the T.U.C. decided against Stockholm and, moreover, the "Labour flunkeys connived at the triple insult to the Russian people, to the Labour Party and to Mr. Henderson!"

What remains? We might hazard a hundred guesses and never chance on the correct answer—so in the *dernier ressort* we remember the bacillus, and then the solution stands out as plain as a pikestaff. "The outburst of popular indignation" has been voiced in *The Call*, and therefore the quartette must be "kicked out"; not by resignation, not by the ballot, not by the verdict of organised Labour, but just by "kicking." Could anything be more convincing, anything more simple?

It is suspected that this new disease may have been imported from Germany for the reason, amongst others, that sufferers exhibit a total lack of humour which is characteristically Teutonic. The classic example from the country of origin is to be found in the text of a German despatch after the Heligoland fight, which declared that "The English ran away very fast, but they couldn't quite catch us."

The Pacifist standpoint is often surprising, but the most unexpected feature is the degree of bloodthirstiness that is exhibited by men who claim to abhor bloodshed. Human nature is full of inconsistencies, and nothing could exceed the piety of Charles Peace on a Sunday. Speaking at Bristol recently a conscientious objector boasted of the feats of valour he would perform "behind the barricades," and we rather suspect that a certain Councillor of Poplar has pacifist leanings. If correctly reported, his views on reprisals are refreshing if not original. According to the newspapers, this is how he expressed himself at the weekly meeting of the Poplar Council: "I only hope that in the next air raid the Huns will get to the West End and blow the lot to hell."

On the day that the fall of Riga was announced the President of the Trade Union Congress at Blackpool told the assembled delegates that the Russian Revolution had not weakened but strengthened the Alliance. In the opinion of the Russian Commander-in-Chief, however, the military *débâcle* was due to the progressive deterioration of the *moral* of the army since the accomplishment of the Revolution.

The game of "General Post" as played by Kerensky with quick-change Commanders-in-Chief goes on with bewildering rapidity, but we are able to contradict the rumour that Sir Eric Geddes has been offered the appointment. Some new rules have recently been introduced which, if obeyed, will simplify the game. In future soldiers are forbidden to place their commanding officers under arrest, or even to remove them from their posts. It is not stated whether these new rules are to apply to the Navy or not, but meanwhile there have been regrettable "misunderstandings" on board the warship *Petropavlovsk*, four officers having been shot by their men for refusing to sign a declaration. Admiral Verderevsky, the Minister of Marine, has ventured to express the opinion that such "misunderstandings" diminish the Navy's capacity to resist a German offensive. Verderevsky is a brave man.

A surgeon was asked the result of a dangerous operation which he had just performed. He replied, "I lost the patient, but I saved the tumour." Kerensky seems determined to save the Soviet.

The imitation Soviet movement launched in this country at the Leeds Convention is not meeting with the success which its originators expected. Speaking at Birmingham, Mr. Will Thorne, M.P., asked: "What was the object of the Leeds Convention if it were not for the purpose of bringing about a physical revolution? No one who had read the three resolutions could put any other interpretation upon them." Whilst Mr. Arthur Henderson, M.P., in the course of an interview with Press representatives, is reported to have delivered himself as follows: "If these proposed councils are to be formed on the model of those in Russia, with the same possible consequences, there will be no harder fighter against them than myself. I have seen quite enough of the consequences of such a course of action in Russia. What has happened there has shown the folly of allowing an army, as an army, to take part in political discussions, and this ought to be a warning to us. I am going to fight most strenuously against any course of action which will paralyse our military force as it has paralysed the military force of Russia." We are in entire agreement with Mr. Henderson, and shall look forward with interest to see the results of his strenuousness.

On one point only was unanimity arrived at during the debates of the Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference held on the 28th and 29th of August. The point of agreement was the decision to congratulate Russia on her Revolution. Poor distracted Russia needs all the assistance that can be afforded her. The bare necessities of life, as well as other desiderata, are at a premium. If there is one commodity at a discount it is, however, "congratulation." However excellent your intentions may be, it is, nevertheless, not in the best of taste to scatter confetti at a funeral.

The U.D.C. for September contains the report of an interview with a recent arrival from Petrograd, who is said to read "the Russian soul aright." In explanation of the equanimity with which the military reverses have been greeted, he states that "local successes of the German armies do not fill the Russians with frantic perturbation. . . . The Russians are convinced that the Germans are much too clever to increase still further their difficulties by adding more territory, inhabited by unfriendly people, to that which they are already holding." He emphasises his assurance that "The Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates is as strong as ever. It continues to be the real guiding power in Russia." We can quite believe it.

Pacifists do not look kindly upon what they call "The Pope's Peace," and have no desire to see "Clericalism triumphing out of the clash of Militarism." They declare that the Red International of the proletariat is the only hope. Having

signally failed to prevent the war, they cannot tolerate the idea of anybody else having a finger in the ending of it.

In view of the attitude of the Central Powers towards Papal intervention, we are reminded of Bismarck's disclaimer when he was accused of enmity to the Holy Chair. "Nothing can be more absurd," said he. " . . . To me the Pope is primarily a political figure, and I have an innate respect for all real power. A man who rules over the consciences of two hundred millions of souls is to me a great monarch; and I should not have the least hesitation in appealing for his mediation, and even his arbitration, in a suitable case of political emergency."

The New Europe points out that the insinuation that the independence of Belgium was threatened as much by France and England as by Germany suffices to stamp the Papal Note as the fruit of enemy machinations. Is it possible that a suitable case of political emergency is about to arise?

M. Branting has said that the first business of the proposed Stockholm Conference (now postponed until January, 1918) would be to investigate the causes of the war, and to fix responsibility on the guilty party. This declaration is not at all to the liking of the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, which announces that under such conditions passports would not be issued to German Socialists. The advantage, to the Central Empires, of substituting the "Voice of the Vatican" for the Talking-Shop of Stockholm is that in Rome they can count on the able advocacy of Fathers Ledochowski, Zabeo and Galen.

The Industrial Worker for October, 1917, furnishes us some new definitions of different types of "Strike" advocated by the I.W.W. We have already heard of "The Opportune Strike," which means taking the employers at a special disadvantage—*e.g.*, when urgent orders are in hand, and "The Final Universal Strike," during which the workers are to remain in the factories, commandeer the plant, and lock the employers out. To these definitions must now be added "The Lightning Strike"—*i.e.*, downing tools without notice; "The Irritation Strike"—*i.e.*, continuously coming out and going back; and "The Stay-in Strike," which consists of "folding arms whilst on the job." It is added that there are other unique but effective weapons.

A National Conference of Engineering and Allied Trades Committees was held at Leeds on the 1st and 2nd of September, and was attended by 73 delegates, representing 195,500 engineers. Resolutions were passed demanding a national minimum rate of wages, a seven hours' day, and a five days' week. The most urgent demand, however, was for a reduction of 50 per cent. in the price of the necessaries of life, and the threat was registered that unless effect is given to this demand before

October 15th, 1917, the Conference recommends that "immediate action" be taken to secure it.

Later in the proceedings an Emergency Committee was appointed, and made responsible for setting in operation any machinery necessary to give effect to the threat.

Referring to this resolution, the Chairman (Mr. Harry Robinson) said: "We can definitely take it for granted that by virtue of the strong action this Conference represents we shall get a reduction in food prices, and perhaps a considerable reduction. In addition we shall get an advance in wages."

Mr. Leonard Magson (Secretary of the Leeds Allied Trades Committee) was the principal speaker at the Conference, and is reported to have made the following, amongst other, observations: "We ought to aim that next time we are against the Government it will have to reckon with a united effort, national and not local, even if we come up against the law, as we shall. But law can only be broken by united action. It cannot be broken by Leeds or Sheffield or Glasgow alone, but by the united and determined effort of the whole country. Our object should be to demonstrate to the powers that be that the limit has been reached, and to demonstrate this in unmistakable terms."

Decidedly we are getting on! If, indeed, there is any limit we would ask Mr. Magson if it has not been reached when Emergency Committees are openly appointed for the declared object of breaking the law?

This Conference also decided to circularise all branches of the Trade Unions, requesting them to take a vote on the question of amalgamating all kindred societies in the engineering industry, the result of the vote to be forwarded to the secretary within six weeks.

Meanwhile the Amalgamation Committee of the Rank and File Movement have presented their ultimatum to the executives of the Trade Unions in the engineering industry. A Conference is to be held at Newcastle on October 15th and 16th, and if the executives neglect to take that "final" opportunity of coming to heel and fail to take the action demanded by the leaders of the Rank and File Movement, an Industrial Union of Engineering and Shipbuilding Workers is to be formed over their heads.

That the "forwards" were determined to declare open war on official Trade Unionism has been obvious ever since the Manchester Conference on June 8th and 9th, 1917. Now we have it on the authority of the President and Secretary of the Amalgamation Committee (both of whom were arrested in connection with the labour troubles in May) that the hour will strike in mid-October. If the workshop ballot, now being taken, decides for amalgamation by a big majority, the

gloves will be "off" with a vengeance; and the Executives may be up against a stiff proposition, for it is their power and their money that the "rebels" are out for.

Commenting on this situation, "A Labour correspondent" of *The Morning Post* says, "The cool proposal to divide up the vast funds of the established craft Unions among persons, '*regardless of craft, grade, and sex*,' who have never contributed a single penny towards them, might be regarded as merely grotesque, but for the fact that officials of high standing in the old Unions are known to be open or covert allies of the scheme. The General Secretary of the A.S.E. has recently written an endorsement of the idea, if he has not openly advocated the precise scheme outlined here, and it is no secret that other officials of the craft Unions are attached to the movement."

It is reported from Newcastle-on-Tyne that the men in the engineering and shipbuilding trades will submit an application in October for an increase in wages equal to the advance in the cost of living, which they estimate at eighty per cent. This is the largest increase ever demanded.

"Has no one the courage to speak out and say what everybody knows who knows anything about Labour affairs? The Government are trying now very hard to remove grievances, lower prices, and so on; but the demands increase instead of diminishing, and no matter what concessions are made they will go on increasing, for the motive of the instigators is not to raise wages or reduce the cost of living or secure any other ostensible object, but to enforce peace or to engineer an industrial revolution."—From *The Times.*

The West London Allied Engineering Trades Organising Committee held a meeting at Hammersmith recently to further the co-ordination of the whole of the Works Committees in West London. Among those present were Robert Smillie (President of Miners' Federation of Great Britain, member of the I.L.P., and Chairman of the N.C.C.L.), J. W. Clark (General Secretary of the Scientific Instrument Makers), and E. Cross (Organiser of the Toolmakers). J. Tanner (A.S.E.) presided. Resolutions were carried calling for the abolition of income tax on wages up to £400 a year, demanding the withdrawal of the Protected Occupations Schedule, and pledging the meeting to support the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils.

"This is obviously no time for unreasoning animosities and hare-brained schemes. It is a time that demands the best observation, thought and action that we can individually and collectively contribute towards the solution of the vast and complex problem that the world has to face to-day."—From *The Woolwich Pioneer.*

INDUSTRIAL PEACE

CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations

Scepticism and Alarm

The Pastoral Functions of Management

The Control of Industry

Conscription of Wealth

Works Committees and Industrial Councils

The No-Conscription Fellowship

The Rank and File Movement. Part III

Food for Thought

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

THE following abbreviations are occasionally used in the following pages and should be noted for future reference:—

A.S.E.	... ...	Amalgamated Society of Engineers.
B.S.P.	... ...	British Socialist Party.
B.W.L.	... ...	British Workers' League.
C.L.C.	... ...	Central Labour College.
C.O.	... ...	Conscientious Objector.
C.W.C.	... ...	Clyde Workers Committee.
D.R.R.	... ...	Defence of the Realm Regulations.
E.A.T.C.	... ...	Engineering and Allied Trades Committee.
E.T.U.	... ...	Electrical Trades Union.
F.O.R.	... ...	Fellowship of Reconciliation.
I.L.P.	... ...	Independent Labour Party.
I.W.W.	... ...	Industrial Workers of the World.
M. of M.	... ...	Ministry of Munitions.
M.S.A.	... ...	Military Service Act.
M.W.A.	... ...	Munitions of War Act.
N.A.C.	... ...	National Administrative Council.
N.C.C.L.	... ...	National Council of Civil Liberties.
N.C.F.	... ...	No Conscription Fellowship.
N.G.L.	... ...	National Guilds League.
N.U.R.	... ...	National Union of Railwaymen.
N.U.T.	... ...	National Union of Teachers.
P.N.C.	... ...	Peace by Negotiations Council.
R.F.M.	... ...	Rank and File Movement.
S.L.P.	... ...	Socialist Labour Party.
S.P.Gt.B.	... ...	Socialist Party of Great Britain.
S.S.C.	... ...	Social Science Classes.
T.U.C.	... ...	Trade Union Congress.
U.D.C.	... ...	Union of Democratic Control.
U.M.W.A.	... ...	United Machine Workers' Association.
W.E.A.	... ...	Workers' Educational Association.
W.I.L.	... ...	Women's International League.
W.L.L.	... ...	Women's Labour League.
W.P.C.	... ...	Women's Peace Crusade.
W.S.D.C.	... ...	Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates Council.
W.S.P.U.	... ...	Women's Social and Political Union.
W.U.	... ...	Workers' Union.
W.W.U.	... ...	Women Workers' Union.

INDUSTRIAL PEACE

SCEPTICISM AND ALARM.

THERE has never been much love lost between Bouverie Street and Carmelite House. In the old days the back-chat which mutually enlivened these two establishments added a piquancy to their output, and nobody would object to its continuance so long as the game is confined to reasonable limits. When, however, professional rivalry and standardised animosity tend to obscure vital issues the whole matter bears a different complexion. These remarks are called forth by the perusal of an article in an influential London daily paper, under the heading of "The Patriotic Stunt." It is a matter of serious concern to the nation that articles such as those on "The Ferment of Revolution" should be weighed dispassionately and estimated honestly. The questions raised are far too serious to be made an opportunity for scoring off an opponent or for exploiting the old device of misrepresenting an issue in order to demolish unpalatable conclusions. In passing, it may be said that, whilst there is room for much honest difference of opinion and ground for criticism, no unprejudiced reader could place the construction on *The Times* articles which A. G. G. suggests, but the paragraph with which we are particularly concerned is the following:—"And surely the story of the strike in the engineering trades is sufficient warning against these loose indictments. The men were driven to take action by gross neglect of burning grievances, and when they had compelled the Government to set up Commissions to enquire into the causes of the unrest the reports showed that those causes were as real and pressing as any that ever drove men beyond the limits of endurance." Now, if these statements are true, the main contention of A. G. G. is justified and the writer of *The Times* articles stands convicted not only of being an alarmist but also of slandering some thousands of engineers. If these statements are not true then the controversialist who gives them currency is either ignorant of his subject or not over fastidious in the choice of his weapons.

The events and tendencies leading up to the May strikes will be examined in this and subsequent issues of INDUSTRIAL PEACE, and it will be shown that there is little, if any, truth in the assertions that "the men were driven to take action by gross

neglect of burning grievances," that they "compelled the Government to set up Commissions to enquire into the causes of unrest," or that "the reports showed that those causes were as real and pressing as any that ever drove men beyond the limit of endurance." For our present purpose it will be sufficient to summarise the chief reasons which disprove the truth of the above quoted assertions. In the first place, be it remembered, the May strikes were indulged in against the authority of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers and other concerned Unions, and, consequently, if A. G. G. is correct, official Trade Unionism sided with the Government and deserted its members at a crisis when they were driven beyond the limits of endurance. In the second place, the "burning grievances" which precipitated the strikes were not the same grievances which the Commissioners declared to be responsible for industrial unrest. The men laid down their tools in order to prevent the extension of dilution on private work and in order to enter a protest against the abrogation of the Trade Card scheme. Thirdly, the grievances disclosed by the Commissioners' reports applied to all localities and to industry at large, whereas the strikes were confined to the engineering trades, and then only in districts where a certain type of agitation had been prevalent. What were the burning grievances which affected, for example, Sheffield and Barrow to the exclusion of Birmingham and Newcastle? The leaders of the Rank and File Movement openly boasted that they had engineered the strikes in pursuance of their general line of policy, and there is abundant evidence to prove that their boasts were not ill-founded. It is a matter of common knowledge that many of the men who downed tools did not know what they were striking for, and that others were induced to stop work by the false representation that the movement was "official."

Fourthly, it was open to the men to submit any grievances under which they might be suffering through constitutional channels, and it is untrue to say that they were "driven" to take action. Any attempt to saddle Government with responsibility for these particular strikes on the grounds of "gross neglect of burning grievances" is disingenuous. The abrogation of the Trade Card scheme had nothing to do with neglect: it was a measure designed to meet the essential and urgent needs of the Army and at the same time to satisfy the demands of the Workers' Union and other bodies who were protesting against the preferential treatment enjoyed by the A.S.E.

Finally, nobody "compelled the Government to set up

Commissions to enquire into the causes of the unrest." Such a course was not even suggested. The decision to hold an enquiry was the spontaneous act of the Prime Minister and was a generous and statesmanlike expedient resorted to in the hope that hot-headed agitators might come to their senses if they were given time for reflection and coupled with the desire to remove grievances by offering an opportunity for their ventilation. Incidentally, it may be remarked that the Commissioners carried out their work with similar generosity, and deliberately ignored one of the main causes of the upheaval by shutting their eyes to the persistent campaign of class-war agitation which had been so sedulously and so openly conducted by well-known firebrands in many industrial centres during many months.

Amongst other critics of *The Times* articles may be mentioned Mr. J. H. Thomas, M.P., and Mr. W. J. Davis. Mr. Thomas, as we all know, has often thrown his great influence into the scale on the side of industrial peace by counselling the railway workers to support the Government until we are through with the war, and his testimony that the ferment of revolution has not permeated the N.U.R., however well founded it may be, has but an indirect bearing upon a movement which primarily affects the engineering industry. On the whole, we are inclined to think that "Sanny McNee," of *The Forward*, gets nearer to the truth than Mr. Thomas when he says: "A see oor ain paipers are makin' a great adoo aboot a series of articles in the London *Times*. . . . The rulin' class, say oor paipers, hae thrown doon the gauntlet tae Labour. They hae declared civil war against democracy. Weel, and whit aboot it? Hes the cless struggle no aye been goin' on, an wull it cease as lang as there is an exploitit cless an' their exploiters? . . . Hev the Socialists in ilka land no lang ago thrown doon the gauntlet, and declared open war on oor capitalist rulers? Why shid we mak' a fuss because it is dawnin' on oor rulers that 'comrade' is no jist simply a 'rodomontadist' phrase?" The complaint of Mr. Davis is that the writer of *The Times* articles has given an *ex parte* version of one phase of Labour unrest whilst the other and more important aspects have been ignored. In support of this view Mr. Davis mentions the failure of any anti-patriotic coterie to command substantial political backing in any industrial constituency. From this admitted fact he concludes that the majority of the workers are not disposed to support movements of the kind described by *The Times*. Many people will regard this inference as reasonable, but the objection raised by Mr. Davis (which was often submitted in pre-war days) will not

bear examination, for it is based on a confusion of the worker's industrial policy with his political beliefs. It is erroneously assumed that the worker will not be led in industrial affairs by men whom he declines to accept as his political leaders. As a matter of fact the majority of successful strike leaders in recent years have not been politicians at all, and few of them could win a seat in Parliament. Nearly all the rank and file leaders to-day repudiate "political" and advocate "direct" action. The Syndicalist justification of this policy is that Labour is more united in the workshop than at the polling booth, and Labour leaders, especially those who favour political action, have often commented regretfully on the habit of Labour to divorce political from industrial questions. Signs are not wanting, however, that a change of attitude in this respect is likely to develop in the near future. For our part we should welcome any change that will put an end to the secret diplomacy of industrial strife, for free discussion is the only safe antidote to mischief which, as we believe, ultimately rests on a medley of unwarrantable suspicions, unverified generalisations and mutually misconceived interests. If *The Times* articles, as we think, contribute an instalment of the truth they cannot fail to do good; if, as Messrs. Thomas and Davis suggest, they represent nothing but the vapourings of an alarmist they cannot fail to do harm. But there are times when the sceptic is more dangerous than even the gloomiest prophet. He starts with an advantage because he runs before the wind, and can easily blanket his opponent, but his victory is often more apparent than real, and the public are more often misled by the sceptics than they are persuaded by the prophets. The bias of the majority is ever inclined to the creed that "what has been will be"; the new is necessarily unorthodox and the reproach of alarmism is too often applied to all but those who are content to play variants of the old tunes on familiar instruments. When Cassandra prophesied the treachery of the Greek horse she was accounted a mad woman, and when Lord Roberts preached the need for preparedness he was regarded as a man obsessed with a single idea, and that an erroneous one. It is always the same: be he optimist or be he pessimist the prophet is without honour in his own generation. We must all keep to the old grooves or run the risk of being accused of harbouring a bee in our bonnet, of panic-mongering, of fanaticism or lopsidedness. This gyroscopic tendency of public opinion serves, no doubt, a useful purpose, in so far as it helps to maintain equilibrium, but it is detrimental in so far as it retards evolution and encourages lethargy. The whole object of the Parliamentary system of

government is to discover the will of the people and to give effect to the demands of the majority. No good can come of bottling opinion in water-tight compartments, and safety valves are intended to be used, not sat upon.

Let us, therefore, take the opportunity of defining our own attitude towards this so-called "ferment of revolution." We foresee great social, political and industrial changes impending. We hold that these changes are inevitable, but not necessarily deleterious if handled with statesmanship. We believe in the wisdom of a policy which has for its motto "Festina lente," and we have every hope that a way will be found to satisfy the legitimate claims of Labour without any revolutionary breach with the traditions of the past and without mortgaging the future prosperity of the nation. We do not neglect the teaching of history, and our optimism is fortified by the fact that, as Professor C. H. Firth has pointed out, the peril of internal explosion appeared more acute during the Napoleonic war than at the present time. On the other hand, our fears are excited when we perceive that the driving power behind the attack is controlled by ill-informed but energetic enthusiasts, who are largely actuated by malice, whilst the defence relies on passive resistance administered to some extent by incredulous and indifferent officials. We are alarmed, not so much by the present volume of the disruptive factors as by the rate of acceleration which characterises their progress. We recognise that the great mass of workers in this country have made, and are still making, a great effort to meet the calls of the Government, to satisfy the needs of the nation, but at the same time we cannot shut our eyes to the growth of a rebellious and a hostile spirit which threatens to undermine our national unity. In this respect our attitude may be compared to that of a pathologist who observes an endemic disease assuming the character of an epidemic, and we are not consoled by the reflection that, after all, the majority of the people are still in robust health. We pin our faith to the ultimate victory of commonsense, but we cannot afford to sit with our hands folded whilst events shape themselves unheeded and unhindered, and we dare not bank on the luck that is supposed to preside over the destinies of the muddlers-through. We are not sufficiently conceited to imagine that our unaided efforts can avail to stem the tide, but we can do no less than our utmost to inform our readers on the one hand as to the trend of untoward events, and on the other as to the development of constructive and meliorist endeavour.

THE PASTORAL FUNCTIONS OF MANAGEMENT.

§ 1.

It is a trite remark that many of the ills of industry are due to the lack of personal relationships. Masters and men, one is told, no longer know each other. The conditions in modern undertakings, large and closely organised, forbid acquaintanceship. Truly, if men do not meet or speak, friendship will be impossible. Things were better, it is often suggested, in old days, when no master employed more men than he could know and make friends of and when most did, in fact, play the double rôle.

§ 2.

There is some truth, of course, in this antithesis of new and old. Not that the *moral* of industry is decaying, for the patriarchal virtues of the old-time employer are easy to overrate. Like the snowstorms of one's childhood, more glorious and complete than any since, he gains from being seen in a dim, favourable light through a mist of years. Memory, as some one has said, is a sort of poetry. The patriarchal employer, doubtless, was little better than he need have been. His problems were infinitely the simpler. Some of his successes were, perhaps, unintended. Under his conditions casual and amateurish solutions often sufficed. He had to face crises, but his intervals of peace were longer. The more manageable scale of his undertakings gave him an advantage. Above all, he scarcely knew the nervous tension which is almost normal in industry nowadays.

§ 3.

It may be said without exaggeration that the problem of personal relationship in industry grows more urgent daily. For the future lies with organisation, both in the small matters and in the wide issues. The success of organisation depends on leadership, and that again makes very diverse calls on character and intellect in those who would lead. It is little wonder if many employers find the complete response difficult. As a second best they devote themselves to their *forte,* which may be buying or selling or conciliation or the technicalities of manufacture, and leave the rest to others—and somewhat to chance. If a group of heads, and not merely a single head, can be afforded, the undertaking will gain on certain sides. The limits of its gain will be set by the abilities and the predilections of the group. Nor is it only the directing heads who are often unequal to their whole task. Throughout the responsible hierarchy—of managers, overseers, foremen, and so on—the

differentiation of tasks is seldom complete, and their combinations are too often haphazard and even provocative.

§ 4.

What combinations or qualities to seek in the men, and what subdivisions to effect in the work, and how to fit the person and the task, are problems of the gravest. They are precisely the permanent problems in all organised effort. Naturally, their solution is progressive. In many cases interest and necessity ensure a sound choice. If the manufacture is chemicals, the cousin of the senior partner cannot, as such, be put in charge of the laboratory, but only a chemist. A man who has the gift of sale may reckon on becoming sales manager one day. A head buyer of materials must know his markets. None but a first-class engineer will be allowed to design a complex stand of machinery. All this is to the good. But observe that it is a group of specialists that emerges. And these specialists have to keep on terms of mutual understanding with, perhaps, ten thousand workpeople. No single-handed employer could know his ten thousand. But now that he has resolved himself by subdivision into a group, and in his several constituents is engrossed with as many special tasks, even less than before is he in touch with the soldiers of his legion. If the sales manager and the chemist are effective in their spheres it will not be by intermeddling with problems affecting labour, and neither is likely to know the men or to be influential with them. In industry, as in other walks of life, the good specialist is apt to lack the gift of "personality." In the great productive undertakings you will find among the heads financiers, inventors, lawyers, chemists, linguists, accountants, and so on. You will find scarcely anywhere a man—and he must be emphatically a man—whose province is the men.

§ 5.

It is indeed a paradox that this evolution should leave a vital phase of management unrepresented in the managing group. The reply will be made that it is represented in part by all members of the group, and authoritatively by some. Within the group, it is true, the handling of labour drifts unavoidably into the most competent or the most ambitious hands. But those hands probably are already full. What happens is only too familiar. A busy man, his mind bent on problems of manufacture or marketing or finance, has to deal with labour at the end of his long day. He deals with it badly. He must rely on others for facts and impressions. His temptation is to procrastinate and to resist. Perhaps, he reflects, the trouble

may blow over before he returns from London, where he is going for three days about a contract. At the climax of the emergency he may be absent. If he is he will wire his colleagues an order, part policy and part sheer obscurancy, to surrender or hold out, as his conflicting thoughts may prompt. The emergency surmounted, he will devote himself again to his contracts and avoid thinking of labour. This man, surely, is attempting too much. No one can deal successfully with the human and personal problems of industry in short periods of respite from other work. Much less can this be done concurrently. The evolution of the managing group must be carried one step farther. Certain work cries aloud to be done. Therefore let someone be set apart in each case to do it. The pastoral phase of management deserves, if any does, to be given distinctive shape and power. The relationships of industry are not comparable, for example, with ties of blood; but they are, nevertheless, moral relationships. Leadership is not free to ignore them. And the recognition accorded must be thoroughgoing. The financier of the group, it is abundantly clear, must not serve as labour master, for in one mind either attitude must compromise the other. To sum up, the pastoral function, if subordinated to some other, might as well not exist. It will be effective in proportion as it is independent.

§ 6.

From lack of human intercourse to estrangement and antagonism the steps are often short. In industry the alienation between masters and men is widespread, though there is little evidence that it is profound. When two parties have lost touch, there is surely no paradox in suggesting that some one should make it his business to bring and keep them together. Nothing, indeed, could be more obvious. Salaries will have to be found. But this expenditure will be highly reproductive. Some dangers may lie in divided control. In the managing group, however, the division of labour must be carried out loyally. Policy is not likely to be weaker or less wise if all sides of it are handled with the same professional thoroughness. The chief difficulties will arise with *personnel*; for men ready fitted for such work are not common in industry, and if men are brought in from other careers serious questions of training arise. And suppose our labour master installed under good auspices, one man alone cannot create an atmosphere. A new spirit is needed throughout the whole hierarchy of control. Something will be said on that in another paper.

THE CONTROL OF INDUSTRY.

In any discussion of the problem of the control of industry there are certain facts on the Labour side that must be frankly recognised, and not least by Labour. They are facts which clearly indicate that, so far as the workers are concerned, the only immediate practicable policy is a policy aiming at a more co-operative and more harmonious control of industry as between Capital and Labour within the existing system of industry. That the growth and development of such a system of co-operative and harmonious control would lead ultimately to a system very different from that which has hitherto existed appears to be obvious. What exactly that new system will be is a subject of interesting speculation; but the speculation can wait, for the reality will depend upon what is done now and in the near future.

In the first place, then, it has to be recognised that the industrial policy of the national Trade Union and Labour movement implicitly accepts the fact that any real increase of the control of industry by the workers, and any real improvement in the condition of the workers, must spring from the existing system of industry. The resolutions on industrial questions which have been passed at the annual conferences of the Trades Union Congress and of the Labour Party do not, in the main, go beyond that position; and where they do go beyond it, it is only in regard to the nationalisation of one or two industries, such as railways or mines.

The declared national industrial policy of the Trade Union and Labour movement accepts—though it does not always explicitly confess it—the existence of Capital as well as of Labour, of employers as well as of workers. We have never yet discovered a responsible resolution adopted by the Trades Union Congress or by the Labour Party, and designed to deal with the industrial problems of the present and of the opening future and not merely to make a Utopian declaration with regard to a distant Golden Age, which does not in reality accept the position that it is the existing system and conditions of industry which have to be modified, and, in consequence, declare implicitly that the foundation of an entirely new system of industry is not the immediate object of the Trade Union and Labour movement. That the nationalisation of one or two industries, such as railways, canals, and mines, should be demanded by the movement is tantamount to a declaration that the movement is not yet prepared to demand the nationali-

sation of industry as a whole; and the movement has not yet considered any alternative to the existing system, save that of nationalisation.

It may be argued, of course, that many of the resolutions which have been adopted in recent years by the annual conferences of the Trades Union Congress and the Labour Party express more animosity towards Capital than desire to co-operate with it. That there is truth in the argument may readily be granted; but there is equal truth in the counter-argument that, while the expression of animosity is sincere, the necessity for co-operation with [illegible] is not the less implied, if not expressed with equal frankness. The threat of strikes may be held out in some of these resolutions, but practically all these resolutions either simply express the demands of labour for better conditions within the existing system, or imply that means such as negotiation, conciliation, or arbitration should be resorted to before more drastic action is taken. Negotiation, conciliation, and arbitration are not co-operation in the fullest and best sense of the word. They are not the form of co-operation which we wish to see established, as soon as possible, between Capital and Labour; but they are, and have been, the means adopted by Capital and Labour to settle their disputes without the open warfare of the strike or the lock-out, and they therefore are, and have been, a form of co-operation, from which the larger, fuller, and more efficacious co-operation which we wish to see established between Capital and Labour may spring before many months have passed.

We maintain, then, that on its industrial side the Trade Union and Labour movement has not officially and actively developed any policy for the immediate overturning of the present system of industry and for its replacement by a different system, and we equally maintain that, however forcibly the movement may have expressed its dissatisfaction with the existing system of industry, practically all its demands for the improvement of the status and the conditions of the workers imply that it looks for the improvement to be achieved from within the existing system, first by direct negotiations between Capital and Labour; failing these, by conciliation or by arbitration; and, finally, as a last resort, by the threat or the reality of the strike.

There is, of course, another means by which the Trade Union and Labour movement has sought to realise its aims. That means is political action. But here, too, equally with its industrial action, it can be said that the political action of the Trade Union and Labour movement has never gone, definitely

or deliberately, beyond a modification of the existing system. That is true of both the industrial and social system. In both respects the Labour Party in Parliament has wisely seen that the line of progress was not revolutionary, but evolutionary. We may agree or we may disagree with its political aims and policy, but the fact remains that the action of the Party, as a Party, has been on lines which it has regarded as making primarily for betterment within the existing system and not at all for the immediate establishment of a new system of industrial, social or political life.

Thus industrially, socially and politically the Trade Union and Labour movement recognises, as a movement, that the immediate and future well-being of the workers can be established only by a recognition of the existing systems of industrial, social and political life, and by a gradual modification and improvement of those. Within the movement there are groups and coteries which declare otherwise, but the national Trade Union and Labour movement moves and acts on the lines just stated. And it could hardly do otherwise. For, in the first place, the so-called "advanced" elements in the movement are a small minority. Collectivist Socialists (whether of the Independent Labour Party, the British Socialist Party, or the National Socialist Party), Guild Socialists, Syndicalists, and others who argue and work for the establishment of an entirely new system of industrial, social and political life, include within their ranks a mere handful of the industrial population; and they present among themselves as many different sections as there are groups. It is no injustice to them to say that, on the whole, their work and influence produce fewer converts to their own ranks than dissentients from the ranks of Trade Unionism and Labour, who are thereby rendered incapable of any sustained constructive action. That is where their danger, and it is a real and present danger, lies.

