



2.

14. Tariffs And The Worker, by  
Brougham Williers. - 167-170 H.
15. Workers' Control In The Coal  
Mining Industry, by  
Frank Hodges. 171-174 H.
16. Taxation, by John A. Hobson. 175-178 H.
17. Organisation of Women Within  
The Labour Party. 179-182 H.
18. The Capital Levy. By F.W. Pothick  
Lawrence. 183-186 H.
19. The Empire in Africa: 187-192 H.  
Labour's Policy.
20. Labour's Russian Policy:  
Peace with Soviet Russia. 193-202  
H.
21. The Present State of The Poor  
Law. By G.M. Lloyd. 203-206 H.
22. International Economic Policy.  
By L.S. Woolf. 207-211 H.
23. Labour Policy And The Famine.  
(Duplicate.) 212-219 H.
24. The Preventive And Curative  
Medical Services And  
Hospital And Laboratory  
. Systems under a Ministry  
of Health . 220-227 H.
25. Memoranda on International Labour  
Legislation. 228-250  
H.

THE LABOUR PARTY.

LABOUR WOMEN  
ON  
International Legislation.

Women's Employment  
The Employment of Children  
The Prevention of Unemployment

BY

GERTRUDE M. TUCKWELL

MARION PHILLIPS, D.Sc. (Econ.)

A. SUSAN LAWRENCE, L.C.C.

---

Price - - - Threepence.

---

The Labour Party,  
33, Eccleston Square, London, S.W.1.

# MEMORANDA

on

## INTERNATIONAL LABOUR LEGISLATION

---

### THE ECONOMIC STRUCTURE OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

---

- I. Uniformity of Workmen's Rights when working abroad.
- II. Obligation to prevent Unemployment.
- III. Provision for Relief of the Unemployed.
- IV. Inspection.
- V. A Uniform Minimum of Factory Legislation.
- VI. International Regulation of Hours of Labour.
- VII. Recognition of the Right of Combination.
- VIII. The Mercantile Marine.
- IX. Asiatic and Other Problems of Native Labour.
- X. International Labour Legislation: Methods of Enforcement and International Machinery.
- XI. A Parliament of the League of Nations.
- XII. The Economic Functions of the League of Nations.
- XIII. The Economic Structure of the League of Nations.
- XIV. Questions of Special Interest to Women.

### APPENDICES.

- I. The Labour Charter adopted by the Berne International Labour and Socialist Conference, 1919.
- II. Report of the Commission on International Labour Legislation to the Peace Conference, with a Draft Convention creating a permanent organisation for the Promotion of the International Regulation of Labour conditions.

*Price 1s. By post, 1s. 1½d.*

---

THE LABOUR PARTY, 33, Eccleston Square, LONDON, S.W.

# LABOUR WOMEN

ON

## INTERNATIONAL LEGISLATION

---

---

Proposals for International Legislation agreed upon by the Standing Joint Committee of Industrial Women's Organisations on:—

### WOMEN'S EMPLOYMENT.

By GERTRUDE M. TUCKWELL (Chairman of the Women's Trade Union League).

### THE EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN.

By MARION PHILLIPS, D.Sc. (Econ.) (Chief Woman Officer of the Labour Party).

### THE PREVENTION OF UNEMPLOYMENT.

By A. SUSAN LAWRENCE (Member of the London County Council and of the Executive of the Labour Party).

---

---

Published by the Labour Party, 33, Eccleston Square, S.W.1.

## The Standing Joint Committee of Industrial Women's Organisations.

---

Chairman - Miss MARY MACARTHUR.  
Vice-Chairman - Miss MARGARET LLEWELYN DAVIES.  
Secretary - Dr. MARION PHILLIPS,  
33, Eccleston Square, London, S.W.1.

---

### Organisations Represented:

Women's Trade Union League.  
The Labour Party.  
Women's Co-operative Guild.  
Railway Women's Guild.  
National Federation of Women Workers.  
National Union of General Workers.  
Railway Clerks' Association.  
Workers' Union.  
Postal and Telegraph Clerks' Association.

---

The Standing Joint Committee of Industrial Women's Organisations was founded in 1916, and, from time to time since, its constitution has been amended in order that it may better fulfil its objects. In general terms these are to watch over the interests of working women, and help to carry out the principles of the Labour and Co-operative Movements in so far as women are specially concerned. The Committee also acts as an advisory body on women's questions to the Executive Committee of the Labour Party.

In order that it may be fully representative of all women within the Labour and Co-operative Movements it invites representation from the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress, the Co-operative Union and "industrial organisations, of which a substantial number of the members are women, which are national in character, and are accepted by the Committee."

The Committee will welcome any enquiries for further information or applications for representation, and these should be made to the Secretary, Dr. Marion Phillips, 33, Eccleston Square, London, S.W.1.

## INTRODUCTION.

The three papers included in this pamphlet have been prepared by members of the Standing Joint Committee of Industrial Women's Organisations to form a women's programme on certain important questions which are ripe for international agreement. They have also an immediate purpose in view of the calling of the first International Labour Conference, which is announced for October 29 at Washington, U.S.A. This Congress will be held under the provisions of the Peace Treaty, which establishes in the League of Nations Covenant provisions for an International Labour Office and a yearly International Labour Conference. The agenda, which has been already published, is as follows:—

- (1) Application of principle of 8 hours day, or 48 hours week.
- (2) Question of preventing or providing against unemployment.
- (3) Women's employment—
  - (a) Before and after child birth, including the question of maternity benefit;
  - (b) During the night;
  - (c) In unhealthy processes.
- (4) Employment of children—
  - (a) Minimum age of employment;
  - (b) During the night;
  - (c) In unhealthy processes.
- (5) Extension and application of the International Conventions adopted at Berne in 1906 on the prohibition of night work for women employed in industry, and the prohibition of the use of white phosphorus in the manufacture of matches.

It will be seen that the third, fourth, and fifth proposals deal particularly with matters of importance to women, and in view of the special hardships now being experienced by women all over the world as a result of unemployment, the second question also has its special interest for them. The Standing Joint Committee of Industrial Women's Organisations in the interests of women has prepared this short programme for dealing with their needs. They are of opinion that if these proposals were adopted internationally much would be done to relieve the worst hardships which fall upon women to-day.

The Covenant of the League of Nations which establishes the Labour Conference has some interesting provisions with regard to women. The whole is of course governed by the agreement that throughout the bodies connected with the League of Nations all positions under or in connection with the League, including the secretariat, shall be open equally to men and women. But with regard to the International Labour Conference a further provision is made that when questions especially affecting women are to be considered, one at least of the advisers who accompany the delegates should be a woman. Each nation will be entitled to four representatives, two representing the Government, and two representing respectively the employers and workpeople; and each delegate may be accompanied by advisers, the maximum being two for each item on the agenda of the meeting. It is for women throughout the nations to take advantage of these provisions and to ensure that they shall be fully represented, not only by representation amongst

the advisers, but by representation amongst the delegates also. At this first Congress Miss Margaret Bondfield and Miss Mary Macarthur will represent women amongst the Labour advisers, and there will also, it is understood, be women representatives amongst those appointed for the Government; but it is important that in future this representation shall be larger, and that it shall not be confined to the two or three nations which have been most progressive in regard to women's affairs, but shall be general amongst them all.

In considering Labour legislation of an international character, it is clear that many difficulties arise from the fact that national Labour legislation has advanced in very different degrees amongst the different peoples. Provisions that may appear to be revolutionary to one may even go very little further than present law in another. In many respects the Committee which has agreed to the proposals here put forward realise that they may meet with criticism of this kind from both sides. To some of their Labour colleagues it may appear that they have not gone far enough—to less friendly critics it may appear that they are asking far too much of backward communities. What they have endeavoured to do is to set forward a programme which is worth working for, and which, if it could be carried to-day, would mean a very definite improvement in the general standard of living throughout the world. They have dealt only with the subjects set down for the Washington Conference, recognising, of course, that these do not cover more than a small part of the whole field open for future Labour legislation on an international basis. Their aim also has been not to give a full and detailed account of the present state of the law, but to make a general statement as to what that law should aim at in the future.

September, 1919.

---

# WOMEN'S EMPLOYMENT.

BY GERTRUDE M. TUCKWELL.

In the past the nations have availed themselves of women's work, but treated it as of inferior value to that of men, and hedged it round with artificial restrictions. The influence of the old ideas which theoretically relegated women to home duties and left the outside work of the world to men still hampers us long after the necessities of society have led to women's entrance into every field of work. It hampers us because the prejudices engendered by the customs of the past have made clear thinking difficult, and we have tolerated conditions in which, owing to the inferior value placed on their labour, women have been under-paid and, as a consequence, under-nourished; have received little or no education or training for work; and have had to compete in the labour market handicapped by an equipment of the most meagre description.

In the interests of national efficiency all handicaps should be removed. Unnecessary grading by sex has led to the competition of two classes of workers at varying rates of payment, and so enabled employers to play off one class of labour against another with disastrous results. Recent Government inquiries in this country show the great measure of success which women's work has so far achieved in spite of the artificial disabilities imposed on it, and there is a general and growing recognition that women, freed from artificial disabilities, can compete on equal terms with men, and that it is desirable that they should do so.

They have been engaged in the heaviest kinds of labouring work, and as science is being brought to bear to economise human energy, the introduction of labour-saving appliances is equalising differences in physical strength which may still exist. Proposals for the limitation of hours to a 48-hour week will affect equally men and the women who have been statutorily allowed a 10 and a 10½-hour day. The same opportunities in educational training joined to intelligent management of work-places and vocational selection will show that there are classes of work in which women not only equal but excel men. They have men's backing in demanding the same rate for the job, in which they are supported by the recommendations of the Women's Employment Committee set up by the Government, and the Minority Report of the War Cabinet Committee. Given the minimum of purchasing power required for efficiency, the tendency is to differentiate not by sex but skill in a labour market from which the labour of all but the adult will be gradually eliminated.

But it must be remembered that one disability has to be reckoned with. Women have been called on to bear a double burden, and to meet the claims of both work and home. They must continue to fulfil their greatest function of mothers and home-makers. Our recommendations have to safeguard this while seeing that it does not interfere with their position of equality in the labour market.

We lay down two principles: That no bar should be placed on women's work which is not imperatively dictated by the demands of the race and the health and well-being of mother and child, and that, when it is proved that work is injurious to maternity, any prohibition should carry with it adequate compensation for the lost wage. To do otherwise is to penalise motherhood.



We are asked to consider three sets of restrictions which at present bear on maternity:—

1. Women's Employment before and after childbirth.
2. Night work.
3. Employment of women in unhealthy processes.

## I. Women's Employment Before and After Childbirth.

Medical opinion appears to vary as to the effects on health of employment before childbirth, and, so far, no prohibition has been attempted in Great Britain.

In other countries a few attempts have been made to deal with this question by legislation, and Italy prohibits work before childbirth in the rice fields for a month, but the great difficulties of prohibition are everywhere apparent, and Switzerland, having first enacted, afterwards withdrew prohibition, finding it impossible to enforce. Though the right to leave work without notice before confinement and the right of reinstatement afterwards have been given by some States, Holland and Poland (recently) are the only countries which require the payment of full average wages before, as well as after, childbirth, during the period of prohibition.

While it is clear that various physical exertions, such as lifting, wheeling of heavy weights, etc., are undesirable, certain periods during the months of pregnancy are more critical than others. Evidence as to the period of pregnancy reached can only be obtained from the woman herself. This she may be unable to fix accurately, or may wish to conceal. Under such circumstances, the difficulties in fixing any time-limit for the cessation of employment are great, and, moreover, there is no consensus of opinion as to its danger. It is held by many medical authorities that, provided the work is not too heavy, it is in the best interests of mother and child that no embargo should be laid on it, the only precautions needed being those dictated by the decency and tact of the management of the workplace.

But bearing in mind the fact that many women prefer to remain at home during the last months of pregnancy, and so sacrifice a wage at the very point when nourishment is most essential; that no general rule can be laid down as to their health, which varies with individuals; and that there is little direct evidence as to the effect of employment on the health of pregnant women, we feel that scientific inquiry is needed to decide whether and to what extent prohibition is necessary.\*

Employment after childbirth is more easily controlled, since there is a fixed date from which prohibition can operate, and there is no dispute as to the need for temporary prohibition, though opinions as to the period vary from one country to another.

Here under the Factory and Workshop Act a period of four weeks is decreed—in some countries a shorter limit is set, in others a longer. Spain gives six weeks, for example, and South Africa eight.

In some countries exceptions are made, the medically fit returning to work at an earlier date than the term prescribed generally.

Though Holland and Poland have been cited as having alone arrived at payments based on the just principle of compensation equivalent to the less entailed by statutory prohibition of employment, many

---

\* We would, however, point out that the provision of recompense for loss of wages does not provide for the skilled care, nourishment, and rest required by all mothers alike, and that, in addition to any such provision in industrial legislation, there must be general health legislation covering the needs of all mothers.

countries, including our own, make some sort of payment to meet maternity claims.

These payments come from various sources, and seem mostly to be based rather on the value of motherhood to the State than on the idea of compensation for loss. In some cases, as in the grants made from our Insurance schemes for maternity benefit, the schemes are contributory, in others gratuitous—in none are they adequate.

There is in this country and in many others some system, either Governmental or municipal, of medical and nursing service for maternity side by side with maternity grants.

But when the question of whether or no a period of prohibition before childbirth is desirable is settled, and a consensus of opinion arrived at as to the period during which after childbirth prohibition is essential, there remains the further question of the removal of the double burden of home-keeping and care of children, which now, after a specified period—varying in different countries—is coincident in many cases with wage-earning. The wage-earning mother cannot give the care necessary to efficiently rear the future citizens of the State, nor can her work take its proper place in the labour market if she is handicapped by home cares. This is recognised in the case of widows and of women whose husbands suffer from some permanent disability by some American States, and a pension is granted in such cases in order to enable the mother to fulfil her home duties. The trade unionists of this country advocate the same step here, and their view is upheld by the reports of Government Committees, who recommend such pensions. But this only partly solves the question.

Individual wages must be based not on the family to be supported but on the value of the individual worker to the employer. The minimum wage has to be fixed with relation to individual needs for a full and healthy life. But the claims of the children have also to be considered, on whom the State depends for a sufficient supply of healthy and efficient future citizens.

In this country these claims have been recognised in two instances. Our income-tax falls less heavily on parents than on those who have no children, £25 being deducted from the assessable income for each child—an allowance which is to be increased to £40. The other instance is the system which has come in with the war, of pensions to the widows and children of soldiers, a sum of 26s. 8d. per week being granted to the mother, and 10s. per week for her first child, 7s. 6d. for her second, and 6s. for each succeeding child. It will be seen, however, that neither of these schemes covers the whole ground, since the income-tax, which is paid on incomes over £130 a year, does not touch those in most need, and the system of pensioning wives and children of soldiers is due to war exigencies, though most interesting as an experiment in the direction of removing mothers from the labour market and enabling them to care for their children. There are many proposals here and elsewhere for full and systematic schemes of grants to parents on account of their children, to apply in the case of the home-keeping as in that of the "employed" woman, lest the limitation of endowment should penalise those married women who prefer to remain at home and induce them to work in order to qualify for grants. The arguments against such schemes are based on the fear that they may prejudice the payment of adequate wages, and also on the idea that they may remove the sense of responsibility of parents to their children, on which so much depends. The various State services of free education and the

institution of free meals, against which exactly the same arguments used to be raised, have not, however, been found to produce this effect. But in view of the fact that the anomaly is not complete, and of the disastrous effect of a fall in wages, some schemes would safeguard the position by allowing pensions only in cases where more than two children had to be provided for, taking two children as a normal family and a charge on the parent's wage. It is clear that the evils with which the proposals deal are so great that the arguments in favour of meeting them by some system of effective provision for the children far outweigh any that has been raised against them.

All the reports which so far deal with this question here are vitiated by the fact that we have no accurate Government statistics to rely on as to the cost, and we cannot proceed on fancy figures. We urge the immediate institution of Government Commissions to report on the best means of carrying into effect an approved scheme for enabling all women who have children to stay at home and care for them.

The Government inquiries would, on this subject as well as on that of the period of prohibition before and after childbirth, be national, the results to be reported to the International Labour Office, not with a view of postponing action on the part of this or any other country, but of comparing experiences and co-ordinating legislation.

## 2. Night Work for Women.

Night work for women is the second subject for consideration. The International Convention of 1906 forbidding night work for women has already been adhered to by eleven European States. It is obvious that in the interests of home-life and health this was necessary, but while night work by men and, to a limited extent, by male young persons continues customary in certain industries, it is also obvious that this places a disability on women's labour. The same argument as to inadequate rest in noisy homes, if sleep is taken during the day, and the break up of the family by the employment of some members during night and others during the day applies to both sexes. The case for prohibiting the labour of male young persons is clear, and some international agreement in this case can probably be arrived at, but it is essential that except in rare circumstances, such as that of continuous industries, night work for men should also be prohibited. Night work should be the exception and not the rule, so that prohibition applies to all classes of labour, and exceptions should be carefully guarded. It has already been pointed out that so far as young persons are concerned, the claims of education and training must lead to their gradual elimination from the labour market altogether.

## 3. Employment of Women in Unhealthy Processes.

The third reference is to the employment of women in unhealthy processes.

The danger in such processes arises mainly from either the inhalation of dust and fumes (the case of lead in potteries may be cited as an example of dust danger), or from absorption through the skin, as in the case of T.N.T. poisoning (Trinitrotoluol).

There are cases in which the trades can be so safeguarded by protective regulation and scientific appliances as to render the dangerous

ingredient harmless. There are other cases in which the danger can only be removed by eliminating the dangerous ingredient.

In this, as in all other cases, the proper policy is to deal with the material and eliminate the danger there, not to prohibit a class of labour. The trade should be made safe for all adult workers.\*

The resources of scientific research must be stimulated to find substitutes for dangerous ingredients, and the promptitude with which science responded when the sufferings caused by the use of Trtrachlorethane in the dope of aeroplanes called for immediate action is the most recent example of what can be done on these lines here.

It is interesting that the Convention of 1906 attacked the danger of white phosphorus used in the manufacture of matches in this way, and the prohibition of the dangerous material rather than restrictions on labour was thus made a precedent for international action in dangerous trades.

The only dangerous processes in which in this country women's employment is forbidden are processes in which lead is used. In the smelting of materials containing lead, in the manufacture of red or orange lead, in the manufacture of flaked litharge, in the manipulation of dry compounds of lead or in pasting for the manufacture of electric accumulators, in manipulating lead colour, in the manufacture of paints and colours, and in the casting shops for the casting of brass their employment is forbidden. The prohibition was supported by arguments as to the difficulty of finding substitutes in the case of white phosphorus, and in the greater rate of sickness which was held to show great susceptibility of women. In the case of potteries where lead is used in glazes, women's employment has only been forbidden in certain processes, and the alternative we lay down of dealing with the materials and not the worker has been adopted. Special advantages are given to employers who use only a limited amount (5 per cent.) of lead in glazes, further advantages to those who use leadless glaze, and power taken to close factories where there are cases of lead-poisoning. We do not feel that the mixture of methods is ideal, and look to the eventual prohibition of the use of lead in potteries.

The recent great falling off in the incidence of lead cases in Staffordshire, for example, cannot be wholly explained by the various provisions for exhaust ventilation, medical examination, washing accommodation, etc.; it has to be realised that there has been a great substitution of leadless for lead glazes during the same period.

The matter is ripe for international discussion with a view to common action.

The practice of allowing exemption by numbers vitiates much of the legislation of European countries, where dangerous trades, such as pottery making, are carried on in the homes.

An interesting instance of the need for international understanding and co-operation between the nations in stamping out dangerous diseases has been recently furnished by the case of anthrax. In spite of regulation, the numbers of persons suffering from this disease rose steadily till the solution of disinfecting the wools coming from infected areas at the port of embarkation has now been arrived at. This remedy, due to British research, will not be thoroughly applied till it is applied internationally, and we recommend the subject for immediate consideration at Washington.

---

\* We can only accept the temporary prohibition of women's employment in processes as to which medical opinion is agreed that this is necessary in the interests of maternity till the trade is made safe.

Two points have to be borne in mind in our national and international legislation.

First, that the health of every human being is of especial importance, and that legislation by numbers, abandoned in this country but still existing in some others, is entirely vicious. Equal protection must be extended to workers, whether in a place where hundreds are employed or where only one is at work.

Second, that the most ideal legislation is valueless without enforcement. Labour's demand in this country for an increased factory inspectorate, including technical, medical and other expert advisers, to deal with the growing intricacies of our industrial system is urgent. This increased factory inspectorate will, as a matter of course, contain a large number of women who should have equal standing and equal responsibility with their men colleagues, including the charge of definite industrial areas. It is essential that all nations should co-operate with each other in arriving at higher standards of administration, both with regard to prosecution and penalties for offenders and to the number of officers employed.

---

## THE EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN, BY MARION PHILLIPS.

The International Labour Conference to be held at Washington will have no more important subject to discuss than that of the employment of children. The war has created a position of tragic difficulty in regard to the children of European countries. After years of acute privation, and in many cases of complete interruption of all education, the position in such countries as Serbia, Bulgaria, Hungary, and in many parts of France and Belgium, has been very serious. In the programme that we put forward we have recognised this, and we are aware that in their needs of increased production it will be urged that it is necessary not to tighten up the regulations with regard to the employment of children, but to relax them. This is a very short-sighted policy. We cannot borrow any longer from the strength of the rising generation without piling up the debt, which, when it comes to be paid, will mean overwhelming ruin for many communities. We therefore make no apology for putting forward a programme for international agreement on this subject which has the high ideal that children should not be employed for profit, and that all their educational opportunities should be greatly extended. The first question is that of an age-limit. The fixation of an age-limit below which no children shall be employed for profit may well be the same in all countries. For even in hot countries, where it is pleaded that children develop more quickly and are adults at an earlier age, probably nothing would aid their slower and more effective development so much as an extended time of education without the pressure of industrial or agricultural employment. Indeed, nowhere should the hours of labour be shorter for the young than in tropical climates. It is, therefore, suggested that no child should be employed below the age of 16. It is necessary that compulsory full-time education should be extended up to this age in order that there may be no break between the two periods. A child

should not be employed between the ages of 16 and 18 for the full time allowed for adults. Its education should be continued, and the time for this education should be taken out of working hours. Continuation schools should be established in which the children should spend half their time—that is, on a 44-hours week, 22 hours work and 22 hours school. School might occupy two or three days in the week, or even so many weeks in the year, but the basis should be one which would give on the whole year an average equal at least to 20 hours in the week.

The whole purpose of the age limit is to ensure that children shall not be employed to the detriment of their physical and mental development. It is, however, necessary that there should be more than an age limit, and every child before being allowed to enter employment should receive a certificate showing that he or she has mentally and physically a normal development. This can best be arranged by the development of the school medical services. Before leaving a full-time school each child should be subjected to a detailed examination which would show (1) if a satisfactory intellectual development had been reached, normal for that age; (2) if physical development was normal; (3) any defect, especially defects of such a kind as to make a particular employment unsuitable. On this subject perhaps investigation is necessary before compulsion can be applied, but the certificate should contain very definite recommendations as to the employment in which the particular child should not be occupied. After this examination the child should remain under the supervision of the school medical service during its years in the continuation school, and from time to time its condition should be specially reviewed with a view to seeing that the employment was not having a bad effect.

Coupled with these requirements must come the possibility of remedial treatment. Any child held to be below normal should be prohibited from engaging in employment until a normal standard be reached, but during the period of the prohibition there should be ample opportunity for improvement in the mental and physical condition. There should be provision, e.g., for convalescent homes for those of tuberculous types, and eye treatment for those with disease of the eyes, special gymnastic training for undeveloped muscles, and in particular there should be special attention given to means by which full and sufficient food should be within reach of those who were found to be suffering from delicacy due to under-nourishment. Remedial measures must be coupled with economic provision so as to enable the family to which the defective child belongs to provide it with a proper home during the period when it may not be employed, and it is clear that there must be special schools for backward children in order that they can rise to a higher standard. This sounds a very expensive proposal. We have already pointed out that in the long run it will cost less than allowing undeveloped children to be forced into wage-earning employment. But it will also have a very great influence in securing better medical supervision and special school treatment at an earlier age in order to save the years when the children might be assisting in the productive work of the country. In addition to these proposals there must be supervision and advice as to the kind of employment into which a child shall go. As the knowledge of industrial processes and their effects upon the young is accumulated it will be possible to see definitely that children of certain physical types should be excluded altogether from some industries. Until there is complete certainty upon these matters it would be unwise to recommend compulsion, but while there is no compulsion there may still be advice and supervision after the child has entered the employment.

The suitability of employment may be dealt with also by improvements in the conditions of the industries themselves. It is important that in all dangerous processes special protection should be given to the young, and it must be noted that boys and girls between 16 and 18 are far less likely to be careful themselves in using safety appliances than older people. It is more difficult to take precautionary measures and to make a process safe for boys and girls than for men and women, and therefore their employment should be more restricted by law than may be necessary for adults. The same applies to night work. No boy or girl under 18 years of age should be allowed to work by night no matter what the particular occupation may be.

---

## PREVENTION OF UNEMPLOYMENT.

BY A. SUSAN LAWRENCE, L.C.C.

Much has been said and written on the question of unemployment. Up to the present time, however, no Government has either made any practical attempt to solve the question, or has undertaken the preliminary work of statistical inquiry with the necessary fullness and detail.

One branch of the question has, it is true, been explored with some approach to completeness. We have statistics of unemployment extending over a considerable period, and from those, and other trade statistics, we are tolerably well informed as to the main causes of unemployment, the seasonal and cyclical variations of trade.

From the point of view of international labour legislation the question of preventing unemployment must almost wholly be confined to the unemployment which arises from the cyclical fluctuations of trade.

Seasonal fluctuations, though causing much distress, and probably preventable to a considerable degree, are obviously matters for each country to settle locally.

The cyclical fluctuations of trade occur with fair regularity over a period of about ten to seven years, and appear in a large number of instances to affect many countries simultaneously.

A certain amount of trade fluctuation is no doubt inseparable from a progressive condition of industry. Extreme and violent expansions and contractions of trade are, however, a unmixed evil, not solely on account of the distress caused to workers by a period of acute unemployment, but also on account of the disturbance they cause to credit and production.

It would appear that the governmental action might be effective in two directions—firstly in preventing the occurrence of extreme and violent fluctuations in industry, and secondly in mitigating the effect of these fluctuations by an adjustment of the State demand for goods.

### Fluctuations in Industry.

While, as has been said, some of the causes of trade fluctuation are probably irremovable, the cause of sudden and violent booms and slumps does not appear either to be difficult to trace or impossible to remedy.

It is, in short, nothing more recondite than the ignorance of the ordinary manufacturer of the extent of the actual demand, and of the extent to which other firms are meeting it.

Let us suppose there is a demand for more clothing. Each manufacturer feels the demand; each desires to receive as large as possible a share of the market. In doing so, he has probably not a very accurate knowledge of the total demand; he has almost certainly no knowledge of what his competitors are doing. His desire is to get in quickly and receive as much as he can for himself. There will, therefore, be a boom in trade. There will follow a glutting of the market, prices will fall, manufacturing will diminish, and a period of unemployment will follow. Now it is clear enough that the boom would not be so high or the corresponding slump so low, if accurate full returns as to production and demand were available to industry at frequent intervals. No such statistics exist at the present time.

In each country, it is true, Government departments collect and publish a considerable amount of trade information.

The various countries, however, and the different departments in each country work independently, and the work of obtaining and of collating such returns is a task almost unbearably difficult to experts and impossible for the ordinary trader.

Further, this information is directed mainly to informing manufacturers of the demand for certain classes of goods. The statistics of production and the extent to which fresh capital is being invested in any class of business are not compiled or published. The mere information, for instance, that boots are demanded in the Argentine will doubtless encourage English manufacturers to make boots; but to prevent an over-production of boots and a consequent glutting of the market, something else is needed—information is needed as to how far that demand is being met by manufacturers in this and in other countries.

What is needed in the first instance is an international bureau charged with the duty of making and publishing trade returns. Such returns should include—what no returns now show—statistics of the production contemplated as measured by the formation of fresh companies or the calls for new capital on the part of existing companies.

It is true that the reference to the Labour Conference at Washington is too narrow to allow that Conference to set up such a bureau. The Labour representatives at Washington should emphasise the fact that unemployment cannot be dealt with as if it were independent of trade and finance; and that the question of the prevention of unemployment must be dealt with not purely as a labour question, but also as an industrial question, by the League of Nations as a whole. In pursuance of this policy, a memorandum on the above lines should be forwarded to the Council of the League, and that they should be asked to take action and to set up an international bureau for the purpose of supplying the returns required.

### **Regulation of National Demand.**

As has been said above, it is probably possible to prevent the extreme violence of trade crises generally by collecting and publishing comprehensive statistics with regard to production. The problem would thus be rendered easier, but not completely solved here.

It is possible, as is shown below, to prove that in certain important



industries unemployment might be reduced, either wholly or very greatly. It is not, however, possible to indicate the total number of the unemployed which any Government adopting such a policy might have to deal with—or the total cost to the community.

There remains to be discussed the possibility of diminishing the effect of trade fluctuations by an adjustment of State demands.

Here, too, the question has been imperfectly explored.

One very well-known attempt has been made to estimate in numbers and money the possible task of the Government in this country in dealing with unemployment—that of Professor Bowley—and in view of the expert criticism which may be expected, it may be as well to point out that these figures should be read with the utmost caution.

The figures upon which he relies are the figures of unemployment as given by the "Board of Trade Gazette."

These figures show for the years from 1896 to 1912 an unemployment percentage varying from 6.9 in the worst year (1894) to a percentage of 2.3 in the best year (1900).

It must be noted that the figures of the Board of Trade are obtained from the returns of certain unions only, mainly trades such as ship-building, peculiarly liable to fluctuations. They have no bearing on certain stable occupations such as railways, municipal employees and agriculture. Professor Bowley, therefore, after taking these questions into consideration, estimated (in 1909) that "200,000 or fewer able-bodied adult males are out of work from non-seasonal causes one year with another, and have no sufficient resources, and that this number fluctuates from 100,000 in the best year to 300,000 in the worst" (evidence before the Royal Commission on Poor Law), and that additional wages to the extent of £10,000,000 a year are needed in order to bring the worst year with regard to unemployment on a level with the best. There appears, however, some reason for doubting Professor Bowley's estimate:—

1. He deals with males only.
2. He excludes from consideration not merely railway and municipal employees and agriculture, but coal, cotton, and some other textiles and shipbuilding.
3. His figures are based upon the Census of 1901.
4. He estimates the average weekly wage of each male at £1 a week only.

It would appear, therefore, very dangerous for any representative at Washington, in dealing with the prevention of unemployment, to rely upon Professor Bowley's estimate. It may be as well to put in this warning, as the estimate has been very widely quoted and is most open to criticism.

The direct part which each Government can play in reducing unemployment can, however, be shown to be considerable. In certain industries cyclical (as distinguished from seasonal) unemployment can be almost wholly eliminated; in others it can be considerably reduced.

The building trade is an instance of a very great amount of unemployment which might be prevented by the regulation of public works. Building, as the following table shows, is subject to very great fluctuations which appear to follow a cycle of their own. Here the percentage of unemployment varies from 8 per cent. in the worst year (1905) to 0.9 per cent. in the best.

The total numbers of males employed in building in July, 1914, were 920,000, the difference between the best and worst years being rather

more than 7 per cent. If employment, therefore, in the building trade were made stable, unemployment in the worst years would be reduced by no less than 64,000 persons. This is a trade in which such an experiment is peculiarly hopeful. Local authorities have already been accustomed to work to a programme extending over a considerable number of years, under the direction of a Government Department. This is so in housing. The L.C.C. has now in hand a five years' programme providing for rehousing 185,000 persons in five years. In the same way the Board of Education has imposed on the same authority a plan for remodelling its schools extending over many years. The need for housing will for many years certainly be far greater than the supply, and the same is true of the modernisation of our school buildings generally. It appears, therefore, that the acceleration of such programmes in bad years could be arranged in order to meet unemployment.

The arrangement of such programmes for building would also affect the light metal industries. No figures can be given here; but it is clear that the provision of the fireplaces, piping, locks and bolts, and all the miscellaneous metal articles required in fitting up houses would depend largely on an arranged programme for building.

### Woollen Trade.

We have further a carefully worked-out analysis of the effect of a Government programme contained in a paper by Mr. Wood, secretary of the Woollen and Worsted Trades Federation.

The paper is printed in the proceedings of the National Conference for the Prevention of Destitution, 1911, and should be one of the documents taken to the Conference by any Labour adviser on the question.

The net result of this elaborate investigation is to show that the regularisation of the central Government's demands would be to reduce unemployment in the worst years from 7 per cent. to 4 per cent.

The total number of those employed in the woollen and worsted trade was 117,000 males and 150,000 females in July, 1914. The scheme would, therefore, reduce the number of unemployed persons by about 5,000 in the worst years.

### Roads and Construction.

In these works—as in housing—the amount of useful work to be done is almost unlimited. There would appear to be no difficulty in drawing up a programme of work—in executing the necessary surveying and acquiring the powers over sites to be taken in the earlier years of the period. Such work would then be capable of very great acceleration in time of depression.

Separate statistics of unemployment in such work are not available, and it is, therefore, impossible to estimate the number of persons who might then be against unemployment.

### Shipbuilding.

The shipbuilding trade is one peculiarly exposed to fluctuation, and here it is clear that a programme of Government shipbuilding could nearly eliminate fluctuation. The variations in employment in the shipbuilding trade are very great. The Board of Trade give the percentage for the shipbuilding trade independently for the years 1894-1900, vary-

ing, as will be seen, from no less than 15.7 per cent. in the worst year to 2.3 in the best.

In July, 1914, shipbuilding was estimated to employ 180,000 males and a few females. The difference in the best and worst year is, roughly, 13 per cent. Unemployment in the worst year would, therefore, be reduced by about 23,000 persons if a scheme of equalisation were adopted.

### Engineering.

Engineering from obvious reasons fluctuates to a certain extent in sympathy with shipbuilding. It appears tolerably clear, therefore, that to reduce unemployment in shipbuilding would of itself be sufficient to very greatly reduce the fluctuations in the engineering trade.

There must also be a certain amount of unemployment caused by fluctuation of shipbuilding in the iron and steel trades and in coal as well upon the demand made by these workers for articles commonly purchased by them, e.g., furniture.

The stabilisation of shipbuilding, therefore, would have a substantial effect upon unemployment here, and therefore probably on imports.

Government programmes of shipbuilding, dependent as they are upon political considerations, are no doubt difficult of adjustment. It might, however, be possible to point out to the Council of the League of Nations the advantages which would result in such adjustment for their consideration.

The publication, however, as is suggested in the first part of this report of the amounts of fresh capital being invested in the trade would most certainly in this instance modify the extreme fluctuation of this industry.

Imperfect as the above instances are, they do in fact represent almost the whole of the detailed information that can be obtained.

The Government demand for boots, cotton goods, metal goods, hemp and metal goods must be very considerable, but as far as can be ascertained no detailed review such as exists for the woollen trade is available.

The Labour representatives at Washington cannot, therefore, prove the case for the Government regulation of demand by any body of elaborate and detailed statistics. They can, however, insist upon a pledge that all Governments shall adopt the principle of regularising their demand for goods in accordance with the state of the labour market, and that the effect in each trade shall be immediately the subject of detailed investigation.

**LABOUR PAMPHLETS ON THE  
PEACE.**

**The Peace Terms.**

By the Rt. Hon. Arthur Henderson, M.P.  
(Secretary of the Labour Party).

**Labour and the Peace Treaty.**

Containing Parliamentary Speeches by—  
Rt. Hon. W. Adamson, M.P.,  
Rt. Hon. J. R. Clynes, M.P.,  
Mr. Stephen Walsh, M.P.,  
Mr. Tom Shaw, M.P.

**Labour Policy and the Famine.**

A Statement of the Economic Position  
of Central Europe and Labour's  
Policy of immediate measures.

---

Price 2d. each; post free, 2½d.

---

THE LABOUR PARTY, 33, ECCLESTON  
SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.

PRINTED BY  
ST. CLEMENTS PRESS, LTD.  
Portugal Street,  
London,  
W.C.2.

**INTER-ALLIED  
LABOUR AND SOCIALIST CONFERENCE**

---

**THE REPLIES  
OF THE SOCIALIST PARTIES OF THE  
CENTRAL POWERS**

TO THE

**'Memorandum on War Aims'**

---

**The Preliminary Draft of a Peace  
Programme by a Committee  
of Neutral Socialists**

---

**AN OPEN LETTER on the 'NEW  
SOCIALIST PEACE CONFERENCE' from  
M. P. J. TROELSTRA to THE RIGHT  
HON. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P.**

---

**PRICE 6d.; BY POST, 8d.**

---

---

Published under the auspices of the  
Parliamentary Committee of the Trades  
Union Congress and the Executive  
Committee of the Labour Party.

---

To be obtained from the Labour Party,  
33 Eccleston Square, London, S.W. 1.

---

---

INTER-ALLIED  
LABOUR AND SOCIALIST CONFERENCE

---

THE REPLIES  
OF THE SOCIALIST PARTIES OF THE  
CENTRAL POWERS

TO THE

'MEMORANDUM ON WAR AIMS'

---

The Preliminary Draft of a Peace  
Programme by a Committee  
of Neutral Socialists

---

AN OPEN LETTER *on the* 'NEW  
SOCIALIST PEACE CONFERENCE' *from*  
M. P. J. TROELSTRA *to* THE RIGHT  
HON. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P.

---

PRICE 6d.; BY POST, 8d.



# CONTENTS

	PAGES
AN EXPLANATORY NOTE .....	4
<b>I. GERMANY :</b>	
<b>A. SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY :</b>	
I. EXCERPT FROM THE "BERLINER TAGEBLATT," 28TH JUNE, 1918 .....	7
II. TELEGRAMS :	
BRANTING-TROELSTRA .....	8
TROELSTRA-HENDERSON .....	8
III. THE REPLY .....	8
IV. TELEGRAMS :	
BRANTING-TROELSTRA .....	9
TROELSTRA-HENDERSON .....	9
V. "STOCKHOLM" : MEMORANDUM .....	10
VI. HERR SCHEIDEMANN : SPEECH IN REICHSTAG ...	16
<b>B. INDEPENDENT SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY :</b>	
I. "STOCKHOLM" : MEMORANDUM .....	21
II. "STOCKHOLM" : OFFICIAL PRESS COMMUNIQUE	24
<b>II. AUSTRIA : GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY :</b>	
THE REPLY .....	27
<b>III. HUNGARY : SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY :</b>	
THE REPLY .....	31
"STOCKHOLM" : MEMORANDUM .....	32
<b>IV. BULGARIA : UNITED SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY ("BROADS") :</b>	
THE REPLY .....	38
<b>V. NEUTRAL SOCIALISTS : STOCKHOLM ORGANISING COMMITTEE :</b>	
PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF A PEACE PROGRAMME .....	42
<b>VI. "THE NEW SOCIALIST PEACE CONFERENCE" :</b>	
AN OPEN LETTER TO THE RIGHT HON. ARTHUR HENDERSON BY M. P. J. TROELSTRA .....	63

## AN EXPLANATORY NOTE.

An Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference was held at London, on Tuesday and Wednesday, August 28th and 29th, 1917. Delegates from the Trades Union Congress were present at this Conference, and their experience was reflected in the report of the Parliamentary Committee to the Congress at Blackpool, held in September, 1917. This report commented on the failure to obtain unanimity, and called attention to the method of representation of minorities adopted at the Conference. It then continued:—

“In view of the divergence of opinion, we have come to the conclusion that a Conference at Stockholm at the present moment could not be successful, and in the light of all the circumstances we make the following recommendations:—

(1) We recommend that the Parliamentary Committee attempt in every possible way to secure general agreement of aim among the working classes of the Allied nations, as, in our opinion, this is a fundamental condition of a successful International Conference.

(2) We are strongly of opinion that an International Labour and Socialist Conference would be of the greatest service, and is a necessary preliminary to the conclusion of a lasting and democratic peace, and we recommend that the Trades Union Congress Parliamentary Committee be empowered to assist to arrange and take part in such a Conference.

(3) We think that the participation of the Trades Union Congress should be subject to the conditions outlined in recommendation (1) and to the further condition that the voting should be by nationalities, sectional bodies within nationalities to be governed by the majority of that nationality, or alternatively that each section should be given voting powers according to the number of persons actually represented.

We desire to make it clearly understood that the above recommendations arise out of the internal difficulties revealed at the Inter-Allied Conference and elsewhere, and are in no way consequent upon the decision of Governments to refuse passports to the Stockholm Conference. In the opinion of your Committee, no Government has any right to prevent an expression of feeling by the working classes of its country, and we regard the action of the Government in this matter as an unwarrantable interference with our rights as citizens. The workers of this country have made enormous sacrifices in life and liberty, and are entitled to a commanding voice in the settlement of peace. We recommend that this Conference enters an emphatic protest against the action of the Government in refusing passports, and demands that, in the event of an International Conference taking place on

the lines recommended, no obstacle shall be placed in the way of the delegates from any country."

The voting on this part of the report resulted as follows: for the report, 2,849,000; against, 91,000. Majority in favour, 2,758,000.

Two days later the Executive of the Labour Party, meeting at Blackpool, assimilated their policy to that of the Trades Union Congress by the adoption of the following resolution:—

"That the Executive of the Labour Party, having received a report from its representatives at the Inter-Allied Conference, places on record its deep regret at the failure of the delegates to reach agreement with regard to war aims and the conditions of an International Conference. The Executive accepts as a basis for considering joint action by the two bodies the recommendations of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress, which were endorsed by such an overwhelming majority of the Congress. The Executive further agrees that until some measure of agreement on war aims, which are so fundamental to democracy and humanity, is reached, they adjourn the Conference of the Labour Party, and the nomination of delegates be not proceeded with, but that the draft war aims be circulated to all the affiliated organisations with the request that they be brought to the notice of their members preparatory to their consideration at a subsequent Conference."

A Joint Committee of the two bodies was appointed to consider the possibilities of joint action on the basis of this resolution, and agreement on war aims was finally realised within the British Labour movement at London on the 28th December, 1917, when the "Memorandum on War Aims" was approved by a Special Conference of the Labour Party and the British Trades Union Congress. In order to attain some measure of agreement within the Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Movement, the Executive Committees of these organisations made themselves responsible for the convocation of another Conference of the Allied Labour and Socialist Parties. This Conference was held at London, February 20th-24th, 1918, and adopted 'The Memorandum on War Aims,' whose text is now very well known.<sup>1</sup> It is stated in this Memorandum that:

"As an essential condition to an International Congress, the Conference is of opinion that the Organisers of the Congress should satisfy themselves that all the organisations to be represented put in precise form, by a public declaration, their peace terms in conformity with the principles 'No annexations, or punitive indemnities, and the right of all peoples to self-determination,' and that they are working with all their power to obtain from their Governments the necessary guarantees to apply these principles honestly and unreservedly to all questions to be dealt with at any official Peace Conference."

The Memorandum was transmitted to the Socialists of the Central Empires, in accordance with the instructions of the Con-

<sup>1</sup> It can be obtained from the Labour Party, 33 Eccleston Square, London, S.W.1. Price, 1d. By post, 1½d.

ference, and their replies, together with other relevant documents, are now published in pursuance of a decision of the Joint Committee of the Labour Party and Trades Union Congress.

The replies of the Socialists of the Central Powers have all been reproduced in the representative organs of the official parties. His Majesty's Government permits the circulation of enemy newspapers among licensed persons in this country, and the translations of the Bulgarian and German replies have been made directly from the official documents. The English texts of the Austrian and Hungarian replies are based on the versions which appeared in "Het Volk," the organ of the Dutch Socialist Party: those versions followed the original documents handed to M. Troelstra personally by the delegations of the Austrian and Hungarian Parties. The German text of the Austrian reply published in "Arbeiter Zeitung" has also been used. All the Stockholm memoranda have been reprinted in a book "Stockholm," published for the Organising Committee of the International Socialist Conference at Stockholm by Tidens Verlag, Stockholm. The translation of M. Troelstra's open letter has been made from the complete text published in "Het Volk."

---

I.  
GERMANY.

A.  
SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

I.

An excerpt from the "Berliner Tageblatt," 28th June, 1918.

Although the English Government has refused Troelstra his passport for the journey to London, the Socialist Conference, meeting to-day in London, as we have heard, will nevertheless be informed about the attitude of the German and Austro-Hungarian democracy with regard to the question of peace, and the settling of a day for a second International Socialist Conference at Berne. The representatives of the German and Austrian Social Democracy have given detailed information to Troelstra concerning their attitude, and have left written declarations with him. These representatives have once more laid stress on their decision to work towards a peace by understanding, and have declared their willingness to take part in an International Conference. Of course, the London decisions of the Entente Socialists (February, 1918) could certainly not form the basis of such deliberations. On the other hand, the German Socialists do not insist on the deliberations starting with the Stockholm declaration of the *German Social Democracy*, but they would be ready to recognise the Stockholm Declaration of the *neutral Socialists* with regard to the peace question, as a basis for the discussions of a new International Socialist Conference. Once more the German Social Democrats have laid stress on the fact that they adhere to the principle of a peace without annexations or indemnities, and that they stand for the restoration of Belgium. With regard to the question of peace in the East, they have pointed out that this peace has not met with the approval of the Social Democracy in the Reichstag. A revision of the peace in the East could therefore not be to this extent in contradiction to the July resolution of the Reichstag-majority, which met with the approval of the German Social Democracy. The German Social Democracy has found it unnecessary, having regard to their former declarations, once more to indicate their standpoint on the question of Alsace-Lorraine. Also, the German-Austrian Social Democracy has explained in detail to Troelstra their attitude with regard to peace. They have energetically declared their readiness to work towards a peace by understanding, and have also decided to take part in a new International Conference. They have also agreed to the establishment of legal guarantees to be incorporated in the treaty of peace,

## Germany (Majority)

and to the formation of a League of Nations, but have pointed out at the same time that the Socialist International did not think this aim one to be obtained easily. But this objection should not hinder, according to their view, the preparation for a peace by understanding. At the same time, the representatives of the German-Austrian Social Democracy have declared that the war ought not to be prolonged for one day in order to obtain objects which would handicap the understanding of the nations. Further, the Austro-German democracy will again answer the London Declaration of the Entente Socialists (February, 1918). The difficulty of the situation is, that the representatives of the Socialist Parties in Germany and Austria, in spite of their readiness to come to an understanding, naturally decline to make the London (February) Declaration of the Entente Socialists the starting point for new international meetings, or to answer the definite war aims contained in the declarations of the Entente Socialists with their own detailed peace programme. It will be shown now in London whether, in spite of all, a way can be found which might lead to a new unanimous manifestation of the International Social Democracy with regard to a peace by understanding, the seriousness and importance of which could certainly not be under-estimated by the Governments. In the circles of Dutch Social Democracy the dividing points still separating the Social Democracy to-day in the enemy countries are not underestimated.

## II.

**A telegram sent by M. Branting to M. Troelstra, on the 1st July, 1918.**

Please inform Henderson if statement Reuter about Vienna correspondent "Berliner Tageblatt" is correct. Statement says German Majority accepted Stockholm neutral peace proposal as a basis of discussion.

**The reply of M. Troelstra addressed to Mr. Henderson on the 3rd July, 1918.**

Statement is correct in so far as concerns Stockholm neutral proposal. I am publishing this week open letter to you containing my views about Conference, its necessity, conditions, and character.

## III.

### THE REPLY.

**A letter, dated 26th June, 1918, addressed to M. Huysmans, Secretary of The International Socialist Bureau, and published in "Vorwaerts," 16th July, 1918.**

DEAR COMRADE HUYSMANS,—Your letter of March 10th, which Comrade Branting sent to us on April 29th, did not reach us until June 3rd. A few days before we had received from another quarter the authentic text in the English language of the Memorandum [the Memorandum on War Aims adopted by the Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference in London on February 23]. As regards the summoning of an International Socialist Conference

to a neutral country, we are ready to take part in such a conference, just as we have been ready at all times during the war to support the efforts which aimed at a meeting of the representatives of the Socialist parties.

We regard it as obvious that admission to this Conference must be open to the representatives of all Socialist parties. We assume in particular that the representatives of the American Socialists, who were always present at the last Congresses of the International, will be invited.

We agree that the Conference can be held only under the leadership of Socialists of neutral countries, because that is the only way by which all appearance of partiality can be avoided.

Now, your letter further expresses the wish that the Social Democratic Party of Germany shall make in public a declaration about its peace conditions. The German Party has already made such declarations on many occasions. Through its spokesmen in the Reichstag and in public appeals it has always assented to a peace by agreement, which should be concluded without annexations and without contributions, upon the basis of the right of self-determination of the peoples. In its Memorandum, with which you are acquainted, the Stockholm Delegation of the Social Democratic Party of Germany defined in detail its attitude towards the peace question. The Party Congress at Würzburg [August, 1917,] approved this Memorandum. We have no cause to depart from the declarations which were made at Stockholm and published textually.

For the rest, we regard it as obvious that at the proposed Conference no party shall be voted down. The Conference can have success only if it is able to bring about an agreement.

Finally, as regards the attitude of the party on the Eastern questions, you have doubtless, during the months which have elapsed since the despatch of your letter, seen from the reports of the proceedings in the Reichstag that during these proceedings the Social Democratic Party stood up resolutely for its Socialist views.

Wishing good success to your efforts to bring about an International Socialist Conference, we remain, with Socialist greetings,

The Executive of the Social Democratic Party of Germany.

(Signed) HERMANN MULLER.

#### IV.

**A telegram sent by M. Branting, London, to M. Troelstra, Vevey, Switzerland, on the 29th July, 1918.**

Your telegram to Henderson 3rd July, intimated German Majority Socialists willing accept neutral Manifesto as basis of discussion. Letter signed "Müller," Vorwaerts, 16th July, does not contain this offer. Can you explain discrepancy and still repeat former declaration? Reply Henderson, 33 Eccleston Square, London.

**The reply of M. Troelstra to Mr. Henderson, dated the 2nd August, 1918.**

Repeat former declaration. Have not received contrary opinion from Majority.

## Germany (Majority)

### V.

A Memorandum<sup>1</sup> dated the 12th June, 1917, submitted to the Organising Committee of the International Labour and Socialist Conferences at Stockholm by the Delegation<sup>2</sup> of the German Social Democratic Party.

#### I.—THE GENERAL BASIS OF PEACE.

The Social Democracy of Germany is trying to bring about a peace based on mutual agreement. It is demanding for its own people freedom of economic, political, and cultural development. It condemns at the same time any violation of the vital interests of others. Only such a peace can have the character of permanence, and enable the peoples to avoid the danger of strained relations and to devote all their energies to the service of social amelioration and the development of the highest humanitarian and national culture.

Starting from this general aim, we have accepted the proposal of the Council of Workmen and Soldiers at Petrograd, which asks for a peace without annexations and without indemnities—a peace based on the right of peoples freely to dispose of themselves. Our attitude on concrete points can therefore be stated as follows:—

##### 1.—ANNEXATIONS.

We are opposed to any forced annexation. Where frontiers are changed as a result of a mutual agreement, it is important to guarantee to any people interested, who desire to retain their old political allegiance, the legal and economic possibility of settling down in their new homes.

The rejection of forced annexations clearly implies the restoration of colonies which have been taken.

##### 2.—INDEMNITIES.

We oppose the imposition of war indemnities. Moreover, they could only be obtained after one of the belligerent parties had been completely crushed. Every day new battles add so largely to the sum of sacrifices in goods and human lives, that for these reasons, if for no others, the postponement of peace with the object of imposing war indemnities is indefensible. Besides, the economic enslavement of one people for the profit of another would make a lasting peace impossible.

##### 3.—RESTORATION.

In so far as this question means political restoration, that is to say, the re-establishment of the independence of a distinctive State, our answer is in the affirmative.

On the other hand, we oppose any one-sided obligation to restore the devastated districts affected by the War. This damage has been done in all the theatres of military operations by friend as well as enemy, during advances and retreats, partly as a result

<sup>1</sup> "Stockholm," pp. 110-118.

<sup>2</sup> The delegation was composed of F. Ebert, Ph. Scheidemann, Ed. David, H. Müller, H. Molkenbuhr, J. Sassenbach, G. Bauer, C. Legien, R. Fischer.



of actual fighting, partly as a result of immediate measures taken in the interest of military security. It seems to us to be extraordinarily difficult to determine the origin of these acts of destruction and to appreciate their military justification. A one-sided obligation to pay for damages would be nothing less than a masked war indemnity.

As to the countries which are incapable of reconstructing their economic life—ruined by the war—out of their own resources, we foresee the possibility of international financial assistance on a basis mutually agreed upon.

Moreover, from the Socialist point of view the destruction of private property is the least part of the damage committed. It is impossible to repair the greatest losses which humanity has experienced—the destruction of human life and productive forces.

#### 4.—THE RIGHT OF NATIONS FREELY TO DISPOSE OF THEMSELVES.

We understand by the right of peoples freely to dispose of themselves the right of peoples to retain or recover their political independence.

The States to be considered in the first place are those which, like Belgium, Serbia and other Balkan countries, have lost their independence during this War.

We are in favour of the re-establishment of the independence of Belgium. Belgium should not be a vassal State either of Germany, England, or France.

As regards Serbia and the other Balkan States, we are of the same opinion as our Austrian comrades.

The second group of nations whose right to dispose of themselves has to be taken into account are those which had formerly lost their independence, but have been liberated from foreign domination by the events of this War. That applies, for example, to Russian Poland (Congress Poland) and Finland. We cannot refuse to these peoples the right to dispose of themselves. The others, in so far as they cannot be granted political independence, should at least be granted autonomy, so as to enable them to develop their own national life.

The third group consists of highly civilised peoples who were formerly independent, but have become the victims of Imperialist domination, and whose political circumstances have not been changed by the War. The following belong to this category:—Ireland, Egypt, Tripoli, Morocco, India, Thibet, Korea, and other countries which have known an independent political life.

German Social Democracy greets with the greatest sympathy the efforts of those peoples who desire to reconquer their national liberty, and would be gratified to see the Socialists of the ruling countries raise their voices on behalf of these nations who demand that they shall be freed from foreign domination.

#### 5.—AUTONOMY FOR NATIONALITIES.

In so far as these words mean cultural autonomy for populations speaking a foreign language, and forming an entity within a larger State, German Social Democracy, in agreement with the policy which it has hitherto followed, will continue to demand the widest possible application of

this principle. In the case of the German Empire, it would apply to the claims of our fellow citizens in Northern Schleswig, Posen and Western Prussia, likewise Alsace-Lorraine, districts where the mother tongue is Danish, Polish, and French. We distinctly condemn any measures which would hinder the use of the mother tongue by these citizens, and any attack on their national customs. These groups of people of the same nationality living within another State ought not to be obstacles to mutual amicable relations, but, on the contrary, should serve as bridges between two peoples and two civilisations. The extension of the principle of democracy in all countries would bring us nearer to this end.

As regards the position of the different nationalities inside the Austro-Hungarian State, here, also, we agree with the declaration of our Austrian comrades.

#### 6.—ALSACE-LORRAINE.

In its questionnaire the Committee has put Alsace-Lorraine under the heading of nationalities. It must be said that Alsace-Lorraine has never been a politically independent State, nor can it be considered as a particular nationality. Nearly nine-tenths of the population of Alsace-Lorraine are of German nationality, whether from the point of view of race, language, or descent. Scarcely 11.4 per cent. speak French as their mother tongue.

Nor is Alsace-Lorraine one of those territories which have changed hands in the course of the War. Apart from one small strip, it has remained in the hands of the German Government. Neither, therefore, can any discussion of its political independence be justified from that point of view.

The territories of Alsace-Lorraine, which formerly belonged to Germany ethnographically and politically, were taken forcibly from her by France. By the Peace of Frankfort in 1871 the provinces again became part of the country of which in earlier times they formed a part. It is, therefore, quite unjust to speak of the historical right of France. For Alsace-Lorraine to be returned to France by force would be nothing less than annexation, and what is more, an annexation of territory where a large proportion of the population speak a foreign language. We must, therefore, oppose this solution in conformity with the principle of peace without annexations.

German Social Democracy claims for the people of Alsace-Lorraine complete equality as an independent federated State within the German Empire, as well as the right to develop its local legislation and administration on liberal and democratic lines. This desire was lately expressed in a resolution adopted at the Congress of Vienna in 1913, a resolution which was proposed by our comrades from Alsace-Lorraine. Before the War the French Socialists expressed their support of the settlement of the question of Alsace-Lorraine on the lines of such equality and the most complete local autonomy. It is a settlement which corresponds with the demands recently made by the deputies from Alsace-Lorraine, chosen by universal, equal, direct, and secret suffrage.

The principle of peace without annexations naturally does not exclude friendly agreements regarding rectification of frontiers at any point whatever.

## II.—INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS.

The right of each people to political independence and freedom of economic development can only be permanently guaranteed and respect at the same time the vital interests of all nations if we succeed in embodying in the Peace Treaty the broad principles of the future law of nations. It would be the work of the years which will follow the conclusion of peace to elaborate on a uniform basis political rights, the rights of labour, civil rights and international commercial rights, with the object of creating among peoples a loftier common conception of justice and civilisation.

### 1.—INTERNATIONAL LAW.

The National Council of the Party and the Reichstag Section of the German Social Democratic Party, in a declaration of war aims on the 16th August, 1915, pointed out that the highest moral duty of all Socialists is to bring about a lasting world peace by international juridical institutions.

In agreement with the resolution of the International Socialist Congress at Copenhagen in 1910, we demand in particular that the peace treaties shall establish an International Court of Arbitration, which shall be informed of all disputes between States.

In order to prevent the violation of agreements established by international law, a supernational juridical organisation must be brought into existence.

### 2.—DISARMAMENT AND THE FREEDOM OF THE SEAS.

Conditions referring to the limitation of armaments on land and sea must find a place in the peace treaties. The object of these arrangements would be the creation of citizen armies responsible for the defence of their country against aggressive attacks and oppressions. The period of military service in the different categories of such armies ought to be limited as far as possible by international treaties.

In the same way it will be important to limit by agreement the use of engines of war, to nationalise the armament industry, limit by international treaty the sale of armaments and munitions by neutral States to belligerent Powers, abolish the right of capture at sea, prohibit the arming of merchantmen, place under international control all straits and oceanic canals necessary for the world's traffic.

There ought to be effective guarantees for the security of world trade during war.

Contraband should be defined internationally and so as to exclude the raw materials of food and clothing. Private property ought to be secured against the encroachments of belligerents. Postal communication between belligerents and neutrals or between one neutral and another should be similarly assured in the event of war. Finally, the definition of blockade should be revised.

### 3.—ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL QUESTIONS.

In order not to hinder the growth of better relations between peoples, the Peace Treaty should contain conditions designed to prevent the military war being prolonged into an economic war.

Freedom of communication by land and sea ought to be guaranteed by the Peace Treaties.

Protectionism must be gradually eliminated. The most-favoured-nation clause should find a place in the Peace Treaty. The object of commercial policy should be to abolish all customs and commercial barriers.

The policy of the "open door," that is to say, the equal right of all nations to economic expansion, should be introduced into colonies.

Freedom of movement, the right of combination, workmen's insurance, the protection of women workers, children and home-workers, ought to be regulated in accordance with the programme published by the Trades Union International.

#### 4.—THE SUPPRESSION OF SECRET DIPLOMACY.

We demand that all treaties between States and international conventions shall be placed under the democratic control of parliaments.

### III.—PRACTICAL MEANS OF REALISING THESE AIMS.

We refer to the exposition of our views under (I.) and (II.).

In the interests even of a rapid peace, it seems of the greatest importance to give first place to the consideration of economic and social questions.

Committees of Investigation could undoubtedly prepare preliminary studies of real importance on the national and economic problems. But do not forget that for International Socialism the first duty is the conclusion of a speedy peace. In our opinion an early peace is possible if it rests on mutual understanding and on the bases: "No annexations! No indemnities!" without its being necessary to set up special committees of investigation beforehand.

### IV.—THE ACTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL.

The neutral countries of Europe have all, without exception, suffered more or less from the war. All have an interest in the conclusion of an early peace. They must, therefore, take part in the discussion of those new measures which will regulate internationally questions of an economic, social, and legal character.

It goes without saying that the collaboration of the elected parliamentary representatives is necessary considering the experience which the proletariat of the belligerent countries has had during the war in their relation with parliamentary majorities. But such collaboration can only shorten the war if all the Socialist parties bring pressure to bear on their Governments and Parliaments with all the means they have at their disposal.

A sufficient answer has already been given to the question concerning the collaboration of the International in the peace negotiations.

The Socialist parties of the belligerent countries ought to bring more and more influence to bear on their Governments, their Parliaments, and on the official Peace Conference.

## V.—THE ACTIVITIES OF THE SOCIALIST PARTIES ON BEHALF OF PEACE.

We come now to the question which was added to the questionnaire on the 7th of June on the initiative of the German Delegation.

“Report from each Delegation on the work of its party during the War on behalf of a lasting peace.”

The Executive Committee of the German Social Democratic Party have brought together in two brochures “a collection of declarations, appeals, and speeches in the Reichstag.” These documents explain the point of view of the Party in regard to the war and the terms of peace. They constitute proof that the German Social Democratic Party, like all other Socialist parties, has accepted the principle of national defence, but has worked from the first day of the war for the conclusion of peace. In order to bring about this peace on a basis of mutual understanding, the party has not laid down any preliminary conditions other than that their opponents should equally declare themselves ready to conclude such a peace. But our party has not been content to confine its work in favour of peace to appeals and declarations. Throughout the war we have organised meetings in favour of peace. We have distributed petitions throughout the war, and have got them signed. In these petitions we expressed the desire that the Government should renounce any plan of conquest and should declare itself ready to enter into peace negotiations.

These peace activities have been crowned with success. Unfortunately our efforts to renew relations with the Socialist parties in Great Britain and France have not been equally successful.

Peace activities can only lead to results when they are undertaken simultaneously on both sides. That might be done, and, in our opinion, could have been done a long time ago, without one party asking the other to sacrifice to any extent whatever the least part of the cause of its own people. We are bound to tell everybody that to punish other people for the crimes, real or imaginary, of their Governments is not our wish. The German Social Democratic Party has always worked along those lines.

## VI.—GENERAL SOCIALIST CONFERENCE.

We are ready to take part, without qualification, in a general Socialist Conference on behalf of peace. We believe that it is the elementary duty of every Socialist to work for peace.

The explanation of the attitude of the Socialist parties would be very much simplified if all sections were to publish a collection of documents on their work on behalf of peace, in the form which we have chosen.

We do not fear a discussion on the question of who is to blame, but we do not think that the objects of the Conference would be attained by such a discussion. The question at issue at the present moment cannot surely be some dispute about the past. We must come to an understanding in regard to the future, and, above all, in regard to the means of bringing about at the earliest possible moment a peace which accords with our principles and our ideals.

We have no objection to the minorities of all parties taking part in a General Conference.

## VI.

**A Speech delivered in the Reichstag, on the 3rd July, 1918, by Herr Philip Scheidemann, the leader of the Social Democratic Party.<sup>1</sup>**

Before discussing the political situation in another connection I must first make some remarks about the Peace Treaty with Rumania. My friends strongly object to certain paragraphs of the Treaty, to take only the most important, the point respecting the Dobrudja and other frontier rectifications which have taken place without any consultation of the population concerned. Other paragraphs are also unsatisfactory, and among them the settlement of the question of the so-called people belonging to a foreign race with various agreements about economic questions. But the Treaty ends the war between Rumania and the Central Powers, and one of my friends will discuss this point more closely.

My friend Geck, the representative of Mannheim, put the question in March whether the Government knew that in the Chamber of Deputies in France and in the Municipal Council in Paris serious voices have pointed out the necessity of belligerent countries putting an end to their attacks on open cities situated outside the war zone and what attitude the German Government would take in this respect. The reply was that the enemy Governments had not yet made this proposal and that the military authorities would consider it as soon as the proposal was transmitted. This reply is extremely unsatisfactory.

There is nothing more repulsive in this war, a war already so full of horrors, than the attacks on open cities outside the war zone (Very true from the Socialist benches.) The attack by foreign aeroplanes have not yet resulted in the destruction of important places where munitions are being made, of administrative centres or railway junctions. Up till now the damage has not been important. I do not know whether the German aeroplanes have done much damage of military importance in enemy countries, but I know for certain that the attacks made during the war in Germany have resulted already in the death and mutilation of hundreds of innocent women, girls, and children. (Very true from the Socialist benches.) I refer to the numbers of children who, for instance, in Karlsruhe have been killed and mutilated as they were playing. I have just come from Mannheim where again many girls have been killed in the same manner. Important damage has not been done, but what significance has such murdering of women and children? It is said here that the English have tried to stimulate war feeling by exhibiting the dead bodies of women and children. In our country reports concerning the innocent victims of the enemy air attacks are completely suppressed. If every war be a barbarity in itself the casting of bombs on open cities behind the war zones is horrifying. (Very true from the Socialist benches.)

I expect to get the following reply: England has begun to make a war against women and children by trying to prevent them getting food. That is true, and I have not a word of excuse for such a manner of waging war. But there is always a difference between the attempt to starve a whole people in order to end the war and the

(<sup>1</sup>) The translation was made from the text published in "Vorwärts."

futile casting of bombs on various places. Why do you follow the initiative of the other side in this respect? If it is possible to reach an agreement about the exchange of prisoners, why is it not possible to reach an agreement about the cessation of futile attacks on open cities outside the war zones? I request the Imperial Government to act in this respect, and if we gain moral victories it will certainly not do us any harm. (Very true from the Socialist benches.)

I come now to the main point in my speech. It is impossible in a general debate on our internal and external policy to avoid reference to the speech delivered last Monday by the Secretary of State, Herr Von Kühlmann. This speech has made a tremendous impression on public opinion. This speech has proved, for instance, how profoundly irreconcilable are opinions about the essence, aims, and possibilities of this war, and it has again thrown over all delusive appearances a strong light on the distribution of forces in our country.

The speech of Herr Von Kühlmann has created a profound impression, not because it has confronted us with the immediate appearance of an unknown truth, but because it seemed to formulate as a programme the opinion of the Government, which had been known for a long time and around which many conflicts have taken place. It is the opinion—and this you know—which has been since the beginning of the war the opinion of the Socialists, and of all those who have in this war maintained a clear political outlook. It is not a question of principle. It is a question of facts. In principle we Socialists are against all annexations, all violence, whether with great or little sacrifices, or whether useful or useless for the conquering people. We should have proclaimed our opinion against annexations and in favour of understanding—nay, I say we should have proclaimed this opinion even more strongly if from the beginning we had had only to conduct war on one front, if we had had a more feeble opponent, or if we had fought for an easier victory. The oppression is the more revolting the greater the difference between the strength of the oppressor and the oppressed, and we Socialists in our external and internal policy have always opposed the arrogance of the mighty. (Hear, hear, from the Socialist benches.)

But these principles are not under consideration now. The question is that of reaching an agreement on the facts among politicians, among all those who are in principle against all policy of conquest and among politicians who in theory are of a different opinion. The point is that this war ought not to be conducted as a war of conquest, for it would mean the ruin of the German people and possibly of the whole of Europe. This opinion arises out of the evolution of material and moral forces acting on both sides, which, by a better employment of our force, would guarantee to the German Empire its undiminished existence against the most terrible attacks, but on the other hand would prove the impossibility of the policy of giving predominance to Germany in the world. (Applause.)

I am not willing in this connection to examine whether the policy of German domination of the world would be favourable to the interests of the German people and of mankind. I am examining here only the purely practical side of the question and I may say here that no policy aiming at the domination of Germany in the world could have been worse than the policy which has been followed for the last thirty years. A policy aiming at the German domination of the world would have

been obliged to do two things. She ought to have chosen carefully her political opponent, to have isolated him diplomatically. To beat him she ought to have gained sympathy for Germanism throughout the whole world, so that the people or essential parts of those peoples would have seen in the advance of Germany's strength an advantage of their own interests also. I say this without declaring that such a policy would have had our support, but it is sufficient for me to state that this policy has not been followed. We have been engaged in this greatest of all wars without any aim and, I find no other expression for it, we have been led into this war by surprise. (Very true from the Socialist benches.) Surrounded by enemies, with the violent hate of the whole world opposed to her, Germany can follow no other policy than to erect strong walls with its human lives in order to resist the violent passions of the enemy until these passions collapse.

Its war policy ought to have been directed not by principle but by practical considerations towards the maintenance of the status quo, which does not signify, of course, that during the war there would be no change of forces, for instance, the change created by the Russian Revolution. Germany had to prevent herself being considered the violent revolutionary force against the existing world order for her own advantage, because, if she had not done so, she would have consolidated anew the strength of the enemy coalition, would have increased the moral forces of resistance, and would have excited new attempts at resistance among the people who had already accepted peace. Germany had therefore to conduct a war of national defence which she was prepared to end as soon as her existence would not be attacked by enemies. For the triumph of this conception the German Socialists have striven for more than four years. (Very true from the Socialist benches.) And during the war there has not been in Germany any Government which has not in reality supported this opinion almost consistently. (Hear, hear, from the Socialist benches and movement.) To speak like this is not to commit an indiscretion, the facts are too well known, and for this reason the speech of Herr von Kühlmann was not a surprise to us. We have heard in this speech what we have always proposed since the beginning of the war, and for which we have always found support, except from the noisy pan-Germanist protesters and the Imperial Fatherland Party.

I suggest that you shall invite all the gentlemen who have, or have had, to do officially with the foreign policy of the Chancellors, the Secretaries of State, the Ambassadors, and other diplomatists to a confidential discussion of Herr von Kühlmann's speech of last Monday week. I do not believe that a single one of them will contradict the Secretary of State's utterances. Many perhaps will declare that this speech was a great mistake—this sort of thing may be thought, but not uttered. (Laughter.) We must most resolutely combat this view, which is frequently met with in private conversation. Herr von Kühlmann uttered what we all think. (Cheers on the Left; denials on the Right.) His speech would have become a political act if a second speech had not followed the next day. In excuse for the Secretary of State I can repeat that he has not recalled his first speech, but has—the tone makes the music—done just enough seriously to weaken its significance and has thereby again destroyed the good he had almost been able to bring about. One can easily imagine to what drumfire of telephonic and verbal reproaches and adulations the Secretary of State was exposed when he spoke.



Perhaps he will tell us himself in how many variations he then heard the eternal and imperishable word of State obscurantism, "You are quite right, my dear fellow, but such things should, for Heaven's sake, not be uttered."

It is not one of the ennobling effects of war that through it an atmosphere of public falsehood has been produced, in which every true word is regarded as dangerous. Let us deliver ourselves from this superstition; let us make an end of the system of lying. (Very true from the Left.) We can do it. It is not at all dangerous, if we say as loudly and as frequently as possible, "We are indeed willing and able to assert ourselves against the whole world, but... we shall never be placed by military means in a position of power to subject the world to our will." This recognition, repeatedly uttered and applied logically to our policy, is the only means of really ending the war in a period that one can foresee. The greatest military success, even if it brought this war to a provisional conclusion, would only bring us a truce, and not the peace which should give us the possibility of recovering from the frightful suffering of this war. (Very true from the Socialist benches.)

So much has been said about the peace offensive. I counsel trying an offensive hitherto unattempted, the offensive of truth. (Very true from the Left.) That appears to me to be an offensive for which courage is most wanting. We shall sooner get a half or three-quarter peace offer than a policy of unconditional truth and clearness. Herr von Kühlmann's retreat before Main Headquarters opens for us unpleasing prospects in this respect. Where is the man in civilian costume who says, unalarmed, to the gentlemen at Main Headquarters that they are self-deceived if they believe they are able to impose peace on the world? They can, perhaps, take Paris; perhaps expel the English from France; perhaps reduce all our enemies to a position in which they shall be compelled to conclude peace, but by purely military means they will never attain the world peace which the German people desire as soon as possible. The sword alone cannot win that; that is only possible through clever political procedure.

The gentlemen of the Main Headquarters ought not to resist that policy for they are only dilettanti in politics. (Very true from the Left benches.) They ought not to meddle in politics, which they do not understand sufficiently, in order that we should not be obliged to diminish by political criticisms their military ability which we admire. Instead of this we see the beginning of such obtrusive domination that this attitude must provoke the bitterest conflicts. If the gentlemen of the Government will themselves realise this, that their declarations made here may be censored by the military authorities, I do not discuss it. That the Reichstag will not permit it is a thing which goes without saying. (Strong applause.) It is very disgraceful that orders are given to the press how it has to interpret the declarations of the ministers. But that the press is not permitted, by an authority who itself is angry about the minister's speech, to give the real meaning to this speech is an almost unbearable situation. (Very true from the benches.) I very much fear that the press will go through difficult times when the Reichstag is not sitting. The constitutional order under which we live is nothing but military absolutism softened by the fear of Parliamentary scandal. (Laughter and agreement.) The gentlemen of the Government are not to be envied. This civil Government of a people who has been engaged in a hundred battles does not seem to have fully realised the whole

seriousness of the situation and the magnitude of its task. The idea that this Government has as a task or could have as a task to lead our people out of this formidable catastrophe to better times ought to give the Government such an irresistible energy that before their acts all opposition would be crushed. (Strong applause from the Left.) We strongly desire the Government to gain esteem on this point, that this Government give utterance to their complete conviction, that this Government indicate clearly its policy and execute this policy vigorously. If the Government does not do this it ought to go. We desire a Government that will vanquish their enemies in their sphere like the military powers in theirs.

The facts of the internal policy correspond to those of the external policy. The suffering people feel themselves in a situation of necessity and dependence. It is inconceivable what this people has to endure under the military law. In these critical weeks—and I do not know how we shall live through them—the question of food will be taken separately—we see in the Prussian Diet the tragedy of the electoral reforms. One of the greatest faults of this Government has been not to have prevented this coincidence by the dissolution of the Prussian Diet at the right time. (Very true from the Left benches.)

You must be clear about the following. Amongst the masses an intensified bitterness exists, not only among the industrial working people, but also among the great masses of the officials, clerks, middle classes, and agricultural people, and throughout the country there is only one feeling which can be summarised in one word—finish. Finish honourably of course. On this point there is no difference of opinion. Finish without humiliation of Germany, but finish. (Strong applause from the Left.) The people know the truth and are completely unmoved by any attempts to impress them. The people want to end this war as quickly as possible as a war of defence which has succeeded.

The Government must be the bearer of this inflexible will of the people. We demand from you that the Government recognise the right of Belgium to complete independence, without any reserve, and that she does everything in order to gain us a speedy peace without harming the interests of Germany. A Government which would follow such a broad policy of peace we should gladly support, but for a Government which, after four years of war, has not been able to suppress the military law, we cannot vote the credits. It is high time to recognise the needs of the people and to act accordingly.

What I say is not lightly uttered, but a profound exhortation and a warning, for on this policy depends the death or the life of millions

## B.

## THE INDEPENDENT SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

## I.

**A Memorandum<sup>1</sup> submitted to the Organising Committee of the International Labour and Socialist Conferences at Stockholm by the delegation<sup>2</sup> of the Independent Social Democratic Party of Germany.**

The peace policy of the German Independent Social Democratic Party, like its general policy, is based upon the common interests of the international proletariat and of Socialist development. Those interests demand immediate peace. The terms of peace ought to include an international agreement for general disarmament. This is the most important method of giving strength and vigour to the enfeebled peoples and of restoring their economic life within a measurable time. Only in this way can the supremacy of militarism be broken and the international relations be built up again on a peaceful and lasting basis.

We demand the fullest freedom for international trade and intercourse, as well as an unrestricted right of emigration and of immigration, with the object of developing the world's productive forces and of bringing the peoples into closer touch with each other and multiplying the bonds which unite them.

We oppose any policy of economic isolation and any economic struggle between States. All disputes between States must be settled by international arbitration.

We demand international treaties to secure the workers against exploitation, especially women and children, in accordance with the principles of international Socialism. The granting of equal political rights to women has become a necessity in view of the considerable increase in the employment of female labour. Equal rights must be granted to all the inhabitants of any country, regardless of nationality, language, race, or religion. This demand includes the protection of national minorities with the object of enabling them to develop their own national life.

National and social liberation cannot be achieved by Governments at war; it can only be the work of democracy. The full realisation of democracy ought to be the object of an unceasing and vigorous popular struggle. The democratic control of foreign policy will improve the chances of preventing aggression. Secret treaties must be abolished. All treaties between States ought to be dependent on Parliamentary approval.

The present era of great internal revolutions will hasten the solution of the many problems which the War has raised or accentuated. These questions ought not to be solved by war and

---

<sup>1</sup> "Stockholm," pp. 119-123.

<sup>2</sup> The delegation was composed of: E. Bernstein, H. Haase, Herzfeld, K. Kautsky, Stadthagen, Hofer, G. Ledebour, H. Wengels, O. Cohn.

the fortunes of battle. The evils of a world war are greater than the evils which, in the opinion of those who support it, the war can remedy.

Although we do not regard as inviolable State frontiers which are the result of conquest, and are often inconsistent with the wishes of the people, we absolutely condemn war, and so, too, condemn its prolongation as a method of settling frontier questions. Any frontier changes ought to be conditional on the consent of the populations concerned, and not imposed by force.

We strongly object to any attempt to violate a people in any form whatever.

From the beginning of the War we have consistently demanded a peace without annexations or indemnities, based upon the right of peoples freely to dispose of themselves. We consider that it is impossible to reconcile with Socialist principles the opinion—a product of militarist thought and of the policy of national expansion—that one's attitude towards a problem should depend upon the war map, and thus that one may pass a different judgment on one and the same question at different stages of the War.