In the second place, the Trade Union and Labour movement represents little more than one-third of the workers of the country, and the vast majority of those whom it does represent cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be termed Revolutionary or Utopian: they are either solid, level-headed working men, who see that any sudden break with the existing system of industrial, social, and political life is impracticable and would be disastrous; or they are content to be merely members of the movement, taking from it such advantages as it can create for them. And it must not be forgotten that the great increase of Trade Union membership in recent years is largely due to

the operation of the National Insurance Act, and that that increase includes a very large number of members whose Trade Unionism is of an exceedingly passive, if not actually indifferent, kind. To say these things is not to make any hostile criticism of the Trade Union and Labour movement. They are facts known to every active, intelligent Trade Unionist, and they are among the fundamental facts which keep the Trade Union and Labour movement upon the lines of a moderate industrial and political policy.

We believe that the circumstances of the industrial world will keep the Trade Union and Labour movement upon the lines of a moderate policy for a long time to come. We do not speak now of the circumstances of the industrial world in the larger sense, as including international competition, the need for increased production, the development of new processes, etc., but simply in the narrower sense of the circumstances of organised Labour. So long as the vast proportion of the workers who are organised in the Trade Union and Labour movement are men of moderate views, trusting for their increasing welfare rather to the improvement of conditions of which they have personal and daily experience than to the hasty setting-up of systems which have not yet got beyond the stage of vague abstractions and ideals, so long must the Trade Union and Labour movement limit itself mainly to ameliorative effort within the existing system of industrial, social and political life. Similarly, if the Trade Union and Labour movement is to win the membership and the support of that vast body of workers who are still outside the movement, it must limit its aims to the moderate and the practicable. The moderate and the practicable eliminate the revolutionary. So far as industry is concerned, they mean that the existence and the functions of both Capital and Labour must be recognised; that the existing system of industry must be the basis of gradual but real improvement of industrial conditions; and that the co-operation of Capital and Labour within that system is the sanest, surest, most efficacious, and most lasting means of effecting the maximum of well-being for Capital, Labour, and the State alike.

CONSCRIPTION OF WEALTH.

USED as a catch-phrase the term "Conscription of Wealth" has, no doubt, fulfilled the mission designed by its author, that is to say, the phrase has ensnared the fancy of a large number of people who are not in the habit of enquiring too closely into the precise significance of the words they employ. Such persons are always ready to accept any proposition at its face value and to assume that an analogy with a prepossessing exterior has sterling qualities behind it. The suggestion that wealth ought to be conscripted because Labour is conscripted has only to be formulated, therefore, to be immediately fallen in love with, at first sight, by a circle of indiscriminating admirers. The obvious truism that life is more valuable than money catches the mind's eye, the apparent analogy is recognised in a flash and another maxim is added to the repertory of that section of the public which delights in living and thinking by rule of thumb.

As a weapon in class warfare the efficacy of the phrase depends on its lack of definition and consequently those who are the most lavish in its use are careful to preserve its quality of vagueness. It is enough for them to know that conscription of wealth is something that will injure the capitalist, and so they are content to let the implied analogy do its work, recognising that the efficacy of labels is greater than the force of arguments.

Let us examine this implied analogy and see how far it holds and where it leads us. In its primary sense "conscription" means personal service compulsorily exacted by the State. The extent of this service varies according to circumstances, but in the ordinary acceptation of the word, conscription compels all male citizens, with very few exceptions, who fall within certain limits of age and who come up to a certain physical standard, to serve in a naval or military capacity under such conditions, at such times, and for such periods as the properly constituted authority may determine. Conscription differs from the Corvée in that the service exacted is remunerated, and it differs from slavery in that no unnecessary interference with personal liberty is imposed, nothing being demanded from the conscript that hundreds of thousands of men from all over the world are not proud to offer of their own free will. Under the British Constitution, moreover, conscription cannot be enforced except by the vote of the elected representatives of the people, and there is not the least doubt that if the issue could be submitted to the straight vote of the British

nation to-morrow the verdict would be for the continuance of conscription for the duration of the war. This disposes of the suggestion which stands at the threshold of the supposed analogy —viz., that compulsory service is a penal measure imposed on an unwilling nation. The next implication that lurks behind the phrase is that conscription applies more particularly to Labour than to the other classes in the community. It is true, of course, that if you count heads the working-class element predominates in the ranks of the Army of to-day, but having regard to the numerical strength of the contrasted groups it may be said without fear of contradiction that, so far as any inequality exists, a smaller proportion of the professional and leisured classes have escaped the meshes of conscription's net than is the case with Labour. The Military Service Act is no respecter of persons and exemption from its incidence can only be claimed by an inconsiderable number of ministers of religion, by a handful of Quakers and genuine conscientious objectors, and by men employed in exempted occupations, such as engineers, miners, railwaymen and the like. Not only are all classes liable, but now that officers' commissions can only be obtained through the ranks it follows that the same type of service is demanded from master and man, rich and poor. No doubt the educated man has a better chance of promotion than the unlettered, but this is inevitable. On the other hand, service in the ranks entails the maximum degree of hardship upon those who are least accustomed to the experience of rough living. It will be seen, therefore, that there is a *suggestio falsi* in dragging the question of class into the argument at all, and that it would be more correct to say that man-power has been subjected to a compulsory levy, rather than that Labour has been conscripted.

Another implied suggestion, and one which is equally untrue, is that when a man is conscripted his expectation of life is thereby reduced almost to vanishing point. In reality, if you deduct the losses suffered by the voluntarily attested men from the total number of killed, and if you also take into consideration the number of men who between August, 1914, and October, 1917, would have died by disease or accident had they remained in their previous occupations, it is doubtful whether the toll of life taken by the war amounts to five per cent. of all the conscripts—that is to say, that out of every twenty men compulsorily enlisted, nineteen are alive to-day. In saying this we are far from desiring to minimise the risks to which our soldiers are subjected, far from understating the valour with which they face those risks; we merely indicate for the purpose of our

argument that conscription does not necessarily, or even probably, involve loss of life.

Passing to the second half of this false analogy, it is claimed that wealth should be conscripted because man-power has been requisitioned. If it be wise and right to conscript wealth or if it will enable us to win the war, by all means let it be conscripted, and the sooner the better; but before coming to a decision the question should be examined on its merits, not settled out of hand because of its imaginary parallelism with another set of circumstances which have no bearing whatever upon the subject. At any rate, let us clear the ground and define our position.

What is meant by conscription of wealth? Does it indicate progressive taxation or is confiscation intended? If the latter interpretation is the true one, is confiscation to be absolute or partial? The War Emergency Workers' National Committee demands that "the entire riches of this island be conscripted and placed at the disposal of the community at large." In other quarters the more moderate claim of a ten per cent. levy on capital has been advanced. The *New Age* proposes that the machinery for collecting death duties should be put into operation against the living owners of capital. Elsewhere this proposal is amplified by the suggestion that, by a legal fiction, every person should be legally deemed to have died and to have become his own heir. The plan advocated by Mr. W. C. Anderson, M.P., is to sequestrate all unearned incomes until further notice. Under this system all rents, interest, dividends, annuities, etc., would cease to be payable to the present recipients and be transferred to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who, through the Public Trustee, would provide subsistence allowances at Army rates of pay to those expropriated owners who might be unable to obtain work at wages. To appreciate the full magnificence of Mr. Anderson's conception one has only to visualise the popular ovation which would be accorded to a Chancellor of the Exchequer should he announce in Parliament that his Government had decided to sequestrate the interest on the National War Bonds which his predecessor had urged the people to buy as the premier gilt-edged security of the British Empire.

Having decided upon the conscription of wealth we have to discover what constitutes riches and fix a point below which the poverty line begins. If an engineer earns five pounds a week is he poor? and if a widow has an unearned income of £250 a year is she rich? Into which category does George Lansbury's pound-a-day man fall? Again, if confiscation is

to apply both to invested capital and to the income it produces, how are you going to deal with fashionable surgeons, painters, novelists, lawyers, music-hall artistes and others whose capital consists in their personality or their skill? Are you going to penalise thrift and endow speculation? Is the State to repudiate its obligations and refuse to repay the loans borrowed from Americans, or, alternatively, are we to differentiate against our own people in favour of foreign creditors? The host of such questions as these is interminable, and the more you try to unravel the skein the more knots will you find in the ever-increasing tangle. Even if you should come to the conclusion that fairness demands that wealth should be confiscated it still remains to be proved that such a drastic change of system would advantage the proletariat in the long run. As things are at present capital is reproductive; but if you destroy security and its handmaid credit, capital will either migrate or become sterile. Obviously that part of capital which consists of machinery, railways, docks, buildings, etc., cannot migrate. But without new capital factories cannot be reconverted into industrial concerns after the war, and any interference with credit would hopelessly handicap the country, especially during the Reconstruction period.

It has been pointed out that if the experiment of conscripting wealth is attempted the result is likely to be that whilst much capital will irrevocably be lost to the community in the process, the remainder will be administered by those least competent to employ it to the best advantage in the national interest.

Whence comes this demand for the conscription of wealth? Does it originate amongst those citizens who voluntarily rallied to the Colours when war fell upon us? Far from it! From the conscripts, then? Not so! The demand is made and supported not by those who are fighting for Britain on land, at sea, and in the air, not by those who risk their lives to bring us food, not by the very poor, but by those in enjoyment of soft billets at home, led by agitators who are always finding fault with England and justifying Germany, who abuse our American allies, who foment strikes, who preach class-war and who encourage resistance to the law of the land. Let the men who matter demand conscription of wealth because it is just, reasonable, and wise, and their arguments will be listened to with respect and consideration; but as long as the demand comes from a source which has so marked and so constant an affinity for everything that militates against an intense prosecution of the war, it will continue to be looked upon with suspicion.

WORKS COMMITTEES AND INDUSTRIAL COUNCILS.

In spite of danger, discomfort, weariness and nerve strain of unprecedented intensity, the British Army at the front still remains a happy family in a sense which cannot truthfully be said to apply to all civilian communities at home; though here also the war has created a new spirit of mutual sympathy and common effort. This quality of cohesion and mutual support which draws together so many men of so many different classes is due to a variety of causes. The Army is inspired by a great ideal, it subordinates individual advantage to the well-being of the whole, and it is face to face with realities which throw into sharp relief the futilities of internal dissension. Discipline suppresses the mischief makers. The officer is taught to regard the care of his men as his first duty—he learns to seek their safety before his own. The men respond by emulating, if they cannot surpass, the devotion of their leaders. The party-wall of class is broken down.

When the war is over, when the Army has done its part in saving the world from the threatened domination of the "insane despoiler of our civilisation," it will return to the pursuits of peace and to the labours of reconstructing industry. The soldiers will become civilians, and though reabsorbed in mine, factory and office, they will never lose their sense of camaraderie, and the old days of common interest and common hope will be "remembered with advantages."

The problem is how to preserve, so far as possible, this spirit of co-operation and amity after the war, when so many difficult adjustments in industrial life will have to be made. It is our part to set our house in order and to ensure that no avoidable grievances, no unnecessary grounds for friction, shall compromise the future outlook.

It is generally agreed that if the old spirit of mutual suspicion and hostility between employers and employed is not exorcised there will be an industrial class war which may wreck industry and make financial burdens resulting from the great war insupportable. It is as generally admitted that, given an *esprit de corps* in the workshops, productivity may be vastly increased, and, as a consequence, wages raised, profits increased, and the public debt easily liquidated.

What are the forces arrayed against the creation of an industrial peace, and how can they be met? That is the question which stands in importance in a class by itself.

The mutual suspicion of employer and employed and the insistence upon the assumption that their interests are antagonistic can only be removed by a willingness to let bygones be bygones, and by an honest search for those interests which the two classes have in common.

If employers could rid themselves of all possibility of being charged with regarding labour as a commodity, subject to a law of supply and demand, and if the workers could realise that increase of real wages can only be secured by increase of production, then the ground would be cleared for building an effective co-operative Commonwealth.

The necessary assumption is that no industry is worth carrying on that cannot provide a healthy and happy life for the workers with reasonable security of livelihood, decent and independent provision for old age, with progressive facilities for educating their children.

The industrial organisation of to-day was not created by living employers and workers. It was inherited from a past which has much that was bad in it. It can be improved by an evolutionary but not by a revolutionary process.

The forces of revolution have had many opportunities for growth during the war. They are growing rapidly to-day, fed by incessant propaganda. As yet they are not so strong that the great mass of moderate opinion cannot be organised against them. But such organisation is absolutely necessary, and it must be begun at once or it may be too late. Those most familiar with the currents of the thought of Labour are convinced that the revolutionary forces may be defeated if honest constructive work on statesmanlike lines is undertaken now.

The first thing needed is to find a means of giving effect to the demand of Labour for some share in the control of Industry. That does not necessarily mean control of the high politics of manufacture, but it does emphatically mean some control of the conditions of workshop life.

In addition to this fundamental measure it is necessary that the immediate, deliberate and avowed object of all concerned must be to secure the essentials of a decent life for the worker, including security of employment during periods of trade depression.

It is believed that if these aims are loyally undertaken and conscientiously pursued by employers there is no fear but that the loyalty of the workers will be secured, and that agreements made by their representatives will be kept.

A Proposed Method of Securing the Co-operation of Employers and Employed in Consonance with these Aims.

It is evident that if all concerned work together to secure these ends they will be attained more readily than if they are left to politicians while employers and employed pursue their individual interests separately, meeting only to dispute as to the demands of Labour.

The report of the Reconstruction Sub-Committee, known as the Whitley Report, is an outline of a scheme for bringing employers and employed together to discuss these matters. It is at present before the country, having been adopted by the War Cabinet "as part of the policy which they hope to see carried into effect in the field of Industrial Reconstruction."

Mr. G. H. Roberts, the Minister of Labour, concludes his circular letter conveying the information to employers' associations and trade unions as follows: "If the spirit which has enabled all classes to overcome by willing co-operation the innumerable dangers and difficulties which have beset us during the war is applied to the problem of reconstruction, I am convinced that they can be solved in a way which will lay the foundation of the future prosperity of the country and of those engaged in its great industries."

1. The Whitley Report applies primarily to industries in which there exist representative organisations of employers and employed.

2. It is assumed:—

(*a*) that such organisations are essential for a permanent improvement in the relations of employers and employed.

(*b*) that improved relations between employers and employed must rest on something other than a cash basis—*i.e.*, that the workers must have greater opportunity for the discussion and adjustment of questions which affect their interest in the industry.

(*c*) that it is nationally important that the recognition of the identity of interests between all classes established during the war must be continued after the war.

3. It is proposed:—

(*a*) that Joint Standing Industrial Councils of employers and employed, with District Committees and Works Committees, be set up in the several industries, or developed out of existing institutions.

(*b*) that regard be paid to sections of each industry and the various classes of labour involved.

(*c*) that these bodies meet regularly and often.

4. It is suggested:

that, in addition to questions of rates of pay and conditions of employment, such matters as the following might be discussed by these bodies:

(*a*) The use of the practical knowledge of the workers and the safeguarding of the workers' interest in improvements introduced by them.

(*b*) The security of employment and earnings.

(*c*) Technical education.

(*d*) Industrial research.

(*e*) Legislation affecting the industry.

(*f*) The special question of demobilisation.

The Trade Union Congress referred the Whitley Report to its Parliamentary Committee, but the comments of that body have not yet been presented. The Ministry of Labour, however, in response to a circular letter addressed to all employers' associations and trade unions, has received replies from a large number of those organisations generally favouring the adoption of the proposals. As a result of these replies the War Cabinet has, as previously stated, adopted the Report.

It is most important to realise the high status of the proposed Joint Standing Industrial Council for each industry, and the fact that these bodies will consist of equal numbers of representatives of the employers' associations and trade unions. According to the Minister of Labour they will be recognised "*as the official Standing Consultation Committees to the Government on* all *future questions affecting the industries which they represent, and they will be the normal channel through which the opinion and experience of an industry will be sought on all questions with which the industry is concerned.*"

The position, therefore, would appear to be favourable for a fair discussion of these proposals and to an honest attempt to put them into practice. The scheme offers the workers a means of securing a considerable share in the control of industry. Our readers are, however, aware that there are a large number of irreconcilables determined to organise a class war of "Capitalists" and "Wage Slaves." The general public, also, has recently had their attention drawn to the existence of

what a writer in *The Times* has called "The Ferment of Revolution." As has already been stated in these pages, the "Rank and File Movement," whose object, according to "Solidarity," is to "force up wages, force down hours, and insist on such improved conditions of employment that the capitalists will find it cheaper to retire," has pledged itself "to obtain the support of all branches of the various unions concerned to oppose any alliance between Capital and Labour that does not invest the control of the industries in the hands of the workers." The Industrial Workers of the World are out for the same policy. They differ from the Amalgamated Committee of the "Rank and File" only in that, instead of seeking to transform the existing trade union organisation of crafts into an organisation of industries, they aim at the formation of a single Industrial Union.

Another body opposed to any truce in the "Class War" is the National Guilds League. This organisation is composed rather of middle-class "intellectuals" than of workers. It presented to the Trade Union Congress certain "Observations" on the Whitley Report. The gist of this document is that since the League seeks to abolish the "Wages System" and the "Master Class" its objects are inconsistent with any proposals for securing a permanent improvement in the relations between employers and workmen. It states that if the proposals are carried out in the spirit in which they appear to be made their effect on Trade Unionism will be disastrous; and that, since there is a *fundamental antagonism* between the two sides, although discussions may be useful, there should never be any sense of an *Assembly* of one body but only a *Meeting* of two bodies. Further, it states that a condition of acceptance of the proposals by Labour must be that the scheme must begin with the Works Committees and not with the National Council, "*so that the power of trade union leaders to foster good relations between employers and employed may be removed.*"

There is a common tendency, even among responsible persons, including trade union officials, to ignore or at least to minimise the activities of these and similar bodies. It is easy also to rate them too high, but the fact that the May strikes in the munitions works were organised by the "Rank and File" in defiance of the trade unions concerned shows that they have the power, in favourable circumstances, to do incalculable mischief. The growth of the Amalgamation Movement of the "Rank and File" among the engineering and allied

trades is also significant. The figures for the October Conference are not yet available.

	Nov., 1916.	March, 1917.	June, 1917.
Total number of Delegates	120	160	188
Delegates from outside the Conference Town	86	160	182
Towns sending Delegates	28	36	72
Number of A.S.E. branches represented after deducting local representatives	39	38	72

In any case it is obvious that to strengthen the hands of those among the employers and employed who are seeking to work together for the common good and are willing to discuss broad measures having for their object to improve the condition of the workers and the granting to them a reasonable say in the determination of workshop conditions, and in other matters of high importance, such as those suggested by the Whitley Report, cannot but tend to influence the moderate men among the workers, and strengthen them to resist the efforts of the irreconcilables to engage them in a " class war."

THE NO-CONSCRIPTION FELLOWSHIP.

THE N.C.F. was founded towards the end of 1914. The idea was first mooted by one or two correspondents in the *Labour Leader* who, fearing that the war, if of lengthy duration, would necessitate the adoption of conscription, suggested that those who disapproved of British intervention and who might be called up as conscripts should band themselves together in an organisation to resist Military Service. The proposal was approved by the editor, Mr. Fenner Brockway (I.L.P. and U.D.C.), and he invited men of military age who objected to Army service to communicate with him at his private address. On November 12th, 1914, Mr. Brockway stated that he had received a large number of letters approving his scheme, and he therefore proposed that a League should be formed immediately, composed of persons of military age who would refuse to bear arms under any circumstances. A week later he announced that he had received the names of 150 men between the ages of 18 and 38 " who are not prepared to take the part of a combatant in the war." This was the beginning of the No-Conscription Fellowship.

As Mr. Brockway was thus the originator of the N.C.F. it may be of interest to give his views on the war, for they go far to explain his ardent desire to organise resistance to any form of military service. In his editorial notes on August 20th, 1914, we are told that " it is monstrously unfair to thrust upon the war lords of Germany all the responsibility of the conflict. It may be true that they have held a pistol at the head of Europe, but is there not some justification for a man whipping out his pistol when he is surrounded by armed enemies plotting his downfall ? That has been the position of Germany. During the last ten years Great Britain, France and Russia have deliberately schemed to isolate and degrade Germany. . . ." " It is all very well to speak of Germany's military arrogance, but what of Britain's naval arrogance ? " Again, " We are fighting Germany not because we think that the mailed fist of her military caste is a danger to Europe or to small peoples or to German democracy. We are fighting Germany because we are jealous and afraid of her increasing power ; for that reason, and that reason only." In the same issue Mr. Brockway announces that " 400,000 copies of the manifesto " against the war " have already been despatched for distribution," and " the National Council (I.L.P.) has decided to reprint Mr. Ramsay Macdonald's reply to Sir Edward Grey (" Why we are

at war ") as a leaflet, and to supply copies free to branches, the carriage only being charged." " We need not," says the editor, " press on our readers the importance of securing the widest possible circulation for Mr. Macdonald's overwhelming indictment of the foreign policy of the Government which has been so largely responsible for the war." In the *Labour Leader* of September 3rd, 1914, Mr. Brockway refers to the Labour Party's decision to assist recruiting for the Army : " When we read of this decision we bowed our heads with shame. It is the most crushing blow we have suffered since the party was formed ; nothing that our enemies have inflicted upon us has been half so terrible." In the same issue he writes : " The despatch of Indian troops to the front is one of the most disgraceful features of this altogether disgraceful war," and on the next page he informs us that " the aggression of German militarism is not comparable with the aggression of British naval power," and that " the triumph of German militarism " need not have meant " the destruction of Belgian integrity and independence, the ruin of France, and the establishment of a hostile and inimical Power at our very doors." In the issue of October 8th, 1914, we are told that in the training camps " dirt, drunkenness, disease, and vice appear to be the general rule, and the character of the towns in which the recruits are stationed is becoming besmirched and degraded."

These quotations from the editorial notes and articles in the *Labour Leader* indicate that the No-Conscription Fellowship was started by a man who, as shown by his writings, is a wholehearted apologist for Germany and a resolute depreciator of his country's case. It is not true that the N.C.F. was formed by a few amiable Pacifists and conscientious Quakers. The Quakers were in the minority, and at the conferences they seldom intervened, except to advise a more moderate course than that proposed by the extreme majority. *The Tribunal* and *The Spur* make no secret of their determination to use conscience as a lever against patriotism.

About the end of November 1914, it was announced that the N.C.F. had been duly inaugurated, with Mr. Fenner Brockway as secretary. The Chairman was Mr. Clifford Allen (I.L.P. and U.D.C.), author of " Is Germany right and Britain wrong ? " Another of the founders was C. H. Norman of the I.L.P. and the Stop the War Committee, most of whose war pamphlets have been destroyed by the authorities. Mr. J. H. Hudson, M.A., the I.L.P. candidate for Eccles, and a member of the General Council of U.D.C., was also on the Committee.

Yet another official member was Councillor Kneeshaw of Birmingham, a prolific pamphleteer and a chronic agitator. A number of Quakers joined the N.C.F. but the members of the I.L.P. and the U.D.C. were, and are, the prominent persons in the N.C.F. The membership form is as follows: "The No-Conscription Fellowship is an organisation of men likely to be called upon to undertake Military Service in the event of conscription, who will refuse, from conscientious motives, to bear arms because they consider human life to be sacred and cannot, therefore, assume the responsibility of taking human life. They deny the right of governments to say "you *shall* bear arms," and will oppose every effort to introduce compulsory Military Service into Great Britain. Should such efforts be successful, they will, whatever the consequences may be, obey their conscientious convictions rather than the commands of the Government."

At one of the Conferences of the N.C.F. held in 1915 in London it was proposed to amend this form by introducing words to the effect that they regard human life as sacred and could not take life, "except in the case of a social revolution," when the workers might be justified in taking the lives of their oppressors. This amendment received a good number of votes but it was not carried.

It will be observed that whilst the membership of the No-Conscription Fellowship consists mainly of C.O.s the motive of the originators was political rather than conscientious. During the initial stages of the organisation all the stress was laid on the pacifist, what we may call the Morellian, aspect of the situation, and it was only when the appeal to pro-Germanism looked like falling flat that we heard much about scruples against the taking of human life. The Conscience Clause was added as a sort of postscript for tactical reasons.

It is impossible to separate the activities of the N.C.F. from the anti-war propaganda of the I.L.P. and the U.D.C. and many of the Rank and File stalwarts are also supporters of the Fellowship. Within the last eighteen months there have been indications of a cleavage within the ranks of the N.C.F. The less extreme C.O's. have accepted alternative Service and many of them are now working under the Home Office scheme. They boast that the value of the work they do does not, by any means, cover the cost of maintaining them, and there were numerous complaints from the districts in which they "work" about the good time they have and about the treatment they receive which is said to be much better than that of soldiers.

It is the attitude that many of the leaders adopt towards alternative service which alienates public sympathy. That a man's conscience should forbid him to take human life is understandable and worthy of admiration, but that anybody's religious convictions should prevent him from joining an ambulance corps or becoming a hospital orderly argues that there must be something radically wrong with the disciple of such a perverted moral code.

The New Age (Sept. 27th, 1917), disposes of Mrs. Hobhouse's contention that conscientious objectors are justified in refusing to perform work of national importance, on the ground that such work is ancillary to military service, by pointing out that the men who choose to go to prison rather than change their occupation are resisting authority for the sake of opposition and not because they cannot bring themselves to take human life. The shortsightedness of conscientious objectors who encourage lawlessness is emphasised by the fact that it is only the law which gives them their right to escape military service, and that without the protection of the law they would be at the mercy of the mob.

Many of the leaders of the N.C.F. oppose alternative service, and accept the consequences, mainly in order to set an example to their followers. Clifford Allen has refused to be medically examined because he would be rejected as unfit and this might lead some conscientious objectors to believe he had purposely taken advantage of his physical infirmity to escape imprisonment. Mr. Scott Duckers of the " Stop the War Committee " is another leader who has refused the Home Office scheme, either as a matter of policy or for conscience' sake.

Whatever views we may hold on the subject of military conscription it is impossible to feel anything but regret that a dilemma should have arisen which compels the Government either to condone breaches of the law or else to send men to prison with hard labour for offences which are wrongheaded rather than criminal. At the same time it is difficult to feel any sympathy for men like those two C.O's. at Princetown who are said to have " only joined the Quakers for the duration of the war," and it is impossible to find any justification for the practice of picketing the approaches to the meeting places of Tribunals and waylaying normal applicants for exemption with the object of persuading them to pose as fraudulent objectors on the score of conscience.

THE RANK AND FILE MOVEMENT.

Part III.

THE strikes in Sheffield and Barrow in November, 1916, though of moderate dimensions and short duration, served the purposes for which they were engineered; for besides achieving their ostensible object, which was to prevent any encroachment on the privileges enjoyed by the A.S.E. with regard to the administration of the Military Service Act, they enhanced the prestige of the R. & F. leaders, tested their organisation, increased class consciousness, and established a precedent for the claim of "no victimisation." Confessedly these strikes were experimental, and when a settlement was reached there was no pretence that the cessation of hostilities was intended to be anything but a temporary armistice. "The agreement between the two parties," said an official of the strike, "is not worth the paper on which it is written. The only thing is to fight."

There is a quality common to all forms of warfare which has to be reckoned with in industrial strife no less than in military operations. The appetite for conquest increases with victory, and added bitterness is engendered by defeat. Peace also is progressive in its tendency, and its prolonged maintenance improves the future whilst it consolidates the present outlook. This is well understood by the champions of class war, and this is why they are so strongly opposed at all times to any efforts which have for their object the elimination of the opportunities for friction. As a characteristic example of this temper may be instanced the manifesto issued by the Vigilance Committee of the National Guilds League against the interim report of the Reconstruction Committee of Joint Standing Industrial Councils. This document declares with insistence that nothing is further from the hopes of the N.G.L. than "a permanent improvement in the relations between employers and workmen." That Guild will listen to no compromise and will accept nothing short of the abolition of the Master class. It considers that the result of the conciliatory spirit of the Whitley Sub-Committee would, if given effect to, be disastrous to the future of Trade Unionism, and it postulates the desideratum that any relationship between Capital and Labour ought to be rendered impossible.

Whilst the result of the strike on the Clyde, which must be counted as a set-back for Syndicalism, embittered the leaders of the defeated party, the Sheffield strike of November, 1916, must be reckoned as a R. & F. victory, which whetted the appe-

tite for further conquest. Consequently, the immediate sequel to the Sheffield-Barrow trouble was a recrudescence of effort directed towards the extension of the machinery which had achieved this measure of success. If, argued the promoters, the new methods of industrial warfare are to produce the maximum effect better organisation for concerted action must be provided; so as soon as the strike was over there radiated from Sheffield a fresh outburst of activity. Propaganda by public meeting and pamphleteering, organisation by secret conference and workshop canvassing increased and multiplied. Missionaries travelled up and down the country preparing the ground in important industrial centres, with the result that shop-stewards and workers' committees were formed at Liverpool, Manchester, Coventry, Bristol, and other places.

Meanwhile W. F. Watson and his Amalgamation Committee were not idle. We have seen that the R. & F. meeting at Leeds had given the A.S.E. executive until mid-February to call an official conference to consider the proposed amalgamation of all unions in engineering industry. This request (which was in the nature of an impertinence) was ignored, and so another R. & F. Conference was summoned to meet at Birmingham on March 3rd, 1917. This gathering, the largest and most important hitherto held, was attended by 160 delegates representing branches from as far north as Invergordon to as far south as the Isle of Wight. It is worthy of mention, however, that the City of Birmingham itself was not represented by a single delegate. In the absence of the President, Mr. Dan Roll, Mr. S. A. Wakeling took the chair, and the first business on the agenda paper was to consider what steps should be taken to give effect to the Leeds resolution now that the A.S.E. executive had refused to be dictated to. The Amalgamation Committee found themselves in a difficulty. As an unofficial body they were not in a position constitutionally to convene an official conference. Nevertheless, they decided to do so and placed a resolution to this effect on the agenda, the secretary declaring "that when constitutional methods fail . . . unconstitutional methods must be resorted to."

According to Watson the policy of the A.S.E. at this time was to amalgamate all the skilled men into one craft union and all the unskilled into another, with a working agreement between the two. Watson's scheme, on the other hand, was to form a single industrial union for the whole of the engineering trades irrespective of craft, age or sex. His immediate object, therefore, was to forestall the A.S.E. executive, and to get his

Engineers' Industrial Union into working order at the earliest possible moment. As things turned out, however, the progress made in this direction at the Birmingham Conference was inconsiderable, although much time was spent in discussing the ways and means of accomplishing the desired object.

Speaking as the leader of the Sheffield Workers' Committee, J. T. Murphy said that in spite of all their propaganda they were still in a minority and had not yet sufficient power to control the executive of the unions. "Just as economic power," he said, "precedes political, so in this case we must first of all organise in the workshops. The fundamental question is how best we can organise along scientific lines to get control of industry." He therefore urged the delegates to form local workers' committees which should subsequently be linked together in a National Workers' Committee, in order that the whole organisation should be in a position to carry on the class war effectively.

The principal resolution at this March conference was moved by W. F. Watson, and ran as follows: "In view of the fact that the Executive Committee of the A.S.E. has not acceded to the demand of the R. & F. to convene a conference of all unions for the purpose of drawing up a scheme of amalgamation, this conference of Trades Councils, allied Trades Committees, Local Amalgamation Committees, Trade Unions, District Committees and Trade Union Branches instructs the Metal, Engineering and Shipbuilding Amalgamation Committee to convene a preliminary conference to take place in the first week in June, 1917. All unions catering for engineering workers to be invited and the basis of representation to be two officials and two members of the rank and file (holding no full-time office) from each Union."

The debate on this resolution was protracted owing to some of the speakers being disposed to limit the delegation within narrower bounds than those desired by Watson. Various amendments were brought forward, with the result that the more moderate proposals were negatived, whilst the aggressive ones were carried. Amongst the latter may be mentioned the following: "This Rank and File Conference urges all members of the business to strenuously oppose their respective executives entering into anything in the form of an industrial truce with the employers." Other resolutions pledged the delegates to resist industrial conscription, arbitration, and any form of compulsory trade unionism as agreed upon between the Government and executives of Trade Unions. The general tenour of

the speeches made by the leaders (and especially the Sheffield group) indicated three main lines of policy: the first being to rely upon the Shop-stewards and Workers' Committees to create the atmosphere favourable to direct action, the second to capture the workshop vote before risking a trial of strength with the Trade Union Executives, and the third to oppose anything in the nature of an agreement with the Government or with employers which might interfere with freedom to take direct action whenever such a course might appear desirable on tactical grounds.

In concluding his report the Secretary made a stirring appeal to the delegates to go back to their districts "more than ever determined to bring about Industrial Unionism. Every delegate must be a soldier in the working class army with that requisite self-reliance and courage without which no revolutionary movement can be successful." Judging by results Watson's advice was taken to heart, and following closely upon the conference there arose a crop of trouble in several industrial centres. Shop-stewards discovered new grievances, and advanced new excuses for advocating strikes. Matters came to a head at Barrow towards the end of the month, when the engineers downed tools and, despite many appeals from the Board of Admiralty, Ministry of Munitions, and A.S.E. Executive, remained on strike for a fortnight.

NOTE.—A short official Report of the Third National Rank and File Conference, held at Birmingham, March 3rd and 4th, 1917, is published by the Metal, Engineering and Shipbuilding Amalgamation Committee, 29, Theobald's Road, London, W.C. Price 2d.

FOOD FOR THOUGHT.

Sir Auckland Geddes has made a happy discovery, and one which has eluded the notice of too many public men. He has realised that the way to treat sensible folk is to speak out fearlessly and to make a direct appeal to their intelligence instead of issuing orders that will be misunderstood and misrepresented because no explanation is given of the reasons which render necessary the measures which those orders enforce. As examples of the sort of plain speaking we refer to, it would be difficult to improve upon the following. Warning the unpatriotic section of the rich, he says: "Unless people are prepared to pull their weight in the national boat they cannot expect to share the national food." Addressing the unpatriotic section of middle-class women, he states: "There is a great class of young, quite healthy middle-class feminity which is doing nothing to help the war along. To them I speak. Get busy, go to the nearest employment exchange, find out what is wanted, and do it if you can. If you cannot, get busy and learn how to do it." Challenging those who accuse British labour of universal slacking and chronic drunkenness, he points to the actual material results which Labour has achieved during the war, and, referring to the would-be wreckers of Industrial Peace and National Unity, he declares: "They are playing the German game, whether they mean to or no. You watch the man who says Germany is willing to make peace; she is not. . . . You watch the man who goes about saying we cannot win. You watch the man who says he does not care who wins. Watch the man who says this is a Capitalists' war. Capitalists' war? This is a people's war. What do you suppose America came in for. To make money? No, she stopped making money the day she declared war. Does anyone really suppose that the capitalist class as a whole is making money out of the war? A few individuals may, but they are very few. No, speaking broadly, the only people who have not lost money through the war in this country are the wage earners. It is in truth a people's war fought to crush the spirit of Kaiserism."

This language is not agreeable to those agitators who desire to exhibit capitalism in a uniformly unfavourable light, and a chorus of dissent has accordingly been raised on the platform and in the columns of a section of the Press. In *The Call* of October 18th Mr. J. T. Walton Newbold, a pacifist, a firm

supporter of the Rank and File movement and the author of "How Europe Armed for War," writes on "Auckland the Apposite," whom he describes as one of the "gilded proletarians of private enterprise." Whilst he is careful to make no very definite charge, Mr. Newbold contrives to insinuate that the views of the Director of National Service are coloured in some mysterious fashion to suit the interests of "his old paymasters." To this non-existent nail he ties a tag accusing the directors of the North-Eastern Railway of exploiting the workers and expropriating the rest of the Capitalist class by means of the war. As Sir Auckland Geddes happens to be an anatomist by profession, not a railway magnate, a greater mental effort than we are capable of is required to appreciate the inference.

Mr. Newbold's familiarity with the financial secrets of Armament Firms does not allow him to deny that America stopped making money the day she entered the war, but rather than admit that American capitalists can be actuated by any but ignoble motives, he is ready with an argument to explain their action in supporting the war, and this is the argument: Capitalism is threatened with dissolution by the increasing rate at which wealth is produced. This surplus wealth cannot find outlets for profitable investment in a world market where too many capitalist nations jostle one another. Therefore America came into the war to save Wall Street finance.

The Herald of October 13th still harps on the theme of impending Industrial Conscription in spite of all assurances to the contrary, and pretends to believe that the policy of the National Service Department and the *Times* articles on "The Ferment of Revolution" are "both integral parts of a big attack on Labour which is coming upon us very soon."

Mr. W. N. Ewer, of the U.D.C., and a conscientious objector, believes that no scheme of national service can succeed under a capitalist Government, "for," says he, "the moment you begin the task of organising your nation industrially for the common purpose of victory you find that there is no nation to organise. You find yourself up against the insistent fact of the class-war. And against that fact every scheme must come hopelessly to ruin." If Mr. Ewer is not mistaken we have no alternative but to choose between ruin and the results of chronic class war.

Mr. George Lansbury is not the only person who has cultivated a distaste for air raids, but we hope the conclusions which he arrives at are unique. His argument runs as follows:—

(i.) Employers starve women and children in the hope of breaking the spirit of the workers, and now Governments use aerial warfare against women and children for the same purpose.

(ii.) If Great Britain and America build 20,000 aeroplanes Germany will do the same.

(iii.) Experts are agreed that the war will be settled in the air, therefore, "all we have experienced during the past few weeks will be mere child's play to what may happen to us in the near future."

(iv.) If London and other great cities are to be brought permanently within the war zone, and "*if the country is determined to continue the war and face all that air warfare means*" (our italics), certain steps will have to be taken to ensure even a minimum of safety. But, in Mr. Lansbury's opinion, "the proper thing to do is not to sanction the creation of these tens of thousands of air machines unless it is first of all proved absolutely necessary," and he is "certain that civilisation will be simply blotted out if the thing is carried through as those who advocate it wish it to be done."

We would give Mr. Lansbury the benefit of any doubt that may exist as to his precise meaning, but if he suggests in all seriousness that our determination to win the war should be diminished by the smallest fraction of an iota because of air raids—if he really means that our output of aeroplanes should be restricted deliberately because it may lead to retaliation—then we assert that the man who can bring himself to use such an argument is absolutely and hopelessly out of touch with the whole spirit of the British Empire. If this country should be seduced by such counsel she would betray her Allies, disgrace her dearest traditions, and strike a discordant note which would re-echo through all the coming centuries. She would earn, and richly deserve, the title of fool, the epithet of craven.

It is said that in Southern China pigeons are furnished with tin whistles attached to their tails with the object of frightening the hawks. This fantastic trick is preferable to the device adopted by those exponents of the new camouflage who don albino plumage in the vain hope of conciliating their enemies.

" Though armed only with a three-pounder gun, outranged by her opponent, she refused to haul down her flag, even when the skipper had both legs shot off, and most of the crew were killed or injured. ' Throw the confidential books overboard and throw me after them,' said the skipper. Refusing to leave his ship when the few survivors took to the boat, he went down with his trawler." In these few words the Prime Minister recounted the epic story of a British trawler attacked by a German submarine. During the same sitting Mr. Arthur Ponsonby, M.P., in a speech of considerable length, tried to persuade the House of Commons to relieve Pacifists from the inconvenience of having their correspondence censored, knowing full well that were absolute inviolability ensured to all domestic correspondence the enemy would take full advantage of the opportunity. When is Mr. Ponsonby going to relieve Stirling Burghs from the inconvenience of being misrepresented in Parliament ?

The result of the recent ballot in the South Wales coalfields is an augury of the greatest promise. By a large majority the miners have answered the straight question put to them by deciding to help the Government to recruit from the pits in spite of the desperate efforts of the disloyalists to induce them to swerve from the patriotic course. That it should be necessary to take a ballot at all on such a question at such a time is not a subject for congratulation ; and, left to themselves, the miners would never have had to prove their manhood at the ballot box. Aberavon is one of the centres which has been subjected to intensive cultivation by the pacifists during the past twelve months, with the result that the Powell Duffryn Colliery at Aberavon is one of the very few centres where an unpatriotic vote has been cast. It is said that in this colliery the committee served out ballot papers only to men under forty-one years of age. How many members of the said Committee are cricketers ?

Mr. Brace, M.P., believes that gregory powder should be administered without the traditional admixture of conciliatory jam. The British workman is of the same mind and prefers straight talk to insincere flattery. Mr. Brace told his audience of miners that they had no right to ask for special privileges nor to talk about downing tools until the soldiers had a chance of dropping theirs. At the end of his speech Mr. Brace received loud and prolonged applause.

An outstanding feature of the attitude of those who preach class war is their claim to exclusive privilege in the province of verbal aggression. In this preserve they permit no poaching. To do them justice they cannot be accused of mincing their words or of hiding their irreconcilability under a bushel. At the same time the boldest fire-eaters are thin skinned to a ludicrous extent and are always ready with a squeal if their opponents show any indication of hitting back. The device is an old one and has been practised since time immemorial by angry women with no small measure of success.

The American Press continues its revelations on the I.W.W. movement. Part of an explanatory statement issued by the Government Attorneys, who directed the investigations, reads as follows: "The astounding feature which stands out at the conclusion of the investigation . . . . is found in the disclosure of the number of men enjoying the protection of the Government who are so far unmindful of social duties and obligations as to openly advocate the most vicious forms of sabotage, particularly in industries engaged in furnishing war munitions. . . . Boiled down and stated in a few words the propaganda of the defendants consists of three assertions. 'We are going to take possession of the industries of this country, first, because we want them; second, because we need them; third, because we are, in this crisis, possessed of the power to put it over.' In addition there is running through all these endeavours a pronounced opposition to the support of the war, ... the teaching being that whatever can be done to make the power of the enemy greater or our power of resistance less affective is a service to the organisation."

The Unites States is not technically at war with the Austrian Empire and consequently strict surveillance is not exercised over Austrians and Hungarians, whose activities are therefore, unrestrained. This may account for the large, almost predominating influence exerted by Austrians at the present time throughout the ranks of the I.W.W. in America. Another reason for this may perhaps be found in the solicitude of the Austrian ambassador for his "poor down-trodden fellow countrymen." A comparatively small coterie of individuals is understood to have directed the entire movement. President Wilson has appointed a Commission to visit the localities where strikes and disagreements have been most frequent. Whenever it is deemed advisable, conferences will be called

with the purpose of working out a mutual understanding between employers and employed which will ensure the continued operation of industry on conditions acceptable to both sides.

If we follow the simple rule of resisting what Germany wants we shall make few mistakes, and if we assume that people whose views habitually coincide with German wishes are disloyalists, we shall more often be right than wrong. Applying these tests to the utterances of certain self-styled revolutionaries we shall find that they are consistent in one thing only and that is in the pursuit of projects which incline towards the advantage of Germany. If you charge a militant member of the B.S.P. with acting unpatriotically during the war he will explain that he is an internationalist and does not believe in the aspirations of local patriotism. He tells you that the only frontier he recognises is that which divides class from class, the only division he approves is that between employers and employed. Nevertheless, with arrant inconsistency, he supports the Sinn Feiners who, whatever else they may be, are extreme Nationalists before everything. The pacifist who declares all war to be unrighteous has no word of condemnation for Mr. de Valera when he organises for conflict. In theory the Syndicalist is bitterly opposed to all monopoly, but when he comes up against the practical difficulties of conducting the class war he summons to his aid what he asseverates is immoral in others. "Monopoly is power," writes J. T. Murphy, in one of his pamphlets, "therefore aim to secure a monopoly of labour power in your industry. . . . This is the way to power. This is the way along which you must go to change your status from that of wage earners to controllers of industry."

A certain newspaper with the misleading title of *Common Sense* is essentially an individualistic journal which supports International Capitalism and which opposes Socialism. Yet it sells like hot cakes at I.L.P. and other Socialist meetings. Why? Apparently for the reason that it favours a "Morel" peace and declaims against the war measures of the Government. So we are forced to the conclusion that to indulge the satisfaction of being convinced that "my country is always wrong" is so great a treat that it will gild even the capitalistic pill.

The disasters which have recently befallen Italy should convince her allies of the folly of countenancing any form of

anti-war and seditious propaganda. It is no secret that the collapse of the 2nd army was due rather to pacificism instigated by the enemy than to any military inferiority. The *New Statesman,* of Nov. 3rd, attributes the tragedy to they influence of pacifists working on the discontent caused by the scarcity of food. For some weeks English pacifists have been expecting internal troubles to break out in Italy, such anticipation being based to some extent on information supplied by E. D. Morel, who is often well-informed on Italian affairs. (It was Signor Giolitti's daughter who translated Morel's book, "Truth and the War.")

Four Socialists, described by Mr. Ramsay Macdonald as Jingoes, visited Russia to study the Revolution. The outcome of their visit is described in the following extract from a letter addressed to Morel from Rome and published in the *Labour Leader* of August 16th. "The four delegates, Lerda, Labriola, Raimondo and Cappa have returned from Russia convinced that the war must be finished at once, and they are going about saying this to everybody."

Two of the leading anti-war Socialists of Italy, Modigliani and Lazzari, who attended the conference of allied socialists held in London in August, were interviewed by Mr. J. Fineberg, of the British Socialist Party, and they stated that the Italian workers were opposed to the war and that the Italian Socialist Party is unanimously against it. Judging from the tone of the Pacifist Press the announcement that the Allies might expect to encounter a setback on the Italian front was not altogether a displeasing item of news to a section of the anti-war brotherhood in Great Britain.

"For members to misrepresent our views in the British House of Commons, knowing that their misrepresentation will receive currency among our enemies, is one of the greatest disservices which any man can render his country."—The Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour, M.P.

Strong motives must drive people who conspire against national unity in these days when the civilised world is struggling for existence against the obscene Hun masquerading in

the garb of humanity. Some, including Pacifists, Internationalists and Conscientious Objectors, may be honestly moved by something in the nature of religious and humanitarian sentiment. Others, such as those of the National Guilds League, may be obsessed by the horror of Industrialism, organised only for "profit," resulting in miles of joyless slums and millions of half-developed human beings. Others, similarly obsessed are only conscious on the one hand of a capitalistic system, which regards Labour as a commodity, the market price of which is to be kept down by a supply of unemployed surplus workers, and, on the other hand, an over-centralised Trade Union Organisation which leaves insufficient scope for the initiative of thousands who have a mind to contribute to the government of their union. Hence the self-styled "Rank and File" movement, which is equally opposed to the Trade Union leaders and to the employers. These people see in the confusion and absorption of war an opportunity for pushing their own social and political ideas.

In America the Government discourages the process which tends to convert humanitarian sentiments into anti-national propaganda. In this country we shall be fortunate if, without disaster, we can continue to permit ourselves the luxury of our traditional toleration.

Finally it is suggested Industrial Peace can only be achieved by a generous recognition of the fact that an Industry organised for any other end than the ultimate fulness of life of those engaged in it is imperfectly organised, however great the volume of wealth produced.

In the world of politics we have long been accustomed to see the greater part of the male adult population enfranchised. The men of Little Pudlington vote heartily on questions affecting the governance of India, fortunately, as some think, with little effect. In the world of Industry, however, the worker has not as yet been allowed to have his say on matters on which he has a living daily experience. But the Government now suggests that he should be given a measure of Home Rule by means of the Workshop Committees, the Constituencies of the Parliament of his Industry, the proposed National Industrial Councils.

INDUSTRIAL PEACE

CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations

The Root of the Matter

The Abolition of Leaving Certificates

The Rank and File Movement. Part IV

Thc Industrial Balance of Power

Profiteering and Finance

More Haste Less Speed

British Socialist Party

Food for Thought

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

THE following abbreviations are occasionally used in the following pages and should be noted for future reference:—

A.S.E.	... ...	Amalgamated Society of Engineers.
B.S.P.	... ...	British Socialist Party.
B.W.L.	... ...	British Workers' League.
C.L.C.	... ...	Central Labour College.
C.O.	... ...	Conscientious Objector.
C.W.C.	... ...	Clyde Workers Committee.
D.R.R.	... ...	Defence of the Realm Regulations.
E.A.T.C.	... ...	Engineering and Allied Trades Committee.
E.T.U.	... ...	Electrical Trades Union.
F.O.R.	... ...	Fellowship of Reconciliation.
I.L.P.	... ...	Independent Labour Party.
I.W.W.	... ...	Industrial Workers of the World.
M. of M.	... ...	Ministry of Munitions.
M.S.A.	... ...	Military Service Act.
M.W.A.	... ...	Munitions of War Act.
N.A.C.	... ...	National Administrative Council.
N.C.C.L.	... ...	National Council of Civil Liberties.
N.C.F.	... ...	No Conscription Fellowship.
N.G.L.	... ...	National Guilds League.
N.U.R.	... ...	National Union of Railwaymen.
N.U.T.	... ...	National Union of Teachers.
P.N.C.	... ...	Peace by Negotiations Council.
R.F.M.	... ...	Rank and File Movement.
S.L.P.	... ...	Socialist Labour Party.
S.P.Gt.B.	... ...	Socialist Party of Great Britain.
S.S.C.	... ...	Social Science Classes.
T.U.C.	... ...	Trade Union Congress.
U.D.C.	... ...	Union of Democratic Control.
U.M.W.A.	... ...	United Machine Workers' Association.
W.E.A.	... ...	Workers' Educational Association.
W.I.L.	... ...	Women's International League.
W.L.L.	... ...	Women's Labour League.
W.P.C.	... ...	Women's Peace Crusade.
W.S.D.C.	... ...	Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates Council.
W.S.P.U.	... ...	Women's Social and Political Union.
W.U.	... ...	Workers' Union.
W.W.U.	... ...	Women Workers' Union.

INDUSTRIAL PEACE

THE ROOT OF THE MATTER.

THE conflicting forces that revolve about the central question of Industrial Peace *versus* Class War are so numerous and so contradictory that our vision is in constant danger of being blurred, our judgment of losing its poise, as succeeding aspects of the problem present themselves, unless we are careful to return periodically to a review of the elemental position. From time to time, therefore, it will be necessary to look beyond the particular controversies of the moment and to reconsider the main proposition in the light of first principles. Such a course has the double advantage that it enables our readers to understand more clearly the object we have in view when we deal with matters which, at first sight, appear to lie outside our province whilst, at the same time, it concentrates our attention within the limits which we marked out for ourselves when we first undertook the task of examining the geography of that part of the social system which is included in our projected survey.

There are many who believe, or, what amounts to much the same thing, act as if they believed, that Capitalism as at present constituted is the only solution of the Industrial Problem. This school harbours a minority of the purse-proud and the tyrannical, but is mainly composed of the upholders of tradition for tradition's sake. Such people are inclined, according to their individual temperament, either to "let sleeping dogs lie" or to arm themselves with the first stick that comes to hand. They are twice in error, firstly because their opponents are particularly wide awake, and, secondly, because the sort of counter aggression they propose will bring about the very thing which they are most anxious to avoid. There are others who believe, or who pretend to believe, that Capitalism in all its forms is inimical to human progress and that the Ideal State will never arrive until Socialism is triumphant both in theory and in practice. This school consists for the most part of well meaning and detached souls who, however, make no effectual protest when the irreconcilable and malicious elements amongst them take the lead and set the pace. Such people are inclined to allow their valour to outrun their discretion, their instinct to destroy before they are ready to build, their method

to ignore hard facts and to trust to specious ideas. They are wrong because there is no short cut to Heaven, no wisdom in leading their ill-provisioned dupes from comparative safety into the unexplored beyond that may turn out to be little better than a wilderness of disappointed hopes.

Between these protagonists come the great mass of Englishmen, honest, unimaginative, wedded to inertia and preoccupied with the great war, who do not trouble overmuch about the industrial future so long as an appearance of internal peace is maintained, but who can be relied upon to do the right thing when, but not before, it is thrust upon their notice. It is to this court especially that we make our appeal. We hope to convince them that, on the attacking side, the Class war is a present reality and a growing danger. We hope to persuade them that, on the defending side, a policy can be found which will satisfy the requirements of humanity, justice and stability and which will not unduly favour any one class to the detriment of the others. We submit that this desired solution can be reached by resisting the demands of both schools of extremists and by following the dictates of common sense uninfluenced by any considerations other than the ultimate good of the whole nation. We do not advocate the adoption of any scheme which is far-fetched or even novel, and we set ourselves in willing opposition only to those who, by their own admission, put class hatred before patriotism. Complete, unchequered peace in industry is too much to hope for, but we are convinced that goodwill must prevail against malice in nine cases out of ten, provided always that we first discover and remove those grievances which are legitimate, reasonable and important.

A cursory survey of the Industrial World will establish the fact that the interests of the good workman are fundamentally in harmony with those of the good employer, the converse being true when men and masters are selfish and inefficient. We shall not have to go very deeply into the matter to make the additional discovery that the interests of the Consumer and the interests of the Producer float on the same keel. The problem, therefore, is to eliminate the bad employer and to improve the bad workman. This cannot be done by a stroke of the pen, but a great advance can be made towards this objective by the establishment of a system which automatically tends to reward the best, and to penalise the worst, elements in each category.

From the manufacturers' point of view the ultimate object of business is increased production. So only may he legitimately aspire to the rewards of increased consideration. There is no

room in the national economy for inefficiency and limitation based on local custom or family tradition. The employer of labour has duties which are more insistent than any rights. He must learn that it is he who should set the standard of courtesy and honour between man and man which will turn his factory from a prison of grudging toil into a workshop of glad endeavour. The type of employer who imagines that he is conferring a favour by graciously allowing others to work for him is one of the baneful anachronisms that must be relegated to the scrap heap without delay. The only method by which the manufacturer can secure increased production is to induce his men to take an interest in securing it and this can only be done by giving them a real and immediate share in the resulting prosperity—not by so-called profit sharing—but by an efficiency bonus over and above an adequate standard rate of pay. Until the employer learns to discard the old shibboleth which declares that men are "spoilt" by earning too much money he cannot expect that the workman will relinquish his old prejudice against improved machinery.

From the workman's point of view the chief desiderata are security against unemployment, progressive increase in real wages, and a say in the conditions of workshop control. He must educate himself out of believing in the discredited fallacy that there is any such thing as a fixed wages fund and he must learn to look upon improved machinery as his helpful coadjutor in increasing his output, not as a rival threatening his means of livelihood. He must give up talking nonsense about wage slavery and take a pride in his work as the natural and healthy pursuit of a self-respecting human being. He must come to think of "ca'canny" as a petty and mean trick beneath his dignity and injurious to his own interests.

From the consumer's point of view increased output means cheaper commodities without deterioration of quality. The cheapness of commodities enhances the real value of wages and improves the standard of living. Trade disputes which hold up production injure the consumer whilst at the same time they diminish wages actually in point of cash and relatively in point of higher prices.

From the viewpoint of the social reformer security of employment and higher wages bring into the range of practical politics better housing, improved hygiene, less fatigue, more education and the disappearance of the submerged tenth. These reforms mean the genesis of a higher average type and the advance of human progress becomes accelerative in an ever

increasing ratio. As a preliminary step and until such time as an all round improved system of industry can be got into working order let everybody concerned help forward the first stages of reconstruction and see to it that, so far as in him lies, the minimum requirements are nowhere lacking. These minimum requirements have been formulated by Mr. B. S. Rowntree and demand that the wages of unskilled men must be such " as will enable them to live in a decent house and provide the necessaries of physical efficiency for a normal family while allowing a reasonable margin for contingencies and recreation."

From the point of view of the general public outside the ranks of productive industry increased wealth and greater efficiency will amplify and fertilise the whole outlook so that, unhampered by internal dissensions, the British Empire can take the place in the world which its genius deserves and can advance worthily in the van of the nations.

This optimistic forecast is no chimera of fancy, no hollow promise of a grinder of axes. It is ours for the taking so long as we keep our heads, grudge no thinking and pull all together. But first and foremost we have got to win the war. If we lose it, which can only come about through rank treachery or criminal *felo de se,* all our hopes of industrial reform and social regeneration would be shattered, and because of the shame it would be better if we had never been born. With such a choice of prospects before us how can we falter for a single instant ? No price is too great for victory, no punishment too severe for defeat. Therefore, let us be prodigal, sparing not the dregs of effort, spending our last reserve.

And, while the war is yet in the winning, let us waste no time in bickering about domestic adjustments, but devote every ounce of energy which cannot be used against Germany to the task of well and truly laying the foundations of industrial peace. There is no limit to the possibilities of achievement, nothing to stand in our way except the drag of stupidity and the cult of civil strife. The irreconcilable agitator is the only active enemy in our path. It is he that seeks to undermine national unity by preaching class war; it is he that stirs up unrest in the workshop by fomenting strikes; it is he that sneers at the nation's sacrifice, whilst himself remaining under cover; and it is he that adheres, when he dares, to the King's foreign enemies. Irreconcilable agitators may not be numerous, but the evidence of their existence is wellnigh omnipresent. Turn which way you will you will find the trail of the serpent: distorting facts,

hinting at dark practices, driving the wedge of suspicion, whispering against our Allies, depressing the nation's confidence, attempting to sap discipline, girding at unnecessary restrictions and blocking schemes of reconstruction.

In addition to the positive mischief which he accomplishes, energy that might otherwise be usefully employed elsewhere is directed to the task of attempting to curb his activities. In other lands his kind have been successful in bringing about unparalleled disasters from which the world may never entirely recover. Let us not be deceived, as others have been. His poison is insidious, doing its work by inches, unseen until the fatal results are manifest. Let us be warned in time, and, if for reasons of high policy the Government decides that drastic interference is not called for, let us minimise the influence of the wreckers by redoubling our efforts towards reconciliation in the way, not only of exhorting our fellows, but still more in that of example, so that by plain living and unselfish service we may at least do our part in helping to remove the reproach that they have laid upon the nation.

THE ABOLITION OF LEAVING CERTIFICATES

BY THE MINISTRY OF MUNITIONS AS FROM OCTOBER 15TH, 1917.

DURING the last two years many observers have been genuinely perplexed by the steady dislike of the working-classes for "Section VII." of the Munitions of War Act, 1915. The decision taken in the early months of 1915 to restrict the mobility of labour passed into law amid general acquiescence. The first great rush to the old war contracting establishments was past. The new munitions programme, for the eventual expansion of which no limits could be foreseen, called for a better check on movement than had been supplied by the Defence of the Realm Regulations. The patriotism of the Government in seeking to meet this need was beyond doubt. Its measures, judged by the character of the emergency in which the nation stood, were moderate. Nor was its diplomacy in fault. The trade unions, as spokesmen of the classes principally affected, had been consulted and had consented on terms. Thus the circumstances under which the section was devised and its contents alike appeared to justify hopes for its success. It reads thus :—

Subsections (1) *and* (2) *Munitions of War Act*, 1915.

(1) A person shall not give employment to a workman who has within the last previous six weeks, or such other period as may be provided by Order of the Minister of Munitions as respects any class of establishment, been employed on or in connexion with munitions work in any establishment of a class to which the provisions of this section are applied by Order of the Minister of Munitions, unless he holds a certificate from the employer by whom he was last so employed that he left work with the consent of his employer or a certificate from the munitions tribunal that the consent has been unreasonably withheld.

(2) If any workman or his trade union representative complains to a munitions tribunal in accordance with rules made with respect to those tribunals that the consent of an employer has been unreasonably withheld that tribunal may, after examining into the case, if they think fit grant a certificate which shall, for the purpose of this section, have the same effect as a certificate from the employer.

These words scarcely sound like the death-knell of freedom. If a man is employed on munitions he must continue in that employment until released by certificate, while the employers' power is limited by the workman's right of appeal to a tribunal. The restraint thus imposed on workmen might well be thought to reflect, without *arrière pensée*, the mere incidence of duty for those, whether eligible or not for military service, whose lot has been cast in the munitions factories. It is advantageous of course for an employer to have his labour assured to him, but it is not more profitable than the Limitation of Profits Sections in the Munitions Acts and the Finance Acts permit. On the other hand the Fair Wages Clause, which forms part of all Government contracts, requires the payment of standard rates. The Prime Minister's historic circular forbade the cutting of piece rates. From the outset the tribunals have tended to give workmen permission to leave if they could "better" themselves thereby. This practice was explicitly recognised and extended in the Amending Act of 1916. Innumerable other pleas have been urged successfully before the tribunals. Migration has occurred, now and then, on a not inconsiderable scale. Most employers have understood that if a man's heart is set on leaving it is bad policy to keep him. To call the section on these grounds a dead letter would be paradoxical. But it would be equally misleading to minimise either the migration which has occurred or the restraining effect of other factors, such as insufficient housing and the difficulties of transport, for these have been at least as effective as the legal restraint.

Let it be admitted, however, that Section VII., along with other factors, has restricted movement. On mobility depends, to a great extent, the industrial power of labour. Has labour suffered in consequence? The answer is "yes" and "no." It is even possible that "no" outweighs "yes." When mobility is impaired from a natural cause for which no one is to blame, and which cannot be made a matter of negotiation, compensation is not usually forthcoming. But an artificial immobility by consent inevitably tends to be compensated. The men will argue that the employers cannot have both advantages. If by arrangement their labour is secured to them they must pay the rates which that labour, but for the surrender of its mobility, would have obtained elsewhere. To this argument, tacit but powerful, there is no real answer. Certainly the employers have found none. Under the leverage of Section VII. a great levelling of rates has been accomplished. The district standards have won new emphasis. Within old

and well-defined districts and within comparable classes of labour anomalies of rating have been eliminated to a great extent. The men's protest has often been impatient and sharp partly because not a few of the grievances were of long standing. But already, perhaps, the prestige of district rates is beginning to wane. Section VII. may be said to have done its paradoxical work on rates. Its abolition has opened a new epoch in which we may expect to see a campaign aimed at ambitious assimilations. Nor need this new epoch be one of great migration, if events since October 15th are a good criterion of the future. There has been no spectacular rush to fill the better paid posts, because, for one thing, these have not been vacated. The abolition of Section VII. has built no houses nor moved any. Train, tramway and 'bus services are inadequate as before. But though migration remains fairly normal there is a growing clamour for the equalisation of rates in cases where the grounds of comparison appear to be airy and far-fetched. Exasperated by its easy but empty success against Section VII. labour has shown a tendency to revert to strikes. Notices to leave have been served by the thousand. Not many of these have been carried out, or, let us hope, are likely to be. But the threat will suffice to sweep away some anomalies. Other differences in rating, more justly founded, may succumb under the general pressure. Thereafter industry will settle down to its normal *malaise* and to the physicians and cures which providence has appointed for it. October 15th neither ended nor began anything. Before that date, to put it roundly, no one, or very few, moved, but everyone talked about mobility and called for compensation for the loss of it. And since October 15th no one's desire to migrate has grown, but the cry for compensation is louder and bolder. Section VII., or its repeal, whichever you like, has only put a new edge on an old weapon.

The great experiment in restraint of mobility is over. It is immaterial now to discuss whether, when the end came, the repeal of the Section, designed under one Minister and carried out under another, was due more to the strength of the attack or to the weakness in defence. It is impossible, too, to strike a balance between the real substance of the men's grievance and the enlarged proportions which adroit exploitation lend it. But certain morals may be drawn from the affair, and these are of more than academic interest at a time when scarcely anyone hesitates to prescribe for the renovation of the conditions of industry. Whatever schemes are proposed for the fusion of interests that tend to clash, whatever new functions may be

suggested for the various parties in production, the schemes and the functions are as nothing unless they fit and satisfy the men and women concerned. These men and women have habits, predilections and policies which must not be ignored. Of some of these, but for Section VII., we should be less sure than we now are. The classes that lay under the disabilities of the section, shaking themselves free of these with downright emphasis, have proclaimed themselves wage-earners. Long experience has taught them to trust to collective pressure for advancing their interests. If mobility is abolished, or even reduced, this pressure, they know well, will be weaker. They insist therefore on mobility. Yet the mobility of labour is often little better than a phrase. It exists rather as a threat, than as a desire or an actual power. Need anyone wonder that workmen have been so unwilling to bargain with the little of it they possess? By reserving the right of movement they signalise their unwillingness to identify themselves with the fortunes of individual firms. Under the shelter of Section VII. many firms have striven to effect this identification. Their measure, such as the stimulation of output by better methods of payment, some of which are virtually profit-sharing, the growing practice of consultation, welfare, provision, etc., have doubtless increased goodwill between masters and men. And in some quarters a claim is being made, more on behalf of workpeople than by them, for a voice in management. Yet in face of the uprising against Section VII. this claim, it is clear, does not mean that workmen are ready to settle down, for better or for worse, in the service of whoever may chance to be their employers. They cherish above all the right to leave. The problems of finance and management they feel are the province of others. The solution of these problems with the due rewards and windfalls, they are inclined to leave in the present hands, subject always to their resolve to press increasingly for higher wages. They are right in the main and more right than they know. Only a motive amounting to compulsion will ensure a thoroughly scientific organisation of industry or the best use of capital. No factor will affect employers so cogently as high wages. Management is still on many sides an undeveloped art in industry. Its development is going to be due to the workpeople, but not by their taking it up in person.

Two comments suggest themselves. First, that the circumstances of the war have laid a sinister and indeed monstrous emphasis on wages. Hundreds of thousands of men and women are now earning sums far above their pre-war dreams. Advances,

moreover, have followed fast on each other's heels. Workmen may be forgiven for thinking that the "Wages Fund" is infinitely elastic. The expansion is mainly due, of course, to the lower value of money and to non-commercial production. But the workmen will not reckon so. While disavowing responsibility for management and avoiding acquaintance with its problems they will be tempted to count on an equal elasticity in wages after the determining conditions have changed. It will not be easy to apply adequate counter-agents against this tendency. But these must be found. It is for the employers and the trade union leaders to devise ways and means of modifying the extravagant expectations of wage-earners. And, second, to promote solidarity a vast task will be thrown on the employers. They will be required in future to organise their shops so as to swell output and thereby wages above pre-war figures. Many employers are admittedly unequal to this task in ways that need not be specified. For their deficiencies of intelligence and experience the most potent aid is education. Machinery and agencies must be found whereby the needful knowledge may be made available. Whether the State should develop the means of education—and these will be very various—in the closest co-operation with industry or should leave this work wholly to organisations of masters need not be discussed here. It is enough to insist that the problem is one of *personnel* and therefore at bottom an educational problem.