It is not our business to draw up a programme on all the questions which will come up for settlement on the conclusion of peace. But we may make the following declarations on the questions which are in the forefront of the discussion.

#### SERBIA.

The re-establishment of Serbia as an independent autonomous State is absolutely essential. We do not deny that the desire of the Serbs for union in a single national state can be justified. The creation of such a State, and its union with other Balkan States in a Republican Federation, would be the best way of establishing in the Balkans permanently satisfactory conditions, which would exclude foreign interference and remove the Eastern question as a cause of war. To seek for such a solution by war would mean a useless prolongation of the conflict.

#### POLAND.

We understand the deep aspiration of the Poles for national unity. The attitude which would allow the right of the Poles to national autonomy to be settled by the war map—admit the right of Russian Poles to national independence but refuse the same right to Prussian and Austrian Poles—is in contradiction with the right of peoples freely to dispose of themselves. But here, also, we oppose the continuation of the War as a means of making this right prevail.

#### ALSACE-LORRAINE.

In the same way we condemn this method of solving the question of Alsace-Lorraine, and here we are in agreement with Engels and Jaurès. A prolongation of the War on the question of Alsace-Lorraine now means that the whole world, including Alsace-Lorraine, is to be ravaged because of the dispute which has arisen in regard to the wishes of this population, and that more people will be destroyed on the battlefields than there are inhabitants in Alsace-Lorraine.

Like Engels in 1892—more than two decades after the Peace of

Frankfort—we cannot shut our eyes, especially to-day, to the fact that the population of Alsace-Lorraine, annexed in 1871 against its will, can only find peace when it has been given the opportunity of voting directly and freely on the question of its national allegiance.

If this vote is taken under conditions of complete freedom and tranquillity—for example, after a period laid down in the Peace Treaty—and if it is similarly stipulated beforehand that the result of this referendum will be recognised as a final solution of this disputed question, which has separated Germany and France for nearly half a century, which has favoured the development of militarism on both sides, and which has burdened heavily the economic budget of the two States and thwarted democratic activity, Europe, and not least Germany herself, would be delivered from a black nightmare. The German people would gain economically, politically, and morally more than they would lose, even if the final decision were contrary to their expectations.

#### BELGIUM.

Complete political and economic independence of Belgium is inevitable. In fulfilment of the solemn promise of the German Government at the beginning of the War, the Belgian nation must obtain reparation for the damage caused by the War, and especially for the economic loss which it has sustained.

Such reparation has nothing in common with the War indemnities, which are simply a plundering of the vanquished by the victor, and which we therefore reject.

#### COLONIAL QUESTIONS.

As opponents of any policy of conquest and foreign domination, we reject, as we have always done, a policy of colonial conquests. The possession of any colony which is not administered by its own population is nothing less than the possession of an unfree people, and so as irreconcilable with our principles as slavery. As a matter of fact, the right of peoples freely to dispose of themselves is not respected either by the acquisition or by the exchange of colonies. Further, the possession of colonies is not necessary from the point of view of economic development. It is, therefore, neither principles of justice nor the economic interests of the working classes, but simply considerations of political wisdom, which demand, as regards colonies, that the Treaty of Peace shall not contain changes which may be of such a kind as to give rise to new causes of war.

#### INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATION.

The Peace Treaty will only be secure if there is an international power to watch over it. We do not regard an international government authority as such a power, but the international Socialist proletariat. Only if the International is transformed into an independent and powerful force, if the proletariat everywhere exercises all its strength to control Governments in the interests of maintaining peace, only then will there be created in the future a state of mutual confidence, instead of the tragic competition in armaments.

---

But in the immediate future the proletariat must do everything possible to bring the world war to an end, to attain peace.

The first step towards the realisation of this aim is the independence of the Socialist Parties in relation to the Imperialist Governments.

The drawing up of a peace programme is important, but this programme is nothing but smoke if it is not supported by energetic international action on the part of the masses.

We must compel all the Governments to adopt unconditionally this international peace programme. We must refuse credits to any Government which rejects this programme, replies evasively or does not declare itself ready to enter into peace negotiations on the basis of this programme. Such a Government must be fought in the most decisive manner.

The organisation and prosecution of such common action should be the first task of the proposed international Peace Conference. It must bring together all the really Socialist elements, determined to work with all their strength to this end.

Any proletarian organisation which refuses to collaborate in this policy would lose the right to be regarded as an international Socialist organisation.

## II.

### **An Official Press Communiqué of the Organising Committee of the Stockholm Conferences, dated the 29th June, 1917, with regard to the activities of the Delegation of the Independent Social Democratic Party of Germany.**

The Delegation of the Independent Social Democracy of Germany arrived at Stockholm on the 22nd June, 1917. It consisted of Comrades Bernstein, Haase, Herzfeld (representing Comrade Adolf Hoffmann, who had not received a passport—he was awaiting trial on a political charge), Kautsky, and Stadthagen. Comrade Zietz had fallen suddenly ill shortly before the journey. Later Comrades Hofer, Ledebour, Wengels, and Oscar Cohn arrived also as delegates.

The delegates have held a series of conversations with Russian comrades, holding various views, on unsettled international questions, conversations which are to be resumed on the arrival of other Russian comrades, whose coming has been announced. The Delegation has also got into touch with the Zimmerwald Committee as well as with the Dutch-Scandinavian Committee.

On several occasions they discussed with the Zimmerwald Committee the necessary conditions of a preliminary Conference of that organisation before the General Conference summoned by the Council of Workers and Soldiers, besides various questions relating to peace policy. It was not possible to hold a general meeting of the Zimmerwald Committee, because the representatives of several countries had not yet arrived, on account of the postponement of the General International Conference, which doubtless cannot meet before August.

The delegates of the Independent Social Democracy of Germany developed their ideas as regards peace activities before the Dutch-Scandinavian Committee. Comrades Haase, Bernstein, and Kautsky spoke at some length on this subject. Comrades Herzfeld, Hofer,

Stadthagen, and Wengels, who had arrived by that time, supplemented their remarks. Haase concentrated on an historical résumé of the peace activities developed by the Opposition section of German Social Democracy from the outbreak of war. He showed by documentary evidence how the Opposition fought from the very beginning for those demands which are now put forward on all sides : for a peace without annexations or indemnities, based on the right of peoples to dispose of themselves. He further demonstrated in detail how the Opposition have continually tried to force the Majority in the Reichstag and in the Party Executive to take an unequivocal and determined stand in conformity with these views, and how, because their efforts have been obstinately resisted, they have been compelled in the general interests of the proletariat and in pursuance of a world peace to defy party discipline, regardless of disciplinary measures and persecution by the party Majority and the party Executive. He showed that this was not a case of misunderstanding, but a profound conflict of fundamental ideas. To the Independent Social Democratic Party the peace formula of the Council of Workers and Soldiers is an expression of principles which they have consistently followed as their own, while to the others it is only an opportunist means of adapting themselves to momentary circumstances.

Bernstein, taking up the thread of the argument, discussed mainly whether the question of responsibility could be excluded from the deliberations of the General Conference. The absolute elimination of this question would not be possible, if only for the reason that the representatives of several countries demand its discussion, and that to refuse would probably be regarded as a partisan action. Moreover, it would not be possible to carry on effectively the struggle for peace and for a peace programme in accordance with the principles of democratic justice, unless a clear conception were attained of the nature of the war and the share of individual Governments in it. That, as he demonstrated in detail, could easily be done by reference to the war documents published by the Governments themselves. And the cause of peace would be served if comrades from the belligerent States expressed their own opinions on these vexed questions at a general conference. The chief obstacles in the way of energetic action on behalf of peace were the differences of opinion as to responsibility for the war, and ambiguities in the peace programmes. It was essential that these should be removed.

Kautsky dealt with the peace programme of the Independent Social Democracy of Germany. He pointed out how the Socialists of the so-called Majority in Germany appeared to have the same peace programme as the Independent Social Democrats, since both demand a peace without annexations or indemnities, but how the agreement consisted solely in the use of the same words, to which the other section assigned a different meaning. He showed by reference to the resolutions on war aims, adopted by the Party in August, 1915, and to the most recent memorandum of the Majority Socialists drawn up in Stockholm, that their views do not rest on the principles of International Social Democracy, but are animated by the spirit of a nationalist policy based on force and of militarist thought, which rendered their attitude towards each problem dependent on the military situation. This he demonstrated in detail from the clauses dealing with Austria and Turkey, with Belgium, Poland, and Alsace-Lorraine.

Finally, Kautsky repeated in the same sense what all the speakers before him had expressly emphasised, that the proposed Conference,

**Germany (Minority)**

if it was to have an influence in the direction of peace, must not regard its work as the elaboration of a platonic peace programme, that the Conference will have no effect unless it gives birth to an energetic movement on all sides for the realisation of the Social Democratic peace programme and unites all sections of the International which are ready to enter into the struggle with determination. This, in the opinion of the Independent Social Democrats of Germany, is the chief task of an International Conference.

---



## II. AUSTRIA.

### GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF AUSTRIA. THE REPLY.

(“Die Arbeiter Zeitung,” 29th June, 1918, and “Het Volk,” 9th July, 1918.)

A peace, which would be fully consistent with the general principles of International Socialism, ought to realise the following principles:—

FIRSTLY.—Union of all peoples in a League of Nations, which would effect international disarmament, submit all conflicts between States to the decision of a compulsory arbitration tribunal, and bring the collective strength of the whole League to bear on any State which transgressed international law.

SECONDLY.—No annexations. The solution of all territorial questions on the basis of the rights of peoples to dispose of themselves.

THIRDLY.—No indemnities. Equal freedom of economic development for all peoples and the prevention of all economic wars.

Only such a peace would merit the name of democratic. Only such a peace could be the means of a democratic world order. But such a democratic peace cannot be attained by the victory of one Imperialist group over another. The victory of one or other of the Imperialist groups would not bring about the right of self-determination, but would violate it. If, for instance, Italy were to gain a complete victory over Austria-Hungary, Italian Imperialists would endeavour to acquire not only the Italian parts of Austria, but, in addition, large Slav districts. If, on the other hand, Austria-Hungary were to gain a complete victory over Italy the Austrian Imperialists would consider it right not only to refuse self-determination to the Italians within their own territories, but, under the pretext of improving the strategic frontier, they would annex Italian territory without consulting the population concerned. It would be the same in the case of France and Germany. If France were to be victorious French Imperialism would try to annex not only Alsace-Lorraine, but also, in all probability, parts of the essentially German Rhineland. If, on the other hand, the German Empire were completely victorious, it would not only retain Alsace-Lorraine; the German Imperialists would also endeavour to annex, against the will of the populations, the mining districts of French Lorraine. In both cases, the right of self-determination would be disregarded.

If the Central Powers were completely victorious they would possibly proclaim the right of self-determination for Ireland, Egypt, and India, but they would declare that the settlement of the rights of their own peoples was an internal affair. If, on the other hand, the Entente were victorious they would perhaps proclaim the freedom of the Ests, Letts, and Poles, but they would postpone the recognition of the rights of the peoples of Ireland, Egypt, and India.

It is evident, therefore, that the victory of one or other of the Imperialist groups cannot establish the democratic order.

Nor would a so-called peace by conciliation concluded from

capitalist considerations completely realise the principles of International Socialism, for such a peace by conciliation would be nothing but a compromise between the Imperialism of the Central Powers and the Imperialism of the Entente. Its terms would not be determined by the principles of democracy, but by the relative strengths of capitalist Governments. At the best, it would not create fresh injustices, but would maintain old wrongs.

Therefore, in any case, the war cannot possibly be a means of creating a democratic order in the world. Under no circumstances can it realise the ideals of International Socialism. It is the duty of working men in all countries to do all that they can so that peace when concluded shall realise their ideals as far as possible, and, above all, render possible the further development of these ideals. This is their duty, although they may be convinced that the real democratisation of the world cannot be attained as the result of this war and the peace made by capitalist Governments, but will be the result of a class struggle and social revolution.

The peoples, bleeding from a thousand wounds, cannot continue the war until the working class becomes the dominant power in all countries. The peoples need an early peace.

For that reason, they cannot refuse a peace which does not completely realise the principles of International Socialism, but must urge their Governments to conclude peace as quickly as possible, even if the terms of that peace, the only one possible under existing circumstances, fall far short of the ideals of International Socialism. So long as the working classes in the different countries have not yet conquered political power the war can only end in a peace by victory, dictated to the vanquished by the victorious party, or in a peace by conciliation which will be a compromise between the claims of the two parties. We are convinced that International Labour and Socialism must strive with all its might in favour of a compromise peace, a peace of understanding, even if that peace does not completely realise our democratic ideals.

We are compelled to prefer an early peace by conciliation to the continuation of the war for the following reasons :

**FIRSTLY.**—A peace by conciliation is now possible. If, on the other hand, peace cannot be obtained except by the victory of one of the belligerents, the war must go on for many long years, and the terrible sacrifices which burden the working classes of all countries will formidably increase.

**SECONDLY.**—Peace by victory would provoke desires for revenge in the vanquished party and would thus become the cause of new wars. A peace by conciliation would facilitate a better understanding among the peoples, and would therefore carry within itself the guarantee of its continuance.

**THIRDLY.**—Peace by victory would consolidate the authority of Imperialism and Militarism in the victorious countries, and thus render the democratisation of these countries more difficult. A peace by understanding, which did not bring to either party any sensible increase of power, would, on the other hand, convince all the peoples that the war provoked by the capitalist Governments had brought to the nations endless sacrifices, but no profit. It would therefore strongly consolidate the democratic, peaceful and Socialist tendencies in all countries.

This result would be especially pronounced if the Governments were obliged to make a peace by conciliation under the pressure of International Labour and Socialism. If Labour and Socialism were to succeed by their actions in bringing their Governments to the discussion table they would appear to the peoples as the peace-bringers, the liberators from the horrors and sacrifices of war. Millions of men would thus be won for Socialism. A peace by conciliation, concluded under the pressure of International Socialism, would therefore hasten the victory in all countries of the working classes over reaction and of Socialism over Capitalism.

We think, for these reasons, that Socialism must postpone until after the conclusion of peace those claims which can only be realised by the complete victory of one party over the other, and thereby involve the prolongation of the war. We think that the great task of International Socialism is to force the Governments to an early conclusion of peace, which under existing circumstances cannot be other than a peace of understanding.

Now, if we are confronted with the argument that the present military situation is not favourable to the beginning of such negotiations because the psychological moment will not present itself until the war stops, and both parties recognise that they are unable to vanquish each other, we recognise the force of the objection. But we must also recall that throughout the whole course of the war, the unfavourableness or favourableness of the military outlook has been used by the Governments on both sides as a pretext for refusing to enter into peace negotiations, and that the German Socialists in Austria have, on the contrary, always desired to enter into peace negotiations regardless of the military situation. The sooner the working classes in all belligerent countries decide to exercise pressure on their Governments in favour of peace the sooner will they be able to exercise an influence not only upon the beginning of the peace negotiations, but also upon the terms of peace and the future organisation of mankind.

With regard to our attitude to the different questions brought forward in the International, we submit the following remarks:—

We agree with the proposals of the Inter-Allied Conference of February, 1918, concerning the creation of a League of Nations. We agree with what has been said on the subject of international economic relations and the politico-social claims to be included in the Peace Treaty. On the latter subject, we especially agree with the demands formulated by the International Trades Union Conferences at Berne and Leeds.

We demand the transformation of Austria-Hungary into a federation of autonomous States, and we also demand the creation of a League of the Balkan peoples.

We oppose all annexations by the Central Powers of frontier peoples detached from Russia. In Parliament and in the Press we have fought against the peace of Brest-Litovsk and the peace of Bucharest, and when Parliament has to come to a decision on those treaties, we shall reject every sentence which connotes annexation or violence.

We claim, as we have always done, the re-establishment and compensation of Belgium. But we do not consider that the question of who is to bear the expense of this compensation is one of

first-rate importance from the point of view of the beginning of peace negotiations.

Considering the immense sacrifices of the war, sacrifices not only in money and goods but in human life, we oppose any prolongation of the war on account of disagreements over financial questions. We think that there must be a compromise on the apportionment of the cost of reconstruction of the small countries.

With regard to the questions of Alsace-Lorraine, Italy, Poland, Turkey, and the tropical colonies we are of the opinion that an absolutely democratic peace, a peace consistent with the principles of International Socialism, would settle these questions also in the spirit of the peoples' right of self-determination. But we are under no illusions on this point; we appreciate the fact that this demand will not be realised.

Since, for the reasons given, we do not favour the prolongation of the war till complete self-determination is possible, and as we favour, on the contrary, a peace by conciliation, we consider that International Socialism must work for a peace by negotiation and accept it, even if it does not completely realise their claims. We reject with the utmost decision the point of view that we must continue the war till these demands are completely realised. We should not desire our claims to be obstacles in the path of an early peace or arguments for the prolongation of the war. None the less we are of the opinion that International Socialism should use all its influence to the end that on these national questions the peace treaty may realise as far as possible the rights of self-determination in so far as they can be realised without prolonging the war.

[Although it may be useful to state on what basis International Labour and Socialism considers that a compromise between the different countries is both possible and desirable, we nevertheless think that the most important task of democracy lies elsewhere. The most important task of Labour and Socialism is rather to push the Governments towards peace by taking strong action in every country. If this policy is carried out continuously and with great enough force in the different countries, the Governments will be obliged to take their places at the same table for the purpose of negotiations, and will find themselves in a compromise between their respective demands; that compromise will be the basis of the peace treaty. The organisation of such work on the part of the working classes of all countries would, in our opinion, be the most important work of the International Conference. We are convinced that peace would be promoted better by this method than by the most exact elaboration of plans for the solution of territorial disputes. The Governments will be obliged to settle these territorial disputes themselves, and they will only settle them in a spirit of compromise if, in the first place, by strong enough pressure in all countries, Labour compels the Governments to come to a compromise.]<sup>1</sup>

We desire, then, the early convocation of an International Labour and Socialist Conference in a neutral country.

We accept as the bases of discussion at such a Conference the Memoranda of the different parties delivered in Stockholm and the Memorandum of the Inter-Allied London Conference.

<sup>1</sup> The passage in brackets was suppressed in Austria by the Censor.

### III.

## HUNGARY

### SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY,

#### I.

#### THE REPLY.

("Het Volk," 18th July, 1918.)

The general conditions which the Hungarian Social Democratic Party considers necessary in order to make a peace by conciliation secure, have already been indicated to the Dutch-Scandinavian Committee.

#### I.

The principal conditions we have indicated are:—The federation of all nations in a League of Nations; the obtaining by all peoples of the right of self-determination; international disarmament; compulsory courts of arbitration; a peace without annexations or punitive contributions; the recognition of the right of free economic development for all nations, and the incorporation of the social demands of Labour in the peace treaty.

We declared, in particular, in favour of the restitution of Belgium and Serbia, and examined in detail the question of indemnities with regard to these two countries.

After reconsidering our Stockholm memorandum, we are bound to declare that the resolutions of the London Conference are not opposed to our views.

#### II.

It follows that we consider the resolutions of the London Conference, as well as the results of the Stockholm discussions, as a suitable basis for an immediate convocation of an international conference, and we should gladly welcome such a conference. We declare beforehand our acceptance of every resolution agreed upon by this conference, and inspired by a Labour and Socialist spirit, and we declare that we will fight with all our strength for the execution of such resolutions, prepared as we are to make the greatest sacrifices in order to attain this end.

#### III.

We declare ourselves opposed to every pretext or suspicion which could be used to prevent the convocation of this Conference.

(a) No argument for an adjournment of the Conference can be accepted by us, because we consider that the first and unavoidable duty we owe to the working classes, who have suffered and endured miseries for four years, is that the Socialist parties of all countries should at last come together at a Conference table and give each other the hand of friendship.

(b) Every obstacle to an understanding can be removed, and justly removed, by a free interchange of ideas on the part of the organisations affiliated to the International.

(c) We have not believed in the past, and we do not believe now at the beginning of the fifth year of the war, that if the repre-

## Hungary

representatives of the different Labour and Socialist parties were once to meet in a Conference they would separate without their deliberations having led to any result.

(d) Finally, it is our conviction—and the preparatory work of Stockholm has strengthened that conviction—that an International Conference is in itself a mighty means for developing the idea of, and the movement towards, a just peace. It would, at the same time, strengthen the Labour and Socialist Parties in all countries.

### IV.

[In addition to the arguments which we have already stated in favour of a Conference, we must add especially here that we consider it the greatest danger for the whole future of the Labour and Socialist movement that—putting aside all special questions—we should not now reach an agreement amongst Labour and Socialist Parties on this one point, the necessity of bringing pressure on the Governments by common and simultaneous action.

### V.

From the movements conducted by the Hungarian Party during the last year, movements which found expression in meetings, demonstrations, and general strikes in favour of peace, and from the influence exercised by these movements and those of the working classes in Austria and Germany, both on each other and the opponents of the working classes, and also from the absence of strong action in the Entente countries, we conclude that the movements of the working classes, who think and feel internationally, must be the consequence of an International agreement and be directed internationally. Every other method, if not a complete failure, would, at the very least, be followed by a complete absence of results and a waste of working-class strength.]<sup>1</sup>

On the strength of these considerations we conclude that, in order that the International Conference may be summoned as soon as possible, the preparatory work should be begun without loss of time and not be postponed under any considerations. In view of the difficulties that may arise we feel called upon to express the special hope that the comrades in France, Great Britain, and Germany will not bring forward demands calculated to prevent the International meeting.

<sup>1</sup> The passage in brackets was suppressed in Hungary by the Censor.

## II.

### **A Memorandum<sup>1</sup> submitted by the Delegation<sup>2</sup> of the Hungarian Social Democratic Party to the Organising Committee of the International Labour and Socialist Conferences at Stockholm.**

The Hungarian delegation is endeavouring, by the exposition of its active policy and point of view, to co-operate in the con-

<sup>1</sup> "Stockholm," pp. 191-7.

<sup>2</sup> The delegation was composed of: J. Weltner, E. Buchinger, D. Bokanyi, E. Garami, S. Jassai, Dr. Kunfi. It met the Committee in Conference on 29th and 30th May, 1917.

clusion of the peace of the International on the foundation of the principles of Socialism. It considers that the preliminary peace of the International is a step towards, and a necessary condition of, the general peace. The Hungarian delegation is convinced that this Socialist peace is not opposed to the principle, supported by the delegation, that the territorial integrity of Hungary, together with that of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, should not be diminished. The Hungarian delegation does not believe that States should be formed on the principle of nationalities, and in support of its attitude on this question it refers later to the example of Belgium. In accordance with the principle of nationalities, Belgium ought to be divided between France and Holland, whereas the Hungarian delegation is in favour of the complete re-establishment of Belgium. One consequence of applying the principle of nationalities in South-Eastern Europe would be the cutting off of Austria and Hungary from all access to the sea. Now, the Hungarian Social Democracy, which asks that Serbia shall be assured free access to the sea, because it recognises the injustice of a policy opposed to the interests of that country, obviously cannot share a point of view which would tend to create in Hungary the very situation which it is itself fighting against elsewhere. Basing itself on these general principles and on its political action, the Hungarian delegation replies as follows to the questions which have been addressed to it by the Dutch-Scandinavian Committee :—

#### PEACE TERMS.

We desire to see a peace concluded immediately on the general bases of no annexations, no indemnities.

It therefore follows :—

(a) That the complete political re-establishment of all the occupied States (Belgium, Serbia, Montenegro, Roumania) must be assured.

(b) That the economic restoration of all the ruined territories is the duty of the State concerned.

Nevertheless, two exceptions must be made to this last paragraph :—

(1) Belgium. We wish the German Government to stand by its declaration of the 4th August, 1914, regarding the re-establishment of Belgium. We consider that the reasons which prompted it have undergone no change.

However, if the realisation of this demand were to become an obstacle to the conclusion of an immediate peace, we would be of the opinion that the re-establishment of Belgium might be effected at the collective expense of all the great belligerent Powers.

(2) Serbia. As Serbia is too small to bear the cost of reconstructing itself, it would similarly be the duty of all the great belligerent Powers to secure its re-establishment collectively.

We demand, further, that Serbia, either by its re-union with Montenegro or otherwise, shall obtain free access to the sea; that this access shall not be restricted by any international condition, and that Austria-Hungary shall not attempt to fetter artificially, by economic treaties, the free development of this country.

As far as Alsace-Lorraine is concerned, we desire, in the first

place, that there should be an understanding between the Socialist Parties of France and Germany. There was such an understanding before the war, and we see no reason why an understanding should be impossible now.

If, however, an understanding of this kind were really impossible for the time being, that fact ought not, in our opinion, to serve as a pretext for the withdrawal of these parties from the work of the International, and, still less, as a pretext for supporting the prolongation of the war.

As regards the solution of the Macedonian question, we should like to see the Socialist Parties of Bulgaria and Serbia come to a similar understanding. We think such an understanding is possible on the bases of national unity and the federal organisation of all the Balkan States.

With regard to Poland, the delegation declares in principle in favour of the complete reunion of all the politically separated territories in a single independent State, bound to all neighbouring States by relations of friendship and free trade. It claims, as a minimum, the independence of Russian Poland—if that is the wish of the population there. For the Polish territories remaining under the power of other States, it demands national liberty and the opportunity of free self-development.

We claim that the small nationalities of all States (Austria-Hungary, Russia, Germany, England, Turkey, etc.) should be guaranteed the opportunity of economic self-development, and that they should have assured to them, on a democratic basis, complete national autonomy in matters of administrative organisation and cultural questions.

We are opposed to the continuation of the Colonial policy hitherto practised, which was the cause of the present war, and we declare ourselves in favour of the establishment of the open door in colonial territories.

We also demand democratic self-government for all colonial populations whose development is adapted to such a constitution.

#### FUNDAMENTAL CONDITIONS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.

The Hungarian Social Democracy desires that the future peace should rest on the bases of international law, compulsory arbitration, and disarmament on land and sea, for it recognises the interdependence of disarmament on land and the re-establishment with guarantees of the freedom of the seas. In order to guarantee this freedom of the seas, the delegation believes it will be necessary to create a maritime police, subject to international law, and to internationalise straits, canals, and the most important trade routes, such as the Dardanelles, Gibraltar, etc. The delegation considers that it is the duty of all the Social Democratic Parties to fight from this very moment against all endeavours to carry on an economic war after the conclusion of peace, and it therefore desires that vigorous opposition should be aroused in the Entente countries to the resolutions of the Paris Conference (June, 1916), and that in the countries of the Central Powers there should be a no less vigorous opposition to the "Central Europe" movement. The Hungarian delegation desires that the peace negotiations



between the belligerent countries, and the work on behalf of peace undertaken by the International, shall not be dominated exclusively by national and territorial questions. It desires, as representing the working class, to call the attention of the International to the fact that there is not only national oppression, but also social oppression, and it expresses the hope that questions of the protection of labour and social policy shall find a place on the programme of the peace discussions.

With regard to the freedom of the seas, the Hungarian delegation thinks it necessary to insist once again on the point that the separation of Croatia from the Hungarian State would result in cutting off Hungary from its only means of access to the sea; and, for that reason, the delegation again protests vigorously against the South Slav aspirations, which might fetter or render impossible the economic development of Hungary.

#### PRACTICAL REALISATION OF THESE IDEAS.

All these important problems—national autonomy, the establishment of an international law of the peoples, the institution of arbitration and disarmament—ought to be detailed again and carefully analysed. The delegation therefore suggests to the Committee the organisation of an inquiry into these questions, and the appointment of specialists and commissions to study them carefully and to present a definite report upon them.

The Hungarian Party desires to see the questions of compulsory international conventions and guarantees concerning the protection of labour, and legislation on social policy, placed on the agenda of the Peace Conferences, and treated with special attention.

#### COLLABORATION OF THE SOCIALIST PARTIES.

We consider that the first duty of the Socialist Parties of all countries is immediately to set to work vigorously along the lines of the Resolution of Copenhagen. We recommend them to make use of all the means in their power, in order to bring about the immediate commencement of peace negotiations and influence their Governments with a view to the conclusion of peace. The Committee ought to exercise in this respect a tireless activity and stimulate the initiative of everyone as much as possible. It would possibly be useful to reorganise the International Socialist Bureau to this end. It would naturally be useful to insist also on the necessity for unity of action in all the belligerent countries.

#### THE WORK OF THE INTERNATIONAL.

The credit of having kept alive the idea of peace among the peoples has belonged until now to the activity of the neutral countries. Whilst thanking the Committee for the work they have done, we consider that it is extremely important to make certain in the future of the permanent collaboration of the neutral countries in the peace negotiations.

#### THE DIRECT COLLABORATION OF PARLIAMENTS.

It might be necessary to work as far as possible towards a speedy convocation of inter-parliamentary socialist conferences. This idea might be realised in the form of meetings of those

members of parliament belonging to the different countries whose favourable attitude towards this kind of meeting is known to the Committee.

### GENERAL SOCIALIST CONFERENCE.

The Hungarian delegation is in favour of unconditional participation in the conference, and it regards the refusal of different Socialist Parties to take part in it as a dereliction of the international duties of the Socialist proletariat. Participation in the conference does not necessarily imply agreement with all its resolutions. On the contrary, the very character of the conference allows each national section to endeavour to win over the whole International to its point of view by the exposition of its arguments.

For example, we should not wish one or several socialist parties to arrogate to themselves the right to sit in judgment upon the others. We wish still less to accord this right to parties which are relatively small. But as we possess no Parliamentary tribunal, and are isolated from the rest of the world by our language, which is not understood abroad, we make use of the occasion to explain to the Committee the attitude of the Hungarian Socialist Party during the war, in order that it may become known to our comrades in other countries.

The essential elements in our attitude during the war have been the following :—

1. The Party has fought against every part of the policy of the enemy countries directed towards the dismemberment of Hungary or of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy.

2. It has thus been able to preserve its unity, and it has not been associated with any of the tendencies which have shown themselves during the war in Germany and in other countries. Moreover, the Party always proposes to retain its political independence, which is a logical consequence of its attitude on a question of principle towards the war.

3. The Party declared, as soon as it was possible for it to do so during the war, that it was in favour of a speedy end to this great conflict. From the beginning it has demanded that the International Socialist Bureau should resume its activities, and it has supported every effort directed towards this end.

4. The Hungarian Party has fought, as long as the war has lasted, against nationalist and imperialist formulæ, and it can affirm with a certain amount of pride that the Socialist working class in Hungary has escaped the nationalist and imperialist contagion, which has wrought so much harm in the other belligerent countries.

5. In Hungary there has been no "sacred truce" during the war, neither with regard to economic questions nor from the political standpoint. The political party has continued to fight against national and social oppression, whilst the trade unionists have fought, by all the means in their power, for the improvement of the conditions of the working classes.

6. This economic and political conflict has not, however, drawn the Party into war "sabotage," for the war aims of the enemy countries aimed directly at the dismemberment of political

Hungary, which the Hungarian Socialist Party has always opposed for reasons at once political, economic, and ethical.

With regard to the problem of responsibility, the Hungarian delegation thinks it right to draw attention to the fact that this question has two aspects: firstly, the question of Governmental responsibility with regard to the war, and afterwards, that of the responsibility of the different Socialist Parties in relation to the International during the war. The Hungarian delegation is opposed to the discussion of this question at the Conference, for it considers that such a discussion is unnecessary for the conclusion of peace, and would be useless. If, however, the convocation of a Conference, truly and completely international, depended on the discussion of this question, the Hungarian delegation would not consider that their opinion was a sufficient reason for abstaining from taking part in the Conference.

In the opinion of the Hungarian delegation, the peoples of the belligerent countries have no hostile feelings towards each other; it is the Governments of all the countries which are responsible for the war. The war was not brought about by accidental causes, but by permanent forces of national and social oppression and exploitation. Imperialism, the war of tariffs, national oppression, the absence of democracy and real parliamentary control, even in countries which possess a democratic constitution, the domination of a financial oligarchy in France and of Tsarism in Russia, the racial and feudal oligarchy in Hungary, and that of the Junkers and bankers in Prussia, the absence of the Parliamentary system in Germany—there, in the opinion of the Hungarian delegation, you have some of the true culprits of the war.

The glorious Russian Revolution has removed one of these causes of the war, and the Hungarian delegation is persuaded that the International will only be able to do real peace work when the different national sections—instead of fruitlessly discussing the question of responsibilities—revolt, in their respective countries, against the fundamental causes of the war, against French nationalism, against the domination of the junkers and bureaucrats in Germany, against the national and social oppression of the masses of the people in Hungary. The Hungarian delegation pledges itself to fight with the same object for the complete democratisation of Hungary. It hopes to see the French comrades fighting against the Chauvinistic idea, whilst the German Social Democracy ought to fight for the introduction of equal voting rights and a parliamentary system throughout the Empire. The delegation expresses this desire, not because it wishes to interfere in the domestic affairs of other countries and other socialist parties, but because an examination of the present situation and the possibilities of peace has convinced it that democracy is, at this moment, the essential element in international policy, and one of the conditions of a speedy and lasting peace.

## IV.

## BULGARIA.

BULGARIAN UNITED SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY  
("BROADS").

## THE REPLY.

("Narod"—"The People," 23rd and 27th April—6th and 10th May, 1918.)

## I.

## THE AGREEMENT.

The Bulgarian Socialists (Broad Section) give their full support to the general part of the Inter-Allied Memorandum.

In this part the general principles are developed—the League of Nations, disarmament, arbitration, and the peoples' right to settle their own destiny. This part does not admit of compromise, and, according to a declaration made by Henderson, it bears the character of an ultimatum addressed to the Socialists of Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Bulgaria.

If agreement on general principles is the most important question, it is also the easiest among Socialists. We do not believe that in the Central Powers or in any other country there exists a single Socialist or a single Socialist Party which would declare itself opposed to the general principles of the Memorandum. Such a Socialist would not be taken seriously, and such a Socialist Party would for ever exclude itself from the International. Such an act would be an open demonstration of betrayal of the international working class. Every Socialist associates himself at heart with the general principles developed by the Entente comrades.

We, too, regard with favour a League of Nations which, by means of Socialism, will be transformed into an international labour organisation, excluding all motives for armed conflicts. We, too, desire the institution of arbitration and disarmament in order to put an end to armed conflicts, and we desire that every nation which might disturb the peace should find all other States in opposition to it. We, too, support complete democratisation in all countries, the abolition of secret diplomacy, and an international control of armaments which ought to end in their total suppression. We, too, are opposed to the traffic and exchange of peoples; we desire that they may be given the right to settle their own destiny without being dependent on the tendency of the States of to-day to create natural strategic frontiers or to obtain for themselves natural outlets to the sea. The League of Nations ought to give all peoples the chance of making use of the natural monopolies of certain countries on condition that they do not thus create new motives for fresh subjugations and conquests.

With regard to these general questions, the unity of Socialists is complete. The Memorandum of the Entente comrades is a serious basis for discussions. These discussions will have advantages over those of the Stockholm Conference. Their limits are already fixed. One-half of the International proposes a formal solution for a common international organisation in the immediate future, and gives concrete proposals for the future of all countries and different States.

The transmission of the Inter-Allied Memorandum to us—the Socialists of the Central Powers—constitutes a remarkable event which may have great consequences for Inter-Socialist relations.

## II.

### THE DISAGREEMENT.

If the general principles of the Inter-Allied Memorandum are of such a nature that they impart to us a passionate conviction of the possibility of agreement in International Socialism on the principal questions of the near future, certain paragraphs of the concrete programme of this Memorandum may hinder the realisation of this agreement. We pass briefly over the questions of the futures of Poland, Belgium, the Baltic Provinces, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey, on which points the Bulgarian Socialists can without much difficulty accept the solutions proposed by the Memorandum.

We also pass briefly over the colonial question, in the hope that the final opinion of the International on this point will be bolder than the solution proposed by the Memorandum, which adheres closely to the existing situation—a situation which may give rise to conflicts in the future, even as it has given rise to the present conflict. Seeing that the rivalry of the Great Powers on the colonial question has produced this war, Socialism ought to broaden the rule proposed by the Allied comrades for Tropical Africa and adapt it for all the colonies; that is to say, all the colonies ought to be placed under the rule of the League of Nations and thus become a free arena for the economic emulations of all peoples, instead of remaining the subject provinces of the present colonising nations. If Socialism binds itself to the present situation it will be doing nothing decisive for the future. It will be content to play a secondary part in the events which now weigh with all their heaviness on the labour masses of all countries.

Moreover, the principle of maintaining the existing state of affairs is not logically developed in the Inter-Allied Memorandum. According to this Memorandum, Alsace-Lorraine must be evacuated by the enemy armies and given to France, who, after this restitution, might admit a plebiscite to be organised among the population of these provinces. This plebiscite would have the following judicial basis: in conformity with the Treaty of Frankfort, Germany tore these two provinces from France by force, and since it is Germany who declared war on France, the results of the Treaty of Frankfort are cancelled by this fact.

With regard to the colonial question, the Memorandum merely registers the opinion of the English comrades, on the question of

Alsace-Lorraine it merely registers the opinion of the French comrades, and on the Balkan question—especially on the Serbo-Bulgarian controversy—the Memorandum registers the opinion of the Serbian comrades, by which they attempt to make Imperialism consistent with Socialist principles—a thing which still astonishes us.

The Inter-Allied Memorandum refers to the Treaty of Frankfort, concluded fifty years ago, but it forgets the Serbo-Bulgarian Treaty of 1912, by which the Serbian and Bulgarian capitalist classes split up Macedonia into "disputed" and "non-disputed" zones. Although this Treaty recognised no zone as indisputably Serbian, by this act the Bulgarian capitalist classes, represented by the Narodniakes and the Tsankovistes, undoubtedly betrayed the national interests of the Bulgarian people.

The Memorandum forgets the Treaty of Bucharest of 1913 and the impartial enquiry of Carnegie, which established that Macedonia, divided from the Char to the Bistritsa, and from Orchide to Mesta between the Serbians and the Greeks, was subject to a foreign yoke; which was the reason for establishing there an oppressive rule with the object of breaking the people's will by blood, fire, terror and exile.

The Memorandum forgets that not a single Serbian Socialist maintained that Macedonia was a Serbian country, for that statement would be in contradiction to the scientific truth incontestably established by the ethnographical physiognomy of Serbia.

The Inter-Allied Memorandum simply asks the Bulgarian people to renounce their unity and their right to settle their own affairs, on account of the natural necessity of Serbia obtaining an outlet to the sea. On this point the Memorandum repeats, of course in a vague form, the point of view of the Dutch-Scandinavian Manifesto, but that too is very out-of-date in comparison with the well-known instructions given to Skobelev by the Russian Soviet, according to which Macedonia was to obtain self-government provisionally in order that the population might finally reach a decision.

We understand this opinion of the Russian revolutionary democracy. We would also have understood it, if it had been supported by the foreign comrades who do not wish to take part in a controversy which they do not feel themselves qualified to conduct. But that Macedonia should be given up directly to Serbia under the form of local administrative self-government—and this in the name of Socialism—is a thing we cannot understand. It seems to us that if the Memorandum had been the expression of the democratic principles referred to in its general part, rather than the expression of "Allied loyalty," we should have had proposed to us in the Memorandum a solution of the question that we would have been able to accept without much difficulty—we, the Bulgarian Socialists who are directly interested in this question.

But we understand that we are only a small part of the International. Our people is too small a people in the concert of nations to be able to endanger those who do not know anything about us. The Bulgarian people are situated in one of the most contested

parts of the world. They know that their dearest hopes, by reason of the interests of the great Imperialist powers who have always one or more satellite States in the Balkans, are often changed into bitter illusions, and that their historic fate is to see themselves politically subjugated, divided, or economically enslaved. But in spite of everything, we, the Bulgarian Socialists, in the name of the democratic principles accepted by us all, again dare to bring before the International, as we did at Stockholm, the demand for the unity and independence of the Bulgarian people, a thing which is in perfect harmony with the interests of democracy and with lasting peace in the Balkans.

---

## V.

**NEUTRAL SOCIALISTS.****THE PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF A PEACE PROGRAMME.**

**Manifesto with an Explanatory Memorandum<sup>1</sup> addressed by the Delegates<sup>2</sup> of the Neutral Countries on the Organising Committee of the International Labour and Socialist Conferences at Stockholm to the Labour and Socialist Parties of the International.**

## I.

**MANIFESTO.**

The Organising Committee of the Stockholm Conference has instructed those of its members who belong to neutral countries to draw up proposals in concrete form round which the Socialist organisations of the International might rally, and which might thus serve as a basis for peace negotiations.

These are the circumstances under which the delegations from the Socialist parties of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and the Netherlands have assumed the responsibility of putting forward the following suggestions, with the idea of helping to bring to an end as soon as ever possible a war which threatens to ruin Europe and strike a blow at the very root of the present and coming generations for a whole century. They are transmitting to you at the same time an explanatory and detailed memorandum which specifies the character and tendencies of their proposals.

The authors of this document know that they will not give complete satisfaction to any belligerent party. But in thinking out their formula they have been sensible of their responsibility as members of the International, and have been guided by their steady and clear consciences as Socialists and men who feel that humanity as a whole is surfeited with slaughter, and that the soldiers in the trenches bless the endeavours of all those who seek, by an effort of reason, to curtail their unmerited sufferings.

\* \* \* \* \*

For three years two immense armies have been facing each other on all the fronts, and yesterday's victory is followed, for each in turn, by to-day's defeat. France is not overthrown, nor is Austria dismembered. Great Britain is still strong, and Germany is no less powerful.

It is not rash to draw the conclusion from these three years of war that there will be neither victor nor vanquished in 1917, nor in 1918, nor yet later on. The peoples have organised themselves for the industry of death, and they have built walls of brass beneath which the flower of their youth comes to die in vain.

*Europe must be saved.*

\* \* \* \* \*

The present war has not solved the problems which gave it birth. As yet it has accomplished nothing, and it is very doubtful

<sup>1</sup> "Stockholm," pp. 491-521.

<sup>2</sup> Holland: Troelstra, Albarda, Van Kol (deputies), with Vliegen (deputy) and M. Wibaut as substitutes. Sweden: Branting, Soederberg and Moller (deputies). Denmark: Borgbjerg (deputy). Norway: Vidnes.



whether it will accomplish anything. The one good result which has come out of it is that it has allowed Russia to free herself from Tsarism by means of a revolution, the effects of which will be all the greater the sooner peace is concluded. Moreover, the absence of any direct results of the war, together with its immeasurable horrors, have made a necessity of the Utopia of yesterday—the creation of an international order.

Modern war no longer appears as a method of settling political and economic disputes, and the world seems at last to have understood that the rule of law must replace a system of violence.

In future, we must endeavour to settle every dispute by adopting the principle of arbitration and mediation. It is possible to apply that principle immediately, on condition that a policy is pursued which leads to the suppression at once of protection and militarism,—these two forms of warfare between the peoples. All nations must secure the opportunity of economic development, subject to the general well-being, and the chief immediate aim of the working class should be international disarmament, which has become a necessity on account of the exhaustion of the nations and the disastrous experiences of this war.

When the belligerent nations agree to accept these fundamentals, the Society of Nations will in fact be created. It will not at first be perfect. But of necessity it will have within itself the possibility of organic development. And therefore the peace will assume a character of permanence.

---

It follows naturally from the equilibrium of military force, noted above, that the peace of to-morrow cannot be one imposed by the victor upon the vanquished. It will be a peace by conciliation.

Such a peace may be concluded on the basis of the *status quo ante*, amended by the solution of those problems which are at the root of the war or which have become subjects of dispute. This is the peace without annexations, the peace without indemnities, the peace which guarantees the freedom of nationalities, or, at the very least, guarantees the opportunity which is given them to develop freely within their political sphere.

The solutions which we propose are inspired by the fundamental idea that the peace will be one of conciliation, and that it ought to be consistent with Socialist ideas. We communicate them to you, not because we regard them as the only possible solutions, but because they seem to us to bring together the maximum possibilities of agreement among the parties of the belligerent countries themselves. Questions like those of Belgium and Alsace-Lorraine have, up to the present time, been obstacles to the beginning of negotiations. An understanding within the International upon these questions would be calculated to hasten the conclusion of peace. Agreement, it appears to us, is consequently a duty. Territorial questions, like that of the Balkans, of Poland, and of the Trentino, must, of course, be solved by the peace treaty. But the settlement of national questions must not delay the conclusion of peace. The settlement of any specified national question, in cases where agreement cannot be reached during the negotiation of the actual treaty, might be referred to the Commis-

sion charged with the duty of working out international law. On the other hand, there are various questions of an economic nature, such as that of the Dardanelles and of Bagdad, the interests of the Powers in Asia Minor and in the Colonies, or the economic liberation of Persia. Such questions lie at the very foundations of the Society of Nations and can be settled upon the same principles.

The distinctions that we have just pointed out show the exact significance of each of the proposals which we now make.

### I.—GENERAL CONDITIONS.

No annexations, that is to say, the total evacuation of all occupied territories in Europe and in the Colonies; the restoration of these territories to the State of which they formed a part before the war; the complete re-establishment of the political liberty, the territorial integrity, and the independence which those States have lost, wholly or partially, during the war. In the interests of a lasting peace, the application of this principle does not in any way exclude the possibility of friendly arrangements for the rectification of frontiers, regard being paid to the wishes of the populations concerned.

No indemnities. The application of this principle does not exclude the repayment of impositions and requisitions which may have been levied during the war in defiance of the stipulations of The Hague Convention.

Restoration of devastated territories by means of an international fund, when this step is deemed to be necessary in the interests of States which have been seriously injured.

The settlement of national problems in the direction of liberty for nationalities; international regulation of national autonomy, respect for which will be assured by an International Court; States composed of various nationalities will be transformed into federal States; territories inhabited mainly by one distinct nationality will constitute the autonomous political districts of these federations, and their national minorities will enjoy cultural freedom.

Guarantees for the Workers on the lines of the resolutions passed at Leeds, Stockholm, and Berne.

A general amnesty for all crimes and misdemeanours of a political character arising out of war conditions.

### II.—SPECIAL CONDITIONS.

Complete restoration, political and economic, of Belgium, and cultural autonomy for Flanders and Wallonia. The repayment of all levies and requisitions raised in defiance of international law. The Court at The Hague can be entrusted with the assessment of the amount to be paid by Germany as damages, an obligation which was acknowledged in principle by the declaration of the German Government on the 4th August, 1914.

The settlement of the question of Alsace-Lorraine by means of a plebiscite, taken at a time to be agreed upon after the conclusion of peace. This plebiscite may be general or local, that is to say, it may comprise the whole of the disputed territory or may be organised in districts. Those who will be entitled to cast a vote

are the electors who form the permanent population, including, of course, those who may have left Alsace-Lorraine during the war, and who wish to return. The register of electors at the last election before the declaration of war could be taken as a basis, and guarantees will be given with the object of securing a free vote.

The re-establishment of Serbia, economically and politically independent, united to Montenegro, and restored by means of an international fund. She, as well as Bulgaria and Greece, will have free access to the port and district of Salonika, which will be placed under the jurisdiction of the three interested States. On the other hand, Bulgaria's claims will be specially satisfied by the cession to her of Eastern Macedonia as far as the Vardar, which will continue to be Serbia's line of communication with the sea.

The creation of a free and independent Poland, with guarantees for her economic development and autonomy for the Jewish and other minorities. The Polish districts in Austria and Germany will enjoy the widest possible measure of autonomy.

Territorial autonomy for the nationalities of Russia within a federal Republic, with guarantees for the rights of minorities. The independence of Finland, united to the Russian Republic.

The solution of the Bohemian problem along the lines of a union of the Czechs inhabiting adjacent districts where they live together in large numbers into a State federated with Austria-Hungary. Within the latter the South Slav peoples will enjoy complete economic equality, and will be united in a single administrative district. Such Italian districts in Austria as may not be ceded to Italy will enjoy cultural autonomy.

Political independence and economic equality of Ireland within the United Kingdom.

A friendly settlement of the problem of Northern Schleswig by means of an understanding between the interested States on the basis of a rectification of frontiers and after a popular consultation.

Territorial independence and re-establishment of Turkish Armenia and her economic development guaranteed.

An international solution of the Jewish problem; personal autonomy in those districts of Russia, Austria, Rumania, and Poland where the Jews live together in large numbers, and protection for Jewish colonisation in Palestine.

### III.—SOLEMN DECLARATION.

In order to confer upon the peace the character of permanence the contracting parties declare their readiness to establish the Society of Nations on the basis of compulsory arbitration and general disarmament, with the repression of every form of economic warfare and the extension of Parliamentary control over foreign policy.

Citizens!

We submit this document to you with confidence, and we should be glad if you would kindly communicate it for the consideration of the proper organisations. We beg you at the

same time to send us their considered opinion before the 1st December, 1917.

In acting as they have done, the members of the parties in neutral countries, who make up the Stockholm Organising Committee, believe that they have done their duty. They expect the Socialists in France, Great Britain, Italy, and the United States to continue their energetic action in favour of the granting of passports, so as to make possible the meeting of the General Conference initiated exclusively by the Russian Revolution and the parties in neutral countries, and, in this way, make ready for peace. They expect the Socialists of Germany and Austria-Hungary to bring equally energetic pressure to bear on their Governments in favour of the establishment of a democratic Parliamentary régime and a definite statement on war aims. They expect the Socialists in all the belligerent countries to continue the struggle against the policy of annexation and imperialism.

The peoples' need for peace is very great. If Socialism understands the importance of the present time it will enforce its collaboration in the establishment of the new political régime of to-morrow, and its work will be worthy of its part in history.

Proletarians of all countries, unite!

Stockholm, 10th October, 1917.

## II.

### EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM.

The Organising Committee of the Stockholm Conference has been animated by the desire to bring about the union of the Socialist working-class on a peace programme, and to produce a positive result from the preparatory work of the Stockholm Conference.

With that object they asked themselves the question to what extent is it possible to formulate definite suggestions capable of facilitating the work of the General Conference and deduced from the Memoranda of the various parties, and from the statements which were made in the course of the separate Conferences it has had with the delegations which came to Stockholm.

The drafting of the study was entrusted to the members belonging to neutral countries. In sending you the result we take the liberty of making a few preliminary observations.

The Committee does not feel that it is called upon to take the place of the Commission which will be appointed by the General Conference, nor to formulate the complete peace programme of the International.

In fact, there were parties of the belligerent nations which did not take part in the preparatory meetings, such as Italy, Roumania and Portugal. There are others which sent us their Memoranda without deliberating with our Committee.

Preparatory work has not, therefore, been done on all subjects, and for that reason it is impossible for us to formulate a final opinion on all the outstanding questions.

We are, therefore, content to send you suggestions which might perhaps facilitate deliberations on the questions we have discussed.

## PRELIMINARY CONDITIONS OF PEACE.

Before going on to consider the peace conditions proper, we are anxious to affirm our agreement with the opinion expressed among all sections of the International that the complete parliamentarisation and democratisation of States is the best guarantee of a just and lasting peace. The fact that the Parliaments and the whole people are behind the Government ought not to be in doubt for a single moment.

The memoranda generally and in similar terms ask for the collaboration of the representatives of the Socialist parties in the peace negotiations. The International Socialist Bureau, conformably with the generally expressed desire, ought to meet while the official conference is being held at the place where the Conference is assembled.

Delegations from all the belligerent countries ought to defend unitedly the interests of Socialism and the widest possible application of the International's programme.

Several memoranda express the conviction that the present war is a struggle for democracy and popular liberty. We think that it is the duty of the Socialists in every country to act so that the war may have such a signification in their own home politics. There is a favourable opportunity to-day, both for the introduction of the Parliamentary system in those countries where that system does not yet exist, and for its extension wherever it has been weakened or violated.

That is also true of Universal Suffrage for men and women, which is demanded as a necessary form of the future organisation of the State after a war in which citizens of both sexes have struggled and suffered for the future of their State. Only by the creation of equal rights for all, by the suppression of semi-feudal relations and privileges held by certain classes of the population can the war have any results favourable to the development of the political liberty of the people. The social republic remains the political aim of Socialism. This war may by these means achieve a great step in the pursuit of that aim.

The suppression of secret diplomacy and the permanent collaboration of the Parliaments in foreign policy has become during this war a real demand of the democracy in every country. The opinion has become general that the people can no longer abandon to cliques, wholly or partially responsible, the care of safeguarding the people's own interests. A parliamentary discussion of decisions already taken is not sufficient to guarantee the people against violence. The diplomatic green room is especially to be feared in this century of Imperialism. It is for this reason that the solemn declaration which we demand from the Governments on this question and other problems which concern future international relations ought to constitute one of the most important parts of the peace treaty.

## PEACE BY CONCILIATION.

Those principles and ideas which have had vitality hitherto in the International, and which, when one reads the Memoranda, have still life and power to-day, were useful to us as a guiding

thread in our endeavour to solve the various questions. The degree in which they are realisable is governed by the fact that we do not desire a continuation of the war but an understanding on the basis of a peace acceptable to all parties. It follows that we cannot, from the point of view of the Central Powers, take the present war map as the basis of peace terms, and that the Entente ought to submit to the fact that the war has not brought about a decision and that the enemy has not been thrown to the ground. A settlement of the conflict is impossible if one of the two sides restricts itself to a consideration of only the national point of view. Social democracy has at all times endeavoured to take account—having regard to the general and international advantage—of the national interests of the proletariat and its tendencies, which coincide with the interests of world peace. That is why it is called upon to assist Europe in getting out of the impasse in which it has been involved by national exacerbation during the war.

The Party Memoranda—it is a pleasure to record it—have taken the importance of this task into consideration. That does not mean that they have all understood it to the same extent and as regards every question. But the fact that we have noted allows us to believe that it will be possible to reach an understanding among them, wherever their collaboration is necessary to throw a bridge over existing oppositions, by the application of the principles of International Socialism and by having regard to the possibilities of concluding peace.

By that means the re-establishment of the Socialist International will be assured. It might even find a new life and be strengthened to the point of becoming a real international power. The feeling of responsibility for the future of the Socialist proletariat, which depends in several respects on the possibility of a general Conference reaching a conclusion, will help more than one comrade to overcome his own opposition. Certainly one cannot demand from parties that they should put themselves in violent opposition to their own people; that would destroy their position as a political party. But it is important to observe that public opinion in the belligerent countries has suffered for a long time from the delusive influence of a press which has been subject to a censorship; that a knowledge of facts, as they become known, can give rise to a considerable change among the masses; that even now, in every country, the desire for peace is growing and is withstanding the bellicose passions; and, finally, it is the duty of Socialism to tell the truth to the people, not merely so that it may act in opposition to the policy of the imperialists and jingoes, but so that it may itself be preserved from ruin before it is too late. Only by fulfilling this duty can it retain the confidence of the masses in every country. It will need this confidence during to-morrow's great events, when the people, threatened by misery, despair and anarchy, will more than ever be in want of the guidance of the Labour Parties. And that, not only in the interest of the parties themselves, but also in the interest of the maintenance of order and the development of a normal situation in every country.

#### GENERAL CAUSES OF THE WAR.

If in this memorandum we do not discuss the problem of who is to blame, we do not therefore mean that we are opposed to any

discussion of this question at the General Conference. Our Committee is of opinion that it is difficult to avoid an exposition by the parties of their respective attitudes during the war. Moreover, several Memoranda contain opinions on this question. But they distinguish between the general causes of the combination of events which engendered the conflict and the special circumstances which provoked the declaration of war. The examination of the general causes of the war is necessary in order to settle the character and conditions of the peace. It seems to us that this point of view is indubitably correct.

The German Majority looks for the principal cause of the war in the policy of encirclement directed against Germany, and the English and French in the danger that the Imperialism of a powerful militarist Germany constitutes to the peace and liberty of the world. These points of view have this in common, that in a period of capitalist development, where the need for economic expansion attempts to gratify itself by way of armed Imperialism and secret diplomacy in the hands of irresponsible persons, the arrival of a new competitor in the world market threatens peace.

The political facts, which have increased this danger and sharpened the oppositions, are notably: the consequences of the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine, which has provoked alliances and hostile understandings, which, in their turn, have driven German militarism, and consequently the militarism of the other Great Powers, to greater and greater armaments; the mutually antagonistic naval policies of the leading Great Powers; the Balkan Wars, the conclusion of which did not yield the basis of a true independence by an understanding among the Balkan States, but perpetuated the situation in which they found themselves when they were subjected to the self-interested struggle of the Great Powers; and finally, the way in which the nationality question has been handled in the several countries—a way both anti-democratic and contrary to the spirit of liberty.

### THE PEACE TREATY.

This general conclusion emerges from what precedes, that the Peace Treaty can now contain nothing which might be an obstacle to the satisfaction of the needs of any State, and that it ought to yield the basis of a friendly arrangement which, in the future, must satisfy these needs. Questions of naval policy and military rivalry on land are intimately connected with this problem.

The question of Alsace-Lorraine must disappear from European politics as a contentious subject. The Balkan question must be settled definitely by satisfying justifiable requirements of economic and natural development, and the international understanding will be the basis of a friendly solution of the burning nationality questions in the interested States.

These questions, to which the Belgian question must be added, are, as we have said in our manifesto, the principal points in the Peace Treaty. For us as Socialists, the speedy settlement of the Belgian and other questions is not only important in itself, but it is particularly important because the absence of a settlement is a barrier to a solution of the international problems of an economic, judicial and social character which are of decisive importance to the future of the proletariat and its fight for freedom.

According to the International Congresses, Imperialism' is primarily responsible for the present situation and for the world catastrophe which has been provoked. The fight against militarism has more and more dominated the policy of the working class. But the working class has been unable to avert the catastrophe, not only because it was weak politically in every country, but also because it was not sufficiently organised internationally for an active common policy. The present war has, however, demonstrated the correctness of its ideas and activities directed against Imperialism and favourable to the creation of international bases for the pacific development of the world. The demands of the Copenhagen Congress in 1910 have more and more become, through experience of the war, the common aspirations of humanity.

The first practical task of International Socialism is to realise these demands. With this purpose it can take its stand on the technical development of war, which leads away from the settlement of international conflicts by that means. The formula that conflicts will be avoided by the international settlement of economic questions and the maintenance and development of international law, that they will be smoothed out by compulsory arbitration and international courts, is not only put in the forefront as the most important guarantee of a lasting peace by all the Memoranda of the Socialist Parties; certain aspects of the conception are likewise brought into the light by the Governments themselves. International disarmament, without which it is difficult to reach the desired end, is more and more taking the premier place in international discussions of the peace problem. What before the war was considered Utopian has become an urgent and practical demand, through the need for a lasting peace and the actual impossibility of beginning again, after peace, a new policy of armaments. It is not possible at the present moment to appreciate the importance of this fact to the working-class fight for freedom.

In order to bring the present war to an end, we must solve the existing and pending questions around which the war is revolving. But a peace which restricted itself to the settlement of these questions, would not take account of the world and historic character of the war. The humanity of to-day will be equal to its work only when it has found appropriate ways and means of replacing by a state of lasting peace the state of latent war of these latter years, which is at the basis of the catastrophe.

It is of the highest importance to place on record that on this aspect of the subject there is unanimity of opinion in all the parties of the International.

The Peace Treaty ought, then, to contain, besides a settlement of existing problems, the principal conditions of a permanent peace. If the complete elucidation of these conditions and agreement on their solution seem very difficult before the conclusion of peace, the Powers must at least solemnly bind themselves in the Peace Treaty to collaborate in the realisation of this object within a fixed time, and the first of the tasks of the Socialist movement will be to see to and accelerate the carrying out of that obligation.

One might distinguish in the Peace Treaty three classes of questions: (1) the general conditions; (2) the settlement of special



matters in dispute; (3) the solemn declaration of the Powers in relation to the claims and principles, the carrying out of which after peace will give to peace the character of permanence.

### GENERAL CONDITIONS OF PEACE.

These conditions find expression in the formula of the Council of Workmen and Soldiers: No annexations, no indemnities. The Soviet has added, for guidance in realising this formula: The right of nations freely to dispose of themselves.

The formula "no annexations" means, then, not only that all territorial claims based solely on the war map must be rejected, but it implies, too, the total evacuation of all occupied territory in Europe and in the colonies, their complete restoration to the State to which they belonged before the war, and the full re-establishment of the political liberty, territorial integrity and independence of those States which may have lost them during the war, wholly or in part.

In laying down this rule we do not exclude the friendly settlement of disputed questions, in the interests of a lasting peace, by agreements as to territorial modifications. But in such cases the wishes of the population concerned must be taken into account.

As a general rule, consultation of the settled population by universal, equal and secret suffrage is the best means of ascertaining these wishes in dubious cases. Nevertheless, there are several reasons against applying this method except in cases where it is difficult to find any other solution. The principal reason is that the question of the nationality of a given people, or of a section of the population, is of importance not only to the groups concerned and the State to which they belong, but may also affect the whole international situation.

The exclusion of indemnities is the essential mark of a peace which is not granted by the victor to the vanquished, but which results from an understanding.

This claim means that the levying of war contributions, collected by an occupying Power during the war, must be justified, and must be proved to be in conformity with the requirements of international law.

As a rule, in the memoranda, it is not the responsibility for devastation, but the necessity of not leaving those States which have suffered the most serious injury to bear alone the cost of restoration, which has served as an argument to justify the establishment of an international fund. Concrete suggestions as regards the form of such assistance are found in the memoranda of several parties.

The restoration of Belgium constitutes, in our view, an exception; we shall give our reasons when this particular question is examined.

The above refers in a general way to the war settlement. We must add one point which is a matter of internal policy for each State, but which finds its justification in the struggle between States. It is of equal importance for each State, and ought to be regulated internationally. This is the general amnesty for crimes and misdemeanours provoked by the war and having in particular a political character.

In agreement with several memoranda, we have cited as one of the causes of the war the anti-democratic handling of nationality questions. An almost universal discontent prevails among non-dominant nationalities, whose inmost character, cultural tendencies, and rights of political action have nowhere been adequately respected. In numerous instances they have been exploited economically for the benefit of the dominant State and its privileged classes. They have also been held in real intellectual dependence and neglected politically. The awakening of the national idea during the war is the proof of this justifiable discontent. National characteristics and the aspirations of peoples must be accorded recognition and be allowed active expression. That is one of the conditions inherent in democracy. When existing States are not sufficiently favourable to these claims, separatist tendencies come to light, and these embarrass the activities and development of those States, the more the peoples' feelings are roused.

It is part of the duty of Socialism to foster this awakening, to support these claims, and yet not to lose sight of the interests of social progress, which are opposed to the breaking up of large economic areas. The right of peoples freely to dispose of themselves within the compass of social progress is the line for Socialism to follow when it deals with the question of nationalities. Wherever a people is unable to form an independent State it must be guaranteed both liberty and the opportunity to develop through political self-government as a member of a federated and democratic State.

In this connection, the declaration of the Socialist Party of France that they do not desire to see enemy countries dismembered is of considerable importance.

The awakening of national aspirations in the colonies may become a counterpoise to the Imperialism of modern States, and may lay the foundations of a development of relations based on the common interests of the existing colonies and the States by which they are ruled. In this spirit Socialism can favour the awakening. The Socialist Party of France recommends, in this connection, administrative autonomy for all groups of people who have reached a certain degree of culture, and in general increasing participation by them in administration. We accept this point of view, regarded as a minimum. In many cases colonial populations can already formulate larger claims and demand a colonial Parliament. But these questions must be solved separately. They cannot be a part of the international arrangement necessary for the settlement of the nationality question in the case of European peoples and those on the same cultural level.

Numerous suggestions are to be found in the Memoranda for the international settlement. The realisation of the right of peoples freely to dispose of themselves—from complete independence to cultural, territorial, or personal autonomy—is a problem whose solution cannot be left to the option of States, because it is of international importance from the point of view of the durability of peace. So long as the people of a given nationality are unable to establish an independent State, they must secure national autonomy; a description of the various forms of autonomy and the shades of difference, which range from the federated State to the

protection of national minorities, is contained in the general report of the Committee on the Memoranda. The Socialist representatives of the oppressed nationalities, in their Memoranda have demanded that it be laid down in an international Act what shall be the rules and general guarantees which will regulate the legal position of nationalities within the State. They demand, further, the establishment of an International Court, to which the nationalities could appeal as arbiter in cases where the latter did not respect the International Act. We declare ourselves in agreement with this claim.

We might summarise the general demands of the nationalities as follows:—The solution of national problems in the spirit of liberty for the peoples to dispose of themselves freely. International regulation of national autonomy, with the establishment of an international tribunal to secure respect for that autonomy. States composed of several nationalities to be transformed into democratic federations of areas which, inhabited mainly by one special people, shall be politically autonomous. Cultural liberty to be guaranteed to minorities. The establishment of an International Commission to elucidate these claims. The right of nationalities to uphold their interests before this Commission.

It would certainly be desirable that the work of this Commission should be incorporated in the peace treaty, but the difficulties will be great enough, and we can only support this desire in so far as its realisation would not delay the conclusion of peace.

It goes without saying that the Conference of Governments which will discuss the conditions of peace will be unable to ignore the resolutions passed by the International Trades Union Conferences at Leeds (July, 1916) and Berne (October, 1917). Almost all the central Trades Union organisations were represented at these Conferences. At Leeds: France, Belgium, Great Britain, and Italy. At Berne: Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands, and Switzerland. The resolutions, passed on both occasions are almost identical. Berne naturally tried to complete the scheme first drafted at Leeds, but the spirit is the same and the wording in the two cases has the same meaning. For the first time the Fourth Estate has enlarged the scope of peace formulæ, and, after having struggled for its own well-being, it has demanded the adoption of measures guaranteeing this well-being—that of its class. Like the national States, it dreams of its restoration, its restitution, its regeneration. The workers have suffered most during the war, and they fear that after the war their enfeeblement will place them at a disadvantage when they have to face a two-fold struggle: the struggle for existence as workers in a given country; the struggle for the improvement of their condition, as workers enrolled on a capitalist list. They know that their Trades Union organisation will protect them against the power of the employing class of their own nation, but they look to international legislation to guarantee them against the undercutting of foreign workers who may have a lower standard of life. They therefore demand that the Peace Conference shall consider not only national frontiers, but to an equal extent their living inhabitants. The workers ask to be consulted in the negotiations which relate to industrial questions, as the French Government has promised they shall be. They ask that international labour

legislation shall take a new course on the conclusion of peace, and thus co-operate in the maintenance of peace by diminishing the rivalry between the workers of different countries and by contributing towards the resumption of international working-class life, which, in spite of the fact that it has been feeble up to the present time, has had an appreciable influence in the direction of world-peace.

Thus the demands made at Leeds and at Berne have at once a special character and a general aspect. On both occasions the right of combination, migration, workers' insurance, hours of work, hygiene, and the administration of social laws were dealt with in turn. Berne added three more subjects: Home industries and the protection of women and children.

The demands which were formulated are not new. They do not constitute a maximum, but a minimum programme. In certain countries they have already been exceeded, but it is important to allow the slow-moving nations to join the main army.

The leading ideas (for details we refer our readers to the particular documents) are:—

- (a) Liberty to immigrate must be secured, but any possibility of the immigrants injuring the native workers must be prevented.
- (b) The right of combination among both foreign and native workers must be recognised in all countries.
- (c) Those States which have not hitherto organised social insurance shall promise to do so within a very short period, and, to secure continuity of insurance, foreign workers shall enjoy the same rights as natives, through mutual arrangements as regards the cost.
- (d) The working day shall be limited to 10 hours and be reduced to 8 hours within a period to be specified, but the maximum working day shall be only 8 hours in the mines, in factories where furnaces are burning day and night, and in unhealthy trades. Night work shall be tolerated only in operations where it is justified on technical grounds, and the workers shall enjoy a weekly rest of at least 36 hours, which may be fixed on some day other than Sunday only for exceptional and technical reasons.
- (e) States shall undertake to modify their public health legislation and to unite in a common struggle against industrial poisons and diseases.
- (f) For home workers, who shall enjoy the benefits of social legislation, Wages Boards shall be established, entrusted with the duty of fixing legal minimum wages, which might possibly be checked by means of a system of wages books and the posting up of lists.
- (g) Children under 15 shall be forbidden to work for remuneration, and the 8 hours' day shall be made immediately applicable to juvenile workers (boys and girls between the ages of 15 and 18), for whom suitable industrial training shall be arranged.
- (h) Women's work shall be limited to 8 hours a day and 44 hours a week, and shall be forbidden in unhealthy trades and in the

mines. Pregnant women shall have a rest of at least 10 weeks, and at least 6 of these shall be after child-birth.

(i) States shall undertake to introduce or perfect the service of factory inspection. The Basle Union shall be recognised as the official organ for the protection of the workers, and the Trades Union International shall be represented at the International Department of Labour.

### CERTAIN SPECIAL CONDITIONS.

Before dealing with special conditions of peace, we have a general observation to make.

If it is desired to make a peace by conciliation possible, it is important to remember that Germany has set before herself as a war aim the security of her opportunity for economic development, and that her fate is linked with that of Austria-Hungary and of Turkey; that, on the other hand, England and France, who resist German hegemony, have a vital interest in the absolute independence of Belgium, and have put in the forefront of their demands a final solution of the problem of Alsace-Lorraine.

Germany will therefore resist not only any cession of territory, but also the dismemberment of Austria-Hungary and the partition of Turkey, while, on the other hand, any peace offer made to England and France must, in order to be a possible subject of discussion, acknowledge the absolute independence of Belgium, and declare readiness to enter into negotiations on the subject of Alsace-Lorraine. Proposals which were inconsistent with these ideas could not be realised by a peace of conciliation, but only by a continuation of the war.

This method of approach gives certain indications for the solution of the questions of Belgium, Alsace-Lorraine, and Poland, indicated for the discussion of the nationality question in Austria-Hungary and the settlement of Turkish affairs, indications which it is important to bear in mind in connection with each concrete solution.

We shall now discuss several special questions, making reference to the grounds upon which we have chosen to confine ourselves within these limits.

### BELGIUM.

For Belgium we demand complete independence and economic re-establishment. The country must be free in all respects to dispose of its own territory and to decide its own policy, both home and foreign. Its territory must be completely evacuated by the foreign troops.

The compensation to be received by Belgium for devastation and ravages caused by the war, and the repayment of illegal levies and requisitions, are not to be regarded as war indemnities. The duty of indemnifying Belgium was conceded in principle by the German Government by the Chancellor's declaration on August 4th, 1914. In the interests of an early peace it could be left to The Hague Court to compute the amount of that compensation.

As regards this solution, our point of view is that of all the Memoranda with respect to the independence of Belgium and its

Indemnification by Germany; our contention is supported alike by the Socialists of France, England, Hungary, Poland, Bosnia, Croatia, Armenia, Serbia, and other countries.

### ALSACE-LORRAINE.

The annexation of 1871 has its repercussion in the war of 1914, and it forms the red link which connects the Franco-German war with the world war of to-day. Attempts to find a solution for the problem of Alsace-Lorraine, so as to prevent the present war, have failed. The joint solution, accepted by the Socialist Parties of Germany and France in 1913, was dictated by circumstances which have been changed by the war. The disannexation of Alsace-Lorraine is the principal war aim of French policy. The Allies are ranged on the side of France, and whoever in truth desires peace by conciliation must be ready to examine this question in the light of the existing situation. Those fresh circumstances equally exclude disannexation pure and simple and a solution confined to a change in the internal constitutional position of Alsace-Lorraine. The real question is whether the disputed territory shall belong to Germany or to France. That question was decided by the sword in 1871, but the representatives of the population of 1871 pronounced at that time in favour of France. It must be submitted to the true population of the provinces who can give their opinion by means of a referendum, so organised as to give honest expression to their will. In this way the question will be relieved of its present character of a Franco-German contest and will become what it ought to be, a question for the population of Alsace-Lorraine. Everyone can and ought to bow before that decision, more especially we Socialists. Here indeed we have a typical case where recourse must be had to a popular plebiscite. But it is necessary, furthermore, for guarantees to be given internationally with the view of preserving the genuine character of the referendum, the honesty of the vote, so that the result of the consultation may have the desired effect in a durable peace and the definite disposal of this question as a factor in European politics.

We appeal to the Socialist feelings of our French and German comrades, and we beg them to engage in propaganda in their respective countries in favour of the solution which we have indicated. Before the war they came to an understanding in favour of a solution which was suited to the conditions then prevailing. They were led to do so by the wish to save humanity from a world-war. At the present time the world war has lasted three years. The cruelties and devastations have exceeded the bounds of imagination. Europe is bled white, and exhaustion is near. The International, the renewal of whose activities the workers are awaiting, is paralysed. Any other policy makes the continuance of the struggle for peace and for Socialism impossible. The reasons which could impose a common solution before the war carry far greater weight now. No Socialist could assume the responsibility of continuing the war in order to bring about a one-sided and nationalist solution of the problem of Alsace-Lorraine. That is why no Socialist Party could agree without demur to the aims of its own Government, so long as the German Government opposes

international consideration of the question and the French Government simply desires disannexation. The Socialist Party of France and the Independent Social Democratic Party of Germany are both supporters of the referendum in Alsace-Lorraine. The former wishes a referendum to be organised after the return of the provinces to France, and the latter demands of the German Government that a referendum be taken at a fixed time after the conclusion of peace. We can support this idea.

As regards the conditions of voting, one can understand that those who wish to end the injustice done to the genuinely French population of 1871 see no other solution than the registration on the electoral lists for the referendum of those French citizens who belong to emigrant families, and the exclusion from those lists of immigrant German elements. They may with good reason bring forward the argument that an act of injustice is not wiped out by time. But history which, in so many respects, is a product of injustice and violence, has created new conditions in the course of 46 years, especially in Alsace-Lorraine. It is not possible to modify them arbitrarily. If we take our stand upon the principle of a plebiscite, that is to say, on democracy, it is not possible to exclude from the vote a part of the settled and permanent population, and to reconstruct the circumstances of 1871 artificially by the addition of citizens who are now French. In this matter the essential question is that of the "permanent" population, and a certain length of residence may therefore be added to the usual general conditions of a ballot. In the same way, it is not possible to exclude those who may have lost their electoral rights during the war because they have sided with France, and who wish to return to the country. As a basis for the referendum, we recommend the last electoral register compiled before the war. Finally, the guarantees necessary to ensure a free vote, protected from any intimidation, must be settled, and the date on which the referendum is to take place should be as early as possible.

### THE BALKANS.

The Balkan question is one of those about which we have not heard the views of all the parties concerned, and therefore we must be content to indicate certain guiding lines for the solution of this important problem.

The creation of Balkan States which shall be strong and capable of development, States whose fate is not determined by the Imperialistic aims of the Great Powers, is a necessary condition of any lasting peace.

The Congress of Basle in 1912, in agreement with all the Socialist parties in the Balkans, asked for the peaceful co-operation of all the Balkan peoples as members of a Balkan Federation. The immediate solution of the Balkan question should be the basis upon which this Federation can develop. In order that the Balkan Socialist Parties may be united upon territorial questions, the solution of which is necessary in order to carry out that policy, they must consider the separate interests of each state from the point of view of their common interests in relation to those of the Great Powers.

The quarrels which poison political life in the Balkans must be ended by a friendly understanding, based upon a system of mutual concessions to satisfy the vital national requirements of each State, and have regard to their possibilities of economic development, and thereby facilitate the political and cultural development of all the Balkan peoples.

Serbia must be re-established as an independent State and restored economically by means of an international fund, in accordance with the general conditions of peace. Serbia's communication with the sea can be secured by the incorporation of Montenegro. But even on that assumption it is doubtful whether Serbia obtains the port which she needs. In point of fact, Serbia's proper port is Salonika. The country's economic development requires her communication with that port to be assured through the valley of the Vardar, and, further, that she should have the power to control the port, the town and the surrounding district, which are at present part of Greece. Bulgaria and Greece have identical interests.

The Bulgarian and Serbian Delegations both ask or agree that the port of Salonika and its vicinity should be subject to the common jurisdiction of the three Balkan States. This reform might be a starting point for co-operation between the Balkan States, which would be fully and ultimately realised in the Balkan Federation.

The solution of Bulgaria's national problem would be the re-union with that country of part of the Southern Dobrudja and, in so far as it may be Bulgarian, of Macedonia. The Serbian Socialist Party recognises that the partition of Macedonia, as effected by the peace of Bucharest, was a mistake. They think that it would be just to restore the Eastern portion of Macedonia, as far as the Vardar, to Bulgaria. They also recognise Bulgaria's right to the joint use of the port of Salonika. But they fear that the total annexation of all Macedonia, which is economically the most important part of the Balkans, might be a hindrance to Serbia's development, for such annexation would include the cession of a large part of the Vardar valley.

In consideration of the incompatibility of the views of the two nations concerned, it does not seem possible for us to be more precise than we have been in the formulas contained in our manifesto. It seems to us essential that Bulgaria's national problem should be solved, so that she may be enabled henceforth to pursue a progressive policy. We hope, too, that the Balkan parties, which have not been able to confer together up to the present time, will unite in support of a solution which will take into account both the national requirements on one side and the economic requirements on the other. They will rise above all these obstacles if they realise that at this very moment the foundations must be truly laid of a system which will enable the Balkan nations to evolve into a federation of democratic peoples.

## POLAND.

The re-union of the Polish districts of Russia, Austria, and Germany, in order to create an independent Poland, is an old tradition of the Socialist International. We think that the



creation of a free and independent Poland, for whom the possibility of economic development must be assured, may be accepted as the basis of a further normal development, side by side with the grant of as wide a measure of autonomy as is possible to the Polish districts in Austria and Germany. If those districts in Poland which are inhabited by compact groups of Lithuanians, and the Ukrainian portions of Galicia, are not re-united with an autonomous Lithuania and an autonomous Ukraine, they shall be guaranteed national territorial autonomy as parts of Poland and of Galicia, and complete cultural liberty will be accorded to national minorities, both Jewish and German.