THE RANK AND FILE MOVEMENT.
Part IV.

AN erroneous impression of a very misleading character has been made on the public mind owing to the Rank and File movement, which is essentially syndicalistic in its origin and aims, being referred to in the Press as the Shop Stewards movement. This latter term would more properly be used to describe the demand for decentralisation in the Trade Union world which is so well defined a feature in current labour thought. That these two movements should have been confused is unfortunate but not to be wondered at because, whilst the points of contact are on the surface, the points of separation are latent. It is the fact that Shop Stewards in certain districts have taken a prominent part in the Rank and File agitation; true also that the Syndicalist policy depends for its success upon the co-operation of the Shop Stewards, but this is the extent of the connection, and no greater mistake could be made than to conclude that a majority of Shop Stewards, as such, have followed or are likely to follow the lead of Mr. W. F. Watson and his lieutenants.

As Syndicalists are inspired by what lawyers call "*animus furandi*," *i.e.*, in plain English, the intention to seize and hold what doesn't belong to them, and as, without the help of the mass of the workers, who have no such intention, they cannot achieve their object, it follows that Syndicalist spokesmen must be placed in such positions that they may be able to misrepresent their fellows with some show of authority. An election of spokesmen nominated *ad hoc*, besides being an impracticable proposition, would not have suited the syndicalist book because a straight vote on a clear issue is the very last thing they desire. Under these circumstances the material for a supply of ready-made spokesmen was sought for and found in the already existing institution of Shop Stewards.

These unpaid officials being the lowest grade of the Trade Union hierarchy are to a large extent self-appointed, that is to say, almost anybody who wants the job can have it. If an election of Shop Stewards takes place it is generally only as a matter of form and but a small percentage of the workers take the trouble to vote. From the point of view of the leaders of the Rank and File movement no more convenient arrangement could be imagined; here was a corps of experts in the art of discovering and presenting grievances, men enjoying a measure of popularity, men in the closest touch with the workers in the shops, who were already established as minor officials without

the need of a series of contested elections. Small wonder then that full advantage was taken of such a promising opportunity. The plan was to work through the Chairmen and Conveners of Shop Stewards who, by virtue of their office, are the proper persons to marshal their subordinates, to instruct them in their duties and to keep them up to their work. The early history of the Rank and File movement is very largely, therefore, a record of the activities of the Shop Stewards in those districts where the movement has "caught on." The systematic employment of these officials as a political force developed in chronological succession on the Clyde, at Sheffield and at Barrow. The results of this development were seen in December 1915 on the Clyde, in November 1916 at Sheffield, and in March 1917 at Barrow.

For some months Barrow had been one of the munition centres to which the leaders of the Rank and File movement had been paying special attention. In consequence of the resulting agitation much discontent became apparent in the district and threats were made that, if certain alleged grievances were not immediately and satisfactorily settled, resort would be had to "direct action."

At this juncture the Government was particularly anxious about the submarine menace. Germany had begun to make us feel the first effects of her intensified submarine campaign and the list of torpedoed merchantmen was already long enough to make level-headed people realise the gravity of the situation. In order to obviate any risk of a stoppage of work in the ship-building and ship repairing yards at such a crisis the reasonable precaution was taken by Government of ensuring that the men concerned in this particular industry should not be left in any doubt as to the reality of the submarine peril. Consequently, on March 20th, Sir Lynden Maccassey visited Barrow on behalf of the Admiralty and addressed a meeting of Engineer delegates in the Town Hall. The national danger arising out of the new enemy campaign was fully explained to the delegates, who were told certain facts which were not accessible to the general public so that they should be in a position to judge for themselves as to the supreme importance of Barrow's share in the task of maintaining the national food supply and of helping the Navy to defeat this novel and serious attack on the safety of England. Sir Lynden Maccassey's appeal was reinforced by telegrams from the First Lord of the Admiralty and from Sir John Jellicoe, who urged that every possible effort should be made to increase production and to expedite repairs. Obviously no greater or more authoritative appeal could possibly be made to any body

of patriotic Englishmen, but, unless the accounts of the Town Hall meeting have been grossly misreported, the assembled delegates disregarded the appeal and adopted an attitude of aggression which was remarkable for its unanimity and for its irreconcilability. There were about 200 delegates present, and not one of them had the courage openly to put principle before party or to subordinate local and personal grievances to the interests of the nation as a whole.

We can imagine grievances so intolerable and so urgent that the sufferers therefrom lose all sense of proportion and become unable to discuss anything except the question of their removal. But what would be the attitude of persons in such a situation? Would they not press their grievances in a spirit of earnestness and proceed by enlisting the support of their Trade Union executive, by submitting their case in the first instance through constitutional channels and by resorting to "direct action" only when other means had failed? If their grievance were against their employers, would they not take the opportunity of bringing the matter to the attention of the representative of the Government who had come to meet them in conference, and if he were unable to promise satisfaction would they not have then and there announced their intention of striking to compel attention to their demands? None of these steps were taken by the Barrow engineers. The appeal to their patriotism was met in a spirit of levity and incredulity, the serious issues being ignored and petty heckling on comparatively trivial points of detail being indulged in, such as the behaviour of foremen under certain imaginary circumstances, the question of the substitution of women for apprentices, the problematical action of the Government after the war, and so on. But the most significant feature of this meeting was the silence that was maintained on the subject of the impending strike. There can be no reasonable doubt that this had already been decided upon, for within eighteen hours after the meeting, viz., at 5 p.m. on March 21st, the night shifts at Messrs. Vickers downed tools and their example was followed by the day shifts who should have come to work the next morning.

A detailed account of all the mass meetings, conferences, manifestos and ballots that took place during the continuance of the Barrow strike of March-April 1917 would occupy more space than we can devote to the subject, and we must refer those of our readers who are sufficiently interested to fuller sources of information. The following extracts from the official statement issued by the Government contain, however, the main features of the course of events during the first week of the strike.

"It is understood from reports of mass meetings which took place on Thursday, March 22nd, and Sunday, March 25th, that the cause of the trouble is the alleged cutting of the time allowance for work done under the premium bonus system and discontent with the rate fixing generally. In reply to enquiries, however, on March 21st the local Trade Union officials representing the men chiefly concerned, stated that though they heard a rumour that a strike was intended owing to grievances on the subjects mentioned, they had not been approached by the men in the matter, except in regard to the cases which were already receiving the attention of the district Committee of the A.S.E. According to information available the strike was organised by the Shop Stewards on their own initiative and without the sanction or knowledge of the recognised Trade Unions.

"At the mass meeting held on March 22nd a resolution was carried to the effect that the chief rate fixer be dismissed and that the strike should continue until this had been done and the rate fixing adjusted. On Friday, March 23rd, the Minister of Labour held a conference of the executive officials of the A.S.E. and other allied trades. As a result of that conference the Trade Unions there represented sent the following telegram to the men on strike in the district :

> "'The executive representatives of the allied engineering unions disapprove of the stoppage of work at Barrow and instruct members to resume work immediately : the matters in dispute to be referred to the Minister of Labour, who agrees to have the question of alleged cutting of premium bonus time allowance considered and settled within seven days after the resumption of work. The award to be made retrospective.'

"This telegram was approved by the Minister of Labour. On the same evening the executive officials of the A.S.E. and other allied trades proceeded to Barrow for the purpose of impressing upon the men the serious character of their action and urging them to accept the offer made to them by the Minister of Labour. . . . The offer of the Minister of Labour was, however, rejected and a resolution passed to the effect that the men must stay on strike until their grievances were rectified. On March 26th the matter was referred to the War Cabinet, who endorsed the attitude adopted by the Minister of Labour and the offer made by him. A statement to this effect was made in the House of Commons by Mr. Bonar Law on the same evening. This statement called attention to the fact that the interruption of the production of munitions of war occasioned by this strike was

looked upon by the Government with the utmost gravity and declared that stoppage of work at this time, when other methods of settlement of disputes are open to the men and the employers, cannot be too strongly deprecated. . . . Further mass meetings were held on Wednesday, March 28th, when a ballot vote was taken. The majority vote was still in favour of continuing the strike until the alleged grievances were rectified. The Minister of Labour, however, determined to give the men a further chance of resuming work by consent. He arranged accordingly for the executive Council of the A.S.E. again to proceed to Barrow on the night of March 28th. Since their arrival the Council have continuously endeavoured to persuade the men to return to work. . . . . In spite of this the men determined by a large majority, on April 1st, to remain on strike.

"It will be seen that the men have struck work without notice and without bringing their complaints to the notice of the firm or the Government for adjustment, and further that they have definitely refused to listen to the urgent advice of their leaders or to accept the repeated offer of the Government to consider their grievances. The works have been continuously open and are still open for the men to return. The production of munitions of the most vital national importance is being greatly delayed. In the circumstances the Government are bound to regard the matter as one of grave consequence, and they will immediately consider the steps necessary to deal with it."

The studious moderation of the official statement above quoted must be admitted even by those who make it an article of faith that men on strike are never in the wrong, but it fell on deaf ears and was followed by no visible weakening in the determination of the strikers to have their own way no matter at what cost. The appeal made by Sir Lynden Maccassey on March 20th was addressed primarily to delegates and at a time when no strike was actually in progress. It might be argued, therefore, that the responsibility for its rejection rested with those delegates and not with the mass of the workers who conceivably might not be fully informed as to the facts of the case. The publication of the official statement, however, whilst not diminishing the responsibility of the leaders, enlarged the issue and gave the men an opportunity of asserting themselves. Moreover, on the eve of the ballot taken on the 28th yet another appeal was made by the First Lord of the Admiralty, who telegraphed :—

"The strike at Barrow is having a serious effect on the output of shells for the Navy. The Government have

promised the men arbitration and a decision within a week if they return at once. The men of the Fleet rely upon their comrades in the workshops to stand by them against the common enemy."

This telegram was extensively published in the district but it proved of no avail, for when the ballot was taken 2,838 voted against a resumption of work on the terms proposed by the Minister of Labour and only 218 for it. That only 3,000 out of the 10,000 men affected took part in the ballot may be accounted for superficially by the explanation that 3,000 were absent on holiday and that 4,000 were neutral, but the fact that 70 per cent. of the workers should fail to register their vote at such a crisis is of the utmost significance and should receive the most earnest consideration. It is this indifference which gives agitators a power out of all proportion to their merits and which makes bad history. What is it in the English character that induces us to pay lip tribute to democracy and at the same time almost invariably permits minorities to decide vital issues which affect the whole future of the nation?

It may be that the method of personal canvassing on an undignified basis, as carried out by so many parliamentary and municipal candidates, has bred a habit of reluctance to respond to appeals which are too obviously opportunist; it may be that the majority have no convictions; it may be that they have not the courage of such opinions as they hold, or it may be that long continued dependence on the leadership of others has destroyed all independent initiative; but, whatever the explanation, this state of affairs remains a root problem which has got to be faced and solved if evolution is to proceed on the lines of stable reason and not on the lines of unaccountable *laissez-faire*. If we cannot combine on any other issue let those of us who hold contrary opinions on matters social, industrial and political join our forces at this one point and do our best to ensure that, in the world of industry at any rate, ballots shall reflect the will of the majority rather than the achievements of the wire pullers. Disasters brought about by external forces over which we have no control are sufficiently grievous, disasters invited by sloth and encouraged by indifference are inexcusable. A national service that all good citizens can perform is to use their utmost endeavour by example and by precept not to allow important judgments to go by default.

◆ ◆ ◆

THE INDUSTRIAL BALANCE OF POWER.

BALANCE of Power is a political or diplomatic doctrine usually associated with the inter-relations of Governments. There are some who assert that the present conflict in Europe is mainly due to the pursuit of this policy; if so the results are a sufficient condemnation of its practice, since it means a catastrophe when any nation feels itself strong enough to upset the balance and to challenge the *status quo*. Whether the critics be right or wrong in political matters, it is certain that industry has in the past been formulated much in the same way, relying on arguments equally good or equally bad to back the need for periodical industrial strife.

Whether or not the balance of power theory in national affairs has been discredited, we believe its retention in matters industrial is indefensible. The pull devil pull baker series of strikes, lock-outs and general industrial warfare is also out of date, and the industrial balance of power theory must be discarded.

There are three parties to industry, and while classification is complicated by other factors, these may be termed labour, management and consumer. This trinity act and react to an economic and industrial poise at any moment of time. Where the first two fall out the consumer or general public —and this includes both combatants—is penalised, to say nothing at all as to national loss and individual hardship.

There is, however, a new view point, a new atmosphere abroad, in political matters as well as industrial, and whatever reconstruction may bring in its train, it is certain that former conditions cannot be reinstated.

The doctrine of the balance of power rests upon force and not upon right. Penalising Labour to earn enhanced dividends is equally indefensible with the penalisation of Capital by Labour, or the exploitation of the consumer by both. When Labour felt itself in a position to challenge Capital, with the latter in a position to resist, the resultant industrial strife inflicted national misfortune. The consumer always found that industrial differences resulted in increased prices. It is submitted that the weapons of strike and lockout are out of date, and will in the near future be looked upon as medieval curiosities. The older reactions which produced temporary poise will have to give way to a new balance of power, based not upon might but upon equity, less upon strength than upon ethics ; and slowly

but surely there is a new orientation of thought directed towards the prevention of national loss caused by industrial strife.

The questions of right is might *versus* might is right are now being fought out on the battlefields of Europe. Industrial strife of the past has been based upon the might is right fallacy, which is a primeval instinct surviving from pre-historic times. The world is slowly but surely getting civilised ; and it was to enforce the cardinal doctrines of civilisation which led to the participation of Great Britain in the war. Unless a new era becomes apparent in industrial relations, these will contradict the national professions of right motives. We cannot afford to have two ethical systems, one international, the other domestic.

Before the resumption of normal conditions is the time to settle with the adversary while he is in the way ; we do not want, and simply cannot afford, to settle labour disputes by the old methods involving national loss, individual hardship, or the barbarism of semi-starvation.

Individually, Labour save in the case of a small minority is reasonable enough ; but when relations are disturbed and open rupture made, it is apt, like any other crowd, to make demands which are excessive and unwarranted. The more extensive the organisation on both sides, the more closely knit the industry, the more likelihood of a pacific solution ; but the greater the latent catastrophe.

One of the most serious factors in a situation fraught with danger is that movements are on foot akin to mob violence. Industrialism, like society itself, rests upon confidence and its stability is a prime national consideration. The employer who sweats labour is offset by the fact that there are labour movements tantamount to larceny in a civil sense, and whether the two conditions are a reaction one upon the other or not, it is certain that neither can have a place in the reconstructed state.

The whole industrial situation demands patient and impartial handling ; more co-operation is needed in the national interest, more equity between employer and employed, between labour and management. Disaffection must be tempered by wise administration ; under systems of increased production neither employer, employed, nor consumer need be penalised. By the more general installation of known process and method increased production can be assured, high average wages maintained and equable dividends paid upon capital.

◆ ◆ ◆

PROFITEERING AND FINANCE.

It is an observation of common experience that whilst the more volatile extravagances of the agitator soon evaporate there generally remains a residue which sinks deeply into the memory of his audiences and which is fortified from time to time as further contributions from similar sources accumulate. The details of stories of profiteering may be forgotten but the essential belief that considerable numbers of the wealthier classes are improperly making a good thing out of the war is widely held by labouring men. The remark that the war was caused by capitalists and is being continued in the interests of capital is constantly heard, and in spite of the inherent improbability, not to say impossibility, of such a proposition the idea that the capitalist spider has somehow enmeshed the proletariat fly has taken root in not a few minds. It is no good mincing the matter—the profiteer in war time is a public danger and he ought to be ruthlessly suppressed as an enemy to the State, but the indiscriminate attempt to father the sins of a few greedy individuals upon the owners of capital, as a class, must be due either to reckless ignorance or to calculated malice.

The whole subject is one that readily lends itself to misrepresentation. Statistics can be manipulated to sharpen any point that the speaker wishes to emphasise, and his hearers are not in the least likely to indulge in mental arithmetic, to question the accuracy of the figures quoted, or to deny the conclusions arrived at. Nor shall we make any attempt to refute the elusive rhetoric of oratorically inclined agitators. Our task must be to devote our attention to the written word and to analyse figures as set down in black and white.

In a pamphlet bearing the alliterative title of 'The Huns at Home" Mr. Thomas Johnston, the editor of *Forward*, presents what he declares to be "a massed unanswerable case against the capitalist system—an arsenal of authenticated fact and figure to which every Socialist may turn in his daily task of sweeping the scales from the eyes of his fellows." In polemics of this nature attack is always easier than defence especially when the object of the defence is to arrive at the exact truth uncoloured by partisanship; because, whilst an attack is all the more telling by reason of its brevity and initiative, defence must laboriously join issue on the ground selected by the aggressor. To take each particular accusation cited by Mr. Johnson and to discuss every individual point in detail would require a veritable encyclopædia, and we must perforce confine

ourselves to a survey of the general charge which he formulates and to an examination of a few typical samples selected here and there from his "armoury."

Our endeavour being to elicit accuracy we must begin by defining what we mean by "profiteering." In *An Alphabet of Economics* Profiteering is said to be production for the sake of profit. But such is far from being the meaning which the ordinary man attaches to the word. Whatever may be the correct economic definition of the term the people have a clear vision of what is implied by profiteering in war time, and no amount of academic verbiage will persuade them to the contrary. To accuse a man of being a profiteer signifies, in popular phraseology, to charge him with taking an unfair advantage of war conditions which by reason of the scarcity of commodities or demand for personal service enable him to extract increased profits out of the necessities of his fellow-countrymen. It would be idle to deny that the crime of profiteering exists; indeed the long arm of the law has already reached some of the offenders. We are in agreement with Mr. Ben Tillett in his denunciation of the malefactors who knowingly rob the national till at the time of the country's peril, but Mr. Johnston's sweeping assertion that "a nation's hour of distress and extremity is Capitalism's hour of greatest opportunity" means nothing unless he can prove that Capitalism has taken advantage of the alleged opportunity. As a matter of fact the war has brought about a serious reduction in the capital value of investments whilst increased taxation has diminished the income of the property-owning classes. If we take the prices of stocks and shares on the eve of the war and compare them with the corresponding prices as quoted three years later, we find that there has been a capital loss of over twenty per cent. It is of course impossible to give the whole of the figures, but the following list is fairly representative of the general position. The table refers to stocks and shares selected as typical examples by *The Bankers' Magazine*. Such lists have been published for over half a century, and there is no doubt about their accuracy and no question as to the impartiality of the object with which they were compiled:—

Value of 387 selected stocks,				20th June, 1914, £3,383,128,000
,,	,,	,,	,,	1915, £3,008,578,000
,,	,,	,,	,,	1916, £2,912,501,000
,,	,,	,,	,,	1917, £2,717,316,000

being a loss in three years of £665,812,000, a sum which exceeds the total funded debt of the nation at the outbreak of war.

If such a loss has been experienced on a list which only deals with 387 stocks it follows that the total loss is much greater, and to accuse capitalists of causing and of prolonging the war for mercenary reasons is about as preposterous as to charge a lunatic with stinginess should he amuse himself by throwing sovereigns over the parapet of Westminster Bridge. Of course, not every investment has suffered depreciation; a few have soared sky high, but the net value of securities as a whole has undergone a phenomenal shrinkage since August 1914. This simple fact, resting as it does on unimpeachable evidence, is quite sufficient to dispose of Mr. Johnston's main contention, viz., that war is profitable to capitalists as a class.

The preface to "The Huns at Home" contains the following paragraph: "Patriotic offer scorned.—Right at the outbreak of war the organised workers of the country, in an excess of patriotic generosity, offered to cancel their applications for increased wages and to ask for no increases during the war, provided that capitalists would not attempt to lower wages, worsen conditions or use the abnormal war situation to exploit the nation. The capitalists refused the offer. They were out for booty, and it is sheer impudence on their part now to write, as Harmsworth's *Times* does, about the 'blackmail of war bonus.' Increased wages had to be paid to the workers after the capitalists had refused the workers' offer of a truce, and after they, the capitalists, had raised the cost of living (see *Round Table* magazine for December, 1915)."

It is obvious that if the definite offer of a truce on the conditions stated by Mr. Johnston had been formulated by Labour and rejected by Capital some mention of the fact would be made in *The Labour Year Book,* which goes into the question of Labour's attitude at the outbreak of war in considerable detail. This is how *The Year Book* describes the breakdown of the "Industrial Truce." "It can never be said that Labour was not prepared to make heavy sacrifices for the national cause. By its acceptance of the industrial *status quo* it surrendered any attempt to carry out the second part of the 1907 resolution, with its demand for the undermining of the capitalist system. There never was any express agreement but there certainly was a tacit understanding that the maintenance of the truce depended on equal sacrifices on both sides. But, with the piling up of profits and the rise in food prices, there came among the workers a growing irritation, increasing in force, until with the occurrence of specific grievances, the industrial truce came to an end."

Nobody is likely to accuse *The Labour Year Book** of being biassed in favour of Capitalism and we may assume, therefore, that in the quotation given above, Labour's case is not understated. Our readers will find it difficult to reconcile Mr. Johnston's version of the breakdown of the Industrial Truce with that of *The Labour Year Book,* but the really surprising part of the business resides in the reference which the author of the pamphlet in question makes to *The Round Table* magazine. Anybody reading Mr. Johnston's presentation of his "arsenal of authenticated fact and figure" would conclude that dated references would at least give some pretence of colour to the point of view expressed, but a careful search of the pages of *The Round Table* for December, 1915, reveals not one paragraph, not one single line, which even remotely support Mr. Johnston's declaration that Capitalists scorned the patriotic offer made by the workers' Joint Board on behalf of Labour. The history of the negotiations between the representatives of organised Labour and the representatives of the employers during the first months of the war, and the true significance of these negotiations, are a different story which will be dealt with in a subsequent article. For the moment it is sufficient to remark that they do not admit of the construction placed upon them in "The Huns at Home."

The game of verifying questionable references *ne vaut pas la chandelle,* and so we will take it for granted that the late Sir Arthur Markham spoke the words attributed to him, viz., "that the Miners' Federation said that if the Government were prepared to limit prices and keep them on the same scale as before the war they were prepared to work for no increase in wages." That such an offer was made redounds to the everlasting credit of the Miners' Federation, but it does not follow that the Government would have been well-advised to take advantage of their generous impulse. To keep the wages of miners down to the pre-war standard whilst other workers were receiving increases would be to differentiate against a patriotic section of the community in defiance of justice and commonsense, and to undertake to keep prices down to the pre-war level would be to give a promise which it might be impossible to fulfil.

The scientific method does not appeal to Mr. Johnston—any argument is good in his eyes so long as it serves to discredit

* *The Labour Year Book,* 1916, issued under the auspices of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress, the Executive Committee of the Labour Party, and the Fabian Research Department.

the object of his attack, any opinion or comment, however casual, ill-informed or misleading, that can be gleaned from the columns of any newspaper is held conclusive and effectual so long as it points in the desired direction. The Editor of *Forward* assumes that every rise in the price of commodities is tantamount to evidence that "profiteering" is to blame. He attributes all increases to higher profits and, conveniently for the purpose of his argument, does not trouble to enquire how much of the rise is due to the diminishing purchasing power of money, how much to the increased cost of imported raw material, how much to increased cost of production caused by higher wages, more expensive fuel and light, and how much to heavier charges for transport and insurance; nor does he compare the gross sums paid to shareholders with the gross sums paid to Labour in order to strike a balance, on a percentage basis, between the two parties.

Passing from the general to the particular, it is quite true that a higher rate of interest attaches to the second and third war loan issues than to the first. This increase in the rate of interest is not the "ramp" which Mr. Johnston calls it, but was due to a variety of causes which, under the circumstances, were unavoidable. The Chancellor of the Exchequer could no doubt have obtained many millions of pounds at a very low rate of interest but he wanted every shilling he could get. Let us suppose that he started with a 2 per cent. loan. After the first war enthusiasm had subsided and what we may call the patriotic sources had dried up, it would be necessary to tap a lower stratum or go without the money essential for prosecuting the war. Obviously he would have to increase the rate of interest, and if the subscribers to the first loan were not allowed to convert, the investors who "stood back" would be privileged at the expense of the more patriotic section. As further loans became necessary the evils of this inequitable process would be multiplied at each successive stage, with the result that a premium would be placed on non-subscription.

Any Chancellor outside Bedlam who adopted such a scheme would very properly have been invited to take Mr. Punch's advice to "come inside." It is not the custom of business men to keep their money lying idle in a bank and, therefore, as the war progressed, loans could only succeed if holders of foreign, colonial, corporation and other non-Government stocks sold out and reinvested the proceeds in War Loan. But all these securities had suffered a depreciation of their capital value, and so those who made the change demanded in the interests of the

State obtained no advantage because, although the nominal rate of interest was higher, they had to raise additional capital by borrowing, saving or otherwise to make up the losses entailed by selling on an already depressed and still falling market.

It may be news to Mr. Johnston but we can assure him that even amongst the well-to-do there are many to whom mercenary considerations make no appeal. The public were content to let the Chancellor of the Exchequer mind his own business, and the average investor was ready to lend his money at the rate of interest fixed by Government without any thought of bargaining. Nor did he stop at lending: he did better than that. We have no means of estimating the amount given in money and in kind by people of all classes—though of necessity the bulk must have been subscribed by the wealthy. Contributions to the Red Cross Fund exceed eight millions of pounds, to the Prince of Wales's Fund six millions, whilst the money spent on private hospitals, convalescent homes and war charities is incalculable.* Thousands of employers continue to pay the wages of their men who have joined the colours, and thousands of the classes that Mr. Johnston attacks are giving their services, often in humble capacities, without fee or reward.

It would be tedious to prolong this article so as to follow Mr. Johnston from one misrepresentation to another. His pamphlet will, no doubt, accomplish a certain amount of mischief, but fortunately the bias which he exhibits is so blatant that his attack is not so dangerous as it might have been had he remembered the old saying: "*Ars summa est celare artem.*" On the other hand he knows his public, and we may venture to hint that the readers of *Forward* like to take their "poison" neat. This accounts, perhaps, for a good deal which might otherwise be obscure.

---

* The roll of hospitals under the Red Cross and St. John Ambulance supported by voluntary contributions or entirely by private individuals in England, Wales and Ireland, but excluding Scotland, comprises over 1,400 establishments, with a total of over 80,000 beds.

◆ ◆ ◆

MORE HASTE LESS SPEED.

THE Russian Revolution conveys many lessons, and the most striking of all is that too sudden and drastic a break with the past involves the danger of incalculable and widespread disaster. That, of course, is no new message for a revolution to convey. All such upheavals have conveyed it in greater or less degree, but the present world situation and the vast dangers, problems, and possibilities of the near future make the lesson which Russia is at present giving to the world one which we must all learn to the fullest capacity of our hearts and minds. There was need for a big break with the past in Russia, and there is need of a big break with the past in every country in the world to-day. There is no question of that. But there is a vital question that faces every country and that question is: What is to be the nature and the extent of the break with the past and how is it to be accomplished?

Just a hundred years ago, at the close of the Napoleonic wars, the thought and the energy of Britain were turned from desperate military contest to the urgent task of internal reform. Possibly before many months have passed the national thought and energy will again be at grips with internal problems. The problems which we shall have to deal with will be greater than those which faced the generation of a hundred years ago, and we shall perform our great task but badly if we fail to realise what the history of Britain has abundantly proved during the course of the nineteenth century—that in the attempt to solve great national problems the process of evolution is the only process that leads to really constructive and permanent results. Insistence on the evolutionary process is not synonymous with defence of reaction, delay, and obscurantism. It is too often made so, and it will be nothing short of a national disaster if it is made so when the war comes to an end. What we need now is not revolution but a complex, comprehensive, and patient process of evolution which will have within it a real measure of the dynamic power of revolution. We must, in short, make the maximum of realisable progress, while preserving that foundation of order in development without which no progress can be more than temporary. That is a task and an ambition that may not suit the desires of the ardent revolutionary; but it is a task and an ambition that will more than exhaust the capacities of our best statesmen and citizens. To attempt more is but to achieve less.

Permanent institutions are not machine made, they are moulded by the careful hand of experience. Nations are the result of slow growth and development. In the long course of

their evolution they present many steps of development, the differences between which always appear to be startlingly revolutionary when the links between them, the slow-moving procession of modification and change, are overlooked. And yet it is these links, these modifications, and changes that are all-important. Few of them are revolutionary in themselves. Many of them appear to be unnecessarily timid, and the boldest of them have generally been made possible only by some earlier condition or development. But, viewed collectively in their aggregate results they are essentially revolutionary. They are, in fact, the only kind of revolution that pays and lasts. And they are the only kind of revolution that we can afford to have after the war.

Look at one or two of the great reforms which the nineteenth century achieved—none of them, of course, yet completed; for nothing ever can be completed, definitely or finally, either in individual or in national development. Take electoral reform, a matter which is very much in the forefront of our domestic problems to-day. The development of electoral reform has been slow. Nearly a hundred years have passed since the Reform Act of 1832, yet the Representation of the People Bill which has just been passed by the House of Commons does not establish the principle of adult suffrage irrespective of sex. Nevertheless, the Reform Bill of 1832, despite all its limitations, was somewhat of a revolutionary measure, for it changed the Constitution and opened the way for further changes in the future. And the Bill which has just passed its third reading in the House of Commons is scarcely less revolutionary, for it sweeps away some sixty or seventy franchise statutes, with all their anomalies and injustices, practically establishes manhood suffrage, and confers the Parliamentary franchise upon some 6,000,000 women. Whether we agree or disagree with the main provisions of the Bill, it remains a Bill which all regard as introducing great and far-reaching changes in our electoral system, and one that may have profound effects upon many elements of the national life. And if those who are impatient with the slowness of evolution ask, "Why did not this Bill come sooner?" we may reply, "Why cannot you agree among yourselves as to the balance of the merits and demerits of Proportional Representation?" Which means that what is called the slowness of evolution is due not only to great cleavages of opinion and to struggle between well-defined and antagonistic political parties but to cleavages of opinion and to struggle within the same Party. Reforms are not retarded only by Party opposition. They are often retarded by a desire to prevent cleavage within

a Party. They are, that is, sacrificed to party unity. The long objection of the Labour Party to draw up a comprehensive national programme is mainly due to a recognition of the danger of attempting too much. The Party has, indeed, recognised that its safest and most effective line of action is towards the gradual and the feasible.

Take, again, education. It is a commonplace that the people of this country take little or no interest in education, and in many respects the self-accusation is true. And yet what has happened in the course of the last hundred years? To a system which was no system, which made elementary education a thing of little importance in the national life, there has succeeded a State system which, despite all its many defects, has produced great results and has made possible in the near future advances of a kind that may well prove revolutionary in the best and most constructive sense of the word. The Act of 1870 gave us a State system of elementary education. It neither made education free nor compulsory, but it laid down that there should be a public elementary school, under State inspection, available in every district. We have realised in later years the grave limitations and defects of the Act of 1870; but in 1870 that Act laid the foundation of a national system of elementary education. And if the progress since 1870 appears to have been slow it must not be forgotten that much has been done to extend the Act and to link up the elementary school with the secondary school and other essential institutions. Nor must it be forgotten that other vital educational reforms which would have seemed to be revolutionary to an earlier generation have now been in operation for a number of years, such as the Acts providing for the feeding and for the medical inspection and treatment of school children. No one of these Acts is perfect. Each requires to be greatly extended. But the important point to lay hold of is that it is the successive, if slow, additions to, and alterations of, the educational structure which was laid down by the Act of 1870 that have made Mr. Fisher's Bill a possibility, and soon it is to be hoped in its essentials a positive reality. Those who are calling out that the Bill does not go nearly far enough forget that the reform of elementary and continuation education at present is limited by the important fact that we have neither the teachers nor the buildings to carry us much farther than Mr. Fisher has invited us to go. And it is not without significance that some of those who most condemned the Bill because of its timidity and lack of revolutionary "go" were among the first to condemn the Government for its rumoured decision not to proceed with it!

Finally, take Public Health. Viewed absolutely from the point of view of our highest ideal, progress here, as with electoral reform and education, has been slow. And yet, viewed historically, the progress has been rapid and great almost beyond belief. The Public Health agitator of the 'thirties, 'forties, and 'fifties would hardly believe such progress as we have made to be possible; and while Chadwick, were he alive, would be leading the campaign for maternity and infant welfare, he would also, we doubt not, be the first to acknowledge that we had already built up a system of Public Health beyond all his most enthusiastic anticipations. We have still far to go in the development of Public Health. So long as slums exist, so long as the infant mortality rate has not been lowered to the irreducible minimum, so long as the healthy functioning of maternity is impaired by poverty, ignorance and other preventable causes, there will be need, and urgent need, for better and better Public Health legislation and administration. But there can be no reasonable doubt that we have made more progress in Public Health by patient evolutionary methods than would we have done by such grandiose and ambitious schemes as are often urged. Remedies have to be fitted to conditions, needs, and possibilities, and not determined by dreams and ideals.

There is scarcely a department of the life of the nation which will not require to be overhauled when the war is over. The overhauling will have to be greater here and less there according to need and to the powers we possess. But one thing is clear. In the process of overhauling we shall have to try to see the things of the national life in their real relations with each other and to the national life as a whole. We have nothing to gain but much to lose by doing otherwise. And if we realise and act upon this truth we shall, as a consequence, avoid all ill-considered revolutionary experiment. We need changes and reforms. We need many drastic changes and reforms. But one thing that we do not need and cannot afford is a hot-headed and impetuous break from that line of evolution which will ensure the maximum of the two things we shall require most after the war—order and progress. And the problem of the control of industry is no exception. Its solution must be sought not in scrapping the existing system of industry but in adapting that system to the constructive and evolutionary developments which the war has emphasised and revealed and made possible.

◆ ◆ ◆

THE BRITISH SOCIALIST PARTY.

THE British Socialist Party is an organisation of Marxian Socialists, small in numbers but extremely active as propagandists. It claims through its delegation to the Labour Party to consist of some 10,000 members, but those who are in a position to know the actual state of affairs do not believe that its membership approaches that figure. The B.S.P. was formed in 1911 and owed its origin to the discontent then prevailing in the Labour world.

Prior to the formation of the B.S.P. there existed the Social Democratic Party, which was originally the Social Democratic Federation, or S.D.F., founded about 1884 by Mr. H. M. Hyndman and other prominent Socialists. The official organ was *Justice*.

We have already referred to the strikes of 1911 and their disturbing effects upon many of the young men in the Socialist movement. In the disputes of 1910–11 the Socialists and revolutionaries took an active part and some of the more extreme believed that the most direct route to the Revolution and the Millennium would be found in the general and the sympathetic strike. This doctrine led to fierce controversies between Socialists over the merits and demerits of Syndicalism, Industrial Unionism and political action. At this time the Independent Labour Party, which was then the largest Socialist party in the country, was in a ferment owing to internal dissensions. Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, who was the leader of the Labour Party, withstood the extreme views and methods of many rank and file members of the I.L.P. Mr. Philip Snowden also opposed the Syndicalists, and there was a very free exchange of opinion between the contending factions. These controversies were often very heated and conducted with the zest for personalities and sarcasm which makes discussion between the comrades so piquant.

Against the Macdonald group, who were often described as conservative and reactionary by their more advanced comrades, were a number of well-known members of the I.L.P., such as Messrs. Russell Smart, Victor Grayson and the late Leonard Hall. This section of the I.L.P. advocated an industrial political policy of a more advanced type, which would be in accord with the new ferment in the Labour world as manifested by the strikes of the summer of 1911. The Macdonald-Snowden

influence, however, was the stronger and the advanced section could make no headway and eventually seceded from the I.L.P.

A similar agitation was going on in the S.D.P. and other Socialist organisations. Victor Grayson was calling through *The Clarion* for a party with a programme adapted to the needs of the new industrial policy. It was proposed that this party should consist of attached and unattached Socialists who were in favour of a more vigorous action, both political and industrial, and that it should be built upon the basis of a coalition between the S.D.P., the *Clarion* contingent, the dissatisfied members of the I.L.P., and as many unattached Socialists as could be got together. A conference for the purpose of arranging details was held in Manchester in the autumn of 1911 and the new party, under the name of the British Socialist Party, was duly established. The executive included Messrs. H. M. Hyndman, Victor Grayson, Harry Quelch, Leonard Hall, Russell Smart, Hunter-Watts and Dan Irving.

At first the party made rapid progress and soon became the largest Socialist organisation in Great Britain, having about 40,000 members. Many I.L.P. branches joined the B.S.P. *en bloc*, but the seeds of dissension were present even before the stage of adolescence was reached. Many of the members were really Syndicalists and Anarchists and they were soon attempting to impose their extreme views and methods on the newly formed party. These Syndicalists were vigorously opposed by Hyndman, Quelch and Irving, and at the first annual conference held at Manchester in Whitsun week, 1912, there were wild scenes, Mr. Hyndman denouncing the Syndicalists and Anarchists in scathing terms. The comrades on this occasion became most disorderly, and the chairman (Mr. Hyndman) had the greatest difficulty in maintaining a semblance of order and threatened to leave the chair if the comrades did not behave themselves.

The disagreements within the party were emphasised rather than allayed after the Manchester conference. W. F. Watson and others visited the branches of the B.S.P. advocating " direct action " and Industrial Unionism. This propaganda tended to intensify the troubles within the party, and when the second annual conference was held at Blackpool on Whit Saturday and Sunday 1913 the whole question was again raised and the conference resolved itself into a perfect bear garden. The chairman was Mr. Dan Irving, of Burnley, and his rulings from the chair were frequently defied by the assembled comrades.

It was practically impossible for the chairman to keep order, and having broken his bell by using it as a hammer he gave up the unequal contest and sat down, calling the delegates "a lot of blackguards." At one period in the conference the extremists moved that the chairman be "ejected" from the chair, the motion being seconded and duly put to the conference by the chairman and declared to be lost. This temporarily restored peace.

Another cause of the dissension within the party was the letter which Mr. Hyndman had sent to *The Morning Post* in support of increasing our naval preparations on account of the German menace. Kehrhan, who has recently earned notoriety by escaping from internment disguised as a hunchback, and a Russian refugee, Clara Kahan, spoke against Hyndman, the latter stating that the German comrades, through their Press, had demanded the expulsion of Hyndman from the Party for writing the *Morning Post* letter. The German comrades said that Hyndman had betrayed the "International" and was a traitor to social democracy. Mr. Hyndman replied with great vigour to these charges, reminding Miss Kahan and other refugees that England had given them greater freedom than any other country had done and that with all its faults it was worth defending. In the end the veteran Socialist leader survived the attack. These bitter feuds weakened the party and its membership began to decline, Russell Smart, Leonard Hall, and others quietly dropping out.

When the war began further dissensions arose, Hyndman, Hunter-Watts, Fred Gorle, Bert Killips (Leeds) and others supporting the Allies, but the majority of the members, and especially the aliens, adopted an attitude which, if not exactly pro-German, was certainly anti-British. This led to yet another split in the party and the anti-war section, failing to capture the official organ *Justice*, started *The Call* under the editorship of E. C. Fairchild. This paper became the organ of the extremist and pro-German element and supported Robert Grimm and the Zimmerwald conference.

At the Easter conference of the B.S.P. in Manchester in 1916 a violent quarrel took place between the patriots and anti-patriots, the latter being in the majority. The sequel was the withdrawal of Mr. Hyndman and his group, who immediately proceeded to form the Nationalist Socialist Party. Since then the B.S.P. has been in strong opposition to the Allies, supporting the Grimm intrigues in Switzerland and the Leninite *régime* in Russia. It is also connected with the I.L.P. through the

United Socialist Council and it was one of the bodies responsible for the Leeds Convention on June 3rd, when the abortive Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates Council was formed. It sent to this convention 88 delegates, each delegate professing to represent 5,000 members, though the membership of the whole party does not greatly exceed 4,000.

Such, in brief, is the record of the party which to-day is calling upon the workers of this country to organise for revolution and to hand over the reins of government to extremists who openly support the Bolsheviks. "The B.S.P.," said Mr. Sam Farrow, Chairman of the Annual Conference, 1917, "bow in admiration to the revolutionary working classes of Russia and swear to be faithful to their example."

◆ ◆ ◆

FOOD FOR THOUGHT.

"An Alphabet of Economics," by Mr. A. R. Orage, editor of *The New Age*, is at once a clever and a very stupid book. It was a good idea to compile a glossary of economic and political terms in everyday use, because if we can agree on the precise meaning of these terms the truth will emerge more quickly than if we employ symbols which mean different things to different schools of disputants. It was a clever device to formulate these premises, not in the shape of a reasoned argument, but as a series of detached definitions that appear, at first sight, to be just a box of bricks which a student may safely use to build his own economic edifice. But it was stupid to fashion these bricks in such obvious shape that they will only fit a single preconceived theory and that a totally impossible one. Like the components of a jigsaw puzzle, Mr. Orage's definitions are carved and coloured so as to present an ultimate picture of his own choosing, and this accounts for their uniform hue and their fantastic shape. Like the author of the Athanasian Creed, Mr. Orage lays down the law with a sublime disregard for the opinion of all heretics, amongst whom must be included, we suppose, everybody who fails to subscribe to the doctrines of the National Guilds League.

◆ ◆ ◆

According to this "Alphabet" the "prime object of popular education is commercial, being to catch wage slaves young and to dwarf and train them to become skilled yet docile labourers. The secondary motive is the desire to become intelligent." Arbitrators will be interested to learn that they habitually cite "the immediate or the more general considerations, whichever shall prove to be the most favourable to their virtual clients, *i.e.*, the Capitalists." We wonder what intelligent Trade Unionists think of the following Orage-ism: "A Trade Union is a rudimentary organ for the ultimate overthrow of Capital. . . . The purpose of Trade Unionism is thus not to assist Capitalist industry but, by increasing its demands, to destroy Capitalism. The destruction of the wage system is the end of Trade Unionism, both will fall together."

◆ ◆ ◆

This is how the "Alphabet" concludes its description of machinery: "Every development of machinery has this double effect upon the proletariat, one section it leaves killed and wounded behind it as it marches along, and the other section

it drives into more intense or skilled industry. The life of the labourer is a race with machinery. Machinery threatens the very existence of the proletariat." We shall not dispute Mr. Orage's dictum that "there is a universal tendency to displace men by more and more complicated machinery," but we do dispute the legitimacy of isolating any one tendency without taking into account other relevant factors which are of greater potency than that selected for isolation. Otherwise how are we to account for the phenomenon that, notwithstanding the constant improvement in machines, an ever-increasing demand for labour arises whilst at the same time the growth of population continually increases the number of workers ?

◆ ◆ ◆

Every brick in Mr. Orage's box must pay tribute to the fetish of anti-capitalism, and therefore he tells us "that a wage slave who is not intent on abolishing Capitalism might as well be a Malthusiast."

◆ ◆ ◆

In the course of a conversation on the subject of Western civilisation we were once told by an Arab Sheik that steamships, railways, bicycles, motor-cars and aeroplanes were so many devices of the devil and that human happiness will never be achieved until the camel becomes the sole means of locomotion. When we suggested that a camel would prove an indifferent mount for a cross-channel trip the Sheik slyly remarked that Allah had made the great waters for the express purpose of drowning infidels. We do not suppose that Mr. Orage would care to develop his argument so thoroughly as our Arab friend, but we would ask him what sort of position the English as compared with the German worker, for example, would arrive at in ten years if we were such fools as deliberately to retard improvements in machinery, and does any man in his senses really believe that Germany would fail to take advantage of our folly ?

◆ ◆

"It is our improved steam-engine," wrote Thomas Jeffrey soon after the fall of Napoleon, "that has fought the battles of Europe and exalted and sustained through the late tremendous contest the political greatness of our land. It is the same great power which enables us now to pay the interest on our debt and to maintain the arduous struggle in which we are still engaged with the skill and enterprise of other countries less oppressed with taxation." Once upon a time the steam-engine displaced some thousands of men. Since then it has

certainly created work for as many millions. Machinery is the servant of mankind whoever owns it, and the resulting benefits eventually enrich the entire community.

◆ ◆ ◆

Karl Marx declared that "the emancipation of the workers must be accomplished by the working men themselves." We suggest that Labour would be well advised to take this maxim to heart by looking into the question of the comparative merits of class war and industrial peace for themselves instead of allowing its case to be made ridiculous by the extravagances of middlemen who, for the most part, are rather pseudo scholars than genuine working men.

◆ ◆ ◆

Mr. James Sexton, M.P., Secretary of the Dockers' Union, has said that since the commencement of the war there had not been a labour dispute of any magnitude which could not be attributed to the Pacifists who had engineered and organised it.

◆ ◆ ◆

In a popular comedy the much harassed but practically minded heroine whose domestic bliss was in grievous peril, whose kitchen had been invaded by unwelcome visitors at the unseemly hour of 5 a.m., and whose future looked black indeed, saved the situation by a homely but well-timed diversion :

"Suppose we have a cup o' tea ourselves," said Mrs. Carve, at the crisis of her fortunes. No sooner were these magic words uttered than the tension was relaxed, the spell broken and things began to settle down quite nicely.

Isn't it about time that our real Labour leaders had a cup o' tea ?

◆ ◆ ◆

Pacifism and Syndicalism are the obverse and the reverse of the same spurious coin.—*Morning Post,* November 29th, 1917.

◆ ◆ ◆

The Weekly Dispatch asserts that deliberate waste is encouraged in the London Docks and at seaports on the East Coast with the object of keeping up prices. It is said that rather than sell the stuff cheaply the owners have preferred to keep bacon and fish "until it is only fit for the soap works or fertilising material." Here is a challenge which the Government cannot afford to neglect. If it is found that the charge is well founded and if the law cannot adequately punish the delinquents there are two old English institutions—the pillory and the stocks—which might be re-established with advantage.

Nothing but "force majeure" is recognised to-day.—Mr. Ben Smith, Organising Secretary, London Taxicab Drivers.

◆ ◆ ◆

Referring to the "slow gear" strike adopted by the railwaymen in the Liverpool District, Mr. J. H. Thomas, M.P., Secretary of the N.U.R., said on November 28th: "Their action is not Trade Unionism but anarchy. It is not helping the negotiations but crippling them. It is not injuring the railway companies, it is only injuring the poor people, whose supplies are being held up. In this connection one must remember that the Society is a national, not a local, Union."

◆ ◆ ◆

Railwaymen are preparing programmes containing the demands to be presented to the companies at the end of the war. Some sections of the men are pressing their executives to demand larger concessions at once. Of these programmes that drafted by the Southport Branch of the N.U.R. and considered at the Leicester Conference on November 20th is, we think, the most advanced. While including all the well-known proposals now being discussed by railway workers it also demands a 4 *hours day or a* 24 *hours week*! This is a good example of the new order anticipated by a section of the workers.

◆ ◆ ◆

One of the compensations which the war has brought in its train is a reduction in the number of drones in the national hive. Let us hope there will be no serious set-back in this respect when peace comes. To those deluded folk who believe there will always be enough honey to go around, work or no work, we would commend the advice given to his son by an American humorist. "My boy," said he, "the only thing you will find in a pie that you didn't put there yourself is flies." This may not be good grammar, nor strictly true of individuals, but it certainly applies to all communities. We are now in the fourth year of our rainy day. Our store of honey is being depleted at a prodigal rate. A maximum effort scientifically organised and enthusiastically pursued will be necessary to replace what we have expended, or—well, perhaps, the sequel is better imagined than described.

◆ ◆ ◆

If imports must be paid for by exports and if we only work 24 hours a week instead of 48, how are we going to induce America to send us wheat that we cannot pay for? If we halve our labour must we not also halve our consumption? If we are going to starve ourselves to oblige the Syndicalists, why worry about U-boats?

In *The Firth Worker* Mr. J. T. Murphy writes : " So greatly has the Russian Revolution stirred the world that the word revolution has become familiar to us all, not as a word of which to be afraid but to represent something to be desired." What's one man's meat is another man's poison. That which Mr. Murphy views with complacent equanimity from his post of observation in Stanley Street, Sheffield, means Hell let loose on the Nevsky Prospekt, agony in the Trentino and much rejoicing on the Wilhelmstrasse.

◆ ◆ ◆

A dwarf on horseback sees farther afield than a giant on foot. Sometimes, nevertheless, a dwarf on foot is cocksure whilst the giant on horseback is still working out his bearings.—*Sayings of Hatasu.*

◆ ◆ ◆

"The only thing cheap in Russia to-day is human life."—*Globe.*

◆ ◆ ◆

The lecture given by Professor Bernard Pares at King's College on the Russian Revolution was of great interest, and the evidence which he adduced as to the direction by Germany of the revolutionary movement provides food for thought. He read letters and telegrams indicating that the Leninite agitation was controlled from Stockholm, the money paid to Lenin and his accomplices being sent *via* the German Embassy at the Swedish Capital. He also proved that many of the demands of the Russian extremists had been instigated by wire-pullers in Berlin. One of these demands, viz., the removal of Professor Miliukoff from the Coalition Government, throws a searching beam and illuminates a typical example of German intrigue. The report that Miliukoff's resignation was called for by the Soviet because, so the slander ran, he was endeavouring to secretly arrange a separate peace with Germany is a diametric reversal of the truth. Regarding Miliukoff as the greatest obstacle to a separate peace, the Huns worked for his removal, and, having achieved their object, cynically attributed his fall to the machinations of a third party and at the same time accused him of the very crime which he had prevented that third party from committing. He must have a long spoon that sups with the devil. Pacifists in this country have not infrequently expressed dissatisfaction with Miliukoff's connection with the Provisional Government, basing their objection to his membership on the self-same grounds that induced Germany to compass his removal, and when the plot succeeded British advocates of Peace by Negotiation evinced no little satisfaction, as may be seen by reading what Mr. Ramsay Macdonald and *The Call* have to say on the subject.

Professor Pares knows Russia and the Russians as thoroughly as any living Englishman. Many years ago he conceived the idea of making England and Russia understand one another, and for that object he has worked ever since. Holding a profound belief in the sincerity and worth of the Russian character and living year after year on terms of close intimacy with Russians of all classes, he has earned the trust of the people, and his message to us is not to desert them in their present extremity.

◆ ◆ ◆

Soon after the outbreak of war he hurried East and lived with the Russian army in bivouac, on the march and in battle, sharing its hardships and glorying in its first successes. When the tide turned he did not relinquish his chosen task, and in the retreat rode in the last wagon that escaped from Warsaw. He tells us that after the old army, reduced by incredible sacrifices, was no longer able to dominate the situation by its example, insidious propaganda began to corrupt the recruits. The process was gradual at first, but the German trick which finally succeeded in demoralising the army was the dissemination of a rumour that the peasants had seized and were partitioning all the land amongst themselves, coupled with the suggestion that the soldiers would lose their share unless they hastened to claim it. A stampede followed. All sense of duty, discipline and valour departed and the trains were crowded to suffocation by herds of deserters racing for the spoils of anarchy. With his own eyes Professor Pares has seen the havoc wrought by German lies financed by German gold, but, whilst bitterly denouncing the traitors who betrayed their country, he steadfastly refuses to believe in the wholesale corruption of a nation which, whatever its shortcomings, is in its essence guileless, religious and patriotic.

◆ ◆ ◆

War always emphasises virtue and exaggerates vice. Germany has exploited both to the top of her bent, neglecting no weapon that she thinks will advance her criminal enterprise. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that she should seek to corrupt the armies of her foes, but there is one depth of infamy which will never blacken even Germany and that is the corruption of her troops by her own people. Of intention this is an obscure saying, but what a travesty of all justice, what a negation of all rules, human and divine, by which mankind has lived since the dawn of history, would appear, if this one saving virtue should triumph in the end against a world outraged and in arms.

INDUSTRIAL PEACE

CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations

Lack of Understanding

Welt Politik and Corruption

Socialism—Made in Germany

Payment by Results

The Independent Labour Party. Part I

Queering the Pitch

The Rank and File Movement. Part V

The National Council for Civil Liberties

Food for Thought

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

THE following abbreviations are occasionally used in the following pages and should be noted for future reference:—

A.S.E.	Amalgamated Society of Engineers.
B.S.P.	British Socialist Party.
B.W.L.	British Workers' League.
C.L.C.	Central Labour College.
C.O.	Conscientious Objector.
C.W.C.	Clyde Workers Committee.
D.R.R.	Defence of the Realm Regulations.
E.A.T.C.	Engineering and Allied Trades Committee.
E.T.U.	Electrical Trades Union.
F.O.R.	Fellowship of Reconciliation.
I.L.P.	Independent Labour Party.
I.W.W.	Industrial Workers of the World.
M. of M.	Ministry of Munitions.
M.S.A.	Military Service Act.
M.W.A.	Munitions of War Act.
N.A.C.	National Administrative Council.
N.C.C.L.	National Council of Civil Liberties.
N.C.F.	No Conscription Fellowship.
N.G.L.	National Guilds League.
N.U.R.	National Union of Railwaymen.
N.U.T.	National Union of Teachers.
P.N.C.	Peace by Negotiations Council.
R.F.M.	Rank and File Movement.
S.L.P.	Socialist Labour Party.
S.P.Gt.B.	Socialist Party of Great Britain.
S.S.C.	Social Science Classes.
T.U.C.	Trade Union Congress.
U.D.C.	Union of Democratic Control.
U.M.W.A.	United Machine Workers' Association.
W.E.A.	Workers' Educational Association.
W.E.W.N.C.	War Emergency Workers' National Committee.
W.I.L.	Women's International League.
W.L.L.	Women's Labour League.
W.P.C.	Women's Peace Crusade.
W.S.D.C.	Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates Council.
W.S.P.U.	Women's Social and Political Union.
W.U.	Workers' Union.
W.W.U.	Women Workers' Union.

INDUSTRIAL PEACE

LACK OF UNDERSTANDING.

It would be superfluous to repeat the trite observation that the evils which afflict society are not attributable to any one cause, were it not for the fact that school after school of enthusiasts is continually attempting to demonstrate the contrary thesis. The eyes of the temperance reformer are fixed on the drink traffic and he is prone to believe that salvation depends on total abstinence. Feminists are convinced that when women come into their own all will go well with the world. Educationalists are apt to reckon by school hours. Political economists would order our affairs in accordance with their latest theory, while Syndicalists are convinced that only by the destruction of the capitalist system can mankind ever hope to reach the valley of content. Each competitor, engrossed in watching the progress or otherwise of his particular hobby-horse, impatiently presses forward towards the goal which he so clearly sees and to which the others are so unaccountably blind. It may be that our view is no more comprehensive than that of those whom we criticise, but as our plea is for comprehensiveness itself, we are entitled, perhaps, to cling to our own panacea and to believe that if there is any one solution for human ills it must reside, not in the narrow path of specialised endeavour, but on the open plain of mutual human understanding. In nine cases out of ten, prejudice is the result of ignorance, the devil is not so black as he is painted, and whoever is wrong it may safely be asserted the extremist is never right.

These are general considerations, but they have a very particular application to the question of the maintenance of Industrial Peace, and for this reason. Anything that concerns the production of wealth, and still more anything that has to do with its distribution, is always a fertile source of jealousy and suspicion. The evil is inherent, and unfortunately it is on this dangerous field that the so-called classes and masses are most commonly brought into personal contact with each other. Industrial peace will never flourish as long as the aspirations and ideals of one class are a closed book to the others. Most people are mildly interested in the truth of the saying that one half of the world doesn't know how the other half lives, and forthwith retire within the pale of their own self-sufficiency. They fail to realise that it is not only their business to know how it fares with their fellows, but their bounden duty to ensure

that, so far as their influence extends, there shall be no legitimate grievance unredressed, no preventible suffering inflicted.

We do not often find ourselves in agreement with Mr. Philip Snowden, but we are in complete accord with his denunciation of the state of affairs which he describes in the opening chapters of his *Socialism and Syndicalism*. We also endorse his estimate as to the nation's responsibility for the well-being and happiness of the people. "The first duty of a nation," he writes, "is to so organise its resources that the means to attain and maintain a healthy and civilised existence shall be within the reach of all, in return for reasonable labour. Our natural resources, our scientific knowledge, our mechanical aids, are of no advantage to the people unless they are the means of lightening arduous toil, of making the struggle for a living less severe, of giving men more leisure for reasonable recreation and of bringing the advantages of progressive knowledge to establish a higher civilisation, which shall be enjoyed by all the members of the community." We are optimistic enough to believe that the great majority of English employers are sufficiently well disposed to desire no lower standard for their fellow countrymen than that indicated by Mr. Snowden; but the trouble is that so many are content to make no effort to secure it. Callousness and inertia are woefully prevalent, but being passive weaknesses rather than active vices they are not irremediable and they will respond to the stimulus which enlightenment can apply. Where we differ from Mr. Snowden is in the choice of the remedy and in the method of its application.

The urgent need of the moment is for mutual enlightenment, but this can only come about if, on the one hand, the employing and governing classes can be induced to acquaint themselves with the conditions under which the working classes live, move and have their being, and if, on the other hand, the incitement to class war by arrogant mischief-makers ceases. We emphasise the lack of understanding on the part of the employing classes because their culpability in this matter, as compared with that of the working classes, is by far the greater. It is the responsibility of the rich to know how the poor live; it is not incumbent on the poor to return the compliment. When, however, we come to the question of degree it must be admitted that the ignorance of the working classes with regard to the average mode of life, standards and aspirations of the professional and leisured classes is grotesque and monumental. Nor is this a matter for surprise. In industrial centres personal contact between employers and employed is reduced to a minimum, and when they do meet, as we have already remarked, the relationship is generally confined to the unsympathetic

field of business. The working man is seldom, if ever, brought into touch with an educated gentleman on the human, social or intellectual side. He has, therefore, to form his estimate of "high life" on what he reads in the newspapers, what he sees on the film and what he hears in the tap-room. Visualise, if you can, a hybrid society composed of the *dramatis personæ* collected from the columns of *Reynolds's Newspaper* (especially the divorce court proceedings), from the "Triangle" plays (especially those "featuring" the American millionaire), and from the scandalous and libellous stories that pass from mouth to mouth. If the resulting picture conveys a feeling of nausea, you will understand, in part, what it is that now and again makes the gorge of the working man rise. The farther a person is removed from the sphere of manual labour the more complex becomes his character and the more difficult the diagnosis of his aims and actions; all the more need, therefore, that the evils of misrepresentation should not be added to the normal difficulties of the position. In rural districts the segregation of the different grades of society is not so absolute and consequently class hatred cannot thrive as it does in industrial centres. It would be difficult to estimate the amount of good that the institution of village cricket has accomplished in the province of good will, and when the squire, who has gone in last wicket down, is bowled first ball by the blacksmith, an event has occurred which, though trivial in itself, may almost be considered as one of national importance. Conversely, if an employer of labour should have occasion to visit his works when he happens to be wearing a fur coat, smoking an expensive cigar, and travelling in a Rolls-Royce, he would be well advised to slink in by the back door instead of using the front entrance. By this simple manœuvre not only will he avoid giving offence, but he will have the satisfaction of seeing himself as others see him.

In the stress and bustle of modern industry it is, we fear, impossible for the desired rapprochement to be brought about by means of extended social intercourse between men and masters, but there are other directions in which much may be done. Square-dealing scrupulously, even meticulously, practised is an asset that never yet made an enemy. A dictatorial bearing is not mistaken for dignity nor does it conduce to friendship. Courtesy costs nothing and is highly infectious, spreading by attraction from top to bottom. Finally, the growth of suspicion may often be allayed by candid explanations when crises arise. Workmen cannot be expected to be sympathetic towards difficulties as to the full significance of which they are imperfectly informed.

WELT POLITIK AND CORRUPTION.

THE obvious and elementary functions of German diplomacy during the war are: (*a*) To spread dissension between the Allies; (*b*) to impart and foster a desire for a premature peace in all the countries which are not fighting on the side of the Central Powers; and (*c*) to impair national unity in enemy belligerent countries by fomenting industrial strife and class war.

The methods of propaganda by means of which these functions have been carried out are well described by Mr. Asquith as "insidious and unscrupulous, adroit and persuasive." He tells us that "every artifice, literary, historical, pictorial, histrionic, has been employed to blacken our record, to distort our aims and to represent the cause of the Allies in this war as the cause of plutocracy and Imperialism." Mr. Balfour also warns us against "that mendacious and untiring propaganda which the Central Powers are carrying on in every country in Europe."

We are glad to be informed by these statesmen that they are alive to the dangers of the situation, but still more should we welcome an assurance that the evils which they describe are being scientifically investigated and courageously grappled with. It may be many years before the complicated network of German intrigue is completely unravelled, but that is no justification for a policy of present inaction. Some of the threads are already patent to an intelligent observer, others are less clearly seen, and others remain in complete obscurity. It is the business of the Government to leave nothing undone in the way of elucidation, it is also their urgent duty to take appropriate action not only against every criminal who is found guilty of trafficking with enemy agents, but also against every culprit who allows himself to become the conscious or unconscious tool of German diplomacy. Obviously we cannot proceed against enemy subjects who are beyond our jurisdiction, but it ought to be possible to find a way of preventing our own people from aiding and abetting our foes. Actions for slander against individuals often occupy the Courts, and there should be no impunity for those who slander a whole nation.

The damage inflicted by persons who give currency to enemy propaganda is every whit as great as that inflicted by a squadron of bombing Gothas, whilst the moral turpitude of their action is far greater. It was a principle of early English law that injury by stealth is less tolerable than injury by violence and it was partly for this reason that the punishment for the crime of

burning down a neighbour's tree was more severe than that for felling it with an axe. Moreover a physical injury is generally determinate in its onslaught, whereas the effects of a moral injury are incalculable and persistent.

Whoever may be the prime instigator of the type of German propaganda which we are considering, he has no cause to be dissatisfied with the success of his operations. His machinations have brought Russia to a pitch of misery and debility such as no military disaster could ever have inflicted upon her. His manœuvres succeeded in keeping America out of the war for two and a half years. In a few days he won back by treachery twice as much territory as Italy had gained after many months of hard fighting. The measure of his success in England is difficult to estimate, but it is perhaps more considerable than most of us have any conception of.

In order to achieve these objects it has not been necessary for German diplomacy to create new organisations, for available machinery was already in existence. The only thing needed was direction, care being taken to adjust diplomacy so as to fit in with the temperamental peculiarities of the people to be operated upon. We may be sure that long before the war, German agents were keeping a stealthy watch on the growth of disintegrating influences in England and reporting progress to the Fatherland. In some bureau in Berlin are tabulated and indexed records of such activities giving the names of likely dupes and the programmes of susceptible coteries. Some, no doubt, of these unwelcome and disloyal guests returned to Germany in July, 1914. Some proceeded to America and other then neutral destinations. A number are safely behind barbed wire, but a residue remains, and it is this residue that must be sifted if we are to discover and stamp out the poisonous germs of a disease which, if neglected, may prove mortal.

It is not suggested that a majority of revolutionary pacifists are the conscious tools of German diplomacy. We are aware that weakminded cranks exist in all grades of society and that in many cases they are inspired by sentiments which they believe to be noble, but none the less do we hold that men and women who place themselves in opposition to every measure which responsible authority, with the approval of the mass of the people, has ordained as necessary for the successful prosecution of the war, who range themselves in defiance of common sense on the side of our enemies, who attempt to palliate, excuse or explain away the abominable crimes of which Germany has been proved to be guilty, and who distort history in order to mis-

represent the cause of the Allies, such people, we consider, are the proper objects of suspicion. Reasonable diversity of opinion, even captious criticism, is to be expected; nobody has a right to expect a uniform level of complaisance; but invariable uniformity of opposition to war measures and to national sentiment is so peculiar a trait that the burden of proof rests with those who are called upon to defend themselves against the accusation of conniving at treason.

As we have suggested, the methods pursued by German diplomacy have been modified according to locality and adjusted to meet opportunity. Thus, in Russia, it was safe to employ bribery on a large scale, in America it was judicious to work through the hyphenated colony and to exploit the cry of "the freedom of the seas," in India it was not difficult to accentuate racial and religious difficulties, in Ireland to encourage Sinn Fein, in England to trade upon our gullibility and so on. It may be assumed that German diplomacy had already completed its underground preparations so far as England, France and Russia were concerned, before the war began. In the case of America it is probable that arrangements had to be improvised, and this perhaps accounts for a certain clumsiness which has led to those disclosures which Mr. Lansing is able to make with serial regularity. There are people who are simple enough to believe that England alone has escaped the attention of Teutonic propagandists and that we are exempt from the effects of a system which has permeated wherever German intrigue could gain a footing. To hold such a theory is tantamount to believing that our bitter enemy deliberately refrained from attempting to undermine our loyalty, for otherwise evidence would be forthcoming from those who were unsuccessfully approached.

Persistence in a specialised line of crime is a well-known characteristic of delinquency and it is unlikely that the authors of German diplomacy are exceptions to this rule. By a careful analysis, therefore, of such facts as have already been made public, and by a comparison between the known methods of corruption employed in different countries, it should be possible to reconstruct the general plan of campaign and to anticipate possible future developments. With this object in view we propose to submit to our readers from time to time certain aspects of enemy propaganda in foreign lands and to show that phenomena which are apparently fortuitous are in fact the co-ordinated parts of a complete scheme of corrupt Welt Politik.

◆ ◆ ◆

SOCIALISM—MADE IN GERMANY.

THE exaggerated estimate of the weight of public opinion in Germany in general, and of the German Socialist Party in particular, expressed in the English newspapers, had led many people to believe that German Socialism is strong enough to influence foreign policy at the present time and to determine Germany's interior and economic future after the war. Careful observers, however, who are acquainted with the anatomy of the German Socialist organisation are well aware that its activity in Germany has been reduced during recent years to a mere machine for seeking petty gains to the accompaniment of big words. But even big words, in the use of which the German Socialists excelled in pre-war times, are now lacking in face of the restraining prestige of the Imperialism which dominates German Social Democracy. Although there exists within the German Socialist Party a minority group, with perhaps a more robust constitution than that of the majority, it justifies no expectation whatever of independent action, as all the leaders of this ineffective minority are at present under arrest or in prison.

The submissive attitude of the German working classes may be illustrated by the conditions under which "Maifeier" (May Day), that traditional festival of the proletariat, is celebrated. All the streets leading to the Schlossplatz in Berlin, where the Imperial castle stands, are barred and guarded by police; troops are confined to barracks, whilst every now and then machine-guns and field-pieces are paraded ostentatiously in the principal streets. No mass meetings and no processions are permitted on that day, and anything like a crowd is immediately dispersed by the police, who do not hesitate to make free use of their weapons. These drastic measures have succeeded to the extent that the number of people participating in the celebration of May Day by industrial action diminishes from year to year.