### RUSSIA.

A final solution of Russia's various national problems will be possible only when a definite system of government, as well as stable and orderly conditions, arise out of the struggle between classes and parties. We hold that it is part of the duty of the Socialist Parties in Russia, whatever the nationality, to support the Russian democracy in its efforts to create such conditions. If the Russian Revolution succeeds in making Russia into a democratic Republic, composed of several federated national States or of various autonomous districts, it will have laid the foundation of a settlement of national questions which gives due weight both to the possibilities of development of each national centre and to the common interests of the various peoples of Russia.

We therefore welcome the awakening of the Ukraine, whose complete political, territorial, and national autonomy in a Republic governed on a federal plan seems certain to be realised shortly. If her neighbours, the Ukrainians of Austria-Hungary, secure territorial autonomy, they can evolve with the Russian Ukraine that same cultural unity which we ask for the Serbians and the South Slavs in Austria-Hungary. For the remaining peoples in Russia who live together in large numbers, we also demand territorial autonomy with guarantees for the rights of national minorities.

It can be understood that Finland should henceforth demand complete independence, and that our party should lead the movement. It is, in fact, the old reform demanded under the Tsarist régime, which was supported by the whole world, including the International. But to attain this end it is necessary to have identical regard for the interests of the Russian Revolution and the defence of the Revolution against its enemies at home and abroad. It is important, therefore, that the new régime should be the result of a friendly understanding.

We are unanimously in agreement with the views of the Czecho-Slovaks who, in their Memorandum, express the opinion that the establishment of a new union between an autonomous Finland and a democratic Russian Republic is a matter whose political expediency seems obvious.

### AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

We have already dealt with Austro-Hungarian national questions as regards the Ukrainians and the Poles. There remain the South Slavs and the Czechs. We have already pointed out that the

South Slavs in Austria-Hungary ought to obtain cultural autonomy, which would give them cultural unity with the Serbian people. We should add to that absolute economic equality and the union of all the South Slavs in Austria-Hungary in a single administrative district.

The claim of the Czecho-Slovaks aspires to the political union of the Czechs, in so far as they inhabit contiguous territory in large numbers, as a federated State within the Danubian Empire, with its own popularly elected representative assembly and a government responsible to it. Experience has proved that, unless the widest possible satisfaction compatible with the general interest is given to Czech national feeling, there result obstacles in the way of an active policy and dangers to the unity of the working class Socialist movement. The advanced culture of the Czech people, as well as their ancestry and their economic development, gives them the right to make such a claim, for they are no less highly developed than States like Saxony and Bavaria. It goes without saying that the German minority would enjoy the same rights of autonomy as the minorities in other districts.

It is difficult for us to form a judgment about the territorial disputes between Austria and Italy, because the Italian Socialists have been unable to take part in the preliminary discussions. But, in so far as Italian districts in Austria do not come under Italian rule, we demand for them autonomy similar to that which we have claimed for the South Slav provinces.

#### ARMENIA.

After reading the Memorandum of the Armenian Delegation, no one could fail to recognise that the problem of Armenia is as urgent and vital as it is difficult. What the Armenians under Turkish rule had to suffer before the war, and above all during the war, is of such a character that it is not humanly possible to expect them to wish to be placed beneath the yoke again. In any case, means must be found to restore to the Armenians those parts of Turkey which they inhabited, and to guarantee to them every opportunity of national and economic development.

#### NORTHERN SCHLESWIG.

Several Memoranda concern themselves with the question of Northern Schleswig, and the French Memorandum demands that it be solved by the application of the referendum, in accordance with the stipulations of the Peace of Prague.

Although this question has no connection with the present war and the end of hostilities, its solution, in view of the new European orientation, would be desirable, by means of a friendly agreement between the countries concerned, based upon a rectification of frontiers, and after a referendum.

#### OTHER NATIONAL QUESTIONS.

If we propose no special solution for the Irish and Flemish questions, it is not because we underestimate their importance, but

because we think they will find their natural solution under the international statute which will lay down general rules for the autonomy of nationalities. What is of the greatest importance for Ireland is political independence within the constitution of the British Isles, with a guarantee that she shall be subjected to no unfavourable economic treatment in her relations with England. What stands first in the case of Flanders is the question of cultural autonomy within the Belgian State. These problems are dedicated to the principle of the liberty of the peoples.

We recognise also the international character of the Jewish question, and the need that it should be dealt with in the Peace Treaty. It will be necessary to enumerate the districts where the Jews live together in great numbers, where they will enjoy national individual autonomy. These districts belong to Russia, Austria, Roumania, and Poland. The development of Jewish colonisation in Palestine should be safeguarded legally and internationally.

### ECONOMIC QUESTIONS.

The solution of the principal economic questions which are related to the War will be barely possible except as part of a general international settlement. (We shall discuss this under the next heading.) To this category belong the internationalisation of the Dardanelles, the Bagdad Railway, the question of Mesopotamia and Syria, the economic freedom of Persia and colonial policy. These questions, then, will be dealt with at the same time as the general international convention upon questions of world economics.

### THE SOCIETY OF NATIONS.

The solemn declaration of the contracting Powers, relative to other matters in the Peace Treaty, aims at international disarmament and the establishment of compulsory arbitration for all international disputes. These two demands are the essence of the Society of Nations, of which the Peace Treaty must lay the foundation. The programme of the Society of Nations would include, according to the suggestions of various Memoranda, the following points:—

(a) The creation of conventions and international organs to regulate in a friendly way questions of world economy, on the basis of opportunities of development for every State, limited only by the general international interest. The abolition of the system of protective duties. Freedom of the seas and of the great trade routes. The open door in the colonies.

(b) The abolition of secret diplomacy. The active participation of the people's representatives in foreign policy.

(c) Revision of international law and sanctions for its maintenance; the creation of permanent bodies to ensure its working.

(d) Disarmament on land and sea to such an extent and under such conditions that military methods of settling international disputes may be out of the question. All conflicts between States will be compulsorily submitted to international arbitration tribunals.

Many parties have expressed the opinion that the International Socialist Bureau ought to promote the publication of a technical study, detailed and exact, of the various questions outlined in this

programme. Such a work would then serve as a basis of future Socialist policy. But it seems to us that, in the course of our examination of the conditions of peace, it is the general tendencies and the principles that have been the principal inspiration of our programme. The Conference will not be able to go beyond these.

That general tendency is, in fact, the substitution of a system of international organisation of justice guaranteeing the peaceful development of the peoples for the imperialistic methods of the bourgeoisie. It is not by a denial of the requirements of national and economic expansion, but by giving satisfaction to such requirements in harmony with the international interest that the foundations of that free development will be laid. Working towards the attainment of that lofty aim we shall be working at the same time for the realisation of Socialism. It is of the utmost importance that the Socialist working class in all countries should concentrate their efforts so that the Powers shall pledge themselves in the Peace Treaty to co-operate in this great task. The policy of to-morrow will concentrate upon general disarmament, the establishment of compulsory arbitration, the abolition of secret diplomacy, and upon all those questions which concern the constitution of the Society of Nations.

---

## VI.

**THE NEW SOCIALIST PEACE CONFERENCE.**

**An Open Letter to the Right Hon. Arthur Henderson, M.P., by  
M. P. J. Troelstra.**

(“Het Volk,” 3rd, 4th, and 6th July, 1918.)

MY DEAR HENDERSON,—When you invited me to come to London, you were good enough to allude to certain experiences of mine in the course of my work for the International during the war, which you thought would also be useful in connection with the plans of the Inter-Allied Socialists to form a new International Conference. I thank you for this appreciation, and as it has not been possible for me to avail myself of this invitation and communicate my opinions about the new Conference to you, I now beg permission to draw your attention to the following points:—

- (1) The pressing necessity of an informal conversation of representatives of Labour and Socialist parties in all countries on the question of peace;
- (2) The conditions of such a gathering;
- (3) The character and agenda of such a Conference.

## I.

**THE NECESSITY FOR A CONFERENCE.**

Since the Dutch delegation of the International Socialist Bureau took the initiative on April 17th in calling the Stockholm Conference, the two belligerent parties have prosecuted the war with all their strength. But the continuation of the struggle has neither brought us peace nor a situation more favourable to the lasting peace which mankind wants, and wherein modern labour will find the conditions for the pursuance of its own struggle in favour of its ideals. The hope of the nations that they would gain this peace through the use of military force has proved to be vain. Even the Governments, the ruling classes, and the military leaders of both parties have been obliged to recognise that, from their standpoint, war until now has proved a fiasco. In the meantime, wholesale murder, economic and financial exhaustion have brought Europe closer to the abyss.

A Dutch financial specialist recently gave me a report on the total expenses and destruction caused through the war, which he calculated at a sum equal to the combined national fortunes of Great Britain and Germany.

The longer this process of mutual exhaustion is continued, the more we must fear that in the end it will be the necessities of the moment that will dictate peace.

Now, the peace of Brest-Litovsk proves what happens when one of the parties is in distress. If the German offensive in the West were ultimately successful, Germany would probably try to impose a similarly oppressive peace on France and on Belgium. And also, if military impotence and economic exhaustion were to create such a situation on both sides as would force the war to an end,

we could not expect a peace which would remove the latent antagonistic feeling which has brought about the present war. The situation would, at the best, be in the nature of a truce, and there would still remain the necessity of solving by violence, at the first favourable opportunity, the numerous questions upon which agreement could not be obtained. The longer the war lasts, the weaker the peoples will become; the less fit they will be for a new and great political orientation, the more they will be occupied with the petty daily work of post-war economic restoration, and, through the burden of debt, the more they will be prevented from developing their social reforms. It is far more probable that out of this there would arise a feeling of apathy and anarchy than that the general exhaustion would lead to the revolutionising action which is asked from the working class in order that they may accomplish their great international task, as you also set it forth in your Memorandum.

I know that among the Entente peoples the anxiety about their unfavourable military situation is at the moment weakened, if not removed, by large expectations based on American help, and also by the hope of the demoralising effect of the economic stress in the Central Empires. On this last point I feel obliged to issue a warning against the repetition of a mistake which was made by the present powers in Russia when they founded their peace policy on the hope of a revolution in the countries of the Central Powers. In the Entente countries, as in the countries of the Central Powers, independent political action against the Government meets with powerful opposition through the national necessity of fighting against the enemy. Revolution is now independent of political action in the highest degree. Those who were to make the revolution are for the most part at the front. In my opinion, revolutionising action (a general strike, the cessation of the making of munitions, etc.) is only possible if it is agreed upon and carried out internationally. That local agitations now and then produced by lack of food would prevent the Central Powers from continuing the war seems less probable when we consider their proved power of organisation, the new possibilities created by the economic situation in the East, and the strength of each State.

As regards the help of America, it is undoubtedly a factor of great importance at this stage of the war, not only for the Entente countries, but for all mankind. No doubt it is questionable whether, if America had not taken part in the war, the possibility of an agreement among the European Powers would not have arisen earlier, especially if America, instead of throwing into the war the fresh and still unimpaired strength of a belligerent, had maintained her original rôle as a peace mediator. But, as matters stand, America—as counterpoise to the successes of the Central Powers in the East and the occupation of Belgium and Northern France in the West—is the main anchor of hope for all who must regard a repetition of Brest-Litovsk in the West as a world disaster.

The question now is what is the duty of America, or rather, what is her responsibility if she desires to remain true to the high peace aim of democracy and international organisation which has been set up by President Wilson? If, as I assume, America is the Power which, in spite of the great military advantage of the

Central Powers, now holds the balance between the two groups of belligerents, her consequent duty is to co-operate at the right moment for the conclusion of a peace by agreement, whereby the foundation will be laid for the League of Nations and for the disappearance of world-militarism as the dominating factor in the fate of the peoples. I am thinking especially of the small nations, whose independence cannot in the long run be maintained if the military system is continued, and which can only continue to exist as members with equal rights of a world-league of the peoples.

What is certain is that the victory of the militarism of one nation over another cannot create the foundation of international disarmament, nor substitute for the imperialist method the acceptance of international organisation, justice, and agreement. It is only by means of the conviction in all countries, among the great masses of all the peoples, that war as a means of deciding conflicts is out of date, that the scheme of international organisation and agreement is no longer a pious desire, but a pressing political necessity, a condition of life for the continuance of human civilisation—only by this means can a real peace be created. Behind every movement for destroying one militarism by another stands, consciously or unconsciously, the imperialism of latent war forces. A peace by agreement must be concluded, and is on the whole possible, before the distress of exhaustion has been reached, and at a moment when there still exists free determination on both sides, as a result of the mutual conviction of the two groups that the realisation of their own war aims, in so far as these exceed the limit of the defence of their own soil, their liberty, and honour, must be sacrificed to the historical necessity of suppressing war in the future as a form of international policy. And when the results of America's support are still indeterminate, when the expected military effort of the Entente and the results obtained by the Central Powers are still in the balance, precisely in the very indeterminateness of this situation lies the real basis of a peace by understanding, under which the need for a lasting peace will be sufficiently recognised. Urged by the egotistical passions of the ruling classes, and through lack of sufficient international and historical ideas, the military and diplomatic leaders of the people steadily show the tendency to modify their peace ideas according to the situation at the moment, and to direct them towards the realisation of purely imperialist aims. The only power which is able to give sufficient consideration to the great world historical ideas is the Labour class, which has found its political expression until now in the Socialist International. The necessity of employing its moral and political influence in favour of a just peace by negotiation as soon as possible and to throw it into the scale of events is sufficiently proved by what I have said.

## II.

### THE CONDITIONS OF A CONFERENCE.

I now come to the question—under what conditions must a Conference be called in order to transform into a factor of world policy the influence of Labour which, until now, has been paralysed by the

neutralising effect of the absorption of the Socialist Parties in the national policies of their countries.

We have to consider, firstly, the date of the Conference. Those who last year convoked a Conference in Stockholm thought that the Russian Revolution and the unmistakable desire for peace in the Central Countries were conditions favourable to the possibility of an acceptable peace. But we must here give a serious warning against the idea that when we see in the enemy country a tendency towards peace that is just the moment when it is not desirable to negotiate. This idea would lead to the conclusion that we must only negotiate with the enemy when he is in the best military situation. Negotiation is also prevented by the exaggerated fear of peace manœuvres on the part of the opposing party even when these might possibly have good results. That this distrust, this fear of surprise and misuse of the situation, should exist especially in the party which is at the moment in an unfavourable position is only natural. But if on that account they prefer to continue the fight instead of risking negotiations for peace they must have a good reason for such an attitude. This can be no other than the expectation that such a party expects to be victorious itself within a certain time, and for that there is or there is not a sufficient basis. In the second instance, peace is refused because of an illusion which cannot be realised. In the first, one party recognises that the forces of the parties do not find their exact expression in the strategical situation of the moment—they still dispose of unemployed strength and possibilities. The enemy also will have to take this into account, and thus there is compensation for the unfavourable facts at the moment.

How these things present themselves to the minds of the Governments which have to conclude peace is one thing. We must not forget that the task of a Socialist is another. You drew the practical conclusions, during the preparations for the Stockholm Conference, when you and your party insisted that the resolutions of this Conference ought to have only a consultative and not a binding force. I gather also from your conclusions about the new Conference that you believe that majority resolutions are not to be voted. Resolutions would be adopted only on questions on which unanimity exists. I consider this to be a limitation which must be accepted by the representatives of only one party on questions which concern the vital interests of their whole people.

Since the occupation of Riga the annexationist current in the countries of the Central Powers has become greater and greater. The significance of the peace resolution of July, 1917, has consequently been weakened. The movement for democratisation and parliamentarisation has been stopped. In consequence of the refusal of the Entente to accept peace proposals, voices were heard, even in the press of the official German Socialists, raising hopes of war successes in the West.

I state with regret that from this side there has not been a strong movement against the forces which, through the abuse of the disorganised Russian Revolution, have acted in direct opposition to the affirmation that this war is a war of defence for Germany, just as I have always regretted that we have not had stronger action from the French and English working classes against the



refusal of passports and the other parts of the war policy of their Governments.

We may expect that the proved fiasco of the Austrian offensive in Italy, and the stopping of the German offensive in France, will create in Germany sentiments in favour of a real peace in the sense of the resolution of the Reichstag, and it is to be hoped that this result, favourable to a peace by conciliation, will not meet with a contrary current in the Entente countries.

I gather from different declarations of English, French and Italian Socialists that they see in the collapse of these offensives the psychological moment for a new Socialist effort in favour of peace. The Dutch delegation on the International Socialist Bureau is also of this opinion.

The question I have now to consider is which parties will be invited to take part in the Conference. In your Memorandum you speak of the whole Labour and Socialist movement of the belligerent countries as having accepted the conditions on which the Congress is convoked; and, as a principal condition, you lay down that "all the organisations to be represented should put in precise form, by a public declaration, their peace terms in conformity with the principles, 'No annexations or punitive indemnities, and the right of all people to self-determination,' and that they are working with all their power to obtain from their Governments the necessary guarantees to apply these principles honestly and unreservedly to all questions to be dealt with at any official peace Conference."

Thus, no Socialist Party of the belligerent countries will be excluded at the outset. However, from each party a certain guarantee is asked of its earnestness as a Socialist Peace Party. You are not satisfied with the acceptance of statements of principles which, as has been proved, may be very easily changed by diplomacy to the contrary when Imperialist practice renders it necessary. You lay stress on the practical execution of principles. This demand for practical execution has already been met by all the parties of the International which are concerned in this matter. The Memoranda sent to the Organisation Committee in Stockholm have been published; they have been the subject of public discussion; and they have been collected by the Secretary of the Committee in a book whose publication we are still awaiting. It is right to consider these Memoranda as the maximum national demands and the international minimum concessions of the different parties, but only an honest and open conversation in the circle of the International itself will make it possible for the national elements to be weakened and the international spirit strengthened. If one party lays down as a condition for this conversation that the other will accept its programme, that would of course exclude every conversation. I see with pleasure that this impossible demand is not embodied in your Memorandum.

The Austrian Party has already satisfied the desire for a reply expressed by the London Memorandum, and I do not doubt that the Social Democracy of Germany will give their opinion in a more official and complete manner than they have done up till now. In the meantime, I understand that, in view of the signature of the so-called Brest-Litovsk and Bucharest Peace Treaties, the Socialist Parties of the Central Powers will be asked whether they

consider that the questions concerning the countries and peoples involved in these treaties are in their opinion settled or not. The German Social Democratic Party—the Majority—refused to accept responsibility for the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, and abstained from voting; while the Austrian Social Democracy protested against both these treaties. We can therefore take it that these parties, like all of us, will not consider the poor results of the Bolshevik separate peace as final, and will be prepared to discuss the questions concerned in that peace in the light of the general peace demanded by the International.

The second condition, the demand for a stronger attitude towards their own Government, with the view of pushing them in the direction we desire, is certainly reasonable. The acceptance of this condition, however, can only have the desired result if, at the Conference itself, an agreement is arrived at for simultaneous action to be taken in all the belligerent countries alike. If such an agreement is not obtained, this condition is nothing but words without meaning, and, if, after so many disillusionments and misfortunes, the International has to be warned against anything, it is against showy resolutions and insincerities which attempt to hide the *misère* of our disunion and our dependence on the policy of our capitalist Governments under the flowers of false rhetoric and declarations of quasi-principles. The formulation and acceptance of these conditions imposes on all parties the duty of using this Conference for the victory of the international Socialist idea over the national war idea, whereon the Socialist proletariat is bound by this war as on the bed of Procrustes.

As regards the calling and organisation of this Conference your Memorandum refers to a Committee, whose impartiality cannot be questioned. Herein I find the idea that there must be no foundation for any suspicion that this peace effort of the International Socialist proletariat is not inspired by the one and only desire to break the chains of imperialism and assist the world to bring nearer the happiness of a real democratic peace, based on fraternity among nations, on liberty and right.

How difficult it is in such an undertaking to avoid the appearance that one is not inspired by an independent Socialist desire for peace, but by the secret machinations of certain Governments, has been experienced by those who took the initiative in the calling of the Stockholm Conference. Yet they were neutrals, charged with the administration of the International Socialist Bureau and invited from all sides to mediate at the proper moment. Now that the initiative is being taken by the Socialists of one belligerent group, how much more are we now threatened by misunderstandings and by insinuations on the part of the enemies of a just peace. The guarantee of impartiality and complete independence of all Governments must therefore be looked for not only in the composition, but also in the authority, of the Organising Committee.

From the side of the Entente we have heard declarations at different times giving the impression that the Memorandum on War Aims of the London Conference is to be considered as the perfect realisation of the Socialist policy and that the Socialists of the Central Powers have nothing to do but accept it without losing any time. Of course this could not have been the intention, because no party possesses the monopoly of Socialist feeling and

thought, and international action can only be the outcome of a free and democratic international conference. In order to avoid all misunderstanding, it would be desirable to give this Committee power to make an appeal for such a Conference on the bases of the London Memorandum, the declarations of the other parties, and the Manifesto of the Stockholm Neutral Committee.

I will now discuss the question of passports, the last, but as regards the possibility of a Conference, the most practical and decisive question. Did the Inter-Allied parties, before taking the initiative, consider the practical possibility of the Socialists of the Entente being able to attend this Conference, from the point of view that the representatives of all the organisations desiring to participate will obtain passports, or, if there is still uncertainty on this point, what decisions and measures have you taken so that when the delegates are due to depart all sorts of reasons will not be found at the last moment for making their departure impossible?

We must agree—as Socialists who love our liberty and rights—that the blow struck at the working classes of the four Allied countries on the occasion of the Stockholm Conference must not be repeated. This depends from first to last on the influence of the Socialist determination for peace in your Labour parties, and the masses which are behind these parties. It would be a sign of great progress if we could consider their initiative in calling this Conference as a symbol of the irresistible will of the masses and the political rebirth of the Socialist Labour classes and Parties in the countries of the Entente. In that case, the question of passports would only be a question of formalities. It does not rest with me, but with you, to say what it is to be, and whether we can begin to execute our plans without fear of being disillusioned again by your Governments.

### III.

What sort of a Conference must we have in order that it should give the results which we expect from it? The principal consideration is the spirit which animates the parties and persons participating in it. The decisive question is whether we go to the Conference as diplomats of the national war policy or as Socialists of the International.

It is certain that in Socialist thought the international does not exclude the national idea. The International is the synthesis of the national ideas; just as the modern working class in every country conducts its own class struggle on one common basis, directed towards one aim, which can be realised by international collaboration and by the international victory of the Socialist working class. But we are only entitled to expect something fine from a Socialist Conference if the international idea, which has been relegated to a second place by the war, regains her supremacy over the national idea. Only by this method can we prevent the Conference from transferring the war to the inside of the International instead of serving the cause of peace, prevent the unity of the Socialists, which should temper the struggle between the States, from being itself ultimately destroyed by the conflicts of the Governments. We do not intend to go to the funeral of International Socialism, but to the re-birth of the long-buried proletariat solidarity. Only he who, after a searching

inquiry into his own feelings and inclinations, can honestly say that he is animated with such a spirit, has the right to devote himself to this work of peace. The holy spirit of Jaurès must permeate this Conference. He must not be invoked as an inciter to the continuation of wholesale murder, but as the apostle of peace, the man without hate, the visionary with an historical perspective—that he was.

The act of going to the Conference must be for each one a moral act in which the man concentrates his holiest forces of love and self-restraint—an act by which the Socialist, in the presence of mankind, frees himself from all responsibility for the continuance of the most abominable struggle of hate, murder, and destruction known to history. Only if this spirit dominates the Conference can we expect the re-establishment of the International from the contact of these separated minds, and not an irreparable breach.

In this connection, I am glad that in your Memorandum, before you consider the special questions of the war, you devote the first paragraphs to the great international problems on the solution of which depend the consolidation and maintenance of democracy and world peace. You state the problem correctly when you say that the first war aim must be to render war impossible in the future. The League of Nations, organising the negotiations between peoples on their right of self-determination, organising international justice, righting wrongs which have been committed, and preparing an international legislature—this is the one great aim, the attainment of which, after so many centuries of injustice and barbarism, can compensate so many millions of dead for the shame of the world crime.

It was already apparent from the Memoranda of the different parties at Stockholm that there was unanimity on this question; and it is clear that this part of your Memorandum is in general the expression of what the International is thinking and willing. Also, outside the International, in pacifist circles, this ideal has been proclaimed. But it has always been the weakness of the Pacifists that their demands were only ideals, for the realisation of which they had no national or international political force at their disposal. If we are willing—we Socialists—we may have such a force, and it depends only on us to put it into action. Negligence is a crime. The psychological moment for the political realisation of our will is before us. Here is an all-dominating international and world-historical interest, before which all other interests, all demands of a territorial character, all partial realisation of right must disappear.

An International Socialist Conference must not fail a second time. The fact that it did take place, together with the unanimous resolution to concentrate the political force of the International and of the national parties on the realisation of the League of Nations and international disarmament, would be a result sufficient in itself to constitute the International anew as a great force of world policy, to hasten peace, and at the same time to give to the world-peace its substance.

Once this unity of Socialist will is demonstrated there will be created that intellectual *milieu* in which the inevitable oppositions on the special questions of the war will lose much of their acuteness. If the Socialist parties of all tendencies indicated their com-

plete refusal to recommence the game of imperialist armaments after this war, they would have the great masses of the people behind them, and the idea of the League of Nations would be an accomplished fact. Socialism would then appear as the expression of a growing reality demanding world peace and democracy.

If, on the other hand, we try in the near future, before we unite on this basis of our policy, to solve the special questions dividing the peoples and ourselves as well, we shall fail. It so happens that the political parties who have the greatest responsibility for their national policy are just those which are unable to agree on questions like Alsace-Lorraine. You rightly desire that on these questions also there should be more of an exposition of mutual standpoints than an effort to arrive at a common solution. I think that such an explanation, and likewise explanations on the origin and aim of the war—limited for practical reasons—will remove many misunderstandings. But these questions can only be solved at the final peace conference of the Governments. It must be our task to bring this conference nearer, and develop within each party of the International the will and force to influence its own Government in favour of the solution most favourable to a just and lasting peace. Therefore, I do not think it necessary to examine the special questions of your Memorandum. I can say this all the more because I took an active part in the drafting of the peace proposal of the Stockholm Commission. I still accept the programme contained in that document.

Before concluding, I desire to discuss the action which might follow from this Conference. It was rightly the intention of Stockholm to make it possible by international agreement for the parties in the belligerent countries to take steps in favour of peace in their respective countries, without giving any justification for the reproach that they were playing into the hands of the enemy. Such action must be related to the resolution of the Conference proclaiming the real working-class aims—the creation of a League of Nations, the substitution for the imperialist method of national militarism of an international organisation securing the peaceful economic development of each nation, and international disarmament. This Conference might decide that a demonstration should take place, if possible on one and the same day, in all countries in favour of this great aim, in order that it should become the intellectual possession of the masses of the people.

In your Memorandum you further express the desire, expressed also at Stockholm, that a Socialist Conference should be held at the same time and in the same place as the official conference of the Governments. Your proposal that in this latter conference every country should be represented at the most by four members seems to me practicable, because this method permits the representation of minorities.

I conclude, my dear Henderson, by expressing the hope that you and your friends will consider that a Conference called together in the spirit which I have indicated is both possible and desirable, in which case I shall be glad to collaborate to the best of my power in the realisation of your plans.

---

---

**Printed by the National Labour  
Press Ltd., 8 & 9 Johnson's Court, -  
Fleet Street. E.C.4.**

---

---

HANDBOOK FOR SPEAKERS. 45

---

③

**LABOUR**  
**AND**  
**THE PEACE TREATY.**

---

**An Examination of Labour  
Declarations**

**and**

**The Treaty Terms.**

---

**THE LABOUR PARTY, 33, Eccleston Square, London, S.W. 1.**

# CONTENTS.

---

## PART I.

### LABOUR'S COMMITMENT TO CERTAIN PRINCIPLES OF SETTLEMENT.

- I. Labour's Pledges : " Revision for Honour and Expediency."
- II. " Open Covenants " and the making of the Treaty : the Old Diplomacy revived.
- III. Labour's Objects at the Peace.

## PART II.

### THE TREATY CLAUSES AND LABOUR'S DECLARATIONS : A SERIATIM COMPARISON.

- I. The League of Nations : Note on Representation.
- II. Responsibility and Punishment.
- III. Reparation and Restitution : Economic Clauses.
- IV. The Boundaries of Germany and German Austria.
- V. Colonies.
- VI. China.
- VII. Naval and Military : Disarmament : Guarantees.

## PART III.

### RUSSIA : THE TREATY AND INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY IN EUROPE.

## PART IV.

### SUMMARISATION : POINTS UPON WHICH REVISION IS MOST NEEDED.

## PART V.

### DOCUMENTS.

- I. German Counter Proposals and Objections (Count Rantzau's Statement).
- II. Manifestoes by General Smuts.
- III. Protest of Mr. Bullitt, American Commissioner.
- IV. A Belgian Protest.
- V. Protest of British University Men.
- VI. President Wilson's Fourteen Points and Five Points.
- VII. Allied Memorandum to German Government of Nov. 5. 1918.



## PART I.

### LABOUR'S COMMITMENT TO CERTAIN PRINCIPLES OF SETTLEMENT.

#### CHAPTER I.

##### LABOUR'S PLEDGES: "REVISION FOR HONOUR AND EXPEDIENCY."

Labour's repeated pledges to revise the Treaty. Why the future of European Democracy depends on the fulfilment of these pledges. Labour's Declarations. pp. 5-8

#### CHAPTER II.

##### "OPEN COVENANTS" AND THE MAKING OF THE TREATY: THE OLD DIPLOMACY REVIVED.

The abandonment of Open Covenants at the Conference; the trail of the Secret Treaties and reversion to the Balance of Power. Why commitments under the New Triple Alliance will be in conflict with the obligations of impartiality under the League of Nations. An American view of the Triple Alliance. pp. 8-12

#### CHAPTER III.

##### LABOUR'S OBJECTS AT THE PEACE.

Summary of principles enunciated by Labour and the respects in which the Treaty is in violation of them. Labour and President Wilson. pp. 12-20

## PART II.

### THE TREATY CLAUSES AND LABOUR'S DECLARATIONS: A SERIATIM COMPARISON.

#### CHAPTER I.

##### THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS: NOTE ON REPRESENTATION.

Labour has always sought in the League of Nations, not so much an alliance of governments for coercion as a parliament of peoples for altering the conditions which, unaltered, would lead to war: why the Covenant fails as such an instrument and some of the changes which are necessary. pp. 21-28

#### CHAPTER II.

##### RESPONSIBILITY AND PUNISHMENT.

The treaty is in flagrant violation of the principles enunciated not only by Labour, but by President Wilson. pp. 28-30

#### CHAPTER III.

##### REPARATION AND RESTITUTION: ECONOMIC CLAUSES.

Labour for restitution, but against economic imperialism and war after the war. How "selfish economic combinations" create war. A warning as to "Preference." The need for international control of raw material if there is to

be equality of economic opportunity. Why Labour is interested in preventing famine conditions in Germany. pp. 31-41

#### CHAPTER IV.

### THE BOUNDARIES OF GERMANY AND GERMAN AUSTRIA.

In what respects the changes of frontier violate the principle of nationality and the right of all peoples to means of subsistence. The unsatisfactory nature of the plebiscites. The violation of the rights of German Austrians. pp. 41-45

#### CHAPTER V.

### COLONIES.

The failure of the Treaty to make provision against the colonial question becoming the cause of further wars in the economic conflicts for raw materials. The inadequacy of the mandatory system. pp. 46-48

#### CHAPTER VI.

### CHINA.

Japanese imperialism in China and the protests of the Chinese Delegates. pp. 48-50

#### CHAPTER VII.

### NAVAL AND MILITARY DISARMAMENT: GUARANTEES.

The disarmament clauses of the Treaty entirely one-sided: no general disarmament. The significance of the Rhineland Republic movement. What a fifteen years' occupation may involve. Militarist activity among the Allies. pp. 50-55

#### PART III.

### *RUSSIA: THE TREATY AND INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY IN EUROPE.*

Why the Russian situation cannot be dissociated from the Treaty. Reasons for Labour's emphatic stand on Russian policy: the key to the future of industrial democracy throughout the world. Labour standing not for Bolshevism, but against reaction. pp. 55-64

#### PART IV.

### SUMMARISATION.

Points upon which revision is most needed. pp. 64-67

#### PART V.

### DOCUMENTS.

pp. 68-87

### NOTE.

*All resolutions and manifestos of Labour organisations are printed in italics.*

# Labour

AND

# The Peace Treaty.

---

---

## PART I.

### LABOUR'S COMMITMENT TO CERTAIN PRINCIPLES OF SETTLEMENT.

---

#### CHAPTER I.

#### LABOUR'S PLEDGES. "REVISION FOR HONOUR AND EXPEDIENCY."

Labour's repeated pledges to revise the Treaty. Why the future of European Democracy depends on the fulfilment of these pledges. Labour's Declarations.

The British Labour Party, as well as the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress, have on several occasions, and through several channels, since the outbreak of the War<sup>(1)</sup> insisted clearly and emphatically, not alone on certain general principles of settlement, but on certain specific details as well.

These declarations, formal, specific, and unmistakable, definitely commit organised Labour in England to a certain policy with reference to the Peace. If we could imagine British Labour not living up to its professions in this respect, but making a scrap of paper of them, not only would the re-establishment of confidence among the workers of the world become impossible, but such efforts as are being made by some at least of the German workers to create a truly democratic and non-military republic would be frustrated. British Labour would have strengthened the forces of nationalism and militarism in Germany, perhaps have delivered German workers and Socialists over to those forces.<sup>(2)</sup>

The militarist parties in Germany have always justified both their violation of treaty obligations and their demand for overwhelming

---

(1) Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference, February, 1915; Labour Party Annual Conference, Bristol, 1916; National Conference of Trades Union Congress and Labour Party, 1917; Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference, London, February, 1918; Idem, September, 1918; Trades Union Congress and Labour Party Conference on League of Nations, April, 1919; International Labour and Socialist Conference, Berne, 1919; Committee of Action Idem, Paris, 1919; Permanent Committee, Idem, Amsterdam, 1919; National Executive, Labour Party, London, May 8, 1919; Joint Meeting National Executive and Parliamentary Labour Party, June 4, 1919; Labour Party Annual Conference, Southport, 1919.

(2) "Does the Labour Party realise that if it allows a Peace of violence to be signed, it disarms German Socialists in face of those Pan-German schemes?"—H. N. Brailsford, writing from Berlin.

armament on the ground that the rights of Germany would not be respected nor her due opportunities ensured unless she were in a position to compel those things by force. If now, at the moment that the new German Republic has destroyed the old royal dynasties and is weak and unable to resist, the Western democracies throw over in their moment of victory and power all the high principles which they proclaimed when they were not yet victorious, the German militarists will point to that fact as proof of the truth of their prediction that promises of justice and fair treatment would melt as soon as Germany became demilitarised.

Whether government by the workers is to succeed, in Germany, Hungary, Russia, and elsewhere, will depend upon the fidelity of Labour in the Entente countries to principles which it has so repeatedly professed in the past.

The commitments of Labour to revision of the Treaty have steadily grown in definiteness and emphasis during the last four years. Not only is Labour committed to revision by the fact that the Treaties, both with Germany and Austria, are in plain violation of the principles it has so often expressed during the War, but it is committed also by repeated declarations, made since the terms of the Treaty and of the Covenant of the League of Nations (embodied in it) became known.

The Annual Conference of the Labour Party at Southport, 1919, voted the following resolution:—

*"The Conference is of opinion, now that Germany has decided to sign the Treaty of Peace, thereby opening up the opportunity of co-operation with the democracies of the world, that its speedy admission to the League of Nations and the immediate revision by the League of Nations of the harsh provisions of the Treaty, which are inconsistent with the statements made on behalf of the Allied Governments when the Armistice was made, are essential both on grounds of honour and expediency; and it therefore calls upon the Labour movement, in conjunction with the International, to undertake a vigorous campaign for the winning of popular support to this policy as a first step towards the reconciliation of the peoples and the inauguration of a new era of international co-operation and good will."*

At a joint meeting of the National Executive Labour Party and the Parliamentary Labour Party on June 4, at the House of Commons, the following manifesto was voted unanimously:—

*The Parliamentary Labour Party and the National Executive, having considered the preliminary peace proposals, declares that the Treaty is defective not so much because of this or that detail of wrong done but fundamentally in that it accepts and, indeed, is based upon the very political principles which were the ultimate cause of the war. The Treaty involves a violation of the principles embodied in Labour and Socialist Conference decisions. It also violates the understanding upon which the armistice was signed, and is, therefore, a repudiation of the spirit and letter of the declarations of President Wilson, Mr. Lloyd George, and other Allied statesmen.*

*"Organised Labour throughout the war resolutely opposed all attempts to transform the struggle for the emancipation of peoples into a war of conquest. . . . The peoples want peace, and demand that peace shall be lasting. We therefore call upon the organised workers of all countries to join in an effort to bring the Treaty more into harmony with the working-class conception of an enduring and democratic settlement. Only when the menace of further war, which this Treaty does not remove, is lifted from the world can the burdened peoples obtain release from conscription and begin the work of raising the international standard of life and labour and the inauguration of a new social order."*

About a month previously (May 8) the National Executive of the Labour Party had issued a Manifesto, of which the following is the opening paragraph :—

*“Throughout the war British Labour and National and Inter-Allied Labour Socialist Conferences formulated their war aims and consistently opposed any settlement of the European struggle calculated to prepare fresh conflicts, create new grievances and subject various peoples to the double plague of armaments and war. In the spirit of these declarations, the organised workers supported the proposals of President Wilson, as expressed in the fourteen points and his subsequent addresses, which later became the basis of the Armistice. The National Executive of the Labour Party considers that the published summary of the Peace Treaty in some essential particulars is opposed to the declarations of President Wilson, the Inter-Allied Conferences, and the Berne Conference, is very defective from the standpoint of world peace, and bears evidence of compromise influenced by capitalist imperialism, which still dominates the European States.*

French, Belgian, and Italian Labour organisations have voiced condemnation of the Treaty even more severe than that just quoted.

### **French Declaration.**

The National Committee of the French General Confederation of Labour adopted unanimously on May 27 the following resolution :—

*“The National Committee is of opinion that the diplomatic instrument born of the Peace Conference in no way corresponds to the aspirations expressed by the belligerent nations and by all the nations;*

*That the treaty carries on the transactions born of secret diplomacy, which is now indefensible;*

*That, far from establishing a new world regime which would render impossible any recurrence of war, it is permitting the continuance of germs of conflict similar to those which brought this great catastrophe upon humanity.*

*Such texts will never realise the just and permanent Peace which is desired by the workers of the whole world.*

*The Peace Treaty will entail a situation aggravated by territorial rivalries, growing hatred, desire for revenge, the impossibility of economic reconstitution, national and international lack of equilibrium.*

*For all these reasons, being of opinion that principles have been affirmed during this war which the treaty ignores, that promises have been made which are being set aside, that none of the hopes cherished by the peoples have been realised.*

*In face of the powerlessness or bad will of the governments to produce equitable and humane proposals, the Committee declares that Labour must take action to redress this peace in order to realise the true peace of the peoples and a stable world organisation which will guarantee peace and secure the resumption of economic life, which is its principal condition.*

*True to the principles of liberty of peace and of justice which guide it, the working classes of this country will resolutely apply themselves to the realisation of this necessary task, both by national action and by uniting their efforts to those of the workers of other countries.*

### **Italian Declaration.**

The Resolution of the Italian Socialist Parliamentary Group (voted unanimously by forty-one deputies) is even more vigorous. It states the Italian Parliamentary Socialist Group :—

*Considers that the agreement of surrender of the defeated nations was expressly based on the fourteen points proclaimed by the President of the United States and on the points added thereto, and that the draft of the treaty, both as a whole, and in each clause, is in flagrant contradiction to these same points, and therefore constitute the most shameful breach of agreement known in the history of conquerors.*

*Considers that the treaty in its very essence violently crushes the conquered with the whole weight of the military and economic superiority of the victors, and that it can only be operative so long as the idea of their own powerlessness and incapacity to find allies and stir up enemies against their oppressors persists among the conquered peoples, shaken by anger and a desire for bloody revenge, and*

consequently, so long as they are resigned to being the slaves of the victors, obliged to serve them alone, to work for them alone, with a mutilated national territory, a divided population, without Colonies, without raw materials, without means of transport, and even without free disposition of their own internal routes of navigation.

Considers that the disarmament imposed upon the conquered peoples without the substitution of any guarantee, not even that of being able to enter the League of Nations, places them in a position of absolute dependence on their conquerors and leaves them exposed to the abuses, to which the victors will be incited by the mere conviction that they can attempt them without risk, thus creating great and constant unrest in international conditions and continual danger of war.

Considers that the treaty multiplies the number of States, nominally free, but in reality vassals of the Entente by assigning to them frontiers which do not correspond to the object and true historical and territorial *raison d'être* of the peoples, but only to the victors' opportunity to divide, disperse and imprison the defeated nations, without considering in the very least that, through these artificial and unnatural State combinations there are new tyrannies and multiplying causes of friction, and consequently the danger of war on the part of the nations to whose aspirations violence is being done.

Resolves :—

To oppose the ratification of the treaty by Parliament, by all means in its power.

To make every effort to have it submitted in its entirety to the judgment of the people at the next election.

Resolves further :—

To communicate this Resolution to all the Socialist groups in the Parliaments of Europe. And while congratulating itself on the strong attitude of protest taken by the Socialist group in the French Parliament, and by many political and economic organisations of the International working classes, expresses the earnest hope that, under the auspices of the executives of the different Socialist Parties, the representatives of Parliamentary Socialism will unite in a joint action of protest and condemnation of the Treaty, and in every case lay down the basis of its radical revision, before it has produced its natural homicidal and liberty-destroying effects, by overthrowing the governments responsible for it, and by rebuilding society on the recognised principles of liberty and justice of International socialism.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### " OPEN COVENANTS " AND THE MAKING OF THE TREATY. THE OLD DIPLOMACY REVIVED.

The abandonment of Open Covenants at the Conference; the trail of the Secret Treaties and reversion to the Balance of Power. Why commitments under the New Triple Alliance will be in conflict with the obligations of impartiality under the League of Nations. An American view of the Triple Alliance.

Labour has always placed in the forefront of its demands concerning the Peace the condition which President Wilson makes the first of his Fourteen Points :—

" Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view."

The Annual Conference of the Party at Bristol, 1916, passed a resolution which included the following :—

" On the conclusion of the War the working classes of all industrial countries must unite in the International in order to suppress secret diplomacy."

The Memorandum on War Aims confirmed this as follows:—

*“The suppression of secret diplomacy, to be replaced by the conduct of foreign policy under the control of popular legislatures, and the publication of all treaties, which must never be in contravention of the stipulations of the League of Nations.”*

This vital pre-requisite of democracy has been utterly disregarded in the making of the Peace, (1) with the inevitable result of vitiating its whole character, rendering the League of Nations but a thin disguise for the re-establishment of the old diplomacy on the basis of the Balance of Power, which, Mr. Wilson had declared, was now “for ever discredited.”

It is important to see how this has come about.

Although at the time that the Conference assembled it was known that there existed Secret Treaties which had poisoned the whole course of Allied diplomacy during the War, only the briefest fight was made for publicity of discussion. Almost immediately the real decisions of the Conference were taken out of the hands of the delegates as a whole and made first by an inner council—the Big Ten—then by a still smaller council of the Big Four, and finally by the “Big Three.” These decisions were made in secret, the reasons for them generally remained secret, and often, as in the case of the Russian matters, the decisions themselves. The diplomacy of the Conference of Paris became even more secret than had been that of the Conference of Vienna.

At the time of President Wilson's arrival in Europe M. Clemenceau stated very frankly in the Chamber of Deputies what his attitude towards Mr. Wilson's principles would be. M. Clemenceau said that he was sceptical as to the League of Nations, and adhered to the old system of the balances of power and the old system of alliances; in his view France's best security lay therein. He announced beforehand very frankly that “this system of alliances would be his guiding thought at the Conference.”

Towards the close of the Conference there was announced the formation of a new Triple Alliance, that of France, Britain, and America. Its object is the re-ensurance of France against German aggression, in case the reduction of the German army to one hundred thousand men and the occupation of the Left Bank of the Rhine, etc., should not suffice.

Did history contain no warnings as to the misuse of this kind of instrument by militarist parties in the past, British Labour would welcome the arrangement, perhaps without reservation, although it implies scepticism as to the efficacy of the League of Nations. British Labour certainly desires the completest protection of Republican France in the future from the agonies of invasion. But the choice between the old and new method in international affairs may be involved in the policy of the new Alliance, and certain relevant facts should be considered.

The first is that if Germany sets about the revival of her military power she will turn her attention first, not to the Left Bank of the

---

(1) Even the *Times*, which resents Labour criticism of the Treaty's violations of the Fourteen Points as implying that “the Labour Party know their meaning better than Mr. Wilson does,” admits the violation of this point. “These piecemeal and imperfect disclosures are really more likely to confuse the public than to enlighten them. They stand in curious contrast to the premise of open covenants and open diplomatic processes made by Mr. Wilson when he traced beforehand the new path on which the world was to enter under democratic auspices.”—Leading article, May 26.

Rhine, but to Poland and the Border States. For if Germany can undermine the barrier which separates her from Russia there is the chance of a Russo-German combination which might offer some prospect of the resurrection of German power; not otherwise. So long as an anti-German Poland, capable of putting a million men into the field, remains, any effective combination of German and Russian forces can be prevented. That is why France has such predominating influence today in the politics and military organisation of all the new Border States. Poland is for France the succession of Russia in Alliance arrangements.

Imagine a quarrel between Poland and Germany—almost inevitable if past history is any guide—in view of the large “unredeemed” German populations which Poland will include. France, being the Ally of Poland, will be involved; and in any case, depending, as she would under M. Clemenceau’s “system of alliances,” upon the Polish offset to German power, would have to side with Poland whatever the merits of the quarrel. She could not afford to see Poland beaten by German arms. If France became involved, could we remain neutral, whatever the merits of the original German-Polish quarrel? It is likely that we should have to interpret “aggression” very broadly<sup>(1)</sup>.

The situation would mean the re-creation of the whole system of the Balance of Power. Our obligation to support the Franco-Polish “Balance” would render the impartiality of our influence within the League of Nations extremely difficult. It would, for instance, be difficult to consider impartially appeals made by minorities within the Polish State—whether Ukrainian, Ruthenian, German, or Jew—if the Polish Government were an ally of our Ally.

President Wilson has always in his speeches insisted that the Balance of Power would necessarily be in conflict with any general obligation to uphold a system of law, resting on what he has termed the Community of Power. If we are mainly concerned to ensure the solidarity of the new alliance, impartiality in the enforcement of the general rules laid down by the League of Nations will be difficult.

These are not far-fetched speculations. The dilemma here indicated has already presented itself in the attempt to restrain some of the 23 wars which we are now told are raging in Europe. The Conference set certain frontiers for Poles, Ukrainians, Czecho-Slovaks, Hungarians, Roumanians. Yet when these frontiers are crossed by their own Allies no action is taken for the purpose of restraining them. When, indeed, the Poles were ordered to desist in their war upon Ukrainians, it was the legions of General Haller, which had just been sent from France and

---

(1) Indeed the Poles already allege an “unprovoked aggression” on the part of Germany, which is not, however, pellucidly clear. Mr. Brailsford—just back from Poland—writes to the “Daily News”: “The Polish General Staff has issued to the Press in Paris an alleged German ‘official dispatch,’ which is said to have been intercepted in Silesia. The dispatch is dated Posen, but is unsigned. It states that while the German Government will oppose the renewal of war in the East officially, it will unofficially support it. This is very strange. The Poles are not in occupation of Silesia. How, then, could they intercept a dispatch there? Again, the Germans officially evacuated Posen many months ago, and the Poles occupy it. How, then, could a German ‘official dispatch’ emanate from Posen? Lastly, Hörising, the Socialist blacksmith who is Governor of Upper Silesia, is said in the dispatch to be in favour of war. In public he has expressed himself satisfied with the concession of a plébiscite for Upper Silesia. I suggest, Sir, that the good faith of the Polish General Staff has been abused.”



were, in fact, a French-officered army, that disregarded the orders of Paris and continued to march against the Ukrainians. Much the same thing happened at an earlier date, when Poles and Czechs were fighting in Silesia.

And let this be noted : These developments are no reflection upon the genuineness of the French nation's desire for peace. The British democracy to-day is utterly unable to prevent a war by its Government upon the Russian Soviets, although Labour has most formally and energetically pronounced against it. And French Labour and Socialism will be equally helpless in controlling the intrigues of military and diplomatic cliques so long as the private diplomacy of a few Foreign Offices and the military combinations of two or three General Staffs are the real forces in international affairs and within the League of Nations, and when the League as a whole is proclaimed—as the formation of a special Alliance does proclaim it—as ineffective. If we expect others—Poles, Ukrainians, Czechs, to say nothing of Germans and Austrians—to trust to the League for defence as well as justice, we must show that we ourselves believe in it, and have no special obligations which conflict with impartial justice to all its members.

French Labour opinion is completely at one with the view just expressed. The National Committee of the French General Confederation of Labour voted unanimously (May 27) a protest :—

*Against the return to the old system of alliances, grouping country against country, rousing imperialism against imperialism, continuing national and racial antagonisms.*

*This system, which was one of the chief causes of the world conflict, was condemned by the war, and should have no place in the general code of the League of Nations. To return to it is to disregard the known will of the peoples and to fall back into the same state of things and the same fatal paths in which the world found itself before the European war.*

If parts in the foregoing judgment should sound harsh, let the English reader consider the views of an American organ which has in the past been a firm supporter of Mr. Wilson (and, incidentally, particularly sympathetic to the aims of British Labour). The *New Republic* (May 24, 1919) says :—

“ Every entangling alliance, almost without exception, is fervently described in the text as defensive, that there is absolutely no practical distinction between a defensive and an offensive alliance, that from the forging of the Ems dispatch to the murder of the Austrian Archduke intriguing diplomats have never found the slightest difficulty in manufacturing a defensive pretext for an offensive purpose. It is incredible that any American statesman should have forgotten this so completely that after denouncing special alliances time without number he should be so flabbergasted by the word ‘ unprovoked ’ as to miss the whole significance of the project.

“ Examine the plan in this European setting and what does it mean? As a result of the War France is left as the one great military power on the Continent of Europe. Her army has a glorious tradition, the staff is the finest in Europe, her greatest rival is completely and permanently disarmed. Against this rival she is to be reinsured by a covenant which is supposed to apply the force of all its members against any kind of sudden aggression. Then a military frontier is given her, which means that at first hint of aggression by the disarmed Germans the whole left bank of the Rhine can be occupied without resistance by a completely armed France, and on top of this she is to be still further reinsured by a special military alliance with the two Powers who control the seas and the greatest military resources.

"To the French people, terrorised for forty years and invaded for four, this may at the moment seem merely defensive caution. But not to the very astute politicians who manage French foreign policy. They know better. They know that the real meaning of this alliance is to give France a free hand in the mastery of the Continent. By making France absolutely immune to the consequences of any policy she may pursue, she is free to pursue any policy. In exactly this way Bismarck reasoned when he reinsured himself several times over on his eastern and southern front in order to be entirely safe in all his other purposes. Let no one deceive himself about this. The beauty of the French landscape, the charm of Frenchmen, the delicacy of French culture, the hardihood of the French peasant, the democracy of French society have no more to do with the question than did German folk songs and Beethoven's music with the policy of Bismarck or of his more degenerate successors under William II. On the Continent of Europe a nation which is in a privileged position of security is fatally tempted to pursue a policy of intrigue and aggression. That privileged position may be the military power of France absolutely reinsured by special alliance with sea power. Where that privileged position exists the temptation to assert mastery is so intoxicating as to be beyond the power of control.

"The result will be what it has always been. The other nations, far more insecure than France, will infer that if the authors of the Covenant do not trust the League, why in heaven's name should they? Italy is already saying it. Spain looking at her dispute with France in Morocco is bound to say it, and as for Central Europe what other conclusion can she possibly draw? If France needs special protection, the weaker States certainly do, and the next step is to find allies. Now, in the choice of allies as a means of protection, no nation has the slightest scruple. Republican France and Tsarist Russia, England and Japan, Germany and Turkey; it is not principles, but battalions that count.

"The French alliance is bound to call up other alliances within what Mr. Wilson once called 'the common family of the League of Nations,' and, we may add, outside the family. With Germany and Russia outside, and China ready to go, with Italy rather dazzled somewhere in No Man's Land, the number of possible combinations is considerable. All of them, of course, will be purely 'defensive.' The only thing to remember is that these defensive groups will be extraordinarily interested in being loyal to one another. And being loyal to a defensive alliance means—as Mr. Wilson has recently discovered at the cost of his reputation—doing just about what the most determined member of the group insists upon. The result is a set of rival diplomatic groups each arming for its own defensive purposes, and each intriguing for a good start in the next war."

It is worth remembering that the durability of the League will depend largely upon the warmth or coldness of American support.

---

### CHAPTER III.

#### LABOUR'S OBJECTS AT THE PEACE.

Summary of principles enunciated by Labour and the respects in which the Treaty is in violation of them. Labour and President Wilson.

A summary of the demands of Labour and the underlying reasons of them might be made as follows:—

1. Completely open diplomacy and discussion; particularly where there is involved directly or indirectly economic and political measures which bear on the efforts of the workers to establish a New Social Order throughout the world. Many decisions which are apparently purely political and territorial will, in fact, profoundly affect the fate of Socialist and Labour experiments, not alone in Germany and Hungary, but in Russia, although the last may not be directly involved in the territorial Settlements of the Treaty.

2. The peace must look mainly to the removal of the permanent causes of war with its concomitant oppressions at home and abroad. The greatest of these causes in the past has been the failure of the nations to agree upon and maintain a common law of international life, enabling all to live in security and with equality

of opportunity. The absence of such law set up the desire, on the part of all great States, for (a) preponderant military power as the only dependable means of ensuring the protection of national existence, and (b) territory with raw materials, outlets to sea, etc., as the only sure basis of national prosperity. But in such conditions the security and prosperity of one involved the insecurity and poverty of another. Labour has therefore demanded that any peace-preserving Covenant must include arrangements by which the political security and economic rights of each shall rest upon the combined strength of the whole Society of Nations pledged to arrangements which ensure fair treatment for all, and not upon the mere preponderance of one group over another.

3. This pledge of political security and economic rights must be extended to the enemy States, if plans of disarmament are to proceed. To deprive the enemy State, of their means of defence and then permit invasion of their territory, or fiscal and economic measures which take from millions of their populations their means of livelihood, would be a condition that obviously could not endure. The inevitable and increasing resistance, even if only by the evasion of economic undertakings, would necessarily perpetuate the armaments of the Allies.

4. Equality of economic opportunity should be assured to all nations, not alone by the negative policy of removal of economic discrimination and refraining from economic war, but by a constructive policy of international arrangements for the allocation of necessary raw materials according to need. A colonial settlement which will assure absolute equality of access to raw materials and economic opportunity.

5. It is in this policy, permitting to Germany the most rapid recuperation, that will be found the best hope of securing the largest measure of reparation for those who have suffered at her hands.

6. Any international or supernational authority established for the maintenance of Peace should not be a mere alliance of governments for the maintenance of a *status quo*, perhaps unjust and unworkable, or a mere instrument of coercion for ensuring compulsory arbitration on the basis of an old international law, which was itself inequitable, but should be mainly an instrument for changing the conditions likely to lead to war. Its function, that is to say, should not be so much coercive as legislative, operating through popular organs representing the European peoples and parties of all opinions, and not merely the Foreign Offices, Cabinets, or Governments.

7. Labour again and again has emphasised the distinction (also repeatedly made both by Mr. Wilson and Mr. Lloyd George) which must be made between the guilt and responsibilities of the German Imperialist Government and the German people that should democratise itself and repudiate its dynastic rulers. A punitive settlement imposed by the Allies has been opposed, first, because it involves the punishment of millions of children, women, and many workers who could have no sort of responsibility for the war or its crimes; secondly, because it makes the victims, to whom the wrongs have been done, also the judges, executioners and beneficiaries of the punishment; and, thirdly, because such punishment itself would do nothing to remove and would be likely to make worse the general causes which have been so productive of war in the past.

The investigation of war crimes should be impartial and undertaken against whomsoever, on whichever side, they may be alleged.

8. All adjustments of boundaries must be based upon the desire of the people concerned, assured by an international supervision of the "consultation of peoples" for self-determination. ("Peoples and provinces are not to be made as part of adjustment or compromise of claims.")

9. The Settlement must conform scrupulously to the undertakings given in the Armistice—including those with reference to the operation of the blockade in so far as it affects the feeding of the enemy populations, and given also in the Declarations of Mr. Wilson, which were accepted as the basis upon which Peace should be made.

The degree to which the Terms of the Treaty violate these conditions may be gathered from a comparison, seriatim, of its points, with the relevant Labour declarations. That comparison is made below. The points of difference may be summarised as follows:—

1. In the drawing up of the Treaty the condition of "open covenants openly arrived at," which Mr. Wilson made the very first of his fourteen points, has not

been observed. Not only have the proceedings and decisions of the Conference been marked by the suppression of all opportunity for public discussion and the information of public opinion, but the commitments of secret treaties have marked the terms of the Treaty itself. In the decisions with reference to the Russian Revolution and the Socialist movements in Russia and Hungary, the democracies have been committed without their knowledge to support counter-revolutionary forces. Organised Labour, progressive and Socialist movements, have been completely without representation in the making of decisions which deeply concern the general struggle for industrial democracy.

2. The permanent causes of war—whether we regard these as mainly nationalist rivalries or economic conflict—far from being removed by the Treaty are rendered more acute and more numerous than ever. The constitution of the League of Nations affords no adequate means for their removal.

3. The policy of removing any cause for the enemy's militarism and of winning him to a peaceful international co-operation by affording him political security and economic rights through a place on equal terms with others in the League of Nations, to which Entente statesmen have again and again pledged themselves, is directly violated. President Wilson has specifically protested against a League which would be "merely a new Alliance confined to the nations associated against a common enemy." It was to be a "Universal Association," based on "guarantees taken and given," and mutual and reciprocal in its provisions; with equality alike of right and obligation. All these principles are violated in the Treaty. Germany is not included in the League of Nations; she is not to enjoy the rights and privileges she is compelled to extend to others, and there is no provision giving her opportunities to win those rights even by good behaviour. "The destruction of German militarism is offset by the intensified militarism imposed upon those of the Allies whose duty it is to hold Germany by the throat through a generation or more."

4. There is no truly international arrangement for the equitable distribution of raw material. Instead, Germany's economic life, both internal through the Reparation Commission, and external through the Allied control of raw material, is placed within the power of her former enemies and future competitors. They will be in a position to deny her population even means of livelihood. The controls over Germany are not given to the League but to the "Big Four," who are free to act on their private interest and discretion. She will be placed for years under an economic government in which she has no part: A denial of democracy and self-government.

5. The League of Nations as devised by the Paris Conference, far from being mainly a democratic organ for the legislative modification of bad international conditions likely to cause war, is a machine by which coercive power is given mainly into the hands of the executive branches of a few great Governments. The project of a Triple Alliance between France, Great Britain and America is in violation of President Wilson's undertaking: "There can be no league or alliances or special covenants and undertakings within the general and common family of the League of Nations."

6. In the matter of responsibility the Treaty makes no distinction between Imperialist and Republican Germany; between the German Government and the German people; between the immediate and the general causes of the War, which Labour, in common with President Wilson, has so often emphasised. These distinctions must be observed if the Treaty is to secure German repentance and atonement and pave the way to reconciliation and permanent peace.

7. Self-determination, the right of populations "freely to choose their allegiance" is violated in the case of the Germans of Czecho-Slovakia, of the Tyrolese Highlands, important districts in West Prussia (added to Poland for strategic and economic reasons), the important district of Memel, and during a generation the Saar Valley; and in a more limited sense by the refusal to allow German Austria to unite with the main German body, despite the declared will of the country. These cases combined will constitute a united German population many times greater than the population of Alsace-Lorraine, whose frustrated desire to rejoin France poisoned international relations for half a century.

## LABOUR AND PRESIDENT WILSON.

It will be noted that very many of the Labour Manifestos insist upon the solemn obligation to adhere to the terms of Mr. Wilson's declarations.

British Labour has in its past associated itself in such a special sense with President Wilson's expressions of democratic opinion that it is particularly bound to see that the ultimate Peace Terms are in keeping therewith. But the Allied Governments are not less bound. On November 5, 1918, they transmitted, through President Wilson to the German Government, the following memorandum :—

" The Allied Governments have given careful consideration to the correspondence which has passed between the President of the United States and the German Government. Subject to the qualifications which follow, they declare their willingness to make peace with the Government of Germany on the terms of the peace laid down in the President's address to Congress of January 8, 1918, and the principles of settlement enunciated in his subsequent addresses."

The Address to Congress of January 8, 1918, is that which contained the Fourteen Points. The qualifications in the Allied Memorandum had reference to two points: " Freedom of Seas," the compensation which they stipulated should be for all damage done to the civilian population of the Allies and their property by the aggression of Germany by land, sea, and from the air.

The five points laid down by President Wilson in his speech of September 27, 1918 (these being the points referred to in the Armistice negotiations as " The President's subsequent utterances "), were as follows :—

" First, the impartial justice meted out must involve no discrimination between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just. It must be a justice that plays no favourites and knows no standard but the equal rights of the several peoples concerned.

" Second, no special or separate interest of any single nation or any group of nations can be made the basis of any part of the settlement which is not consistent with the common interest of all.

" Third, there can be no leagues or alliances or special covenants and understandings within the general and common family of the League of Nations.

" Fourth, and more specifically, there can be no special, selfish economic combinations within the League, and no employment of any form of economic boycott or exclusion except as the power of economic penalty by exclusion from the markets of the world may be vested in the League of Nations itself as a means of discipline and control.

" Fifth, all international agreements and treaties of every kind must be made known in their entirety to the rest of the world."

These expressions of principle have been duplicated and supported by the Labour Party.

Most noticeable of all the contrasts which the draft Treaty presents to the Inter-Allied War Aims and the Fourteen Points is the fact that, whereas both the latter set out to " make the world safe for democracy " by laying down the constructive basis on which a new world can be built, the draft Treaty is concerned almost solely with the moment and with securing to the victors in the late War the immediate spoils of victory. The prophecy contained in the Inter-Allied Labour War Aims has, unfortunately, proved to be all too true. The Inter-Allied Conference (February, 1918) declared that :—

*" It will be a device of the capitalist interests to pretend that the Treaty of Peace need concern itself only with the cessation of the struggle of the armed forces and with any necessary territorial adjustments."*

At the Inter-Allied Conference of the Socialist and Labour Parties held on February 14, 1915, the following declaration was unanimously agreed to:—

*"This Conference cannot ignore the profound general causes of the European conflict, itself a monstrous product of the antagonisms which tear asunder capitalist society and of the policy of colonial dependencies and aggressive imperialism, against which international Socialism has never ceased to fight, and in which every Government has its share of responsibility. . . ."*

*"The Socialists of Great Britain, Belgium, France and Russia do not pursue the political and economic crushing of Germany. They are not at war with the peoples of Germany and Austria, but only with the Governments of those countries by which they are oppressed. . . ."*

*"Socialists are none the less resolved to resist any attempt to transform this defensive war into a war of conquest, which would only prepare fresh conflicts, create new grievances, and subject various peoples more than ever to the double plague of armaments and war."*

*"Satisfied that they are remaining true to the principles of the International, the members of the conference express the hope that the working classes of all the different countries will before long find themselves united again in their struggle against militarism and capitalist imperialism. The victory of the Allied Powers must be a victory for popular liberty, for unity, independence and autonomy of the nations in the peaceful federation of the United States of Europe and the world."*

At the Inter-Allied Conference held three years later (February 20-24, 1918) this declaration was confirmed and reproduced, and the following added:—

*"Whatever may have been the objects for which the War was begun, the fundamental purpose of the Conference in supporting the continuance of the struggle so that the world may henceforth be made safe for Democracy. Of all the conditions of Peace none is so important to the peoples of the world as that there should be henceforth on earth no more war."*

*"Whoever triumphs, the peoples will have lost unless an international system is established which will prevent war. It would mean nothing to declare the right of peoples to self-determination if this right were left at the mercy of new violations, and was protected by a super-national authority. That authority can be no other than the League of Nations, which not only all the present belligerents, but every other independent State, should be pressed to join."*

Mr. Wilson's principles were again confirmed, and his protest against any attempt to base Peace upon a re-creation of the Balance of Power reproduced.

#### PRESIDENT WILSON'S DECLARATIONS.

The declarations of President Wilson include the following:—

No "PEACE OF VICTORY."—"The question upon which the whole future peace and policy of the world depends is this: Is the present war a struggle for a just and secure peace, or only for a new balance of power? . . . Victory would mean peace forced upon the loser, a victor's terms imposed upon the vanquished. It would be accepted in humiliation, under duress, at an intolerable sacrifice, and would leave a sting, a resentment, a bitter memory upon which terms of peace would rest, not permanently, but only as upon quicksand. . . . The world can be at peace only if its life is stable, and there can be no stability where the will is in rebellion, where there is not tranquillity of spirit and a sense of justice, of freedom, and of right."—Address to the Senate, January 22, 1917.

"SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY."—"We have no quarrel with the German people. . . . We are glad now that we see the facts with no false pretence about them, to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German peoples included; for the rights of the nations great and small, and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience. The world must be made safe for democracy. . . . We are, let me say again, the sincere friends of the German people, and shall desire nothing so much as the early re-establishment of intimate relations of mutual advantage between us—however

hard it may be for them, for the time being, to believe that this is spoken from our hearts."—Address to Congress, April 2, 1917.

"THE PROMISES OF THE ARMISTICE."—"The war ended, moreover, by proposing to Germany an armistice and peace which should be founded on certain clearly defined principles which set up a new order of right and justice. Upon those principles the peace with Germany has not only been conceived, but formulated. Upon those principles it will be executed."—Statement dealing with the Jugo-Slav dispute at Paris, April 23, 1919.

"THE FOUNDATIONS OF WAR TO BE SWEEP AWAY."—"We are glad to see, in short, that the very foundations of this war are swept away. Those foundations were the private choice of a small coterie of civil rulers and military staffs. Those foundations were the aggression of great Powers upon the small. Those foundations were the power of small bodies of men to wield their will and use mankind as pawns in a game. And nothing less than the emancipation of the world from these things will accomplish peace."—Address before the Peace Conference, January 25, 1919.

"RIGHT AND JUSTICE."—"We have used great words, all of us have used the great words 'Right' and 'Justice,' and now we are to prove whether or not we understand these words, and they are to be applied to the particular settlements which must conclude this war. And we must not only understand them, but we must have the courage to act upon our understanding."—Speech at Buckingham Palace, December 27, 1918.

"DISINTERESTEDNESS."—"But we cannot stand in the shadow of this war without knowing that there are things which are in some senses more difficult than those we have undertaken; because, while it is easy to speak of right and justice, it is sometimes difficult to work them out in practice, and there will be required a purity of motives and disinterestedness of object which the world has never witnessed before in the councils of nations."—Speech to Italian Deputies at Rome, January 3, 1919.

## GERMAN DECLARATIONS.

Finally, fairness demands the reproduction, and political wisdom our consideration, of the appeal made by the German Social Democratic Party to "The Socialists of all Countries." The appeal is in these terms:—

The Versailles draft Peace Treaty has exceeded the worst expectations of the friends of peace in every country. The peace of violence which is to be forced upon us by the dictatorship of Versailles is the best justification of the attitude of German Social Democrats towards the defence of their country. We always knew what would threaten the German nation when the Imperialists of the Entente came to dictate peace to them. Therefore, we wished to try by every means to prevent this situation.

Socialists of other countries, do you now understand our attitude?

The Imperialists of other lands are no better than ours. The peace of conquest which is to be forced upon us to-day strikes at the very heart of the German Republic.

According to the plan of the capitalist Governments of France, England and America, this peace will make it impossible for a Socialist Germany to prosper, and thus at the same time strike at International Socialism.

Throughout the war we German Social Democrats advocated a peace of conciliation and of understanding among the nations, a peace which should not contain the germ of future wars. During the war, Entente statesmen frequently trumpeted forth the fact that they were only fighting for right and justice, fighting against the Kaiser and Junkerdom, but not against the German people.

But the Peace of Versailles is directed against the German people! If all the proposed economic restrictions and tyrannical financial clauses are carried out, the German workers would be enslaved for all time, and all the profits would go to the capitalists of other countries.

The German nation is prepared to make reparation for all the damage done contrary to the rights of nations at the bidding of its rulers who were overthrown by the November revolution. It is willing to be responsible for the reconstruction of Belgium and Northern France. But in order to do this it must have

ordered economic conditions. The proposed peace means a death sentence for any such conditions. Its decisions are incapable of fulfilment; and, consequently, the attempt to carry them out in detail will lead to constant friction. And so the spring of hatred will continue to flow and Europe, which has endured the horrors of war for four years, will never be at rest.

In every single point, the Versailles peace proposals are an absolute mockery of Wilson's fourteen points. There is to be no right of self-determination for the German nation. Purely German territories such as Danzig, the Netze district, and others, are to be forcibly separated from the German Republic, and their population is to be compelled to submit, without any voice in the matter whatever, to the yoke of a foreign sovereignty. Equally intolerable is the veiled annexation of the Saar Valley. Truly, Bismarck was but a miserable bungler compared with the bullies who are dismembering Germany to-day, and who, moreover, are counselling us to put out trust in a League of Nations which they alone have founded, and which they will continue to dominate for the permanent subjection of the German nation.

Peace conditions such as these, which are a mockery of all justice, cannot produce a lasting peace. They breed hatred. They would facilitate the nationalist propaganda of the reactionaries and render the enlightenment of the masses by the socialists more difficult. They would become a perpetual menace to peace.

After the terrible human slaughter which has lasted more than four years, to preserve world peace must be the principal task of the workers of all countries. The Socialists of the belligerent countries have recognised this. At Berne, the Socialists of neutral countries united with those of Europe in the formulation of a joint peace programme. They protested against any falsification of the Wilson principles, and for such questions as those of Danzig and the Saar Valley, endeavoured to find solutions which would not contain the germ of fresh wars.

The Socialists of all countries solemnly recognised that German peoples should have the right of remaining within the German State, and that the German-Austrians should have the right to unite with their German brothers. The Entente Governments contemptuously disregard all such attempts to secure permanent peace, and prefer to rely upon force.

Will the Socialist International raise its voice so loudly against this peace of violence that the present day rulers in the victorious countries will be obliged to listen to it?

We are waiting for this. But it is high time!

The German nation is on the point of being destroyed. But far more than this is involved; the fate of Europe itself is at stake! Following on this horrible world tragedy, the masses in all lands will have to endure unheard of sufferings. If one nation is completely destroyed, all the others will suffer. Therefore, workers of all lands, join your forces to prevent this peace of violence, which would not bring rest to Europe, and would do the greatest injury to the Socialist movement in all countries.

The German Independent Socialist Party has made an appeal in the following terms:—

The peace offered to the German nation by the Entente is a peace of violence of the worst possible kind. Territories with wholly German populations, which desire to live in political community with the German nation are to be separated from it against their will. The projected annexation of the Saar Valley is scarcely even veiled. The north-eastern strip of East Prussia, which regards itself as one with the German nation, is being torn from it by force. The whole of East Prussia is to be cut off from the German Empire. Danzig is apparently to be converted into an independent State; in reality, it is being handed over to Poland, against the will of the inhabitants. Elsewhere, too, as in West and East Prussia, in Posen, and in Silesia, the right of self-determination, which we claim should be applied to all territories, is being ignored.

The economic life of the German nation is being strangled, the proletariat enslaved, and the foundation of fresh international conflicts is being laid. All peace ideals are being shattered by the brutal spirit of imperialism.

From the very beginning the Independent Socialist Party proclaimed the imperialist character of the war, and, undeterred by abuse and persecution, it fought in the Press, in public meetings, and in parliaments, against the crime of ruthless human murder and the senseless destruction of national strength and economic wealth. It demanded the cessation of the war long before any one of



the belligerent Powers had gained an ascendancy over another. The old régime supported by all parties except the Independent Socialist Party, forced a peace of incredible violence upon the Russians at Brest-Litovsk, and upon the Roumanians at Bucharest. It thereby increased the hatred of Germany, and by its restoration of militarism, the present Government has intensified that hatred and distrust. Thus is the German nation being driven into the abyss, of which the International Socialist Party has so often warned them.

We have no hope of securing essential modifications of the conditions of the Allied imperialists, whose influence in the peace negotiations plays such an all-important part, the more especially as the composition of the Government and of the Peace Delegation cannot inspire the other Governments with confidence. Even if no considerable changes are effected in the course of the negotiations which have begun, we have ultimately no other alternative than to submit to pressure, and sign the treaty. A refusal to sign would mean the retention of our prisoners of war, the occupation of all districts producing raw material, the tightening of the blockade, unemployment, famine, terrible mortality—it would, in short, involve an unspeakable catastrophe which, in the end, would compel us to sign. And it would be the working classes which would suffer most from the consequences. However harsh and oppressive it may be, peace is a necessary condition for our very existence, quite apart from the restoration of our social and economic life demanded by the revolutionary working-class. The Peace of Brest-Litovsk and that of Bucharest have been of short duration, and we are convinced that the Peace of Versailles will also be shattered by revolutionary developments.

We observe with satisfaction that the Socialists of other countries, in England, France, Italy, and America, have organised resistance against this peace of violence.

The working-class considers it an insult that the German nation should be called upon to give its united support to a Government, which is constantly—ever since its appeal to the people—calling out the soldiery against sections of the people, which butchers masses of working-people, which sacrifices freedom by the unjustifiable proclamation and maintenance of martial law, which suppresses the revolutionary Press because it does not meet with its approval, which fills prisons, reformatories, and military prisoners' camps with victims of political persecution, and permits military tribunals to wreak vengeance on the working-classes.

We call upon all members of our Party, men and women, to realise the gravity of the situation, not to be led astray by talk of patriotism, but to stand firm in revolutionary resolve. Capitalism offers no hope of salvation, either to you or to the German nation. Your prosperity, the prosperity of the German nation, and of the whole world, depends upon the progress of the revolution, which will free the working-class world from capitalism and its wars, and bring about the realisation of Socialism and Peace.

Workers of all lands, rise and unite against international capitalism. Fight boldly and resolutely for the emancipation of the working-classes. Fight against capitalism and nationalism, fight for peace, for Socialism, for world-revolution! (1)

### Note on Brest-Litovsk and Versailles.

The German Socialists have been much blamed for failing to protest by their votes in the Reichstag against the treaty of Brest, which has been described as the acme of vindictive cruelty and oppression. Yet in many respects the provisions of Brest were more favourable to Russia than are the Versailles terms to Germany.

*Indemnity.* Germany demanded from Russia a definite sum, namely 6,000 millions of marks, at the time worth roughly 150 million pounds, or at to-day's exchange £100 million. A portion of this sum the Germans were willing to accept in Russian paper money.

The Allies have compelled Germany to agree to the payment of a sum as yet undetermined, and to be determined by them alone, demanding on account £5,000 million payable in gold or its equivalent at their exclusive valuation. Thus the Versailles indemnity is at least thirty times as heavy as the Brest one.

(1) From *Frieheit*, 12th May, 1919.

*Treaties.* (Brest, art. 6). Russia is obliged only to recognise the treaty of peace concluded between Germany and the Ukraine (in its economic parts almost identical with the Russian treaty), but Germany is compelled to give in advance her consent to a large number of treaties to be concluded in the future.

(Article 13.) For the interpretation of the Brest treaty, the German and Russian text was official, Versailles recognises only an English and a French text, ignoring the language of the enemy.

*Brest* (supplementary ch., 2 articles 3 & 4) revives all pre-war treaties between the parties giving them reciprocal rights to have treaties, etc., revised, and failing revision those cancelled which in their opinion no longer correspond to new conditions.

*Versailles* (art., 289e) gives each Allied power the one-sided right to notify to Germany which pre-war treaties it wishes to revive. Germany has no right to give such notification, but will be held to acquiesce in the revival of such treaties only as the Allies select.

*Occupied Territory* (art. 4). Germany agreed to evacuate all genuine Russian territory as soon as (1) the demobilisation of the Russian Army should be complete, (2) the general peace should be concluded. Versailles provides for a 15-year occupation of indisputably German territory.

*Private Rights.* Brest (Supplementary ch., 3, arts. 6 & 7) annuls for both parties equally all war-time legislation imposing restrictions upon the civil rights of "enemy subjects."

Versailles provides "most favoured nation treatment" in Germany for the subjects of any and every Allied State, but does not grant any reciprocal rights to German subjects; on the contrary, most stringent anti-alien legislation is now being passed in this country.

*Enemy Property.* Brest (ch. 3 arts. 13-15) orders all private property belonging to subjects of either country under administration or custody of an "enemy state" to be returned to its rightful owner.

Versailles (art. 297) gives such right only to Allied subjects in certain cases. Brest gives reciprocal compensation to subjects of both parties for losses suffered in the enemy countries through exceptional war-time legislation, such damage to be assessed by mixed Arbitral Tribunals, composed of Russians, Germans and Swiss in equal numbers, a Swiss as Chairman.

Versailles, which provides for similar mixed Arbitral Tribunals, grants right to such compensation exclusively to Allied subjects, ruling out all corresponding claims by German subjects.

*Prize Courts.* Brest (art. 29) confirms for both sides equally the judgments given by prize courts, Versailles confirms only the judgments of Allied prize courts, giving the Allies the right to examine the findings of the German courts.

*Rights in Industrial, Literary and Artistic Property, Patent Rights.* Brest (arts. 9-11), re-establishes these rights on a basis of complete reciprocity, Versailles establishes them for Allied subjects, but subjects German-owned rights to the effects of Allied war legislation and other conditions.