Being, like the German nation itself, an organisation that is colossal and at the same time ill-balanced, the German Socialist Party suffers from its own want of equilibrium and its own colossal size. Representing to the outside world an electorate of over four million votes it may be safely assumed that more than half of the Socialist voters have nothing whatever to do with Socialism and do not even understand the meaning of the word. The organisation is incompetent to effect reforms and incapable of forcing a revolution. Political parties in Germany, although called Conservative, Liberal and

Socialist, can in no way be compared with the same political parties in Great Britain. In the new Germany political traditions and leadership are monopolised by the upper classes, the higher clergy and the territorial nobility (Junkers). For the middle classes the ideal of the Fatherland and the nation is overshadowed by an enormous official organisation which works without a hitch, which admits of no initiative and which includes no aspirations towards democracy or constitutional liberty. This state of mind is characteristic of the entire middle class and even the more intelligent feel in no way hurt in their dignity by the archaic condition of the German constitution. Amongst the working classes, also, the great majority being submissive to authority and without a well-developed political sense, no need is felt of a really democratic atmosphere.

At election times it very often happens that at second ballots, which are necessary to secure a two-thirds majority, Liberals, who usually oppose Socialism, cast their votes for the Socialist candidate against the Conservative one. By such means nearly forty Socialist deputies have found their seats in the Reichstag; but the electorate they represent consists of the socially invertebrate German citizen, who, in the words of Bebel, only owns the soul of a servant (*Das Deutsche Volk is ein Volk von Bedientenseelen*).

Although the German Socialist movement, influenced by the French enthusiasms of 1848, originally held democratic, even republican, ideals, these did not correspond to any definite and positive conception of liberty in the German population and soon subsided into the mild form of Socialism which bows low before its masters to-day. Even the German Trade Unionist movement is in its essence nothing but a co-operative effort to reach the middle-class standard of comfort. The volume of the Trade Unionists' demands is no doubt considerable, but their programme is far removed, both in import and in scope, from that which would be considered adequate by any independent working-class movement organised on Socialist principles.

Many people in England still hold the opinion that the German Socialist movement will eventually lead to a revolutionary outbreak in Germany. If they knew the Germany of to-day they would never entertain such futile hopes. After the war, and especially if the invincibility myth is shattered, anything may happen, but during the continuance of hostilities the German people of all classes will rally to the support of Kaiserism, militarism and bureaucracy both because of their inherent sense of discipline and because they are too intelligent

to destroy national unity at a moment when victory can only be secured by internal cohesion.

The Germany of to-day has no political traditions, much less has it any revolutionary ones. The Imperial unification achieved by Bismarck in 1871 had nothing whatever in common with the democratic movement for unification which matured before the Franco-German war, when democratic ideals were prominent in South Germany, progressing in the middle States, and not altogether absent in Prussia itself. Bismarck very cleverly manipulated the democratic ideal in order to make a Prussian and, at the same time, an anti-democratic reality. Thus it was not Prussia that was absorbed by Germany but Germany that was absorbed by Prussia, and such is the ultimate basis of the German Empire of to-day. The German statesmen know, of course, that German Socialism is no menace to German Imperialism and that is why they have so often used it as a tool to influence public opinion. The Stockholm Conference, stage-managed by German diplomacy and packed by her docile creatures, would be controlled in such a way that German Socialists acting as the mouthpiece of the German Government should make the world believe that a democratic wave is passing over Germany. Dominating in this fashion a gathering of International Socialists and pulling the wires behind the screen the German Government would score another diplomatic triumph by killing three birds with a single stone. Her own Socialist dupes would be flattered by being allowed to intervene, on behalf of Germany, in international politics; enemy Socialist delegates would be out-manœuvred far more easily than enemy armies in the field, and the world would be invited to observe with admiration the edifying, if unusual, spectacle of an honest and democratic movement inspired by God's elect, the Kaiser himself.

England has paid dearly for her conceit in cultivating an insularity of mind which kept her in ignorance of German psychology and German aims. It is now too late to undo past mischief and our best defence is to retain our insular attitude until we are through with the trouble. England is in the position of a boxer, only trained in the use of his fists, who is suddenly challenged to a duel with rapiers. If we allow Germany the choice of weapons we shall gain the applause of our enemies, but we shall lose everything else. An honest English Socialist with idealism in his heart and only his own language on his tongue could offer a resistance to German intrigue about as effective as the struggles of a naked baby in the hands of armed burglars.

PAYMENT BY RESULTS.

A Failure and a Suggestion.

[Note.—*The whole subject of payment by results is full of pitfalls and perplexities. A system which succeeds in one factory may fail in another. The fact that a system is technically excellent is not in itself sufficient to ensure its success. So much depends upon the personality and energy of those who are responsible for its application, so much upon the patience and goodwill of those whom it is sought to benefit, so much upon immediate readjustment whenever new factors intervene. But no problem is insoluble, and we believe that the best way of arriving at a satisfactory solution is to approach the matter from several points of view, to examine the different systems now in operation, and to analyse the shortcomings which in practice have wrecked likely schemes and the merits which have redeemed from failure less promising ventures. The field is a wide one and we shall be grateful for any suggestions or criticisms which our readers may be willing to offer.*]

It is admitted that the problem of reconstruction centres round the relationship of the units which go to make up productive organisations of the factory type. In the past these relationships have chiefly centred round money. More recently the question of material environment (as exemplified by the formation of Welfare Committees, etc.) has received some attention, and it is quite clear that a third factor—namely, mental content, must be put in the forefront of any programme which aims at a permanent adjustment of the components of the industrial machine.

Certain aspects of this third factor have already been raised in the pages of Industrial Peace. In *The Human Touch*, Mr. Cecil Walton's condemnation of the piece-work system is quoted. Mr. Walton is right: piece-work is unsatisfactory from almost every point of view, except that of pure expediency of a vicious sort: whether of the "straight" premium bonus or any variety of those systems, it is unscientific because, in the first place, it does not and cannot take into consideration the elemental fact that, just as there is no limit to progress either of method or dexterity, neither is there at present a fundamental relation of stability between money and value.

Consequently all piece-work systems produce one of three conditions: (1) Large classes of workers earn continuously increasing sums of money which bear no ratio to the result of equally meritorious efforts on other bases. If an effort is made to unify the basis the purchasing power of money becomes

completely unstable—this is the present position; or (2) the workers will " nurse " a piece rate to avoid any incentive to change of method as an excuse for cutting the rate, and as a result will restrict output to a locally agreed basis (the pre-war condition in big works); or (3) the price will be cut by dubious management*, and a constant state of friction engendered and the whole business surrounded by a strong suspicion that the harder the operator works the sooner will he be unemployed.

To blame any one section of the community for the results is about as sensible as blaming the victim of a large dog-tax for drowning puppies.

In *The Remuneration of Employment* an endeavour is made to point the way to a more stable condition, to be reached by payment of a minimum yearly wage, irrespective of output, supplemented by a sort of general bonus on working full time. Mr. Walton has much the same idea, except that he proposes a general bonus on production. Both articles appear to accept periodical over-production and short time as a sort of cyclic law not susceptible of treatment, but to be met by methods for protecting its victims from the recurrent effects of its operation. While a general bonus on production is superior to a separate piece-work system in most cases, where the latter exists many of its inherent disadvantages may be modified by great circumspection in rate fixing.

It is clear that what is wanted is a system conducive to the best possible conditions for automatically evolving security of employment by the real co-ordination of demand and supply which shall provide the most powerful incentive to the full employment, during working hours, of hand and brain by securing both common and individual benefit to the exercise of initiative, inventive capacity and industry.

In the factory we might start by deciding upon a year's programme of standardised production, based on the capacity of the undertaking referred to, say, a six-hours day or shift, as the case might require. All the employees of such a factory might be given a yearly salary in accordance with their position and security of tenure, based on the undertaking that the rated production of the factory on a man-hour basis must be attained,

* In the past some employers have been guilty of cutting rates, which brought about lamentable " ca'canny " methods. In every shop working piece-work should be posted a notice which must be honourably and religiously adhered to by the employer that " Piece-work prices once set will never be reduced unless there is an alteration in the method of production." If the employees realise by experience that the employer scrupulously abides by this understanding, the spirit of distrust which unfortunately exists in many shops to-day will gradually disappear, to the mutual advantage of those concerned.

neither more nor less, but that the hours worked are not of interest except to those responsible in any degree for such production.

Further, let promotion, plus a considerable bonus of some sort, be the reward of the invention of processes, etc., which would reduce the length of the day worked by all employed in it.

Such an undertaking, even under present conditions, might easily attain an efficiency per unit per hour quite beyond anything now experienced.

If such a system became general it would automatically prevent unnecessary strikes, reward thrift, popularise industry, stimulate invention and stabilise currency.

Ex hypothesi, the production would be for any year at least as great as under any other system, while the leisure, special and general remuneration, would be the direct outcome of efficiency.

The line of development suggested attacks neither the legitimate claims of capital nor the reasonable demands of Labour, but, on the contrary, consolidates the interests of both. Doubtless it is a revolutionary proposal in one sense, but it is better to make up our minds as to how far changes of a revolutionary character may be beneficial to the nation at large, and to inaugurate such changes without delay rather than to wait until some crude and destructive experiment is thrust upon us by people who would prefer a change for the worse than no change at all.

It is clear that only a principle is indicated, but it is a principle which seems to have the merit of flexibility in regard to details of development.

◆ ◆ ◆

THE INDEPENDENT LABOUR PARTY.
Part I.

ANYBODY who pays careful attention to current Labour and International politics will be impressed by the prominence and the very obvious activity of the Independent Labour Party. In previous articles we have suggested that much of the unrest in the Labour world to-day is fomented with ulterior motives by a number of societies, several of which have been formed during the war for the specific purpose of interfering with its successful prosecution, and with the intention of undermining public confidence in complete victory. In an article on the Union of Democratic Control we referred to the various anti-war activities of the I.L.P. and we indicated the close connection between this Socialist body and the organisation formed in August, 1914, by Mr. E. D. Morel, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, and others. We now propose to describe the origin and growth of the I.L.P. This is necessary, as there is still much confusion in the public mind regarding the character and the numerical strength of this body. Confusion arises mainly from the title of the I.L.P. often being mistaken for that of the Labour Party, properly so called, and also from the fact that the leaders of the former advertise their existence so successfully. This misunderstanding as to the real position of the I.L.P. in the Labour Movement leads many people to assume that this party is a representative Labour organisation. This is not the case. When we study the origin of this Society, and when we trace its elusive ramifications, we discover that the influence it wields in the world of Labour is very largely the result of its astute and usually secret manipulations of the administrative machinery of certain Trade Unions.

The Independent Labour Party was formed at Bradford in 1893 by a number of Socialists, including the late Mr. Keir Hardie, who were dissatisfied with the small progress Socialism was then making in this country. In 1881 the Social Democratic Federation had been formed in London with the object of bringing about the socialisation of the means of production, distribution and exchange. But the S.D.F. was a rigid Marxian body and its methods of propaganda repelled many Trade Unionists, and the response was the reverse of enthusiastic. Mr. Keir Hardie and his friends saw that other and less doctrinaire methods would be necessary if Socialism was to make any headway among the workers in this country. The founders of the I.L.P. also realised that the word "Socialism" was

unpopular with the masses, and that more success would be obtained by judiciously diluting the pure word of Marx and by omitting the word "Socialism" from the name of the new party. This course was all the more necessary as it was the intention of the promoters of this organisation to carry on a political campaign within the Trade Unions, the eventual object being to get members of the Party into Parliament as direct and "Independent" representatives of Labour. Whilst the chances of avowed Socialists at the polls were negligible in most constituencies it was believed by the I.L.P. leaders that it might be possible to get a number of Socialists elected to Parliament in the guise of Labour candidates.

Having arrived at this conclusion, the founders of the new party decided to adopt the policy of permeation and to saturate the Trade Unions and other Labour organisations with Socialist doctrines. Referring to this policy, Mr. Victor Osborne (of Osborne judgment fame) states in his book on "Sane Trade Unionism" that "recognising their own inability to organise they sought to use the already existing societies, and on account of this earned the name of the 'political cuckoos.'" Strenuous efforts were made to capture branches of the Trade Unions,* and through them the executives of local Labour bodies, such as the Trades and Labour Councils. Socialist groups were formed within the Trade Unions, and the tactics of entry by the back door were industriously employed. These "Cuckoo" groups held secret meetings to prearrange their policy, and the I.L.P. members were seldom absent at the branch or other meetings of the respective Unions. As Mr. Osborne remarks: "They attended regularly and took a prominent part in the work of the branch, while the ordinary member was often apathetic and irregular in attendance. Resolutions were prepared previous to meetings and supporters were always ready to play their part, so that the organised minority easily outmanœuvred the unorganised majority." This is even more true to-day, members of the I.L.P. being conspicuously influential on a scale out of all proportion to their numerical strength. Describing the manner in which members of this party obtained official appointments in the Unions, Mr. Osborne says: "The edict had gone forth to capture the official positions, and this was done in the most unscrupulous manner. At private meetings of the Socialist section nominations would

* The policy of forming groups within the Unions was urged upon the members of the U.D.C. by Mr. Morel at the annual meeting in October, 1915. Before the war Mr. Morel had not shown any concern for Labour.

be decided upon for the different positions, nominators and seconders would be arranged, and often a fierce attack would be made on the holder of the coveted position." Quiet canvassing would go on outside the branch, conducted in such a way as not to disclose the real plan of campaign. The candidates would drop all talk of Socialism and in some cases go so far as to repudiate it. The person to be driven from office being wholly unconscious of the coming attack would make no effort to organise support. Similar methods were adopted to secure a seat on the Executive Committee or for delegation to an annual congress. "Once in possession of the official position the same means were used for the manipulation of the machinery. Important matters were placed at the top or bottom of the agenda, so that they could be rushed through before many members arrived or after the majority of the ordinary members had left."

At the General Election of 1895 the leaders decided upon a course that would at least compel people to recognise the existence of the new Party. Members of the I.L.P. were selected to contest about a dozen constituencies. None of the candidates had the slightest chance of winning, and seats were only contested for propaganda purposes in susceptible centres. Amongst the candidates was Mr. Tom Mann, who had left the Social Democratic Federation to join the new political party. Mr. Mann stood for the Colne Valley division of Yorkshire, a seat which was won in 1907 by another member of the I.L.P. in the person of Mr. Victor Grayson. This rather expensive form of propaganda was not repeated, the more far-seeing members of the party coming to the conclusion that some other method of securing Parliamentary representation would have to be adopted.

From 1893 to 1900 the I.L.P. made very little progress, in spite of its sustained efforts to capture the Labour movement. The leaders had been keen critics of the Trade Unions and their officials, and this attitude had not increased the popularity of the party. Realising, somewhat late in the day, that to attack the Trade Unions and their leaders was a tactical mistake, the I.L.P. organisation began to adopt new measures. This change of policy was necessary if the members of the Independent Labour Party were to secure any portion of the loaves and fishes in possession of the large Unions. To preach intensive Socialism to the working man was recognised as hopeless; he would not accept the new social gospel. The number of Socialists in this country in 1900 was only about 20,000—a

very disappointing return for the labours of the propagandists after twenty years of hard work.

Owing to their failure to build up a powerful political party the leaders of the I.L.P. were driven to the expedient of trying to convert the Trade Unions into political bodies, with, of course, the new Socialists of the I.L.P. as the real leaders. But as many of the prominent persons in the I.L.P. belonged to the middle class and had never been members of a Trade Union they found it somewhat difficult to pose and to speak with authority for organised Labour. The difficulty had only to be recognised to be overcome, and the objection to the technical status of the leaders of the I.L.P. was removed by their joining the "General Labourers' Union." This manœuvre not only enabled these middle-class and professional men to pose as Trade Unionists when addressing public meetings but it gave them the *entrée* to the Councils of the Labour Movement and afforded opportunities for permeating the Unions with their own political doctrines.

After much manœuvring and log-rolling within the Unions the formation of the Labour Party on the lines suggested by the I.L.P. became a matter of acute controversy in the Labour movement itself. The older Trade Unionists were hostile to the proposal on the ground that the introduction of party politics into the Unions would tend to disruption. But these protests did not carry much weight with the advocates of the new policy, and when the Trade Union Congress met at Plymouth in 1899 a resolution was carried in favour of calling a special Congress to consider ways and means of securing direct Labour representation in the House of Commons. Trade Unions and Co-operative and Socialist Societies were to be invited to send delegates, and the over representation of the more advanced sections was designed and secured from the beginning. The special Congress was held in the Memorial Hall, London, on February 27th and 28th, 1900, and was attended by 129 delegates representing 545,316 Trade Unionists and 22,861 Socialists.

(*To be continued.*)

◆ ◆ ◆

QUEERING THE PITCH.

THE circumstances which led up to the Labour and Socialist Special Conference, held at the Central Hall, Westminster, on December 28th, and the conduct of the proceedings, as well as the actual terms of the War Aims Memorandum adopted by the meeting, deserve the most careful attention; for, considered as a whole, they represent an epitome of the designs, methods, and conclusions of a small but powerful group who have secured control of a system of machinery which enables a few wirepullers to pose as the spokesmen of British Labour and to embarrass the Government in its herculean task of carrying on the war with vigour and determination.

The design of those who originated the idea of this conference was an ambitious one, amounting as it did to an attempt to commit British Labour to an endorsement of the programmes of the I.L.P. and U.D.C., with the object of forcing the hand of the Government to adopt a policy differing in important respects from its already declared aims, and that without obtaining the agreement of our Allies and without consulting the self-governing colonies. The annual conference of the Labour Party opens on January 23rd, and it would naturally be expected that the question of war aims would be brought forward and discussed on that occasion: but there were several reasons why the originators and organisers of the earlier meeting were anxious to anticipate the normal course of events. One of the reasons was to influence the decision of the conference on the new Man-Power Bill fixed for the week ending January 5th. Another was to stampede the Annual Labour Party Conference by getting the war aims memorandum settled in advance, it being calculated that the delegates at the annual meeting on January 23rd, in their natural anxiety to devote as much time as possible to the important problems of Reconstruction on the agenda paper, would jump at any excuse to treat the question of Labour's war aims as a *chose jugée*, and what better pretext could be found than the almost unanimous joint decision of the executives of the Labour Party and of the T.U.C. arrived at only a month previously? There were other reasons of a tactical nature which came into the reckoning, but those already indicated are quite sufficient to explain why Mr. Stephen Walsh was outvoted when he appealed to the Conference to stand by its democratic principles and to allow time for steps to be taken to discover whether the Trades Unions were really in favour of the memorandum.

That the opinion of Labour, in the mass, was never invited nor received, and that there is no popular mandate, in any sense,

for many of the aims agreed upon at the Conference, cannot be denied. It is equally certain that, if genuine British working men instead of a select coterie of international intellectuals had drafted the memorandum in question a very different version of "aims," couched in very different language, would have been forthcoming. Dr. Marion Phillips is reported as "thinking" that the "unanimous vote" well expresses the views of over three million workers connected with the T.U.C., the Labour Party, and the War Emergency Workers' National Committee. She is also reported to have added that if any section has not already considered the terms of the memorandum "their views and feelings are not of a high importance." There's good democracy with a vengeance! If organised Labour has not made up its mind on a complicated and equivocal document which has never been balloted upon, with regard to which the other side has not been heard, which concerns such remote considerations as the dismemberment of Islam, a referendum in Alsace-Lorraine, and the future of that part of Africa which lies between the Zambesi and the Sahara—if, forsooth, these and similar problems have been disregarded or postponed for future consideration by over-worked and preoccupied masses, then, "their views and feelings are not of high importance." To get the full flavour of this tit-bit you have only to imagine the tornado of righteous wrath which would have burst upon the land if, for example, Lord Milner had voiced such a sentiment. We are reminded of that once popular refrain "Tableau vivant! There's a picture for you!"

Dr. Marion Phillips is entitled to her opinion, but she will not have to share it with anybody who is on speaking terms with the working man's point of view. This latter has since been more correctly presented by an unanimous resolution passed by the Hartlepool Branch of the A.S.E., which declined to associate itself with the war aims memorandum on the grounds that the delegates, whilst claiming to express the wishes of their constituents, had not submitted the issue to the workers, who, consequently, had been given no opportunity of stating their views.

So much for the boasted authority of the so-called mandate, but that is not the end of the puzzle. This declaration of war aims was not even the unanimous verdict of the officials whose responsibility for its phrasing is invoked. When the memorandum was first discussed by the Parliamentary Committee of the T.U.C. there was considerable opposition to certain clauses, and when the matter was actually put to the vote, only seven members of the committee were present, some of those who were the most strongly opposed being

unavoidably absent. The " card vote " system is seldom quite convincing even on a simple straightforward issue, and examples of official verdicts being repudiated as soon as the rank and file get an opportunity of a direct say in the matter are not wanting. The recent ballot in South Wales was a case in point, and we venture to assert that out of the 700,000 votes which Mr. Robert Smillie had in his pocket on December 28th not quarter would have been redeemed at their face value by the miners if they could have voiced their own opinions without an intermediary. At the same time it must never be forgotten that working men, as a class, are intensely loyal to the leaders in whom they put their trust, and from the wire-puller's point of view a decision in the desired direction once given, however achieved, is something gained; because partisans, especially if they happen to be of Scottish extraction, are little prone to turn their coats without superabundant cause.

The success of the conference of December 28th was an undoubted triumph for the I.L.P., U.D.C., N.C.C.L. group, which so largely dominated the situation, and those who profess to belittle the powers wielded by the organisers of the schemes under discussion would do well to revise their estimate before what was once a cloud no bigger than a man's hand waxes until it obscures the whole firmament. Whilst the best brains and the stoutest hearts in the country are absorbed in trying to win the war, a force, led with no mean ability, is continually manœuvring for position, enrolling recruits and consolidating its resources in the pursuit of objects which, in the opinion of the great majority of thinking people in all the Allied countries, approach perilously near to virtual defeat.

We are not in agreement with many of the contemptuously hostile criticisms which have been levelled against most of the items in the war aims memorandum. The summarised reports printed in some of the newspapers do less than justice to the intelligence which prompted, and the spirit which inspired, the document. At the same time it is sufficiently clear that vaulting ambition has once more o'erleapt itself, and that the authors of the declaration, over-confident that the ring in his nose will prevent the labouring bull from jibbing, over-secure in the belief that the Government is infirm, and over-anxious to satisfy the conflicting claims of all the contributory groups, have allowed the incorporation of certain items which wisdom would have excluded.

Perhaps the greatest *faux pas*, so far as Labour opinion is concerned, is the implied, if unintentional, suggestion that our Government should assist Germany to recover from the

effects of the war, for which she is primarily responsible, by readily furnishing her with the raw materials for industry after peace is declared. We may hold our own views as to the practicability, even as to the advisability, of exacting punishment for the cruel wrongs which German ruthlessness has brought upon the world, but to go out of our way to reward the most unscrupulous and uncompromising enemy that this country has encountered in the course of all her history would be a refinement of self-abnegation which is never likely to appeal even to the long-suffering and over-generous British public. It will be a long time before there is a sufficiency of raw materials to go round, and in the meantime we shall be hard put to it to deal with the problems of the prevention of unemployment and poverty. Judging, not by racial prejudice, but by every reasoned test that can be applied, we are forced to believe that the German Government intended from the very first to humiliate and to destroy the British Empire; nor can we doubt that the German people are intoxicated with the same desire to-day. When the true history of the last seven or eight years is written those outstanding facts will compel the attention of all observers, and there will be no toleration for any party in England which fails to put national interests in the forefront of its programme.

The spirit of the clause dealing with the colonies in tropical Africa looks almost like a studied insult to the intelligence of the Empire and like a liberty taken with the easy complaisance of Labour. The authors can have no access to the information necessary to arrive at a considered judgment on the subject, so they dictate to all belligerent countries a policy which is little better than a réchauffé of the dishes which E. D. Morel has been serving up for many years. If the draughtsman of the clause had given ten minutes' study to the results achieved by the Colonial Office in our Protectorates in the Malay States and in Africa, he would probably have accepted the existing British policy of local self-Government for native communities as the groundwork of his proposals.

We refrain from comment on the proposed Supernational Authority or League of Nations because, although we can see no prospect of security in any safeguard that is not burglar proof, so long as Germany is unrepentant, we are bound to assume that the continued menace of predominant militarism in Europe will somehow or other be removed. A League of Nations supreme, impartial, and incorruptible would be a gift of the gods indeed. Anything less would be worse than a pretence: it would be nothing but a suicide club with England as the first victim.

THE RANK AND FILE MOVEMENT.
Part V.

We have carried the narrative of the Barrow strike to the point when, by a twelve to one majority, the engineers elected to disregard the advice of the A.S.E. Executive, to challenge the authority of the Government, to reject the appeal of the Admiralty, and to obey the promptings of their hotheaded leaders. On Tuesday, March 29th, a mass meeting was held at which the Rank and File leaders were to the fore, and their efforts to prevent the men from resuming work were supplemented by an emissary from Sheffield (W. Sweeting), who said that the position at Barrow was not fully understood in other parts of the country (a statement which was undoubtedly accurate, seeing that many of the Barrow men did not understand it themselves), but that having attended the meeting and having heard the speeches of the strike leaders he would be able to go back and tell the men of Sheffield what they wanted to know. He added that, in his opinion, the result of his visit would be a sympathetic strike. In the course of the following days the London Executive of the A.S.E. redoubled their efforts to bring about an understanding and begged the Shop Stewards to refrain from influencing the men against a settlement, but without avail. After a stormy mass meeting on the 31st, at which the A.S.E. Executive were contemptuously flouted, a further ballot took place, with the result that 550 voted in favour of a resumption of work and 2,608 against it. Every attempt at conciliation having failed, the Government were forced to take action, and on Monday, April 2nd, Barrow and neighbourhood were placarded with bills warning the men that should they fail to return to work by Tuesday morning they would be brought before a Munitions Court and summarily dealt with. Personal warnings were also conveyed to the leaders. Some delay appears to have occurred in posting the placards, the last of which was not exhibited until late on Monday afternoon, and the men were given twenty-four hours to make up their minds. Thereupon yet another mass meeting was held, and again the Rank and File leaders exerted their influence in favour of a continuance of the strike, but at the ballot which took place after the meeting it was resolved by the narrow majority of 373 votes to reverse previous decisions. On Tuesday evening 176 returned to work, followed by 3,097 on Wednesday morning and by a further 1,554 on Wednesday evening, leaving a balance of 1,012 still out. Although the time

limit of twenty-four hours from Monday afternoon was not actually complied with, the Government took the generous course of disregarding the letter of their proclamation, and the Minister of Labour, speaking in the House of Commons on April 4th, said it was a matter for congratulation that the men, even at the eleventh (by which he presumably meant the thirteenth) hour had realised the seriousness of their action and gone back to work. He announced that direct negotiations were in progress, that awards would be retrospective and that there would be "no victimisation."

Thus ended a conflict remarkable in the annals of English industrial warfare both for the lack of any response on the part of the men to the appeals made to their patriotism and for the irreconcilable attitude persisted in by the strike leaders, coupled with the absence of any well-defined grievances which could not have been settled by negotiation. Barrow has a standing and a very serious grievance—viz., the abominable condition of the housing accommodation for so many of its workers, but this legitimate complaint was hardly touched upon, and enthusiasm only waxed eloquent when certain events in Russia were mentioned. We may therefore safely attribute the origin of this strike to political rather than to industrial causes, and we may assume that the underlying motive of those who organised the ferment and kept it alive was not the redress of such ostensible grievances as the alleged cutting of the time allowance under the premium bonus system and discontent with rate fixing. The active hostility of the men was directed against three separate objects, apparently in about equal proportions, and these objects were: the Government, as represented by the Minister of Labour (Mr. John Hodge), the Central Executive of the A.S.E., as represented by Mr. Brownlie, and the employing firm, as represented by Mr. Evans, the chief rate fixer. These personal hostilities must have been artificially stimulated. They lacked the bite of conviction, and they disappeared from view as soon as the provocative animus ceased to operate. The broad motives which inspired the strike leaders can be surmised from the general policy which actuates the Rank and File movement.

The outcome of the whole affair was the loss of thirteen days' work and an equivalent loss in munitions and wages, the victimisation of a considerable number of women (some of them brought to Barrow from a distance), who were thrown out of work through no fault of their own, and the holding of a conference between Messrs. Vickers and their workmen

which the latter could have had for the asking in the first instance and without any strike.

If any vindication is needed for the proposed establishment of Joint Standing Industrial Councils, as recommended by the Whitley Report, it is to be found in the circumstances which attended this strike at Barrow-in-Furness, with its record of energy misdirected, hot blood engendered, and mutual misunderstanding increased; whilst nothing was gained that could not have been settled across a table in half a day by any conference of intelligent and well-disposed men. In the course of the negotiations which eventually took place the accusations made against the chief rate fixer were not substantiated, and the men's representatives withdrew the charges which had been so passionately insisted upon during the heat of the conflict.

Passing from the story of the Barrow strike to a consideration of contemporary events elsewhere, we find a repetition of the same tactics which accompanied the Sheffield strike in November, 1916. Emissaries were sent to Liverpool, Glasgow, Sheffield, Newcastle, and other places charged with the task of persuading the engineers in those districts to support the men of Barrow. No success attended their efforts at the shipbuilding yards on the Clyde and on the Tyne, but they met with a better reception at Sheffield, where the Shop Stewards put their machinery into operation with the object of bringing about a sympathetic strike. It appears, however, that they met with a certain amount of opposition, and the official element in the A.S.E., which disapproved of the suggested strike, seems to have prevailed against the counsels of the forward group. Be this as it may, these manœuvres and counter-manœuvres resulted in a compromise which took the form of referring the question to the decision of a mass meeting, which was held on Saturday, March 31st. At this meeting, which was attended by about ten thousand men, Mr. J. T. Murphy, as representing the Shop Stewards of the Rank and File persuasion, found himself in something of a difficulty. He was unable to speak with the undivided authority of the Shop Stewards behind him and there was no obvious local pretext for a strike at this particular moment. As soon, therefore, as it became apparent that the feeling of the meeting was by no means unanimous the proverbial red herring was produced, and although the gathering had been called together for quite a different purpose an emergency grievance was discovered and embodied in the following resolution: "That we give seven days' notice to remove Sir William Clegg from the chairmanship of the Munitions

Tribunal." This happy afterthought saved the faces of the conveners of the meeting and after the resolution had been declared duly carried everybody went home to tea.

We have already referred to the speech made at Barrow on March 29th by Sweeting, the Sheffield emissary, in which he described the attitude of the workers at Sheffield towards the question of a sympathetic strike. In this connection it may be mentioned that Thomas Morton, of Barrow, paid a visit to Sheffield to find out how the wind was setting in that quarter, and when he returned to Barrow he told the strikers that Sheffield had agreed to " down tools," in sympathy, on Wednesday, March 28th. As we have already shown that no such agreement had been reached, it will be seen that Morton's report to the men of Barrow was, to say the least of it, misleading. If Sweeting's statement was true, then Morton's report was inaccurate, and if the men on strike had taken the trouble to compare the two versions they might have realised that they were being fooled by their leaders.

Nothing came of the Sheffield threat to strike unless Sir William Clegg was removed, for the simple but sufficient reason that the Government flatly refused to submit to dictation. On the whole, things turned out more favourably than at one time seemed probable. If the Sheffield meeting had taken place at an earlier date the resistance of Barrow might have been stiffened, and if the Barrow strike had continued after April 4th the mischief would possibly have spread to Sheffield.

So far as the south of England was concerned no great interest was evinced in the Barrow affair except at Erith, where the following resolution was passed under the auspices of the Rank and File leaders at that centre: " That this meeting emphatically protests against injustice being meted out to our comrades at Barrow and passes a severe vote of censure on the officials responsible for issuing the twenty-four hours ultimatum." It was agreed also that a deputation from Erith should present to the Minister of Labour a further resolution, which declared: " That in the event of any members concerned in the dispute being prosecuted for any part they have taken in it, or being fined or victimised in any way, this meeting emphatically states that it is determined to take drastic action."

◆ ◆ ◆

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR CIVIL LIBERTIES.

THE National Council for Civil Liberties (N.C.C.L.) was formed in 1915 to oppose the introduction of compulsory military service in this country. It was then called the "National Council Against Conscription." The persons who were mainly responsible for its formation were already well-known leaders in various "stop-the-war" societies.*

When the campaign against the introduction of conscription proved fruitless, the N.C.C.L. undertook to assist all those who appealed for exemption from military service either on conscientious or business grounds. In this respect its scope was much wider than that of the No-Conscription Fellowship. Members of the organisation were sent to the Tribunals to act as "watchers," and to report to the Central Office on the cases before the tribunals.

Later it was decided to extend the scope of the Society and to deal with the operation of the Military Service Act, the Defence of the Realm Act, the Munitions Act, and all other measures that restrain the liberties of the individual. With this extension of programme came the above-mentioned change in the name of the Society, and a new department, called the Trade Union Section, was added with A. G. Ammon (of the Fawcett Association) as Secretary. This section sends circular letters to all Trade Union branches and other labour organisations, advising them of new measures emanating from the Government and generally suggesting that labour should adopt a hostile attitude.

Affiliated to the N.C.C.L. are several other societies, including the B.S.P., the N.C.F., the W.L.L., the Fawcett Association, the Scientific Instrument Makers and others. Over seventy trades councils and about a hundred Trade Union branches have decided to support the N.C.C.L.

The Society is an active one and was prominent in organising the Pacifist Convention at Leeds. Recently there has been a falling off in the public propaganda of the N.C.C.L. This is due not to any slackening of the campaign against the war but to a decision to concentrate on work within the ranks of Trade Unionism, a line of attack which is thought to be more promising than that offered by the holding of meetings and the issue of pamphlets.

* Messrs. C. H. Norman, I.L.P., N.C.F., Clifford Allen, I.L.P., U.D.C., N.C.F., Langdon Davies, U.D.C., Robert Williams, I.L.P., C.O., Robert Smillie, I.L.P., Adrian Stephens, U.D.C.

◆ ◆ ◆

FOOD FOR THOUGHT.

THE incredible and apparently incurable folly of those who wish to see a revolution in this country after the Bolshevik model is exposed in all its naked lunacy in *The Call* of December 20th. This "Organ of International Socialism" attempts to stimulate the energies of Socialist leaders who are accused of expressing no enthusiasm "at the marvellous spectacle of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the initiation of measures, with courage and intelligence ushering in the long-yearned-for Socialist order of Society." The ravings proceed in *crescendo*, "You, who are still Socialist, why do you not come out with dance and song to greet the new, the glorious, the ever memorable days we are living through? Where are your meetings? Where are your demonstrations? Where are your oaths that you, too, would strike a blow against the Capitalist Society for the triumph of Socialism? Does not your heart beat higher? Does not the blood course quicker in your veins? Who are you then? Reply!"

◆ ◆ ◆

On the same day that this effusion was published *The Westminster Gazette* gives the following account of affairs in the Russian capital. "Petrograd has been declared in a state of siege. All street meetings and gatherings are prohibited. Attempts to pillage wine stores, shops and private dwellings, etc., will be suppressed by machine-guns without warning. No one will be allowed out after nine in the evening without the authorisation of house committees."

◆ ◆ ◆

In such garb comes the long-yearned-for Socialist order of Society. Chastisement by whip has given place to chastisement by scorpion; therefore we are bidden to "come out with dance and song to greet the new, the glorious, the ever-memorable days we are living through."

◆ ◆ ◆

The statement that the cost of living has increased since August, 1914, by 106 per cent. has been widely advertised by people who desire to put the figure as high as possible and widely accepted by people who are ready to believe anything they are told. In order to arrive at a just estimate of the actual increase in the necessaries of life to the working classes certain factors should be brought into the calculation which are commonly omitted. We refer, amongst others, to rent, travel, and insurance. In many districts rent has risen, but taking the country as a whole the increase is small. The

uxury of long distance travel has gone up by 50 per cent., but tramway and omnibus fares, which represent a working class necessity, are unaltered in some places and show a rise of from 25 to 50 per cent. in others. Subscriptions to Trade Unions, National Health and Unemployment Insurance, etc., have not been affected by war conditions.

Coming to actual food, *The National Food Journal* of December 12th, 1917, says: "The average expenditure of artisan families on meat, bread and other principal foods was in 1916 17s. per week. The cost of the corresponding group in December, 1917, is about 26s. 9d., that is an increase of slightly under 60 per cent." If the increase was equal to 106 per cent. the average expenditure would be 35s. for the same standard of living.

◆ ◆ ◆

Bread has risen 54 per cent., margarine 65 per cent., and English mutton 75 per cent. Taking everything into consideration it is very doubtful whether the actual increase in living under all necessary headings amounts to 50 per cent. The cost of board and lodging for a single man in working class districts is a more reliable index than any figure evolved from statistical tables which obviously take no account of the process of substitution, as we may rest assured that landladies are not robbing themselves for the sake of their lodgers. Another factor which should be taken into account is the comparatively new institution of works canteens where a full and very excellent meal consisting of cut from the joint, two vegetables, bread, and sweet can be obtained for a shilling.

◆ ◆ ◆

The Sheffield Worker for December, 1917, gives a list of percentage increases for each six months since the war commenced as follows: In January, 1915, the increase was 23 per cent. In July of the same year the increase was 36 per cent. In January, 1916, the increase was 49 per cent.; in July, 62 per cent. In January, 1917, 93 per cent., and in July of the same year 105 per cent. But for the various reasons already given we are not inclined to take these figures as representing the *bona fide* and unavoidable additions to the cost of living in Sheffield.

◆ ◆ ◆

During November, 1917, says *The Labour Gazette*, wage increases were granted to 170,000 workpeople amounting to over £30,000 a week. In the eleven months ending November 4,322,000 people have received additional wages amounting to £1,507,500 a week, or £78,390,000 per annum. Of the

£1,507,500 weekly some £450,000 goes to coal miners and an equal amount to engineers and shipbuilders. Any nett increase in prosperity that has come to working class households during the war is mainly due, however, not to the wage increases tabulated in statistical tables, but to the fact that under present conditions many wives and daughters who used to be an expense now contribute to the family budget more than the cost of their keep.

◆ ◆ ◆

The new National Administrative Council of the Rank and File Movement, constant to their often reiterated principle that no agreements are binding, have passed resolutions at Manchester refusing to recognise any agreement arrived at between the Trade Union officials and the Government. They declare that they will actively resist the man-power proposals now under discussion and they threaten to cause a general strike to compel the Government to adopt the peace terms formulated by Lenin and Trotsky. On the other hand, the Erith District Committee of the A.S.E. pledge themselves to resist by all possible means any further call on the man power of the nation unless the Government immediately intimates its willingness to adopt the war aims of the Labour Party. What is the poor Government to do? Must it yield to the threat from Manchester or obey the mandate from Erith? It can't do both.

◆ ◆ ◆

As we know to our cost, America took a long time to make up her mind about the war. To what extent this delay was due to our own fault must remain a matter of opinion, but it is certain that had we shown early appreciation of the American point of view, and gone out of our way to meet it, had we realised the supreme importance of her intervention and made up our minds to secure it, had we displayed a little more imagination and a little less dignified propriety, had we substituted "hustle" for "highbrow," the Bernstorff, Boy-ed, Von Papen combination would have been *cuchred* before they had time to develop their game.

◆ ◆ ◆

Once in the war, however, America quickly got to work in a business-like fashion, and proved that sound democracy is not incompatible with strong government. The elaborate edifice fabricated by German agents collapsed directly it was tackled. The Government was not afraid of telling the people the truth, with the result that public opinion rallied to the support of the President, and refused to countenance any agitation that savoured of anti-nationalism.

◆ ◆ ◆

Justice republishes a manifesto of American Socialists who declare "Peace to-day would save German militarism and achieve the destruction of the Russian Revolution. German militarism saved would mean the establishment of militarism in all the great nations, including the United States, and would sound the death-knell of liberty and democracy everywhere. . . . The programme of the organising committee of the Stockholm Conference provided for an indemnity for Belgium in name only—a miserable counterfeit indemnity which must have been concocted by the German General Staff or the Kaiser's Foreign Office. . . . The Stockholm Conference is ardently supported by all Socialists who are the dupes of the German Socialists or victims of the pro-German propaganda . . . (it) decided each and every one of the numerous questions at issue in favour of Germany. . . . Parallel columns will demonstrate that the proposals of this so-called Stockholm Conference are not only 75 per cent. pro-German, but 100 per cent. . . . These false democrats do not put in a single sentence about democracy; their masters, the German Socialists, who had absolute veto in the meetings that framed the programme, would not permit it."

◆ ◆ ◆

The rebuke to Berlin administered by the new Russian journal, *Der Volkerfriede*, contains passages which show that Russia has not yet been completely hypnotised by German hypocrisy. Speaking of the conquered provinces it says: "In the occupied districts the Germans rule with the mailed fist. Workmen are pursued and seized in the streets and deported to Germany, where they are forced to work in factories and are treated like slaves. . . . The workers' leaders have been relegated to German concentration camps, where for months past they have been starving. Hunger demonstrations organised by the workmen are dispersed by force of arms. The hunger of women and old men is appeased by bullets. All these facts have been exposed many times in the German Reichstag and the Prussian Landtag by social, democratic and bourgeoise deputies, and are borne out by documentary evidence. Unmeasured tyranny over the working classes—such is the nature of the German occupation in the occupied districts. . . . The German Government utters hypocritical phrases and puts on the mask of democracy, but when we look, not at its lips but at its hands, we see its fists clenched."

◆ ◆ ◆

We have referred elsewhere to the League of Nations project

so enthusiastically supported at the Labour and Socialist Conference of December 28th. This proposed system of compulsory arbitration which is to make war between nations impossible is an ideal that we must all admire, even if we are unable to understand how its authority is to be maintained without the ultimate arbitrament of the very force which it is intended to supersede. But there is no doubt that industrial strife, with all its waste and all its recurrent inefficiency, *could* be prevented by compulsory arbitration. In the industrial field the law would be self-sufficient to give effect to its decisions without the intervention of force; for the simple reason that the mere threat of practicable compulsion, combined with the obvious advantage to all parties of keeping the peace, would achieve the desired object. Why, then, does Labour, which approves of a League of Nations, set itself in opposition to compulsory arbitration in industrial disputes? Four possible answers suggest themselves: (*a*) That there are Englishmen so blind that they would rather trust Germans than their own countrymen; (*b*) that the moderate and sane elements in the Labour world are unable to curb the predatory instincts of the Syndicalists; (*c*) that Labour is war weary and will support any expedient that promises peace, whether it be a good, bad or an indifferent one; (*d*) that Labour cannot bring itself to believe in the impartiality and good faith of any Government tribunal.

◆ ◆ ◆

Generosity forbids us to lay stress on the three solutions first mentioned until every effort has been made to remove the bad impression which attaches to the fourth. All recent experience tends to the conclusion that Government action is at present disposed to favour the working classes, who have won victory after victory. Nevertheless, the belief is widely and honestly held that Government yields only to fear. Is the policy of "too late" never to be eradicated? Cannot foresight, understanding and firm leadership take the place of opportunism? If the authorities intend always to give way at the eleventh hour, cannot they perceive that it is less troublesome and more gracious to be generous at first? How long must the process continue of truckling to insolence and penalising loyalty? The sands are running out, but "the Pharaohs" remain sublimely indifferent.

◆ ◆ ◆

"The camel driver has his thoughts, and the camel—he has his."—*Arabian Proverb.*

INDUSTRIAL PEACE

CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations

The Antidote

Profit-Sharing

Defeatism

Payment by Results

The Rank and File Movement. Part VI

The Industrial Army

Food for Thought

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

THE following abbreviations are occasionally used in the following pages and should be noted for future reference:—

A.S.E.	Amalgamated Society of Engineers.
B.S.P.	British Socialist Party.
B.W.L.	British Workers' League.
C.L.C.	Central Labour College.
C.O.	Conscientious Objector.
C.W.C.	Clyde Workers Committee.
D.R.R.	Defence of the Realm Regulations.
E.A.T.C.	Engineering and Allied Trades Committee.
E.T.U.	Electrical Trades Union.
F.O.R.	Fellowship of Reconciliation.
I.L.P.	Independent Labour Party.
I.W.W.	Industrial Workers of the World.
M. of M.	Ministry of Munitions.
M.S.A.	Military Service Act.
M.W.A.	Munitions of War Act.
N.A.C.	National Administrative Council.
N.C.C.L.	National Council of Civil Liberties.
N.C.F.	No Conscription Fellowship.
N.G.L.	National Guilds League.
N.U.R.	National Union of Railwaymen.
N.U.T.	National Union of Teachers.
P.N.C.	Peace by Negotiations Council.
R.F.M.	Rank and File Movement.
S.L.P.	Socialist Labour Party.
S.P.Gt.B.	Socialist Party of Great Britain.
S.S.C.	Social Science Classes.
T.U.C.	Trade Union Congress.
U.D.C.	Union of Democratic Control.
U.M.W.A.	United Machine Workers' Association.
W.E.A.	Workers' Educational Association.
W.E.W.N.C. ...	War Emergency Workers' National Committee.
W.I.L.	Women's International League.
W.L.L.	Women's Labour League.
W.P.C.	Women's Peace Crusade.
W.S.D.C.	Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates Council.
W.S.P.U.	Women's Social and Political Union.
W.U.	Workers' Union.
W.W.U.	Women Workers' Union.

INDUSTRIAL PEACE

THE ANTIDOTE.

It is a bad omen for a nation when its system of government fails to command the support of the majority. In days gone by this political party and that had their ups and downs and what was lost by one side was gained by the other, and so the system itself did not suffer in the public estimation. The pendulum shifted its position, but the mainspring was unaffected. At the present time we are confronted by a problem of the gravest moment, for the prestige of the whole system of Parliamentary government is impaired to such an extent that its authority is not only questioned but challenged. People who used to be strong partisans now say that one side is as bad as the other—nobody ever expresses the opinion that one side is as good as the other. The virtual emasculation of the House of Lords has not invigorated the House of Commons, and the decisions of the War Cabinet of the Coalition are not accepted with so good a grace as those party measures which used to be carried in the teeth of a strong opposition. The country used to play the game according to the rules and obey the law whether they liked it or not; there was no insubordination worth mentioning.

But during the last few years a marked change has asserted itself and rebels openly claim the right to defy the authority of Parliament and to act as they see fit. The Military Service Act has been evaded by anti-nationalists who are not genuine conscientious objectors with the support of Members of Parliament, and the Munitions of War Act has been contemptuously disregarded by thousands of citizens on hundreds of occasions without giving rise to any serious public alarm. We do not propose to discuss the merits or demerits of these Acts of Parliament; it is sufficient to state the fact that any group of malcontents, any individual agitator, can usurp authority without any serious risk of punishment, and, what is worse, often without so much as even a formal protest. Contempt for the law has become so much an everyday habit in Ireland that nobody pays much attention to its manifestations; but the question is how far we can afford to travel on that same road to ruin which is being so conspicuously negotiated by Mr. de Valera and his lieutenants. Open defiance is still something of a novelty in Great Britain, and on that account, perhaps,

it is not taken as seriously as it ought to be. Our temperament is always disposed to regard anything new (except musical comedy) as being unworthy of serious notice, and, as all things which are not new (except vintages and furniture) are contemptuously dismissed on the score of being "back numbers," we are relieved from the discomfort of exerting ourselves until the last moment; that is to say, until the coming danger is actually at the threshold. This habit of taking time by the tail instead of by the forelock is an expensive luxury which we may indulge in once too often. It is impossible for the nation to continue on this path or for Parliament to ignore any longer the fact that its authority is flouted by organisations which acknowledge no law, and of the many problems confronting us there is none so vital nor so urgent as the restoration of authority.

Parliamentary government, the great constructive feature of the last six hundred years of English history, stands to-day on its trial. If in great emergencies we can feel that the present House of Commons has worthily represented the nation, we must admit, on the other hand, that as regards everyday needs Parliament has more often obstructed than assisted the Cabinet, and that criticism has been altogether out of proportion to helpful suggestion. Now the authority of Parliament is attacked at once from two directions. The revolutionists boast that by the use of the "economic weapon," that is, the strike, they can at all times bring Parliament to its knees; and this boast has frequently been made good in action. Members of Parliament will shortly be challenged to fight for their position in every urban constituency in the kingdom. If they are so challenged by a united Labour Party having a policy of its own and prepared to form an alternative and effective Government, then we might have an electoral struggle in the old sense.

It is to be feared, however, that many ex-Coalition candidates may be tempted to accommodate their policy to the exigencies of their local campaigns in the hope of saving their seats by avoiding the real issues. If the electors are called upon to choose between two sets of men and two policies the country would get the type of Government which it desires, and, whatever the fate of the contending parties at the polls, a constitutional decision would be reached and the work of reconstruction could then proceed on intelligent lines.

Two questions stand out by themselves as being of exclusive importance, and these are the prosecution of the war to a successful termination and the subsequent re-establishment of

peace conditions on a stable basis. But these questions can never be solved to the national advantage unless all parties concentrate their minds and direct their energies in accordance with honest and studied convictions. It is not sufficient that Liberals and Conservatives should oppose Labour for the sake of opposition on traditional lines, it is essential that they should formulate a policy which they sincerely believe to be in the best national interest and that they should adhere courageously to such a policy at every cost. Ex-Coalition candidates will need to take a definite and united stand with regard to those fundamental problems of society which till now they have studied so little, but upon which they will be cross-examined at every street corner. They will need to explain their attitude to Marxism. Will they accept the doctrine that Labour always produces more than is sufficient for its own needs, that Capital exploits and robs it of its surplus; that Labour is therefore entitled to a larger share in its own products, and to a controlling voice in the management of all industries? They will be tempted to answer all these questions in the affirmative, because thereby they will court immediate applause. But if they do so they will have given away the nation's cause, and they will fall victims to those who will be able to say that they hold these doctrines with more consistency and more sincerity.

For these supposedly popular doctrines do not constitute a well-balanced statement of social facts, and their unqualified adoption must have disastrous results. To be clear on this point it is necessary once more to restate the function of capital in the modern State.

Capital is neither more nor less than the product of labour reserved to aid the future production of wealth, and Capitalism is the spirit which maintains this reserve. In its simplest form capital is seed-corn reserved to beget a future harvest; in its modern development it at least includes all materials, food, fuel, and machinery reserved for future use. Whether such capital is owned by individuals or the State is immaterial from this point of view, but it must be kept in the possession of those who will use it as capital, and it must not be distributed amongst those who are likely to consume it. Capitalism in its essence is thrift. Thrifty individuals we have in numbers; a thrifty State is unknown in experience, but is in theory conceivable. Sir A. J. Marriott tells us that he belongs to a party which aims at the State taking over the capital of individuals, and using it in the interest of all its members. With that doctrine we might have no quarrel, if indeed the State could learn to use and not to waste the capital which it

seizes. In many countries a thrifty working-class population is firmly established, and thrift is not unknown in the United Kingdom. But we have to consider not abstract theories only, but also the actual facts of the modern Labour Movement. It is unhappily dominated to a large extent, not by experienced and responsible heads of families, but by youths to whom the mention of any kind of thrift or foresight is unbearable; and they claim the nation's capital in order to consume it. It is often deemed to be a crying scandal that one-half of the income of the nation should be "enjoyed" by one-tenth of the population. The statement is inaccurate, the complaint is superficial, and the facts are now greatly modified. No word will be said here to defend a class of "idle rich"; but in our opinion such a class no longer exists in this country on a large scale. If, before the war, the well-to-do classes jointly received an income of £1,000,000,000 a year, at least one-half of that sum was available for national purposes, either through taxation or through thrift. The savings of the working classes may have represented a greater moral effort, but they can never have contributed an equal amount to the public service. To-day, in consequence of more than three years of war, the balance is greatly altered. The former well-to-do classes perhaps receive a third of the national income, but their contribution to taxation and their savings are greater than ever. The wage-earners receive two-thirds, and of this only a trifling proportion is available for either purpose.

Now let us ask for what purposes Labour movements demand higher wages or greater control of industry. If it is that working men may save more or produce more, then, indeed, it is time that the demand was granted. If, on the other hand, their desire is to spend more and to enjoy more, then it is national folly to grant the request. The Revolutionary Leaders at least have left us in no doubt on this point, their advice to Labour is: "Claim all you can and spend all you can." From this policy only one result can follow, the depletion of the national stores; this result is taking place to-day, and it must be checked.

A patriotic Parliamentary candidate will need to say at the next election that capital, the reservoir of the national wealth, must in these times be conserved, that we cannot venture on the experiment of thrusting it into the charge of those who have not yet learned to practise thrift, and that we dare not tempt working men in the mass to increased expenditure by ever-increasing wages. The captain of a wrecked vessel short of food does not distribute all he has amongst his men, but keeps

it in a central store, the commander of a beleaguered city does the same. Yet in both cases the danger of famine comes home to each man. In our community the great majority do not know by experience what real famine means, and cannot comprehend its possibility. Hitherto there has always been food in the shops at a price, and many seem to believe it to be a law of nature that it must always be there. But they can understand the contrary if it is explained to them; and the more that capital and stores of all kinds are concentrated under public management the easier it should be to bring the lesson home.

But, if this is so, why should politicians be afraid to defend the "Capitalistic State" which the revolutionists revile? It is the supreme function of the State to be capitalistic, and to maintain a reservoir of wealth, so that we may never be reduced to actual want in metals, munitions, clothing or food. If the next Parliamentary election is to afford a stable basis for a national authority, then every candidate, whatever his political colour according to old party divisions, should speak with the same voice as to the absolute necessity of the conservation of national resources. And to the popular Marxism to which he may have been inclined to give some sort of assent he must reply:—

"There is no law of nature by which Labour produces more than it needs for subsistence. Without law, order, education, skill and thrift mere Labour can barely support the savage's standard of life. At the present time, with all these advantages, of which the Marxists reck nothing, British Labour does not produce enough for the bare subsistence of the working classes. Its principal products are munitions of war, for which only the State has a use. Of articles of consumption its store is being depleted. Unless it be alleged that "capitalists" are eating more or wearing out more clothes than wage-earners, it is not true that they are exploiting Labour, but the charge is true against wealthy working men who grab at the still higher wages which can only be paid at the cost of others poorer than themselves. The nation must retain a hold upon its stores and must deal them out with a niggard hand."

But if we have ventured in this article to suggest one item in the future programme of Government candidates, and may be permitted later to discuss others, there are urgent matters which will not wait so long. For the last twelve months Government has continuously yielded ground before the Revolutionary Movement; this retreat must be stayed. We venture to call attention to three immediate issues.

Week by week there is being circulated throughout the kingdom a revolutionary literature in which all law and authority is openly held up to contempt. This literature is well known to the Government. It cannot rightly be tolerated any longer.

Not only by Act of Parliament, but also with the free consent of great Labour organisations, a combing-out of certain industries for military service is being prepared. Against this combing out certain sectional bodies are preparing open opposition. Such action can only be described as a stepping-stone to high treason. If it is permitted the evil will spread.

Certain Labour leaders are at the moment demanding for their followers increased wages on a scale hitherto undreamt of. Such demands cannot be granted without a further inflation of currency and great injustice to the poorer sections of the community. To meet them, Government should have a wages policy based on the principle of payment by results, the maximum wage, or some other which is distinct from mere drifting. The principle that "wages should rise in proportion to the price of commodities" is inconsistent with war conditions.

These three movements taken together constitute, in our judgment, a serious menace to the national safety. We earnestly commend them to the immediate consideration, not only of the Government departments concerned, but also of our legislators generally.

◆ ◆ ◆

PROFIT-SHARING.

For an idea which, *prima facie* at least, has great attractiveness profit-sharing has had singularly little success. The name sounds well. Profits, most men would lazily agree, are among the gifts of Providence, so good a gift that no one can be blamed for monopolising them, or praised enough for allowing others a share. No one will deny that if the goal of industry, as many hold, is profits, all the parties to production should share in profits. Yet, while everyone speaks well of profit-sharing, very few practise it. On every side the idea gains a cursory acceptance. Here and there it arouses a brief and thin enthusiasm. To tell the truth, it has barely affected the fabric of industry.

The causes of this failure, if what has never been tried can be said to have failed, are not really obscure. Profit-sharing is praised, as the Millennium is praised. No one proceeds to apply or enforce the Millennium. No direct theatrical stroke, single and decisive, will establish that heaven in our midst, but only an infinity of small acts and long courses of conduct. Indirect action is here the only practical method. Similarly, profit-sharing is not an ingredient of industry that may be added in like any other. It is rather a touchstone, the veriest tell-tale. Its effects may be those of a ferment. It cannot be counted on to improve the mass, except, perhaps, by first making it worse. But as violent cures are usually to be avoided, let us discuss profit-sharing as an effect rather than try to use it as a cause. The question is not what profit-sharing would do for industry if only it were adopted, but rather what must be done with industry to make profit-sharing easy and natural. The answer, of course, is that in a properly ordered house there is no quarrelling as to what food shall be cooked or who shall sit on the chairs. Organise industry, therefore, by thoroughly scientific methods, inspire the true spirit of co-operation in employers and men, and you may, if you like, have profit-sharing to crown the whole. But if you succeed with the spirit and the machinery of industry, you may find profit-sharing superfluous, for you will already, in great measure, have shared out the profits. The preparatory steps, the change in personal attitude and the consequential changes in organisation, will probably accomplish all that is necessary. Profit-sharing, if it comes at all, will come last as the symbol of a perfected co-operation among the

parties. At that stage the parties may think profit-sharing pedantry. It is but a rough justice that governs the division of the spoils of industry. For neither masters nor men, in their praise be it said, value the small change or care for scrupulosity in half-pence.

It is bad theory to say that profits are the goal of industry. The goal is output. This is true, not only of manufacture in general, but of each manufacturing unit or firm in particular. If a firm made no profits or made losses, its career would be short, but so far as the making and retaining of profits enters into its aim, it enters in, on a sound view, in order to secure and perpetuate the firm's function as an instrument of output. It may be objected that to say this is to attribute to business as a whole and to businesses in detail a motive which cannot be demonstrated in any individual's mind at any point in the whole movement. This is partly true and partly irrelevant. The facts of manufacture and trading too often fall short of the demands of sound theory. But if it is true, and so far as it is true, so much the worse for present-day industry. For this industry must be working not from the soundest motives, but by an automatic drift, an extraneous pressure, an interplay of lower and confusing motives, by force of which output is produced indeed, but not in the quantity or of the quality that are desirable and possible. Consider the attitude of the average profits-man or employer, as he was before the war rather than as he is now, for the war has educated him. Slightly slovenly, slightly suspicious, slightly shortsighted, he saw in the consumer a man who could be induced to take wares a little worse and dearer than they need be, in his labour the chief hope and pivot of his success in so far as wage-costs could be reduced without checking production seriously, in provident organisation something for which life, at least his own industrial life, was too short and uncertain. Human life is unfortunately all too short. Just how this affects those undertakings which cannot be brought to perfect working within very short periods may be seen from a comparison of certain kinds of effort and of the habits they breed among ourselves and, for example, among certain eastern races which are shorter-lived. England has some measure of natural advantage over those races. Here, however, as elsewhere, a conscious cultivation of long views, and a resolute pursuit of the motives and methods which these dictate are needed. But let us return to the average or under-average employer of this era. Working nervously among conditions and persons that he has neither conciliated nor understood, and taking restricted views, he has often preferred

to amass immediate profits rather than to lay solid foundations of permanent usefulness in the relations in which he found himself. He desired to be rich, whereas he was only entitled to be solvent, with the addition, of course, of such safeguards and reserves as would tide him through crises and ensure him permanency.

Of such views in their employers work-people are increasingly critical. They challenge the privileged position of profits as monopolising all balances. Claiming good wages for themselves, they are not disinclined to allow adequate salaries for staff, and also "normal" interest on capital. They dislike excessive profits, whether these are distributed at once in dividends, or are accumulated beyond "normal" needs in respect of reserves. The sums thus intercepted should go mainly, they claim, in reducing prices or in raising wages and salaries. If profits, beyond a modest limit, are in truth an awkward bye-product of industry and not its goal, the sharing of profits is clearly no panacea for labour difficulties and no pledge of good production. The workpeople, as critics of their employers, lay the stress on output, with its corollaries of cheapness, plenty and quality. Their own past policy has shown less solicitude on this point. They have preferred, or at least pursued, methods which, by restriction of production, made the policy of the under-average employer more harmful than it would otherwise have been. The two factors have doubtless interacted, the faults of each side intensifying those of the other. The errors of both sides as producers have prejudiced them as consumers from their cradles to their graves.

Where then does the cure lie? It lies partly in new motives and partly in a new system. It lies perhaps more in the latter, since new motives are best learnt by working in accordance with them.

If output is the true theoretic aim of industry, every agent in production must be put in the true relation to output. This is, in reality, an extraordinarily simple thing to do. If your workpeople have it in their power to raise or reduce output, you must pay them to raise it. You must give them a direct wage interest in it, letting part at least of their earnings depend on the figures of production. One important caution is necessary. The workpeople must be saved by a system of minimum guarantees from the full force of the extreme vicissitudes of business. This burden in a sense is unavoidable, and in fact has always been borne by industry. Good times must pay for bad ones. But they do it poorly. Inadequate, unsystematic and somewhat unwilling this form of insurance has failed over

long periods and for great numbers of workpeople. The insurance of wages can only be effected by the creation and earmarking of reserves. Industry may appear to some unequal to such a burden. This may well be true of a good part of present-day industry. But it is chiefly true because industry has not first adjusted its means to its end and then shouldered the burden. The end is output and the means a direct interest in output for all who contribute towards it. Adopt this end and this means, and the burden will be easy to carry.

To sum up, industry needs a double reorientation, firstly of each establishment towards the economic community of which it forms part, and secondly among the parties which it comprises. Conceive on the one hand of an efficient unit, well supported by reserves and better balanced than before between the motives of gain and service, and on the other of a staff united and energised by the stimulus of common interest and purpose; within the establishment every person and every thing made organic to its success, and these as a whole an organ of the community. And perhaps the supreme merit of such a development is that it should not come by force or fear, for these are not subtle contrivers, but by conviction and choice, that it should in just this way correct mere interest by humaner principles. Man shall not live by output alone. Industry lends itself readily to the clash of greed and pride. If men care, they can make it the field for freer, happier, and more fruitful elements in themselves.

◆ ◆ ◆

DEFEATISM.

THAT mixed and curious body of people whose multifarious activities are best described by the word "defeatist" present a complex and important problem. The problem they present is, for the moment, mainly of war importance, and as such it has not a little significance in its relations not only to military but to national and international, and to political, social and industrial affairs. But, while its current significance is mainly in regard to the successful prosecution of the war, its after-war significance will hardly be less important; for, just as its present activities are concentrated upon preventing the nation from carrying out successfully its great and overwhelming task, so will the activities of many of its members be concentrated after the war in obstructing those practicable measures of reconstruction which will be so essential to the rebuilding of the national life in all its elements. The ideals, the claims, the demands, the propaganda and the work of the "defeatists" in regard to the war are, of course, the more immediately important; but these must be studied closely in relation to their possible expression and activity when the war is over. In other words, the problem of "defeatism" is a problem of peace as well as of war, and we must recognise and reckon with the fact that many of the forces which are now seeking to undermine the national will and purpose in regard to the war will spare no effort to thwart the national will and purpose in regard to national and international reconstruction when peace has come.

In one sense the whole nation is "defeatist"—in the sense that no individual, no community, no nation can live fully and continuously up to the ideals and the sacrifices which the war is demanding from all of us to-day. The loss of relatives and friends in the war; the difficulties of food supplies and prices; the financial, physical, mental and nervous strain imposed by the war; uncertainty as to precise result of the war and as to the conditions and possibilities as to the future and other causes of disheartenment are all at work in greater or in less degree throughout the nation and are producing a greater or less degree of "defeatist" results. But the essential difference between the vast body of citizens and the majority of "defeatists" is that, while the former strive to brace themselves more and more against all disheartening influences and strive more and more to play their part in the winning of the war, the latter exploit all the disheartening influences with the deliberate object of increasing indefinitely their "defeatist" influence and so increasing the ranks of those who are opposed to the suc-

cessful prosecution of the war. And there is abundant evidence that as the strain imposed upon the nation by the war becomes greater these " defeatists " grow more and more active. Their numbers are small, but the methods and the results of their influence are hard to trace, and that influence is of a kind that certainly cannot be ignored with impunity. When one speaks of " defeatists " one does not think of a solid body of organised men and women with a unified impulse and purpose. If they were so organised their work and influence would be more easily counteracted. The fact is that " defeatists " as such belong to no particular class or party or even type, nor are they likely to form a solid and highly organised body; for if they attempted to do so they would quickly find that the only thing they had in common was opposition to the war and that the causes of that opposition were so varied and so contrasted in object and operation that no society could long stand the strain of co-ordinating and harmonising them all. There are, of course, a few societies which probably contain representatives of all types of " defeatists," such as the National Council for Civil Liberties, the No-Conscription Fellowship, and the Union of Democratic Control ; but we believe that two things are very clear : first, that such societies are more dangerous indirectly than directly, and, secondly, that the real menace of " defeatism " is in the patient and often skilful way in which individual " defeatists " or groups of " defeatists " attempt to permeate the political and other industrial associations to which they belong with " defeatist " aims and ideas.

We do not propose for the moment to investigate the actual methods and propaganda of " defeatist." All we wish to do is to draw attention to two main types of " defeatists " and to some of the mainsprings of their thought and action.

The first type can best be described as anarchistic. By anarchistic we mean the type of man and woman who has a vague and sentimental feeling that the one thing that counts in life is personal freedom and who has somehow got the idea that all laws and government, traditions, customs and usages of Society are in the main to be regarded as so many trammels upon the freedom of the individual. We have all met the type. It is not the anarchistic who, though almost entirely a myth, managed to capture and horrify the imagination of all the conventional people some twenty or thirty years ago. It is a type eminently harmless in itself, sometimes lovable, often amusing, and not infrequently foolish to a contemptible degree. It has fed much—and with but little healthy digestion—upon Theosophy, Christian Science, and other new religions. It has a real faculty for mistaking the weakest things in, say, Tolstoy,

Whitman or Carpenter for the best. And it is found elsewhere than in garden cities and garden suburbs. It is a type that worships personal freedom and makes of it a new convention. Freedom, brotherhood, comradeship, liberty of conscience and speech are very precious things, but the anarchistic type we speak of tends to dissociate them from the facts of daily life, to make sheer abstractions and ideas of them and to become itself really one of the most conventional of all types of people. The type is well-meaning and in normal times it is harmless and even has its uses, but in times like the present it affords a ready recruiting ground for more dangerous and sinister types.