*Free Ports.* Brest (art. 4) provides for free zones for Russian trade within the ports of Riga, Reval, Windau. This is more than the Allies have done for Austria, say, at Trieste and Fiume.

## PART II.

### THE TREATY CLAUSES AND LABOUR'S DECLARATIONS: A SERIATIM COMPARISON.

#### CHAPTER 'I.

#### THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Labour has always sought in the League of Nations, not so much an alliance of governments for coercion as a parliament of peoples for altering the conditions which, unaltered, would lead to war: why the Covenant fails as such an instrument and some of the changes which are necessary.

The following are the outstanding characteristics of the League of Nations as outlined in the Covenant:—

1. The controlling power of the League is given to the "Council," consisting of *one* representative of each of the Great Powers, thus making it a small diplomatic cabinet of ministers or diplomats responsible not to the Assembly of the League of Nations, but each to his own Government. It is thus an Alliance of Governments.
2. Since Germany is excluded from the Council it makes it an Alliance of one group as against a rival group.
3. The "Assembly," which is the nearest approach to an international legislature, will be composed of three representatives of each constituent State, but *voting as one.* Haiti, or Nicaragua or Liberia, will be as powerful as Great Britain or the United States, rendering it undemocratic in the sense that by virtue of the equality of States as thus realised, a citizen of Haiti or Nicaragua or Liberia will have in it very many times the voting power of the Englishman or American. It is certain to lose authority in favour of the Council.
4. The Members of the Leagues are not bound to disarmament, only to future vague consideration of the problem.
5. The League is condemned beforehand to impotence in dealing with the economic causes of conflict, since it is not the League but the Allies who are to have control of the world's economic system, or of Germany's relation thereto. Germany is placed under the economic governance not of a truly international authority, but under the power of her chief industrial and commercial competitors.
6. The authority and arrangements for most of the plebiscites called by the Treaty are not under the League but under the Allies.
7. The Treaty, with which the Covenant is bound up, and which must be accepted as a collateral obligation, permits both economic discrimination and partial Alliances within the League.

In all these points it violates Labour declarations.

The Labour Party Annual Conference of 1919 demands:—

*Germany's "speedy admission to the League of Nations."*

The Joint Manifesto of the National Executive of the Labour Party and the Parliamentary Labour Party states:—

*"A League of Nations, to be effective, should be an organ of international justice, inclusive of all free peoples, and not, as it will be under the Peace Treaty, a restricted instrument of the victorious coalition. This essential aim can best be attained by the admission of Germany to membership of the League as speedily as possible after her signature to the Peace Treaty. The League should also be strengthened by being made more directly representatives of peoples and Parliaments."*

The Memorandum of War Aims (1918) demanded that the League should :—

1. Include all present belligerents.
2. Should supervise the " Consultation of Peoples " for self-determination.
3. Ensure that the conduct of foreign policy should be placed under the control of popular legislators.
4. Secure the concerted abolition of compulsory military service in all countries ; prohibition of fresh armaments ; limitation of existing armaments ; and the entire abolition of profit-making armament firms.

The Berne International Labour and Socialist Conference demanded that :—

" Representation in the central organ of the League should be not by the delegates of the executive branches of the governments of the constituent States, but by delegates from the Parliaments representing all parties therein, thus ensuring not an alliance of cabinets or governments, but a union of peoples."

All these provisions are violated in lesser or greater degree by the terms of the proposed League of Nations.

The Permanent Commission of the Labour and Socialist International at Amsterdam, April 26-29, passed the following resolution :—

" The Conference is of opinion that the League of Nations will only attain its object :—

1. If it is composed, from the beginning, of all the independent nations of the world who are willing to accept the obligations of the covenants, having equal rights and duties, and whose delegations have been elected by their Parliaments.

2. If a super-national authority is empowered to secure the carrying out of all obligations undertaken, whether under the Treaty of Peace or under the covenant of the League of Nations. This super-national authority is, moreover, to be entrusted with the duty of establishing international regulations, having as their object the gradual abolition of all legal hindrances to international commerce and the international organisation of world production and distribution.

3. If, with the object of finally arriving at total disarmament by land and sea, the League of Nations at once takes measures to prohibit fresh armaments, bring about the progressive reduction of existing armaments, and control the manufacture of such armaments as may still be permitted. In order to prevent any danger to democracy, such armed forces as may be required by the international situation, so long as total disarmament has not been effected, shall be placed under the control of the League of Nations, as regards both the number of effectives and the method of recruiting.

4. If all the nations forming the League of Nations are obliged to submit all questions which may arise to the decision of the League, and bind themselves to accept these decisions and exclude recourse to war under any circumstances whatever.

5. If, in order to attain this end the Governments adopt the method of open diplomacy, as employed by President Wilson with regard to the difference between Italy and the Jugo-Slavs, as this method guarantees that the claims of the different nations shall be settled strictly on the justice of each case and in the only way calculated to assist the permanency of a world peace.

These conditions have not yet been realised by the Paris Conference, and the Conference therefore appeals for effective action on the part of the workers of all countries, who should raise their protest and demand that the League of Nations shall be organised on the solid basis of a durable peace."

The Committee of Action of the Berne International Labour and Socialist Conference issued a Manifesto at Paris on May 11 in the following terms :—

" The Committee draws the attention of the Socialist and Labour movements to the following points in particular :—

" The League of Nations in the final form retains all the objections taken to it

at Berne and Amsterdam. It remains a League of Governments and Executives and not of peoples and parliaments. It does not compel its affiliated nations to renounce totally a recourse to war by accepting its arbitration and decisions. It also seems to be the instrument of a victorious condition dominated by five great Powers rather than an organ of international justice upon which all nations ought to find a place.

"Though the League of Nations as at present constituted may be the beginning of a methodical organisation of a continuous regime of peace, the failure to include Germany and Russia must be righted as speedily as possible if the League is to be made effective for preventing war."

The Special Meeting convened by the Trades Union Congress and the Labour Party to consider amendments to the Covenant of the League (held April 3, 1919) passed the following:—

"That the Body of Delegates should be chosen from the National Parliaments by some such method as Proportional Representation, so as to secure an accurate representation of national opinion. Each nation should have five representatives and have votes upon a graded system.

"That the Executive Council shall consist of eleven members, including representatives from the five Allied Powers and from Germany and Russia; and that it be so constituted as not to be independent of the Body of Delegates.

"That the regulation of the activities of the League shall be under the control of the Body of Delegates and not of the Executive Council.

"That the International Secretariat shall be under the final control of the Body of Delegates and not of the Executive Council.

"That, as Article VII. contemplates the starting of the League without invitations being sent to Russia or any of the late enemy countries, the Article be re-drafted so as to provide that these countries may take part in the inauguration of the League.

"That, any country accepting the purposes, the constitution and the obligations of the League, may notify its willingness to join the League, and if there be no objection on the part of a majority of the Executive Council, shall be admitted a member of the League, but if there be such objection the decision shall rest with a majority of the Body of Delegates. The debates on this subject must be held in public.

"That no armies should be raised by conscription.

"That, as 'geographical considerations' carry with them policies of national defence by rival armaments, their mention in Article VIII. assumes a military menace which the League of Nations ought to remove and not encourage.

"That the manufacture of armaments should be under the direct control of the League, as well as whatever forces are necessary for police purposes.

"That, as there is no real security for Peace which does not include national disarmament, a declaration to that effect should be included in this article.

"That on the International Bureau of Labour, Labour be directly and adequately represented, and that the interests of women be also represented.

"That Article XXI. should include a declaration that its final purpose is to secure freedom of commerce between States."

#### Note on the Representative Principles in League.

It will be noted that the most important Amendments of Labour bear on the introduction of a more truly representative element into the machinery of the League, particularly the representation of minority parties.

It is an open secret that powerful groups, in both the American and the British delegations to the official Conference in Paris, were in favour of an amendment to the Covenant as it now exists, which should embody the principle indicated in the Berne Resolution. This amendment aimed at carrying out the principle of the Berne proposal by the creation, in addition to the *Body of Delegates*, of a Representative Assembly, so constituted as to ensure due representation of all political parties in the nations belonging to the League.

Why is the addition of a truly Representative Assembly (even though it had only powers of recommendation) the most important amendment to the Covenants which Labour could secure? Why cannot the principle of minority representation be carried into effect by modifying the form or powers of the existing Body of Delegates?

To deal with the first question.

The real effectiveness of a League of Nations will depend upon its being a suitable instrument for changing the conditions which lead to conflict and to war. It will serve no purpose to provide force for compulsory arbitration or juridical decision of the law and practice on which a Court's decision must be based are themselves unjust. If Europe had been in a position in 1914 to have compelled Austria to submit its difference with Serbia over the Sarajevo murders to arbitration, the Court could not have allowed Serbia to raise the Southern Slav question, which was the real cause of the conflict between the two countries. The Court would have been compelled, on the basis of "international law," to support Austria's right, if she so chose, to make economic arrangements in the matter of tariffs and railroads that might strangle Serbia's development. In the same way, the old international "law" could do nothing for a land-locked State embarrassed in its access to the sea by burdensome railroad rates along the line of route outside its borders. Compulsory arbitration will always be inadequate to prevent conflict so long as the Court is unable to deal with the causes of conflict.

A Court cannot alter the law. That is the business of a legislature, and we shall have made an immense step in a more scientific conception of the League of Nations when we come to put more emphasis upon the legislative—law-changing and making—side of its task, and less upon its juridical and coercive side. For force itself can only be employed against an offender when there is agreement between the various parties using the force as to what the law should be. Our very alliances are menaced with disruption and incapacity to unite their forces so long as the causes of conflict remain unremoved. Again, that removal is a task legislative in its character.

Why is the Body of Delegates likely to prove an unsuitable organ of international legislation? Because it represents States, not people. Britain must cast one vote on a given question: a Conservative capitalist employer and a Socialist worker, in flat contradiction the one with the other on every principle, must both vote in the same lobby as an effective representation of the 45,000,000 people of Great Britain. Such a system reduces popular representation to an absurdity. In practice the members of the proposed Body of Delegates will, in fact, be the nominees of the executive branch of their Governments, since even if one represents opposition parties, the three must vote as one. This means that Cabinet opinion alone has voting power. Thus, while the most elementary of democratic precaution denies legislative powers to the executive at home, that executive—or even its nominees—has complete legislative power when it comes to the most important legislation of all, that concerning the conditions which determine war or peace.

The Body of Delegates as at present devised in the Covenant accepts the principle that all States are equal: the United States will have three delegates voting as one, Nicaragua will have three voting as one, which means that every citizen of Nicaragua will have 1,139 times (or some such multiple) the voting power in international affairs than has

the American citizen. The equality of States means the inequality of men.

Yet the small nations for whose survival the War has, in a sense, been waged, will fight for the maintenance of the principle of State equality somewhere in the world constitution. There must be some organ giving every small State representation. To increase the number of delegates all round does not get over the difficulty. The only way out is some application of the principle embodied in the American Constitution: there must be one body in which all the States are represented by an equal number of delegates, another in which the *people* are proportionately represented. Thus, while in the American Senate a little State like Rhode Island has as many representatives (two) as a great State like Pennsylvania, in the House of Representatives, the latter State has thirty-two representatives as against the former's two. Ultimately some such device must be employed in the representation of the Nations. Details are difficult, but not impossibly so.

Why is the representation of minority, or "opposition," opinion important? Because, as we have seen, one opinion or one vote can never fairly represent a country. Even the Covenant recognises this when it comes to deep realities like the representation of Labour and Capital. In the arrangements for representation on the Labour Charter both Employers and Labour from each country have representatives. But what would be the use of there being a Labour representative and an Employers' representative if both had to vote as one? This is so obvious that in the case of this particular Labour Parliament the delegates have the right to vote as individuals. But in the League of Nations itself each country must give one vote—Labour, Capitalist, Conservative, Socialist, all must somehow vote in agreement as "Nations."

There is a further point. The Opposition of to-day may be the Government of to-morrow, and because no Governmental party can, in fact, speak for a whole nation, many Governments (and not alone in Russia) represent a minority. If the American Congress had been represented in Paris Mr. Wilson's Congressional difficulties would have been less. The Prinkipo suggestion was a blundering attempt to meet the need for hearing all political parties. In a Europe in flux, as Europe will be for a generation, perhaps, it will be extremely difficult to say whether a given Government represents the nation. Who will say that such and such a Finnish or Ukrainian Government is more representative than a previous one? To say that only the Governmental parties will be represented is to put a premium upon rebellion and secession, for the rule is a standing temptation to a political group to seize power by force as the only means of securing any representation whatever internationally; and to a disaffected area to secede, and so become a State with voting power in the world's affairs.

As for class interests—the vast groupings that cut clean athwart national frontiers—some plan of "minority" representation is the only means of securing their constitutional expression, as it is the best means of attenuating the rigidity and harshness of national frontier lines.

### **Labour Party Memorandum.**

In this connection the reader may be referred to some notes on "A Parliament of the League of Nations" included in the Labour Party Memorandum on "International Labour Legislation" (price, 1s.),

Section XI. It seems worth while to reproduce here the following passages :—

“ If a joint Cabinet is to administer, it seems to follow that a joint Parliament must be created to criticise its work.

“ So long as international action is confined only to Governments, it may be doubted whether we shall ever escape from the obsession of force. It is a fiction that any Premier or Foreign Secretary represents a nation. He represents the nation as Power. It does not think unanimously. It acts, however, as a single force, because its army, fleet, and treasury obey a single command. The real divisions of class and opinion which make the life of the nation are obliterated before this artificial unity is achieved. The result will be that on these councils of Cabinets the true solidarity of human masses, which think alike across frontiers, will not be reflected. There will be coalitions based, after bargaining, on assumedly national interest, i.e., on the interests of the ruling class, but there will be no genuine associations based on common principles. The real basis of internationalism, the common thoughts and interests of populations, will not be reflected.

“ The only organ which could give this reflection would be a genuine Parliament, based on proportional representation. That would at once bring together common opinions and common interests across national frontiers. A Socialist Party would at once be formed, then, perhaps, a Clerical Party, and gradually other shades would coalesce. The result would be to diminish the importance of the State as power, and to emphasise the sovereignty of opinion. The class line of cleavage would be seen to be international, and a great step would be gained in emancipating the workers from the obsessions of a narrow nationalism. Precisely for this reason our opponents will resist, and we ought to promote the idea.

“ Two methods of choosing the League's Parliament are conceivable. One is by direct election, proportionally, on a basis of population, with very large constituencies, which might be entire nations. By far the easier plan would be that the popular House in each national Parliament should elect the national delegation by proportional representation. Thus each national delegation would reflect the composition of the Parliament. If the Parliament itself were fairly elected, the result would be a reasonably exact mirror of national opinion.

“ It might be convenient to create European, American, and Asiatic Chambers of the League's Parliament, from which large delegations would be sent to compose the World Parliament.

“ The assembly so constituted would at first be deliberative only. It should have the right to call before it spokesmen of the Executive of the League, and of all its Commissions, to receive their reports, to question them, to interpellate them, and to record its opinions by vote. It ought also to have the right of initiative to suggest new administrative departures to the executive, or to draft new proposals of legislation, for submission to the Conference of Governments. Certain limits to its powers are obvious. It could not dismiss the Executive (though it might censure it), for it could not overturn the Cabinets of the constituent States. Neither could it tax, unless the League should invent certain international sources of revenue. Nor could it legislate, though it might propose legislation to be afterwards ratified by the national Parliaments. It would, none the less, exert an enormous moral power, and more swiftly than any association of Governments, would mould opinion to accept the international idea. Eventually, after a long period of evolution, it might become strong enough to set up its own Executive and transform the League into a true federation. •

“ Our 'Internationale' would remain a powerful instrument of organisation and agitation. It could never control the League, however, unless, indeed, we look forward to the revolutionary triumph of the Soviet idea. Those who reject that conception are bound to work for the democratic evolution of the League of Nations on the basis of Parliamentary forms.”

#### RECOMMENDATIONS.

*“ That the Conference shall propose the inclusion in the governing machinery of the League of Nations of a Deliberative International Parliament, composed of delegations chosen by proportional representation from each national Parliament. Its functions should be to create an international public opinion, to bring it to bear upon the Executive and Commissions of the League in their administrative action, and to prepare drafts or suggestions of international legislation for the Conference of the League.”*



So much for the two points of the immediate admission of Germany and the machinery of representation. There remains the no less important question of the relation of the League to the economic government of the world. This is dealt with in part in this Handbook, under the heading of the general economic clauses of the Treaty. On this point, also, the reader is referred to Sections XII. and XIII. of the Labour Party "Memorandum on International Legislation." The following passages thereof are here reproduced for his convenience :—

" It is of the utmost importance, if the League of Nations is to be a reality and not merely an association of diplomatists, that its economic structure should receive fully as much attention as its political structure. The League of Nations that is required is not merely an *ad hoc* association for the prevention of war by conciliation or arbitration, but at least the groundwork of a real system of international co-operation in peace as well as in the prevention of disputes. This means that the economic functions of the League must be clearly defined, and that every effort must be made to preserve those forms of war-time co-operation, which are at once valuable and capable of being incorporated in the permanent structure of the League.

" This is essential even if a narrow point of view is taken and the problem is considered only in its bearings on the proposed international Labour Charter. International Labour legislation has little chance of real success unless it forms a part of a wider system of international economic co-operation."

" There is an inclination in some quarters to press for the establishment of a Labour section of the League of Nations, entirely divorced from any economic section which may be established to deal with trading and economic questions generally. To adopt this policy would be a great mistake, and would doom the Labour section to comparative ineffectiveness. As soon as any attempt is made to establish by means of an international Labour Charter minimum Labour conditions and rights in all countries, it is seen that each proposal made raises intricate economic questions, which go far beyond the narrower sphere of merely Labour legislation. For instance, the question of international competition at once arises, and it is impossible to get States to agree to reasonable Labour conditions as long as international economic policy is conducted on lines of unrestricted competition and virtual 'warfare' between the various States. Labour questions cannot be divorced from questions of markets, and the only basis upon which an effective international Labour Charter can be built up is that of international co-operation in the economic sphere as a whole."

" It is not, however, enough to ensure the continuance of economic co-operation during the emergency period, except in the sense that such continuance will go a long way to ensure the permanence of the machinery when once its benefits have been generally appreciated. It is also necessary to make this international machinery an integral and permanent part of the structure of the League of Nations. This does not mean that systems of international rationing of materials must be retained when the supplies are enough for all, and when the credit position is such that they are actually being fairly allocated without international interference. But it does mean that the League of Nations must have permanent machinery for ensuring that these conditions are maintained. Among the necessary functions of this economic section of the League would be the following :—

" 1. To assist in the maintenance of credit, i.e., purchasing power, in the various countries at such a level as will ensure (a) a fair allocation of supplies of materials, etc.; (b) stimulation of supply of important materials by promoting production in the various countries; (c) no unnecessary disturbance of world market conditions through a breakdown of purchasing power in a particular country owing to preventable causes.

" 2. To prevent exploitation by trust, operating in the world market, whether of interests concerned in production, transport, or distribution, and to control the operations of international firms and combines.

" 3. To regulate the granting of concessions in undeveloped countries, and to safeguard such countries from unfair exploitation or monopolisation by particular interests.

" 4. To secure the enforcement of international conventions, in the matter of the open door and other matters, and to prevent their evasion by secret rebates, concessions, etc.

" 5 To promote international economic conventions based on the widest possible measure of international co-operation, e.g., commercial treaties, Labour conventions, traffic agreements, and so forth.

" 6. To undertake the international allocation of supplies of which there is a shortage, or which are in danger of being monopolised by a particular nation or interest to the detriment of others.

" 7. To promote the formation of international conferences or Councils in various industries and economic groups, in order to secure the greatest possible measure of co-operation in each industry or group."

## CHAPTER II.

### RESPONSIBILITY AND PUNISHMENT.

The Treaty is in flagrant violation of the principles enunciated not only by Labour, but by President Wilson.

There are certain points in the problem of responsibility and punishment upon which the great Inter-Allied Labour Bodies are in practical agreement. They are these :—

1. Reparation is due from Germany for the devastation caused by the War.

2. The immediate responsibility for the War rests with the former Imperial Government of Germany.

3. "The profound general causes of the European Conflict, itself a monstrous product of the antagonisms which tear asunder capitalist society, and the aggressive policy of colonialism and imperialism, against which Socialism has never ceased to fight, and in which every Government has its share of responsibility" (1) cannot be ignored.

4. Distinction must be made between the guilt of an autocratic Government acting in secret, uncontrolled by popular institutions, and the guilt of the people as a whole, often deceived as to the facts of the war, and who, in many cases, as the result of this deception, honestly (however mistakenly) believed that War to be defensive.

5. Clear distinction should be made between the Peace policy, which might be necessary in the case of a reactionary German monarchy and that which it would be safe and wise to adopt towards a revolutionary Socialist Republic. To declare that whatever Germany may do in the way of democratization will make no difference in the Allied treatment of her is to aid German reaction and to be false to many Allied declarations.

6. Punishment, as distinct from reparation, should fall, not upon the nation as a whole, which necessarily includes very many completely innocent persons (as the children, the politically uninstructed), but upon the guilty individuals (to which ever side they may belong) impartially and justly tried.

These principles are revealed in the following declarations :—

*"On the question of reparation, Labour always insisted that Germany must make full reparation for the wanton destruction in all the Allied countries, and we consider that the payment by Germany of the sum of 5,000 millions is not excessive in view of the damage done."* (2)

*"The invasion of Belgium and France by the German Armies threatens the very existence of independent nationalities, and strikes a blow at all faith in Treaties. In these circumstances a victory for German Imperialism would be the defeat and destruction of democracy and liberty in Europe."* (3)

(1) Quotation from resolution of the Inter-Allied Conference of Feb., 1915, repeated and re-approved in the Conference of Feb., 1918.

(2) Manifesto of the National Executive of the Labour Party and Parliamentary Labour Party.

(3) Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference, Feb. 14, 1915, repeated and re-affirmed at Inter-Allied Conference. Feb., 1918.

"The Conference declares that whatever may have been the cause of the outbreak of war, it is clear that the peoples of Europe, who are necessarily the chief sufferers from its horrors, had themselves no hand in it."

"The Socialists of Great Britain, Belgium, France, Italy, and Russia do not pursue the political and economic crushing of Germany; they are not at war with the peoples, but only with the Governments by which they are oppressed." (1)

"The Berne Conference acknowledges that, so far as it is concerned, the question of the immediate responsibility for the war has been made clear, both by the discussions and by the declaration of the German Majority, affirming the revolutionary spirit of New Germany and its complete separation from the old system which was responsible for the war.

"In welcoming the German Revolution and the development of Democratic and Socialist institutions which it involves, the Conference sees the way clear for the common work of the International.

"The further declaration made by the German delegates in the course of the debate on the League of Nations, has convinced the Conference that, from now onward, the united working classes of the whole world will prove the most powerful guarantee for the suppression of all militarism and of every attempt to destroy international democracy." (2)

Mr. Wilson's statements in this connection are worth quotation.

After the American declaration of war upon Germany he said:—

"We have no quarrel with the German people. . . . It was not upon their impulse that their Government acted in entering this War. It was not with their previous knowledge or approval. . . . The American people have suffered intolerable wrongs at the hands of the Imperial German Government, but they desire no reprisal upon the German people, who have themselves suffered all things in this war, which they did not choose.

"The people of Germany are being told by the men whom they now permit to deceive them and to act as their masters that they are fighting for the very life and existence of their Empire, a war of desperate self-defence against deliberate aggression. . . . No one is threatening the . . . peaceful enterprises of the German Empire. . . . The wrongs, the very deep wrongs committed in this war . . . cannot and must not be righted by the commission of similar wrongs against Germany and her allies."

"Punitive damages, the dismemberment of empires, the establishment of selfish and exclusive economic leagues, we deem inexpedient, and in the end worse than futile; no proper basis for a peace of any kind, least of all for an enduring peace."—Reply to the Pope, August 27, 1917.

"They (the American people) insist that the war shall not end in vindictive action of any kind; that no nation or people shall be robbed or punished because the irresponsible rulers of a single country have themselves done deep and abominable wrong. It is this thought that has been expressed in the formula: 'No annexations, no contributions, no punitive indemnities.' . . . We shall be free to base peace on generosity and justice to the exclusion of all selfish claims to advantage on the part of the victors. No one is threatening the existence or the independence or the peaceful enterprise of the German Empire. . . . No representative of any self-governed nation will dare disregard it (the opinion of the world) by attempting any such covenants of selfishness and compromise as were entered into at the Congress of Vienna."—Address to Congress, December 4, 1917.

The reasons for the distinctions made by the Labour Party, and for the adherence to the principles enumerated by it, and the Allied statesmen just quoted, are obvious.

(1) Memorandum on War Aims, Inter-Allied Conference, 1918.

(2) Berne Conference, 1919. The declaration of the German Majority referred to, whose declaration was embodied in the report adopted by the Conference, was in these terms: "By the revolution the German proletariat has overthrown and destroyed the old system which was responsible for the war. German Democracy, however one may judge its policy in detail during the war, has now, by its action, shown its firm determination to devote all its strength to the reconstruction of the world ruined by war, and to fight in the spirit and service of the International, side by side with the Socialists of all countries, for the realisation of Socialism within the League of Nations."

While it is true that even a Treaty strictly conforming to these principles would still bear very hardly upon the German people, and appear harsh to them, it would not be a permanent bar to peace. It would stand the test of examination by a Germany recovered from the bitterness of war and defeat, and would ultimately be no obstacle to a better temper. If, on the other hand, these conditions are not adhered to, if, despite our implied promises to the contrary, Labour allows revolutionary and democratic Germany to be treated as harshly as would be an autocratic one; if punishments fall as much upon the innocent as the guilty; if all the professions (made not only by Allied Labour but by Allied statesmen) as to our fighting for the freedom and welfare of the German people as much as our own prove vain, then we shall have closed the door to the possibility of German repentance and atonement, and have made just that peace against which President Wilson so eloquently warned us:—

“Victors’ terms imposed upon the vanquished . . . leaving a sting, a resentment, a bitter memory upon which terms of peace would rest, not permanently, but only as upon a quicksand.” (1)

In estimating the character of the Treaty, in this, as in other of its features, we can, it is true, take into consideration the fact that much will depend upon the way the Treaty is interpreted and applied by the Allies. They may not demand their pound of flesh. They may, of grace, accord opportunities, economic and other, to which Germany under the terms of the Treaty has no defined right. But the very fact renders it important for Labour to realise (in order that its influence may be exercised for the purpose of preventing the development of international conditions leading to further conflict) just what this Treaty under the stimulus of commercial greed and national animosities might become.

The terms of the Treaty, as they stand, are in violation of the principles outlined above at least to this extent:—

(1) They disregard the profound general causes of the War so emphasised in the Inter-Allied Conferences of 1915 and 1918, and compel the present German Republic to assume, not merely a defined and limited responsibility for reparation to France, Belgium, Britain, Serbia, and Russia, and the other belligerents, but, by implication, the whole moral guilt for the entrance of even Japan, Italy, and Roumania into the War, notwithstanding the special circumstances of the belligerence of these last-named States; and to assume an indeterminate material responsibility. (2) The terms fail in impartiality in demanding only inquiry into and punishment only of German offences. (3) They set up purely Allied, instead of international, tribunals to try those offences. (4) The failure to accord to Germany assured access to necessary elements of industrial life, threaten very seriously the “peaceful enterprises” of the German people which Allied statesmen declared would be respected. (5) They thus fail to accord what every civilised state accords to individual criminals (as a necessary part of their reclamation), the protection of the law, and the restoration of rights when the defined penalty of crime shall have been paid. (6) The prospective penalty (like that already suffered through the blockade) falls with particular severity upon the women, the children, the old, the invalids, without reference to their special guilt. (7) The territorial provisions create very large “irridentist” German populations.

---

(1) January 22nd, 1917.

### CHAPTER III.

#### REPARATION AND RESTITUTION : ECONOMIC CLAUSES.

Labour for restitution, but against economic imperialism and war after the war. How "selfish economic combinations" create war. A warning as to "Preference." The need for international control of raw material if there is to be equality of economic opportunity. Why Labour is interested in preventing famine conditions in Germany.

The various declarations in which Labour has pronounced for the principle of complete restoration and restitution by Germany have already been given.<sup>(1)</sup> It will be noted that the Joint Manifesto of the National Executive of the Labour Party and the Parliamentary Labour Party supports the principle of a defined and a limited, as against an indeterminate, indemnity.

A word as to the reasons which justify this preference.

It has become quite evident during the course of the deliberations of the Paris Conference that two contradictory tendencies have made themselves felt: the interests that hope to profit by the "capture of German trade" naturally do not desire to see German industry once more in a highly flourishing condition. Yet if Germany is to pay vast sums for restoration or indemnity, her population must be set to work as actively as possible; her industry must be completely re-established. It must be remembered that in order to have means of payment, she must not only be permitted to manufacture, but the goods she makes must be sent abroad. There is no other way by which she can pay the sums whatever the financial mechanism of the thing—the creation of bonds which she shall be compelled to deliver to the Allies or what not—the ultimate fact in the operation will be the export of German goods to Allied or neutral countries. And if the Allies really are to exact the sums commonly mentioned, Germany is destined by virtue of the very demands made upon her by the Allies, to become not only one of the most highly industrialised of modern nations, but the one having the greatest export trade in the world. If relatively small sums only were required, payment might be made by means of ships, coal, potash, building materials, in such a way as not to establish German trade in foreign markets. But if the payments are to go on for a long series of years and to amount to the vast sums represented by any considerable proportion of the Allied debts, the exports will have to cover a very much wider range of goods.

Here, then, is the dilemma of those who would make Germany pay great indemnities and prevent her commercial restoration or development. This contradiction has left its trail over many of the economic clauses of the Treaty.

An important fact in this connection should be pointed out. While the indemnities would go to the Governments, ultimately to individuals who have suffered; the profits of "captured" trade (on behalf of which we may yet find commercial imperialists ready to sacrifice the reparation funds) would go, not to the Government (*i.e.*, the nation) or necessarily to sufferers by the War, but to individual traders.

---

(1) See p. 28.

Germany was ready to shoulder an indemnity of five thousand million sterling (the sum mentioned in the Labour Manifesto above referred to). A definitely fixed obligation enabling Germany to prepare her budgets and taxation accordingly is obviously more likely to produce results than an arrangement by which her indebtedness is practically unlimited, and by which Allied Commissions have power to "take what they can get." If the whole budgetary surplus, whatever it is, is likely to be collected by a foreign Commission, the surplus is likely to be small. It is not an encouragement to thrift or industry. There is more than a trace, both in the German and Austrian Treaties, of an attempt to "dodge" the whole reparation problem by passing it on to the Reparation Commissions, and leaving it to some future time when the public will have other preoccupations. One recalls the promises made by the British Government at the time of the Boer War that great contribution to its cost should be made by the Trades Council mine owners. We are still, nearly twenty years later, waiting for the first payment.

As Labour is sincere in its demand for complete reparation, and as it has, unlike commercial profiteers, nothing to gain by the destruction of German trade, it is in favour of allowing Germany as rapidly as possible to reconstitute its industry in order that it may pay its debts: and of making those definite.

This is in keeping with the attitude of French, Belgian, and Italian Labour.

The National Committee of the French General Confederation of Labour voted unanimously (May 27) a resolution protesting:—

*"Against the continuation of the economic war, and of an undisguised blockade, seeing that all economic boycott is certain to make it impossible for the defeated countries to face the heavy obligations imposed on them by the treaty, and to bring about the continuance of hostility between nations and of international lack of equilibrium for an indefinite period."*

The National Committee of the Belgian Labour Party (see *Le Peuple*, June 5) voted as follows:—

*"The Party declares that Germany, which was guilty of the most unjust aggression, owes full reparation for the damage caused through her misdeeds. . . . But it is important that the amount of the indemnity to be paid should be specified without loss of time. The Party cannot permit Germany to be forced under the pretext of reparation to sign a blank cheque, or a commission, on which she will not even be represented, to be intrusted with fixing, at its convenience and without discussion, the amount of the debt and the method of payment, and with exercising an almost dictatorial authority, which would reduce Germany to a form of economic slavery."*

### General Economic Clauses.

What are the outstanding features of the economic terms of the Treaty?

They may be summarised thus:—

1. The demands made upon Germany are indeterminate, and can in practice be indefinitely extended on the decisions of a Commission on which Germany is not represented. Germany has no guarantee of what may really constitute a discharge of her obligation entitling her to the liberation of her territory.

2. The extent of the demands is such as to punish mainly persons innocent of all war guilt, such as the rising generation (details such as the surrender of milch cows press most hardly upon children).

3. Tariff and Fiscal arrangements are not Reciprocal.

4. They offer no substantial guarantee of economic rights in the matter of raw materials and markets which alone would enable Germany to make adequate reparation.

Some of these features make the Treaty a very great departure from precedent.

The usual Peace Treaty of history opened with a profession that the former enemies desired to live in "peace and amity." It then went on to restore provisionally the old basis of intercourse, the commercial treaties as they stood before the War, rights of consular representation, etc. This Treaty does nothing of the kind. No rights accrue from it to Germans, whether as to tariffs, shipping, and railroad rates, aviation, etc. As things stand, they cannot begin to trade until a whole series of further arrangements is made with each of the Allies. In these negotiations each Ally is free to concede as much or as little as it pleases, to exclude German trade—partly or entirely—or to penalise it in various ways and degrees. The German Government cannot bargain or retaliate, for its hands are tied. It has nothing to refuse. It must, according to the Treaty, grant most favoured nation rates to all the Allies, both as to customs and transport rates. It may even be required to build new railways and canals to accommodate their trade. In return it gains no equivalent rights, *e.g.*, to use the Polish railways for its future trade with Russia, or to use the upper course of the Vistula. The Danube is even placed under a Commission on which German Austria is not represented. It must be recollected that in reconstituting their foreign trade, the Germans must start afresh. All their merchants resident in China, Africa, Turkey, and Allied countries generally have been expelled. This Treaty gives them no right to return. That means that if they can sell or buy at all in these markets, it must be through Allied middlemen. Their exports and imports, since they lose all their shipping, must also pay a toll to foreign shipping rings. In short, they are at the mercy of their competitors, who may choose either to boycott them, or to exploit them. In these conditions German experts reckon that their foreign trade will necessarily be so lamed that about fifteen millions of their population (roughly a quarter) will be unable to earn their bread.

An American critic of the Treaty says :—

"The Treaty gives the Alliance the dictatorship over the industrial system out of which Germany is to pay. This was never stipulated, and is the fundamentally vicious thing in the whole Treaty. By signing away Germany's economic independence, the principle enunciated in the subsequent addresses is torn to shreds: the controls over Germany are not given to the League but to the Big Four, who are free to act on their private interest and discretion.

"The unconditional surrender of German militarism is accompanied by the unconditional surrender of German commerce. But German commerce surrenders not to the League but to English industry. Germany loses her economic independence to her greatest competitor. . . . The Treaty gives France an elastic claim on the surplus of whatever industrial life England allows Germany to have." —(New Republic, May 24.)

Now there should be repeated here what has been said in another connection, namely, that in the application of the Treaty the Allies may show themselves more statesmanlike than the terms themselves; that since neither the peace of the world nor the peoples of the Allied nations will gain anything in the long run by hostile commercial discrimination against Germany and the starvation of her people, those things will not be attempted. But it is unfortunately an unduly optimistic assumption in politics that governments in international affairs will always act in the best interests of their peoples as a whole, unswayed by the special interests of particular commercial groups exercising powerful influence on Commissions and Cabinets; or by national animosities and resent-

ment. The Allies (as Labour at Southport and elsewhere has not failed to point out) had certainly no interest in maintaining the blockade "with rigour," as Mr. Churchill boasted, and in aggravating the condition of famine months after the Armistice was signed. Yet it was done, and has added enormously to the difficulties of the re-establishment of Europe. Economic wars, like military ones, may not pay, but that fact will not prevent the one or the other from taking place. Their profitlessness will only be a deterrent when the futility, from being a fact, comes to be a generally recognised and insisted upon fact, operative in public opinion and politics. It is not possible to pretend that that is the case to-day. Every student of those "general causes" of war upon which Labour has laid so much stress recognises that economic rivalries and discriminations, the monopolistic exploitation of backward countries, the exclusive control of areas containing raw material must be reckoned as among the most potent excitements of international jealousies, intrigue, resentment, rivalry, and war. That is why Labour has always so strenuously condemned economic wars, why, in common with President Wilson, it has always insisted upon the principle of equality of economic opportunity for all nations, upon provisions for access to raw materials, etc.

No such provisions are made in this Treaty. To say that they are not necessary because no nation has any real interest in denying Germany access to raw material is to be guilty of very faulty reasoning from an entirely sound premise. To say that the world has no interest in hampering German industry is a good reason for definitely assuring its needs by international arrangement, as Labour proposes to do; it is a very inadequate reason for leaving Germany at the mercy of its commercial competitors, or those who regard her as their competitor. The very absence of any "self-denying ordinance" or defined obligation on the part of the Allies will make it very much easier for special capitalist interests, advocates of Imperial preference, and so forth, to exploit national animosities and capitalistic avarice to create anew international conditions provocative of war.

Labour's point of view is expressed in the following passage from the Memorandum on War Aims<sup>(1)</sup> :—

*"All attempts at economic aggression, whether by Protective tariffs or Capitalists' Trusts or Monopolies, inevitably result in the spoliation of the working classes of the several countries for the profit of the capitalists; and the working class see in the alliance between Military Imperialists and the Fiscal Protectionists in any country whatsoever not only a serious danger to the prosperity of the masses of the people, but also a grave menace to Peace."*

And consequently :—

*"The Conference declares against all the projects now being prepared by Imperialists and capitalists, not in any one country only, but in most countries, for an Economic War, after Peace has been secured either against one or other foreign nation or against all foreign nations, as such an Economic War, if begun by any country, would inevitably lead to reprisals to which each nation in turn might in self-defence be driven."*

The reasons for Labour's emphasis on the evils of Economic Imperialism as a cause of war are not always sufficiently understood. Yet the logic of it is simple. We give a preference to, say, Indian tea or Egyptian cotton, or Nigerian tobacco, or Canadian wheat. At home

---

(1) February, 1918.



the corresponding increase of prices must be "compensated for" by a preference accorded to British manufacturers in the Canadian, Egyptian, Indian, or Nigerian markets. From those markets, therefore, "foreigners"—that is to say, the American, Frenchman, Italian, Belgian—are excluded in lesser or greater degree. The British Empire becomes an institution hostile to their interests. Every time it expands they, in their view, lose a market. To forestall that, France must be on the lookout to expand *her* Empire in Africa; Japan hers in China; America hers in Mexico—or Canada. By no possibility could development along this road avoid armament rivalry. It is not, perhaps, intended that it should. Already an Anglo-American Naval rivalry threatens to follow the Naval competition which cursed the world in the years preceding Armageddon. We are already at war with one of our Allies of 1914 (or, at least, if not legally at war with Russia, our ammunition is killing Russians); conflict between another Ally, Italy, and one of the lesser peoples, on behalf of whose independence the war was justified by so many of us, grows every day more likely. If the Treaty renders future peace with the Central Empires impossible, so also must the tendencies of the peace even between the members of the existing Allies permanently be impossible.

These underlying causes of explosion are neither abolished nor lessened by the Treaty. In the case of Germany they are made immeasurably worse.

The facts of the situation should be grasped.

#### **Germany's Economic Position.**

The German population was expanding before the war at the rate of considerably over a million a year. The soil of Germany is not rich, and did not before the war furnish food for the population living on it, the country, like England, only in lesser degree, being dependent upon industry and foreign trade for the wherewithal to purchase food. "Iron is bread," as some German economist has put it. The transfer of territory under the Treaty deprives Germany of three-fourths of her iron and much of her coal, and, with her colonies, certain tropical raw materials. Her shipping will have been confiscated. Let us look at these facts in relation to the future security of France, which it is one of our main objects to achieve.

For several generations France has been of stationary, of recent years, indeed, of declining population. It is not a new tendency; remedies have been endlessly discussed in the past with no result; its causes are evidently very deep-seated indeed. The soil of France is among the richest and most varied in the world, producing in the way of wines, brandies, and certain other luxuries, results which can be duplicated nowhere else. It stretches into the sub-tropics. In addition, the country possesses a vast colonial empire—in Algeria, Tunis, Morocco (which include some of the greatest food-growing areas in the world), Madagascar, Equatorial Africa, Cochin-China, an Empire managed, by the way, on strongly protectionist principles.

We have thus, on the one side a people of forty millions with no tendency to increase, mainly non-industrial (because not needing to be), possessing undeveloped areas capable, in their food and mineral resources (home and colonial), of supporting a population very many times its size. On the other hand, is a neighbouring group, very much larger and rapidly increasing (race suicide not having yet set in), occupying a

poorer and smaller territory, and unable to subsist at modern standards on that territory without a highly developed industry, of the essential raw materials of which the smaller group has deprived it, and may, on grounds of self-defence, fearing to be outnumbered, withhold.

How can such settlement affect the future operation of the underlying causes which led to the war? We know that pre-eminent among these causes was the indoctrination of a whole people with a certain theory of life in the world; so that the welfare and survival of nations depends upon their power to seize the means of subsistence; war is part of the inevitable struggle for life in the world, the pressure of population upon subsistence; nations can only provide for their increasing populations by expanding their territory; "biological need," "struggle for bread," and so forth.

It was a false doctrine, as Germany's own success in feeding a vastly increased population by virtue of industrial co-operation with peoples over whom she exercised no political dominion proved. She was feeding growing millions without conquest or extension of territory. The degree of freedom in economic movement which had already come to be recognised as part of the established comity of nations before the war, made it unnecessary for a country to "own" the sources of its raw material as it is for Lancashire to "own" Louisiana, although that foreign State is the source of the raw material of one of England's greatest industries, and the basis of livelihood for millions of English workers. There had already come about a degree of economic interdependence which made the theory of rival economic nationalism essentially false. The needs of all could have been met without sacrifice of vital interest on either side by consciously organised co-operation. And those most concerned—the workers—had so far realised this as to stand in their policies for a fraternal internationalism. Although special groups may have benefited by economic imperialism—as doubtless special groups will benefit by the imperial or colonial protectionism of Britain or France if ever that policy is enforced—the great rising popular parties, Labour, Radical, and Socialist, had repudiated on behalf of the mass of the people any economic interest in conquest.

The Allies were in an ultimate sense right when (May 22), replying to the criticism that transfers of territory deprive Germany of the basis of a large portion of her industry, they say:—

"It would appear to be a fundamental fallacy that the political control of a country is essential in order to procure a reasonable share of its products. Such a proposal finds no foundation in economic law or in history."

But several facts should be noted with reference to this theory that political control of territories containing raw material is of small consequence to a nation's industry. The first, very much insisted upon by the school most notable in defending the theory, is that it only holds good fully if we can assume that a people in occupation of territory containing sources of raw material will in the long run be guided by that people's own best interest and not sacrifice it to the deliberate object of injuring a foreign nation for political reasons. If, as a deliberate part of policy, any of the Allies, even minor States like Poland or Czecho-Slovakia, should in future deny German access to necessary minerals; or if other Allies should deny access to the raw materials of Algeria, Morocco, Tunis, Equatorial Africa; if the growing power of Preferential Imperialists within the British Empire should result in with-

holding the raw materials of the rest of Africa—including Egypt—of India, Mesopotamia (or necessary coal for ships), from the future inhabitants of Germany, present and future, that country will have no recourse under the Treaty.

Secondly, although this doctrine that the political control of territory containing raw materials is essential to a nation's prosperity may be a fallacy, as the Allied note says, it is a fallacy to which the Allies themselves very readily subscribed on occasion. When Germany pointed out that France could have the coal of the Saar Valley, without political control over the population, M. Clemenceau, for the same Powers who two days previously (May 22) denounced the fundamental fallacy, said; "In particular I would point out that no arrangement of the kind put forward would give to France the security and certainty which she would receive from the full exploitation and free ownership of the mines of the Saar."

And what of Persian oil, loans in China, enterprises in Morocco, Mesopotamia; of Italian desire for coal mines in Turkey; of the quarrels between Czechs and Poles over Teschen coal mines—and numberless similar cases the world over?

There is a further point. The changes in political sovereignty wrought by the great wars of Europe during the last few centuries have not, as a rule, involved any disturbance of the titles to private property. This War marks a very great departure in that respect. Coal and iron mines, and other properties, have been taken over by the new political administration, leaving the defeated Government to indemnify former owners. In other words, there has been widespread confiscation by the conqueror. This is a departure from past practice more fundamental than we seem to realise. Even under feudalism the means of subsistence of the people, the land they cultivated, as whole, remained as before. Only the lords were changed—and one lord was very like another. But where, under the modern industrial economy, titles to property in indispensable raw materials can be cancelled by a conqueror, and become the State property of the conquering nation which enforces the right to distribute them as it pleases, whole populations may find themselves deprived of the actual means of supporting themselves on the territory that they occupy. Lancashire starved for want of cotton; Westphalia may well starve for want of iron.

It is possible at least to imagine such a development of this tendency that "the fundamental fallacy" of the Allied note may become by no means a fallacy; that what was false before the war, will be true after. The militarist theories which before were evil errors will have become monstrous truths.

Be that as it may. The truth is that the world as a whole does not accept the Allied doctrine of May 22; it accepts that of May 24. "It is not the facts but men's opinions about the facts" that make political situations. If one side is entitled to demand the political control as a necessary security for access to raw material, the other is in justice entitled to demand the security by Treaty right definitely formulated. That involves an international system or Code of Rights, under which security, fair treatment, and economic opportunity will be ensured to all peoples, whatever the political limits of their State. This neither the Treaty nor the League accomplishes; nor, indeed, does it take the first indispensable steps thereto. While the repressive and pro-

hibitory conditions of the Treaty are exceedingly severe, and while the Covenant of the League which is embodied in it provides elaborately for plans of coercion if its authority should be challenged, neither the one nor the other makes provision for assuring the economic future or the political rights of the countries against which they are in fact directed. The Treaty sets up no rule of international conduct, the observance of which will entitle the German population to any proportionate participation in the resources of the world; it contains no undertaking that future good behaviour will win that privilege; it embodies no Bill of Rights.

Yet precisely this constructive Code of Rights was amongst the most definite of the declarations of policy made by President Wilson. The third of the Fourteen Points demanded (a) equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the Peace, and (b) the removal, as far as possible, of all economic barriers.

The following are other declarations to the same effect:—

“Peace should rest upon the rights of people . . . their equal rights to . . . a participation upon fair terms in the economic opportunities of the world, the German people, of course, included.” (Reply to Pope.)

“It has come about in the altered world in which we now find ourselves that justice and the rights of peoples affect the whole field of international dealing as much as access to raw materials and equal conditions of trade. . . . Separate and selfish compacts with regard to trade and the essential materials of manufacture would afford no foundation for peace.” (February 11, 1918.)

“With a right comity of arrangement no nation need be shut away from the free access to the open paths of the world's commerce.” (January 22, 1917.)

“The principle of public right must henceforth take precedence over the individual interests of particular nations. . . . We are willing . . . to limit ourselves along with others to a prescribed course of duty and respect for the rights of others.” (May 27, 1916.)

#### End of Laissez-Faire.

Labour has recognised that for effect to be given to the principle of equality here indicated, it will be quite inadequate merely to restore laissez-faire and individual scramble in the matter of trade in raw materials. That era has passed as much for nations as for private traders.

The Resolution of the Berne Conference concerning the League of Nations included the following:—

“The League of Nations should have powers which will enable it to develop into an organ controlling the production and distribution of foodstuffs and raw materials throughout the world, with a view to the raising of that production and distribution to the highest degree of efficiency.”

This Resolution is of course in keeping with the general decision arrived at by the Inter-Allied Conference on War Aims of February 25, 1917. The memorandum there passed under the head of Economic Relations agreed, after urging the importance of the principle of the open door and the absence of hostile discrimination against foreign countries, the following:—

“In view of the probable world-wide shortage after the war of exportable foodstuffs and raw material and of merchant shipping, it is imperative in order to prevent the most serious hardships, and even possible famine, in one country or another, that systematic arrangement should be made on an international basis, for the allocation and conveyance of the available exportable surpluses of these commodities to the different countries, in proportion, not to their purchasing powers, but to their several pressing needs; and that within each country the Government must for some time maintain its control of the most indispensable commodities in

order to secure their proportion, not in competitive market mainly to the richer classes in proportion to their means, but, systematically, to meet the most urgent needs of the whole community: 'no cake for anyone until all have bread.'

The foregoing is, of course, equivalent to the demand that certain of the international controls over shipping, the distribution and price fixing of foodstuffs and raw materials, the furnishing of credit, established during the War by the various Allied Governments and exercised through the Inter-Allied Commissions, should be continued. While it is true that these bodies have during the War been little subject to democratic control, they can for peace purposes be rendered accessible to working class and Trades Union representation, and could of course be made truly international in character by the inclusion of representatives of neutrals.

The Memorandum published by the Labour Party on "International Labour Legislation" has (p. 29) the following:—

For the emergency period at least, it is vitally necessary that from the supreme Economic Council of the Allies should emerge a World Economic Council with the function of rationing the nations with supplies while the world shortage and dislocation of normal trade conditions continue. This is essential, not only because both raw materials and foodstuffs and the tonnage necessary for their transport are largely in the hands of Great Britain and the United States, but also because purchasing power and credit are largely concentrated in the same hands. There can be no speedy restoration of the world's economic life unless supplies and the credit necessary to obtain them are placed freely at the disposal of all nations. Failure to do this, which will mean a scramble for supplies between the nations, coupled with a stagnation in most of the markets of the world, even where the need for supplies is greatest, would merely ensure the perpetuation of old economic antagonisms between the nations and the rapid creation of new ones, even among the countries at present in alliance. This would clearly be fatal to every possible hope of a real League of Nations.

The principle here indicated is fully supported by French Labour. The National Committee of the French General Confederation of Labour voted unanimously (May 27) the following:—

*The National Committee protests against the absence of an international economic organisation whose duty it will be to secure the distribution and transport of raw materials.*

*At a time when there is a world-wide deficit, when needs and demands exceed supplies of products necessary to the restoration of normal collective life, the creation of an international organisation for distribution was indispensable. By permitting the maintenance of competition, at the present time, between nations unequally affected by the war, certain of these are placed in an obviously inferior position, and it is to be feared that the constitution of a commercial imperialism will be added to the dangers of an as yet undestroyed militarism.*

*The workers cannot accept that certain nations should enjoy a surfeit of material wealth while others are plunged in poverty.*

The bearing of such a policy upon the objects aimed at in the International Labour Charter is obvious.

International regulation of Labour conditions must be largely ineffective if the control of transport, of the distribution of food and raw materials is left in the hands of vast capitalist organisations working outside Government or popular control, managed by private capitalists for the purpose of profiteering. Experience of the past shows that in any case there will be international arrangements of some kind in such things as shipping and the great staple industries. If such international organisation is not under public control it will be formed under the control of private capital. In the latter case it will be possible for capitalist organisations to wreck any industrial enterprise—wherever

established—into which has been introduced a degree of Trade Unionism, Socialism, or Syndicalism that Capitalism may consider dangerous.

It is obvious, therefore, that the policy of Labour towards the international regulation and controls worked by the Governments for the purpose of the war is that these bodies should not be simply and purely abolished, but that their defects should be remedied and their functions enlarged and democratised for the purpose of peace. These bodies, however autocratic and bourgeois in character during the war, constitute the beginnings of an organised economic Government of the world, an international control that may be made the basis of valuable international sanctions. They represent at least a departure in principle from the old order of individual competition in favour of one of international co-operation on a basis of real need and common welfare. They should be made the beginnings of a constructive international society.

### **Labour's Concern in the Famine.**

All these points were again emphasised in the Resolution on the Blockade voted at the Annual Labour Party Conference at Southport in these terms :

*" This Conference enters its emphatic protest against the method of starvation, especially when used against women and children, as an instrument of government policy, and views with grave anxiety the effects of the blockade on Central Europe in bringing the horrors of famine upon the great masses of the population in those countries. It protests further against the failure to provide in the Peace Treaty either for the restoration of industry throughout Europe with equality of fiscal treatment, or for any adequate international control of raw materials and food. It urges that the administration of the Supreme Economic Council dealing with the distribution of raw materials and food supplies, and the management of finance, should be made more democratic by the inclusion of representatives of the international working-class movement; and that full publicity be given to its proceedings."*

The Labour Committee of the " Save the Children Fund " issues a brief statement bringing out Labour's concern in the famine and the ineffectiveness of the mere raising of the blockade. It says :—

The famine that now rages will not be stopped by " permitting the importation of food " if, at the moment of granting that permission we take away the only means of getting food, the means of paying for it, or of transporting it. Without ships, or rolling stock, or iron, or coal, or needed raw material it will be impossible for Central Europe to grapple with the famine. There are such losses the world over to make up that nothing but normal conditions and getting back to work will suffice. *The Treaty won't ensure that unless you insist.*

The Treaty places Germany's foreign trade, and even her internal industry in the hands of her commercial Capitalist competitors. It is her trade rivals who will decide the amount of food, raw material, shipping, credit, she is to receive.

There are powerful influences at work that will try and use the economic clauses of the Treaty to prevent, in the interests of " trade rivalry," the re-establishment of industry in Central Europe—the only thing which now can stop the famine. And however Capitalism may profit by the starvation of Germany, Labour will lose. For famine will mean :—

(1) *Reduction, or extinction, of Restitution or Indemnity.*

Mr. Hoover (June 9, 1919) points out:—

“Of the 70 millions of Germans, some 25 or 30 millions lived before the war by trade, by the import of raw material, and by exports in exchange for food and other necessities, and these cannot be supported on the land. How they will pay the indemnity and at the same time secure credits for raw materials is the problem for the Commission. . . . If they do not get raw material and food they will never be able to pay the indemnities.”

(2) *Reduction in the standard of living for the workers throughout half of Europe:* Obviously.

(3) *The forced emigration of millions of workers into the more fortunate areas.*

Mr. Hoover says: “One possibility that must not be overlooked is that 10 or 12 millions of this (German) population may emigrate eastward or overseas under the economic pressure which will be their fate at best.”

(4) *Servile conditions of Labour in large areas.*

In the transfer of territories, especially mining areas contemplated in the Treaty, great numbers of workmen will be placed under the control of alien governors enforcing an alien rule, and so compelled to employ “stern” measures of order—threatened by famine.

(5) *Economic discrimination against Socialist or Workers’ Governments.*

The measures taken by great organisations—necessarily under capitalistic influence—for controlling and limiting Germany’s trade, industry, shipping and finance, will also be used, unless held in check by Labour influence, for discriminating against Governments that attempt to give Labour a larger share of the products of industry or to increase its part of control. Where shortage is severe the “undeserving” are apt to be left out.

(6) *Greatly increased difficulties in the international co-operation of Labour throughout the world.*

Should British workers acquiesce in measures involving the starvation of those in Germany who are now attempting to establish a democratic Republic, or those in Hungary who have already established an orderly workers’ Republic, the faith of these nascent democracies in the possibility of future co-operation with the western democracies will have been utterly shattered. German militarists would not fail to point out that a disarmed German Republic was being treated by British workmen as badly as any autocratic Germany could be treated; that all the promises of reconciliation and co-operation, if only Germany would change her system, had proved an illusion. The parties who stood for military power as the only means by which the country could secure the right even to feed its population would inevitably gain in influence. This would mean, ultimately,

(7) *Counter-revolution and the revival of militarism in Central Europe—and thus everywhere.*

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### BOUNDARIES OF GERMANY AND GERMAN-AUSTRIA.

In what respects the changes of frontier violate the principle of nationality and the right of all peoples to means of subsistence. The unsatisfactory nature of the plebiscites. The violation of the rights of German Austrians.

The Berne Conference protested against:—

1. *The right of the victor to the spoils of war, and all the agreements whereby States have been drawn into the war by the promise of an increase of territory at the expense of other nations.*

2. *The determination of frontiers according to strategical interests.*
3. *Forced or veiled annexations on the ground of so-called historic rights or of alleged economic necessities.*
4. *The recognition of "faits accomplis" by the military occupation of disputed territories.*
5. *The establishment of any economic or political sphere of influence.*

The Allied Memorandum on War Aims (February, 1918) states:—

*The new Treaty of Peace, in recognising that Germany, by her declaration of war of 1914, has herself broken the Treaty of Frankfurt, will make null and void the gains of a brutal conquest and of the violence committed against the people.*

*France, having secured this recognition, can properly agree to a fresh consultation of the population of Alsace and Lorraine as to its own desires.*

*The Treaty of Peace will bear the signatures of every nation in the world. It will be guaranteed by the League of Nations. To this League of Nations France is prepared to remit, with the freedom and integrity of a popular vote, of which the details can be subsequently settled, the organisation of such a consultation as shall settle for ever, as a matter of right, the future destiny of Alsace and Lorraine, and as shall finally remove from the common life of all Europe a quarrel which has imposed so heavy a burden upon it.*

Alsace-Lorraine is handed back to France without consultation of her population, without effective guarantee of the private rights of remaining German citizens; without any provision (such as that which is made in favour of France should the Saar Valley return finally to Germany) for German access to iron-ore fields which have heretofore furnished two-thirds of the ore required by German industry. German-Austria is not to be free to unify herself with the main German stock, although she is now a little State of six millions, which cannot be economically self-supporting, and has by a unanimous vote of its Reichstag, confirmed in the February elections, declared for union with Germany. This is vetoed by the Treaty.

The German districts of Czecho-Slovakia are (by arrangements which Germany is compelled to agree to beforehand) refused the right of self-determination; a similar refusal is made in the case of the Germans of the Austrian Tyrol. Together they form a population as large as that of Ireland. If to those we add the German districts that go to Poland we get a German "irredentist" population several times as great as the population of Alsace-Lorraine, whose separation from France was so large a factor in preventing, during half a century, the establishment of European peace.

Where plebiscites are granted they are to be under the management of a Commission appointed by the Allies, as are also the regulations giving East Prussia access to and use of the Vistula, and not under the League of Nations or Commissions on which Germany is represented. The purely German city of Dantzig is placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations, but is controlled in its customs and foreign affairs by Poland. For 15 years territory West of the Rhine is placed under foreign occupation, the termination of which is subject to the fulfilment of the Treaty, which many regard as quite impossible to fulfil, an occupation which places for nearly a generation under alien military rule a large section of a people now struggling towards republicanism, democracy, and Socialism.

These items demand some expansion.



### The Saar Valley.

It is true that in the final treaty some of the provisions of the draft treaty against which the Joint Manifesto of the National Executive and the Parliamentary Labour Party (June 5) protested, have been amended. But the remaining provisions still justify the objections made in the Manifesto to even a provisional cession of the territory.<sup>(1)</sup> The German Government has no representation on the Commission which will administer the territory; the French Government or a French Syndicate will be the sole employer in the chief industry of the territory, and can import foreign labour at its discretion; is to have the right of establishing schools and of imposing the French language therein; and of creating charitable institutions. And finally, although the Treaty provides that those resident in the territory at the date of the Treaty may have the right to vote, it does not provide that no one else shall. These facts should be considered in conjunction with certain features which are already characterising the military occupation of the Left Bank of the Rhine.<sup>(2)</sup>

The protest of the French "General Confederation of Labour" against this feature of the Treaty is particularly notable. The National Committee of the Confederation, on May 27, voted unanimously the following resolution:—

*"As regards the Saar Valley, the National Committee denounces the economical and political disputes, which cannot fail to arise between the workers in this district and the authorities in occupation. The French workers owe it to themselves to protest against the slavery which the workers will have to endure when under a Government about which they have not been consulted."*

### Danzig, West Prussia and Poland.

The Joint Manifesto of the National Executive of the Labour Party and the Parliamentary Labour Party says:—

*"In the delimitation of the frontiers of the new Polish State violence is done to the right of the people to determine their national allegiance. Thus, there is a contravention of President Wilson's 'Thirteenth Point,' which lays it down that the new Polish State should only contain genuinely Polish elements."*

The Permanent Commission of the International (Amsterdam, 1919) passed the following Resolution:—

*It is important to reject all proposals to take from Germany territory, forming part of the Eastern and Western provinces of Prussia and inhabited by Germans, in order to cede it to the Polish State, with the object of giving the latter access to the Baltic Sea.*

*The River Vistula affords the Polish State free and assured access to the sea by the conversion of the German town of Danzig, where two per cent. of the inhabitants are Polish, into a free port under the control of the League of Nations.*

The Manifesto of the Committee of Action of the Berne Labour and Socialist International (Paris, 11th May) says:—

*"In drawing the boundaries of the new Polish State (the creation of which the Committee welcomes) violence is done to the right of people to choose their*

---

(1) The Manifesto said:—

*"The Draft Treaty cedes to France 'full ownership of the coal mines in the Saar Basin.' The terms of the armistice never so much as hinted at such a possibility. France should undoubtedly receive from Germany a sufficient supply of coal to compensate her for the temporary loss of her own mining resources. This claim can be met without handing over the population of the Saar districts even to a neutral administration."*

(2) See pp. 50-52.

*political allegiance. The division of the German State into two separate parts is dangerous, and will remain a source of trouble and ill-will."*

The National Committee of the Belgian Labour Party (see *Le Peuple*, June 5) voted the following:—

*"By incorporating within a 'Greater Poland' numerous German, Lithuanian, and Ukrainian population, the right of self-determination of the peoples is directly violated, and future peace is seriously endangered. The Party demands that only unquestionably Polish populations should be included in the new State; its right to free access to the sea being fully recognised."*

The Treaty assigns to Poland nearly the whole of West Prussia, thus cutting off East Prussia from the rest of Germany and placing nearly a million Germans of West Prussia under Polish rule. The population of West Prussia is over 1½ millions, of whom only about 500,000 are Poles, who inhabit a narrow strip of land adjoining the River Vistula. The Treaty provides for no plebiscite in West Prussia nor for any other method of consulting the desire of the people concerned, for the obvious reason that if the desire of the people concerned were consulted, West Prussia would remain German.

The only reason which has been alleged for this annexation is the further provisions in the 13th point that Poland "should be assured a free and secure access to the sea." But access to the sea cannot be assured by annexing territory in West Prussia, inhabited by Germans; it can only be assured by the opening of the River Vistula to free navigation. In other words, Poland's free and secure access to the sea could have been assured by making Danzig a free port and by internationalising a free right of way down the Vistula to Danzig under the guarantee of the League of Nations.

The terms now dictated to Germany profess to create a "Free City of Danzig" under the guarantee of the League of Nations. In effect, Danzig is handed over to Poland, for the City is included within the Customs frontiers of Poland, the administration of its railways, postal, telegraphic, and telephonic communications is given to Poland, and its diplomatic and foreign relations are handed over to Poland. Yet Danzig is a German city, and if the desire of the people of Danzig was consulted, in any way whatever, they would by an overwhelming majority elect to remain within the frontiers of Germany.

#### Upper Silesia.

Point 13 demands that "an independent Polish State should be erected, which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations," and this was substantially supported by the Inter-Allied War Aims Memorandum.

The arrangement under which Upper Silesia is ceded to Poland, obviously aims less at applying to that region the principle of self-determination than at depriving Germany of mineral assets. The Treaty hands over to Poland various towns and districts like Oppeln, Ratibor, etc., lying on the border of the proposed frontier, the German character of which has never been questioned. It is true that in the revised Treaty provision is made for plebiscite. The plebiscite, however, is under the control of a Commission composed solely of Allied representatives, and may be taken eighteen months after evacuation by German authorities. There is, moreover, attached to the plebiscite a condition of especial interest to Labour. When the Allies take over the control of the province during the interim period, not only are German officials to disappear (a proper provision), but the Workers' Councils are to be dissolved and

their members "evacuated." These Workers' Councils exercise no governing functions. They are simply trades councils representing the working class. Their members in a dense mining and industrial area like Upper Silesia are certain to be numerous, and may total many hundreds of men. The intention of this condition is obvious. Germany has a prospect of winning this plebiscite only if the organised working class considers that its lot will be happier in semi-Socialist Germany than in decidedly anti-Socialist Poland. Therefore, the Poles demand that all the elected leaders of the organised workmen shall be expelled while the vote is under consideration. A plebiscite ought to be taken without pressure, but certainly not without argument and advice from the natural leaders of those most affected.

#### Malmedy and Eupen.

The National Committee of the Belgian Labour Party (see *Le Peuple*, June 5) has voted the following :—

*"The Party warmly welcomes into the Belgian family the Malmedy Walloons who wish to join us of their own free will. But it does not acquiesce in the annexation of German populations against their will. It demands that the referendum anticipated for the cantons of Malmedy and Eupen should have bona fide guarantees, and especially that the voting should be obligatory, secret, and organised in such a way that the votes in each district should be counted separately."*

#### German-Austria.

The National Executive of the Labour Party in the Manifesto of May 8th state :—

*"In accordance with the principle of self-determination, the people of German-Austria should have free and unrestricted right to decide for themselves whether they will become one of the Federal States of Germany or remain independent; any other solution would be an act of injustice and repression of national impulses that may imperil the peace of Europe."*

The Amsterdam International (April 26) passed the following :—

*"The International Conference recognises that while Imperial Austria, whose régime was based upon violence, was still powerful, the Social Democracy of German-Austria fought for the freedom and self-determination of peoples against its own capitalist classes. To-day, therefore, the Socialists of German-Austria may claim for themselves the right of self-government, which in conformity with President Wilson's programme, belongs to every nation."*

*"German-Austria has the right to determine for itself to which State or Nation it wishes to be united, and above all it has the right to refuse to be subjected, against its will, to another people."*

*"It has the absolute right either to preserve its independence, or, as the majority of the population now demands, to unite the whole of its Austro-German territories to Germany, and to oppose every attempt at separating national homogeneous territories against the will of the populations. The Conference refuses to recognise historic or any other claims of alien nations to sovereignty over such homogeneous German districts or districts which form a geographical unity with German-speaking districts."*

*"The rights of minorities in such districts should be determined by agreement and guaranteed internationally."*

*"The Conference protests, with the Austrian Socialists, against the efforts of those who desire to anticipate the final decisions of the Peace Conference by the military occupation of German-Austrian territory."*

It will be seen, from the facts already summarised, that both the Treaty with Germany and that with Austria violate these conditions: German-Austria is denied self-determination and necessary freedom for its economic life; German-Austrians are placed under alien rule.

## CHAPTER V. COLONIES.

The failure of the Treaty to make provision against the colonial question becoming the cause of future wars in the economic conflicts for raw materials. The inadequacy of the mandatory system.

Early in the war (October 2, 1914, at Cardiff) Mr. Asquith, outlining British aims, said :—

We do not covet any peoples' territory. We have no desire to press our rule upon alien populations. The British Empire is enough for us. All we wish for now is to be allowed peaceably to consolidate our resources. . . . We have no desire to add to our imperial territories over any area or any responsibility.

The German allegation, of course, was that the British Empire intended to enrich itself territorially at the expense of its enemies.

Eight hundred thousand square miles of territory have been added to the Empire—not without creating jealousies, even among our Allies.

The *Avanti* of May 29 publishes the following Resolution, voted by the Italian Parliamentary Socialist Party (41 deputies) :—

*In conformity with the imperialistic nature of this war of victory, the Treaty distributes the territorial, colonial and financial spoils, according to the naval and military superiority of the victorious States, and not according to their needs, thus realising within the alliance itself the hierarchic law of capitalism, according to which the rich become richer, and the poor poorer, with the certain result of the loss of all liberty for the latter and of the creation of deadly enmities, which will be another powerful cause of war.*

The National Council of the Belgian Labour (see *Le Peuple*, June 5) voted the following :—

*The party cannot admit the right of the Great Powers, as mere victors, to appropriate the German Colonies. Determined to claim the guarantee of international control for colonial populations, it protests vigorously against the system which assigns them to the strongest as spoils of war and as profitable chatels.*

*Further, it considers that a dangerous and untenable situation would be created in Europe, by depriving an industrial country, whether Germany or any other, of colonial raw materials and colonial markets.*

The National Committee of the French General Confederation of Labour voted (May 27) as follows :—

*Against the continuation of colonialism, another source of conflict, and against the absence of all international regulation concerning the administration of colonies unto to govern themselves.*

*The solution of the colonial problem, which has in the past instituted a grave element of discord, can only be found in the internationalisation of the exploitation of the natural wealth of new countries, which is indispensable to post-war economic activity, and in the training of the enslaved natives to lead a free and modern life. The handing over of the German Colonies to certain countries, even under cover of a mandate of the League, in no way corresponds to this solution.*

*Moreover, it is nothing but annexation, which is scarcely even veiled, and in which the interests of the natives have not been taken into consideration.*

The National Executive of the British Labour Party in their Manifesto of May 8 state :—

*"As the war was partly the product of frustrated colonial ambitions, and the Treaty makes no provision for equality of trade conditions for all the nations consenting to the peace, any permanent denial to Germany of the opportunity to become a mandatory under the League of Nations must be a cause of jealousy and unrest, leading to further international strife, whilst the increase of colonial territories under allied control will involve a corresponding increase of naval, military and administrative burdens upon the allied peoples."*

The Manifesto of the Committee of Action of the Berne Labour and Socialist international states:—

*"The disposal of the German Colonies and the denial of a mandate by the League of Nations will be universally regarded as nothing more nor less than Imperialism satisfying itself with the spoils of war."*

Labour has had a very clearly defined policy in certain particulars with reference to the Colonial questions in the Peace Settlement.

The Memorandum on War Aims (February, 1918) demands:—

*"The Treaty of Peace . . . must secure economic equality in such territories (colonies taken from any belligerent) for the peoples of all nations, and thereby guarantee that none is shut out from legitimate access to raw materials, prevented from disposing of its own products, or deprived of its proper share of economic development."*

*"As regards more especially the colonies of all the belligerents in Tropical Africa, from sea to sea, including the whole of the region north of the Zambesi and south of the Sahara, the Conference condemns any imperialist idea which would make these countries the booty of one or several nations, exploit them for the profit of capitalist, or use them for the promotion of the militarist aims of the Governments."*

*"With respect to these colonies, the Conference declares in favour of a system of control established by international agreement under the League of Nations and maintained by its guarantee, which, whilst respecting national sovereignty, would be alike inspired by broad conceptions of economic freedom and concerned to safeguard the rights of the natives under the best conditions possible for them, and in particular:—*

- 1. It would take account in each locality of the wishes of the people expressed in the form which is possible to them.*
- 2. The interests of the native tribes as regards the ownership of the soil would be maintained.*
- 3. The whole of the revenues would be devoted to the well-being and development of the colonies themselves.*

The Permanent Commission of the Labour and Socialist International (April 28) passed the following:—

*"The International Conference . . . welcomes the introduction in the Covenant of the League of Nations, of the idea that peoples unable to stand on their own feet should be placed as wards under the protection of the more advanced States that are in a position to exercise the responsibility. It reiterates, however, the proposals for amendment which it has made and brought before the Chairman of the League of Nations Commission in Paris, as follows:—*

- 1. That all colonies and dependencies as above defined, and not merely German Colonies, should be so treated;*
- 2. That the mandates should not be assigned until the League of Nations is fully representative of the democratic nations;*
- 3. That every mandate issued should be definite in the responsibilities it imposes on the mandatory power and safeguard to the utmost the rights of the protected peoples including those of training towards the exercise of self-government.*

*The Conference further declares that the economic opportunities should be open to all nations equally.*

No provision is made in the Treaty in order to prevent the application in the recently conquered African colonies of the same policy of preference, exploitation and exclusion which certain powers have heretofore adopted in Africa. And even if we assume that certain of the former German colonies will come under the mandatory system, the open door will be more than counterbalanced by the closed door of Morocco, in which territory not only Germany but other countries lose international rights as soon as Morocco becomes a French Protectorate.

In the early period of the War, British Statesmen—notably Mr. Asquith in his Dublin speech—emphasised Britain's territorial dis-

interestedness. They declared that Britain's "Imperial responsibilities" were heavy enough already, all that she could bear, and so forth. As the result of the War, however, immense areas have been added to the British Empire—added either undisguisedly, as in the case of the German colonies annexed by Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa—and in somewhat thin disguise as in the case of the "mandatory" territories.

It will be noted that though those mandates are to be held under the League of Nations, the League of Nations has had nothing to do in assigning them. The Allies have assigned the mandates to themselves. A greater air of impartiality, to say the least, would have been given to the transaction if the burden of Empire had been a little more evenly distributed by giving some mandates to neutral States (Switzerland and the Scandinavian States have furnished admirable administrators in certain cases in the past where international control has been advisable).

This assignment of mandates by the Allies to themselves synchronises with a recrudescence of Protectionism and Imperial Preference in England. Persistent efforts will certainly be made by all the special interests concerned to work up sentiment on behalf of a self-contained Empire. Already we have an export duty upon African palm nuts (the raw material of margarine, soap, oil, cake, and other articles) designed to favour British at the expense of foreign manufacturers. Certain Indian products like jute are, in practice, placed in the same position. The list is likely soon to be added to. This cannot fail to create those tariff wars and wrangles against which Labour has so repeatedly protested. At the moment when the British Empire includes something like a quarter of the earth's surface, anti-foreign prejudice leading to policies of exclusion seems to be taking a firmer hold than ever. Yet unless with increase of territory and power goes an increase in the sense of responsibility to mankind as a whole, our Empire may end by becoming, as world empires have been before, a menace to the freedom and welfare of mankind.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

### CHINA.

Japanese imperialism in China and the protests of the Chinese Delegates.

The cession to Japan of the province of Shantung is so flagrant a violation of the rights of the Chinese population of forty millions that it has been the occasion of China's withdrawal from the Conference. This clause is the culmination of the arrangements by which the Allies make themselves the sponsors of Japanese claims in China; a very cynical violation of all the declarations against Imperialism and conquest, the "handing over of people as though they were pawns," etc., etc.

The Manifesto of the Committee of Action of the Berne Labour and Socialist International states:—

*"Nor must the callous handing over of the Shantung Peninsula, with all its resources, and the transference of from 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 Chinese to Japanese*

*economic control, be passed over in silence, as it is a frank recognition of the right of conquest."*

The Chinese National Defence League in Europe published a protestation against the China-Japanese arrangements in the following terms:—

"They were concluded without the *bond-fide* acquiescence of the Chinese people, and extorted by duress . . . .

"The treaties in question are inconsistent with the very existence of China as a sovereign state . . . .

"It will create a dangerous precedent in international law and morality if these treaties are to remain in force. No permanent peace can be hoped for as a result of the formation of a League of Nations so long as these monstrous treaties are not repealed or set aside. Referring to the abrogation of inequitable treaties, Woolsey says: "The only tribunal in the case is the moral indignation of mankind." Again, Hall states: "The requirement, that contracts shall be in conformity with law, invalidates, or at least renders voidable, all agreements which are at variance with the fundamental principles of International Law and their undisputed application."

"That the Treaties of 1915 (like those of Bucharest and Brest Litovsk) have been condemned by the whole civilised world, amounts to being condemned by the 'Moral indignation of Mankind.' Moreover, by breaking the pledges which she gave to England, America, France, and Russia, by putting the immoral methods of Germany into practice in order to filch concessions and rights to which she is not entitled from China, by attempting to make China her vassal state; by taking unfair advantage of China's transitional period of reform while other countries are preoccupied, and further, by reviving the oppressive 'Sphere of Influence,' and by adopting the policy of impiantation and exploitation in China, Japan has rendered these Treaties illegal, for they are in direct opposition to the fundamental principles of International Law and its application."

The Chinese have taken the only means open to them of protesting against what are, perhaps, the most cynical articles in the Treaty. Japan has followed a policy of unblushing Imperialism, and while she may plead that she learned that lesson from her Western Allies, the pupil has shown remarkable aptitude. When Japan entered the war, she gave solemn assurances that she had taken up arms only in order to restore to China what Germany unlawfully took from her. That promise she has quietly ignored, and under a secret pact with her, her Allies have allowed her to ignore it. Worse than that, she has exacted from China an immense list of economic concessions, which virtually reduce her to a Japanese sphere of influence. These were justified at the time as payment by China for the service which Japan rendered her in freeing Shantung from German occupation. In the end she has pocketed this extravagant payment, while keeping for herself the port of Kiaochow and all the onerous German economic privileges in the province of Shantung.

The Western Allies come disgracefully out of this transaction. They persuaded China to come into the War as an ally, against Japan's wish. It was represented to China that in this way she would gain a status at the Peace Conference, and secure their support for her just rights. She did what was asked of her. In particular, she declared war on the Germans, wound up all their businesses on her territory, and expelled all Germans resident in China. This was of course a direct service to Allied commerce. German trade with China was torn up by the roots, and Germany's competitors, in particular the British, are thereby (on a short view) the gainers. China, however, has placed herself economically more than ever in our power. Her reward has been that when it came to the point at Paris, the whole Allied world

backed the purely predatory demands of Japan. Even on the narrowest egoistical ground it would be interesting to know what we have gained by substituting Japanese ascendancy in China for Japanese-German competition. Morally, we have become accomplices in one of the most odious bits of Machiavellianism in all the dealings of West with East.

## CHAPTER VII.

### MILITARY AND NAVAL DISARMAMENT: GUARANTEES.

The disarmament clauses of the Treaty entirely one-sided: no general disarmament. The significance of the Rhineland Republic movement. What a fifteen years' occupation may involve. Militarist activity among the Allies.

The disarmament clauses of the Treaty are entirely one-sided. While conscription is abolished in Germany and Austria, and the German Army reduced to 100,000 men, most, if not all, the Allies retain conscription. The Poles and the Tchechs with a quarter of Germany's population will each retain larger armies than hers. Her fleet disappears. Ours is not reduced. That of America is probably to be increased.

Clause XIV. of the Treaty (Guarantees) contemplates a fifteen years' occupation of the German territory West of the Rhine, with a possible further indefinite period of occupation if, as is inevitable, Germany fails to carry out in full the terms of the Treaty. This Clause, while it does not literally violate any single phrase either of the Inter-Allied War Aims or of the Fourteen Points, only fails to do so because it is so completely contrary to their whole spirit that such military occupation, or even the need for pronouncing against it, was never contemplated in either. It is in fact wholly at variance with the declaration of the Inter-Allied Labour Conference (1918) that:—

*"The League of Nations, in order to prepare for the concerted abolition of compulsory military service in all countries, must first take steps for the prohibition of fresh armaments on land and sea, and for the common limitation of the existing armaments by which all the peoples are already overburdened."*

It is consistent with this declaration, because it logically and inevitably involves the maintenance of huge Allied Armies for the occupation of Germany, and in place of a policy of universal disarmament, a one-sided disarmament coupled with the maintenance of militarism among the Allies.

#### Occupation of the Rhineland.

The Permanent Commission of the Labour and Socialist International (April 26-29) voted the following resolution:—

*The Conference energetically opposes all attempts, open or veiled, to separate portions of the German population from the main body of the German nation, as would be the case if the region of the Saar, the Palatinate and the left bank of the Rhine were detached from Germany. Such attempts would do violence to the principles of self-determination, and maintain a spirit of hatred and discord. They would, therefore, lay the foundation of new wars and violate the principles of the League of Nations.*



The dangers involved in an occupation as prolonged as fifteen years have already begun to reveal themselves in most disturbing form.

A few months after the installation of the French military authorities in the Rhineland district, of which Mayence is the centre, and while the Berlin Government were grappling with all the difficulties of the nascent German Republic, a "separatist" movement, for the formation of an independent Rhineland Republic, began in Mayence and Weisbaden—also in French occupation. It was headed by quite obscure Germans and greeted, both in the Rhineland and in the rest of Germany, with a storm of protest. There was no attempt, even in the French Press, to disguise the fact that the movement had been fostered by the French military authorities on the Rhine.<sup>(1)</sup> An independent Rhineland making a buffer state as an alternate to the annexation of the country to France has been intermittently an openly avowed French policy since the days of Louis XIV.

But the action of the French authorities in the matter—and particularly one feature of it—is particularly suggestive in this connection, and has an especial interest for Labour. The "Proclamation" of the Separatist Government had been met by something resembling a general strike throughout the Rhineland. Reuter's special correspondent at Cologne (June 4) reported as follows:—

"Protests multiply daily against the action of the Separatists, which is generally condemned as not only unpatriotic, but foolish. There seems to be little support behind the mostly unknown men who framed the proclamation.

"In Mayence yesterday a three-days' strike of workmen and tradesmen was started as a protest against the new Republic, and all businesses and factories, as well as many shops, were closed early in the day, while the streets were filled with crowds.

"In Coblenz railway officials and workmen also stopped work for some hours in the morning by way of protest, but resumed work after mid-day. At a big meeting a resolution was passed against a Rhenish Republic, and it seems clear that the general opinion of the inhabitants of Coblenz of any weight is opposed to separation.

"For the rest the egregious Dr. Dorten has sent an explanatory statement of his position and actions to Berlin, but the Government has contented itself with a curt announcement enjoining the population to pay no attention to any orders they may receive from the so-called Executive of the Rhenish Republic."

We next learn, however, that this protest was met by wholesale arrests and imprisonments by the French authorities. The German authorities addressed to General Mangin the following appeal:—

"The French Military Court at Mayence has sentenced twenty-two railwaymen to terms of imprisonment aggregating thirty-three years and seven months in connection with a strike demonstration! These punishments include single sentences to imprisonment for five years. The severity of the sentences has created a feeling of

---

<sup>(1)</sup>The following despatch appears in the English papers of June 7, dated Coblenz:—

"Despite reports to the contrary, the Rhine Republic movement is not making any progress in either the American or British areas, where, in the interest of public order, both military authorities are opposed to any change. The activities of Dr. Dorten are confined to Mayence and Wiesbaden and the rest of the French zone, where he enjoys the support of the French authorities.

"It is now admitted that the movement for a Rhine Republic was fostered by the French military authorities on the Rhine, under the leadership of General Mangin. An attempt was made to obtain the co-operation of the Americans over a week ago, but they refused.

desmay among all classes of the population, especially as the strike was not directed against the French occupational authorities, but against activities of a treasonable nature.

"I therefore appeal to you, Herr General, with the urgent request that, in view of the terrible severity of these punishments, you will mercifully make use of the right of pardon which is your prerogative."

It will be remembered how the German authorities in Belgium pursued a Separatist policy directed at the division of Flemings and Walloons in not dissimilar fashion.

The point is that if, when the period of military occupation draws to a close, we have the proclamation of a fictitious Rhineland Republic opposing re-union to Germany, the fact might well furnish to the Chauvinist and Imperialist parties in France an opportunity of reviving the old French military policy. The militarists would justify further military conflict with Germany "on behalf of the self-determination of the Rhinelanders." The situation would involve the perpetuation of the French military establishment. Intrigues of this kind by military cliques would be all the easier in view of the powers of censorship and police inherent in the state of siege which foreign military Government entails. As it is, German newspapers from unoccupied Germany are not allowed to enter the occupied areas, and all sorts of restrictions upon freedom of movement and communication are imposed. They may be necessary, but they constitute none the less an immense danger to the re-establishment of democracy in Germany itself and in Europe generally.

The matter raises the whole question as to what guarantee for the fulfilment of the Treaty is furnished by a prolonged occupation of German territory. Suppose the German Government does not fulfil the terms of the Treaty; or that poverty and bankruptcy prompt evasion of some of its terms at the end of ten or fifteen years. Will the Rhinelanders still be held under Alien military Government; will the annexation be made permanent? This is the use of human beings as "pawns," the denial of the right of self-determination, the punishment of one group for the offence of another all in one. Would the annexation of German populations, creating new Irelands for France, Belgium, and England, be any less demoralising to the democracies because certain bills had not been paid by the Berlin Government?

### Allied Militarist Activity.

In any case the occupation involves the maintenance, during the best part of a generation, of large armies of occupation by the Allies while exacting the disarmament of Germany. This is in conflict with the declaration contained in the Fourteen Points (Point IV.) in favour of:—

"Adequate guarantees, *given and taken*, that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest possible point consistent with domestic safety."

Instead of "guarantees, *given and taken*," the draft Treaty exacts from Germany guarantees to be enforced by military occupation, involving the militarisation of the Allied peoples and entirely removing the possibility of a disarmament among the Allies corresponding to the disarmament imposed upon Germany.

The National Executive of the British Labour Party in their Manifesto of May 8 state :—

*"We regret that the Treaty, which imposes a drastic measure of disarmament upon Germany, does not include provision for progressive limitation of the armaments of the other signatories to the Treaty, with the object of finally arriving at a general total disarmament."*

The joint Manifesto of the National Executive of the Labour Party and the Parliamentary Labour Party (June 4) states :—

*"In order to secure the concerted abolition of armaments and compulsory military service Labour believes that steps must be taken to prohibit the private manufacture of fresh armaments and to limit existing armaments."*

*"The Treaty, on the contrary, is likely to impose fresh burdens of this character upon the peoples as a consequence of the military occupation of the west bank of the Rhine for a period of fifteen years, and possibly longer. In such circumstances it will be impossible to take full advantage of the enforced disarmament of Germany in order to secure general disarmament and demilitarisation."*

The Manifesto of the Committee of Action of the Berne International Labour and Socialist Conference (Paris, May 11) states :—

*"The limitations imposed upon German armaments are a necessary condition to that general disarmament which the International has repeatedly declared to be the only hope of national security and peace, and which is made more imperative than ever by the creation of large numbers of new small States. The mere limitation of the German army, however, need not weaken European militarism, and therefore the International calls for a declaration that the Allies themselves proposed to abandon their present militarist policy and to reduce immediately their armaments on land and sea. Further, it must be noted that the settlement of frontiers for military reasons and the predominance of strategic considerations in certain of the provisions of the proposed Treaty tend to perpetuate armaments."*

French Labour has protested against the one-sided character of the disarmament terms of the Treaty. The National Committee of the General Confederation of Labour (May 27) unanimously protested :—

*"Against the impossibility of general disarmament, which can only take place if there is a new world-organisation, founded on other principles than those which have prevailed up to the present, and which the Peace treaty is resuming."*

*"Just as the National Committee loudly protested against the persistence of obligatory service at the time when every hand was needed for productive work, so it points out that unless there is general disarmament, the liquidation of war debts is a vain hope, for military budgets, and the charges resulting from armaments will continue to weigh on the people, and to hinder the task of reconstruction, without which there can be no restoration of the ruins which have been accumulating for more than four years."*

The National Committee of the Belgian Labour Party (see *Le Peuple*, June 5) voted in this connection as follows :—

*"The Party asserts the pressing necessity of giving Belgium and France bona fide moral and material guarantees against any repetition of aggression on the part of Germany. It considers that the two countries most directly exposed to a fresh blow should obtain securities, at least equal to those which England derives from the maintenance of her fleet, and America from the actual distance which separates her from the scene of conflict. It demands that these securities should be sought, not so much in the maintenance or increase of armaments on the part of the Allies, nor in the military occupation of portions of German territory, as in a disarmament which shall become more and more wide-spread, and strongly guaranteed by the very growth of the powers of the League of Nations."*

How necessary is this reciprocity of disarmament is shown by the fact that already, the Jingo Press, alike in Britain, France, and America, is exploiting the popularity of military and naval leaders for

the purpose of *increasing* armaments (from beyond their pre-war standard) and rendering conscription permanent. The *Daily Mail* recently published a long interview with General Foch in the course of which the Generalissimo enlarged on the "inevitability" of war in the future and the need of being "prepared for it." This is followed by a booming of Sir Douglas Haig's call for "the training of every man for his country's defence."

The *Daily Mail's* appeal is typical :—

"We all desire peace, but we cannot, even in the hour of complete victory, disregard the injunction uttered by our first soldier, that 'only by adequate preparation for war can peace in every way be guaranteed.'

"A strong citizen army on strong territorial lines' is the advice Sir Douglas Haig urges on the country. A system providing twelve months' military training for every man in the country should be seriously thought of. We ought to be ready to fight in order that we may never have to fight. Morally and physically the war has shown to us that the effect of discipline and training upon the youth of the country is an asset beyond calculation."

In America popular military figures like General Leonard Wood—freely spoken of as republican candidate for President—echo Generals Foch and Haig. "This War has simply been a lesson that war will go on. . . . Pacifists tell lies when they say that war as an institution is dead." He consequently demands an immense American Army based on permanent conscription.

One meaning of all this is generally overlooked. It is an admission on the part of the very persons who demand "severe" and "punitive" treatment of Germany, that such treatment will altogether fail to preserve peace.

Sir Douglas Haig, in his Rectorial Address at St. Andrews, May 14, said :—

"The seeds of future conflict are to be found in every quarter, only awaiting the right condition, moral, economic, political, to burst once more into activity."

Moreover, men of the influence of Generals Foch and Wood are in the position of being able to make their prophecies of never-ending war come true. It is eminent Generals and Admirals of great personal influence in the Councils of Governments, whose decisions are taken without Parliamentary sanction, who are able, with the help of Chauvinistic newspapers, to rush the country into military adventures like the occupation of Petrograd, Moscow, Budapest, and Odessa, or the re-creation of a new military front reaching from Archangel to the Caspian Sea—all of which the *Times*, for instance, is now advocating. Thus, while we are planning the celebration of "Peace," new and vast wars are already being demanded—and begun. Nor is that all. These same forces, made up of an amalgam of private intrigue, newspaper propaganda, and Government irresponsibility, are moving towards the introduction of an Imperial protectionism which must bring the interests of the British Empire into opposition with those even of our Allies.

Mr. Bonar Law stated at the Guildhall that we are now waging twenty-three wars. One enumerates some of them as follows :—"There are ten distinct operations in Russia, one in Siberia, one in Transcaspia, one in the Balkan States, two in Hungary, one in Austria, one in India, one in Kurdistan, one in Arabia. That makes nineteen. Then the Poles are in action against a group of Germans."

Another authority is more precise with this list :—1. We are, in Georgia, defending the Georgians from Denikin and Denikin from the

Georgians. 2. We are fighting in Turkestan and have recently evacuated Merv. 3. We are fighting in Afghanistan. 4. Colonel John Ward and the Middlesex Regiment are (or recently were) in Siberia assisting Kolchak. 5. Our expeditions based on Archangel and Murmansk are fighting in various parts of Northern Russia. 6. Rumanians are fighting against Bela Kun under Allied inspiration. 7. Czechoslovaks are fighting Hungarians. 8. Poles are fighting Ukrainians. 9. Ukrainians are fighting Hungarians. 10. German troops are fighting Letts and have re-occupied the country. 11. Esthonians are fighting Germans. 12. Germans are fighting Bolsheviks. 13. Esthonians, urged by Allies, are fighting Bolsheviks (much against their will). 14. Finns are fighting Russians. 15. Kolchak, with Allied assistance, is fighting against the Bolsheviks in the east. 16. General Denikin, with Allied assistance, is fighting against Bolsheviks in the south-east. 17. The British Navy is in the Baltic assisting in shelling Cronstadt. 18. The British Navy is in the Black Sea assisting Denikin.

---

### PART III.

## RUSSIA, THE TREATY, AND INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY IN EUROPE.

Why the Russian situation cannot be dissociated from the Treaty. Reasons for Labour's emphatic stand on Russian policy: the key to the future of industrial democracy throughout the world. Labour standing not for Bolshevism, but against reaction.

The signature of one of the belligerents, Russia, does not appear on the Peace Treaty at all. Yet the Treaty, and the situation it creates, cannot be adequately dealt with in the absence of that belligerent. Mr. J. L. Garvin wrote recently:—

"The real key to the future does not lie in Germany. It lies in Russia. That is the 'acid test' of the Allies' capacity. There can be no basis of natural stability in the world until a strong and a free Russia is restored and brought fully into the League of Nations."

To this extent he is in agreement with Labour. The 1919 Conference of the Labour Party at Southport passed this resolution:—

*"This Conference protests against the continued intervention by the Allies in Russia, whether by force of arms, by supply of munitions, by financing subsidies, or by commercial blockade. It calls for the immediate cessation of such intervention; it demands the removal of the censorship so that an unbiassed public opinion may be formed upon the issues involved; it denounces the assistance given by the Allies to reactionary bodies in Russia as being a continuation of the war in the interests of financial capitalism, which aims at the destruction of the Russian Socialist Republic and as being a denial of the rights of peoples to self-determination and it instructs the National Executive to consult the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress with the view to effective action being taken to enforce these demands by the unreserved use of their political and industrial power."*

This is in keeping with the declarations of French and Italian Labour. The French General Confederation of Labour protests (May 11) as follows:—

*"The C.G.T. protests vigorously against the expedition in Russia, an Allied country, against which no official declaration of war has been made."*

*"The continuation of this policy of intervention makes France the guardian of the reactionary privileges and institutions of all countries.*

*"The working-classes, the people of France, cannot subscribe to this humiliating and dishonourable attitude."*

Nor has French action been confined to mere verbal resolutions or to Labour circles.

The *Times* of July 7 has a communication from Paris "lifting the veil" which the censor had thrown over certain "regrettable incidents" at Odessa in the operations against the Bolsheviks. The correspondent says:—

"In Odessa, as at Sebastopol, there were but few French troops, and they had to evacuate both places in circumstances which were, to say the least of it, unfortunate. It was, in fact, very largely due to the forbearing assistance of the Bolsheviks themselves that the evacuation was rendered possible at all. The French Black Sea Fleet mutinied. The Red Flag of the Social Revolution was hoisted, together with the Tricolor, and for a time the control of the Fleet passed from the hands of the officers into that of the men."

It was a revolt of French troops against the Russian anti-Soviet expedition.

We know, also, now (see, among others, New York despatches, *Daily News*, July 7, 1919) that the American troops in Northern Russia, as well as in Siberia, mutinied when ordered to fight the Soviet forces.

The Socialist Party of the Italian Parliament (the Resolution passed unanimously by forty-one Deputies), May 17, voted as follows:—

*"That the imperialistic nature of the war works most strongly against the working-class forces, whether these are already organised on a communist basis or are progressing rapidly towards a collectivist regime, is proven flagrantly by the Entente recognition of the adventurer Koltchak, the sinister representative of Tsarist reaction, against the will of the Russian revolutionary working-classes. The result of all this is that, side by side with the intensified class struggle within each State, an international class struggle is appearing, which aims at destroying the hope of emancipation of the working-classes of the whole world."*

What underlies these protests? Why, for instance, did the British Labour Party attach so much importance to the Russian policy as to make it the occasion of the first step towards what would be the most momentous development in the history of British Democracy?

The gravity of the step is justified by the fact that in the Russian policy is involved the whole future of industrial democracy throughout the world. Let us get the situation clearly. British Labour does not approve the methods employed by the Soviets—if reports, which are unlikely, however, to be the whole truth, are indeed reliable. But the present policy of the Government in supporting counter-revolutionary military dictators must ally this country, whether that be the intention of the Government or not, with reactionary forces in Russia. For only by the aid of those forces can the parties represented by leaders like Denikin and Koltchak impose their power. We are fighting, in other words, for Russian parties working to destroy not only the present Bolshevik régime, but any Socialist or Communist régime whatsoever.

Indeed, in the obscurity and secrecy of the Conference there seems to have been evolved very clearly a determination to forbid any people to try the experiment of communistically socialist government and to use our military and naval power—particularly the latter, in its capacity to create or intensify famine through blockade "the instrument of starvation," as Mr. Churchill calls it—to suppress such socialistic experiments. We were committed to this policy by secret decisions, so

secret indeed that while these new expeditions were being prepared certain Governments were giving solemn assurances that under no circumstances would such a policy be pursued. President Wilson declared that such would be the repudiation of the principles he had enunciated, principles which should find their "acid test" in our treatment of the Russian Republic.

Then suddenly the democracies discovered that their soldiers were in Russia fighting the Soviet Republic, that agreements had been made to support its monarchist counter-revolutionary enemies with money and supplies. The Governments, after having by turns denied and defended this course, have now allowed it to be known that our definite policy is to suppress all Governments founded on Soviet or Communist principles. (1)

Yet the British Government itself seems to feel the moral difficulty of its policy in Russia by the line of its defence of its Russian policy. This has always been to minimise the extent of our aid to the counter-revolutionary parties. In defending the sending of men to Archangel and Murmansk Mr. Churchill rested his whole case on the fact that it was designed simply for the purpose of assisting the withdrawal of existing forces. Again and again Mr. Churchill has taken the line that our expeditions to Russia are "trifling," or on the point of being withdrawn. Then why are we mixing in the matter at all? Why repudiate our intervention, if, as is claimed, it is in the interest of the highest humanity? If our aid to the counter-revolutionaries is morally defensible, there is no need to minimise its extent: we should be proud of its effectiveness. If, indeed, as is claimed, it is our duty to rescue Russia from a tyranny, then Mr. Churchill ought to be ashamed to declare that the expeditions are so small. As a matter of fact, it is not the number of men sent out by which the extent of our intervention

---

(1) On 12th April the Vienna Government were officially and expressly informed by the British Military Plenipotentiary that "if riots should occur in German-Austria, the import of food and raw materials would be entirely stopped at once." On April 17th the Italian Mission at Salzburg gave the same warning in the event of a "Communist or Bolshevik rising." The chief Vienna paper hastened to remind the Viennese that "famine of a kind to make one shudder" would ensue. Vienna would have "literally nothing," and "the two million people who inhabit this town have only one common duty . . . salvation from bestial, merciless hunger." The Supreme Economic Council has placed Hungary and Russia outside the scope of its Relief Fund, simply on the ground of the character of its Government.

The London papers of July 14 contain the following despatches:—

"Bela Kun has addressed a long telegram to M. Clemenceau, pointing out that while the Hungarian troops have ceased hostilities against the Czecho-Slovaks and withdrawn to the frontiers fixed, the Rumanian troops have not only not yet begun withdrawal from the Theiss line, on to the specified boundaries, but have undertaken attacks on several places. Bela Kun finally urges the Allied and Associated Governments again to order the Rumanian troops to withdraw, and to get their orders respected."—Reuter.

"The Allies have sent a wireless message to Bela Kun informing him that as he will not carry out the conditions of the armistice they cannot enter into any discussions with him."—Central News.

"According to a Press report from Bucharest, General Franchet d'Esperey has requested the Budapest Government to make place for a Government freely elected by the people, otherwise military action will be immediately taken against Hungary."—Reuter.

"According to the Rumanian Press Bureau here an offensive against the Hungarian Soviet Government is imminent and will be directed by Gen. Franchet d'Esperey."—Exchange.

must be measured, but the amount of ammunition and material and general economic aid furnished to the monarchist counter-revolutionaries. This will be the decisive factor. As the *Manchester Guardian* (June 12) says:—

“ Either we are at war with Russia or we are not. If we are, then the war should be formally declared, and the grounds for it clearly stated. But to make war without doing either of these things is to indulge in something which a rude person might plausibly describe as piracy, and which in any case is something not quite worthy of a nation sedulous for the maintenance of international law.

“ What we are doing is to go about killing men to whom we have never given any reason why we should kill them. Conversely, we are sacrificing the lives of gallant men in our own Army and Navy without taking the trouble to explain to them or to those who are called upon to mourn their loss for what good reason or in what good cause their blood is shed. It is a bad and dishonouring business, of which those who are responsible for it ought to be deeply ashamed, and which the people at large should take every opportunity of disowning and punishing.”

It is ridiculous to pretend, as the Government does, that uneasiness as to the moral justification of our course in Russia is confined to “ Bolsheviks.” It has excited the indignation of a round score of Englishmen, Frenchmen, and Americans—Red Cross men, journalists, Government officials—who happen to be familiar with the facts at first hand. The list includes men like Colonel Raymond Robbins, who was the head of the American Red Cross in Russia, and was for months in close, almost daily, contact with Lenin and the Soviet Government; Colonel Thompson, also of the American Red Cross; Mr. William Bullitt, of the American Peace Delegation in Paris (who visited Lenin on behalf of Mr. Wilson as lately as March last, and who subsequently sent in his resignation); John Reed and Lincoln Steffens, the American journalists; Mr. Arthur Ransome, the *Daily News* correspondent, and many more. They include, also, Mr. Douglas Young, ex-British Consul at Archangel, who, replying in the *Times* (Dec. 19, 1918) to some statements by Rear-Admiral Kemp, writes:—

“ Admiral Kemp divides British opinion on the Russian situation into two classes only, interventionists and pro-Bolsheviks. Does he not realise that there is a considerable body of thoughtful men, Unionists and Liberals, as well as Labour men, of no less patriotism than himself, who are anti-interventionist by conviction and who feel that our dealings with the Soviet Government do not accord with the British tradition of fair play and honest dealing even with an ignoble foe? Can he not admit that the actions of certain British representatives in Russia, with or without the knowledge and sanction of the British Government, gave the Soviet Government good grounds for suspecting us of deceiving them and of playing a deliberate double game? Does he not remember the, to me, memorable afternoon of July 6, when some time between 4 and 6 p.m., in the Presidium Chamber of the Archangel Soviet, he informed them in my presence that, ‘ speaking for himself, and he was sure he could say the same for General Poole, he could assure them that Allied action in the White Sea was not aimed against the Soviet Government ’? And has he forgotten another similar meeting a few days later, when with scowling faces the Soviet representatives communicated reports of high-handed action by the Allied military and naval forces on the western shores of the White Sea, including the shooting of three members of the Kem Soviet? Does he deny that these reports, which were subsequently confirmed, swept away like a house of cards my attempts to reach a *modus vivendi* with the local Soviet authorities? They at any rate were ready until the last to come to an arrangement with us on the basis of the exchange of goods, but they would not sell their birthright—their right to resist our landing except it were done ‘ upon their invitation ’—for an Allied mess of pottage, the food of which they were in sore need.

“ Can we not negotiate and endeavour to remove suspicion and misunderstandings which have arisen, in part at any rate, through our failure to fit our actions



towards Russia to the 'acid test' enunciated by President Wilson? If and when negotiation fails, and the Soviet Government formally proclaims itself to the world as the champion of anarchy and of the extermination of the upper classes, then will it be time enough to consider whether the civilised Powers, Allied and neutral alike, shall proclaim a holy war against this evil thing and call for volunteers to stamp it out, even if it takes 10 years.'

That the British Government at this time, itself felt that the situation called for some attempt at negotiation is proven by the suggestion of Mr. Lloyd George (revealed by the publication in the *Humanité* of a secret despatch to the French Government) to the Allies that representatives of the Soviet Government be invited to Paris. The suggestion was furiously resisted by M. Pichon. Another attempt towards negotiations was made. It was suggested this time that the representatives of all political parties in Russia be invited, not to Paris, but to the Island of Prinkipo. Officially and publicly, the French Government acquiesced, although the Russian emigres in Paris used all their influence to defeat the proposal. They were successful.

We know now (see documents published by *Manchester Guardian* of June 16, 1919) that the Prinkipo proposal was never officially transmitted to Moscow. We know further that whereas all the counter-revolutionary Governments refused, the Soviet Government accepted the invitation on terms most favourable to us (see *Common Sense*, May 10, and Mr. Ransome's "Six Weeks in Russia," pp. 30-42), and that their acceptance killed the scheme. We know further (*Manchester Guardian's* correspondent at Helsingfors, May 27) that Lenin accepted the Nansen proposal and asked for the nomination of Entente delegates. The Allied Governments invited all the *de facto* Governments existing in Russia to a new Peace Conference upon a basis agreed to by all the Allied Powers, leaving only details to be further arranged. The Soviet Government made some modifications, and these were accepted by Bullitt. The open invitations should have been sent out on April 10.

They were never sent out, and the whole transaction was shrouded in secrecy, at the insistence of the Allies. But now (July, 1919) the Soviet Government issues the terms of the proposal, which ran as follows:—

The principal points in the Allied terms were:

An armistice to be declared on all Russian fronts whilst the Peace delegates were discussing the following:—

1. All the Governments formed within the territory of the old Russian Empire to keep their full power over the territories occupied by them, until the inhabitants should declare the form of Government preferred by them.

2. None of such Governments to attempt to overthrow another by force.

3. The blockade of Russia to be raised.

4. Re-establishment of commercial relations.

5. All produce existing or received in Russia to be accessible to all classes of the population without any distinction.

6. All the above Russian Governments to grant full and complete amnesty to political opponents, soldiers included.

7. The Allied troops to evacuate Russia.

8. Simultaneous reduction of the Soviet and of the Anti-Soviet armies to peace footing.

9. All the above Russian Governments to recognise, jointly, the financial obligations of the former Russian Empire.

10. Freedom of residence and movement of all Russian subjects over all parts of Russia.

11. Repatriation of all prisoners of war.

England and America were to guarantee the observance of these terms on the part of France.

The message, of which above is part, goes on :—

Although the Red Army was then on the eve of taking possession of Odessa, the Crimea, and the Don region, the Soviet Government was ready to accept these terms; to accept the *status quo*; in the certain hope that the inhabitants of those parts would, sooner or later, withdraw their support from their reactionary and monarchic Governments.

The Soviet Government was ready to accept, but the Allies withdrew.

The attitude of the Allies towards the Soviet Government is generally defended on the ground that Bolshevik atrocities have been such as to make recognition of their Government impossible.

Several points stand out with reference to that. First, though atrocities and bloodthirsty cruelty were a known feature of the Tsarist Government, that not only did not prevent recognition; it did not prevent alliance. Secondly, the evidence of atrocities by the "White" parties that we are supporting in Russia and in Finland is even clearer, both as to extent and character, than that which we urge as reason for our refusal to recognise the Bolsheviks. Thirdly, we have condemned the Hungarian Soviet Government without even alleging "atrocities." Fourthly, in so far as Governments have managed to secure acquiescence in their policy from inert and tired public opinion, it has been a system of deliberately "cooking" and faking the evidence by refusing to allow publication of the Soviet side of the case and giving extensive and artificial publicity to the evidence of the monarchist parties. The Soviet Government of Russia has never had a fair trial in the court of Western public opinion, which has been distorted by a one-sided and falsified presentation of the case to a degree of which the public as a whole are absolutely unaware.<sup>(1)</sup> While hearing has been refused to the representatives of the Soviet Government, the representatives of the counter-revolutionary groups, mainly monarchist, have had free and ample access to the representatives of the Allied Powers now in Paris; Sazonoff, the Tsar's ex-Minister, is known to be in close and constant touch with the French and British foreign offices.

The British Labour Party has, from first to last, unequivocally condemned the violence which has marked some phases of the Russian Revolution and of its Bolshevik development. But it declines to lend itself to the injustice which would make violence and tyranny offences only to be invoked internationally when they are committed by a revolution fighting for its life, and to be disregarded when committed by dynastic and tyrannical autocracies.

One cannot, unhappily, overlook the fact that the evidence of the "White" Terror in Russia and Finland—the Terror imposed by the military dictators whom we are supporting—is as damning as that brought against the Bolsheviks.

Very carefully analysed evidence has appeared in organs like the *New Republic* (notably July 2, 1919) and the *New Statesman*, showing that the violence of repression and the numbers of executions by the Finnish Government which we have now recognised are proportionately

---

(1) Take the stories concerning the "nationalisation of women." The publication of the Soviet Marriage Law proves the alleged "proclamation" on which these stories were at first based to be a forgery. Yet as late as June 12 the *Times* in a leading article refers to "nationalisation" as though the story had never been exposed.

very much greater than those even alleged against the Bolsheviks. Mr. William Hard writes (*New Republic*, July 2, 1919) :—

"In Finland, in the spring of 1918, when the Finnish Civil War was over, the White-Guard Finnish Government (of property-owners) was possessed of the persons of some 120,000 Red citizens as prisoners. The figure 120,000 is given out by the official White-Guard Finnish Government Information Service in the United States. . . . In December, 1918, the White-Guard Finnish Government issued a certain amnesty. It was to White Guards. It was to those numerous White Guards who had shot Red prisoners without any trial, civil or military. All such White Guards were granted a permanent immunity from prosecution or punishment for any such acts."

Judge Tanner, in a Finnish court, on March 18, 1919, testified that :—

"Altogether the number of the executed and of the murdered among the prisoners, on the basis of reports still very incomplete, is 15,817."

An English correspondent of the *New Statesman*, of London, after a detailed study of the evidence, supported Judge Tanner. He said that "at Lahti 200 women were taken out early one morning in the second week of May and mowed down in a batch by machine-guns." The total number of Reds executed or murdered was from 15,000 to 20,000.

Mr. Hard comments :—

"The Red Guard Government of Russia, in order to equal the White Guard Government of Finland as an executioner and starver of political opponents in prison, would have to execute and starve 750,000 captured and incarcerated anti-Bolsheviks."

Yet we have recognised the Finnish Government and fight the Bolsheviks, notwithstanding that its dictator, Mannerheim, is monarchist and undisguisedly pro-German. When the Finns who had formed part of the German army returned from Germany, Mannerheim addressed them as follows :—

"At the request of the Finnish Government, detachments of Germany's victorious army have landed on Finnish soil to help us drive out the Bolsheviks. I am convinced that this brotherhood in arms will only serve to strengthen the friendship and confidence which Finland has always felt for Germany's great Kaiser and his mighty people. I hope that Finland's young army may become permeated with that lofty sense of duty which has served to create the greatness of the army of Germany. I bid Germany's brave warriors welcome to Finland."

The simple truth is this: even assuming that some of the worst stories of Lenin and Trotsky are true, our policy of intervention will merely compel us to support military and monarchist dictators whose methods are every bit as ruthless, anti-democratic, and cruel. This fact has been hidden from the public heretofore. Only now is the real character of the "Allies" whom we propose to install in Russia leaking out. Even the more conservative French press, heretofore most hostile to admissions of this kind, is beginning to admit the truth. Thus the Special Correspondent of the *Petit Parisien* with Koltchak's armies reveals the secret frankly. "Among the administrative, and especially among the military *personnel*," he writes, "are people who understand a revival of power only as a return, pure and simple, to the system of oppression of Tsarism." They "flog or shoot without trial," he continues, "persons rightly or wrongly held by them to be suspect," and the result is that the peasants and the soldiers who witness or suffer these abuses, begin to suffer from "a tiresome uncertainty as to the utility

of replacing the men of the Soviets by masters who are worth no more." The unhappy correspondent is trying timidly to convey his meaning. In plain words Koltchak's soldiers desert from him, and the peasants rise against him at the first approach of a Soviet army. And this they do, because they have learned by experience that the triumph of Koltchak would mean the restoration of Tsardom.

These things we have long known in a general way. The evidence was ample, but across the great distance and the censor's curtain it usually reached us in an unimpressive form. We have now, however, in adequate length and detail, from a competent witness, a full narrative of what the Koltchak system is. The *New Republic* (July 9) has published under the title of "The Rise of a New Russian Autocracy," a final and decisive revelation from the pen of Dr. Joshua Rosett. His qualifications are undoubted: he was sent out to Siberia by the official American "Committee on Public Information"; he speaks Russian well; he is evidently a good observer, and partly in work for the War Trade Board, partly under the Red Cross, he had, during a nine-months' stay in Siberia, every opportunity for observing events and opinions before and after Koltchak's *coup d'état*. He is, moreover, no admirer of Bolshevism, which he regards as "an historical soap-bubble." His summary of that ruler's performances may be quoted:—

*"Koltchak . . . whom I have seen break up a democratic government in Siberia with a ruthlessness of a Tartar conqueror; who has suppressed free speech and free press; who has either jailed or exiled or murdered every member of the Russian Constituent Assembly upon whom he could lay his hands; and who caused the opponents of his rule of the fist to be tortured and killed."*

Dr. Rosett describes how the news of Koltchak's *coup d'état* of November, the dissolution of the Convention, and the arrest of the elected Directorate, all through the action of the army, gradually reached Vladivostok. He had heard of Koltchak already, from an ex-priest turned officer. This man had been sent from France to start a propaganda for the restoration of the autocracy—not, however, in the person of a Romanoff.

"There is but one man in Russia who is strong enough to meet the situation. He is known to be faithful to the Holy Greek Catholic religion, and he alone can be depended upon to purge the sacred ground of Russia of Jews, Poles, Bolsheviks, infidels, and foreigners."

The Strong Man, of course, was Koltchak. His emissary presently appeared at Vladivostok, and placards all over the town announced that a certain self-appointed Council of Ministers had decided "to hand over temporarily the highest governmental power to Admiral Alexander Koltchak, attaching to him the title of *Supreme Ruler*." There followed a statement from his Supremacy over his own signature: "*This day I have taken Chief Command of All the Power of the Land and Sea of Russia.*" The people of the town were aghast, and Dr. Rosett records their naïve expressions of horror and their forebodings of bloodshed. Next, there followed the solemn publication of articles of the Criminal Code which conveyed to Koltchak all the attributes of the old Autocrat. Anyone guilty of an attempt against the Supreme Ruler, or "of a violent attempt at the overthrow or change of the existing order of government, or at the separation or secession of any part of the Russian territory shall suffer the punishment of death." The punishment for any insult by word of mouth, in handwriting, or in print, against the Supreme

Ruler was imprisonment. Finally, came a truly Oriental Holy-Russian touch :—

“ Paragraph 329 of the Code of Criminal Corrective Punishments.—Any person guilty of the conscious nonfulfilment of an order by the Supreme Ruler is subject to the punishment of being deprived of all rights and confinement to hard labour for a term of from fifteen-twenty years.”

Admiral Koltchak, one perceives, was busily “ making democracy safe.”

At Omsk, every known or suspected malcontent was branded as a Bolshevik and arrested accordingly, including the members of the Constituent Assembly. An attempt at a rising against Koltchak was made near Omsk, and as the official proclamation put it, “ the Supreme Ruler ordered the merciless execution of all persons who attempted to create disturbances.”

“ The simple words of the telegram do not begin to tell the story. The reader may know that the Omsk district is one of the coldest inhabited spots of the world. The December of 1918 was one of the coldest on record. Koltchak's men made use of this fact; they stripped the rebels and drove them naked through the streets, and in agony they confessed the names and hiding-places of their leaders. They were then placed in rows and shot, and their frozen bodies piled into freight cars. Protuding arms and legs were severed with a blow of the axe. The cars were pulled out of town and the bodies dumped in heaps to wait for the spring.”

One of the alleged “ Bolsheviks ” who were thus done to death was a leader of the Russian Co-operative movement, Mr. Meiske, well known during his long stay in London, who was as we imagine most, if not all, of Koltchak's victims were, a member of the most moderate Social-Democrat “ Menshevik ” group.

An anti-Bolshevik witness, friendly to Koltchak, thus describes him :—

“ Koltchak scouted the notion of man's equality, quoting the Papal dictum (Pius X.) ‘ that God has ordained a human society composed of princes and subjects, employers and workers, rich and poor, learned and ignorant, nobles and plebeians.’ Therefore, the rank and file must obey without questioning, or take the consequences. If he had more polish and self-control, Admiral Marakoff told Koltchak, he might one day hope to rival the fame of Nelson himself. But as years went by, Koltchak's temperament became still more pronounced.

“ Even as a middy in the old cruiser Rurik, Alexander Koltchak was dreaded by his men; for he was an officer who swore by the knout and the knock-down blow.

“ His genius for dealing with demoralised crews became a legend in the Imperial Navy, in its troublous and stormy days. His flag was no sooner flown in a new ship, than he called the crew to hear his ‘ Tartar ’ admonitions. ‘ If I catch one of you tripping,’ he told them bluntly, ‘ I shall punish you then and there. I *must*. For if I waited a day I should be angry. If I waited two days, I'd be furious. And if I nursed my wrath for *three* days I'd shoot you at sight!’ These words were snapped with clicking teeth and blazing eyes, and a peculiar motion of the pistol-hand.

“ ‘ Make them all drunk,’ he told a sub-Admiral who brought news of yet another desperate rising. ‘ Vodka can be a great friend to authority.’ ”

There is a painfully close resemblance between the present relations of the Allies to Russia and the relation of dynastic Europe to the French Revolution. That Revolution was marked also by terror. The fact of such terror was utilised by Toryism in Europe as justifying the suppression of the French Revolution as the enemy of order and civilisation. The French Revolution was suppressed. But the attempt to suppress it brought into being the military dictatorship which it took Europe 20 years to destroy, and having destroyed it, it was not the Republic which

was restored to France but the monarchy, and the war against French militarism ended in a League of Nations which in effect declared that such experiments in political democracy as the French Revolution would not be permitted. For British opinion at that time the French Revolution was merely the Terror and the September Massacres, but we know now that that great event was much more than those incidental violences, that it marked something vital and necessary to the developments of human freedom. So now, although we do not approve the methods of the Russian Socialistic Republic, the attempt to give to democracy a new meaning by grafting on to its political forms some method of industrial self-government, however blunderingly that attempt may be made, is an experiment which mankind direly needs. And yet as the war against French militarism ended, in the attempt of the Governments to suppress political democracy, so now the war against German militarism seems to be ending in an Alliance of Governments to repress industrial democracy and just the same cause nearly a century ago when the French Revolution was involved.

The matter is of the deepest concern to the Labour movement. If it acquiesces in the attempt to destroy Hungary's or Russia's experiment in industrial democracy, if it acquiesces in alliance with the Russian Reactionaries to re-establish the monarchist system in Russia—a thing which is now actually taking place before our eyes—it will be open to the charge of having betrayed democracy and that industrial development of political republicanism which the Russian and Hungarian experiments, purged of their errors and excesses, might with sympathy grow into.

---

## PART IV.

### SUMMARISATION.

#### POINTS ON WHICH REVISIONIST EFFORTS MUST CONCENTRATE.

A study of the declarations here reproduced reveals clearly the fact that apart from the American, all the great Labour bodies of the world are pledged to the Revision of the Peace Treaty as it now stands. What method of revision presents itself? How can international Labour carry its declarations into effect?

One or two facts stand out.

One is that full effect cannot be given to Labour declarations until the existing governments of the belligerents have been replaced by others of a more truly democratic character; that indeed a real international peace cannot be established while the national policies of the principal belligerents are in the control of reactionary elements.

While it is evident, therefore, that active efforts towards the capture of political power in every state is part of the process of full revision, those efforts do not exclude resort to the machinery provided in the League of Nations for the purpose of attempting to secure a revision of the worst injustices of the Treaty.

Under the provisions of the Covenant the Assembly may advise the reconsideration of Treaties, deal with matters affecting the peace of the world, and (by two-thirds majority) admit any state to membership of the League.

Labour and Socialist Parties can, therefore, bring pressure to bear upon their Governments by interpellation or by demanding that the Assembly of the League be convened at the time announced for the meeting of the Labour Commission of the League in October.

The points of revision indicated by the declarations of Labour so far made are the following :—

1. Immediate admission of Germany and Austria to the League, and
2. Revision of the Treaties with Germany and Austria on the following points :—

#### ECONOMIC.

1. Sums in reparation demanded of Germany should be fixed, not indeterminate.

2. Arrangements for reparation should not be made a means of annexation in disguise or a means of placing workers under a Government in which they have no share. Saar Valley arrangements should be amended to assure France the necessary coal without placing the population under French rule.

3. The arrangements for securing payment (the Reparation Commission arrangements) should be made by the League of Nations, not merely by the Allies.

4. Germany's and Austria's access to raw materials and economic opportunities should be assured by definite provisions guaranteed by the League of Nations, and not left to the discretionary power of Germany's late enemies and present economic rivals.

5. Arrangements for the control of credit, shipping, food, raw materials should be definitely entrusted to bodies in which the late enemy States should have representation under the League of Nations, instead of being (in fact) in the hands of bodies dominated by two or three of the chief Allies. The consideration governing the apportioning of necessities of life should be the degree of vital need, not the degree of the capacity to pay. (Such international controls are essential to the successful working of any international Labour Charter, and to prevent exploitation by private international capitalist rings.)

6. All economic provisions with reference to favoured nation treatment, railroad transit, internationalisation of rivers, canals, in the Treaty should be made reciprocal, *i.e.*, Germany should be included in their benefits as well as in their obligations.

#### TERRITORIAL.

1. The annexation—even temporary—of the Saar Valley should be rescinded, and French rights limited to the receipt of the coal.

2. All limitations upon German Austria's right to determine her future relations to Germany should be removed.

3. Permission to the predominantly German areas of Czecho-Slovakia to determine their political future should be granted.

4. The same right should be accorded to the German districts of the Tyrol included within the new Italian frontiers.

5. The districts of Western Prussia, predominantly German, should be permitted to remain German, access to the Baltic being assured to Poland by the internationalisation of the Vistula and the making of a free port of Dantzig, whose foreign relations should be under the control, not of Poland, but of the League of Nations, and whose internal affairs should be under her own control, not Poland's.

6. The plebiscites in Silesia and East Prussia should be under the League of Nations, and not an inter-Allied Commission. All provisions, as in the Annex to Article 88 of the Treaty, demanding the dissolution of workmen's organisations before the plebiscites be begun, shall be annulled.

7. In the Province of Shantung, the sovereign rights of China should be fully recognised and protected, and the arrangements which make the Allies the accomplices of the worst form of Imperialism, and which the League of Nations is asked to approve, should be cancelled.

## COLONIES.

1. Equality of economic opportunity in all non-self-governing colonies should be assured under the League of Nations.

2. All such colonies and not merely the conquered German colonies should be subject to the mandate principle.

3. The conquered Colonies should be ceded to the League of Nations, not to the Allies. The mandates should be granted by the League of Nations, not the Allies.

4. Germany should be afforded an opportunity to become a mandatory under the League.<sup>(1)</sup>

## DISARMAMENT.

The disarmament should be made general, not one-sided. This involves a drastic reduction of the period of occupation on the Left Bank of the Rhine. The schemes of disarmament should apply to Navies as well as to Armies.

## LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

1. There should be a constitutional revision involving the creation of a body, distinct from the existing Assembly (which is representative of States as equal units, each being obliged to vote as one irrespective of divisions, as say, between Socialists and non-Socialists within each State), representing the people, as distinct from the States, in the same sense in which the American House of Representatives, composed of Delegates from the people, is distinct from the Senate, which is composed of Delegates from the States. This revision would fulfil the demand of the Berne International for "a central representative organ made up not by delegates of the executive branches of the governments of the constituent States, but by delegates from the Parliaments repre-

---

(1) From the Manifesto of the National Executive of the Labour Party, May 8, 1918. Also embodied in the resolution of the Permanent Commission, Amsterdam, April, 1919. The latter resolution protests against depriving Germany of her colonies.



senting all parties therein, thus ensuring not an alliance of cabinets or governments, but a union of peoples.”

2. A permanent World Economic Council, for investigating and supervising the production and distribution of foodstuffs and raw materials, with the object of preventing monopoly, unfair pressure upon the weak, and international profiteering, should be created and placed under the control of the League in accordance with the recommendations already made by the International.

3. The Assembly should discuss the solution of the more pressing of those questions which, apart from the changes made by the war, affect the peace of the world, such as the position of subject nations like Egypt, India, and Ireland, and of old possessions whose affairs call for revision, a special case being that of Cyprus, whose cession to Greece should be considered.

## RUSSIA.

The situation with respect to Russia above sketched is this:—

The Entente Governments are giving material aid to groups and parties in Russia and elsewhere, which if triumphant will establish, not a democracy—not even a Bourgeois-Liberal political democracy—but a military dictatorship of autocratic Tsarist reaction. The choice which is presented is not as between two kinds of Socialism, not even as between two forms of democracy. The Workers are now asked to support an anti-Parliamentary Black Hundred Dictatorship; a Koltchak Napoleonism based on White Terrorism, a monarchical, ecclesiastical, land-owning, military conscript imperialism. The facts now brought to light concerning the circumstances in which the Koltchak régime came to power in Siberia show that the support accorded to it is on behalf of Parliamentary Democracy as against Socialist Dictatorship, it is on behalf of monarchist reaction as against any form of real democracy.

Various Labour declarations, therefore, oppose the present intervention of the Allied governments in Russia for the following reasons:—

1. It is an obvious interference by outside dictatorship with the right of the people to choose its own form of government.

2. It is not in the interests of democracy or Socialism.

3. It is not the result of a declaration of war or of Parliamentary sanction, but is action resulting from secret diplomatic commitments.

4. It is prompted by militarists and capitalists interested in the restoration of Tsardom.

5. It is carried on in defiance of the fact that offers of peace have been made by the Russian and Hungarian Governments.

## PART V.

### DOCUMENTS.

I.—GERMAN COUNTER PROPOSALS AND OBJECTIONS  
(COUNT RANTZAU'S STATEMENT).

II.—MANIFESTOS BY GENERAL SMUTS.

III.—PROTEST OF MR. BULLITT, AMERICAN COMMISSIONER.

IV.—A BELGIAN PROTEST.

V.—PROTEST OF BRITISH UNIVERSITY MEN.

VI.—PRESIDENT WILSON'S FOURTEEN POINTS AND FIVE POINTS.

VII.—ALLIED MEMORANDUM TO GERMAN GOVERNMENT  
OF NOV. 5, 1918.

#### I.—GERMAN OBJECTIONS: COUNTER PROPOSALS.

The German objections and counter-proposals have not so far been published in England. A brief summary of them appears below.

On receiving the text of the Draft Treaty at Versailles, Count Brockdorff-Rantzau delivered the following address:—

GENTLEMEN,—We are deeply impressed with the sublime task which has brought us hither to give a durable peace to the world. We are under no illusion as to the extent of our defeat and the degree of our want of power. We know that the power of the German arms is broken. We know the power of the hatred which we encounter here, and we have heard the passionate demand that the victors shall make us pay as the vanquished, and shall punish those who are worthy of being punished.

It is demanded of us that we shall confess ourselves to be the only ones guilty of the war. Such a confession in my mouth would be a lie. We are far from declining any responsibility for this great world-war having come to pass and for its having been made in the way in which it was made. The attitude of the former German Government at the Hague Peace Conference, its actions and omissions in the tragic twelve days of July, certainly contributed to the disaster, but we energetically deny that Germany and its people, who were convinced that they were making a war of defence, were alone guilty.

#### THE OUTBREAK OF WAR.

Nobody will want to contend that the disaster took its course only in the disastrous moment when the heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary fell the victim of murderous hands. In the last fifty years the Imperialism of all European States has chronically poisoned the international situation. The policy of retaliation and the policy of expansion and the disregard of the rights of people to determine their own destiny have contributed to the illness of Europe, which reached its crisis in the world-war.

The Russian mobilisation took from the statesmen the possibility of healing, and gave the decision into the hands of the military powers. Public opinion in all the countries of our adversaries is resounding with the crimes which Germany is said to have committed in the war. Here also we are ready to confess the wrong that may have been done. We have not come here to belittle the responsibility of the men who have waged the war politically and economically, and to deny any crimes which may have been committed against the rights of peoples.

#### THE WRONG DONE TO BELGIUM.

We repeat the declaration made in the German Reichstag at the beginning of the war—that is to say, a wrong has been done to Belgium, and we are willing to repair it. But in the manner of making war also Germany is not the only guilty one. Every nation knows of deeds of people which the best nationals only remember with regret.

I do not want to answer by reproaches to reproaches, but I ask them to remember when reparation is demanded not to forget the Armistice. It took six

weeks till we got it at last, and six months till we came to know your conditions of peace. Crimes in war may not be excusable, but they are committed in the struggle for victory and in the defence of national existence, and passions are aroused which make the conscience of peoples blunt.

#### VICTIMS OF THE BLOCKADE.

The hundreds of thousands of non-combatants who have perished since the 11th of November by reason of the blockade were killed with cold deliberation after our adversaries had conquered and victory had been assured to them. Think of that when you speak of guilt and of punishment.

The measure of guilt of all those who have taken part can only be stated by an impartial inquest before a neutral commission, before which all the principal persons of the tragedy are allowed to speak and to whom all the archives are open. We have demanded such an inquest, and we repeat this demand again at this Conference, where we stand facing our adversaries alone and without any Allies.

We are not quite without protection. You yourselves have brought us an Ally—namely, the right, which is guaranteed by the Treaty, in the principles of the peace. The Allied and associated Governments forswore in the time between the 5th of October and the 5th of November, 1918, a peace of violence, and wrote "A peace of justice" on their banner.

#### RELYING ON WILSONIAN PRINCIPLES.

On October 5, 1918, the German Government proposed the principles of the President of the United States of North America as the basis of peace, and on the 5th of November their Secretary of State, Mr. Lansing, declared that the Allied and associated Powers agreed to this basis with two definite deviations. The principles of President Wilson have thus become binding for both parties to the war—you as well as for us, and also for our former Allies. The various principles demand from us heavy national and economic sacrifices, but the holy fundamental rights of all peoples are protected by this treaty. The conscience of the world is behind it. There is no nation which might violate it without punishment.

#### NEW AIMS OF SOCIAL PROGRESS.

You will find us ready to examine upon this basis the preliminary peace which you have proposed to us with a firm intention of re-building in common with you that which has been destroyed, and of repairing any wrong to Belgium—any wrong that may have been committed—principally the wrong to Belgium,—and to show to mankind new aims of political and social progress.

Considering the tremendous number of problems which arise, we ought as soon as possible to make an examination of the principal tasks by special commissions of experts on the basis of the Treaty which you have proposed to us. In this it will be our chief task to re-establish the devastated vigour of mankind and of all the people who have taken part by an international protection of the life, health, and liberty of the working classes.

#### BELGIUM AND NORTHERN FRANCE.

As our next aim I consider the reconstruction of the territories of Belgium and of Northern France, which have been occupied by us, and which have been destroyed by war. To do so, we have taken upon ourselves a solemn obligation, and we are resolved to execute it to the extent which will have been agreed upon between us.

In this task we cannot do without the co-operation of our former adversaries. We cannot accomplish the work without the technical and financial participation of the victorious peoples, and you cannot execute it without us. Impoverished Europe must desire that the reconstruction should be fulfilled with the greatest success and with as little delay as is in any way possible.

This desire can only be fulfilled by a clear understanding about the best methods to be employed. It would be the worst method to go on and have the work done by German prisoners of war. Certainly this work is cheap, but it would cost the world dear if hatred and despair should seize the German people, when they consider that their brothers and sons and fathers who are prisoners are kept prisoners beyond the preliminary peace doing the former penal work.

Without any immediate solution of this question, which has been drawn out too long, we cannot come to a durable peace. Our experts of both sides will have to examine how the German people may come up to their financial obligations to

repair without succumbing under the heavy burden. A crash would bereave those who have a right to reparation of the advantages to which they have a claim, and would draw after it an irretrievable disorder of the whole European economical system. The vanquishers as well as the vanquished people must guard against this menacing danger, with its incalculable consequences.

#### THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

There is only one means of banishing it—unlimited confession of the economical and social solidarity of all peoples in a free and rising League of Nations. Gentlemen, the sublime thought to be derived from the most terrible disaster in the history of mankind is the League of Nations; the greatest progress in the development of mankind has been pronounced, and will make its way. Only if the gates of the League of Nations are thrown open to all who are of goodwill can the aim be attained, and only then the dead of this war will not have died in vain.

The German people in their hearts are ready to take upon themselves their heavy lot if the bases of peace which have been established are not any more shaken. The peace which cannot be defined in the name of right before the world always calls forth new resistances against it. Nobody will be capable of subscribing to it with a good conscience, for it will not be possible of fulfilment. Nobody could take upon himself the guarantee of its execution, which ought to lie in its signature. We shall examine the document handed to us with goodwill, and in the hope that the final result of our interview may be subscribed to by all of us.

#### GERMAN COUNTER PROPOSALS.

##### PART I.

The first part of the German comments contains general remarks.

##### CHAPTER I.—THE LEGAL BASIS OF PEACE.

The German Delegates state that they entered upon their task with the conviction that the contents of the Treaty of Peace have in principle been outlined by the events preceding it.

They then recapitulate the interchange of communications with President Wilson, between October 5, 1918, and the Armistice on November 11. As a result of these they consider that Germany as a basis of Peace has expressly accepted President Wilson's Fourteen Points and nothing else. The acceptance of the terms of the Armistice was to be evidence for the honest acceptance of these conditions by Germany. This evidence has been furnished. The Allies also have accepted President Wilson's Fourteen Points, and a solemn agreement as to the basis of Peace therefore exists between the two contracting parties. Germany has a right to this basis, and the Allies, by forsaking it, would break an International legal agreement. But the practical application of the principles must be negotiated upon, and Germany has a right to discussion.

##### CHAPTER II.—CONTRADICTIONS.

Chapter II. deals at length with the alleged contradictions between the draft of the Treaty and this agreed basis, taken in connection with previous assurances of the statesmen of the Entente. The Delegates point out that their enemies have repeatedly professed that they were not making war against the German people, but against an imperialistic and irresponsible Government. But the Conditions of Peace are an obvious contradiction to such assurances.

Speeches of Mr. Asquith, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Winston Churchill, and President Wilson are quoted, as proving that the war was not intended to be against the German people. To-day, however, the Allied Powers are facing not an irresponsible German Government, but the German people ruling its own future for itself. This has been utterly disregarded in the draft Treaty, and it cannot be imagined what harder terms could have been imposed upon an imperialistic Government.

Again, it was affirmed that the Peace to be concluded with Germany was to be a Peace of Right, and not of Might. To this effect speeches of M. Painlevé, M. Pichon, Mr. Winston Churchill, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Lloyd George, and President Wilson are quoted.

But the Peace Treaty shows that none of these solemn assurances have been kept. The purely German territory of the Saar is to be separated from the German Empire for at least 15 years. The line of demarcation for a *plebiscite* in Schleswig

has been traced through purely German districts and goes further than Denmark herself wished. In the East, Upper Silesia is to be separated from Germany and conveyed to Poland, though it has had no political connection with Poland for 750 years. The province of Posen and most of West Prussia are to be separated from Germany, though millions of Germans are living there. The Memel district is also to be separated in order to cut off Germany economically from Russia. East Prussia is to be isolated from the Empire; the purely German city of Danzig is to become a free city.

The settlement of the colonial question is equally unjust. Germany has a natural claim to colonies from her culture and undeniable colonial accomplishments.

Further provisions are equally contrary to a Peace of Right, such as those insisting that Germany should recognise beforehand Treaties which may be entered into by her enemies with the States formerly part of the Russian Empire. The economic provisions for the liquidation of German property within the territories of the Allies, the claim that German citizens must be handed over to Courts of the hostile powers, the insistence on Germany acknowledging her responsibility for all damage incurred by the Governments hostile to her, are all contrary to the innate rights of nations.

Again, as to the League of Nations, Germany had repeatedly been promised that the League of Nations would unite the belligerents, conquerors as well as conquered, to secure the world against future disasters. To this effect speeches are quoted by Mr. Asquith, Lord Robert Cecil, Lord Grey, M. Ribot, and President Wilson.

All these utterances made it a matter of course that Germany would from the beginning take part in establishing the League of Nations; but the statute of the League has been established without German help, and Germany is not even invited to join the League. Germany's importance is independent of her temporary military or political position. If she is not admitted it is impossible to speak of a League of Nations.

The enemies of Germany have repeatedly assured the whole world that they do not aim at the destruction of Germany. Speeches to this effect by Mr. Lloyd George, Lord Milner, M. Pichon, and President Wilson are quoted.

But the proposed Treaty of Peace shows that Germany's position as a world power is to be destroyed in every possible manner. Economic provisions are cited to prove the intended destruction of German economic life, both at home and abroad, even to the detail of the confiscation of her cables.

During the war a new principle has been put forward—the right of self-determination of nations. Speeches proclaiming this principle, by Mr. Asquith, Mr. Churchill, Lord Grey, Mr. Lloyd George, Signor Orlando, M. Pichon, and President Wilson, are quoted or alluded to.

But the treatment of the inhabitants of the Saar region and of the districts of Eupen, Malmédy, and Moresnet does not comply with such a solemn recognition of this right. The same is true about Alsace-Lorraine, the cession of which, without consulting the population, would be a new wrong.

If two-and-a-half million Germans are to be torn away from their native land against their own will, this cannot be considered compatible with self-determination. Statistics are given with regard to a number of districts in Central and Upper Silesia and in South-East Prussia to prove that the majority of the populations is German.

The cession of Danzig and of Memel is claimed to be equally contrary to the principles laid down, as is the refusal to allow the German Austrians to unite with Germany, and the compulsion exercised on millions of Germans to remain part of the newly-created Czecho-Slovak State. Even in Germany itself the right of self-determination is denied by the nomination of an alien Commission to carry out the conditions of the Treaty, a surrender of its independence which may not be inflicted upon any State.

#### CHAPTER III.—RESULTS.

A brief third chapter deals with the results of the Draft. The Delegates claim that it involves the utter destruction of German economic life, and leaves the German people to a financial slavery of a kind unknown in history. The Delegates point out that this would first make itself felt in the sphere of economics, for Germany's creditors could not obtain the immense sums required from a pauperised country. The elimination of Germany from the world's trade might get rid of a troublesome competitor, but the world, already impoverished by the war, would become infinitely poorer.

The world now requires an international community of Labour, to which Germany agrees. But the proposed Treaty is merely a celebration of the last triumph of Imperialist and capitalist tendencies. The Delegates appeal to the innate right of men and nations; the proposed Treaty is incompatible with respect for this innate right; but in the resolve to fulfil her obligations Germany makes the counter-proposals which follow.

## PART II.

### GERMAN PROPOSALS.

#### CHAPTER I.—THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

A lasting Peace can only be obtained by way of a League of Nations which guarantees equal rights for the great and small Powers. Germany has already submitted its own proposals for such a League, but the Delegation is prepared to negotiate on the basis of the Allied proposals if Germany is admitted on equal terms as soon as Peace has been signed. At the same time clauses must be inserted, guaranteeing complete equality in trade conditions and freedom from external interference and preventing economic warfare and exclusion by boycott.

Germany is prepared to agree to the basic idea of army, navy, and air regulations (contained in Section V. of the Treaty), and especially to the abolition of compulsory military service, provided this is the beginning of a general reduction of armaments and abandonment of compulsory military service. Their own readiness to reduce armaments at once is a proof of their sincerity. But a period of transition must be allowed during which Germany may retain such forces as are required to preserve internal order before reducing her army to the hundred thousand limit. On condition that Germany enters the League at once she will dismantle the fortresses in the West, and establish a neutral zone, but no special supervision of the process of disarmament, except that of the League, can be admitted, and an extension of time must be granted after discussion on a basis of equality.

Under the proviso of a financial arrangement, Germany is prepared to surrender not only the surface warships demanded, but all ships of the line. Germany is also prepared to accept all general regulations of the League as regards aviation.

Immediate oral negotiations to settle details are proposed. Germany is prepared to do everything in her power to preserve humanity from another war, and if the nations are disappointed in their hope of this it will not be her fault.

#### CHAPTER II.—TERRITORIAL QUESTIONS.

Chapter II. deals with territorial questions. The first section lays down the principle of the right of self-determination in accordance with President Wilson's four points in his speech of February 11, 1918, and the second point in his speech of July 8, 1918. The German Delegates claim that on these principles the cession of Upper Silesia and the Saar district cannot be demanded at all, and that where territorial cession can be acquiesced in it must be preceded in every case by a plebiscite with universal suffrage under fair conditions administered by a neutral Power after evacuation of foreign troops. Further proposals are made as to the exchange of enclaves and the fixing of frontiers.

This section also advocates the principle of protection of national minorities under the League, including such German minorities as may pass under alien sovereignty. These must be afforded the fullest possible cultural autonomy.

The second section deals with Belgium. It claims that the contested territories of Moresnet and Prussian Moresnet have a German majority. Eupen again is purely German, and the Walloons are considerably in a minority in Malmédy. Germany cannot consent in principle to the cession of such indisputably German districts, and in these instances a real plebiscite is not provided for. Germany is prepared to supply wood from the Eupen forests in reparation to Belgium, but cannot consent to the bartering of human beings.

The brief third section on Luxembourg declares that the proposed economic and political conditions are one-sided and inadmissible.

The fourth section deals at considerable length with the Saar district. Germany declares that the frontiers have been drawn to include important industrial districts beyond the coalmines, but even the cession of the mining district could not be admitted. A supply of coal can be guaranteed; but the total coal computed to exist in the Saar mines would represent a hundred times the maximum French demands.

The population of the Saar district is peculiarly uniform and has been attached to Germany for over a thousand years, during which period France has possessed it for not more than 68 years. The people to-day are as German as they were a hundred years ago, when they demanded to be reunited with Germany, but on account of the coalmines they are put under an abnormal and unfavourable form of government; and since the Armistice they have begun to learn what they will have to suffer.

All this is to compensate France for the coal destroyed in the north; but such a question can only be settled on an economic basis, not by tearing away a nationally undisputed territory and degrading the League of Nations by involving it in the transaction.

The German Government declines to make any reparation in the form of punishment, and still more emphatically declines to pass on to individual parts of the population the punishment intended for the whole of the community. The annexation of the Saar district to France would mean the creation of another Alsace-Lorraine, and Germany claims that the whole question must be reconsidered.

The fifth section, dealing with Alsace-Lorraine, insists that for the most part this district is German, but admits that according to present conceptions of right an injustice was committed in 1871 when the people were not consulted. Germany has, therefore, promised reparation, but it would be no reparation to cede Alsace-Lorraine with its immensely increased economic wealth to France at once.

A vote must be taken allowing a choice between union with France, union with Germany as a free State, and complete independence. Even if the population should decide for France, the present conditions must be modified as to the dating back of the cession and the question of nationality; and if France is to take over the results of German effort she must equally take over a proportionate share in the German debt.

A short sixth section declares that Germany has never intended to shift the frontier with Austria by force, but cannot pledge herself to oppose a possible desire of German-Austria to be united with her.

A long and important seventh section deals with Germany's eastern frontiers. Germany has agreed to the creation of an independent Polish State, but the terms of the Treaty include in it a number of totally German towns and extensive German tracts of land for military or economic reasons, without regard to nationality or to history.

It is claimed that this particularly applies to Upper Silesia, which has had no connection with the Polish Empire since 1163. The wishes of the inhabitants have been clearly expressed by the elections of the Reichstag in 1903 and 1907, when the majority voted for German rather than Polish deputies. In 1919, when the Poles proclaimed their abstention from voting, 60 per cent. of possible voters voted for German candidates.

With regard to language, the parents of less than 22 per cent. of the school children have declared themselves in favour of education in a non-German language under the new provisions, and the Polish dialect spoken by a considerable part of the Upper Silesians is really a mixed language, and does not represent a mark of nationality.

Upper Silesia owes everything to Germany, and Germany cannot dispense with Upper Silesia, while Poland does not really need it. The Upper Silesian coal has supplied almost the whole industry of Eastern Germany, and last year the output was 43,500,000 metric tons. Poland at the same period used about 10,500,000 tons, and the Polish output was nearly 7,000,000. Half the deficit came from Upper Silesia, the remainder from the mines now in Czecho-Slovakia, but the new Poland could probably supply herself with all the coal she needs.

German conditions for working-class life are incomparably better than those in Poland, and the cession of Upper Silesia, to which Germany cannot consent, would be as disadvantageous to its own population as to the rest of mankind.

The province of Posen cannot be regarded as indisputably Polish. Germany is prepared to cede such parts as are truly Polish, but the proposed frontiers are based on obsolete strategic, not national, considerations.

As to West Prussia, the Treaty gives almost the whole of it, and even a part of Pomerania, to Poland. West Prussia is claimed as old German territory on which the Polish dominion of 300 years has left little trace. In the district assigned directly or indirectly to Poland, it is claimed that the population includes about 744,000 Germans against 580,000 Poles and Cassubians (who are not to be identified with the Poles), and the German population is of far greater economic and cultural importance.

Germany cannot consent to the severance of East Prussia, with its German population of a million and a half, from the German Empire. A connecting bridge must absolutely be preserved, but Germany is ready to cede to Poland such West Prussian territories as are indisputably Polish.

The cession of Danzig, a purely German town, is claimed to be in direct opposition with President Wilson's principles. To make it a free city and to surrender certain of its rights to Poland would lead to violent opposition and a continuous state of war in the East. Danzig must remain with the German Empire. But Germany is ready to make Memel, Königsberg, and Danzig free ports in order to secure to Poland the promised access to the sea, and to grant special transit facilities under specified conditions reciprocally applied.

In the southern parts of East Prussia a plebiscite is demanded; but these districts are not indisputably Polish, and the fact that a non-German language is spoken in certain regions is in itself of no importance.

With regard to Memel and the adjoining districts, even the Lithuanian-speaking inhabitants have never shown any desire to separate from Germany, and the Delegates state that in the whole territory there are about 68,000 Germans, as against about 54,000 Lithuanian-speaking inhabitants, who generally also speak German. Memel in particular is claimed as a purely German town, and Germany therefore declines to cede this territory.

If any German territory is ultimately ceded to Poland, Germany must protect its former nationals. This is all the more necessary because the Poles have not so far shown themselves trustworthy protectors of the national and religious rights of minorities.

The Germans further protest against the regulations as to change of nationality, and against the lack of security for German interests in the districts affected; and they demand a Commission to assess damages caused by recent Polish disturbances.

In the eighth section the German Delegates agree to the holding of a plebiscite in Schleswig, although this point was not mentioned by President Wilson. They protest, however, against the delimitation of the voting districts, and propose another boundary and a different system of voting and control for the plebiscite.

A short ninth section accepts the dismantling of Heligoland, but insists on any measure necessary for the protection of the coast and port in the interest of the population.

The tenth section deals with the colonies. The Delegates maintain that the demand that Germany should relinquish all her rights and claims is an irreconcilable contradiction of Point 5 of President Wilson's address to Congress of January 8, 1918, which promised a free, sincere, and impartial settlement of colonial claims.

Germany's claim is based on the fact that she has acquired them lawfully and developed them laboriously. The possession of them will be even more necessary to her in the future than in the past, as, owing to the low rate of exchange, she must obtain raw material from her own colonies. She further requires her colonies as a market, and as settlements for a part of her surplus population.

As a great civilised nation, the German people have the right to co-operate in the joint task of mankind, in which they have already achieved great things. The interests of the coloured population of the colonies speak for Germany remaining in possession of them, for the German administration has abolished abuses and introduced peace, order, justice, health, education, and Christianity.

Germany has clearly looked after the interests of the natives. She has refrained from militarising them, and has adhered to the principle of the open door. The demand that the colonies should be renounced is, therefore, considered unjustified.

Without modifying this position, the Delegates further point out that the conditions under which the cession is demanded are unacceptable in detail, particularly as to State and private property and compensation; and they claim that any mandatory Power should pay all expenses incurred by the German Empire, and that the territory should still be responsible for liabilities incurred.

They therefore make a counter-proposal that an impartial hearing of the colonial question should take place before a special Committee.

Germany claims that though justified in demanding the restoration of her colonies, she is ready to administer them according to the principles of the League of Nations if a League is formed which she can enter at once as a member with equal privileges.



The eleventh section agrees to the renunciation of German rights and privileges regarding Kiao-chau and Shantung with certain stipulations as to compensation.

Section twelve deals with Russia and the Russian States. Germany does not claim or propose to interfere with any territory which belonged to the former Russian Empire. The Peace of Brest-Litovsk has already been renounced in the Armistice.

But Germany cannot recognise any right on the part of Russia to demand restitution and reparation, and it is only able to recognise the relevant Treaties and Agreements if their contents are known, and if they do not prove to be unacceptable.

### CHAPTER III.—GERMAN RIGHTS OUTSIDE EUROPE.

The German Delegates complain that according to the draft Treaty, Germany is to have no rights whatever in Europe, outside her own frontiers.

If Germany is to continue to exist, the realisation of these terms is impossible. Germany must have the use of shipping, but she is called upon to deliver up her entire overseas fleet with all tonnage which happened to be in enemy harbours at the beginning of the war. Further, the Allies refuse to recognise the decisions of German prize courts, or to consider German claims for damages, while German sea-ports are deliberately weakened by a number of claims so that a reconstructed German mercantile fleet will encounter totally unfair conditions in traffic.

The German submarine cables are to be taken away. Germany's foreign trade is to be excluded from all kinds of activity. Germany is called upon to violate the Egyptian right to self-determination by recognising the British Protectorate. All concessions and privileges acquired in Russia since August, 1914, are annulled, and many other foreign rights are left in jeopardy. The Allies have proposed economic and financial provisions which put Germany under a continued disadvantage, and they reserve to themselves the right to take exceptional war measures in regard to German rights, properties, and interests abroad, so that German citizens will be placed in an unbearable state of uncertainty.

The German Delegates cannot reconcile such provisions with the principles of impartial justice. They may offer great advantages to rival merchants, but they do nothing towards repairing the damage which Germany has undertaken to make good. It is only natural that the German people should now believe that the Allies intend to stamp out German commercial competition. The German Delegates lay great stress on the necessity of granting full and reciprocal freedom of action whenever possible, and outline the proposals repeated in the following chapter.

### CHAPTER IV.—REPARATION.

Germany accepts the obligation to pay for all damages sustained by the civil populations in the occupied parts of Belgium and France, inasmuch as she brought upon them the terrors of war by a breach of international law through the violation of Belgian neutrality. She opposes reparation to other occupied territories in Italy, Montenegro, Serbia, Rumania, and Poland, as no attack in contradiction to international law was involved. She voluntarily concedes responsibility for Belgian loans, but claims that the Allies have far exceeded in the categories of damages named in the draft Treaty the agreements entered into at the Armistice, especially in holding Germany responsible for losses to civilians outside the occupied territories, to the States themselves, to military persons, and in losses caused by Germany's allies.

Germany contests certain specific responsibilities, particularly as to the costs of an army of occupation, which she considers both unnecessary and uneconomic. She cannot accept the Reparation Commission as outlined, as the giving of such dictatorial powers would mean a renunciation of sovereignty. The Commission would be both party and judge, and the greater part of the reparation could only be collected by force. A German Commission is therefore proposed for co-operation with this Commission, any disagreement to be finally decided by a mixed Court of Arbitration under neutral presidency.

Germany is anxious to co-operate in the restoration of France and Belgium, to which end proposals will shortly be made. She recognises the principle that her taxation shall be not less heavy than any Allied State, but predicates her whole attitude as to reparations upon the acceptance of her general proposals, on the ground that she can bear the heavy burdens imposed only if her territory is not divided up, her industrial as well as her food basis not destroyed, and her overseas

connections, colonies, and mercantile fleet retained. Also territories separated from her should pay their proportionate share of the war debt.

Germany agrees to issue, four weeks after Peace, Government bonds for 20 billion marks gold [£1,000,000,000], payable before May 1, 1926, and for the remainder of the reparations to draw up deeds for annual payments without interest, beginning May 1, 1927, the total not to exceed 100 billion marks [£5,000,000,000], including repayments to Belgium, deliveries of materials during the Armistice, and other concessions required. The annuity to be paid each year is to be fixed as a distinct percentage of Germany's revenue, that for the first 16 years not to exceed a billion marks [£50,000,000] annually.

Ton for ton replacement of shipping cannot be accepted, as this is entirely beyond Germany's reduced production power, and would destroy the German economic system. She agrees, nevertheless, to construct an even greater tonnage, and over a longer period than stipulated. The demand for the surrender of fishing vessels is impossible owing to their supreme value for the food supply of Germany, and especially as 146 of the 210 fishing boats are demanded. The surrender of the whole overseas merchant fleet is unacceptable, and not over 10 per cent. of the river tonnage can be given over.

Germany acknowledges the principle of placing her resources directly in the service of reparation, but only in so far as not to infringe on her economic sovereignty. To this end they propose a German Commission parallel to the Reparations Commission, the two to work out details in co-operation. The requisition of materials shall be carried out, however, in such a way as to avoid the disorganisation of German economic life; restitutions must be made first of all from free stocks; the time limits in certain instances must be increased.

Germany agrees, if her situation permits, to export to France coal equal to the difference occasioned by the destruction of the French mines, the maximum to be 20 million tons for the first five years and five million tons thereafter. In order, however, to expedite the reconstruction of the French mines, Germany asks to be allowed to devote her skill to this work. She is unable to accord the options for coal demanded owing to decreased production, but is willing to agree to a priority on the surplus over the German inland requirements of the next ten years, to meet the requirements of France and Belgium. In return, Germany expects adequate supplies of minerals for her smelting work from Lorraine and France. As to coal deprivations, decreased production makes it possible to deliver only a portion of that demanded.

Germany agrees to the option demanded as to dyestuffs and chemical drugs, though refusing to accept price control by the Commission as involving a surrender of business secrets wholly unwarranted. A continuing option until 1925 is refused as impairing Germany's financial capacity.

In a final paragraph Germany states that shortage of time has made it impossible to give an exhaustive statement, and therefore proposes oral negotiations, with the suggestion that she has in mind ways of reparation possibly not considered by the Allies, especially the compensation of owners of destroyed industrial undertakings by the transference to them of proportionate shares in similar undertakings in Germany.

#### CHAPTER V.—REGULATIONS CONCERNING COMMERCIAL POLICY.

Germany demands that the economic provisions of the Treaty be drawn up with full regard of the perfect equality of rights of Germany with those of other nations. She states that every creditor has the greatest interest in keeping his debtor solvent, although her strength has already been greatly impaired through an illegal blockade. She can only bear her burdens and regain a position equal to that of other nations if economic freedom similar to that before the war be granted her. She therefore insists upon immediate admission to the League of Nations with the economic advantages proposed in her draft, and suggests an unrestricted grant for a certain number of years of mutual most-favoured-nation treatment instead of the one-sided rights provided in the Treaty Draft. Similarly, she proposes that all nations in the present unsettled state of the world retain full freedom as to tariffs, which would be especially desirable in her case, in order to facilitate reparation. Questions as to the certificates of vessels, navigation, unfair competition, industrial, literary, and artistic property, and the international law of traffic, could be settled through the League of Nations, by special agreements or at an international conference. She agrees not to discriminate against Allied goods

going by rail or vessel, but rejects interference with her internal railway and traffic organisations.

#### CHAPTER VI.—INTERNAL NAVIGATION

The control of German river system by International Commissions, in which Germany in no case is to have a majority, gives an economically unlimited authority over Germany's internal waterways and indirectly over German railways. This would have a decisive influence on the internal regulation of Germany's whole economic life incompatible with Germany's sovereignty, and therefore impossible. Germany agrees, however, to revise existing conventions to meet new conditions and open up German rivers to the utmost extent to the traffic of all nations, subject to the principle that riparian States alone are to participate in the administration.

As to the Elbe, she agrees to take the utmost account of the needs of Czecho-Slovakia; for the Rhine, she believes the Central Commission adequate, but is willing to accept negotiations for improvement; for the Danube, she demands representation on both Commissions; for the Oder, a purely German river, she states that no Commission is necessary; for the Vistula, she is willing to enter into negotiations with Poland, and for the Niemen, with other riparian States. She is unwilling to accept, except after more detailed negotiation, the arrangements placing Strasburg and Kehl under a single administration, or those dealing with the Rhine bridges and works for producing water-power.

As to the use of Hamburg and Stettin by Czecho-Slovakia, she is willing to negotiate a separate treaty to this end, and also to enter into negotiations as to how interested States may obtain a proportional share of the river tonnage beyond that surrendered under reparations. The Kiel Canal can be open to the traffic of all nations under conditions of reciprocity, though the International Commission proposal is acceptable only if other straits are similarly treated.

#### CHAPTER VII.—TREATIES.

While unable in the short time available to check the completeness of the list of multilateral arrangements enumerated in the Draft Treaty as becoming operative again, Germany believes it preferable in principle for all multilateral treaties in force at the outbreak of war to come into force again at the Peace, a later examination to decide which of them should be altered or terminated.

The provision to accept in advance future arrangements made by the Allies as to international postal, telegraphic, and wireless traffic is held incompatible with the dignity of an independent people. An energetic protest is raised against the provision giving the Allies the exclusive right to decide which of the bilateral treaties in force before the war shall be revised. Instead, each party should be free to inform the other of any provisions which have become inoperative, the settlement to be arrived at by special commissions.