The second type is one that is actuated by a very definite and a very deliberate if limited impulse. That impulse, viewed superficially, appears to be constructive; in reality it is really destructive. The type includes such as are animated by bitter hostility to the structure and functions of the modern state, to the waging of war for whatever purpose, to the conditions of modern industry and society, etc. With some of their ideals all thinking men and women are in deep sympathy. The modern state and contemporary industry and society certainly need many and drastic reforms; and war is a thing to be avoided if at all possible. But at a time when the State itself and the whole future of industry and society are threatened from without, conservation is more important than reform, and such reforms as can be effected must be essentially such as will enable the State, industry and society most powerfully and effectually to oppose those who threaten them from without. To insist at such a time upon "reforms," even if they be genuine reforms, which would be difficult enough to carry out in times of peace, is to play the defeatist game. This game is played especially in the industrial world by those who see in every industrial and national crisis only an opportunity to push their own particular revolutionary proposals. Many of these people are perfectly sincere, and their sincerity and their enthusiasm are the source of much of their influence and strength; but what is wrong with all of them is that they are so obsessed by the need for this or that particular principle or particular "reform" that they are prepared to sacrifice the freedom and the security of the State in order to attain it.

Both types are strongly characterised by a habit of simplifying problems. The complexities, the inter-relations and all the subtle and elusive play and interplay of the life of a modern nation are ignored by them and they have lost all sense of perspective and proportion. A part—and a very small part—has been substituted for the whole and the part has inevitably been exaggerated out of all resemblance to its real self, and a

place and functions have been assigned to it which have no true relation with reality. In the one case the rights claimed for the individual, in the other the rights claimed for a party or for a class, have been made preponderant over the needs and the rights of the nation as a whole. And when that happens in a time of great national crisis the inevitable result is that a " defeatist " influence is generated and exerted.

The factors which make for " defeatism " are many. Beyond those which we have already noticed there are four which demand special mention. There is, firstly, the preponderance of the destructive over the constructive. The substitution of one industrial system for another is not necessarily constructive ; and when the substitution is attempted at a time when its effects would inevitably lead to national disaster the process can be termed no other than destructive, even though the new system might, in normal times, be constructive in the best and fullest sense of the words. In the same way over-emphasis upon personal freedom is at present essentially destructive. Dirt, it has been said, is only matter out of place. Principles and reforms, however excellent in themselves, which are out of place for the time being, are in the category of dirt.

The second, third and fourth factors we wish to mention are closely allied to each other. They are egoism, a desire for notoriety and a kind of priggishness which finds satisfaction in a feeling of superiority. Most of us are subject to these human weaknesses, but they invariably find their supreme expression among minorities in times of great national crisis. The present is no exception. The " defeatists " are a small minority of the nation ; but it must never be forgotten that minorities often exercise an influence out of all proportion to their numerical strength, for the simple reason that minorities, when they have a definite purpose in view, are, by the very nature of the case, more compact, more self-conscious, more constantly alert and active than majorities. There is no need to exaggerate the influence or the results of " defeatism," but the aims and the activities of the " defeatists " in our midst are insidious and are not without some elements of real danger to the nation as a whole. They can exercise but little real *direct* influence upon the attitude and the will of the people in regard to the prosecution of the war, but by exploiting industrial and political differences, difficulties of food supplies, distribution and prices, and the feeling of war weariness wherever they find it, they can and do exercise an indirect influence that demands the greatest watchfulness and may yet demand more drastic and effective counter measures than have yet been taken.

◆ ◆ ◆

PAYMENT BY RESULTS.

PAYMENT by results has long been a vexed problem, and much shop dissatisfaction (quite apart from the broader question of labour dissatisfaction) has been traceable to the shortcomings of some of the systems employed. Many expedients, some simple and some ingenious, have been tried in the effort to speed up production. Generally speaking organisations of workmen have been hostile to the principles involved, and there is a distinct tendency from the side of the workmen to advocate the abolition of piece work, whether premium or bonus or any combination of these with time rates. That a great deal of piece work (to use a single term to cover all the ramifications of the various schemes) has been ill advised is certain, that it increases the cost of supervision is equally true, that in some instances it is hazardous to utilise such methods is not to be gainsaid, and that a large amount of very highly skilled and responsible work cannot be so rewarded is common knowledge.

There is a confirmed belief on the part of the men (justified to some extent by past experience) that rates as set are an unstable quantity. Moreover the declared policy of setting a limit to endeavour has had in some instances the effect of limiting production as the outcome of a system designed to increase it. Again, a piece of mechanical thinking, tantamount to production invention, introduced by a man keen to increase his pay has been quickly noticed and the rate cut as a reward for his ingenuity. None of these things tend to render workshop relations any more cordial.

The average man is an animal with desires above the needs of his stomach and disinclined to over-exertion. Hence the facts that he uses tools, enlists natural forces to serve his ends, invents mechanism to save trouble or to gain leisure, and substitutes the mechanical for the manual. It is not the most robust, nor those to whom hard work is second nature, who are the most ingenious. Several well-known steps in the path of mechanical evolution have come about owing to a desire for relief from monotony on the part of operatives who resent drudgery.

The pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, otherwise scientific research or scholarship, is not far removed from pleasure, and the individual fitted for such study derives satisfaction from his mental activities however hard he may work. The average man acquires knowledge and skill rather because it

increases his commercial rewards than for its intrinsic value; but there is, or should be, active enjoyment in "the daily round" when a man does paid work for which he is well adapted by temperament and capacity. Nevertheless it is often necessary to offer a bribe to obtain efficiency, and increased pay for extra effort is a fair deal between the contracting parties. But there are limits which cannot safely be exceeded. Danger lies in any attempt to achieve the impossible, and one of the main problems of the situation is how to make the day's industrial effort strike the happy mean between over-fatigue and under-production.

All men are not equally capable nor equally willing, one can whistle through a job that would break the heart of another. It was in order to differentiate between the two classes by rewarding the more efficient that work by task or piece was introduced. Just as profit is the incentive to effort for the manufacturer or merchant, so payment above the market or agreed rate is the inducement for the ambitious workman. The trouble commences when the rate has to be set for the average, rather than the exceptional, individual. Wherever men work in close association there will be found a healthy public opinion which combines contempt for the idle with a strong determination that the weak shall not be penalised, and such an attitude is as commendable as it is common. Add to this the belief, tenaciously held, that to increase earnings beyond a certain point is eventually to have the same reduced to little above the old level, and we are brought face to face with existing and realised troubles.

"The network of Trade Union rules, agreements, usages and customs," of which we have heard so much in the past and of which assuredly we are to hear still more in the future, is the product of a long series of disputes arising out of, and adjusting itself to, the old system of payment by time. Consequently this network is ill adapted to deal with the new class of disputes which have their origin in payment by results. These rules and customs have not been won without a struggle and they will not readily be relinquished, even though it may be demonstrable that their repeal would be advantageous to Labour as a whole. British working men distrust experiments on a large scale in any question which concerns their wages or hours of labour and they prefer to take a single step at a time. It is worth remembering, therefore, that an inferior scheme introduced gradually is more likely to be successful than a superior one put into operation before the men are ready to digest it. Trade Unionism, like the Common Law, is fashioned out of precedents; but its foundation

rests ultimately on sound principles of an elementary and easily understood character. The British are intolerant of rigid systems, whether they be of law or of custom, and neither the comparative simplicity nor the presumed scientific superiority of such an institution, as, for instance, the Code Napoléon, is held to be sufficient reason for its adoption in the United Kingdom. We must dree our own weird in the development of industry and stick to our national "last" of proceeding by compromise, trial and error. Some measure of friction is inevitable, and to attempt to please everyone usually ends in displeasing all. It is, therefore, safer to regard payment by results as a promise of amelioration rather than as a panacea for universal and immediate adoption.

A reasonable day's effort is very difficult to define. It depends in the first place upon the resources available, on the organisation of the work and upon the cheerful co-operation of the worker. It is this latter which is the least easy to secure.

Confidence and consideration are the parents of good relations. Impartial and unprejudiced management begets confidence, and consideration must be mutual if the perfect industrial commonwealth is to become a reality. In future articles we intend to describe in detail methods of payment by results which have proved eminently successful on a larger scale, but mention may here be made of two examples, within our own experience, which are typical of a number of minor experiments on what we may call a personal basis.

In the first case the bonus system was installed by a new manager and met with the usual hostile reception on the part of the men. He called a meeting, and after discussion it was resolved that only he should set the rates; if any man disputed their fairness, the manager should do the job in question in 25 per cent. less time. The test was applied to half a dozen cases in the first few days, since when there has been no further challenge. The relations in that particular shop still remain excellent, and, the matter having been proved once for all to everyone's satisfaction, mutual confidence has been established and the asset of goodwill realised.

In the second case the system has only recently been installed, but the experiment promises to be successful. In each department two men have been elected to represent the workers, rates are set by the foreman or by the estimators in the usual way. In the event of dispute the works manager, the foreman, the aggrieved individual and the two elected representatives meet by arrangement. The complainant states his case, after conferring with his shopmates, and the matter is

threshed out in conference. Whatever decision is arrived at must be unanimous and acceptable to all parties. There have been several such conferences to date, and they have been almost uniformly satisfactory to all concerned. In some instances past awards could be produced as evidence, in others the disputed rate was revised, in others again the old rate was proved to be fair and reasonable. The firm in question is perhaps exceptionally well suited for such an experiment, as several directors are working in the business, each having control of a department. The welfare work, introduced before the term became a commonplace in industry, has been considerable. A percentage of the profits is paid every year to a benefit fund for the men, and one section of this is administered by a council upon which all the foremen, two directors, the works manager and elected representatives of the men sit. It is strange but true that in many cases where the directors would have been lenient and made an award the men's representatives have refused it. Domestic hardship caused by sickness has been relieved, even in cases where the applicant is no longer employed by the firm. Every case is impartially investigated; the man's previous record is known to the Committee, who conserve the funds with real care but without parsimony. Should a promising lad in straitened home circumstances desire some educational help he can apply with every expectation of receiving assistance, not from an outside charity, but from a source toward which he will probably contribute in the future for the benefit of others similarly situated. The fund is democratic in its sympathies and has been in existence for twenty years.

Industrial relations like these tend to round off awkward corners and make for good relations. The directors are trained engineers and practical men, and everybody in the works realises that only by co-operation can the common profit be increased and all-round efficiency secured.

◆ ◆ ◆

THE RANK AND FILE MOVEMENT.

Part VI.

ALL revolutionary movements may be divided into two main types—viz., those which arise spontaneously and those which develop as the product of sustained agitation. No revolutionary movement can be successful unless a sense of grievance exists already, but the nature of the grievance and the measure of its intensity are powerful factors determining the lines along which the movement shall progress.

When personal freedom and family life are visibly interfered with, or when heavy taxation is illegally imposed by tyrannical rulers, the incitement to rebellion is widespread and constant. Under such conditions resentment is concentrated on the particular grievance which occupies the public mind, and the paramount consideration, common to all, is the redress of the exciting cause. When the crisis arrives it is generally spontaneous; leaders, hitherto unknown, suddenly become famous, and outbreaks occur in rapid succession, if not simultaneously, at many different centres. To produce such a result previous organisation is unnecessary; the masses instinctively rise to the occasion because they are individually familiar with the outstanding grievance and have long determined to remove it at the first opportunity.

When, however, revolutionary movements grow out of artificial agitation, the symptoms and progress are naturally more personal, local and deliberate. In the absence of any predominant grievance which carries all before it there are found a number of ill-defined complaints, which rise and fall, not by natural law, but by industrious fomentation. That which excites one section is disregarded by another; the movement is strong in one place and non-existent in another; the leaders are professional demagogues, always raving on the top note and continually manœuvring for position and setting their sails to catch the prevailing breeze. Elaborate organisation is substituted for instinctive initiative, and a multiplicity of conflicting issues takes the place of a single burning grievance.

The genuine revolutionary movement which is based on intolerable conditions is more deeply rooted and more inevitably violent than its spurious cousin, but, on the other hand, is also more responsive to sympathetic treatment. Everyone knows what the trouble is about, and as soon as the grievance is removed, resentment subsides, and the mischief is at an end.

But so long as the ferment of agitation continues, artificially created movements are difficult to diagnose and impossible to placate. They are also slow to recover after the agitation has died down. Moreover, there is always the danger, especially in war time, of serious grievances, which may be irremovable, supervening and then the artificial organisation, making the most of a fleeting opportunity, precipitates a catastrophe.

Judged by every test the Rank and File movement is essentially a manufactured product. It is inspired by the teaching of a German Socialist-philosopher of a past generation, whose theories have been proved to be fallacious; it is propagated by men in whom superfluity of malice is more conspicuous than any more worthy qualification; it allies itself with all disruptive agencies and rejects all compromise; it assiduously cultivates grievances and is ever on the lookout for a new weapon; it is consistent in nothing but animus; it relies for success on the gospel of self-interest; it flourishes only by dint of sustained effort, and it has spread laboriously from a single focus by successive stages from one district to another wherever abnormal conditions present a favourable opportunity and wherever the leading agitators have a personal influence.

The connection between the Clyde, the Sheffield, the Barrow and the Coventry sections of the Rank and File movement is due, not to any community of working-class interest peculiarly affecting those centres, but to the personal relationships which exist between the leading agitators who happen to live there, and this applies also to those other districts in which the movement is established. As might be expected under such circumstances, although what we may call the outlying provinces look to the organising centre for a lead, local conditions have to be taken into account, and consequently there is no exact uniformity in the type of agitation pursued nor in the class of demand put forward. In previous articles we have sketched in outline the growth of the Rank and File movement on the Clyde, in Sheffield and at Barrow, we now propose to give some indication of the state of affairs in Coventry. As everybody knows, Coventry has had a remarkable history. It is at once mediæval and progressive. Always to the fore in industrial development, manufacture of safety bicycles took the place of the weaving of silk ribbon, bicycle manufacture was the prelude to motor-car making, and motor works led up to aeroplane construction. The contrast between the mediæval buildings and the modern workshops is hardly less marked than the contrast between the old inhabitants

and the new floating population. Men from Scotland, girls from Ireland, and both sexes from all over the country greatly outnumber the natives of Warwickshire, and the newcomers, besides crowding out the housing accommodation, have brought some new standards and ideas in their train. In the Trade Union world the A.S.E. are naturally well represented, but the Workers' Union can also claim a very large membership. Speaking generally the Workers' Union does not greatly concern itself with polemics; it is a somewhat loose organisation which caters for all sorts and conditions of workers of both sexes whose interests it protects on traditional lines. On this account it is often referred to contemptuously by the "forwards" as a "Wreath and Coffin Club." In Coventry, however, the Workers' Union by no means confined its activities to "benefits," and when one of its leading officials, George Morris, was sentenced to a term of imprisonment for an offence under the M.W.A. much unrest was occasioned, and a strike was only averted at the eleventh hour by the strategic retirement of the Government from the position it had taken up. The successful issue of this agitation heightened the prestige of the militant section of the Workers' Union, and when the R. and F. movement obtained a footing in the town it had either to fill a subordinate *rôle* or to enter into an alliance with the W.U. Needless to say the latter course was the one adopted and since that time the combination has held the local field. It will readily be perceived that this alliance played into the hands of Watson's amalgamation scheme which aims at workshop solidarity regardless of craft or sex. Consequently, we find Coventry in the van of the shop steward movement on the Rank and File model, and at the Birmingham conference in March no fewer than twenty-nine delegates represented Coventry, which thereafter became a storm centre of unrest.

We have already referred to the large part played by the personal equation in the development of the R. and F. movement, and it is not too much to say that Coventry would in all probability have remained the preserve of the Workers' Union had it not been for the personal influence of Arthur McManus who, during his supposed detention in the Liverpool district, found time and opportunity to visit his old Clyde friends in the Midlands. Lest, however, we should excite jealousy by "drawing invidious distinction between such eminently learned and pious men" (as the Divinity student said of the Major and Minor Prophets) we hasten to add that Tom Mann, Egerton Wake and R. C. Wallhead have paid particular attention to Coventry.

Whilst the result of the Barrow strike was still in the balance and whilst efforts were being made at Sheffield and Coventry to engineer a sympathetic rising in that connection, trouble also arose over the Trade Card scheme. An attempt to organise a strike over this grievance was defeated, but the unrest was not allayed and a new manifestation appeared a day or two later in a different guise.

Without previous warning Messrs. Blank and Co., who had every reason to believe that the relations of the firm with the Trade Unions and with their workers were normal and harmonious, were suddenly informed that a strike would be called unless the shop stewards were recognised immediately. Unaware of any such grievance, and being a "Controlled Firm," the management could not accede to the demand without reference to the Ministry of Munitions. A stay-in strike was thereupon commenced, and the now too familiar position was reached that one side said that the demands could not be discussed until work was resumed, whilst the other side declared that the strike would continue until the shop stewards were recognised. Before long, however, a majority of the hands returned to work and the trouble appeared to be subsiding when a minority went through the shops intimidating those who had resumed and, in a few moments, work was again at a standstill. Some of the men resented such high-handed methods and signed a petition suggesting that they should be permitted to stay out pending settlement "owing to intimidation," but offering to continue to work "if protected." The strike came to an end on the condition that the demand for recognition should be settled within seven days, and it was arranged that a ballot for new shop stewards should be held. This was done, with the result that the ringleaders were not re-elected.

About the same time strong opposition was apparent in Coventry to the National Service scheme, and the local Trades Council and the local Labour Party issued a joint notice claiming that the control of Labour should be vested entirely in Trade Unions.

We have detailed only a few, out of many, untoward incidents; but enough to prove that the R. and F. agitation at Coventry is not ineffective, that if one method misses fire another is quickly found to take its place, and that when a firm is said to be "controlled" the adjective cannot be taken to apply to the workers. It is said that some of the older men became so enraged at the course of events that they tore up their membership cards in disgust.

◆ ◆ ◆

*

THE INDUSTRIAL ARMY.

In current discussions on the subject of Industry stress is too often laid on the interchange of relations between Capital, Labour, Interest and Wages to the exclusion of Organisation, which, after all, is the most important factor. The point is lost sight of that industry is an organic body with a framework designed for a particular end—viz., the production of commodites which feed, house, clothe and generally support the whole community. Everything else is of secondary and incidental importance.

The orgainisation of industry may, in many respects, be compared to that of an army. Mechanics and labourers correspond to the soldiers in the ranks, foremen to non-commissioned officers, shop-managers to company officers, works managers to battalion commanders, managing directors to brigadiers and chairmen of companies to the higher command.

But organisation does not only consist in the grading of officers, and in this country such organisation as exists is often casual and incomplete. No system of scientific training exists for the general staff, the regimental officers, the non-commissioned ranks and the private soldiers. Professionals are the exception rather than the rule in our industrial army. The machine needs overhauling from top to bottom. Every grade should be capable of instructing the one below it, so that each in turn may pass on the lessons which are essential to success.

Public schools and the older Universities are largely to blame for the failure of young men to recognise true values in the industrial world. The sense of duty inculcated in these institutions is admirable, but narrow. To start life with a sporting resolution to "play the game" is to be insufficiently equipped. It needs to be supplemented by a determination to eschew idleness as unworthy of the dignity of a grown man, who, above all things, should be ashamed to pull less than his own weight in the national boat.

Since the abolition of the old Guild system relations between the various ranks and grades of the British Industrial Army have been growing more and more inharmonious. Gaps have opened up isolating the different classes and making friendly intimacy and intelligent co-operation extremely difficult. It is urged that in the industrial army of the future it is necessary that the generals and superior staff should all strive to become

past-masters in the art of organisation and never fail to recollect that the welfare of those below them must always be their chief concern. If that duty is neglected no other part of the work can prosper. Among the officers and technical sections devotion to duty in support of their chiefs and an endeavour to perfect their own knowledge with a view to instructing the rank and file, with sympathy for them as men and not machines, is essential.

Specialists and manual labourers alike must make up their minds that an honest day's work alone is worth an honest day's pay; that man must earn his bread by the sweat of his brow, and that no amount of resolutions will alter this economic fact.

There is much to be said in favour of officering a military army on an aristocratic basis, but the industrial army must be organised on a democratic foundation. This does not mean that men of education and men of brains should be excluded, but it does essentially mean that no artificial barriers whatever must be allowed to prevent ability from climbing to the top of the ladder, nor should it be possible for any incompetent interloper to begin half way up. In future it should be impossible for anybody to obtain a commission in the industrial army without first passing through the ranks.

A great deal of animosity, which is now raised by constant inaccurate reference to Capital as in some way antagonistic to everybody who has to work, might be dispelled if it were appreciated that this reserve fund has not only to provide salaries and wages for those who are actually engaged in industry but also for those who have done their work and are entitled to a pension. All but extremists agree that graduated pensions are necessary, and it is not a matter of vital importance whether they are drawn from a fund labelled "private capital" or from some other source.

Without accumulated wealth industry must languish, for many important investigations and long-sighted experiments are only possible and legitimate when they are undertaken by the speculative intelligence of individuals.

When capital is regarded not as money abstracted from the many for the enjoyment of the few, but as the war chest of the industrial army and as the breeding stock for the continued production of wealth, an advance will have been made towards clarifying our ideas and removing a great stumbling block to the reorganisation of industry on sound lines.

◆ ◆ ◆

FOOD FOR THOUGHT.

CONTRADICTORY events follow so close upon each others' heels in Russia that the general effect left on the mind of an observer is one of bewilderment. The inconsequent medley of the Lenin-Trotsky regime is illuminated, however, from time to time by characteristic flashes which demonstrate that neither reason nor plan have any influence on the course of events. The administration, if the word can rightly be used in such a connection, forges ahead like a vessel under full sail with no rudder to guide its path, and no anchor to prevent it from going on the rocks. Leninism is the product of war weariness, the corner stone of his power is the support of the peace-at-any-price party in Russia, and Lenin is belauded by pacifists in this country as the standard-bearer of the Red Internationale, the man elected to inaugurate the blessed era of universal peace. Such is the illuminated frontispiece in the pacifist story book.

◆ ◆ ◆

Let us now pass from adorned fiction to plain fact and see how far it agrees with the fairy tale. Lenin, Krilenko and Podvozhski recently addressed an ultimatum to the remnant of little Rumania threatening war within twenty-four hours unless a satisfactory reply was received in answer to certain demands. In reinforcement of this threat the Council of People's Commissioners took the outrageous step of arresting the Rumanian Minister at Petrograd, and his staff. The Legation was surrounded by soldiers and M. Diamandi was removed to the Petropavlovsk fortress. This violation of all established international law was made the subject of a protest signed by the representatives of seventeen Allied and Neutral States, and after some delay the imprisoned Minister was set at liberty. Lenin's subsequent explanation that the Commissioners desired to avoid war by taking a hostage as a guarantee of Rumania's acceptance of their demands only makes matters worse, for no act better calculated to cause war could be imagined. Whilst the sacred person of an accredited representative of a defenceless allied Power was in his prison cell, and whilst the Italian Embassy was being attacked by an armed mob, German emissaries, great and small, were free to swagger at their pleasure without fear of molestation.

◆ ◆ ◆

When the big bully comes in at the door the little bully gets under the table.

◆ ◆ ◆

The ancient story of the farmer and his bull-calf may bear repeating on account of its applicability to current events,

especially in Russia. Needing both hands to unlock a gate, the farmer tied the calf's halter to his own leg. The calf bolted and dragged the now prostrate farmer down the road. Fortunately a passing stranger caught the calf and released the farmer. Quoth the stranger: "You never ought to have tied a big calf like that to your leg." "That's so," answered the bruised and bleeding victim. "I hadn't gone ten yards before I realised my mistake."

◆ ◆ ◆

When a criminal anticipates the verdict of the jury by admitting his guilt prosecuting counsel has an easy task. Krilenko is reported to have confessed that he is a sanguinary tyrant and a declared enemy of the human race, in these words: "We uphold the power of the Soviets. We shall shrink from nothing, not even from spreading wholesale terror and woe to all who attempt to cross our path. Otherwise our enemies will recover and again move against us. Vengeance on them to the end without mercy. We must not stop short in our reign of terror until we have completely exterminated all our enemies. Otherwise we shall be undone. Therein lies our pledge of the solidarity of our success" (*Reuter*). By the cheers given for the present Russian tyrants the Nottingham jury as good as told Krilenko that he left the court without a stain on his character.

◆ ◆ ◆

Whatever opinion we may hold as to the intelligence or the honesty of British "defeatists" we cannot deny that they possess both versatility and persistence. Kerensky, the whilom idol, has fallen and his name is now seldom mentioned in those select pacifist circles which worship at the shrine of Lenin, Trotsky and Krilenko. It will be interesting to note what excuse this bloodstained Triumvirate may have to offer for the machine-gun practice by Maximalists on the procession of the Constituent Assembly in the streets of Petrograd. Will M. Maxim Litvinoff be instructed to apologise for this murderous crime against the international brotherhood, or do his masters hold British democratic opinion so cheaply that they will simply ignore it? And in that case will British Labour keep silence?

◆ ◆ ◆

We confess that we are unable to appreciate the necessity for the attendance of any foreign visitors at a Labour Party Conference, and we are of opinion that British working men would be better advised to frame their policy on a British rather than on a Continental basis, for it is certain that otherwise they may be committed to decisions which they do not

fully understand. In any case it is essential that they should be quite certain that the foreign visitors they consult should rest under no imputation of being influenced by Germany. We are not in a position either to prove or to disprove the allegations that have been made against MM. Longuet and Huysmans, and even less than ourselves are the masses of British workers in a position to know the truth; but it is not an inopportune moment to recall certain charges which have been formulated against these gentlemen in responsible quarters. M. Longuet, a grandson of Karl Marx, was publicly accused in the French Chamber of having collaborated in a newspaper financed by Germany, and at the time of writing this allegation has not been cleared up. With regard to M. Camille Huysmans the Stockholm correspondent of *Vorwärts* finds it worth remembering that "this Belgian deputy openly admits the humaneness and righteousness of the deceased Governor-General, von Bissing" (the murderer of Edith Cavell). M. van de Veer, the London editor of the Amsterdam *Telegraaf*, suggests that the German Government allowed M. Huysmans to escape into Holland. Since then M. Huysmans has incurred the disapproval of the Belgian Committees in the Netherlands, who regret that their colleague should run counter to the wishes of "as good as the whole Belgian people" by "striving for an immediate peace which could only mean a German peace."

◆ ◆ ◆

La Metropole says that "other Belgians abroad consider that M. Huysmans has treated directly with enemy agents, in particular with Herr Schneidemann, the Kaiser's emissary." Schneidemann's method of organising German propaganda abroad is exposed by the Danish newspaper *Copenhagen*, which asserts that commercial advantages of a very substantial character have been secured through Schneidemann's agency by certain named individuals in Denmark in return for "political considerations."

◆ ◆ ◆

"Internationalism and anti-nationalism . . . are much the same thing, or if they are two they shade off into each other so gradually that it is impossible to tell where the one ends and the other begins. Let us be quite frank. We believe that the International Movement is directed in the interests of Germany or of interests situated in Germany."—*Morning Post.*

◆ ◆ ◆

M. Litvinoff, the Bolshevik ambassador who attended the Nottingham conference as a representative of the Soviet, attacked the Government to which he is accredited and advo-

cated revolution in the country which has given him sanctuary for many years. He was not called to order nor even hissed—on the contrary, we read that he was "overwhelmed with joy and surprise at the warmth of his welcome." We invite our readers to correct their values by comparing this attitude with that of other countries by considering what results would have followed: (*a*) If Sir George Buchanan had publicly advocated counter revolution in Russia; (*b*) if Litvinoff had made a similar speech against the United States Government in an American city; (*c*) if any official in any other part of the world had dared openly to attack the Government under whose protection he was living.

◆ ◆ ◆

"Why not a British Soviet?" asks Mr. Robert Williams in *The Herald* of January 26th, and continues: "Of a certainty the moment has arrived when we must fashion some instrument to create political power to reflect Labour's economic influence. We may be satisfied with a Constituent Assembly. We should prefer an Association of Soviets, Workers' and Soldiers' Councils."

In our view Mr. Williams might as well ask, "Why not an epidemic of cancer?" There is a wide field of selection from which to choose an answer, but perhaps the cold-blooded murder of the ex-ministers, MM. Shingareff and Kokoshkin, whilst they were patients in hospitals would satisfy most people. Once again we remind Mr. Henderson of his pledge "to fight strenuously against any course of action which will paralyse our military force as it has paralysed the military force of Russia."

Egyptian art always portrays the Pharaohs in profile. Our British Pharaohs, who have a constitutional disinclination to look facts in the face, adopt a similar pose whenever they are in danger of seeing anything that might offend their sense of decorum.

◆ ◆ ◆

The unanswerable logic with which the Prime Minister is wont to smash the hollow pretensions of the "defeatists" whenever he takes up his sledge hammer was never displayed with more telling effect than in his speech to the Trade Union delegates assembled in the Central Hall, Westminster, to discuss the man-power proposals of the Government. No doubt the effect he produced will wear off as other and more persistent influences are brought to bear upon his hearers; but, at the time, not a single member of his audience could

find any answer to the virile challenges which Mr. Lloyd George delivered with such crispness and vigour.

Clever cranks, with no other occupation "of national importance" sit up at nights to weave an elaborate tissue of misrepresentation, inconsequence and sentimentality which the Prime Minister, who bears an unprecedented burden of responsibility and cares of State, reduces to shreds and tatters apparently without an effort.

◆ ◆ ◆

Never was inflated balloon pricked more neatly than by the recital of that imaginary conversation with Hindenburg.

"We want you to clear out of Belgium," says the Pacifist.

"You cannot turn me out of Belgium with Trade Union resolutions," says Hindenburg.

"No," answers Lloyd George, "but we can, and *will*, turn you out of Belgium with Trade Union guns and Trade Unionists behind them."

◆ ◆ ◆

The falsehood, cherished by our pacifists, that it was the attempted isolation of Germany by the Entente Powers which caused the European conflagration is demolished by no less a personage than the last German ambassador at the Court of St. James. Prince Lichnowsky is reported by *The Berliner Tageblatt* as declaring that "Our Navy policy and our Morocco policy on the one hand, and our Serbian and Turkish policy on the other hand, created the state of feeling out of which the Entente grew . . . the world-war developed out of the resistance offered by Russia." It must be especially galling to sensitive pacifist souls to be "put in the cart" time after time by the very people they are so anxious to defend. What could be more disheartening than to keep on whitewashing a sweep who persists in spoiling the effect by a lavish use of soot?

◆ ◆ ◆

The innate and ineradicable militarism of Germany is revealed by the writings not only of those who built up the system, but even more forcibly by those who administer the machine in this, the fourth year of the war. "The spirit of German militarism," according to Prince Bülow, as Prussia first developed it and Germany adopted it, "is every whit as monarchical as it is aristocratic and democratic, and it would cease to be German and the mighty expression of German imperial military power and military efficiency if it were to change. If our enemies, to whom with God's help our militarism will bring defeat, abuse it, we know that we

must preserve it, for to us it means victory and the future of Germany."

◆ ◆ ◆

In his *Deductions from the World War*, Baron von Freytag-Loringhoven writes: "The spirit of German militarism, which has enabled us to stand the test of the world-war and which we must preserve in the future, because with it our world position stands or falls . . . rests ultimately on the building up of an officers' corps. For this purpose a sound aristocratic tradition is of the highest value. . . . In any case the masses, as such, can never rule . . . only under the absolute command of a war lord can an army achieve a really vigorous development . . . a lasting peace is guaranteed only by strong armaments. . . . and it will only be by this might that we shall be able to safeguard our peace in the future. . . . We misconstrue reality if we imagine that it is possible to rid the world (of war) by means of mutual agreements . . . such agreements will, after all, only be treaties which will not on every occasion be capable of holding in check the forces seething within the States. Therefore the idea of a universal league for the preservation of peace remains a Utopia, and would be felt as an intolerable tutelage by any great and proud-spirited nation. . . . In the future, as in the past, the German people will have to seek firm cohesion in its glorious army and in its belaurelled young fleet."

◆ ◆ ◆

To a world weary of the slaughter and waste of war such words as those we have quoted are like gall and wormwood, for they mean nothing less than a choice between complete submission to German supremacy or acceptance of a fresh German challenge. To our generation has it fallen to bear the most colossal responsibility ever laid on the shoulders of mankind, but we have never been a race of "quitters," and the magnitude of our present task is the supreme test of our national courage. It is now or never. If we fail at this crisis we fail for all time. No past victories will avail us, and no future regeneration can wipe out the infamy of present failure.

◆ ◆ ◆

In war 'tis all or naught. No second prize
Consoles the vanquished, but the bare event,
Oft by a narrow margin, must decide
Betwixt these distant neighbours that we call
Defeat, Success, Disaster, Victory."—*The Flag.*