Germany notes that treaties with States not at war with her—as Peru, Bolivia, Equador, and Uruguay—are not affected by the rupture of diplomatic relations; refuse to accept the general abrogation of engagements with her former Allies and Russia and Rumania, as threatening the ordered relations with those countries, and declines to give the Allies certain advantages secured to her own allies and to neutrals until she has had time to examine them in full, after which special negotiations are proposed.

#### CHAPTER VIII.—PRISONERS OF WAR AND GRAVES.

Germany requests the release of prisoners of war and interned civilians convicted of a crime or offence committed during their confinement in a hostile State. She also demands a full reciprocity of treatment for such prisoners and for the care of graves, and consents to bear only such expenses for prisoners of war and interned civilians as are incurred after they have left the territory of the enemy Power.

#### CHAPTER IX.—PENALTIES.

As to the trial of the ex-Kaiser, Germany cannot recognise the justification of such criminal prosecution, which is not founded upon any legal basis, or agree to the competence of the special tribunal proposed, or the admissibility of the surrender to be requested of the Netherlands. She cannot admit that a German be placed before a special foreign tribunal, to be convicted as a consequence of an exceptional law promulgated by foreign Powers only against him, on principles, not of right, but of politics, and to be punished for an action which was not punishable at the

time it was committed. Nor can she consent to a request being addressed to Holland to surrender a German to a foreign Power for such unjustifiable proceedings.

As to the surrender of persons accused of violations of the laws and customs of war for trial by a military tribunal, even when proceedings have already been begun by German courts, Germany is forbidden by her criminal code to make such extradition of German subjects to foreign Governments. Germany again declares her preparedness to see that violations of international law are punished with full severity, and suggests that the preliminary question as to whether such an offence has been committed be submitted to an international tribunal of competent neutrals to judge all violations by subjects of all the signatories, Germany to have her share in the formation of this tribunal, and the meteing out of punishment to be left to the national courts.

#### CHAPTER X.—LABOUR.

The conditions of Peace start from the standpoint that the interests of the working-classes are not to be decided by the workers themselves, but are to remain the concern of their Governments. Moreover, since Germany is not immediately accepted as a member of the League of Nations and the Organisation of Labour, the German people are to be excluded from co-operation in determining the rights and duties upon which the health and welfare of the workers depend, although Germany's labour legislation has become a model for the entire world. The Peace conditions destroy all the progress which the German workers have made and submit them to extreme distress and exploitation.

Such a Peace would be concluded at the expense of the working-classes in all countries. Consequently, the German workers can only agree to a Peace which embodies the immediate aims of the international labour movement, and which does not sacrifice all their achievements in favour of alien oppressors. A solemn protest is, therefore, made against even a temporary exclusion of Germany from the Organisation of Labour. The Allied and Associated Governments possess no right to inflict damage upon German workers by the exercise of wilful and irresponsible power. A Peace which does not bestow equal rights upon working-men would be based upon quicksand. The Peace terms are lacking in the first essentials for the recognition of equal rights of workers of all lands.

Germany once more proposes the summoning of a conference of labour organisations to discuss the Allied proposals, the German counter-proposals, and the Berne resolutions of February, the result to be embodied in the Treaty of Peace and to attain thereby the force of international law. Any other settlement would signify a violation of fundamental human rights which the conscience of the world dare not allow.

#### CHAPTER XI.—GUARANTEES.

Even in the provisions for its execution the Peace Conditions do not renounce the principle of force. As a guarantee for the fulfilment of conditions which strike such a terrible blow at the life of the German people, an occupation of German territory, extending over many years, is demanded, obviously to provide security against German aggression and as a guarantee against a refusal by Germany to fulfil her obligations. No human being, however, could possibly consider that the German people weakened as they are, could be seduced to the madness of an aggressive war, which could only mean utter annihilation. Better guarantees of the fulfilment of the economic and financial obligations could be afforded.

Whereas the occupation of the German Rhenish territory strikes a particularly hard blow at Germany, it also renders the payment of reparations most difficult or absolutely impossible, as large sums would have to be spent by Germany for the upkeep of the army and the free economic life within Germany would be broken up. The occupation would deprive the German authorities of the control of the administration, economic life, and ways of communication, including the Rhine, and permit the continuance of the right of requisition which is permissible only in war. Moreover, a special customs tariff could be introduced for the occupied territory, which might cut off this territory economically from the motherland, and bring it under the influence of Belgium and France.

Germany, therefore, expects that the territory which has been occupied by the terms of the Armistice shall be evacuated not later than six months after the signing of the Peace Treaty, and that during this time the occupation shall be restricted and most exclusively military.

Up to now the world has failed to give due consideration to the great transformation which has taken place in the national life of Germany. Through the will of her people Germany has become a democracy and a Republic. The new Germany is convinced that it deserves the confidence of its neighbours and that it may therefore demand its place in the League of Nations, which in itself would constitute the most inviolable guarantee of good faith.

However little Germany is in a position to exercise pressure in bringing about a Peace which alone can be permanent, it would be remiss in its duty if it did not once more raise its voice in warning against the consequences of a Peace of brute force. The fate of Russia, indeed, speaks in unmistakable terms. The utterly exhausted German people is struggling desperately to preserve the country from the final dissolution of all its constituent elements. The outcome of this battle, which is now being fought with its last remaining strength, will be determined almost exclusively by the form which the Treaty of Peace assumes.

A Permanent Peace can never be established upon the oppression and enslavement of a great nation. Only a return to the immutable principles of morality and civilisation and the sanctity of treaties would render it possible for mankind to continue to exist. In the very moment of founding a new commonwealth based upon liberty and labour the German people turns to those who have been its enemies and demands in the interests of all nations and of all human beings a Peace to which it may give its assent in accordance with the dictates of its conscience.

### LEGAL SUPPLEMENT.

A supplement contains comments on special legal questions. These are for the most part of a detailed and technical character and hardly lend themselves to summarising.

The first section deals with the resumption of diplomatic and consular relations. The second section deals at great length with the treatment of private rights, which the Delegates claim to be unfair owing to the lack of reciprocity. The German Delegates have no fundamental objection to the proposed Clearing House system, but they insist that it must be applied reciprocally and that the private parties concerned should retain full powers of disposition.

A number of detailed criticisms and demands for fuller explanation are appended.

A protest is entered against the alleged anticipations of the signature of the Peace Treaty by the Allied Powers in France, Belgium, China, and elsewhere, and among the special criticisms which follow is a claim that the differentiation between the property of former German Sovereigns and that of any other German is unjustifiable.

Further protests deal in some detail with the articles in the Treaty concerning contracts, mixed courts of arbitration, and the protection of industrial property, with regard to which its claim that the restrictions on German industrial property are unbearable owing to their weakening of German economic strength is one of the few fields in which reconstruction might be attempted.

The third section, which is much shorter, deals with the special provisions affecting maritime law and prize courts, which are claimed to be intolerable and unjustifiable.

The fourth and final section deals with criminal law. In this connection the German Delegates propose that each Power should grant the nationals of the other party immunity for all criminal acts committed in the course of the war for the benefit of their own country, with the exception of acts infringing the laws and customs of war.

### FINANCIAL SUPPLEMENT.

Another supplement contains the comments of the Finance Commission of the German Delegation. These cover much the same ground as the corresponding section of the main comments, but at greater length.

Two further short notes have been issued by the German Delegates; dealing with special points in Section IX., Finance, of the Peace Treaty, chiefly in reference to Turkey and Brazil.

## II. PROTESTS BY GENERAL SMUTS.

Following the signature of the Treaty, General Smuts issued the following manifesto:—

“General Smuts has issued the following statement for publication:—

“I have signed the Peace Treaty, not because I consider it a satisfactory document, but because it is imperatively necessary to close the war; because the world needs peace above all, and nothing could be more fatal than the continuance of the state of suspense between war and peace. The months since the armistice was signed have perhaps been as upsetting, unsettling, and ruinous to Europe as the previous four years of war. I look upon the Peace Treaty as the close of those two chapters of war and armistice, and only on that ground do I agree to it.

“I say this now, not in criticism, but in faith; not because I wish to find fault with the work done, but rather because I feel that in the Treaty we have not yet achieved the real peace to which our peoples were looking, and because I feel that the real work of making peace will only begin after this Treaty has been signed, and a definite halt has thereby been called to the destructive passions that have been desolating Europe for nearly five years. This Treaty is simply the liquidation of the war situation in the world.

“The promise of the new life, the victory of the great human ideals, for which the peoples have shed their blood and their treasure without stint, the fulfilment of their aspirations towards a new international order, and a fairer, better world, are not written in this Treaty, and will not be written in treaties. ‘Not in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, but in spirit and in truth,’ as the Great Master said, must the foundations of the new order be laid. A new heart must be given, not only to our enemies, but also to us; a contrite spirit for the woes which have overwhelmed the world; a spirit of pity, mercy, and forgetfulness for the sins and wrongs which we have suffered. A new spirit of generosity and humanity, born in the hearts of the peoples in this great hour of common suffering and sorrow, can alone heal the wounds which have been inflicted on the body of Christendom.

“And this new spirit among the peoples will be the solvent for the problems which the statesmen have found too hard at the Conference.

“There are territorial settlements which will need revision.

“There are guarantees laid down, which we all hope will soon be found out of harmony with the new peaceful temper and unarmed state of our former enemies.

“There are punishments foreshadowed, over most of which a calmer mood may yet prefer to pass the sponge of oblivion.

“There are indemnities stipulated, which cannot be exacted without grave injury to the industrial revival of Europe, and which it will be in the interests of all to render more tolerable and moderate.

“There are numerous pin-pricks, which will cease to pain under the healing influences of the new international atmosphere.

“The real peace of the peoples ought to follow, complete, and amend the peace of the statesmen.

“In this Treaty, however, two achievements of far-reaching importance for the world are definitely recorded. The one is the destruction of Prussian militarism; the other is the institution of the League of Nations. I am confident the League of Nations will yet prove the path of escape for Europe out of the ruin brought about by this war.

“But the League is as yet only a form. It still requires the quickening life, which can only come from the active interest and the vitalising contact of the peoples themselves. The new creative spirit, which is once more moving among the peoples in this anguish, must fill the institution with life, and with inspiration for the pacific ideals born of this war, and so convert it into a real instrument of progress. In that way the abolition of militarism, in this Treaty unfortunately confined to the enemy, may soon come as a blessing and relief to the allied peoples as well.

“And the enemy peoples should at the earliest possible date join the League, and in collaboration with the Allied peoples learn to practise the great lesson of this war—that not in separate ambitions or in selfish domination but in common service for the great human cause lies the true path of national progress.

" This joint collaboration is especially necessary to-day for the reconstruction of a ruined and broken world.

" The war has resulted, not only in the utter defeat of the enemy armies, but has gone immeasurably further. We witness the collapse of the whole political and economic fabric of Central and Eastern Europe. Unemployment, starvation, anarchy, war, disease and despair stalk through the land. Unless the victors can effectively extend a helping hand to the defeated and broken peoples, a large part of Europe is threatened with exhaustion and decay. Russia has already walked into the night, and the risk that this rest may follow is very grave indeed.

" The effects of this disaster would not be confined to Central and Eastern Europe. For civilisation is one body, and we are all members of one another.

" A supreme necessity is laid on all to grapple with this situation. And in the joint work of beneficence the old feuds will tend to be forgotten, the roots of reconciliation among the peoples will begin to grow again, and ultimately flower into active, fruitful, lasting Peace.

" To the peoples of the United States and the British Empire, who have been exceptionally blessed with the good things of life, I would make a special appeal. Let them exert themselves to the utmost in this great work of saving the wreckage of life and industry on the Continent of Europe. They have a great mission, and in fulfilling it they will be as much blessed as blessing.

" All this is possible, and I hope capable of accomplishment; but only on two conditions.

" In the first place, the Germans must convince our peoples of their good faith, of their complete sincerity through a real honest effort to fulfil their obligations under the Treaty to the extent of their ability. They will find the British people disposed to meet them halfway in their unexampled difficulties and perplexities. But any resort to subterfuges or to underhand means to defeat or evade the Peace Treaty will only revive old suspicions and rouse anger and prove fatal to a good understanding.

" And, in the second place, our Allied peoples must remember that God gave them overwhelming victory—victory far beyond their greatest dreams, not for small selfish ends, not for financial or economic advantages, but for the attainment of the great human ideals, for which our heroes gave their lives, and which are the real victors in this war of ideals.

On his departure from Europe, General Smuts issued a manifesto which included the following passages :—

" Certain things have to be said to-day, though I find great and general unwillingness to say them. The position I have occupied in this country, and the fact that under very difficult circumstances and in spite of many heart-searchings, both for myself and my people, I have taken a most active part against the Germans from the first to the last day of the late war, give me the right to say them without giving offence to anybody.

" The protest which I issued on signing the Peace Treaty has called forth a vast correspondence which shows a widespread agreement with the views I hold on that document, as well as on the international situation generally. Deep as my disappointment was with many important features of the treaty, I did not protest in bitterness or from any desire to criticise.

" The past is done and must be accepted as a fact; the future is before us to make or mar. And I spoke with an eye to the future, with a desire to create the right spirit wherewith to confront the difficult situation before us.

" In spite of the apparent failure of the Peace Conference to bring about the real and lasting appeasement of the nations to which we had been looking forward, our faith in our great ideals should be kept untarnished. The sting of bitterness should be taken out of the great disillusion which is overtaking the peoples. Instead of sitting down in despair as reactionaries or anarchists we should continue to march forward with firm step as those who have the great hope.

" . . . There must be a real peace between the nations. The word reconciliation has to be writ large on our skies. Our hearts have to be emptied of all

bitterness and hatred, and the memories of war atrocities should not harden our hearts against the revival of a new international life. A new life, a new spirit is imperatively necessary if Europe is not to fall backward and lag behind other continents in the great march of humanity.

"Her lot is indeed pitiable beyond words. The Continent which is the motherland of our civilisation lies in ruins, exhausted by the most terrible struggle in history, with its people broken, starving, despairing, from sheer nervous exhaustion mechanically struggling forward along the paths of anarchy and war, and seeing only red through the blinding mist of tears and fears—almost a mad Continent, more fit for Bedlam than for the tremendous task of reconstruction that lies before it.

"It is the most awful spectacle in history, and no man with any heart or regard for human destiny can contemplate it without the deepest emotion.

"No, it is not a case for hatred or bitterness, but for all-embracing pity, for extending the helping hand to late friend and foe alike, and for a mission of rescue work such as the world has never seen. Europe is and will, for this generation, be the greatest mission field in which the energies of the great-hearted peoples of this country and America could be spent. And the gospel will be that original one of "goodwill among men," of human comradeship beyond the limits of nations, of fellow-feeling and common service in great human causes.

"All this applies to Europe generally, but I wish to add a word in reference to Germany and Russia, in particular, as the situation is too grave to permit of any shrinking from the frankest expression of opinion.

"The brutal fact is that Great Britain is a very small island on the fringe of the Continent, and that on that Continent the 70 odd million Germans represent the most important and formidable national factor. You cannot have a stable Europe without a stable, settled Germany, and you cannot have a stable, settled, prosperous Great Britain while Europe is weltering in confusion and unsettlement next door.

"In our policy of European settlement the appeasement of Germany, therefore, becomes one of cardinal importance. We have to-day in Germany a moderate republic, which, in my opinion, deserves encouragement and support from this country. It has done its best to prevent anarchy on the one hand and military reaction on the other, and has done so with more success than I, for one, expected.

"Ebert's republic has been for months standing in the breach fighting the battle of European order against the growing forces of anarchy. The great issue will probably be decided in Germany for good and all. And Ebert deserves our backing and encouragement. Do not let us deal with Ebert as we dealt with Kerensky and Karolyi—with results beyond recall to-day.

"There are whole chapters in the Peace Treaty which are as nothing compared to the supreme importance to this country and to Europe of having a stable, moderate, democratic, republican Germany. In my opinion, we should do our best to give it stability and to recognise it in the family of nations represented on the League.

"Russia is an even more obscure and difficult problem than Germany, and one on which no dogmatic opinion would be justified. But from all the information which has come into my possession, I am seriously doubtful about the sort of policy which we seem to be pursuing there. Russia can only be saved internally by Russians themselves, working on Russian methods and ideas. She is a case of national pathology of a people with a sick soul, and only Russian ideas could work a cure. Our military forces, our lavish contributions of tanks, and other war material may temporarily bolster up the one side, but the real magnitude of the problem is quite beyond such expedients.

"Leave Russia alone, remove the blockade, adopt a policy of friendly neutrality and Galliolike impartiality to all factions.

"It may well be that the only ultimate hope for Russia is a sobered, purified, Soviet system, and that may be far better than the Tsarism to which our present policy seems inevitably tending. If we have to appear on the Russian scene at all, let it be as impartial, benevolent friends and helpers and not as military or political partisans. Be patient with sick Russia, give her time and sympathy, and await the results of her convalescence."



III. LETTER OF MR. WILLIAM C. BULLITT,  
FORMERLY ASSISTANT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, ATTACHED TO THE  
AMERICAN COMMISSION TO NEGOTIATE PEACE, TO PRESIDENT WILSON,  
MAY, 1919.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT,—I have submitted to-day to the Secretary of State my resignation as assistant of the Department of State attached to the American Commission to negotiate peace. I was one of the millions who trusted confidently and implicitly your leadership, and believed you would take nothing less than a permanent peace based upon unselfish and unbiased justice.

But our Government has consented now to deliver the suffering peoples of the world to new oppressions, subjections and dismemberments—a new century of war.

And I can convince myself no longer that effective labour for “a new world order” is possible as a servant of this Government.

Russia—the acid test of goodwill for me as for you—has not even been understood. The unjust decisions of the Conference in regard to Shantung, the Tyrol, Thrace, Hungary, East Prussia, Danzig, and Saar Valley, and the abandonment of the principle of the freedom of the seas, make new international conflicts certain.

It is my conviction that the present League of Nations will be powerless to prevent these wars, and that the United States will be involved in them by obligations undertaken in the Covenant of the League and the special understanding with France.

Therefore, the duty of the Government of the United States to its own people and to mankind is to refuse to sign or ratify this unjust Treaty, to refuse to guarantee its settlements by entering the League of Nations, to refuse to entangle the United States further by an understanding with France.

That you are personally opposed to most of the unjust settlements, and that you accepted them only under great pressure, is well known. Nevertheless, it is my conviction that if you had made your fight in the open instead of behind closed doors, you would have carried with you the public opinion of the world, which was yours. You would have been able to resist the pressure, and might have established that “new international order based upon broad and universal principles of Right and Justice” of which you used to speak.

I am sorry you did not fight our fight to a finish, and that you had so little faith in the millions of men like myself in every nation who had faith in you.—Very sincerely yours, WILLIAM C. BULLITT.

IV. A BELGIAN PROTEST.

Dr. Charles Sarolea, Belgian Consul at Edinburgh, writes to the *Manchester Guardian* (May 25) as follows:—

As a Belgian by birth, whose household goods have been destroyed, and who has been financially ruined by the deeds of individual Germans, I cannot be accused of any tender feelings for the enemy. . . . I confess that I cannot look upon this world convulsion merely as a kinematic melodrama, with consummate villains on the one side and innocent heroes on the other. . . . Nor is this war rooted only in a few diplomatic and political causes; it is rooted in a hundred and one causes, economic, religious, geographical, as well as political and diplomatic. These causes making for war were operative everywhere. If they were more “dynamic” in Germany, it is mainly because the German people were politically a hundred years behind us whilst economically they were fifty years ahead of us; it is also because the German people were more passionately patriotic than their enemies, and because they practised more consistently the three theological virtues of blind faith, passive obedience, and patient endurance. All the causes suggested made Germany the initiator of *this* war. But those same causes had made other nations initiate within the last generation no less than ten other wars, with none of which “Prussian militarism” had anything to do.

And even assuming Germany and Austria to have been solely responsible for *this* crime, we must acknowledge that Europe generally and Great Britain in particular were in the past the accomplices of “Prussian militarism.” Before 1900 it is Germany and not France which earned our unstinted sympathies. It is Bismarck and not Gambetta who was glorified as the super-statesman. Even our theologians repaired to the German universities as to the fountains of wisdom.

It is true that Prussia stole Poland, but the very Prussian armies which conquered Poland were paid with British subsidies, as Lord Eversley has once more proved. It is true that Prussia stole Slesvig-Holstein, but we connived at the deed. It is true that Germany annexed Alsace-Lorraine, but Great Britain did not utter one word of protest, and Lord Granville and Mr. Gladstone turned a deaf ear to the pathetic appeals of Thiers. It is true that the annexation of Bosnia started the train which led up to the explosion. But Lord Salisbury and Mr. A. J. Balfour were the "loyal secundants" of Bismarck and Andrassy at the Treaty of Berlin, which surrendered Bosnia, and to-day after 41 years Mr. Balfour is only undoing what as a young diplomat he helped to accomplish in 1878. It is true that the alliance of Germany and Austria with Turkey became the cornerstone of Pan-German policy; but that same alliance with Turkey was until recently the cornerstone of our own policy, and it is that alliance which maintained the chaos of the Balkans.

But let us grant that not only Prussia but the whole of Germany is responsible for the crime of the war. What do we mean by the abstraction "Germany"? The Congress of Vienna did distinguish between Napoleon and the French people. Must we not establish a similar distinction? Shall we not say that in the last resort this war was even more a crime against the German people than a crime of the German people? If it be objected that German public opinion was wholly favourable to the war, I reply that there was not, there could not be, an independent public opinion in Germany. We know how easy it is even in a free country like ours to manufacture an artificial public opinion. How much easier in Germany, where the churches and the universities and the banks and the press were in the service of the State. How much easier to hoodwink a docile and disciplined people, a sentimental and a passionate people, carried away by that fiery patriotism which all nations still agree to consider as the highest of all virtues. The German people had not one single word to say in the declaration or initiation of the war. And once war was declared, once Prussia was invaded, how far was it possible even for the Socialists not to submit to military law?

Let us even admit that the German people must pay the penalty of the sins of their own Government, that every nation have the government they deserve, that they therefore must be punished for submitting to the countless atrocities perpetrated by their rulers, even that admission does not settle either our moral or political peace problem. By all means let the innocent Germans suffer *with* the guilty. Unfortunately under the peace settlement it is not the innocent that are suffering *with* the guilty; it is mainly the innocent who are chastised. We are punishing not the past or even the present generation, we are punishing the untold millions of young lads and children who will be reduced by the peace settlement to industrial helotry, who will become hewers of wood and drawers of water for the conquering nations.

## V. BRITISH UNIVERSITY MEN.

A letter, signed as under, was addressed to the Press on May 24, pointing out that it was on a promise of settlement on the basis of President Wilson's Fourteen Points that Germany laid down her arms.

It was on all sides anticipated that the peace would embody these points. Instead of this, after six months, during which the maintenance of the blockade has deeply accentuated the sufferings of Central Europe, the Allied and Associated Governments have proposed such terms as no nation would accept otherwise than under duress, or with any intention of keeping them a day longer than such duress can be maintained.

For each detail of the proposals taken separately it may be possible to make out some colourable case, but taken as a whole they belie the spirit of the fourteen points and thus in substance constitute a breach of faith with a beaten enemy. They reduce Germany to the position of a helot nation, and thereby impose forces to hold her people down. The League of Nations is transformed into an alliance to secure this end, and if the terms are accepted the future policy of Europe must be more than ever based on force.

As Alsace-Lorraine kept Europe in ferment for forty years, so must the Saar basin and a separated East Prussia poison international relations in the future. The indemnity of £5,000,000,000 definitely demanded, still more the undefined

claims in the background, reduce Germany, if they are taken seriously, to economic servitude, while if it is intended that such claims shall be nugatory because impossible to execute, this very fact makes them a means of constantly imposing fresh political burdens upon a beaten people.

We do not know whether by the omission of some of these points it would be possible to transform the proposed terms into a practicable basis of permanent peace. It is, we fear, their whole spirit rather than specific details that is at fault. At any rate, of the Draft Treaty as it stands it may be predicted with certainty that it will have no endurance; that it will give the impression of having been inspired by vindictiveness and fear; that on such a basis it is impossible to establish any true League of Nations; but that it can only initiate a new epoch of mutual aggression and suspicion, with the inevitable consequences of increased armaments, permanent and universal conscription, and the perpetual danger of war.—Yours, etc.,

C. OXON.

C. BAILEY, Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford.

J. BELL, Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford.

HENRY BENTINCK, M.P.

ALICE M. BRUCE, Vice Principal and Tutor of Somerville College.

E. A. BURROUGHS, Fellow and Tutor of Hertford College, Canon of Peterborough.

J. ESTLIN CARPENTER, D.Litt., D.D.

E. I. CARLYLE, Fellow and Tutor of Lincoln College.

THEODORE CHAUDY, Student and Tutor of Christ Church College, Oxford.

J. D. DENNISON H. ELLOW, Fellow and Tutor of Hertford College.

VERA FARNELL, Librarian, Somerville College.

W. H. FYFE, Fellow and Tutor of Merton College.

H. W. GARROD, Fellow and Tutor of Merton College.

C. BUCHANAN GREY, D.Litt., D.D.

A. B. GILLETT.

C. B. HEBERDEN, D.C.L., Principal of Brasenose College, Oxford.

ARTHUR HENDERSON.

L. T. HOBHOUSE, Professor of Sociology at London University.

JULIAN S. HUXLEY, Senior Demonstrator, Department of Comparative Anatomy.

L. P. JACKS, LL.D., Principal of Manchester College, Oxford.

JEROME K. JEROME.

K. LEYS, Fellow of University College, Oxford.

J. M. KENWORTHY, M.P.

A. D. LINDSAY, Balliol College, Oxford.

WALTER LOCK, D.D., Warden of Keble College, Oxford.

WALTER H. MABERLEY, Fellow and Dean of Lincoln College.

J. J. MALLON.

JOHN MASEFIELD.

GILBERT MURRAY, Regius Professor of Greek of Oxford University.

A. R. ORAGE, Editor of the "New Age."

A. E. J. RAWLINSON, M.A., Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford.

W. B. SELBIE, D.D., Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford.

E. DE SELINCOURT, Professor of English Literature at Birmingham University

NORMAN H. SMITH, Mansfield College, Oxford.

F. C. SNOW, St. John's College, Oxford.

J. L. STOCKS, Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College.

BEATRICE STONEDALE, Bursar, Somerville College.

R. H. TAWNEY, Fellow of Balliol College.

H. G. WELLS.

LEONARD S. WOOLF.

## VI. PRESIDENT WILSON'S FOURTEEN POINTS.

1. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

2. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

3. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

4. Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest points consistent with domestic safety.

5. A free, open-minded and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined.

6. The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest co-operation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

7. Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored, without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is forever impaired.

8. All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly fifty years, should be righted, in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interest of all.

9. A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

10. The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.

11. Roumania, Serbia and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea, and the relations of the several Balkan states to one another determined by friendly counsel along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and international guarantees of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan states should be entered into.

12. The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guarantees.

13. An independent Polish state should be erected, which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

14. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

## THE FIVE POINTS

Laid down by President Wilson in his speech of Sept. 27, 1918, these being the points referred to in the armistice negotiations as "The President's subsequent utterances."

First, the impartial justice meted out must involve no discrimination between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just. It must be a justice that plays no favourites and knows no standard but the equal rights of the several peoples concerned.

Second, no special or separate interest of any single nation or any group of nations can be made the basis of any part of the settlement which is not consistent with the common interest of all.

Third, there can be no leagues or alliances or special covenants and understandings within the general and common family of the League of Nations.

Fourth, and more specifically, there can be no special, selfish economic combinations within the League and no employment of any form of economic boycott or exclusion except as the power of economic penalty by exclusion from the markets of the world may be vested in the League of Nations itself as a means of discipline and control.

Fifth, all international agreements and treaties of every kind must be made known in their entirety to the rest of the world.

## VII. MEMORANDUM OF ALLIED GOVERNMENTS

Transmitted through President Wilson to the German Government on November 5, 1918.

The Allied Governments have given careful consideration to the correspondence which has passed between the President of the United States and the German Government. Subject to the qualifications which follow, they declare their willingness to make peace with the Government of Germany on the terms of peace laid down in the President's address to Congress of January 8, 1918, and the principles of settlement enunciated in his subsequent addresses.

They must point out, however, that Clause 2, relating to what is usually described as the freedom of the seas, is open to various interpretations, some of which they could not accept.

They must, therefore, reserve to themselves complete freedom on this subject when they enter the Peace Conference.

Further, in the conditions of peace laid down in his address to Congress of January 8, 1918, the President declared that the invaded territories must be restored, as well as evacuated and freed. The Allied Governments feel that no doubt ought to be allowed to exist as to what this provision implies. By it they understand that compensation will be made by Germany for all damage done to the civilian population of the Allies and their property by the aggression of Germany by land, by sea, and from the air.

# INDEX.

	Page		Page
Allied Memorandum on War Aims	42	Garvin, Mr. J. L. . . . .	55
Allies' Memorandum to German Government . . . . .	15, 87 (text)	General Confederation of Labour	7, 11, 32, 39, 46, 53, 55
Alsace-Lorraine . . . . .	42, 73	General Confederation of Labour and German Colonies . . . . .	46
Asquith, Mr. . . . .	46	German-Austria . . . . .	45, 65
Balance of Power . . . . .	9, 10	" " Amsterdam International on	45
Bela Kun . . . . .	57	" " National Executive of the Labour Party	45
Belgian Labour Party . . . . .	32, 44, 53	German Counter Proposals (text)	70-9
Belgian Labour Party on German Colonies . . . . .	46	German Independent Socialist Party . . . . .	18
Belgian Labour Party on Malmedy and Eupen . . . . .	45	German Labour, Declarations of	17, 18
Belgium . . . . .	68	" Militarism . . . . .	14
Berne Conference . . . . .	22, 41-2	" Social Democratic Party	17
Blockade . . . . .	69	Germany's Economic Position . . . . .	35-6
Boer War . . . . .	32	Guarantees . . . . .	50-2
Bolsheviks . . . . .	56-7-8, 60-1, 63	" German Proposals . . . . .	78
Boundaries of Germany and German-Austria . . . . .	41	Haig, Earl . . . . .	54
Brailsford, H. N. . . . .	10	Hard, Mr. Wm. . . . .	61
Brest-Litovsk and Versailles . . . . .	19, 20	Hoover, Mr. . . . .	41
British Labour Party . . . . .	5	Indemnity . . . . .	19, 31, 32, 41
British Labour Party on German Colonies . . . . .	46	" German Proposals . . . . .	76
British University Men, Protest by . . . . .	84-5	India . . . . .	67
Bullitt's, Mr. Wm. C., resignation . . . . .	58, 83 (text of Letter)	Inter-Allied Conference on War Aims (1917) . . . . .	38
China . . . . .	48	Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference (1915) . . . . .	16, 28
Chinese National Defence League	49	Inter-Allied Labour Conference (February, 1918) . . . . .	15, 16
Churchill, Mr. Winston . . . . .	34, 56-7	Internal Navigation in Germany	77
Clemenceau, M. . . . .	9, 37	International Labour Legislation, Labour Party Memorandum on . . . . .	25, 26, 27
Colonies . . . . .	46, 66, 74	Ireland . . . . .	67
Counter Proposals, German (text)	70-9	Italian Declaration . . . . .	7
Credit . . . . .	65	Italian Socialists and Russia . . . . .	56
Cyprus . . . . .	67	Japanese Imperialism in China . . . . .	48
Czecho-Slovakia . . . . .	42, 65	Kiao-chow . . . . .	49
" Daily Mail " . . . . .	54	Kiel Canal, German Proposals . . . . .	77
Danube . . . . .	33	Koltchak . . . . .	56, 61-3
Danzig . . . . .	42, 43, 44, 66, 71, 74	" " Supreme Ruler " . . . . .	62
Disarmament . . . . .	50-2, 66	K nigsberg . . . . .	74
East Prussia . . . . .	44, 66	Labour, German Proposals . . . . .	78
Economic Clauses of Treaty . . . . .	32	Labour Party, Annual Conference (1916) . . . . .	8
" Imperialism . . . . .	34-5	Labour Party, Annual Conference (1919) . . . . .	20
" War . . . . .	32	Labour's Demands . . . . .	12, 13
Egypt . . . . .	67	" Pledges . . . . .	1-8
Enemy Property . . . . .	20	Lahti . . . . .	61
Eupen . . . . .	45, 71		
Famine, Labour's Concern in . . . . .	40		
Foch, General . . . . .	54		
French Declaration . . . . .	7		
French General Confederation of Labour	7, 11, 32, 39, 46, 53, 55		
French Revolution . . . . .	63-4		

	Page
Laissez-faire .. .. .	38
Law, Mr. Bonar .. .. .	54
League of Nations .. .. .	14, 20-7, 64
"    "    Clemenceau on .. .. .	9
"    "    German Proposals .. .. .	72
"    "    Labour Commission of .. .. .	65
"    "    Proposed constitutional revision of .. .. .	66
"    "    Representative Principles in .. .. .	23
Lenin .. .. .	58-9, 61
Lloyd George, Mr. .. .. .	58
Malmédy .. .. .	45, 71
" Manchester Guardian " and Russia .. .. .	58
Mannerheim .. .. .	61
Meiske, Mr. .. .. .	63
Memel .. .. .	71, 74
Memorandum (Allied) to German Government .. .. .	15, 87
Memorandum on War Aims .. .. .	9, 22, 34
" German Colonies " .. .. .	47
Militarist Activity among Allies .. .. .	51-3
Moresnet .. .. .	71
National Executive of Labour Party .. .. .	7, 53
National Executive of Labour Party and Parliamentary Labour Party, Joint Manifesto .. .. .	6, 21, 53
" Nationalisation of Women " .. .. .	60
" New Republic " .. .. .	11, 60, 62
" New Statesman " .. .. .	60, 61
Occupation of Rhineland .. .. .	51
Occupied Territory .. .. .	20
Omsk, " White Terror " at .. .. .	63
" Open Covenants " .. .. .	8, 13, 14
Parliamentary Committee of Trades Union Congress .. .. .	5
Permanent Commission of Labour and Socialist International .. .. .	22, 43
" Petit Parisien " .. .. .	61
Pichon, M. . . . .	59
Plebiscite, Upper Silesia .. .. .	44-5
Poland .. .. .	10, 43
Prinkipo .. .. .	59
Private Rights .. .. .	20
Ransome, Mr. Arthur .. .. .	58-9
Rantzau's (Count) Statement .. .. .	68
Raw Materials .. .. .	13, 14, 36, 65
Raw Material, Germany's need of .. .. .	36
Red Guards .. .. .	61
Reparation and Restitution .. .. .	31

	Page
Reparation and Restitution, Arrangements for .. .. .	65
Reparation and Restitution, German Proposals .. .. .	75-6
Responsibility and Punishment .. .. .	28-30
Revision of Treaties .. .. .	65-67
Rhineland, Occupation of .. .. .	50-1
Rhine, Left Bank of .. .. .	66
Rhine Republic Movement .. .. .	51
Rosett, Dr. Joshua .. .. .	62
Russia .. .. .	55-63
Russian Constituent Assembly .. .. .	62
Russia, Summary of Position of .. .. .	67
Saar Valley .. .. .	37, 42, 43, 65, 70, 73
Sarajevo Murders .. .. .	24
Sarolea, Dr. Charles .. .. .	83
" Save the Children Fund " .. .. .	40
Sazonoff .. .. .	60
Schleswig .. .. .	70
Self-determination .. .. .	14
Shantung .. .. .	48, 66
Silesia .. .. .	44, 66, 71, 73
Smuts, General, Protests by .. .. .	80, 81
Southport Conference .. .. .	6, 40, 55
Soviet Government .. .. .	11, 58-9
"    "    Allies offer to .. .. .	59-60
Soviet Marriage Law .. .. .	60
Summarisation .. .. .	64
Synopsis of Chapters .. .. .	3-4
Tanner, Judge .. .. .	61
" Times " .. .. .	9, 56, 58
Trades Union Congress and Labour Party .. .. .	23
Trades Union Congress, Parliamentary Committee of .. .. .	5
Treaty and Labour in Germany .. .. .	17, 18, 19
Trotsky .. .. .	61
Tyrol .. .. .	65
University Men, Protest by .. .. .	84-5
Upper Silesia .. .. .	44
Versailles and Brest-Litovsk .. .. .	19, 20
West Prussia .. .. .	43-4, 66
White Guards .. .. .	60-1
" White Terror " in Russia and Finland .. .. .	60-1
Wilson, President 8, 12, 15, 16, 17, 29, 38 .. .. .	38
"    on Responsibility and Punishment .. .. .	29
"    Declarations .. .. .	16, 17, 38
"    Five Points .. .. .	15, 86-7 (text)
"    Fourteen Points .. .. .	15, 38, 85 (text)
Wood, General Leonard .. .. .	54
World Economic Council .. .. .	39
Young, Mr. Douglas .. .. .	58

# **T**HE WORK OF THE LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT.

THE work of the Research Department can be roughly classified under two main heads: that of collecting information and documents bearing on questions of interest to the Labour Movement, and that of rendering the information thus collected generally accessible.

## **PRESS-CUTTINGS SECTION and LABOUR NEWS SERVICE.**

¶ All the leading newspapers and Labour papers, many local papers and journals of employers' associations are cut and filed for reference in the Department. From this source comes a large amount of the material which the Department, in conjunction with the Publicity Department of the Labour Party, is using as a basis for the Labour News Service, political and industrial.

## **LIBRARY OF LABOUR DOCUMENTS.**

¶ The Department has a very large collection of Trade Union, Co-operative, Socialist, and other Labour documents, and also of Government Reports and White Papers dealing with matters of interest to Labour, including Education, Local Government, Public Health and Insurance, Trade Unionism and all questions relating to Trade Unions, legal questions affecting Labour, after-war problems, and a large number of others. All documents are filed and indexed, and the information derived from them is available for consultation by members and affiliated societies.

## **INTERNATIONAL SECTION.**

¶ A collection of foreign labour documents has now been accumulated, and an international section has been set up. The information is published through the Monthly Circular, and communications are being established with Labour abroad in various countries.

## **LOCAL CORRESPONDENTS.**

¶ The Department has secured the services of a number of local correspondents and investigators who report upon the state of industrial and political organisation in various districts. This also enables special investigations to be undertaken on points of particular interest; and it is hoped to develop this branch of the work very considerably in the near future.

## **COMMITTEES OF INQUIRY.**

¶ Committees of Inquiry are set up to investigate any subject of particular importance, and the Reports of these Committees are published in due course. Subjects already dealt with include the Co-operative Movement, Co-operative Production, the Organisation of Teachers and Other Professionals, Industrial Assurance, and the working of the Health Insurance Act, and proposals for an international authority; and Committees are at present at work on the history, organisation,



THE LABOUR PARTY.



LABOUR POLICY  
AND  
THE FAMINE.

Price 2d. ; post free, 2½d.

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.

**LABOUR PAMPHLETS ON THE  
PEACE..**

**The Peace Terms.**

By the Rt. Hon. Arthur Henderson, M.P.  
(Secretary of the Labour Party).

**Labour and the Peace Treaty.**

Containing Parliamentary Speeches by—  
Rt. Hon. W. Adamson, M.P.,  
Rt. Hon. J. R. Clynes, M.P.,  
Mr. Stephen Walsh, M.P.,  
Mr. Tom Shaw, M.P.

---

Price 2d. each; post free, 2½d.

---

**THE LABOUR PARTY, 33, ECCLESTON  
SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.**

## LABOUR POLICY AND THE FAMINE.

In the Memorandum on War Aims of the Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference of 1918 occurs the following passage:—

“This Conference insists that, in view of the probable world-wide shortage, after the war, of exportable foodstuffs and raw materials, and of merchant shipping, it is imperative, in order to prevent the most serious hardships, and even possible famine, in one country or another, that systematic arrangements should be made, on an international basis, for the allocation of the available exportable surpluses of these commodities to the different countries, in proportion not to their purchasing powers, but to their several pressing needs; and that, within each country, the Government must for some time maintain its control of the most indispensable commodities, in order to secure their appropriation, not in a competitive market mainly to the richer classes in proportion to their means, but, systematically, to meet the most urgent needs of the whole community on the principle of ‘no cake for anyone until all have bread.’”

Contained in this passage are two things: a prophecy and an outline of policy. The prophecy has been fulfilled and the proposed policy justified by that fulfilment.

Europe is faced by famine, and there is only one way adequately to deal with it, and that is to make a thorough and sincere application of the policy for which Labour stands.

It is because the forces hostile to that policy so far have triumphed that we face such a famine as we do. If we could imagine that condition getting worse the hopes which Labour bases upon an extended international co-operation of the workers must utterly collapse; if capitalistic as distinct from Labour remedies are applied in dealing with the famine, then forces hostile to Labour will have been greatly strengthened; Labour will have suffered a very great political defeat, a set-back which may embarrass the effectiveness of its programme for a generation.

These seem at first glance sweeping propositions. Let us examine them.

We would note at the outset that the very fact of the famine—its extent and character will be dealt with presently—is justification enough for Labour's special interest in this question. With whatever indifference “statecraft” may accept hunger and suffering and disease and pestilence raging over great surfaces of the earth as a mere incident of high politics, the workers, if they are wise, will not do so.

### LABOUR'S PROTEST AT THE SOUTHPORT CONFERENCE.

This determination was reflected in the resolution voted at the Annual Labour Party Conference (1919) at Southport:—

“This Conference enters its emphatic protest against the method of starvation, especially when used against women and children, as an instrument of Government policy, and views with grave anxiety the effects of the blockade on Central Europe in bringing the horrors of famine upon the great masses of the population in those countries. It protests further against the failure to provide in the Peace Treaty either for the restoration of industry throughout Europe with equality of fiscal treatment or for any adequate international control of raw materials and food. It urges that the administration of the Supreme Economic Council dealing with the distribution of raw materials and

food supplies and the management of finance should be made more democratic by the inclusion of representatives of the international working-class movement, and that full publicity be given to its proceedings."

The Labour Party has put the simple, decent, humane aspect of this thing first, before any political consideration whatsoever. It refuses to sanction the starvation of children, old men and women, the weak and ill, as an "instrument of policy." And it may justly be proud of its stand on that point. It is one, let us hope, needing no argument. All that Labour needs on such a question is to be sure of the facts.

What are the facts?

We propose to review them briefly as they have developed in Germany—next to Russia the largest of the areas affected by famine. But the situation in Austria and in Hungary, and even in some degree in the small Allied states, exhibits the same evils both in the development of famine and distress itself and in the inadequacy of the methods used in dealing with it. The differences are those of degree.

Dealing primarily, then, with the conditions prevailing among the German people, we may note that (1) the Allies in the Armistice terms (November 11th, 1918) practically undertook such provisioning of Germany "as should be found necessary"; (2) no food at all was allowed into Germany till nearly five months later, and meantime Germany's provisioning of herself was made far more difficult by several measures not foreshadowed in the Armistice, e.g., the prohibition of sea-fishing and the extension of the blockade to the Rhine; (3) the Brussels Agreement was at length arrived at (March 15th, 1919) as the direct result of General Plumer's message to the Peace Council warning them that his soldiers could no longer endure the sight of women and children starving.

#### THE INTERVENTION OF OUR SOLDIERS.

A very strong report by a Commission of 14 British officers was made in February, 1919. They found the following conditions in Germany (a) conditions of starvation falling severely on children, women, and the sick, and on the working capacity of labour; (b) rapidly increasing unemployment, caused by lack of raw materials and lack of transport due to the deliveries under the Armistice terms; (c) the rapid spread of Bolshevism, as the direct result of so much misery. Captain Roddie (from Leipzig) reported "the policy of continuing starvation . . . is not only senseless but utterly harmful to ourselves." Captains Roddie, Bell, and Tennant (at Berlin): "The nation has lost nearly all its powers of resistance to illness and infection and its energy for work. Women in childbirth are dying on a terrible scale." Captain Bell (at Cassel): "The poor are suffering horribly . . . the mortality amongst women, children, and the aged has been awful for years past, and is at its worst to-day." Captain Roddie: "Germany is on the brink of a volcano . . . it would be foolish to suppose that the ensuing disaster would be confined to us." Not one of these English officers disputed the reality of the distress, and their statements only confirmed the repeated warnings of neutral as well as German authorities, statements invariably scoffed at by our Press and disregarded by our rulers.

The food supplies in Germany were then rapidly diminishing, and were expected to be exhausted in May. The Brussels Agreement (March 15th) allowed Germany to import a maximum of 370,000 tons of cereals and fats per month, provided she could find the means of payment and transport. The first ration of U.S. flour was distributed in Hamburg on 3rd April

The maximum of 370,000 tons per month itself represented less than two-thirds of what neutral as well as German medical authorities calculated to be the minimum required to maintain health and strength. Quantities to restore the enfeebled health of large sections of the population would have needed to be much larger. By the end of June the amount actually allowed would have been over 1,000,000 tons. Owing to the financial difficulty, however, Germany had only succeeded in importing about 655,000 tons.\* Mr. Hoover severely blames German capitalists for unwillingness to give up their foreign securities to provide payment for food imports. Apart from this difficulty, Germany's power to import was restricted by her power to provide goods for export, and the blockade, by cutting off supplies of raw materials, had paralysed industry. Moreover, the fall of the mark to one-third its pre-war value trebled price in Germany. This stops many goods coming in at all, or if they do so, renders prices prohibitive to the poor (e.g., rationed meat and bacon have cost 8 to 11 marks a lb.; by illicit trade a great deal more).

The production of goods for export was also seriously hindered by strikes, especially among coal miners. The strikes themselves, however (see reports of British officers), result largely from hunger conditions. Meanwhile, the complications caused by the strikes are used in Germany to discredit Trade Unionism and Socialism.

#### DISTRESS OF THE GERMAN WORKING CLASSES.

In March, Mr. Villard, the editor of the well-known New York weekly, the "Nation," made a personal investigation of the situation in Germany, and cabled to America: "No one can live on the ration allowed. . . . One workman I saw earns 100 marks a week, but has had no clothes since the war began, and is literally in rags. His two children are dead, and his wife is dying from consumption." Similar cases of the practical wiping out of working-class families, through tuberculosis and other troubles, directly due to malnutrition, can be found in great

---

\*The Finance Minister, Gothein, explained Germany's difficulty in finding means of payments for imported food, as follows:—

"Now we are at last allowed to import food, but we are deprived of the means of acquiring it. We can only pay with our own products. But our enemies have crippled our industrial production. First of all, by taking away our transport . . . . Repairs, too, are enormously in arrear (lack of materials). We are asked to deliver coal to neutral countries and to Belgium and France, but we have no means of doing so.

"We are to deliver iron but the ores of Lorraine and Luxemburg—our main supply in the past—are forbidden to us . . . and our harbours are closed by the blockade. One after another our furnaces must be let out, and steel works and rolling mills and foundries closed. Our electrical industries used 263,000 tons of copper, mostly American. The world cries aloud for their products, but our factories are empty and silent, for copper is forbidden to us. . . . After England, Germany was the best customer of America for cotton. In 1913 we imported 389,000 tons, worth £23,000,000. Most of our factories are standing still, the workmen idle and losing their skill. We cannot provide for a fraction of our own needs, to say nothing of export, and meanwhile the American planters are at a loss what to do with their cotton. In peace time the English spinners used to send us 39,000 tons of cotton and woollen yarn, value £17,000,000. . . . So also with the Italian and French raw silk and Indian jute. Our rubber industry is also idle, while the plantation owners are at a loss where to dispose of their products. . . . Long continued unemployment brings degeneration and loathing of work. The habit grows of dependence on public support, and the more meagre, the more insufficient the food obtained, the greater the discontent and the responsiveness to wild and fantastic ideas—to the idea that all must be ruined in order that a better future may arise out of the wreck."

numbers in the records of German child welfare and other charitable societies. As Mr. Villard went on to explain, "No special diets are possible, and physicians are unable to build up their patients after fever or when the shock of an operation is over." The lack of milk especially still reduces doctors, nurses, and parents to despair.

The adjoining neutral countries are at the present time (summer and autumn, 1919) making great efforts to rescue German children. Even fishermen, poor railway employes, and peasants, scantily rationed themselves, are opening their doors to them. A Swedish article ("Stockholm Dagblad," May 31st, described the "tragic aspect" of a trainload of German and Austrian children; "their faces were thin and pale, or sallow or sunken, like those of old and sick persons. Hunger and privation told their own tale." An appeal for help against starvation, sent to the Swiss Government by the Swiss colonies in Germany, mentioned 800 as the daily death-roll in Germany due to the "hunger blockade" (May, 1919).

Journalists of English papers of the most varied hue, from the "Daily News" to the "Daily Telegraph" (see articles of Mr. Philip Gibbs), bore witness as to the intensity of distress, and their accounts and those of other English investigators varied little between December, 1918, and August, 1919. To give a few examples:—

On May 5th the Berlin correspondent of the "Daily Express" writes—

"Thirty per cent. of the German women die in confinement. Thirty per cent. of the children born to married mothers die, and 50 per cent. of those born to unmarried mothers. I have encountered dozens of children 2 years of age who have never tasted milk. Children born since Armageddon was let loose on the world are shrivelled-up creatures."

Mr. Garvin, in the "Observer," on May 18th, writes—

"Nearly six months after the Armistice the blockade is still inflicting some of the most frightful miseries of war, especially on the women and children. . . . It works most on women and on the young. . . . Tuberculosis, scrofula, skin diseases, intestinal disorders, anæmia, in a way that will leave its mark on more than one generation, are grinding out the health and vigour of millions who are the least guilty, the poorer of the German masses."

On Christmas Eve, 1918, Mr. Nevinson wrote from Cologne of the "lines of babies" in the largest hospital, "fevered for want of food, their limbs wasted to sticks," "staring about them with ape-like and hopeless faces." At the end of June the same hospital was visited by another Englishman, who found "the same babies that Mr. Nevinson had seen, along with many others born since, who seemed to me in far worse condition. . . . I begged to be shown no more."—(Letter to Emergency Committee, June 28th.)

Scepticism as to the existence of distress has at times been freely expressed by certain individuals whose experience of German conditions is limited to the occupied districts. It does not seem to be generally known that in April the Inter-Allied Military Commission for Food Supply, apparently owing to pressure from the soldiers, decided themselves to increase the German ration of food value 1,400 calories to one of 2,400 calories for the occupied districts.—("New York World," May 1st.) This increase is at the expense of the rest of Germany.

The significance of the facts touched on above lies not only in the effect already produced on the future physique, morale, and political outlook of the German people, but in the fact that these conditions of destitution, disease, and unemployment are to be indefinitely prolonged as the result of the terms of peace.

## THE RESULTS OF THE PEACE TREATY.

Germany's position is, to a lesser degree, that of Britain: an enemy who can prevent foreign trade can starve the country. And that interdiction of trade need not be done, in the case of Germany (or German-Austria), solely by the use of the blockade. The Allies have taken her ships, most of her iron ore, much of her coal, her fertilisers, her railway rolling stock, her agricultural live stock, a large part of her best corn-growing districts; they control most of the overseas raw material (like cotton and rubber) which she needs for her industries; control her access to foreign markets, and, finally, through the Reparation Commission, control her financial relations with the outside world: she can send no money abroad save by our permission. So the situation is this: we say to Central Europe:—

“Your people are starving; we have raised the blockade. You are free to buy foreign food; but you must send no money abroad, since it is needed by the Reparation Commission. You are free to work; but we shall most narrowly limit your supply of coal and of raw materials. You may engage in foreign trade; but we shall take all your ships and allow you none of ours. Your children may have milk; but we shall take your milch-cows, although we have access to the world's stock, which you have not. You may re-establish your iron industries; but France and Poland shall be free to say on what terms you shall have iron.”

The statement of Count von Brockdorff-Rantzau that the Peace Treaty would force millions of people to emigrate or starve has been endorsed by Mr. Hoover, the Director of the American Food Administration. In his statement of June 10th he points out that 25 or 30 million Germans (in Austria and Germany) “lived before the war by trade . . . and these cannot be supported on the land.” It is possible that “ten or twelve millions of this population may emigrate . . . under the economic pressure which will be their fate at the best.”

It needs no explaining that “economic pressure” strong enough to drive ten or twelve millions of people from their homes implies conditions of destitution, death, and despair which would cause the death probably of as many millions as would finally succeed in emigrating. This was what happened at the time of the great famine in Ireland.

The Peace now imposed does, in fact, spell destruction for millions of humble homes, and for millions of others indefinite prolongation of squalor and the sordid scramble for joyless existence. It is a Peace which passes sentence of death upon, it may be, the only surviving child, upon countless men and women, old and young, who so far have just managed to hold out against the cumulative effects of privation.

One of the very earliest effects of the Peace Treaty will be the death of large numbers of babies, who, owing to the cession of 140,000 milch cows, will be entirely deprived of the milk which even now provides only the scantiest ration for children up to 4, and for serious cases of illness.

In April a Commission of neutral doctors reported that it was impossible to cope with the appalling spread of tuberculosis and rickets, owing to the dearth of milk.

In August, 1919, an official White Paper (Cd. 280), drawn up by British scientific and medical experts, confirms the earlier neutral and enemy reports. The death rate from tuberculosis has increased from two-and-a-half to six times, according to locality. “The shortage of milk has already told heavily on the children, . . . and the parents are already driven to distraction in their efforts to provide food which will keep life in the bodies of their children.” (The White Paper urges an alternative to the cession of cows; see page 22.)

To Germany, whose own food supplies in June were approaching exhaustion, the alternative of signing or not signing the Peace presented itself as the alternative

of a slow death or a more rapid one. Switzerland, indeed, and the other neutrals (at considerable risk to themselves) refused to be parties to the renewed application in its extremist form of "the starvation weapon," which has been described by Mr. Churchill himself as falling "mainly on the women and children, the old, the weak, and the poor." Nevertheless, it was only the immediate necessity of escaping from the blockade which induced Germany to accept the Peace, which they regard as the death-blow to their country.

### THE HUNGER SCOURGE: NEW USE OF AN OLD WEAPON.

The use of economic pressure by the ruling class is by far the most powerful political weapon at their disposal, and is familiar to all workers. The new feature now is its application *internationally*, and on a scale so vast that the life of once mighty nations, and the continued existence of our whole civilisation, is involved. Some further illustrations may here not be out of place. On April 12th the Vienna Government were "officially and expressly" informed by the British military plenipotentiary that "if riots should occur in German Austria the import of food and raw materials would be entirely stopped at once." On April 17th the Italian Mission at Salzburg gave the same warning in the event of a "Communist or Bolshevik rising." The chief Vienna paper hastened to remind the Viennese that Vienna would have "literally nothing" (Austrian supplies had been exhausted in January), and "the two million people who inhabit this town have only one common duty . . . salvation from bestial, merciless hunger." The hunger at this time was already so intense that old and young were being attacked by a disease hitherto hardly known, in which the bones go soft and the patient becomes crippled and deformed. e

That the Bolshevik evil for which the Entente proposed the remedy of hunger was in Vienna, as in Germany, the direct result of hunger was obvious to other observers. The correspondent of the Italian Radical paper, the "Stampa," wrote (April 22nd): "Yesterday's disturbances are nothing but Vienna's yell of famine and the last appeal of German Austria for some generosity on the part of the victors . . . the famished, horrible reality in Vienna has only one word to express itself—desperation."

Again, in Socialist Budapest, we have had a perfect example of what Mr. Harmsworth calls "the most powerful and at the same time the most merciful weapon" of the blockade! The population was, and still is, being decimated by the diseases due to famine and dirt. For nine months past even the hospitals have been destitute of the most primitive necessities of coal, soap, sheets, swaddling clothes, bandages, disinfectants, medicines, and milk. Mothers and new-born babies perish together on the soiled and lice-infected mattresses, unprotected either by sheet or blanket. And where Hungarians perish in their thousands, the Russians, in like case, perish in their hundred thousands. "There are no babies under 2 left in Petrograd," said Dr. Nansen, already in April.

In Moscow hospitals 80 per cent. of women die in childbirth, and 90 per cent. of the infants perish likewise.—("Novaya Jizn," May 28th.)

On 19th May the Supreme Economic Council announced that the "blockade of Hungary will be suspended as soon as a Government is installed which gives some assurance of settled conditions," or of "law and order," the phrase used on another occasion. British workers, who know something of what hunger, or the menace of it, means, might well have asked, "How many more babies must perish; how many mothers must be driven desperate; how many more men be infected with the sickness bred of hunger and the anarchism bred of despair before the "settled conditions" demanded by the Entente were realised?"



## THE VICTORIOUS MARCH OF DISEASE AND DESTITUTION.

The blockade is indeed a most potent weapon, but it is two edged. Month after month was taken up at Paris in the work of allocating mining districts, ports, indemnities, and other fruits of victory. But if a long view is taken many times the value of these assets was jeopardised by the spread of social unrest, unchecked pestilence, and, above all, by the paralysing effect on industry and the arrest of production which the delay involved.

Disease is the inevitable bye-product of a successful blockade. Apart from the countries above mentioned, all the countries of Europe and the Near East are already ravaged by disease as a result of war conditions and, above all, of the blockade. Famine and fatigue produce a condition of lowered resistance to infection; absence of soap, disinfectants, etc., favours its spread, and Europe is menaced by the reproduction of the epidemics of the Middle Ages. In March, 1919, the typhus menace was already so great that Red Cross delegates from the warring States of Hungary, Roumania, Czecho-Slovakia, the Ukraine, Austria, and Poland met to confer at Budapest. They urgently begged for assistance (which they did not get) from the Allied Powers. Some weeks later Mr. Davison, chairman of the Board of Governors of the new Red Cross League stated:—

“Right now there are 275,000 cases of typhus in a line stretching between the Baltic and the Black Sea, and the wave is rolling in our direction. If the people of the United States knew the distress in Middle Europe they could not sleep.”—(“New York World,” April 23rd, 1919.)

And again:—

“I would not give a damn for all the Peace Treaties in the world if something is not done to relieve the incredible, the unbelievable distress that exists in the world to-day.”

“In Russia there are terrible typhus and small-pox epidemics, against which there is not the slightest possibility of protection. The Government has no means to fight or stop these epidemics.” “It cannot even procure wood enough for coffins. just as little as it can organise the transport of the corpses to the cemeteries. Survivors must wait several days before they can succeed in burying the victims.”—(The Danish paper “Politiken,” April 13th.)

In March the International Red Cross appealed to the Peace Conference for a lifting of the blockade on account of the “unspeakable miseries” of the hospitals in the countries of Eastern Europe, which make them simply foci of epidemic diseases. The almost total absence not only of medicines, anæsthetics, and all sorts of medical appliances, but of the most elementary necessities, such as coal, soap, linen, sheets, etc., created a “desperate” situation. In April another manifesto described disease as spreading with “agonising rapidity.”

An Allied Conference of the Red Cross reported (“Times,” April 14th) that “unless active measures are now taken in Eastern Europe a much greater epidemic may be feared there in the autumn, especially owing to the famished condition of the populations.”

“Europe is a good place to avoid just at present” is the moral drawn by an American paper.

Typhus is an epidemic carried by fleas and lice. To quote Mr. Davison again, “Having had to fight men with bullets, it looks now as if the world would have to mobilise to fight—lice.” Meanwhile the hotbed of infection created by the effects of our blockade in Hungary, Austria, and Russia remains unremedied. In August English doctors cabled home imploring help for the still “desperate” situation in Budapest and Vienna hospitals.

### MORAL DEBACLE AS RESULT OF FAMINE.

Not only physical health, but civilisation itself and the most primitive morality crumble under the unnatural stress of prolonged suffering. An account given by a Russian writer applies equally to other countries. He explains (in the Danish "Politiken," (April 23rd) that after a time the spectacle of misery ceases to make any appeal to sympathy. It only avails to make the instinct of self-preservation more keen.

"At the sight of those who are most miserable, people only think how they themselves must make provision to escape a similar fate. They must see to it that they collect more foodstuffs; they must take care to hide them still more effectively . . . . Hopelessness is the feeling that dominates all and everything. And it is no doubt this feeling that there is no way out that each day is so changing the character of the people. And when one considers that the character of children and young people is being formed in this morass one shudders at the thought of the probable consequences."

Is it any wonder to us then that the peasant hoards, that the profiteer clutches his profits! That parents steal to save the lives of their starving children, and children to help their parents? "Virtuous German women," wrote a British soldier to his family, "are selling themselves to provide food for their families." The truth of this was confirmed to the writer of this memorandum a few weeks later by a Swiss girl who had been living in Germany.

### THE DIFFICULTY OF TRANSPORT AND FINANCE.

But before passing on to the question of remedies it is necessary to answer the question, Was not the world shortage of food and transport so great as to render the evils described partly inevitable?

The "New York Times" wrote of America early this summer, "If ever there was a country distressed by excess of materials for food and clothing, this is one." There was, in fact, last spring a glut of corn and other foodstuffs in the United States, and this summer's crops, though not so large that "we shall have wheat to burn" (as a U.S. paper put it), are large enough to meet the needs of Europe. Whether shipping and inland transport difficulties can be overcome is really a question of how much will there is to overcome them. In the last months shipping, which might have carried flour for starving children, has been freely used to bring superfluities to England for the rich (e.g., the embargo on the import of wine was removed), and to carry munitions to Russia. Ultimately the question resolves itself into this: What efforts and sacrifices is the crisis really worth? The same applies to the far more serious financial difficulty. If Europe is to be saved she must be allowed to purchase her necessities mainly on credit.

The extreme seriousness of the crisis in Europe finds confirmation, if more were needed, from the fear repeatedly expressed by leading men, both here and in the U.S., that repercussions may reach ourselves. On July 8th Lord Robert Cecil stated: "The economic situation in Europe was as serious as it possibly could be. People were unable to get sufficient food, and there was a general breakdown of all transport. The whole system of credit—a vital point—was seriously injured or absolutely destroyed. The most urgent problem of foreign affairs was to try to set right that economic position, and for that purpose, even in our own interests, we must be prepared, if necessary, to come to the assistance of Europe—and we must in particular so frame our Peace policy as not to hinder the economic recovery of Europe. If we hindered it we must not be surprised if revolutionary ideas developed which would ultimately engulf, if not ourselves, at any rate every other country in Europe."

### A CRISIS WHICH INVOLVES OURSELVES.

Similarly, Mr. Frank Vanderlip, a great American financial expert, recently created a "profound impression" ("Times" and "Daily News," May 29th) in America, by pointing out that the industrial crisis in Central Europe is not going to stop there. "A responsible (English) Minister had told him that unless the European demand was re-established (that is, our markets throughout Europe), 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 Englishmen must be got nearer the sources of food supplies." ("Times," May 28th.) In other words, unless we can "rehabilitate the European markets" which our blockade has destroyed, England will not be able to support her present industrial population.

The "rehabilitation of the European markets" is a question of restarting the industrial machine, which has first been paralysed by the blockade and then by the bankruptcy which is the legacy of the blockade. The White Paper referred to above (Cq. 280) shows that the output of the German worker has been reduced in many cases 55 per cent. by malnutrition; the productivity of the starved soil 50 per cent. If Germany can only maintain her present rations and the resultant "miserable state of nutrition of the people" this must be attended "with a constant increase in the incidence of sickness and mortality, and with a continually diminishing efficiency of the workers. Thus the country will be unable to produce sufficient wealth to pay for the imported food, and still less to discharge any portion of its debts in the way of reparation to the Allies." Unless Germany (and similarly German-Austria) can be provided with sufficient food and raw material on credit, she "stands face to face with a catastrophe which may involve the death of millions by famine and disease" (page 12). Side by side with the conclusions of these impartial Englishmen, the authors of the White Paper, let us set the verdict of Mr. Hoover himself, who maintains (to quote the summary of the "Times," August 13th) that "the continuation of the blockade, after the Armistice, has destroyed enterprise even in open countries, and prevented any recovery in enemy countries. . . . Unless productivity can be rapidly increased there can be nothing but political, moral, and economic chaos, finally interpreting itself in loss of life on a scale hitherto undreamed of," and "production cannot increase if political incompetence continues the blockade, embargoes, censorship, mobilisation, large armies, navies, and war."

It is this "political incompetence" of which we have sketched the story. Having established the facts, let us now consider the policy which is to meet them.

### THE ISSUE FOR LABOUR.

The reasons why Labour, apart from humanitarian considerations, should concern itself with conditions in the famine areas, and with the measures employed to remedy them, are:—

1. Labour's acquiescence—if such a thing could be imagined—in a policy which, resulting in the starvation of millions, and the destruction, both economically and physically, of whole nations would be a cause of future war—and all that war means to the worker in the way of helpless submission to military and autocratic governments, the suspension of Labour's efforts towards a better social order, and the collapse of International Socialism.

2. The arrest of productivity in Central Europe, due partly to previous prolonged famine and partly to disabilities imposed by the Peace Treaty, which, *inter alia*, perpetuate famine, must powerfully contribute to world-shortage and universal high prices, and restrict demand for the products of British industry.

3. Famine must mean obviously reduction or extinction of the payments due from those areas for restitution and reparation—a loss for which groups of capitalist traders could find compensation in the “captured” German foreign trade which would result from measures like depriving the enemy countries of raw material.

4. Famine must mean over large areas in Europe a reduced standard of living, servile condition of Labour, and perhaps forced emigration, which would increase everywhere the difficulty of maintaining labour standards.

5. All these concomitants of famine will greatly increase the difficulties in the way of the international co-operation of Labour and militate against the success of its international plans.

If the whole question is left in the hands of capitalist groups and interests (as it is now being left) what will be the result?

1. The virtual control of the world's shipping, credit, much of its raw material and food will pass from public bodies to private capitalist “rings” operating internationally.

2. This power can be used to defeat the apparent gains of Labour by the manipulation of prices in freights, raw materials, etc.

3. And by this, and the manipulation of credit, to discriminate powerfully against Socialist or Workers' Governments, wherever they may be established.

#### IMMEDIATE MEASURES AND PERMANENT POLICY.

What, then, in brief, is Labour's policy? Apart from the revision of the Peace Treaty (see above), the immediate needs are:—

1. A complete raising of the blockade **everywhere**, in **practice** as well as **in name**.

2. Granting **credits** to enemy and to liberated countries alike, to enable them to obtain food and raw materials sufficient to put them in a position where they can begin to help themselves.

3. Measures for the special relief of children **everywhere**, without regard to the political allegiance of their parents; and the provision of hospital necessities.

Labour, however, has a more permanent and far-reaching policy.

It is indicated in the Labour Party's “Memorandum on International Labour Legislation” (Section XIII., “The Economic Structure of the League of Nations”) in these terms:—

“For the emergency period, at least, it is vitally necessary that from the Supreme Economic Council of the Allies should emerge a World Economic Council, with the function of rationing the nations with supplies while the world shortage and dislocation of normal trade conditions continue. This is essential, not only because both raw materials and foodstuffs and the tonnage necessary for their transport are largely in the hands of Great Britain and the United States, but also because purchasing power and credit are largely concentrated in the same hands. There can be no speedy restoration of the world's economic life unless supplies and the credit necessary to obtain them are placed freely at the disposal of all nations. Failure to do this, which will mean a scramble for supplies between the nations, coupled with a stagnation in most of the markets of the world, even where the need for supplies is greatest, would merely ensure the perpetuation of old economic antagonisms between the nations and the rapid creation of new ones, even among the countries at present in alliance. This would clearly be fatal to every possible hope of a real League of Nations.”

### CONTROL OR LAISSEZ-FAIRE?

Three facts demand special attention in connection with the above policy.

1. No measure short of the complete re-establishment of the normal economic life of the countries concerned—which means their access to credit, shipping, raw materials—can, as Mr. Hoover declares, ensure these populations against starvation.

2. The restoration of industrial activity throughout the world can take place, broadly, along one of two lines. The methods which were applied to the worst crisis of the war—to the shortage of munitions, the distribution of food and transport—can be extended and applied to the purposes of peace; or we may revert to the older methods of making the production of things simply depend upon the prospect of private gain, and their distribution respond simply to the varying degrees of ability to pay on the part of those who want them. This system had to be abandoned during the war simply because under it the nations and the Alliance would have collapsed.

3. This last method will be increasingly applied to the famine situation unless Labour makes itself heard.

### THE BEGINNINGS OF AN INTERNATIONAL ORDER.

It should be noted here how rapid has been the reversion to laissez-faire methods since the termination of the war, although individualist laissez-faire happens to be the system against which the Labour Movement, alike on its purely Trade Union and on its Socialist side, is in revolt. This reversion has taken place not only in home affairs, but in the international field. During the period of the war we had great international bodies for the control and distribution of shipping, credit, and raw material in accordance not with capacity to pay, but with vital need. Only so could the common enemy be met.

There was in these arrangements the beginnings of an organised economic government of the world, a real international society, subjecting to a common control those things essential to the common life. Here was a world-government actually in being. And immediately the war was over it was ruthlessly pulled to pieces, mainly in obedience to pressure exercised by private capitalist organisations. Shipping, banking, trading, and manufacturing concerns naturally desired to revert to the untrammelled and uncontrolled exploitation which characterised trade and industry before the war.\*

In speaking of this reversion to the laissez-faire regime, an important distinction has to be made. If it were a real freedom, even of competition, if all economic

---

\*Whilst constantly creating new dangers, the capitalist system has proved itself incapable of meeting the existing crisis. Thus, while for some months past the Government has given every opportunity for trade with South Russia and Siberia, private industry and commerce have proved unable, largely owing to the difficulties of the exchange, to take advantage of the opening. Meanwhile the Co-operative Wholesale Society has come to an agreement with the corresponding productive and trading organisation of Russian Co-operative Societies, under which the British movement will ship manufactured goods to the Rostov district, and will receive in exchange raw materials and food. An agreement such as this is full of promise for the future. It is to be hoped that co-operative trading will be conducted on a large scale by wholesale societies organised on a national basis, or possibly by the creation of an international wholesale society for the purpose of international trade.

Apart from the advantage of finding together the democracies of the different countries by definite economic bonds, there are two main reasons why trading by

barriers were in process of disappearance, all Governmental restrictions being withdrawn, there would be a great deal to be said for it. But that is not what has taken place. International control for the purpose of assuring an equitable distribution according to need has disappeared. But national control of foreign trade, exercised through administrative order, has been maintained, and maintained at a time when administrative powers are at their very height.

Their realisation has for the time being been left to Roumanian bayonets and a Hapsburg Archduke!

### FINANCE AND INTERNATIONAL POLICY.

Licences to trade, to export or to import to or from this or that country, are granted at the entire discretion of Governmental Departments. What forces guide the decisions of Olympian Governmental Departments in these matters of high international finance and foreign trade? What influences determine that trade in certain things shall be permitted with, say, Constantinople or Berlin and denied to Budapest or Petrograd? The Trade Unions and Labour organisations do not have very much to say to these particular matters of policy. So far, indeed, they have not shown much interest in the matter. The relation of hours and wages to an authorised banker's loan to a new kingdom in Arabia or a Provisional Government in Esthonia or Finland is not always very clear. The relations between British Siberian companies, capitalised at several millions sterling, with the British Government on the one hand, and the relations of that Government to a Siberian dictator who has confirmed the concessions granted to the British companies on the other; the bearing of both these relationships upon licences granted to certain cargoes to Vladivostock are perhaps even still more obscure.

It is thus clear that the abolition of international control merely means that the field is left clear for private capitalism to influence the various national Governments for its own ends. International control must be re-established and in a more democratic form than before. The policy of Labour is not to destroy the system of international regulation which the Governments have created for the purpose of the war. It is to demand that the system shall be maintained, but to insist at the same time that its defects shall be remedied and its function enlarged and democratised for the purpose of peace. These bodies, however autocratic and bourgeois in character during the war, constitute the beginnings of an organised economic government of the world. They represent at least a departure in principle from the old order of individual competition in favour of one of international co-operation on a basis of real need and common welfare. They should be made the beginnings of a constructive international society.

---

co-operative organisations is more appropriate to the present scale of the world's development than trading by capitalist groups, and is destined, therefore, to a great future:—

1. Co-operative organisations are agencies for consumption as well as for production and distribution. They can receive goods in exchange for the foods they sell, and consume these goods. They do not need to receive money, or to sell the goods they receive to someone else. Transactions like that between the British and Russian Co-operative movements form, in reality, a process of barter. The result is that co-operative organisations can avoid all the difficulties caused by the disorganisation of currencies, and of international finance, which have at the present moment thrown the whole capitalist machinery out of gear.

2. They eliminate profiteering. They even eliminate that suspicion of profiteering which is found in all countries to-day, and which is at the bottom of a great part, at least, of the social unrest of the time.

# Memoranda on International Labour Legislation.

---

## THE ECONOMIC STRUCTURE OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

---

- I. Uniformity of Workmen's Rights when working abroad.
- II. Obligation to prevent Unemployment.
- III. Provision for Relief of the Unemployed.
- IV. Inspection.
  - V. A Uniform Minimum of Factory Legislation.
  - VI. International Regulation of Hours of Labour.
  - VII. Recognition of the Right of Combination.
- VIII. The Mercantile Marine.
- IX. Asiatic and Other Problems of Native Labour.
- X. International Labour Legislation: Methods of Enforcement and International Machinery.
- XI. A Parliament of the League of Nations.
- XII. The Economic Functions of the League of Nations.
- XIII. The Economic Structure of the League of Nations.
- XIV. Questions of Special Interest to Women.

### APPENDICES.

- I. The Labour Charter adopted by the Berne International Labour and Socialist Conference, 1919.
- II. Report of the Commission on International Labour Legislation to the Peace Conference, with a Draft Convention creating a permanent organisation for the Promotion of the International Regulation of Labour conditions.  
Price 1s. By post, 1s. 1½d.

### IN THE PRESS:—

#### LABOUR WOMEN ON INTERNATIONAL LEGISLATION

containing—

- I. MEMORANDA ON WOMEN'S EMPLOYMENT  
by Miss Gertrude M. Tuckwell.
- II. THE EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN  
by Dr. Marion Phillips, D.Sc. (Econ.).
- III. THE PREVENTION OF UNEMPLOYMENT  
by Miss A. Susan Lawrence, L.C.C.





**INTER-ALLIED  
LABOUR AND SOCIALIST CONFERENCE.**

5

---

**Memorandum**  
ON  
**WAR AIMS**

Agreed upon at the Central Hall, Westminster,  
London, S.W., on

**February 20th to 24th, 1918.**

---

**PRICE ONE PENNY.**

1½d. post free; 1s. per doz.; 3s. 6d. per 50; 7s. per 100; £3 per 1,000, carriage paid.

---

I, VICTORIA ST., WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W. 1.

# INTER-ALLIED LABOUR AND SOCIALIST CONFERENCE.

---

The third Inter-Allied Conference, held on the 20th February, 1918, and three following days, was organised in consequence of a decision taken at the Conference of the British Trades Union Congress at Blackpool in September, 1917. Two days later the policy of the Labour Party on the resumption of International Labour and Socialist relations was assimilated to that of the Trades Union Congress, and a Joint Committee was appointed to consider the possibilities of common action.

In London, on the 28th December, 1917, the British "Memorandum on War Aims" was approved by a Special Conference of the Labour Party and the British Trades Union Congress, and the Executive Committees of these organisations thereupon made themselves responsible for the convocation of a Conference of Allied Labour and Socialist Parties, with the view of obtaining an agreement on the basis of this Memorandum, as the Conference might desire to amend it.

The two British National Committees consisted of:—

The National Executive of the British Labour Party.—W. Frank Purdy (Chairman), J. McGurk (Vice-Chairman), J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P. (Treasurer), W. C. Anderson, M.P., W. Carter, J. R. Clynes, M.P., Tom Fox, W. H. Hutchinson, F. W. Jowett, M.P., A. G. Cameron, W. C. Robinson, J.P., Ben Turner, J.P., Egerton P. Wake, George J. Wardle, M.P., Sidney Webb, James Wignall, J.P., Right Hon. Arthur Henderson (Secretary).

The Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress.—J. W. Ogden (Chairman); John Hill, J.P. (Vice-Chairman), F. Bramley, W. J. Davis, J.P., H. Gosling, J.P., F. Hall, M.P., J. H. Jenkins, E. Judson, A. Onions, J.P., E. L. Poulton, J.P., J. Sexton, J.P., H. Skinner, G. H. Stuart-Bunning, J.P., Right Hon. J. H. Thomas, M.P., W. Thorne, M.P., R. B. Walker, J. B. Williams, Right Hon. C. W. Bowerman (Secretary).

They invited the Labour and Socialist organisations of the following countries to the Conference:—

FRANCE.—Socialist Party and General Confederation of Labour.

GREAT BRITAIN.—Labour Party and Trades Union Congress.

BELGIUM.—Labour Party.

ITALY.—Socialist Party with Trade Unions; Reformist Party with Trade Unions.

SERBIA.—Socialist Party.

UNITED STATES.—American Federation of Labour..

PORTUGAL.—Socialist Party.

GREECE.—Socialist Party.

RUSSIA.—Social Democratic Party (Bolshevik and Menshevik Sections); Social Revolutionary Party.

SOUTH AFRICA.—Labour Party.

AUSTRALIA.—Labour Party.

NEW ZEALAND.—Labour Party.

CANADA.—Labour Party.

ROUMANIA.—Socialist Party.

All these organisations, with the exception of the American Federation of Labour, the Bolsheviks, and the Roumanian Socialist Party, replied favourably to the invitation. The American Federation of Labour sent a telegram saying that circumstances made it impossible for them to be represented. The Bolsheviks refused to come because they could not accept an invitation to a Conference which, in their opinion, was opposed to the principles of the International. The Menshevik Section of the Russian Social Democratic Party and the Social Revolutionary Party of Russia were not represented at the Conference because the Bolshevik Government refused to give passports to their delegates. No reply was received from the Roumanian Party. Telegraphic approval of the draft Memorandum on War Aims of the British Parties was received from Portugal, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa. The Serbian delegation, who also approved of the main lines of the Memorandum as finally adopted, arrived after the close of the Conference. A few days later MM. Sideris, Couriel (deputies), and Dimitratos, who are qualified to express the point of view of the Greek Socialist Party, arrived from Greece. They also gave general approval to the Memorandum.

Delegates of the following organisations were admitted to the Conference in a consultative capacity:—

- (a) Serbian political and trade union groups of Socialist refugees living in France.
- (b) Socialist Party of Bosnia-Herzegovina.
- (c) Italian Irredentist Groups.
- (d) The new Labour Party of Roumania.
- (e) The South African International Socialist League.

The following were the delegates to the Conference:—

FRANCE.—French Socialist Party: P. Renaudel, A. Thomas, M. Caohin, Mistral, J. Longuet, L. Dubreuilh, A. Bourderon. General Confederation of Labour: L. Jouhaux, A. Luquet, M. Maurin, Merheim, V. Lefèvre, M. Laurent.

BRITAIN.—The members of the National Executive of the Labour Party and the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress.

BELGIUM.—Belgian Labour Party: Emile Vanderveelde, L. de Brouckère, H. de Man, Camille Huysmans, V. De Meulemeester, A. Labouille, W. Eekelers.

ITALY.—Italian Socialist Party: G. Modigliani, A. Schiavi. Italian Socialist Union: F. Arca, G. Canepa, M. Silvestri, P. Mantica, L. Caetani, G. Lazzarini,\* A. Sestan,\* E. Schott.\*

SERBIA.—Serbian Socialist Party: D. Popovitch. Serbian Socialist Party in France: A. Pavlovitch,\* R. Novakovitch.\* General Trade Union of Serbs in France: K. Tchhalpa.\*

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA.—Socialist Party: F. Markitch.\*

ROUMANIA.—Labour Party: N. Lupu.\*

SOUTH AFRICA.—International Socialist League: W. H. Andrews.\*

(Those indicated by an asterisk were admitted as consultative delegates.)

Profiting by their experiences at the second Conference, where agreement could not be obtained, a British delegation and representatives of the French, Belgian, and Italian (Reformist) Parties took part in preliminary discussions at Paris. Owing to a difficulty about passports the delegates of the Italian Socialist Party were unable to be present at these Conferences.

The British delegation was composed of Bowerman, MoGurk, Thorne, Webb, MacDonald, Thomas, and Henderson, accompanied by C. Huysmans. The meetings took place on February 15th, 16th, and 17th at the Chamber of Deputies, the offices of the Confederation of Labour, the offices of the Socialist Party, and, finally, at the meeting of the National Council of the French Party, where a complete understanding was reached.

The Inter-Allied Conference met in the Central Hall, Westminster, on the 20th February and three following days. The Chairmen on the respective days were Ogden, A. Thomas, Vandervelde, and Henderson.

In order to facilitate discussion the meetings were not open to the public, but official reports were issued daily to the Press, and the members of the Conference were not pledged to secrecy.

#### COMMUNICATIONS TO THE CONFERENCE.

Telegrams accepting the British "Memorandum on War Aims" were received from the Canadian Labour Party, the Australian Labour Party, Portugal, and Greece.

A telegram from the Paole-Zionist Socialists congratulated the British Labour Movement on their policy of a Jewish settlement in Palestine.

Gompers cabled: "Your January 16th letter reached me late Saturday, February 9th, and brought to attention Executive Council. American Federation of Labour, in session on 11th. We regret that circumstances make it impossible to be represented at the Inter-Allied Conference, London, February 20th. Executive Council in declaration unanimously declared we cannot meet representatives of those who are allied against us in this world-war for freedom, but we hope they will sweep away the barriers which they have raised between us. All should be advised that anyone presuming to represent Labour of America in your Conference is simply self-constituted and unrepresentative. We hope shortly to send delegation to England and France. Please convey our fraternal greetings to the Inter-Allied Labour Conference, and assure them that we are pledged and will give our man-power and at least half we have in wealth-power in the struggle to secure for the world justice and freedom and democracy.—GOMPERS."

[This telegram, as published in the Press, contained an addendum which attributed to Gompers the statement that he believed German influences inspired the Conference. The Conference telegraphed to Gompers: "Press in this country circulating statement, on your alleged authority, that American Labour believes that German influences inspire the London Conferences. Nothing of this appears in your telegram to us, and we feel sure that you will resent gross falsification of your message, apparently part of a campaign of malicious misrepresentation on the part of enemies of Labour. Trust you will dissociate your Federation from statement, which is wholly untrue.—ALBERT THOMAS (Chairman), ARTHUR HENDERSON (Secretary)."]

The Bolsheviks telegraphed in the sense already indicated.

Roubanovitch, who was in Paris, sent a telegram expressing his personal approval of the Memorandum, but regretting that he was unable to get into touch with the Committee of his party the Menshevik Section of the Russian Social Democratic Party

The delegates of the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries sent a protest from Russia against the refusal of passports by the Bolshevik Government.

A collective declaration of the Italian Irredentist and Reformist Groups, the South Slavs, the Serbians, and the Roumanian delegate present at the

Conference asked for the nationalities of Austria-Hungary the right to determine their own political future. Telegrams to the same effect were received from various Irredentist Groups.

The South Slav Groups in England, France, and the United States of America sent letters in agreement with the declarations already referred to about the future of nationalities in Austria-Hungary.

A declaration presented by the Italian Reformist Socialists asked for such frontiers as would make the union of the Italian peoples possible and give freedom of development to the South Slavs.

The Czecho-Slovak Socialist workingmen of America asked the Conference to pronounce in favour of an independent Czecho-Slovak Republic.

Letters were received from Polish Groups protesting against the cession of Polish territory to the Ukraine Republic.

The Polish Socialist Party of Poland (Revolutionary Section) appealed to the Conference in favour of a united and independent Poland.

A declaration on behalf of the new Labour Party in Roumania submitted to the Conference asked for the frontiers before the Treaty of Bukarest, 1913, and suggested an agreement among the countries interested regarding the Banat, Bukovina, Bessarabia, and other territorial questions.

The Italian Socialist Party protested against the admission of the Reformists in these terms: "Comrades Modigliani and Schiavi, representing the Italian Socialist Party, again protest in the strongest terms against the admission to the Conference of other and self-styled sections of the Italian Socialist and Labour Movement, whose right to represent the movement to any extent they contest. They found their protest on grounds which have many times been pointed out to the B.S.I. by the leaders of the Italian Socialist Party, and were repeated at the previous Inter-Allied Conference by the Secretary of the Italian Socialist Party. Moreover, taking into account the very recent formation of the Italian Socialist Union, comrades Modigliani and Schiavi draw special attention to the fact that the other Italian delegates really represent only a group formed with the single purpose of opposing the true Labour and Socialist movement in Italy."

#### BUSINESS OF CONFERENCE.

The business of the Conference, as described in the invitation, was:—

1. To consider the Memorandum on War Aims adopted by the British Conference on December 28th, 1917, with any amendments from countries represented.
2. To consider the advisability of convoking an International Conference, and the conditions.
3. To consider what steps should be taken to secure working-class representation at any official Peace Conference, and whether it is desirable to organise either an Inter-Allied or an International Conference to sit concurrently with the official Peace Conference.
4. Other business.

The Conference appointed five Commissions as follows:—

I. GENERAL POLICY.—Renaudel (Chairman), MacDonald (Secretary), Bourderon, Laurent, Caetani, Laboulle, Sexton, Wignall, and Novakovitch.

II. TERRITORIAL QUESTIONS.—Webb (Chairman), Longuet (Secretary), A. Thomas, Luquet, Modigliani, Arca, de Man, Vanderveide, Poulton, Hutchinson.

III. ECONOMIC QUESTIONS.—J. H. Thomas (Chairman), Mantica (Secretary), Jouhaux, Lefèvre, Schiavi, Tchalpa, Meulemeester, Eekelers, Bramley, Carter.

IV. INTERNATIONAL.—Henderson (Chairman), de Brouckère (Secretary), Mistral, Merrheim, Dubreuilh, Silvestri, Modigliani, Maurin, Pericat, Bowerman, Cameron.

V. DRAFTING AND PUBLICITY.—Cachin (Chairman), Stuart-Bunning (Secretary), Caneps, Williams, McGurk, and Huysmans.

The Secretary and Chairman of each Commission reported to the General Conference and presented revised texts, which were accepted almost without question by the Conference. Before the discussion of the several texts the following resolution was moved by the delegates of the Italian Socialist Party, and rejected by the Conference:—

“These war aims must be considered merely as a guide to the peace negotiations, which should follow the immediate conclusion of an armistice, because the Conference formally rules out the view that the war is capable of establishing the international relations of the peoples on a democratic basis. This democratic system can only be established through the political power which will be gained by the working classes after the war, both in international relations and with respect to the Governments in the several countries.”

The following text was then adopted:—

## MEMORANDUM ON WAR AIMS.

### I.

#### THE WAR.

The Conference declares that whatever may have been the causes of the outbreak of war, it is clear that the peoples of Europe, who are necessarily the chief sufferers from its horrors, had themselves no hand in it.

The Conference sees no reason to depart from the following declaration unanimously agreed to at the Conference of the Socialist and Labour Parties of the Allied Nations on February 14th, 1915:—

“This Conference cannot ignore the profound general causes of the European conflict, itself a monstrous product of the antagonisms which tear asunder capitalist society and the aggressive policy of colonialism and imperialism, against which International Socialism has never ceased to fight, and in which every Government has its share of responsibility.

“The invasion of Belgium and France by the German armies threatens the very existence of independent nationalities, and strikes a blow at all faith in treaties. In these circumstances a victory for German Imperialism would be the defeat and the destruction of democracy and liberty in Europe. The Socialists of Great Britain, Belgium, France, Italy,\* and Russia do not pursue the political and economic crushing of Germany; they are not at war with the peoples, but only with the Governments by which they are oppressed. They demand that Belgium shall be liberated and compensated. They demand that the question of Poland shall be settled in accordance with the wishes of the Polish people, either in the sense of autonomy in the midst of another State, or in that of complete independence. They demand that throughout all Europe, from Alsace-Lorraine to the Balkans, those populations that have been annexed by force shall receive the right freely to dispose of themselves.

\* The word “Italy” was added February 24th, 1915, at the request of the Italian delegation.

" While inflexibly resolved to fight until victory is achieved to accomplish this task of liberation, the Socialists are none the less resolved to resist any attempt to transform this defensive war into a war of conquest, which would only prepare fresh conflicts, create new grievances, and subject various peoples more than ever to the double plague of armaments and war.

" Convinced that they are remaining true to the principles of the International, the members of the Conference express the hope that the working classes of all the different countries, recognising the identity of their fundamental interests, will before long find themselves united again in their struggle against militarism and capitalist Imperialism. The victory of the Allied Powers must be a victory for popular liberty, for unity, independence, and autonomy of the nations in the peaceful Federation of the United States of Europe and the world."

## II.

### MAKING THE WORLD SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY.

Whatever may have been the objects for which the War was begun, the fundamental purpose of the Conference in supporting the continuance of the struggle is that the world may henceforth be made safe for Democracy. Of all the conditions of Peace none is so important to the peoples of the world as that there should be henceforth on earth no more War.

Whoever triumphs, the peoples will have lost unless an international system is established which will prevent war. It would mean nothing to declare the right of peoples to self-determination if this right were left at the mercy of new violations, and was not protected by a super-national authority. That authority can be no other than the League of Nations, which not only all the present belligerents, but every other independent State, should be pressed to join.

The constitution of such a League of Nations implies the immediate establishment of an International High Court, not only for the settlement of all disputes between States that are of justiciable nature, but also for prompt and effective mediation between States in other issues that vitally interest the power or honour of such States. It is also under the control of the League of Nations that the consultation of peoples for purposes of self-determination must be organised. This popular right can be vindicated only by popular vote. The League of Nations shall establish the procedure of international jurisdiction, fix the methods which will guarantee a free and genuine election, restore the political rights of individuals which violence and conquest may have injured, repress any attempt to use pressure or corruption, and prevent any subsequent reprisals. It will be also necessary to form an International Legislature in which the representatives of every civilised State would have their allotted share, and energetically to push forward, step by step, the development of International Legislation agreed to by and definitely binding upon the several States.

By a solemn agreement all the States and peoples consulted shall pledge themselves to submit every issue between two or more of them to arbitration as aforesaid. Refusal to accept arbitration or to submit to the settlement will imply deliberate aggression, and all the nations will necessarily have to make common cause, by using any and every means at their disposal, either economic or military, against any State or States refusing to submit to the arbitration award, or attempting to break the world's covenant of peace.

But the sincere acceptance of the rules and decisions of the Super-national Authority implies the complete democratisation in all countries; the removal of all the arbitrary powers who until now have assumed the right of

choosing between peace and war; the maintenance or creation of legislatures elected by and intended to express the sovereign right of the people; the suppression of secret diplomacy, to be replaced by the conduct of foreign policy under the control of popular legislatures, and the publication of all treaties, which must never be in contravention of the stipulations of the League of Nations, with the absolute responsibility of the Government, and more particularly of the Foreign Minister, of each country to its Legislature.

Only such a policy will enforce the frank abandonment of every form of Imperialism. When based on universal democracy, in a world in which effective international guarantees against aggression have been secured, the League of Nations will achieve the complete suppression of force as the means of settling international differences.

The League of Nations, in order to prepare for the concerted abolition of compulsory military service in all countries, must first take steps for the prohibition of fresh armaments on land and sea, and for the common limitation of the existing armaments by which all the peoples are already overburdened; as well as the control of war manufactures and the enforcement of such agreements as may be agreed to thereupon. The State must undertake such manufactures themselves, so as entirely to abolish profit-making armament firms, whose pecuniary interest lies always in the war scares and progressive competition in the preparation for war.

The nations, being armed solely for self-defence and for such action as the League of Nations may ask them to take in defence of international right, will be left free, under international control, either to create a voluntarily recruited force or to organise the nation for defence without professional armies for long terms of military service.

To give effect to the above principles, the Conference declares that the rules upon which the League of Nations will be founded must be included in the Treaty of Peace, and will henceforward become the basis of the settlement of differences. In that spirit the Conference expresses its agreement with the propositions put forward by President Wilson in his last message:—

1st. That each part of the final settlement must be based upon the essential justice of that particular case and upon such adjustments as are most likely to bring a peace that will be permanent;

2nd. That peoples and provinces are not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were chattels and pawns in a game, even the great game now for ever discredited of the balance of power; but that

3rd. Every territorial settlement involved in this War must be made in the interest and for the benefit of the populations concerned, and not as a part of any mere adjustment or compromise of claims among rival States; and

4th. That all well-defined national aspirations shall be accorded the utmost satisfaction that can be accorded them without introducing new or perpetuating old elements of discord and antagonism that would be likely in time to break the peace of Europe, and consequently of the world.

### III.

#### TERRITORIAL QUESTIONS.

The Conference considers that the proclamation of principles of international law accepted by all nations, and the substitution of a regular procedure for the forceful acts by which States calling themselves sovereign have hitherto adjusted their differences—in short, the establishment of a League of Nations—gives an entirely new aspect to territorial problems.



The old diplomacy and the yearnings after domination by States, or even by peoples, which during the whole of the 19th century have taken advantage of and corrupted the aspirations of nationalities, have brought Europe to a condition of anarchy and disorder which have led inevitably to the present catastrophe.

The Conference declares it to be the duty of the Labour and Socialist Movement to suppress without hesitation the Imperialist designs in the various States which, even in this war, have led one Government after another to seek, by the triumph of military force, to acquire either new territories or economic advantages.

The establishment of a system of international law, and the guarantees afforded by a League of Nations, ought to remove the last excuse for those strategic protections which nations have hitherto felt bound to require.

It is the supreme principle of the right of each people to determine its own destiny that must now decide what steps should be taken by way of restitution or reparation, and whatever territorial readjustments may be found to be necessary at the close of the present War.

The Conference accordingly emphasises the importance to the Labour and Socialist Movement of a clear and exact definition of what is meant by the right of each people to determine its own destiny. Neither unity of race nor identity of language can be regarded as affording more than a presumption in favour of federation or unification. During the 19th century theories of this kind have so often served as a cloak for aggression that the International cannot but seek to prevent any recurrence of such an evil. Any adjustments of boundaries that become necessary must be based exclusively upon the desire of the people concerned.

It is true that it is impossible for the necessary consultation of the desires of the people concerned to be made in any fixed and invariable way for all the cases in which it is required, and that the problems of nationality and territory are not the same for the inhabitants of all countries. Nevertheless, what is necessary in all cases is that the procedure to be adopted should be decided, not by one of the parties to the dispute, but by the super-national authority.

Upon the basis of the general principles herein formulated the Conference proposes the following solutions of particular problems:—

#### (a) BELGIUM.

The Conference emphatically insists that a foremost condition of Peace must be the reparation by the German Government, under the direction of an International Commission, of the wrong admittedly done to Belgium; payment by that Government for all the damage that has resulted from this wrong; and the restoration of Belgium as an independent Sovereign State, leaving to the decision of the Belgian people the determination of their own future policy in all respects.

#### (b) ALSACE AND LORRAINE.

The Conference declares that the problem of Alsace and Lorraine is not one of territorial adjustment, but one of right, and thus an international problem the solution of which is indispensable if Peace is to be either just or lasting.

The Treaty of Frankfort at one and the same time mutilated France and violated the right of the inhabitants of Alsace and Lorraine to dispose of their own destinies, a right which they have repeatedly claimed.

The new Treaty of Peace, in recognising that Germany, by her declaration of war of 1914, has herself broken the Treaty of Frankfort, will make null and void the gains of a brutal conquest and of the violence committed against the people.

France, having secured this recognition, can properly agree to a fresh consultation of the population of Alsace and Lorraine as to its own desires.

The Treaty of Peace will bear the signatures of every nation in the world. It will be guaranteed by the League of Nations. To this League of Nations France is prepared to remit, with the freedom and integrity of a popular vote, of which the details can be subsequently settled, the organisation of such a consultation as shall settle for ever, as a matter of right, the future destiny of Alsace and Lorraine, and as shall finally remove from the common life of all Europe a quarrel which has imposed so heavy a burden upon it.

#### (c) THE BALKANS.

The Conference lays down the principle that all the violations and perversions of the rights of the people which have taken place, or are still taking place, in the Balkans must be made the subject of redress or reparation.

Serbia, Montenegro, Rumania, Albania, and all the territories occupied by military force should be evacuated by the hostile forces. Wherever any population of the same race and tongue demands to be united this must be done. Each such people must be accorded full liberty to settle its own destiny, without regard to the imperialist pretensions of Austria-Hungary, Turkey, or other State.

Accepting this principle, the Conference proposes that the whole problem of the administrative reorganisation of the Balkan peoples should be dealt with by a special conference of their representatives or in case of disagreement by an authoritative international commission on the basis of (a) the concession within each independent sovereignty of local autonomy and security for the development of its particular civilisation of every racial minority; (b) the universal guarantee of freedom of religion and political equality for all races; (c) a Customs and Postal Union embracing the whole of the Balkan States, with free access for each to its natural seaport; (d) the entry of all the Balkan States into a Federation for the concerted arrangement by mutual agreement among themselves of all matters of common interest.

#### (d) ITALY.

The Conference declares its warmest sympathy with the people of Italian blood and speech who have been left outside the boundaries that have, as a result of the diplomatic agreements of the past, and for strategic reasons, been assigned to the Kingdom of Italy, and supports their claim to be united with those of their own race and tongue. It realises that arrangements may be necessary for securing the legitimate interests of the people of Italy in the adjacent seas, but it condemns the aims of conquest of Italian Imperialism, and believes that all legitimate needs can be safeguarded, without precluding a like recognition of the needs of others or annexation of other people's territories.

Regarding the Italian population dispersed on the Eastern shores of the Adriatic, the relations between Italy and the Yugo-Slav populations must be based on principles of equity and conciliation, so as to prevent any cause of future quarrel.

If there are found to be groups of Slavonian race within the newly defined Kingdom of Italy, or groups of Italian-race in Slavonian territory,

mutual guarantees must be given for the assurance of all of them, on one side or the other, full liberty of local self-government and of the natural development of their several activities.

(e) POLAND AND THE BALTIC PROVINCES.

In accordance with the right of every people to determine its own destinies, Poland must be reconstituted in unity and independence with free access to the sea.

The Conference declares further that any annexation by Germany, whether open or disguised, of Esthonia, Livonia, Courland, or Lithuania would be a flagrant and wholly inadmissible violation of international law.

(f) THE JEWS AND PALESTINE.

The Conference demands for the Jews in all countries the same elementary rights of freedom of religion, education, residence and trade and equal citizenship that ought to be extended to all the inhabitants of every nation. It further expresses the opinion that Palestine should be set free from the harsh and oppressive government of the Turk, in order that this country may form a Free State, under international guarantee, to which such of the Jewish people as desire to do so may return and may work out their own salvation free from interference by those of alien race or religion.

(g) THE PROBLEM OF THE TURKISH EMPIRE..

The Conference condemns the handing back to the systematically violent domination of the Turkish Government any subject people. Thus, whatever may be proposed with regard to Armenia, Mesopotamia, and Arabia, they cannot be restored to the tyranny of the Sultan and his Pashas. The Conference condemns the Imperialist aims of governments and capitalists who would make of these and other territories now dominated by the Turkish hordes merely instruments either of exploitation or militarism. If the peoples of these territories do not feel themselves able to settle their own destinies, the Conference insists that, conformably with the policy of "no annexations," they should be placed for administration in the hands of a Commission acting under the Super-National Authority or League of Nations. It is further suggested that the peace of the world requires that the Dardanelles should be permanently and effectively neutralised and opened like all the main lines of marine communication, under the control of the League of Nations, freely to all nations without hindrance or customs duties.

(h) AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

The Conference does not propose as a War Aim dismemberment of Austria-Hungary or its deprivation of economic access to the sea. On the other hand, the Conference cannot admit that the claims to independence made by the Czecho-Slovaks and the Yugo-Slavs must be regarded merely as questions for internal decision. National independence ought to be accorded, according to rules to be laid down by the League of Nations, to such peoples as demand it, and these communities ought to have the opportunity of determining their own groupings and federations according to their affinities and their interests. If they think fit they are free to substitute a free federation of Danubian States for the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

(i) THE COLONIES AND DEPENDENCIES.

The International has always condemned the Colonial policy of capitalist governments. Without ceasing to condemn it, the Inter-Allied Conference nevertheless recognises the existence of a state of things which it is obliged to take into account.

The Conference considers that the treaty of peace ought to secure to the natives in all colonies and dependencies effective protection against the excesses of capitalist colonialism. The Conference demands the concession of administrative autonomy for all groups of people that attain a certain degree of civilisation, and for all the others a progressive participation in local government.

The Conference is of opinion that the return of the colonies to those who possessed them before the war, or the exchanges or compensations which might be effected, ought not to be an obstacle to the making of peace.

Those colonies that have been taken by conquest from any belligerent must be made the subject of special consideration at the Peace Conference, in which the communities in their neighbourhood will be entitled to take part. But the treaty of peace on this point must secure economic equality in such territories for the peoples of all nations, and thereby guarantee that none is shut out from legitimate access to raw materials prevented from disposing of its own products, or deprived of its proper share of economic development.

As regards more especially the colonies of all the belligerents in Tropical Africa, from sea to sea, including the whole of the region north of the Zambesi and south of the Sahara, the Conference condemns any imperialist idea which would make these countries the booty of one or several nations, exploit them for the profit of the capitalist, or use them for the promotion of the militarist aims of the Governments.

With respect to these colonies, the Conference declares in favour of a system of control, established by international agreement under the League of Nations and maintained by its guarantee, which, whilst respecting national sovereignty, would be alike inspired by broad conceptions of economic freedom and concerned to safeguard the rights of the natives under the best conditions possible for them, and in particular:—

1. It would take account in each locality of the wishes of the people, expressed in the form which is possible to them.
2. The interests of the native tribes as regards the ownership of the soil would be maintained.
3. The whole of the revenues would be devoted to the well-being and development of the colonies themselves.

#### IV.

#### ECONOMIC RELATIONS.

The Conference is of opinion that the main lines of marine communication should be open without hindrance to vessels of all nations under the protection of the League of Nations. It declares against all the projects now being prepared by Imperialists and capitalists, not in any one country only, but in most countries, for an Economic War, after Peace has been secured, either against one or other foreign nation or against all foreign nations, as such an Economic War, if begun by any country, would inevitably lead to reprisals, to which each nation in turn might in self-defence be driven. The Conference realises that all attempts at economic aggression, whether by Protective Tariffs or capitalist trusts or monopolies, inevitably result in the spoliation of the working classes of the several countries for the profit of the capitalists; and the working class see in the alliance between the Military Imperialists and the Fiscal Protectionists in any country whatsoever not only a serious danger to the prosperity of the masses of the people, but also a grave menace to Peace. On the other hand, the right of each nation to the defence of its own economic interests, and, in face of the world-shortage

hereinafter mentioned, to the conservation for its own people of a sufficiency of its own supplies of foodstuffs and raw materials, cannot be denied. The Conference accordingly urges upon the Labour and Socialist Parties of all countries the importance of insisting, in the attitude of the Government towards commercial enterprise, along with the necessary control of supplies for its own people, on the principle of the open door, and without hostile discrimination against foreign countries. But it urges equally the importance, not merely of conservation, but also of the utmost possible development by appropriate Government action of the resources of every country for the benefit not only of its own people, but also of the world, and the need for an international agreement for the enforcement in all countries of the legislation on factory conditions, a maximum eight-hour day, the prevention of "sweating" and unhealthy trades necessary to protect the workers against exploitation and oppression, and the prohibition of night work by women and children.

## V.

### THE PROBLEMS OF PEACE.

To make the world safe for Democracy involves much more than the prevention of war, either military or economic. It will be a device of the capitalist interests to pretend that the Treaty of Peace need concern itself only with the cessation of the struggles of the armed forces and with any necessary territorial readjustments. The Conference insists that, in view of the probable world-wide shortage, after the War, of exportable foodstuffs and raw materials, and of merchant shipping, it is imperative, in order to prevent the most serious hardships, and even possible famine, in one country or another, that systematic arrangements should be made on an international basis, for the allocation and conveyance of the available exportable surpluses of these commodities to the different countries, in proportion, not to their purchasing powers, but to their several pressing needs; and that, within each country, the Government must for some time maintain its control of the most indispensable commodities, in order to secure their appropriation, not in a competitive market mainly to the richer classes in proportion to their means, but, systematically, to meet the most urgent needs of the whole community on the principle of "no cake for anyone until all have bread."

Moreover, it cannot but be anticipated that, in all countries, the dislocation of industry attendant on Peace, the instant discharge of millions of munition makers and workers in War trades, and the demobilisation of millions of soldiers—in face of the scarcity of industrial capital, the shortage of raw materials, and the insecurity of commercial enterprise—will, unless prompt and energetic action be taken by the several Governments, plunge a large part of the wage-earning population into all the miseries of unemployment more or less prolonged. In view of the fact that widespread unemployment in any country, like a famine, is an injury not to that country alone, but impoverishes also the rest of the world, the Conference holds that it is the duty of every Government to take immediate action, not merely to relieve the unemployed, when unemployment has set in, but actually, so far as may be practicable, to prevent the occurrence of unemployment. It therefore urges upon the Labour and Socialist Parties of every country the necessity of their pressing upon their Governments the preparation of plans for the execution of all the innumerable public works (such as the making and repairing of roads, railways, and waterways, the erection of schools and public buildings, the provision of working-class dwellings, and the reclamation and afforestation of land) that will be

required in the near future, not for the sake of finding measures of relief for the unemployed, but with a view to these works being undertaken at such a rate in each locality as will suffice, together with the various capitalist enterprises that may be in progress, to maintain at a fairly uniform level year by year, and throughout each year, the aggregate demand for labour; and thus prevent there being any unemployed. It is now known that in this way it is quite possible for any Government to prevent, if it chooses, the occurrence of any widespread or prolonged involuntary unemployment; which if it is now in any country allowed to occur, is as much the result of Government neglect as is any epidemic disease.

## VI.

### RESTORATION OF THE DEVASTATED AREAS AND REPARATION OF WRONGDOING.

The Conference holds that one of the most imperative duties of all countries immediately Peace is declared will be the restoration, so far as may be possible, of the homes, farms, factories, public buildings, and means of communication wherever destroyed by war operations; that the restoration should not be limited to compensation for public buildings, capitalist undertakings, and material property proved to be destroyed or damaged, but should be extended to setting up the wage-earners and peasants themselves in homes and employment; and that to ensure the full and impartial application of these principles the assessment and distribution of the compensation, so far as the cost is contributed by any International Fund, should be made under the direction of an International Commission.

The Conference will not be satisfied unless there is a full and free judicial investigation into the accusations made on all sides that particular Governments have ordered, and particular officers have exercised, acts of cruelty, oppression, violence, and theft against individual victims, for which no justification can be found in the ordinary usages of war. It draws attention, in particular, to the loss of life and property of merchant seamen and other non-combatants (including women and children) resulting from this inhuman and ruthless conduct. It should be part of the conditions of Peace that there should be forthwith set up a Court of Claims and Accusations, which should investigate all such allegations as may be brought before it, summon the accused person or Government to answer the complaint, to pronounce judgment, and award compensation or damages, payable by the individual or Government condemned, to the persons who had suffered wrong, or to their dependents. The several Governments must be responsible, financially and otherwise, for the presentation of the cases of their respective nationals to such a Court of Claims and Accusations, and for the payment of the compensation awarded.

## VII.

### INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS.

The Conference is of opinion that an International Congress of Labour and Socialist organisations, held under proper conditions, would at this stage render useful service to world democracy by assisting to remove misunderstandings as well as the obstacles which stand in the way of world peace.

Awaiting the resumption of the normal activities of the International Socialist Bureau, we consider that an International Congress, held during the period of hostilities, should be organised by a committee whose impartiality cannot be questioned. It should be held in a neutral country, under such conditions as would inspire confidence among all who take part; and the Congress

should be fully representative of all the Labour and Socialist Movement in all the belligerent countries accepting the conditions under which the Congress is convoked.

As an essential condition to an International Congress, the Conference is of opinion that the organisers of the Congress should satisfy themselves that all the organisations to be represented put in precise form, by a public declaration, their peace terms in conformity with the principles "No annexations or punitive indemnities, and the right of all peoples to self-determination," and that they are working with all their power to obtain from their Governments the necessary guarantees to apply these principles honestly and unreservedly to all questions to be dealt with at any official Peace Conference.

In view of the vital differences between the Allied Countries and the Central Powers, the Conference is of opinion that it is highly advisable that the Congress should be used to provide an opportunity for the delegates from the respective countries now in a state of war to make a full and frank statement of their present position and future intentions, and to endeavour by mutual agreement to arrange a programme of action for a speedy and democratic peace.

The Conference is of opinion that the working classes, having made such sacrifices during the war, are entitled to take part in securing a democratic world peace, and that M. Albert Thomas (France), M. Emile Vandervelde (Belgium), and Mr. Arthur Henderson (Great Britain) be appointed as a Commission to secure from all the Governments a promise that at least one representative of Labour and Socialism will be included in the official representation at any Government Conference; and to organise a Labour and Socialist Conference, in which no country shall be entitled to more than four representatives, to sit concurrently with the official Conference.

The Conference regrets the absence of American representatives from the Inter-Allied Conference, and urges the importance of securing their approval of the decisions reached. With this object in view the Conference agrees that a deputation, consisting of one representative from France, Belgium, Italy, and Great Britain, together with M. Camille Huysmans (Secretary of the International Socialist Bureau), proceed to the United States at once, in order to confer with representatives of the American Democracy on the whole situation of the War.

The Conference resolves to transmit to the Socialists of the Central Empires and of the nations allied with them the Memorandum in which the Conference has defined the conditions of Peace, conformably with the principles of Socialist and International justice. The Conference is convinced that these conditions will commend themselves on reflection to the mind of every Socialist, and the Conference asks for the answer of the Socialists of the Central Empires, in the hope that these will join without delay in a joint effort of the International, which has now become more than ever the best and the most certain instrument of Democracy and Peace.

---

Finally, the Conference invited the respective Labour and Socialist organisations and parties to demand the necessary freedom of propaganda, both written and oral, in favour of the principles adopted by the Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference.

THE LABOUR PARTY.

(5<sup>a</sup>)

**LABOUR**  
AND  
**THE PEACE TREATY**

---

---

CONTAINING

The Text of the Southport Conference  
Resolution on "Peace."

Speeches in Parliament by—

RT. HON. W. ADAMSON, M.P.  
RT. HON. J. R. CLYNES, M.P.  
MR. STEPHEN WALSH, M.P.  
MR. TOM SHAW, M.P.

Joint Manifesto of the Parliamentary Labour  
Party and the National Executive.

---

Price 2d. Post free 2½d.

---



**Resolution adopted by the Annual Conference of the  
Labour Party, held in Southport, on June 25th, 26th,  
and 27th, 1919:--**

**PEACE.**

This Conference is of opinion, now that Germany has decided to sign the Treaty of Peace, thereby-opening up the opportunity of co-operation with the democracies of the world, that its speedy admission to the League of Nations, and the immediate revision by the League of Nations of the harsh provisions of the Treaty, which are inconsistent with the statements made on behalf of the Allied Governments when the Armistice was made, are essential both on grounds of honour and expediency; and it therefore calls upon the Labour Movement in conjunction with the International to undertake a vigorous campaign for the winning of popular support to this policy as a first step towards the reconciliation of the peoples and the inauguration of a new era of international co-operation and goodwill.

# SPEECHES IN PARLIAMENT.

---

In the debates on the introduction and Second Reading of the Treaty of Peace Bill in the House of Commons on July 3rd, 21st and 22nd, the spokesman of the Parliamentary Labour Party formulated the working-class protest against those parts of the Treaty which have been condemned as inconsistent with the terms of the Armistice and as a violation of the Fourteen Points of President Wilson, and the decisions of successive Labour and Socialist Conferences. Their speeches are reproduced here from the pages of Hansard.

## Right Hon. W. Adamson :

We have had a very interesting statement from the Prime Minister, and we welcome the decision of the Government to have the terms of the Treaty considered in the form of a Bill. I do not intend to intervene for more than a few minutes. I am sure that not only am I expressing the gratification of the members of the Labour Party and of myself that at last, after nearly five years of war, the Peace Treaty has been signed, but I believe I am at the same time also expressing the gratification of the whole of the people of this country. While I am strongly of the opinion that the Prime Minister could have lightened his labour and his responsibility by giving the people and their representatives a greater share in the fixing of the Peace Terms, at the same time I want to take this opportunity of paying my tribute to the right hon. gentleman for the way in which he has devoted himself to the settlement of this most stupendous task—a task which, I think, is greater than has ever confronted the head of any democratic Government before. With reference to the terms of the Treaty, Labour has always insisted that Germany must make full reparation for the wanton destruction done in all the Allied countries. But there are certain features of the Treaty with which neither I nor the Labour Party agree. For instance, we do not agree with the exclusion of Germany from membership of the League of Nations after she has ratified the Treaty. We want to see the League of Nations become at the earliest day a League of Nations, and not a league of the Allied countries. (The PRIME MINISTER: Hear, hear!)

Again, we regret very much that the Treaty does not contain the machinery whereby conscription would be abolished in the Allied countries as well as in Germany. Neither do we agree with all the territorial adjustments. When the Prime Minister was giving us that in-

teresting and eloquent explanation of his he referred to certain territories that had been taken from Germany, and justified what had been done by the fact that these territories did not belong to Germany originally. With that I think the House and the country will be in general agreement, but there are territories that are dealt with in the terms of the Peace Treaty which are of a different character from those described by the Prime Minister. Again, Labour would have liked to see the question of armaments dealt with in the machinery of the terms of peace in the way certain other matters have been dealt with. (The PRIME MINISTER: It is in the League of Nations.) But not exactly in the way that Labour would like. There are other matters contained in the Peace Treaty with which we are not in agreement, but we will reserve our criticism of these matters until the Second Reading of the Bill which the Prime Minister has intimated, and all I want to say further to-day regarding the matter is that I hope, now that the Treaty has been signed, that the German people will realise that the only chance of a peaceful and orderly development from the old conditions to the new is for them to try to give effect to the terms of the Treaty, while we on our part meet that effort in a spirit of reconciliation. I hope that the spirit which animated the Prime Minister while he was dealing in his speech with the question of the League of Nations is the spirit which will animate the whole of the British people, at least in their efforts to make war an impossibility in the future, and to carry out the ideal which animated our people at the beginning of this terrible conflict, to make this a war against war. If that ideal is to be realised in all its fulness, Britain and Germany must forget, as rapidly as they can, all that has occurred in the course of the last five years, and I hope that, so far as we are concerned, if we show a proper spirit in trying to carry out the terms of the agreement that has just been come to, we will meet them in a spirit of magnanimous reconciliation, and do our best to make their task as light as possible.

### Right Hon. J. R. Clynes :

I join with my right hon. friend who has just sat down in his words of praise and acknowledgment justly offered concerning those whose labours are more or less completed by the Treaty which the House has to consider this afternoon. I am sure the House will not begrudge me the right of adding a word of praise to the very large number of unnamed and unknown men who have also done their share in the war—I refer to the general body of the working classes of this country. I am sure the House will not at any time allow itself to forget the great contribution of our big industrial population because of any occasional lapse into wrong-doing or error that may stand to the account of a section of the workers. I therefore recall the fact that, just as the workers are the greatest sufferers by war, they are perhaps the greatest contributors to the victory which this country now enjoys. Before there was a Conscription Act compelling them to serve, many millions of them had voluntarily joined the Colours. As we have heard very much in this House during the past few days about coal, may I recall the fact that our first

—  
experience of a coal shortage, two and a half or three years ago, was due to too many miners having walked out of the pit and into the trenches in defence of their country. If we set aside the inevitable fact that a number of the working classes did incidentally profit by service on munitions, it still remains that the great majority of the masses of our people, who in a material sense, in the sense of possessions, land, or property, had no country to fight for at all, went out and fought for their country as valiantly as any man.

I am asked to present to the House a few considerations from the Labour Party standpoint in regard to this Treaty. I want to approach it in the spirit of my right hon. friend who has just sat down. We must not give a vote to this Treaty because of certain blemishes in it. We must balance the great gains now enjoyed—which I hope will be perpetuated for the benefit of mankind—as expressed in the Treaty, against the defects that we may consider are within that Treaty. On balance, we must all feel the immense sense of relief that the world has secured by the victory of the Allied arms and, consequently, by the defeat of the military spirit, which itself was the cause of this war. I cannot leave out of account what I know to be the feelings of a very large body of working-class opinion in relation to this Treaty. I believe that spirit has been very eloquently expressed by a man who himself played no small part in the conduct of this war—I refer to General Smuts. Only a few days ago, in regard to this Treaty, he wrote:—

“ I have signed the Peace Treaty, not because I consider it a satisfactory document, but because it is imperatively necessary to close the war, because the world needs peace above all, and nothing could be more fatal than the continuance of the state of suspense between war and peace.”

We, therefore, wish to have Peace concluded, in order to begin the new era which we trust this Treaty symbolises, and to come immediately to all those opportunities for that urgent work of reconstruction which this House has specially elected to take in hand. The Labour Party has had an opportunity of considering this Treaty, and at the Southport Conference a resolution was unanimously passed which expresses the views of the party in relation to this Treaty. It declares:—

“ That the Conference is of opinion, now that Germany has decided to sign the Treaty of Peace, thereby opening up the opportunity of co-operation with the democracies of the world, that its speedy admission to the League of Nations, and the immediate revision by the League of Nations of the harsh provisions of the Treaty, which are inconsistent with the statements made on behalf of the Allied Governments when the Armistice was made, are essential both on grounds of honour and of expediency, and it therefore calls upon the Labour Movement in conjunction with the International to undertake a vigorous campaign for the winning of popular support to this policy as a first step towards the reconciliation of peoples and the inauguration of a new era.”

The Labour Party does not speak in these terms out of any feeling of friendliness for the German people or the German Government. It takes many countries and many different peoples to make a war, and we can put ourselves in a position at times of too great righteousness by

considering that we alone are an influence for good, and that all others in every part of the world are influences for harm, and what we are afraid of in respect of this Treaty is that in the moment of our victory we have committed some of the blunders of victors of previous wars whose battles were well conducted, but whose peace arrangements only laid the foundation for further struggles, and the question we ask ourselves is, "Will this Treaty make in any other part of the world any other Alsace Lorraine for the generations of the future?" We trust it will not, because we can turn to the League of Nations as the international machinery which in the years ahead of us will be able to deal with the blemishes of the Treaty, and acting, as we can see it will, under the influences and the pressure of a more potent democratic body of opinion than has ever previously existed, the defects of this Treaty may in that way be diminished or entirely removed by the machinery of the League of Nations. We are conscious that the crime of the German Government was a colossal one. We are equally conscious that the penalties imposed upon certain sections of the German people may be too heavy for the particular offences for which they were responsible, and we look with some degree of concern and fear upon the fact that the Germans have been parcelled out and put under the authority and government of other Powers, and that the principle of self-determination has not been jealously applied and followed carefully in every one of these instances. If self-determination is so good a gospel as to cause us to preach it as we do, it should be recognised in the case of considerable portions of German territory and of the German people just as well as of the people in any other land. I have here a communication which to-day reached me from the offices of the Labour Party from a body of German workmen, and I do not fear to read it to the House. It is from the Birnbaum Workers' Council. It states that the council represents an almost exclusively German town. It protests against the town and the neighbourhood being ceded to Poland. The town is five kilometres from the proposed frontier:

"We claim the right of self-determination. According to vote there are ninety per cent. Germans who wish to remain united to Germany in her present need. We Socialists and Democrats ask you to help us to protect our new political and social gains."

The PRIME MINISTER: What is the name of it?

Mr. CLYNES: The Birnbaum Workers' Council. I have said the Labour Party's attitude in relation to this Treaty is in no way determined by any considerations of tenderness for the German people themselves. Their crime has been so enormous that the penalty naturally must be severe. But the truer statesmanship will be found in making this Treaty acceptable to all who are affected by it, and thereby preventing the development or growth of that spirit of revolt or revolution which was naturally developed in the case of France, following the German victory in 1870. We can make the mistake of committing excesses now against standards of self-determination and just treatment to a vanquished foe. They must pay for many years to come a heavy and bitter price for the enormity of the offences of which they were guilty. We hardly need to strengthen their case by inflicting any kind of territorial

or other injustice upon masses of people who, collectively or individually, have been in no sense the offenders. I have heard it said in connection with the League of Nations that we must look upon it with suspicion because it has been set up by the victors. It is just for that reason that I think the League of Nations will be all the stronger and all the more welcome to the masses of mankind. The countries of the Allies could have avoided this method of preventing differences between Governments or countries in the years ahead. I am glad this country has played such a leading part and such an effective part in the institution and development of this League of Nations. As an instrument for providing, through the medium of International Courts and international action, an opportunity for considering differences as they arise, it offers to mankind the greatest hope of avoiding future conflict which has ever been afforded to it. If I may single out by name any one man more than another to whom Labour is indebted for a great part played in the development and building up of this international structure, it is the Noble Lord (Lord Robert Cecil). If he has at any time run the risk of forfeiting the good will of Labour, he may feel confident that the great work he has done in this regard entitles him to the respect, and, I hope, the confidence, of the working classes in connection with any public labours in which he might indulge in the future. But we want to consider how soon this League of Nations can get to work and carry out the great labour for which it was created.

It must not be a League of some nations. It must not be a League of victorious nations.

A band of conquerors acting together in a league would not at all serve the purposes for which it was intended. I have read somewhere that the representatives of Germany who eventually were delegated to sign this Peace Treaty publicly declared that in doing so they meant to sign in the most real sense possible, and honourably to carry out their undertakings, and they referred to their desire to be admitted to the League of Nations. Probably the right hon. gentleman is fully aware of all their statements on the matter, and we should like to ask when can we be informed as to the admission of the representatives of the German Government to this League? We believe they ought not to be kept out for any mere purposes of vindictive treatment, and that as soon as their Government is composed enough, and as soon as their representatives can act in a responsible manner, the gates of the League should be widely opened to them.

We therefore trust that every inducement, and every invitation, if necessary, will be held out to the representatives of these former enemy nations in order that this League may be made the real and potent force for international peace that we desire it to be.

I cannot leave the subject of the League of Nations without referring to that part of it which is exceptionally welcome to our industrial population. The industrial and economic structure within the League of Nations, as part of the League of Nations, affords Labour in this and other countries a means for making more uniform, and I hope more humane, the industrial and working-class conditions of the great masses

of population in different countries. Whilst we could not consider my right hon. friend (Mr. Barnes) to be an officially appointed Labour representative at the Peace Conference, we have the greatest admiration for the work he has performed. We know of no other man, if it came to a choice of men, who could bring to bear such capacity, such experience, and such sympathy and knowledge as he possesses for a work so delicate and so important as this. I am sure the working-classes of many lands in future generations will bless the name of our right hon. friend for the great work which he has done.

The provisions in this Treaty will be viewed with a great deal of suspicion by the masses of the industrial population unless very soon their minds can be made quite composed and clear upon two points. One is Conscription, and the other is Armaments.

We have by this Treaty killed conscription in Germany. We have insisted upon the German Army, such as it is, being raised upon a voluntary basis. We have limited it to a very small number. All these things are the penalties which a defeated foe must suffer. This country at length accepted conscription as a dire necessity, as the last item in the balance that was to turn the scale in our favour. The House will remember that organised Labour reluctantly consented to a condition of conscription as a matter of the greatest urgency in view of the military situation then existing, but it accepted conscription with the clear understanding that it would be for the duration of the war only, and that it was not to be possible in any way so as to become a permanent part of our military system. The Prime Minister, on account of his business elsewhere, has not been so closely associated recently with opinion in this House or with working-class feeling in the country, but I can assure him that there is a profound suspicion and distrust of the Government arising from this one question alone. The workers joined for the duration of the war, and, though the Armistice was arranged last November, and though Peace was well on its way in the early part of this year and everything pointed to the physical impossibility of Germany being able to resume anything like a fight, the workers did not find themselves liberated from the conditions of enforced military service. (An Hon. Member: "What about Ireland?") Ireland, I am sorry to say, has no part in this Treaty. Therefore, it is outside my theme. I hope during this debate that the Prime Minister will be able to reassure the working-class men upon this very disturbing point.

Finally, I want to touch on the second of these two important matters, namely, armaments. A great deal of distrust of the Government and misunderstanding as to a war like the one we have gone through is arising because of the fact that so much of our armaments in this country were provided at an immense profit to those who manufactured them. I hope I have not fallen so low in my estimate of mankind as to believe that any class would trade in the making of armaments for the purpose of profit and having no other motive in their business than that of seeking wars in order that they may increase their profit. I have never shared that view, but I say with regret that it is a view widely held. Accordingly, we of the Labour Party have reached the conclusion that so far as armaments in a country are necessary for such pur-

poses as future conditions may require—for even the League of Nations, I conclude, will require some strength and some form or manner of physical force behind it, so as to make its decrees effective—no matter to what degree armaments in the future are required, it is essential that they should be made alone under the responsibility and control and ownership of the Government, and not of any private firm. We have in relation to armaments, as well as in relation to conscription, ourselves expressed to Germany a doctrine which I hope the Prime Minister, if he is to speak in this debate, will not entirely ignore, and I should like to draw his particular attention to it. In the twelfth paragraph of the Allied Note in reply to Germany that was published some weeks ago, we speak to the Germans in this language:

“The German reply also ignores the immense relief that will be caused to her people in the struggle for recovery by the enforced reduction of her military armaments in future. Hundreds of thousands of her inhabitants who have hitherto been engaged either in training for armies or in producing instruments of destruction will henceforward be available for peaceful avocations and for increasing the industrial productiveness of the nation. No result should be more satisfactory to the German people.”

If that is a doctrine which it is good to preach for the benefit of the German nation, it is a doctrine which cannot be bad to preach and practice for our own nation. It expresses the whole philosophy of how much a nation can benefit in material wealth resulting from the energy, the hand and the brain of her people by following what are termed peaceful avocations and the production of the ordinary needs of existence, instead of wasting their energies in the barrack yard, in the armament factory, or in any other way such as a condition of war has always compelled men to do. Therefore, I would like this gospel to be more commonly preached by our principal statesmen, and by public men in this country. It would do no harm if the Prime Minister, either on the floor of this House or on any platform in the land, would explain and emphasise this truth. Indeed, it would help as much as anything to turn the minds of the country to that great work of reconstruction of which so little has yet been done.

I said at the beginning that we have had to balance considerations in relation to this Treaty. Our view is that, with all its defects, with all its blemishes, it is the work of men who, in the circumstances which surrounded it, must have acted with motives of the highest patriotism and with the highest and noblest considerations for human government. We have stated what may seem to some to be rather narrow points of criticism, but I can assure the House that that is not our view. We want not merely our class, but the whole human family to be saved by future provision from any awful and ghastly state of things such as we have recently gone through. We do not begrudge our word of praise to those who seldom are praised from working-class platforms. I refer to the well-to-do men, the favoured, the rich, those who have land, power, authority and affluence, and who set them all aside, turned their backs upon a life of ease in the early months of the war, and went out and led our men and found soldiers' graves, just like the men in the ranks. These



things but show how the great needs of the nation called forth equality of sacrifice and got equality of service. That ought to show all of us now that the war is over, that as the war lasted five years, and in that time all classes fought and struggled together for a common purpose, that if we can only last together for the coming five years, if all classes would think, in the main, in the terms of their country, and be moved, in the main, by those inspirations of real patriotism which caused our men, rich and poor alike, to offer the highest that man can offer—their life for their native land; if only for five years we can allay differences and unite for the purpose of repairing all the ravages of war, we can then, perhaps, begin in a much more enriched condition, certainly in a much more secure position, to engage in those narrower class struggles and, perhaps, selfish demands which both poor people and rich people at the present moment are, in my judgment, pressing too far. We ought not entirely to lose the lessons of this war, and that sacrifice of the men who can only be honoured by silence or by the spoken word should be a signal sufficient for us to begin now to march on and on towards the light, to avoid the calamities which have befallen other countries, to unite as well as we are able for the welfare of our native land, and to make it a place far, far better, especially for the masses of the people, than it ever has been up to the present.

### Mr. Stephen Walsh :

If I might be permitted, with the most complete sincerity, to add the congratulations of my Party to those which the right hon. gentleman must have received in great measure, I would be very pleased to do so. We have really on this occasion, by our country and through the influence of the right hon. gentleman, very largely achieved what is perhaps the most remarkable Peace the world has ever known. One or two hon. Members have said that there is great need for restoring the credit of the nation. In my opinion the credit of this nation never stood higher than it stands to-day. There are some things much greater than finance. People attach value to the sovereign, and regret very much that its value has gone down to 10s. ; but if this nation had not stood to its bond, entered into many years ago, its moral credit would have been so low that the name of Englishmen would have stunk in the nostrils of the world. To-day there is no name higher. And however low our financial credit may be at the moment, our credit throughout the whole world will be constantly upon the increase, and to-day we have nothing to regret in the way of credit. The name of England is higher and nobler to-day than it has ever been before. Something was said about coming well out of this deal. We fall very easily into these slipshod phrases. I wonder what the hon. gentleman meant when he said that. With what had we been dealing? We had the most terrible military organisation arrayed against the freedom of the world, and that military organisation has been broken to bits.

I think we ought to recognise that we are standing on the threshold of a new epoch. This House to-day is considering not so much the horrors of the past as how to prevent their awful repetition in the future. A

solemn duty rests upon every one of us in this House, and out of it, to prevent a recurrence of those horrors from which we have just been delivered. I was more than delighted to hear the speech of the right hon. gentleman the member for Hitchin, when he devoted so many of his remarks to the necessity for the establishment of the League of Nations. Of course, ever so much can be found fault with in the idea of the League. "It may fail here," and "It may fail there," say people; "If you do this or attempt that, you will find yourself up against an impossible proposition." Therefore, I suppose the idea is that we had better not try at all. That kind of argument and plea has been submitted from time immemorial. Is there anything more horrible than the previous conditions—conditions which deluged the world in blood for hundreds of years? Have those conditions to go on for ever? Has this civilisation, of which we are always talking in such high terms, nothing better to offer?

In science, in everything else to which the mind of man can devote itself, tremendous progress has been made. Only on this particular point, in respect of the relations between nations, is the counsel of despair urged. "Old jealousies are perennial; therefore you will always have war"—that is the argument of despair. Not only that. It commits all the generations of the future to the same horrible thing from which we have only just emerged. It is said that the right hon. gentleman was told that in a very little time, when he came out of the unreal world in which he was living, and into the world of fact, he would find himself up against some very serious proposition, and it would prove to him that his idea of the League of Nations had no existence in fact. I wonder if it has or not?

I think it is about 104 years since we were at war with the United States of America; certainly it is well over 100 years. For some years there has been, and I think at this moment there is, a Treaty between the United States and ourselves which prevents any war between us until the whole matter in dispute has been referred to arbitration. I remember very well when there seemed to be tremendous indignation on the part of the British people against the United States, and, indeed, on their part indignation against us. Most of us have some knowledge of the Alabama claim. We know how a privateer went out from a British port and did tremendous damage to northern shipping; and we know also that the slightest mistake on the part of the statesmen of that time would have hurled these two nations into a terrible war. What happened? A great statesman, greatly against the predominant feeling of the time, said, "This matter must go to arbitration." They paid a few millions for the losses inflicted on the shipping of the Northern States of America, and from that day, more than fifty years ago, instead of antagonism, violent and constant, a kindly feeling grew up between the Northern States and ourselves, and to-day, amongst all the great acclamations that are given to famous Generals of recent history, no greater acclamation is accorded to any than that which is given to the American General. And here to-day, between these two great nations, Great Britain and the United States, there is established a friendship largely dating from the time when Great Britain was sufficiently magnanimous to recognise that

she was wrong, and proceeded to arbitration. That, after all, lies at the very basis of the League of Nations—that you shall settle your difficulties, not by blood or violence, not by the drawn sword, but by an appeal to reason. The appeal to reason is the very basis of the League of Nations. In Canada there are, I suppose, between three and four thousand miles of territory from east to west, and between Canada and the United States so many thousands of miles of frontier. One is territory governed under the British flag, and the other belongs to the United States, and I suppose a few frontier police—not more than the membership of this House—guards the whole frontier and preserves order and civilisation in the very highest degree. If that is not a League of Nations, I do not know what it is. Surely, if that can be done for such vast territory when there are constantly conflicting interests, it goes to show that the League of Nations is not that chimera that many people imagine, and that it has a working basis in fact. Not very long ago the remark of one of our greatest admirals was that when you went into battle you must always get your ship to the side of your enemy, and hate the Frenchman as you hate the devil. Do we hate Frenchmen to-day? It is 104 years since we fought against France. We always fought chivalrously, and so did they. I believe most people now recognise that we made a great mistake, in the early seventies and in 1869, in not placing our resources chivalrously on the side of France at that time, but that mistake, great as it was, has been rectified, and to-day there are no truer comrades, and I hope that comradeship may be perpetual between ourselves and that great nation against whom Nelson said we should cherish hatred as we hated the devil. There again is the idea on which the League of Nations is to be founded and to come into force: we must all congratulate the right hon. gentleman the Prime Minister and his friends. If I may be permitted one word of reminiscence, let me mention that I wrote to the right hon. gentleman, many months ago, that I wished him, in the gigantic task he was undertaking, the most complete success.

Everybody who had ever thought of the gigantic difficulties he had to encounter must have felt almost appalled at the obstacles he was undertaking to remove, or at least to ameliorate. He has come back here with a magnificent record of success. The evil-running sore in the side of Europe—Alsace-Lorraine—has at last been healed. It would have been a perpetual source of discord and strife for scores and indeed hundreds of years, and it has been removed from the arena of conflict. I think the whole world must have breathed all the more freely when they saw that that source of discord was ended. We must, I think, congratulate him and his friends in the matter of Poland. Who that has read history at all but must have seen the horrible injustice that had been perpetrated upon that great nation in the back end of the eighteenth century? It is perfectly well known that one of our great poets described the partitioning of Poland as “the bloodiest picture in the book of time.” She is once again regenerated. She is established as a new nation once again in the comity of nations, and we sincerely hope, with him and his friends, that Poland will exercise in the future history of Europe that proper sphere of influence which she is perfectly enabled to accomplish.

There is one thing, I think, however, that we really must ask whether it is possible for more attention to be paid to. My right hon. friend will admit, I think, that I move a very good deal amongst the industrial classes and that I speak quite freely upon this point, because my attitude has not varied one inch from that which I took up many months ago. I refer to Russia. Whatever we may think about her failure—in respect of the assistance that we had a right to look forward to—we must admit that that great people is going through an awful time. Their sufferings have been terrible, and indeed their condition must evoke the heartfelt sympathy of the whole world.

If there is one thing upon which our people feel keenly, it is that no British soldier be utilised to lengthen or prolong the agony of Russia. We never had any right there to begin with, except to redeem those troops who perhaps were there because of us all working together in the early stages of the War, but merely because of a change in government—merely indeed because of the fact that there is no government at all—we have no right to prolong the agony of the Russian people, and I do say this, that the Labour Movement would hail with the greatest possible joy an announcement from the Government that at the very earliest moment and by the most expeditious means possible British soldiers will be removed.

I think it was said by Bismarck ever so many years ago that a certain territory was not worth the bones of one Pomeranian soldier, and we do say this, that there is nothing in the political and there is nothing in the economic condition of Russia that justifies a sacrifice of another British soldier, and we do appeal to the right hon. gentleman. We know the difficulties are great, we know that winter prevented expedition in matters such as this, but we are a little doubtful as to the *bona fides* of many of the folks who have been in charge of these expeditions against the Russian people. After all, the Government of Russia, their policy, their administration, all that belongs to them, are matters for the Russian people themselves. We have no right there, and we ought to get out as quickly as possible.

There is one other point I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman. Some few days ago questions were asked in this House about the mandates that were given in respect of the various colonies, the German colonies in particular. It was stated that those charters were being prepared. Of course, I understand the charters are in preparation. We know that in the Treaty of Peace the annual conference will examine from time to time—every year, or at such intervals as are proper—the conduct of the various mandatories to see that they comply with the charters laid down. What those charters contain we do not know. It is desirable that we should know. After all, we really are at this moment starting on a new condition of things for the world's future, and it is a solemn obligation upon every one of us not lightly to enter upon obligations which may involve the world once again, and at no distant time, in a repetition of the horrors from which we have just emerged. Therefore we have a right to know what the charters do contain. Of course, the general terms in the Treaty of Peace we do know. The Prime Minister himself has put that quite explicitly.

These are the points, and we have a right, before we go from this House to-night, in so far as inquiry can elicit the facts, to know whether we are now settling the peace of the world for future generations, or whether we are really lightly discharging our task, and going away with a possibility of horrors quite as great as those on which we have turned our back. These, after all, are great questions. There is the question of Ireland. When I sat upon the bench opposite with my right hon. friend the member for Manchester, we often thought of the position of Ireland, and we often thought what an unenviable attitude Great Britain would perforce be compelled to take with the wrongs of Ireland not merely unredressed but not attempted to be redressed, and I say the claims of Ireland to-day are more clamant than ever. I know nothing upon which the industrial opinion of Great Britain has so completely veered round as upon the question of Ireland. In the old days there used to be a very great deal of Orange, a very great deal of Catholic, and a very great deal of indifferent opinion, but to-day in the vast mass of the organised labour opinion of Great Britain, without exception, there is absolutely no difference at all as to the immense urgency of a settlement of this question. I was a little sorry to hear the right hon. gentleman talk as though Ireland were two nations. If she is two nations, then I despair, as one almost despairs, of any settlement that can give the slightest satisfaction to any democrat, including the right hon. gentleman himself. After all, in the back end of the eighteenth century Ireland had a Parliament of its own. It is perfectly true to say that it was a Protestant Parliament, but it was an Irish Parliament, and it made laws for the whole nation, and we surely cannot say that, merely because it was Protestant at that time, therefore you can deny the unity of its people. Since then all claims based upon merely religious ascendancy or difference have been banished altogether, and we do say that the only way this terrible problem, which is constant, burning, urgent and clamant, can be settled is by reorganising Ireland as a whole, and by giving such safeguards within a single Parliament as the various differences or sympathies of the people may require. I was in hopes that was the line on which the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues would proceed to the settlement of this terribly burning question, which has lowered our prestige for a hundred years. Wherever an Englishman goes he is an honourable, high-minded, straightforward man—there is no better in the history of the world: but there is always some slight feeling that he is a hypocrite, after all, when he is talking about the freedom of others and of broadening the basis of freedom for everyone else, because here, right against his own door, are people who are deprived of their rights, and deprived of them under conditions which everybody admits to be of the greatest perfidy. We deny to them the same rights for which we plead so eloquently and fight so strenuously on behalf of other people. After all, Ireland must be recognised as a nation. That can be the only way in which the burning question can be solved. Let such safeguards be given within the Parliament as are proper, but let the Parliament be a self-governing unit. On those lines we shall not only achieve peace for the world, as I sincerely hope that the right hon. gentleman and his friends have done, but we shall achieve peace for the sister island which has such a great claim upon us.

## Mr. Tom Shaw :

At the beginning of last year—(Hon. Members: "Divide!")—President Wilson laid down Fourteen Points—(Hon. Members "Divide!")—subsequently modified by a later speech. In the early spring our own Prime Minister made a speech to the troops in France in which he said that Germany could have peace to-morrow on those terms, and the Armistice was definitely arranged on the understanding that the Allies should deal with the representatives of the German people, and that Peace should not be discussed on the Fourteen Points, but should be arranged on them. Is there a right hon. or hon. Gentleman here who will claim that the annexation of the Saar Valley for fifteen years is not a distinct violation of the terms upon which the Armistice was signed? If that be the fact, in what respect are we better than the Germans were when they tore up the scrap of paper? (Hon. Members: "Divide!") Right hon. and hon. Gentlemen may protest. I put the question: Were those the terms on which the Armistice was signed or were they not? I say they were, and those terms have been broken by the Saar Valley provisions.

On the question of Ireland I have only a few words to say. All I have to say about Ireland is that a country which employs the Army to govern and imprisons men for selling extracts from speeches of Cabinet Ministers is not a country that can claim fair play. To vote against the Treaty is a very serious thing, a thing that no thinking man can contemplate without some degree of hesitation. One desires to recognise the difficulties that have stood in the way of our statesmen, and whilst I personally and my Party object very strongly to certain things in the Treaty I doubt very much whether, after all, we shall vote against it, not because we believe in it intact, but because the greater danger is to refuse it.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the question."

The House divided: Ayes, 163; Noes, 4.

---

## Manifesto of the Parliamentary Labour Party and the National Executive of the Party.

The Parliamentary Labour Party and the National Executive, having considered the preliminary Peace proposals, jointly declares that the Treaty is defective not so much because of this or that detail of wrong done, but fundamentally, in that it accepts, and indeed is based upon, the very political principles which were the ultimate cause of the war. The Treaty involves a violation of the principles embodied in Labour and Socialist Conference decisions; it also violates the understanding upon which the Armistice was signed, and is therefore a repudiation of the spirit and letter of the declarations of President Wilson, Mr. Lloyd George, and other Allied statesmen.

Organised Labour throughout the war resolutely opposed all attempts to transform the struggle for the emancipation of peoples into a war of conquest. On the question of reparation, however, Labour always insisted that Germany must make full reparation for the wanton destruction in all the Allied countries, and we consider that the payment by Germany of the sum of five thousand millions is not excessive in view of the damage done.

The Draft Treaty cedes to France "full ownership of the coal mines in the Saar Basin." The terms of the Armistice never so much as hinted at such a possibility. France should undoubtedly receive from Germany a sufficient supply of coal to compensate her for the temporary loss of her own mining resources. This claim can be met without handing over the population of the Saar districts even to a neutral administration. The provision in the Treaty requiring the German Government at the end of fifteen years to buy out at a valuation the mines in any part of the Saar Valley which may be restored to Germany as a result of a plebiscite, would involve a violation of the principles of self-determination equivalent to disguised annexation.

In the delimitation of the frontiers of the new Polish State violence is done to the right of the people to determine their national allegiance. Thus there is a contravention of President Wilson's "Thirteenth Point," which lays it down that the new Polish State should only contain genuinely Polish elements.

In order to secure the concerted abolition of armaments and compulsory Military Service, Labour believes that steps must be taken to prohibit the private manufacture of fresh armaments and to limit existing armaments. The Treaty, on the contrary, is likely to impose fresh burdens of this character upon the peoples as a consequence of the military occupation of the west bank of the Rhine for a period of fifteen years, and possibly longer. In such circumstances it will be impossible to take full advantage of the enforced disarmament of Germany in order to secure general disarmament and demilitarisation.

A League of Nations to be effective should be an organ of international justice, inclusive of all free peoples, and not, as it will be under the Peace Treaty, a restricted instrument of the victorious coalition. This essential aim can best be attained by the admission of Germany to membership of the League as speedily as possible after her signature to the Peace Treaty. The League should also be strengthened by being made more directly representative of peoples and Parliaments.

The peoples want peace, and demand that peace shall be lasting. We therefore call upon the organised workers of all countries to join in an effort to bring the Treaty more into harmony with the working class conception of an enduring and democratic settlement. Only when the menace of further war, which this Treaty does not remove, is lifted from the world can the burdened peoples obtain release from Conscription and begin the work of raising the international standard of life and labour and the inauguration of a new Social Order.

June 1st, 1919.

War Emergency :  
Workers' National Committee.

— (6)

REPORT

August, 1914,  
to  
March, 1916.

Price 2d.; post free, 2½d.; 2s. 6d. per  
dozen; 15s. per 100, carriage paid.

1, VICTORIA STREET, LONDON, S.W.



# WAR EMERGENCY: WORKERS' NATIONAL COMMITTEE

(March, 1916).

---

## Chairman:

ROBERT SMILLIE, J.P.

## Vice-Chairman:

JAMES O'GRADY, M.P.

## Treasurer:

W. A. APPLETON,

HAMILTON HOUSE, BIDBOROUGH STREET, LONDON, W.C.

## Executive Committee:

H. GOSLING, L.C.C.	W. B. STEER
FRED BRANLEY	(National Union of Teachers).
C. W. BOWERMAN, M.P.	F. W. JOWETT, M.P.
(Trades Union Congress).	H. DUBERY
W. C. ANDERSON, M.P.	(Independent Labour Party).
W. H. HUTCHINSON	Mrs. M. A. GASSON.
J. RAMSAY MACDONALD, M.P.	B. WILLIAMS
BEN TURNER, J.P.	(The Co-operative Union).
(The Labour Party).	H. J. MAY
BEN COOPER	(Co-operative Congress Parli- mentary Committee).
BEN TILLET	W. H. BROWN
W. A. APPLETON	(Stratford Co-operative Society).
(General Federation of Trade Unions).	Miss MARY MACARTHUR
DAVID GILMOUR	(Women's Trade Union League).
(Scottish Trades Union Congress).	Miss MARGARET BONDFIELD
ROBERT SMILLIE	(Women's Co-operative Guild).
HERBERT SMITH	Dr. MARION PHILLIPS
J. WINSTONE	(Women's Labour League).
(Miners' Federation of Great Britain).	Miss SUSAN LAWRENCE, L.C.C.
JOS. CROSS	SIDNEY WEBB
(United Textile Factory Workers).	E. R. PEASE
ALBERT BELLAMY	(The Fabian Society).
(National Union of Railwaymen).	H. M. HYNDMAN
ROBERT WILLIAMS	(British Socialist Party).
(National Transport Workers' Federation).	JOHN STOKES
	(London Trades Council).

## Consultative Member:

H. H. SLESSER, Barrister-at-Law.

## Secretary:

J. S. MIDDLETON,  
1, VICTORIA STREET, LONDON, S.W.

---

Telegraphic Address:  
"LABREPCOM, YIC., LONDON."

Telephone:  
1213 VICTORIA.

# REPORT

OF THE

## War Emergency: Workers' National Committee

(AUGUST, 1914—MARCH, 1916).

---

The War Emergency: Workers' National Committee was the outcome of a Special Conference called by the Secretary of the Labour Party and held on August 5th, 1914. The Conference was attended by the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress, the Management Committee of the General Federation of Trade Unions, the Executive Committee of the Labour Party, representatives of many leading Trade Unions, the Independent Labour Party, British Socialist Party, and a number of Industrial and Political Women's and Co-operative organisations. Despite the shortness of the notice at which the Conference was summoned, the attendance was large and representative. Mr. Henderson presided, and a very full discussion took place upon the general industrial and social outlook consequent upon the war crisis, the following recommendations ultimately being adopted:—

1. That arrangements be made at once to press upon the Government and municipal authorities measures for officially controlling: (a) the purchase and storage of food; (b) the fixing of maximum prices of food and trade necessities; and (c) the distribution of food.

2. That the Citizen Committees proposed to be set up be urged to guard against the exploitation of the people by unnecessarily high prices.

3. That an appeal be issued to all Labour, Socialist, Co-operative, and Women's organisations to render whole-hearted assistance in the work of the Citizen Committees.

4. That the Government be urged to appoint a standing Departmental Committee to stimulate and co-ordinate the efforts of Government Departments, local authorities, and other employers to maintain the aggregate volume of employment by keeping their staffs at the fullest possible strength, and, if circumstances allow, to undertake additional enterprises in order to prevent the occurrence of as much unemployment as possible.

5. That an appeal be made to the Government for the powers under the Development Commission and Road Board, together with the Unemployed Workmen Act, to be put into extensive operation in order that works of public utility may be expedited.

6. That an appeal be made to the Board of Education to use its influence on local education authorities to adopt the Education (Provision of Meals) Act, including the powers contained in the Amending Bill about to become law.

7. That the Local Government Board be requested to issue a circular to Health Committees, calling upon them to arrange to supply milk to nursing mothers, infants, young children, and sick people.

The following were appointed an Executive Committee to take charge of War Emergency matters, power being given to add to their number: Messrs. J. A.

Seddon, H. Gosling, C. W. Bowerman, M.P., W. C. Anderson, M.P., John Hodge, M.P., Arthur Henderson, M.P., Ben Cooper, Ben Tillett, W. A. Appleton, Robert Smillie, Albert Bellamy, Sidney Webb, H. M. Hyndman, Miss Mary Macarthur, and Dr. Marion Phillips. In the course of the intervening period the personnel of the Committee has been changed and augmented, other representatives of the Co-operative Movement, the Scottish Trades Union Congress, Independent Labour Party, Fabian Society, National Union of Teachers, London Trades Council, etc., having been co-opted.

At its first meeting the Committee appointed Mr. Arthur Henderson, M.P., Chairman; Mr. J. A. Seddon, Vice-Chairman; Mr. W. A. Appleton, Treasurer; and Mr. J. S. Middleton (Assistant Secretary of the Labour Party), Secretary. Subsequent to Mr. Henderson's retirement from the Committee upon his appointment to Cabinet rank, Mr. Seddon succeeded, and upon his retirement from the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress, Mr. Robert Smillie was elected Chairman, with Mr. J. O'Grady, M.P., as Vice-Chairman.

The work of the Committee has been both varied and extensive, and it is only possible to place on record some of its chief activities. It has met on 54 occasions, apart from meetings of various Sub-Committees, weekly meetings being held during the first few months of the war, and fortnightly during the greater part of 1915. The whole of the office work has been performed by the staff of the Labour Party.

#### RELIEF OF DISTRESS.

Upon the inauguration of the National Relief Fund, and the institution of Local Representative Committees throughout the country, the Committee issued circulars to all Trades Councils and local Labour Parties urging the necessity of Labour and women's representatives being appointed to take a share in the work. In many districts the chairman of the local authorities promptly appointed Labour and women's nominees, but a considerable amount of the Committee's correspondence during the first months of the war concerned the appointment of Labour and women's representatives in districts where their claims had been neglected. Arrangements were made with the Government Committee controlling the administration of civil relief whereby, generally speaking, complaints were promptly dealt with.

A pamphlet, written by Mr. Sidney Webb, outlining the general programme of civil relief, was widely circulated by the Committee, and a further pamphlet, specially written by Mr. Webb, was circulated for the guidance of representatives on the local Committees administering the Fund. Throughout the period of the Committees' activities a large number of inquiries respecting the working of the Fund have been dealt with, and inquiries into errors of administration have been secured.

When it became evident that the calling up of the Reserve forces, and the enhanced enlistment of new men, rendered it impossible for the War Office to deal adequately with the administration of Separation Allowances for their dependants the Committee protested against the lavish, unsystematic manner in which the Relief Fund was being distributed through various charitable organisations in order to relieve the Naval and Army Estimates. It has been necessary from time to time throughout the war to renew this protest. It is now apparent that a much larger proportion of the amount subscribed to the Fund has been devoted to military and naval relief than was anticipated, and difficulty is being experienced in securing adequate refunds from the War Office.

The Committee expressed considerable dissatisfaction at the mean scale of relief adopted to meet civil distress recommended by the Government Committee; data was collected regarding the scales adopted by the various committees throughout the country, and, after considerable pressure, an improvement was effected, though not to the substantial extent that was anticipated or the circumstances deserved. The scale of relief, as originally put forward by the Government Committee, is contrasted below with the demand of the Workers' National Committee and that

ultimately agreed upon and recommended as a maximum to the Local Representative Committees:—

GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE'S ORIGINAL SCALE.

	s.	d.
Single parent .....	6	0 per week.
Two parents .....	10	0 "
Each child .....	1	6 "
Persons over 16 years, if living alone .....	6	0 "
Persons over 16 years, if living in family .....	4	6 "

6d. per week to be deducted for each child receiving meals at school.

No deduction because of savings, sickness, or unemployment benefit, except where such benefit exceeds 5s. per week.

WORKERS' NATIONAL COMMITTEE'S SCALE.

	s.	d.
One adult .....	12	6 per week.
Two adults .....	17	6 "
One adult and one child .....	15	0 "
Two adults and one child .....	20	0 "
Two adults and two children .....	22	6 "

2s. 6d. for each additional child, and an additional 3s. 6d. for adoption in London boroughs.

THE ADOPTED SCALE.

	LONDON.		OUTSIDE LONDON.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.
One adult .....	10	0 per week.	8	0 per week.
Two adults .....	14	0 "	12	0 "
Each additional adult .....	4	6 "	4	6 "
Two adults and one child .....	15	6* "	13	6* "
Two adults and two children .....	17	0* "	15	0* "
Two adults and three children .....	18	6* "	16	6* "
Two adults and four children .....	20	0* "	18	0* "
Maximum coming into household ...	20	0 "	18	0 "

\*Less 6d. per week in respect of each child receiving meals at school.

Following the increased cost of living, in March, 1915 the Government agreed to the abolition of the above maximum and sanctioned increases in the scale up to 15 per cent. In March of the present year the London scale was made applicable to the larger Scottish towns, and the Scottish Advisory Committee were authorised to allow Local Representative Committees to increase the scale of relief in the case of small families up to a maximum of 3s. 6d. per week in respect of the first child, and 2s. in respect of each additional child so long as such relief is appreciably lower than wages. Similar increases in the scale of relief are to be allowed in English towns where, in the opinion of the Government Committee, such increases are warranted.

Various restrictions in the administration of relief were removed on the initiation of the Workers' National Committee, including payment in kind in certain districts, the fixing of a maximum amount, and the penalisation of unemployed men of enlistable age. Considerable controversy took place respecting the definition of "distress arising out of the war," and strong representations had to be made in a number of cases where men and women, who happened to be out of work before the war broke out and who afterwards remained unemployed, were denied relief. The most serious omission, however, is the ruling out of Old Age Pensioners, who find their pensions altogether inadequate as the result of the increased cost of living. Repeated representations have been made, both to the Government Committee on Civil Distress and the Executive Committee controlling the Fund, but entirely without success.

The total contributions to the Fund up to September 30th, 1915, amounted to £5,305,505. In addition, a sum of £95,388 has been received in respect of interest earned on the balance of the Fund temporarily invested, and out of the amount collected on behalf of the Queen's Work for Women Fund £127,750 was paid over to the National Relief Fund for the purpose of financing schemes of work for women. The aggregate receipts, therefore, amounted to £5,528,643, and of this sum £2,108,509 has been issued for naval and military relief. These payments included £1,271,599 administered by the Soldiers and Sailors Families' Association; £185,000 by the Royal Patriotic Fund Corporation, which made grants to upwards of 12,400 widows, 26,000 children, and 7,700 other dependants. The Soldiers' and Sailors' Help Society, which assists discharged and disabled soldiers, received £55,000, and dealt with approximately 45,000 cases during the first year of the war. A sum of £15,000 was provided to provide the necessary temporary buildings and to meet current expenses of St. Dunstan's Hostel for Blind Soldiers and Sailors (Regent's Park, London). This institution undertakes the training of blind soldiers and sailors in various suitable industries, in addition to teaching all the simpler operations of everyday life, which cease to be automatic when a man loses his sight. A grant of £10,000 was made to enable Roehampton House to be opened as the first of Queen Mary's Convalescent Auxiliary Hospitals, where soldier patients who have lost their limbs are provided with suitable artificial substitutes.

Civil relief totalling £367,628 was granted by the Government Committee, and of this amount £176,132 was given as grants-in-aid of direct assistance, £3,603 for schemes of work for men, £44,970 for women's work-rooms, and £4,187 for training schemes for women and girls. These various grants, totalling £228,893, were for England and Wales only. £53,000 was administered by a separate Scottish Committee, £20,700 was given to Ireland, £600 to the Isle of Man, £1,050 for the relief of British refugees, £20,139 for the relief of members of the professional classes, and £2,550 for the training of upholsterers in the leather trade. In addition, the Central Committee on Women's Employment received £39,761, and various other associations of a relief character received smaller sums. It should be noted that all the above statistics extend over the period August, 1914, to September, 1915.

The Workers' National Committee is keeping constantly in mind that the Fund was chiefly instituted to relieve civil distress, and is using its endeavours to secure that it will not be altogether depleted when the war ends and the need for industrial relief may become acute.

#### **COURTS (EMERGENCY POWERS) ACT, ETC.**

At the outset of the war the Committee were impressed by the necessity for some legal protection being given to families of men joining the colours and others affected by industrial dislocation. The Government was urged to provide means whereby distraint or eviction for the non-payment of rent, the lapsing of insurance policies, and the voiding of hire purchase agreements should be prevented. The Courts (Emergency Powers) Act was subsequently introduced, amended in detail by the Parliamentary Labour Party, and afterwards passed into law. An opinion explaining the powers conferred by the Act was prepared by Mr. Slessor and received a wide circulation in leaflet form. Numerous cases of hardship and points of law were forwarded to the Head Office by local organisations, and, after consultation, suitable advice was tendered in each case.

With the calling up of married men, attested under the Derby scheme of recruitment, the problem of preserving their homes became acute. A Sub-Committee was appointed to consider a scheme, and ultimately the following was endorsed by the National Committee and forwarded to the Government for consideration:—

#### **MEMORANDUM ON PROPOSALS TO PRESERVE THE HOMES OF MEN CALLED TO THE COLOURS.**

That married men already enlisted should be treated in the same way as those about to join the colours.

That single men who have responsibilities similar to the home ties of married men should be dealt with in the same way as married men.

That a moratorium, which means that debts will accumulate until the end of the war, is no solution of the problem of family house rents.

That it is unfair to ask houseowners to bear the whole burden of unpaid rents.

That the rents should not be charged upon local rates, as the incidence of such rates would be heavy where enlistment has been heavy and light where enlistment has been light.

That Local Committees should be empowered to consider local claims and the public funds required to meet them should be found by the Treasury.

The permanent charges that require to be dealt with are in the main :—

- Rent;
- Mortgage and Building Society obligations;
- Insurance and Annuities.

This brings in the following chief creditors :—

- The Houseowner;
- The Mortgagee and Building Society;
- The Insurance Company;
- The Ground Landlord;
- The Rating Authority.

As regards rent, we think it might be apportioned approximately as follows :—

- The Landlord should bear one-third;
- The Householder one-third; and
- The Treasury one-third.

As regards mortgages and ground rents, the houseowner should be entitled to deduct the same proportion of these charges as has been deducted from his rent.

As regards insurances, the Treasury should make arrangements with the companies upon a business basis, by which all enlisted men shall be kept in full benefit without payments during the period they are serving with the colours.

Houses should be exempt from rates, but there should be no change in the incidence of rates; grants-in-aid should be made from the Treasury to the local authority affected.

The whole scheme should be worked by Local Committees with powers to adjust the scheme to individual cases which plainly demand separate treatment—as, for instance, cases where no relief is required owing to the means of the families.

It is not intended that the Committee's proposals should interfere in any way with the operation of the Courts (Emergency Powers) Act, 1914.

#### **WOMEN'S EMPLOYMENT.**

One of the most successful features of the Committee's work has been the co-ordinated endeavours of the representatives of the women's side of the Labour movement. Upon the institution of Queen Mary's Fund and the setting up of various schemes of voluntary work in the way of sewing, knitting, shirt-making, etc., strong criticism of the economic effect of such schemes, at a time when working women were already suffering through unemployment and industrial dislocation, was put forward by representative women Trade Unionists. These representations were promptly followed by requests from the Queen for the Workers' National Committee to appoint a number of representatives of working women to co-operate with the Queen's Fund Committee. The five women members were appointed, and throughout the period of industrial distress they devoted practically the whole of their time to the work of the Central Committee on Women's Employment, appointed by the Local Government Board to consider and report on schemes of women's work, with which the Queen's Fund Committee was merged. The record of the

Committee's work has been officially published (Cd 7848. Price, 4½d.), and, although the first phase of their activity is now concluded, the machinery of administration which was set up remains intact and available for renewed effort when the need arises.

Their policy sought to achieve a fairer distribution of women's work required by the Government, to adapt workers in depressed trades to those industries catering for war demands, and, in a lesser degree, to develop new trades for women workers. By arrangement they handled a number of Government contracts direct, including the making up of 20,000 Army grey shirts and repeat orders of 10,000 per week; 105,000 body belts for the French and British Armies; and 2,000,000 pairs of Army grey socks. The best grade of workers were able to earn at piece rates 30s. per week, with an average of 19s. per week.

Relief work-rooms, on lines laid down by the Committee, were also opened in various boroughs. The working week was limited to 40 hours and 10s. per week was fixed as a maximum relief allowance. This rate of 3d. per hour was decided upon in consideration of the rates fixed by Trade Boards governing conditions in several industries in which women are largely employed. Supervisors were paid 25s., 28s., and 32s. per week; and, although the Committee were criticised for conducting their work at these rates of wages, it will be admitted that they contrast favourably with the average rate of wages paid to women in normal industry, which has been estimated by experts at 10s. 7d. per week. The rate was subsequently increased to a maximum of 11s. 6d. per week. It has to be realised that the schemes throughout were of the nature of relief, and were financed by grants from the National Relief Fund. The total amount paid in wages in relief work-rooms was £15,063, material costing £2,131; 8,963 women and girls passed through the various workshops instituted by the Committee.

Experimental schemes for the training of women workers in workshops, of juveniles and of home-helpers, and the teaching of domestic economy were initiated by the Women's Committee. A fruit-growing scheme at Radlett and a fruit-pulping and vegetable drying scheme at Studley College were also financed.

#### **WOMEN'S WAR SERVICE.**

Upon the Board of Trade issuing announcements that women's services were desired for farm work, leather-stitching, brush-making, clothing-machining, and light armament work, the Committee convened a representative conference at Caxton Hall on April 16th, 1915. Most of the women's Trade Union organisations, suffrage societies, and other bodies directly interested in women's work, together with a number of men's Trade Unions concerned with the labour indicated, were represented. A number of resolutions were submitted, and, after discussion and amendment, were adopted. These sought, generally speaking, to lay down the principle of equal rates of pay for equal work, no sweating of women's labour, and readjustment at the conclusion of the war to be met by priority of employment being given to men transferred to war service, the workers displaced to be found other suitable occupation. The Committee afterwards issued a "Women's Appeal to Women Workers," urging women entering war employment to join Trade Unions and generally to seek to keep up the men's standard of industrial conditions. This was signed by a large number of representative women of all classes.

#### **PROVISION OF MEALS.**

The war crisis was responsible for the publication of a notable Government document in that issued by the Board of Education to educational authorities throughout the country urging them to adopt the Provision of Meals Act and detailing schemes of work, menus of meals, food values, costs, etc. This gave a lead to many local authorities which had hitherto hesitated to adopt the Provision of Meals Act, and, although subsequent improvement in industrial conditions led to its suspension in many districts, it will prove of great assistance when occasion arises in the future. The Committee issued a summarised form of the memorandum urging local Labour and women's organisations to press for the adoption of the Act in their localities. Perhaps one of the best successes was at Hull, where the local authority adopted a scheme which provided for three meals per day for seven days per week.

### CHILD LABOUR.

The war had not been waging a month before it was reported that one relief committee at least had recommended the release of children of 13 years from school in order to take up work in boot and shoe factories relinquished by men who had joined the colours. That proposal, however, was successfully resisted.

Later on a concerted movement took place in many agricultural districts with a view to children being released for field and farm work, it being notable that the demand was keenest when the price of wheat was standing at 60s. per quarter and when many sections of agricultural workers were persistently demanding increases of wages in order to meet the increased cost of living. The Committee co-operated with the officials of the Agricultural Workers' Union in a counter agitation. Facts and figures were collected, and a deputation waited upon the Right Hon. J. A. Pease, M.P., President of the Board of Education, to urge that the Department should use all its influence to oppose the release of children of school age. Later, in 1915, the agitation on the part of the farmers was renewed, and there were also evidences that demands were to be made for children to be released to take up work in various factories. A further deputation from the Committee met the Home Secretary (Sir John Simon) and the new President of the Board of Education (the Right Hon. Arthur Henderson), and their Departmental officials, when a very full and friendly discussion took place on the whole subject. On January 31st, 1916, the number of school children exempted for agricultural employment was 7,934 boys and 92 girls, of whom 4,437 were under 13 and the remainder under 14.

The Committee regret that a concession granted by the Home Office, whereby boys engaged in the glass trade have been allowed to work night shifts, was given at the joint request of the employers and the workmen.

A careful watch is being kept in this matter, and further action will be taken as occasion arises.

### CARE OF MATERNITY.

The efforts of the Women's Co-operative Guild in the promotion of maternity care schemes have been supported by the Committee. Special documents have been circulated and local organisations encouraged to press their local authorities to institute maternity centres to provide nourishment for nursing and expectant mothers and to arrange for the provision of doctors or midwives and household helps at confinements.

When the "war babies" scare arose the Committee, while discounting the exaggerations that were prevalent, urged that the Notification of Births Act should be made compulsory, that more health visitors should be appointed, and lying-in-homes instituted. The Government brought in a measure making notification of births compulsory and giving general powers whereby local authorities could adopt special schemes for maternity care.

The Women's Co-operative Guild, the Women's Labour League, the Women's Trade Union League, and the Railway Women's Guild have co-operated in urging their members to join in pressing local authorities throughout the country to institute maternity schemes under the Act. Unfortunately, while some authorities realise their responsibilities for future generations and are spending wisely to assure healthy births for the children of to-morrow, far too many are subject to the dictates of unwise "economy."

It is worthy of note that during the war crisis the authorities in Bradford have instituted the last link in the chain of health administration. They now have schemes for the care of individuals from a period prior to and at birth at pre-natal clinics, during infancy at a baby clinic, during school days at a school clinic up to the time when they come under the National Health Insurance Act, thus caring for people literally "from the cradle to the grave." The example of Bradford in this pioneer work is heartily commended to the study and investigation of the whole working-class movement.



## MILITARY ALLOWANCES AND PENSIONS.

Probably one of the most important and successful phases of the Committee's work has been that concerning the increases secured in the consideration shown to the wives and dependants of men who have joined the fighting services. The Committee gave its solid backing to the demand, which was popularised in the "Daily Citizen" and elsewhere, for a "pound-a-week" basis of separation allowances and pensions. A Sub-Committee was appointed and drafted a detailed scheme, which is indicated below, and a series of District Conferences, held simultaneously on Saturday, November 7th, 1914, was arranged in conjunction with the local Labour organisations in representative industrial centres throughout the country. The "pound-a-week" scale was demanded and equal status claimed for unmarried wives and their children as well as for unmarried mothers with sons with the colours. State machinery was urged to dispense the allowances and pensions, preferably under the control of one Government Department. Returns were compiled showing the number of Trade Unionists who had joined the colours, and these and similar facts were used by Labour Members in the debate on the subject in the House. A Select Committee was appointed, and included in its membership the Right Hon. George N. Barnes, M.P., who had been prominent in demanding better treatment for soldiers' and sailors' dependants. Mr. Robert Smillie and Mr. Harry Gosling appeared as witnesses on behalf of the Workers' National Committee and Dr. Marion Phillips on behalf of the Women's Labour League. A memorandum in support of the "pound-a-week" proposal was prepared and formed the basis of the evidence of the Committee's witnesses. The general case put forward was that the Government had no right to presume upon the fact that many men were being recruited from low-paid industries as a reason for a cheap army, and the Committee have some satisfaction in knowing that their endeavours assisted towards an improvement in the old scale. For purposes of comparison the old pre-war scale, the first new scale, the Committee's scale, and the present scale are given herewith.

When the Select Committee issued its second report recommending that a Statutory Committee of the Royal Patriotic Fund Corporation should be instituted to administer pensions the Committee entered its strong protest, and reiterated its representations in favour of the Local Government Board being responsible for the work (thus ensuring Parliamentary rights over its administration), and that the local Old Age Pensions Committees should be recast in order to take over the local administration. Unfortunately, the influence of the existing charitable organisations was too strong for this method of democratic control to be instituted, and the Statutory Committee has been set up very largely on the lines recommended by the Select Committee. It consists of 27 members, of which two—the Right Hon. George N. Barnes, M.P., and Mr. Harry Gosling, L.C.C.—are Labour representatives, and Mrs. Sidney Webb one of the women members. It came to the knowledge of the Workers' National Committee that an attempt was to be made to secure a large proportion of the National Relief Fund for the purpose of financing the Statutory Committee, and efforts were successfully made to defeat the proposal in its early stages, although the same result has been achieved by the Relief Fund continuing until June 30th, 1916, as the means of supplementing military pensions and allowances. Local organisations have been urged to secure representation on the committees which are to be appointed to administer locally; and although it is adverse to all the democratic principles of the Labour movement to assist in the old charity methods of dealing with the country's defenders a fair chance will be given to the scheme, and we can only look forward to the time when the State will shoulder its responsibilities and abolish every element of charity in the matter of military and naval payments.

In addition to the above activities, the Secretary and staff have dealt with scores of individual cases concerning separation allowances, pensions, pay, etc., and after the first few months of inevitable delay, generally speaking, the claims were reviewed with satisfactory promptitude by the War Office and Admiralty authorities.

# TABLE SHOWING INCREASE IN PENSIONS AND ALLOWANCES.

## I.—SEPARATION ALLOWANCES.

Pre-War Scale.	White Paper, November, 1914.	Proposals of Workers' National Committee, November, 1914.	From March 1st, 1915.																																															
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;"></td> <td style="text-align: right; vertical-align: middle;">s. d.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wife .....</td> <td style="text-align: right;">7 7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>  " and one child.....</td> <td style="text-align: right;">8 9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>  " and two children ...</td> <td style="text-align: right;">9 11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>  " and three children...</td> <td style="text-align: right;">11 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>  " and four children ...</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other dependants .....</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Nil.</td> </tr> </table>		s. d.	Wife .....	7 7	" and one child.....	8 9	" and two children ...	9 11	" and three children...	11 1	" and four children ...	12 3	Other dependants .....	Nil.	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;"></td> <td style="text-align: right; vertical-align: middle;">s. d.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12 6</td> <td rowspan="4" style="font-size: 2em; vertical-align: middle;">}</td> <td rowspan="4" style="vertical-align: middle;">Irrespective of "marriage on the strength," including compulsory allotment of 3s. 6d. from soldier.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15 0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20 0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>22 0</td> <td></td> <td>A sum determined by allotment from soldier, but not more than 9s.</td> </tr> </table>		s. d.	12 6	}	Irrespective of "marriage on the strength," including compulsory allotment of 3s. 6d. from soldier.	15 0	17 6	20 0	22 0		A sum determined by allotment from soldier, but not more than 9s.	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;"></td> <td style="text-align: right; vertical-align: middle;">s. d.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20 0</td> <td rowspan="4" style="font-size: 2em; vertical-align: middle;">}</td> <td rowspan="4" style="vertical-align: middle;">Exclusive of allotment from soldier. 3s. 6d. per week in addition if in London.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>23 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>27 0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>34 0</td> <td></td> <td>Dependants of unmarried men to be treated as wife and children.</td> </tr> </table>		s. d.	20 0	}	Exclusive of allotment from soldier. 3s. 6d. per week in addition if in London.	23 6	27 0	30 6	34 0		Dependants of unmarried men to be treated as wife and children.	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;"></td> <td style="text-align: right; vertical-align: middle;">s. d.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12 8</td> <td rowspan="4" style="font-size: 2em; vertical-align: middle;">}</td> <td rowspan="4" style="vertical-align: middle;">Including compulsory allotment of 3s. 6d. from soldier. 3s. 6d. per week in addition if in London.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>23 0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25 0</td> <td></td> <td>Dependants of unmarried men can be rated as wife and children.</td> </tr> </table>		s. d.	12 8	}	Including compulsory allotment of 3s. 6d. from soldier. 3s. 6d. per week in addition if in London.	17 6	21 0	23 0	25 0		Dependants of unmarried men can be rated as wife and children.
	s. d.																																																	
Wife .....	7 7																																																	
" and one child.....	8 9																																																	
" and two children ...	9 11																																																	
" and three children...	11 1																																																	
" and four children ...	12 3																																																	
Other dependants .....	Nil.																																																	
	s. d.																																																	
12 6	}	Irrespective of "marriage on the strength," including compulsory allotment of 3s. 6d. from soldier.																																																
15 0																																																		
17 6																																																		
20 0																																																		
22 0		A sum determined by allotment from soldier, but not more than 9s.																																																
	s. d.																																																	
20 0	}	Exclusive of allotment from soldier. 3s. 6d. per week in addition if in London.																																																
23 6																																																		
27 0																																																		
30 6																																																		
34 0		Dependants of unmarried men to be treated as wife and children.																																																
	s. d.																																																	
12 8	}	Including compulsory allotment of 3s. 6d. from soldier. 3s. 6d. per week in addition if in London.																																																
17 6																																																		
21 0																																																		
23 0																																																		
25 0		Dependants of unmarried men can be rated as wife and children.																																																

## II.—PENSIONS.

<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;"></td> <td style="text-align: right; vertical-align: middle;">s. d.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Widow .....</td> <td style="text-align: right;">5 0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>  " and one child .....</td> <td style="text-align: right;">6 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>  " and two children...</td> <td style="text-align: right;">8 0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>  " and three children</td> <td style="text-align: right;">9 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>  " and four children.</td> <td style="text-align: right;">11 0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Motherless children .....</td> <td style="text-align: right;">8 0 each</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other dependants .....</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Nil.</td> </tr> </table>		s. d.	Widow .....	5 0	" and one child .....	6 6	" and two children...	8 0	" and three children	9 6	" and four children.	11 0	Motherless children .....	8 0 each	Other dependants .....	Nil.	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;"></td> <td style="text-align: right; vertical-align: middle;">s. d.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7 8</td> <td rowspan="4" style="font-size: 2em; vertical-align: middle;">}</td> <td rowspan="4" style="vertical-align: middle;">Gratuity on re-marriage £39.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15 0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20 0</td> <td></td> <td>Separation allowance rates for 26 weeks from husband's death.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5s. up to three; 4s. thereafter.....</td> <td></td> <td>At discretion of Pensions Committee, but in no case more than a widow's.</td> </tr> </table>		s. d.	7 8	}	Gratuity on re-marriage £39.	12 6	15 0	17 6	20 0		Separation allowance rates for 26 weeks from husband's death.	5s. up to three; 4s. thereafter.....		At discretion of Pensions Committee, but in no case more than a widow's.	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;"></td> <td style="text-align: right; vertical-align: middle;">s. d.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20 0</td> <td rowspan="4" style="font-size: 2em; vertical-align: middle;">}</td> <td rowspan="4" style="vertical-align: middle;">Dependants of unmarried men to be treated as widow and children.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>23 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>27 0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>34 0</td> <td></td> <td>3s. 6d. each .....</td> </tr> </table>		s. d.	20 0	}	Dependants of unmarried men to be treated as widow and children.	23 6	27 0	30 6	34 0		3s. 6d. each .....	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;"></td> <td style="text-align: right; vertical-align: middle;">s. d.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10 0</td> <td rowspan="4" style="font-size: 2em; vertical-align: middle;">}</td> <td rowspan="4" style="vertical-align: middle;">Rising by 2s. 6d. at 85 and at 45.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15 0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>19 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>22 6</td> <td></td> <td>Gratuity on re-marriage, two years' pension.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5s. each for any number.</td> <td></td> <td>Allowance for 26 weeks, then pension to be determined by authorities.</td> </tr> </table>		s. d.	10 0	}	Rising by 2s. 6d. at 85 and at 45.	15 0	19 6	20 6	22 6		Gratuity on re-marriage, two years' pension.	5s. each for any number.		Allowance for 26 weeks, then pension to be determined by authorities.
	s. d.																																																									
Widow .....	5 0																																																									
" and one child .....	6 6																																																									
" and two children...	8 0																																																									
" and three children	9 6																																																									
" and four children.	11 0																																																									
Motherless children .....	8 0 each																																																									
Other dependants .....	Nil.																																																									
	s. d.																																																									
7 8	}	Gratuity on re-marriage £39.																																																								
12 6																																																										
15 0																																																										
17 6																																																										
20 0		Separation allowance rates for 26 weeks from husband's death.																																																								
5s. up to three; 4s. thereafter.....		At discretion of Pensions Committee, but in no case more than a widow's.																																																								
	s. d.																																																									
20 0	}	Dependants of unmarried men to be treated as widow and children.																																																								
23 6																																																										
27 0																																																										
30 6																																																										
34 0		3s. 6d. each .....																																																								
	s. d.																																																									
10 0	}	Rising by 2s. 6d. at 85 and at 45.																																																								
15 0																																																										
19 6																																																										
20 6																																																										
22 6		Gratuity on re-marriage, two years' pension.																																																								
5s. each for any number.		Allowance for 26 weeks, then pension to be determined by authorities.																																																								
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">Totally disabled soldier ..</td> <td style="text-align: right; vertical-align: top;">Between 10s. 6d. and 17s. 6d.</td> </tr> </table>	Totally disabled soldier ..	Between 10s. 6d. and 17s. 6d.	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">Between 14s. and 28s., according to dependants, and 5s. National Insurance.</td> </tr> </table>	Between 14s. and 28s., according to dependants, and 5s. National Insurance.	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">20s. per week, with scale for children as above.</td> </tr> </table>	20s. per week, with scale for children as above.	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">25s. and 3s. 6d. for each child and 5s. National Insurance.</td> </tr> </table>	25s. and 3s. 6d. for each child and 5s. National Insurance.																																																		
Totally disabled soldier ..	Between 10s. 6d. and 17s. 6d.																																																									
Between 14s. and 28s., according to dependants, and 5s. National Insurance.																																																										
20s. per week, with scale for children as above.																																																										
25s. and 3s. 6d. for each child and 5s. National Insurance.																																																										
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">Partly disabled soldier ...</td> <td style="text-align: right; vertical-align: top;">Between 3s. 6d. and 10s. 6d., according to wage-earning capacity.</td> </tr> </table>	Partly disabled soldier ...	Between 3s. 6d. and 10s. 6d., according to wage-earning capacity.	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">Between 3s. 6d. and 17s. 6d. ....</td> </tr> </table>	Between 3s. 6d. and 17s. 6d. ....	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">20s. per week as minimum...</td> </tr> </table>	20s. per week as minimum...	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">Difference between 25s. and what he can earn.</td> </tr> </table>	Difference between 25s. and what he can earn.																																																		
Partly disabled soldier ...	Between 3s. 6d. and 10s. 6d., according to wage-earning capacity.																																																									
Between 3s. 6d. and 17s. 6d. ....																																																										
20s. per week as minimum...																																																										
Difference between 25s. and what he can earn.																																																										

### GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.

Soon after the outbreak of war it became apparent that there was a possibility of the war contract scandals that accompanied the War Office administration at the time of the South African War being renewed, and as various complaints respecting sweating, bad conditions, and violation of the Fair Wages Clause in connection with Government work were forthcoming a Special Government Contracts Committee was set up, with Mr. W. Stephen Sanders as Chairman. The Committee received considerable attention in the general Press, and its exposure of the conditions under which Army huts were being erected brought it into public prominence, and no doubt served as a warning to Government contractors in general.

The suspension of the publication of Government contracts in the "Board of Trade Labour Gazette," which had taken place in the early months of the war, was removed so far as the War Office was concerned on the representation of the Committee in conjunction with the Parliamentary Labour Party; for some unaccountable reason, however, the Admiralty have continually refrained from renewing their previous practice.

Upon complaints being received from numbers of recruits in the new Army, and also from many Trade Unionist workmen engaged in hut-building, an investigation was conducted into the methods of construction, and, with the co-operation of trustworthy experts who had visited many of the military camps, a lengthy report was prepared, issued to the general Press, and forwarded to the War Office. The report gave details of estimates for hut-building, based upon Government specifications, and cost of materials as reported in current building trade journals, with Trade Unionist labour employed throughout, showing that a typical hut for which contractors were charging from £130 to £150 could be erected for between £85 and £90.

Instances were cited of firms who were manufacturing thousands of sashes and doors for the huts at from 2d. to 2½d. per hour under the Trade Union rate, while a number of fair firms had been refused a share in the work. Incontestable evidence was forthcoming that an agent for a London West-End jeweller was handling contracts for tables and forms for use in huts, and had let a contract for 750 sets at a fixed price of 31s., as against the contractor's offer of 30s. 3d. Samples of both tables and forms, in addition to a collection of other military requisites for the contracts, were on show at a West-End furrier's and milliner's establishment. Side by side with this and similar exposures, the "Daily Chronicle" was active in exposing the unbusinesslike way in which the Government had arranged for the general timber supply. Considerable discussion followed in the House of Commons, and it became necessary to issue a further document refuting many of the statements made in defence of the War Office administration. Subsequently, the Contracts Sub-Committee interviewed a number of War Office officials, and arrangements were made for further complaints put forward by the Committee to be more promptly dealt with.

Unfortunately, one of the most extraordinary incidents in connection with this department of the Committee's activities still remains unexplained. Complaints were received from several sources that certain manufacturers of Government hosiery were making a practice of sprinkling military socks with water for the purpose of bringing them up to the weights as specified in their contract. Repeated interviews took place with officials at the War Office, and actual workers detailed to the authorities their own participation in the process, which it was alleged was confined to Government contracts only. Various scientific defences were put forward to justify the manufacturers in their practice, and the result of sample tests, showing that certain deliveries contained a less proportion of moisture than normally allowed, were reported to the Committee's representatives. It is understood that the practice has now been discontinued, but it is worthy of record that this practice was simply a renewal of one that characterised the same manufacture in certain centres at the time of the South African War.

### FOOD PRICES.

At the beginning of August, 1914, the Committee made representations with a view to securing workmen being represented upon the Food Prices Committee that had been set up by the Board of Trade. This was refused on the ground that the various Advisory Committees whose recommendations the Board were communicating to the Press were voluntary committees constituted by the trades concerned. Subsequently Messrs. J. A. Seddon and B. Williams met the Government officials and put forward certain proposals with respect to foodstuffs. The Government had already taken control of the sugar supply at fixed minimum prices (3½d. for granulated and 4½d. for lump) and threatened to cut off supplies to any retailer selling at a lower rate. This action was taken to restrict consumption and so avoid a famine, which under other circumstances would quite possibly have followed the outbreak of war. It has since been reported that about 100,000 tons of sugar were supplied in the first month of war at an extra profit of 100 per cent. In view of the action of the Government, the representatives of the Committee recommended that the Government should commandeer all the available home supply of wheat at 37s.; that they should sell the supply at current rates, allowing from 5 to 10 per cent. additional profit to the grower, remitting the balance of the profit for the relief of taxation. This suggestion was declined, and the price of wheat began steadily to rise.

It was suggested in May, 1915, that that year's crop should be commandeered, but without success, with the result that the price of English wheat increased from 40s. 4d. in November, 1914, to 60s. in June, 1915, and has remained at a high level throughout the war. It was acknowledged that considerable assistance was rendered to the Board of Trade by the Co-operative Movement in providing particulars of the retail prices of commodities, but, although recognition was given to the national services rendered by this great organisation, it remains a matter of great regret that no direct representative of the consumers found a place on the Government Committee.

It was pointed out by the Workers' National Committee that serious hardship was being inflicted owing to excessive shipping freights. At the outbreak of hostilities the whole shipping trade was naturally in a nervous condition due to the risks of war, and the Government instituted an insurance scheme whereby ships and cargoes could be covered. For some time the prevailing premium for single voyages was 1½ per cent. and 2½ per cent. for round voyages. Later 2½ per cent. was charged to cover a period of three months and cargoes were covered at the rate of £3 3s. per cent.

On November 26th, 1914, the Board of Trade issued a report dealing with the number of ships over 100 tons register in use before the war. These comprised:—

BRITISH SHIPS .....	10,123	...	20,523,706 tonnage.
GERMAN SHIPS .....	2,000	...	5,134,720 tonnage.

Up to that date the number of captured and detained vessels were:—

BRITISH SHIPS captured .....	49		
Detained in German ports .....	75		
Detained in Baltic and Black Sea ports.	71		
	-----	Total.....	195
		Tonnage .....	585,551
GERMAN SHIPS captured .....	80		
Detained in allied ports .....	166		
Obtaining refuge in neutral ports .....	646		
Confined in German ports .....	329		
	-----	Total.....	1,221
		Tonnage .....	4,584,926

The total unavailable British and German vessels (1,416) represented 11 per cent. of the shipping over 100 tons register in use in July, 1914.

The number of British ships plying for charter numbered 9,928, representing a tonnage of 20,122,173, being 97 per cent. of the gross tonnage available prior to the war.

The following noteworthy commentary on this statement appears in the "Journal of Commerce," a periodical representing shipping interests, dated November 27th, 1914:—

"The opportunities now open to British shipping are obvious. There are no more cut rates by subsidised German vessels. German ships being swept off the sea, we have now no serious competitors in the carrying trade of the world."

The Government scheme obviously led to a general steadying effect upon shipping, and the vigilance of the Navies of Britain and her Allies in sweeping the enemy fleets from the seas entirely protected our merchant ships. Shipowners found their vessels in great demand and reaped record freightages, the freights on cargoes advancing from 25 to 50 per cent. and on passenger rates even to 100 per cent. Dear food thus became the direct outcome of naval victory. The following table indicates the typical freightage charges from similar ports in various parts of the world at different periods prior to and during the war:—

South America to U.K...	10s. 0d. (Feb., 1914)...	65s. 6d. (Jan., 1915)...	150s. 0d. (Jan., 1916)
Bombay to U.K. ....	11s. 0d. (April, 1914)...	22s. 0d. (Jan., 1915)...	147s. 6d. (Jan., 1916)
New York to Liverpool...	6s. 5d. (Jan., 1914)...	31s. 4d. (Jan., 1915)...	12s. 3d. (Feb., 1916)
New Orleans to Liverpool	8s. 6d. (July, 1914)...	25s. 0d. (Dec., 1914)...	19s. 6d. (Feb., 1916)

Faced by the position of affairs as indicated in the first two columns above, the Workers' National Committee convened a series of District Conferences throughout the country in January, 1915, concluding with a representative Conference in London on March 12th, urging the Government to take control of merchant ships for the conveyance of goods for public consumption and itself bring wheat from the Argentine and Canada at the bare cost of transport. The Board of Trade announced ten months later (November, 1915) that they proposed to take over a proportion of the merchant service.

When the problem had been debated in Parliament at the instance of the Labour Party early in 1915 the Government recommended that the working classes should seek redress by securing advances of wages. Thus encouraged, the organised workers secured war bonuses or wage advances of varying amounts, but in practically every instance they were quite inadequate to meet the soaring prices. The poorer class of the community, of course, remained entirely unprotected, and Old Age Pensioners soon found their pensions reduced in purchasing power, persons with small fixed incomes suffered a reduced standard of living, and the dependants of men with the colours realised that the increased separation allowances were in reality worth little, if at all, more than the original rates. In order to demonstrate the result of the Government's inaction the National Committee prepared a Memorandum detailing the increased cost of living during the war, basing its calculations entirely upon the official statistics issued by the Board of Trade. Accepting the standard working-class budget formulated by the Board of Trade, and which required 22s. 6d. as the expenditure on food for a family of two adults and three or four children at the prices prevailing in the summer of 1904, it was shown that a similar standard of life for a similar family would cost 25s. in July, 1914; 29s. 9d. in January, 1915; 34s. in August, 1915; and 37s. 9d. in March, 1916; the latter representing an increase of 51 per cent. above the prices prevailing at the outbreak of war. At the moment of presenting this report there is every indication of further increases being reached.

A summary of the chief table is given on the following page.

# INDEX NUMBERS OF RETAIL PRICES OF FOOD IN LARGE TOWNS (POPULATION OVER 50,000) IN THE UNITED KINGDOM.

("NORMAL PRICES IN JULY, 1914"—100.)

Date	Weighted Total.	BEEF.						MUTTON.				Lamb: Streaky.	Fish.
		British.		Chilled or Frozen.		British		Frozen.					
		Ribs.	Thin Flank.	Ribs.	Thin Flank.	Legs.	Breast.	Legs.	Breast.				
1914, July.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
„ 8th August.....	116	107	109	111	114	105	108	112	119	115	118	113	118
„ 1st December..	117	107	111	116	130	105	114	118	127	108	134	134	134
1915, 1st June.....	135	137	150	143	165	129	149	139	160	119	171	171	171
„ 1st December..	146	136	151	150	188	127	148	145	187	133	205	205	205
1916, 1st February ..	149	187	154	153	171	129	153	149	176	135	226	226	226
„ 1st March .....	151	139	155	155	174	133	153	154	185	136	215	215	215

  

Date.	Flour, Household.	Broad.	Sugar, White (Gram.).	Milk.	Potatoes.	Margarine.	Butter.		Cheese.	Eggs (Fresh).	Tea.
							Fresh.	Salt.			
1914, July.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
„ 8th August.....	120	112	133	101	115	119	115	115	107	124	100
„ 1st December..	113	114	170	105	86	103	107	108	107	161	112
1915, 1st June.....	158	150	172	110	104	106	116	116	132	115	126
„ 1st December..	143	143	197	129	99	107	133	131	129	202	149
1916, 1st February ..	155	156	207	131	102	112	131	128	137	174	149
„ 1st March .....	159	159	225	132	105	118	132	130	141	148	149

15

NOTES.—1. The above Table is compiled from information communicated by the Board of Trade through the "Labour Gazette." The figures are based upon between 500 and 600 returns, relating to prices in every town in the kingdom with over 50,000 population.

2. The difference between an index number of an article for any date given and 100 is the percentage increase or decrease in price since July, 1914. For instance, the price of bread on March 1st, 1916, was 59 per cent. higher than the price prevailing in July, 1914.

3. The "Weighted Total" in the first column represents the cost of all the articles in proportion to their consumption in working-class households, as ascertained by the Board of Trade in 1904. Thus, between July, 1914, and March 1st, 1916, the cost of the working-class food budget had increased 51 per cent.

### COAL PRICES.

During the winter of 1914 coal prices, particularly in London, rose to an exorbitant level. The Committee consulted with various experts, including Mr. J. Burgess, of the Co-operative Wholesale Society (London district). It was found that, although coal was being delivered to the London merchants at the prices contracted for in the summer of 1914, and although there had been no increase in the railway rates owing to Government control of the railways, the best qualities of coal had been increased from 28s. and 30s. per ton (winter prices, 1913) to 31s. and 32s. per ton (winter prices, 1914), while the cheaper grades had been increased from 22s. and 24s. per ton (winter prices, 1913) to 30s. per ton (winter prices, 1914). The Committee found upon investigation that while there had certainly been a reduced output in the pits, and a certain amount of congestion on the railways, as well as increases in the cartage costs owing to the scarcity of horses and men, there still remained an unnecessary monopoly profit inflicted by the London merchants and the colliery companies in the country, who themselves sell their surplus output very largely for household purposes. It was demonstrated that the London coal trade was largely under the control of a restricted ring of merchants, despite the extraordinary numbers of apparently competing companies, etc. So long as the small domestic consumers alone were fleeced little attention was paid to the matter, but when the large business concerns, gas companies, etc., and various municipalities were subjected to similar exploitation the urgency of the problem became all the more acute. The Glasgow Corporation were compelled to increase the price of their gas from 1s. 11d. to 2s. 6d. per thousand, and their renewals of contracts, amounting for the gas department alone to 750,000 tons, involved a prospective increase of £300,000. The London County Council was exploited in a similar way, as their renewed contracts for similar quantities of coal supplied from the same collieries, for use in schools, fire brigade stations, tramway depots, etc., were subjected to increases varying from 5s. 8d. per ton to 15s. 9d. per ton.

The Committee published memoranda on these points, and that dealing with the South Wales contracts for the London County Council was quoted extensively on the occasion of the South Wales miners demanding increases of wages, as this exposure came at the same time as the expiry of their old wage agreement. Although, from speeches made in the House of Commons on behalf of the Government, there appeared to be every desire to leave the coal supply to the operation of the orthodox law of supply and demand, it was soon discovered that that was not sufficient. A Bill was brought forward for the limitation of coal prices at the pit-mouth, by which contracts were to be renewable at an increased rate of 4s. per ton on the prices prevailing twelve months before. A Sub-Committee went very carefully into the details of the Bill, and co-operated with the Parliamentary Labour Party in the drafting of amendments thereto. Upon inquiry, it was found that an increase of 4s. per ton was quite in excess of the requirements of the case, as the average effect of war bonuses paid to miners did not exceed 1s. 6d. per ton, and 1s. per ton was a fair calculation of the increased cost of supplies (pit props, oil, fodder, etc.). The coalowners were thus left with an average increased profit of 1s. 6d. per ton, and Sir Arthur Markham, a particularly frank coalowner, bluntly told the House of Commons that he would himself make an increased profit of at least 1s. per ton as a result of the proposed legislation. The Bill was passed, however, but its effective value is very doubtful. It has been reported that in many instances coal merchants were compelled to renew contracts at the old prices; and although recourse to arbitration at the Board of Trade in case of dispute was allowed under the Act, apparently little benefit has accrued to the public. The new legislation left the coal merchant free to charge such prices as trade monopoly might demand, and rather than attempt drastic legislation fixing standard prices to operate in various areas, as had been recommended by a Departmental Committee, the Board of Trade conferred with representatives of the London coal trade and prevailed upon several hundred firms (a large number of which were, of course, duplicate) to agree to limit their charges to 7s. 6d. per ton above the price at which the coal was delivered at London depots. A further 2s. per ton was allowed for the extra labour involved in distributing trolley coal. The result of this legislation, generally speaking, has been to stereotype the

exorbitant prices that were prevalent at the beginning of the agitation. A minor proposal that trolley dealers should display on their wagons the prices of the coal they were selling was adopted by the London County Council, but obviously consumers were justly entitled to reasonable prices rather than to the public display of high prices. It is also clear that household consumers have no check whatever as to whether either the terms of the Coal Prices Limitation Act, on the one hand, or the coal traders' voluntary arrangements, on the other, is being observed. In the meantime, the coalowners have done remarkably well during the period of the war, as consumers, unfortunately, are apt to look upon the increased costs as being a necessary accompaniment of war conditions.

### INCREASED HOUSE RENTS.

Following upon the demand for shells, and the increased productiveness of armament works, the influx of additional workers into munition areas led to increased rent charges. In Glasgow, Coventry, and elsewhere, for instance, the public Press contained advertisements in which prospective tenants offered various sums, amounting, in some instances, to £3, £4, and even £5, as key money, in order to secure a tenancy. There was a general assumption on the part of Press and Parliament that rents were only being increased in these munition areas, but from information collected by the Committee it was very evident that landlords were increasing rents in many other districts throughout the country. These increased demands were partially due to the fact that mortgagors were demanding increased interest as a result of the more remunerative investment offered by the Government War Loan, and the suspension of speculative building consequent on increased war charges for material led to an accentuation of the already limited supply. This led to considerable agitation in some districts, and in Glasgow a "No rent" campaign was organised, and munition workers in some yards left their work to demonstrate in force at the Court House when applications for eviction orders were being sought. Evictions were successfully resisted by tenants and their neighbours, and there appeared every likelihood of the Glasgow method of redress being adopted generally elsewhere.

Where landlords were building on mortgage (and it is stated on reliable authority that something like 80 per cent. of working-class house property is subject to mortgage) they had a common interest with their tenants to secure legislation limiting mortgage interest on the one hand and rents on the other. Representatives of the Committee attended a joint conference of property owners, ratepayers, and building society representatives, held under the auspices of the Housing and Town Planning Association. The problem received detailed consideration, and certain proposals put forward on behalf of the Workers' National Committee were, in the main, adopted, and subsequently were made the subject of representations to the President of the Local Government Board. It was suggested that house rents should be fixed upon a pre-war basis; that the only ground for increased rents should be in cases where local rates, when paid by the landlord, entitled him to recover from the tenant; that no increase in mortgage interest should be allowed; and that County Courts should be given powers to administer as Fair Rent Courts. Mr. Walter Long brought forward a Bill which sought to limit the restriction of rents to certain districts, and which was generally to be administered by Order in Council. The Committee co-operated with the Parliamentary Labour Party in drafting amendments to the Bill, and succeeded in securing the acceptance of the chief principles put forward by the Committee.

Special literature explaining the terms of the Act was printed, Mr. H. H. Slesser preparing a legal opinion for that purpose, and many thousand copies were circulated. Many local Councils, etc., issued their own leaflets on the subject, and in some districts—Newcastle-on-Tyne, for instance—an official notice setting forth the terms of the Act was issued by the Corporation over the signature of the Lord Mayor. Many inquiries respecting the operation of the Act have been dealt with, Mr. Slesser rendering useful service on occasion in this direction also.



### OLD AGE PENSIONERS.

As reported above under "Relief of Distress," the Committee endeavoured to secure some betterment in the position of Old Age Pensioners who throughout the period of the war have found their pensions steadily decreasing in purchasing power. In addition to the repeated attempts to secure grants from the National Relief Fund, representations were made to the Premier, Mr. Lloyd George, when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. McKenna when he succeeded to that office. Members of the House of Commons have been circularised on the subject, and a continual stream of resolutions has been received at the Head Office from all sections of the Labour movement, many municipal bodies, Co-operative Societies, and Old Age Pensions Committees. The Miners' Federation of Great Britain gave special consideration to the matter, and urged the Prime Minister to have legislation brought forward increasing the pensions from 5s. to 7s. 6d. per week. Up to the present (March, 1916) all this concentrated effort and opinion remains unrewarded, and the aged poor are left to subsist on amounts that have been reduced by at least one-third of their value owing to the continual increase of food prices.

### BELGIAN REFUGEES.

Following upon the occupation of Belgium by the German troops, culminating in the surrender of Antwerp, the flight of refugees to England and their engagement in British industry led to a somewhat intricate industrial problem. While, on the one hand, British workers, true to their old traditions, welcomed the thousands of refugees, men, women, and children, and sought to provide for their maintenance and shelter, there was a tendency on the part of some employers in various industries to exploit the needs of refugees by engaging them to work at wages much below the standard rates. Attempts were made to employ some of them in northern coal-pits, despite the fact that many of them had but scanty acquaintance with the English language, and thus proved a danger to the life and limb both of themselves and the British workers alongside of them. It, therefore, became necessary for the Government to have the whole problem carefully considered, and a Special Committee was set up upon which Labour was offered first one and then two seats. The matter was reported to the Workers' National Committee, and in view of the fact that the problem was of a purely industrial character the Committee were of opinion that unless Labour was represented to the extent of at least one-half no responsibility whatever should be accepted by the movement. The Committee's demands were met by the appointment of Messrs. Arthur Henderson, M.P., C. W. Bowerman, M.P., Robert Smillie, H. Gosling, L.C.C., and Miss Susan Lawrence, L.C.C., but subsequently the position was somewhat modified by the fact that the personnel of the Committee was increased by additions of a non-Labour character. However, under the Chairmanship of Sir Ernest Hatch, the whole problem received full and careful consideration, and conditions of employment and remuneration were attached to the engagement of Belgian refugees that were in general accord with the accepted views of the Trade Union and Labour Movement. Standard rates were to be observed and Belgian workpeople were to be treated in exactly the same way as if they were of British nationality. On the whole, the recommendations were carried out in a satisfactory manner, and although complaints arose from time to time they generally received the prompt attention of the Commission appointed for the purpose. The Committee was disbanded, however, without consultation, and the functions of the Commission were transferred to the Belgian Refugee Committee that had been responsible for the organisation and distribution of maintenance and hospitality, one Labour representative (Mr. C. W. Bowerman, M.P.) being co-opted.

### BUILDING SCHEMES.

At the outbreak of war the Government hurried through Parliament the Housing (No. 2) Act, and voted £4,000,000 for the purpose of financing rural and urban housing schemes. This was intended to meet the period of unemployment and dislocation which it was anticipated would follow the beginning of hostilities. However, it soon became apparent that all forecasts in this respect were to be belied, and

in any case the high cost of building material curtailed both public and speculative schemes. The invasion of Belgium led to the cessation of glass imports; the risks attending Swedish shipping and the high freights subsequent thereon reduced timber imports; the commandeering of horses for Army purposes dislocated general cartage; while the necessary preference given to military and naval requirements impeded commercial transport. Probably never before in British history was there such a combination of drawbacks to general house building. Many sections of the building trade, wood workers, particularly, were absorbed in the erection of the military camps in various parts of the country.

Later on, when the financial problem became more acute, the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Lloyd George), addressing the Association of Municipal Corporations, urged more stringent municipal economy, and recommended that building schemes of all kinds should be suspended and the money devoted to the prosecution of the war in the form of what he termed "silver bullets."

The Workers' National Committee collected information from local Trades Councils, etc., with regard to the housing and general building schemes that were held up, together with the general state of housing accommodation in their respective areas. Subsequently a deputation was received by Mr. Lloyd George, when these facts were brought under his attention, and he was urged to modify the suggestion of extreme economy he had previously advocated. In reply, Mr. Lloyd George stated that his proposals had been somewhat misunderstood, as it was not intended that essential schemes should be suspended, but as Chancellor he again emphasised the importance of the financial problem. He intimated that arrangements had been made with the Board of Works for the preparation of estimates, plans, etc., for the erection of public offices where needed, and these schemes would be released as the state of the building trade appeared to warrant. It became evident later, however, that the enormous enlistment of men eased the problem in some districts, while on the other hand, as is dealt with elsewhere, the question of housing accommodation became much more acute with the extension of munition manufacture.

The Committee also considered and endorsed a proposal put forward by the Women's Labour League that the State should undertake schemes for the erection of cottages, with gardens attached, for the occupation of disabled soldiers and sailors.

#### **INSURANCE ACT.**

Attempts were made by the Committee to secure amendments to the National Insurance Act whereby arrears of contribution should not be reckoned during the war period; no deductions should be made from low wages; and casual workers should be exempted from contributions.

A deputation met the Insurance Commissioners under the presidency of Mr. C. F. Masterman, and the whole matter was carefully discussed. Correspondence afterwards ensued, in the course of which the Commissioners announced that the question of arrears would be dealt with when that problem became more acute, but that there was no likelihood of any legislation amending the Act with regard to low wages and casual workers. The contention of the Committee that consideration should be given to lower-paid workers who were already suffering from the increased cost of living, and to many of whom insurance contributions were items of some importance, met with the retort that the remedy for high prices lay elsewhere than in the amendment of the Act.

#### **POSTAL FACILITIES.**

Following upon correspondence with the Postmaster-General during the early months of the war, a deputation representative of the Committee, together with Mr. G. H. Stuart-Bunning, of the Postmen's Federation, waited upon Mr. C. E. Hobhouse, who was then Postmaster-General, with the object of securing the restitution of certain public services that had been suspended, the keeping up to standard of the general postal staff, the adequate remuneration of all temporary employes, and the cheapening of postal rates on letters and parcels to members of the Expeditionary Forces. Certain minor concessions were secured, but the cheapening of postal facilities, in which considerable interest has been evoked as the

Expeditionary Forces to France, the Mediterranean, and elsewhere have developed, led to a continued correspondence with the Department. It was officially reported that the difficulty to be surmounted did not arise in connection with the postal arrangements in this country, but was due to the enforced limitation of transport facilities in France and elsewhere. It was stated that at that date (February, 1915) the postal and parcel mail to France amounted to 40 tons a day, and that any reduction in the postal rates would lead to a daily increase that would be quite beyond the power of the Army transport in France to deal with. This view was endorsed by representatives of postal unions, and though the continuance of the high rates has been an increasing hardship to many families, the plea put forward by the Department still remains sound, and must be accepted, however unwillingly.

#### WAR FINANCE.

The Committee considered certain proposals put forward by the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. McKenna) in his Budget of 1915, and passed resolutions against the suggested taxation of wages, in addition to the various increases in postal rates and in particular the abolition of the halfpenny post. Their opposition in this respect was in harmony with general public opinion. The taxation of wages was waived, although the limit of the income tax was reduced to £130. The general letter rate was increased, but the proposal to abolish the halfpenny post was successfully resisted. The suggestions of the Committee that the 40 per cent. increase on income tax should also be applied to the super-tax, and that the tax on war profits should be increased to 80 per cent., instead of 50 per cent. as proposed\*, were not entertained.

#### MILITARY AND INDUSTRIAL CONSCRIPTION.

When it became evident that the Conscriptorist Press, aided by the Conscriptorist Section of the Government, were seeking deliberately to overthrow the voluntary method of enlistment, and to secure a system of industrial compulsion for both the Army and the workshops, the Committee issued a special pamphlet on the subject combating both proposals, and urging the necessity for the conscription of riches as an alternative to conscripting men. Unfortunately, the method by which the Group System of Recruiting, which arose directly out of the agitation, was pursued, the Conscriptorists secured a Bill for Compulsory Military Service for single men. The wider proposal to introduce compulsion to industry, apart from the Munitions Act, was disavowed by the Prime Minister, and amendments eliminating its suggestion from the Bill were accepted. The Bill was the subject of a special Labour Congress, with which the National Committee was not directly associated, but which condemned the measure as introduced, and the Labour Party Conference, subsequent to its passage, condemned the Act as placed upon the Statute Book by 1,716,000 votes to 360,000.

#### LABOUR PROBLEMS AFTER THE WAR.

Towards the end of 1915 the Committee turned its attention to various problems that were arising in the course of the War, and which it was obvious would persist after peace was declared. It was also recognised that the general question of demobilisation would require careful consideration by the Labour Movement so that considered opinions could be tendered to the Government with regard to the action which it was necessary to take during the next few months with a view to avoiding unnecessary unemployment and industrial dislocation when war conditions again gave place to peaceful industry.

The following representative Committee was appointed for this purpose: Messrs. R. Smillie, W. A. Appleton, A. Bellamy, J. O'Grady, M.P., H. Dubery, H. M. Hyndman, J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P., Sidney Webb, Dr. Marion Phillips, and J. S. Middleton (Secretary).

After the work had developed on certain lines and a preliminary report was under consideration, it was announced that the Joint Board (representing the Executive Committee of the Labour Party, the Parliamentary Committee of the

\* This decision was re-affirmed when the Budget of 1916 was under consideration early in April, but the Committee are of opinion that the surpluses of Co-operative Societies should be exempt, as they are not "excess profits" in the ordinary sense.

Trades Union Congress, and the General Federation of Trade Unions) had also set up a Sub-Committee with the same object in view.

In February, 1916, the Executive Committee of the Labour Party also appointed a Sub-Committee with a similar purpose, but charged it as a first duty with the co-ordination of other Committees having the same object.

It was understood that the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress had appointed an Advisory Committee to consult with the Labour representatives on the Statutory Committee dealing with Naval and Military Pensions, and it was known that the General Federation of Trade Unions had previously appointed a Sub-Committee to deal with the Employment of Disabled Soldiers.

These various Sub-Committees were invited to attend a Joint Conference, which was held at the House of Commons under the auspices of the Labour Party on March 9th. It was then reported that the Sub-Committee of the General Federation of Trade Unions had been disbanded, but four representatives of that organisation were in attendance by invitation. The Advisory Committee appointed by the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress was not present, Mr. Gosling attending as president of that body. The other Committees were largely represented.

Considerable discussion took place on the status and responsibility of the Workers' National Committee and its right to take up matters concerning Labour after the War. Finally, it was agreed by six votes to five that each of the four national bodies should be invited to appoint representatives to a Joint Sub-Committee for the consideration of After the War Problems.

This was discussed at a subsequent meeting of the Workers' National Committee, and, in view of the fact that the three other national bodies had been represented directly upon it since its formation, the practically unanimous decision of the Committee was to proceed with its work, at the same time inviting the other National Committees to appoint such increased representation as they might deem desirable. At the moment of going to Press the other three Committees are being summoned to a joint meeting to consider the whole situation.

### GENERAL.

The foregoing gives a general indication of the more prominent subjects which have engaged the attention of the Committee during its short period of existence, but do not in any way convey an adequate impression of the multitudinous matters which have been dealt with, or the mass of correspondence, inquiries, etc., that have followed the various investigations, reports, and proposals with which the Committee has been engaged. Generally speaking, the Committee has pursued the policy of meeting frequently and dealing promptly with the various social and general issues that required urgent consideration and which were obviously matters of "war emergency." It has avoided dealing with subjects which were specifically matters of Trade Union interest, such as the Munitions Act, and for which the trade organisations concerned had obviously to be responsible, and generally it has refrained from touching issues which were engaging the attention of one or other of the older National Labour Committees. The representative character of the Committee enabled every section of the Working-class Movement to bring forward its particular views, and the distinct characteristics of the Committee meetings have been the absence of very acute divisions and a general desire to achieve an agreed policy which would command the support of all sections. Throughout the period of the war it has served as a direct channel of communication with local Labour bodies throughout the country, and it is pleasing to note that its work has been recognised on many hands as a force making for unification of effort in organisations whose members have differed, in some cases most acutely, on general war policy. It has served to keep in the minds of local Labour supporters the urgent necessity of general unity being preserved against the period of uncertainty and dislocation that will probably accompany the cessation of the war. That is the inspiration under which the Committee has conducted its work, and in its local achievements on these lines it hopes to find its greatest and most enduring satisfaction.

Whether the Labour movement, central and local, sanctions the continuance of the Committee on its present lines, either for the remaining period of the war or thereafter, is not at present clear, but this, the first and successful attempt at bringing together in one common work representatives of practically every section of the Working-class Movement, both industrial, political, and co-operative, marks a long-sought-for development in Labour history, and the Committee ventures to hope that its success in this direction will not be lightly forgotten.

## ATTENDANCES OF MEMBERS.

	Possible attend- ances.	Actual attend- ances.		Possible attend- ances.	Actual attend- ances.
W. C. Anderson, M.P. ....	54	35	Miss Susan Lawrence, L.C.C.	53	35
W. A. Appleton .....	54	9	Miss Mary R. Macarthur.....	54	28
A. Bellamy .....	54	36	J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P.	53	26
Miss M. G. Bondfield .....	53	27	H. May.....	50	30
C. W. Bowerman, M.P. ....	54	20	Jas. O'Grady, M.P. ....	20	11
W. Brace, M.P.* .....	21	30	Dr. Marion Phillips .....	54	48
F. Bramley.....	12	12	Edw. R. Pease .....	4	2
W. H. Brown.....	49	18	W. Stephen Sanders* .....	48	41
Ben Cooper .....	54	44	J. A. Seddon* .....	38	23
Jos. Cross.....	46	8	Robert Smillie .....	54	34
H. Dubery .....	36	33	Herbert Smith .....	39	23
Mrs. M. A. Gasson .....	52	45	W. B. Stear.....	35	17
D. Gilmour .....	22	14	John Stokes.....	33	28
H. Gosling, L.C.C. ....	54	38	Ben Tillet .....	54	33
Arthur Henderson, M.P.* ...	24	21	Ben Turner.....	3	1
John Hodge, M.P.....	50	11	Sidney Webb .....	54	42
W. H. Hutchinson .....	17	6	B. Williams.....	53	49
H. M. Hyndman .....	54	52	Robert Williams.....	53	43
F. W. Jowett, M.P. ....	36	14	Jas. Winstone.....	15	14
Fred Knee (the late).....	16	11	J. S. Middleton .....	54	54

\* These members resigned at various dates.





# LABOUR AND THE NATIONAL FOOD SUPPLY.

---

The following is the text of a letter addressed to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Food by the Secretary of the War Emergency Workers' National Committee in response to the Ministry's invitation for the Committee to appoint representatives to the proposed Consumers' Council:—

Mr. J. R. CLYNES, M.P.,  
Ministry of Food, Palace Chambers, S.W. 1.

January 28th, 1918.

MY DEAR CLYNES,—

The Workers' National Committee have appointed the following to the proposed Consumers' Council:—

Mr. H. M. Hyndman, 13, Well Walk, Hampstead, N.W. 3.

Mr. Duncan Carmichael, 7, Staple Inn Buildings, Holborn, W.C. 1.

Mr. C. T. Cramp, 60, Slate Street, Olive Grove, Sheffield.

I have to state on behalf of the Committee that in accepting your invitation they have no illusions whatever as to what the Consumers' Council can now achieve, but they are willing to do their best to assist the Ministry to cope with the present extreme situation.

They are mindful of the fact, however, that the repeated and consistent representations they have made to the present as well as to previous Governments respecting the organisation of the National Food Supply have been until quite recently just as consistently ignored. The Committee feel very strongly that if, when they put their various proposals forward, prompt and businesslike attempts had been made to put them into operation, by this time there would have been something like ordered system in the handling of the food difficulty in place of the existing chaos and the discontent to which it is giving rise.

The Committee may be pardoned for recalling that at the Conference held on August 5th, 1914, when it was first formed, the following were its first resolutions:

“That arrangements be made at once to press upon the Government and Municipal Authorities measures for officially controlling:—

“ (a) The purchase and storage of food;

“ (b) The fixing of maximum prices for food and trade necessities; and (c) the distribution of food.

“That the Citizen Committees proposed to be set up be urged to guard against the exploitation of the people by unnecessarily high prices.”

It was early in September, 1914, that the Committee proposed that a Consumers' Council should be set up. That was the time when the Minister for War was looking ahead to a three years' war, at least. The third anniversary of its outbreak had come and gone before this somewhat obvious suggestion received the attention it merited.



A month later the Committee proposed the commandeering of the national wheat supply at fair prices, and that all holders of land, other than market gardens up to five acres in extent, shall put at least one-fifth of their holdings, where suitable, under wheat, and maintain the same from year to year under fair conditions.

In December, 1915, we suggested the cultivation of all vacant lots in and about urban centres, the extension of small holdings, and the development of the use of machinery for arable cultivation under Government auspices. It took just twelve months for the first part of this particular programme to be adopted.

In February, 1916, we pursued our previously announced policy of State control of freightage, and demonstrated that it was then possible to place the "6d. loaf" on the market without Government subsidy.

In October, 1916, we recommended the adoption of the Government's Food Prices Committee's proposal that Municipal Shops should be set up to check excess prices and inordinate profits. We also backed the Committee's unanimous suggestions that a supply of milk and meals for nursing mothers should be instituted by the Local Authorities.

In November, 1916, we urged that the Board of Agriculture should take steps to turn the four million acres of land abandoned to grass or fallow into cultivation, including land kept as private parks, and, in order that the labour shortage might be met, that German prisoners should be employed for the purpose. It would be interesting to know to what extent public commons and recreation grounds have been cut up in preference to the private preserves of the well-to-do.

In December, 1916, we urged the turning of barley land into wheat cultivation on the principle that food was more important than beer.

Twelve months ago we suggested that Local Authorities should be empowered to organise the distribution of milk in their areas.

Twelve months ago we proposed the registration of sugar customers as a method by which the short supply could be most equitably distributed. Had the proposal then been received sympathetically, the system could easily have been in operation nine months ago, and could have been extended to other foodstuffs in a way that would have avoided much of the present panic.

It was in February last year that a memorandum on "Municipal Kitchens" was published by this Committee, and our view then was, as it still remains, that these kitchens should be instituted by the municipalities as an essential part of their administrative duties. Instead of pursuing this policy, however, the Ministry allowed the proposal to become the subject of a war economy agitation, and voluntary schemes were altogether too inadequately financed by the War Savings Committee. We are interested to learn that the Ministry has now resolved to take up this proposal in real earnest, and have appointed a Director for the purpose. We are bound to observe that this is a much more constructive measure than the appointment of a Director to talk economy. "Practice is better than precept," and Communal Kitchens are more to the point than whirlwind campaigns of mere words and false economics.

In June last the Committee pressed Mr. Fisher to sanction the provision of meals for school children as one measure of communal feeding that would help to combat the increasing scarcity. The response was unsympathetic, but, unless we are much mistaken, events will justify our foresight before many weeks are over.

We have watched with considerable and sympathetic interest the activities of the Ministry since Lord Rhondda took control last year, and since you yourself assumed office. As you know, we have not hesitated to point out what appeared to us to be blemishes in the Department's administrative policy. In the prevalent state of mind of the industrial community, we very strongly urged that the Local Food Control Committees should be adequately representative of Co-operative, Labour, and Working Women's Organisations. As you are well aware, the minimum of Labour representation suggested in the circulars issued by the Ministry has worked out as practically a maximum, with the result that a considerable amount of time and temper have been consumed in seeking to amend this defect. At the present moment, indeed, we are afraid Labour representation on these Committees remains quite incommensurate with the importance of the interest involved.

I recite the foregoing facts on behalf of the Committee, not in any boastful spirit, for it has been ever present in our minds that the clearest minds in European military science had given a foremost place to the question of Food Supply in any outbreak on a large scale. But when you asked at Nottingham on Friday that Labour should contribute its common sense to the solution of these problems with which your Department now found itself faced, some of us at any rate had in our minds the recollections of a steady three years of persistent and fertile suggestion and an almost equally persistent neglect. Records in the pigeon holes of the Government Departments will testify that the commonsense of Labour men and women has not been lacking in the consideration of this great problem, and that shortcomings and delays and all the responsibilities for them lie on other shoulders.

The Workers' National Committee will take up its share of the work of the new Consumers' Council, but, naturally enough, it feels very much like a fire brigade called up after the blaze has got going and the task given to it almost hopeless.

With kind regards, yours very sincerely,

J. S. MIDDLETON, Secretary.

---

Further copies of the above can be obtained at the rate of 3d. per dozen, 2s. per 100, post free, from the—

WAR EMERGENCY: WORKERS' NATIONAL COMMITTEE,

1, VICTORIA STREET, LONDON, S.W. 1.



# ORGANISATION OF WOMEN

WITHIN

## THE LABOUR PARTY

---

### The Work of the Women's Sections

---

#### I.—CONSTITUTION OF WOMEN'S SECTIONS.

THE Constitution of the Labour Party provides for the establishment of a Local Labour Party in each borough constituency and in each urban district of a county constituency. The Women's Section in each consists of the individual women members of the Local Labour Party. Any woman accepting the principles and agreeing to abide by the rules of the Labour Party may join a Local Labour Party as an individual member on payment of the subscription fixed by the rules of the Party, which must not be less than 6d. a year. Members of associations such as trade unions which are already affiliated to the Local Labour Party are also eligible to become individual members on payment of the subscription.

In County Divisions there must be a Divisional Labour Party covering the whole constituency, and in each Urban District a Local Labour Party which will be represented on the General Council of the Divisional Labour Party. In the Rural Districts of County Divisions there are Polling District Committees which men and women join, and it is advisable to form a Women's Group in each Rural District in order to promote organisation amongst them. In Divided Boroughs (i.e., Boroughs consisting of more than one constituency) the Constitution provides for the establishment of a Central Labour Party, on which the Local Labour Party in each constituency will be represented. In a Central Labour Party it may be well to form a Women's Association consisting of all the individual women members of all the Local Labour Parties, which will help to carry out in all parts of the Borough the work of political organisation amongst women. By thus joining all the forces of the women greater stimulus will be given to educational political work amongst them. In a similar way the County Divisions might arrange for the formation of such an Association linking up the women of the Local Labour Parties and the rural Polling District Committees.

## II.—FINANCE.

The Women's Section forms part of the Local Labour Party, and the method of financing it must be a matter for decision by the Local Labour Party itself, which will, of course, discuss the matter with the Section. It may be decided to pay all contributions from individual members into the Local Labour Party funds and to have the expenses of the Section met from those funds as need arises. Another method would be to give the Women's Section a certain proportion of each contribution. In either case it may be found advisable to allow the Women's Section to raise special funds for its own purposes. The Local Labour Party should, however, provide for a meeting place out of its funds and also for the ordinary expenses of stationery and postage. It must, however, in any case be remembered that the Section must abide by the decision made by the governing body, that is, the General Committee of the Local Labour Party, upon which it is represented.

The financing of the Associations is a matter entirely for local arrangement, and their needs must be met by contributions (1) from the Central Labour Party or the Divisional Labour Party, or (2) from the Local Labour Parties and Polling District Committees, or (3) by a special contribution paid to the Association by each member.

## III.—ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SECTION.

Where there is any group of organised Labour women the Local Labour Party Executive should invite them, together with representatives of other industrial women's organisations both affiliated and not affiliated, to act as a provisional committee for forming a Women's Section. It is of great importance that representatives of other women's organisations should be included in order that the full support of bodies such as the Women's Co-operative Guild, the Railway Women's Guild and the women's trade unions may be gained. In districts where there are mixed unions or other bodies eligible for affiliation which contain a number of women, representatives of these should also be included. Such a provisional committee should at once set about the work of getting new recruits and arrange with the Local Labour Party to hold a special meeting to form the Women's Section.

When the Section has been established its members should without delay select representatives up to the number agreed upon by the Local Labour Party in accordance with its rules for the General Committee. The Secretary of the Section should send to each meeting of the General Committee a short report of the work of the Section, together with any proposals made by the Section as to action which should be taken by the Local Labour Party.

#### IV.—OFFICERS OF THE SECTION.

The Women's Section should elect its own Secretary, Chairman and Vice-Chairman, Literature Secretary and Committee and any other officers which it thinks necessary to carry on its work. It may be advisable in the first place to elect all the officers and representatives on the General Committee for a short period only, say three months. By that time the Section may have grown a great deal, and it would then be possible to bring into office some of the new members.

The Section must hold an Annual Meeting for the election of its representatives on the General Committee of the Local Labour Party. At this meeting it would be advisable to elect its other officers also.

#### V.—MEETINGS.

The Section should meet once a week or once a fortnight. In some districts it is found convenient to have meetings alternately afternoon and evening, as many women cannot get away easily in the evening. At these meetings the Section's business should be discussed and a point made of always having some matter of general interest discussed also. Whenever possible, lectures should be arranged and visitors invited to hear them. Social functions, too, should not be despised and sewing parties, besides helping to raise funds, are useful in drawing members together and in bringing in new ones. It must always be remembered that politics are new to many women, and to come into them by means of social intercourse is an easy way. A section, therefore, should have :—

- (1) Business Meetings.
- (2) Educational Meetings, either combined with business meetings or as separate meetings to which outsiders may be invited.
- (3) Propaganda Meetings. Wherever possible these should be held in conjunction with the Local Labour Party.
- (4) Tea Parties, Dramatic Entertainments, and Socials, with short speeches explaining what the Labour Party is.
- (5) Sewing Meetings for those who like to meet and chat over the affairs of the Party.

At all meetings, membership forms should be available for new members.

In choosing the subjects for the meetings it must be remembered that women join the Party who have very varied interests, and it is best to choose matters which give all a full opportunity. Sometimes a trade union question should be discussed, sometimes a question dealing more especially with the home. "The Labour Woman" has from month to month suggestions for lectures in citizenship which would make subjects for an evening's discussion.

## VI.—BUSINESS MEETINGS.

At these meetings representatives on the General Committee should report and delegates who may have been sent to any Conference should give their account of the proceedings. Representatives on other committees, to which reference is made later, should also give their regular reports.

## VII.—REPRESENTATIVES OF THE WOMEN'S SECTIONS ON OTHER BODIES.

As the Women's Section forms part of the Local Labour Party it will not be able to send direct representatives to serve on Committees, etc., unless specially asked to do so by the Local Labour Party. It will, however, be found an advantage if women representatives on Maternity and Child Welfare Committees, National Kitchens Committees, Local Pensions Committees, Local Food Control Committees, and women Councillors or Guardians keep in very close touch with the Women's Section and report to it on the proceedings of the body with which they are connected. It is always in the power of the Local Labour Party to ask the Women's Section to make nominations for such appointments, or for the Women's Section to put forward their nominations through their representatives on the General Committee. The closer the touch that is kept between such representatives and the Section the greater will be the interest felt by women in the work of Labour.

The same applies to representatives sent to attend Conferences; where women representatives are sent it will be useful if they give a report to the Women's Section as well as to the Local Labour Party.

## VIII.—ELECTION WORK.

A very important part of the work of the Section is to help in organising for Local and Parliamentary elections. They have not only to prepare themselves to become candidates but also to help in getting support for Labour candidates in the constituency. Most of their work will be done on the Ward Committees and Polling District Committees where they will work with the other members of the Party in organising the constituency. Women's Visiting Committees should undertake the special task of visiting women electors and distributing literature explaining the work of the Party and also the registration of electors and the qualifications needed by women. In addition to these Visiting Committees, Cottage Meetings will be found useful—five or six women meeting together to discuss what the Labour Party stands for and how to work for it. In this way a large number of women will be reached who will be willing to go to their neighbour's parlour to a small gathering, but would not like to go far off to a bigger meeting. New members will be gained in this way and public opinion amongst women will be influenced. In all election work the help of the women will be greatly needed and cordially welcomed by the election agent.

## IX.—LITERATURE.

The Labour Party publishes every month a journal called "The Labour Woman," dealing especially with questions in which women are most interested. This paper costs 1d., and is supplied to Sections at 6d. per dozen, post free. The Literature Secretary should make it her duty to get as many subscribers as possible and arrange for members of the Section to deliver the paper to subscribers as soon as it reaches the Secretary. She should also try to get volunteers who would sell the paper at meetings and take it round from house to house seeking new subscribers. Other literature is published by the Labour Party and lists of new publications appear from time to time in "The Labour Woman." Whenever a new leaflet comes out it is well to get some copies and ask one member to make a special study of it and discuss it at a Section meeting.

## X.—TRADE UNION ORGANISATION.

The Women's Section should maintain especially close relations with all trade unions having women members and assist them in the work of getting new members and in any industrial crisis that may arise.

## XI.—OTHER ORGANISATIONS OF WOMEN.

The Women's Section should exercise great care when asked to affiliate to any organisation outside the Labour Party. If they should decide to affiliate their decision must be endorsed by the Local Labour Party before it can be carried out. It is specially necessary to be careful now about joining any non-party political organisation, for this may serve to turn the interests and energies of the members into other channels and draw them away from the more important work of organising within the Party. It is, however, often advisable to join with other organisations of either a party or non-party character for some special object such as the organisation of National Kitchens, the extension of open spaces, or some such specific purpose.

## XII.—CONFERENCES WITH OTHER WOMEN'S SECTIONS.

It will be found valuable in stimulating organisation amongst women to hold from time to time District or County Conferences at which all the Women's Sections are represented and questions of organisation amongst women and other matters of special interest such as Housing, Education, Night Work for Women, Equal Pay for Equal Work, Woman as Domestic Worker, etc., etc., may be discussed. The best method of establishing such Conferences would be for a Women's Section, or a Women's Association, with the consent of the Local Labour Party, to take the initiative in calling a Conference of all the Sections within an area which is conveniently arranged for railway communication. At such a Conference a District Committee could be



elected to take in hand the arrangement for future gatherings, either half-yearly or quarterly. The expenses of the Conference could be met either by a contribution made by each Women's Section or Local Labour Party, or by a fund raised by some special effort amongst the Sections concerned. These Conferences might be arranged on a county basis, or by one or two counties joining one another, and other organisations eligible for affiliation might be asked to send women delegates. Where there is a federation of Local Labour Parties the area of the federation would probably be the most convenient one to take, and in that case the expenses of such a conference might be met by the federation. A delegate's fee of 1s. would probably cover the greater part of the expense other than fares.

### XIII.—VISITS OF NATIONAL ORGANISERS.

The National Executive has appointed women organisers to assist in establishing the Sections and to help in their development. These organisers make short visits to the constituencies and it is intended that they should give a stimulus to organisation and not do the spade work necessary in the constituency itself. The chief burden of such work must necessarily fall upon the people resident in the locality. It may be advisable for a constituency to appoint a resident woman organiser to help and direct such work as this. The visit of the national organiser can do no more than set things going, or give special encouragement when once they have been started. In arranging for the visit it is desirable that on the first day in the constituency she should meet the Executive of the Local Labour Party and discuss with them the conditions of the district. Arrangements for her to meet the women members either for the establishment of the Section, or who have already formed the section, should be made beforehand.

Where the Women's Section has not yet been established it would be well to arrange for a social gathering with a speech from the organiser. This should be followed by a meeting to inaugurate the Section and to appoint a committee. The organiser would discuss with the Committee the work which lay before them, and if possible, arrangements could be made for her to return at a later date. A Conference for women might be arranged for her return visit on a subject such as Housing, which is of general interest, and another meeting at which she would discuss with the Section the business side of their organisation. If before her visit the Women's Section is already in being, a Conference on the organisation of women would be most valuable. It is important to impress upon all Local Labour Parties whose constituencies are being visited that meetings of the organiser should be well advertised beforehand, in order that the short time at her disposal may be used to the best advantage. Part of her time might be occupied in visiting trade union branches which contain women members, or important organisations of women, such as the National Union of Railway Women's Guilds and the Women's Co-operative Guild.

It is important that large branches of Trade Unions, even though they contain only male members, should be visited in order to impress upon the men the need of interesting their wives in political matters. The delegate meetings of the Labour Parties give a good opportunity for the organiser to get into touch with all the affiliated organisations and she should be invited to address them. It is also advisable in holding public meetings to invite men as well as women, for it is often easier for husband and wife to attend together, and it is desirable to interest the men in women's questions.

As soon as a Section is formed the Secretary is invited to communicate with Dr. Marion Phillips, The Labour Party, 33 Eccleston Square, London, S.W.1, who will at all times be glad to give advice and help in the conduct of the work, to suggest subjects for discussion, to tell her of suitable literature, and to send information on the work of various Local Government bodies in which the Section may be interested.

---

**PUBLISHED BY**  
**THE LABOUR PARTY, 33 ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON,**  
**S.W.1.**

**Price 1d. each, or 8d. a dozen.**

# PUBLICATIONS of the LABOUR PARTY

---

**T**HE following publications will be found useful by women interested in the work of the Party:—

**Women and the Labour Party.**—By various women writers, including Mrs. Sidney Webb, Margaret Llewelyn Davies, Mary Macarthur, Margaret McMillan and Rebecca West, edited with an Introduction by Dr. Marion Phillips, and a Foreword by the Rt. Hon. Arthur Henderson. 1s., post free 1s. 2d.

**Labour and the New Social Order.**—A Report on Reconstruction after the War. 2d., post free 3d.; 1s. 6d. per 13, carriage paid.

**Memorandum on War Aims,** agreed upon by the Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference, February, 1918. 1d., post free 2d.; 1s. per dozen, carriage paid.

**New Party Constitution.**—1d., post free 2d.; 9d. per dozen, carriage paid.

**Labour Year Book, 1916.**—Cloth edition, 5s.

**Labour Year Book, 1919.**—Cloth edition, 5s., Paper, 3s. 6d. Ready shortly.

**The Labour Woman.**—The Labour Woman's Monthly. 1d., post free 2d.; 2s. per year.

**The Aims of Labour.**—By the Rt. Hon. Arthur Henderson. 1s., post free 1s. 2d.

**The Position of Women after the War.**—Report of the Standing Joint Committee of Industrial Women's Organisations, presented to the Joint Committee on Labour Problems after the War. 2d., post free 3d.; 5s. for 50, carriage paid.

## LEAFLETS

**The Labour Party.**—A statement of its objects, with application form for membership attached. 6 page folder, 30s. per 1,000, with particulars of Local Party.

**Why Women should Join the Labour Party.**—2 pages. 1s. per 100; 5s. per 1,000, post free.

**Men and Women, Look after your Votes!**—A Summary of Franchise qualifications. 2 pages. 2s. per 100; 12s. 6d. per 1,000, with particulars of Local Party, post free.

**The Working Woman's House.**—4 pages, with plans. 1d., post free 2d.; 9d. per dozen; 5s. 6d. per 100; £2 per 1,000, post free.

**To the Woman in the Home.**—2 pages, 1s. per 100; 5s. per 1,000, post free.

**Why Labour Supports a League of Nations.**—2 pages, 1s. per 100; 5s. per 1,000, post free.

---

To be obtained from—

**THE LABOUR PARTY, 33 Eccleston Square,  
London, S.W.1**

---

The National Labour Press, 8 & 9 Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, E.C.4.  
Also at Manchester.

THE LABOUR PARTY.

---

*Duplicate  
of (5a)*

9

LABOUR

AND

THE PEACE TREATY

---

---

CONTAINING

The Text of the Southport Conference  
Resolution on "Peace."

Speeches in Parliament by—

RT. HON. W. ADAMSON, M.P.

RT. HON. J. R. CLYNES, M.P.

MR. STEPHEN WALSH, M.P.

MR. TOM SHAW, M.P.

Joint Manifesto of the Parliamentary Labour  
Party and the National Executive.

---

Price 2d. Post free 2½d.

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W.1.

**Resolution adopted by the Annual Conference of the  
Labour Party, held in Southport, on June 25th, 26th,  
and 27th, 1919:--**

**PEACE.**

This Conference is of opinion, now that Germany has decided to sign the Treaty of Peace, thereby opening up the opportunity of co-operation with the democracies of the world, that its speedy admission to the League of Nations, and the immediate revision by the League of Nations of the harsh provisions of the Treaty, which are inconsistent with the statements made on behalf of the Allied Governments when the Armistice was made, are essential both on grounds of honour and expediency; and it therefore calls upon the Labour Movement in conjunction with the International to undertake a vigorous campaign for the winning of popular support to this policy as a first step towards the reconciliation of the peoples and the inauguration of a new era of international co-operation and goodwill.

# SPEECHES IN PARLIAMENT.

---

In the debates on the introduction and Second Reading of the Treaty of Peace-Bill in the House of Commons on July 3rd, 21st and 22nd, the spokesman of the Parliamentary Labour Party formulated the working-class protest against those parts of the Treaty which have been condemned as inconsistent with the terms of the Armistice and as a violation of the Fourteen Points of President Wilson, and the decisions of successive Labour and Socialist Conferences. Their speeches are reproduced here from the pages of Hansard.

## Right Hon. W. Adamson :

We have had a very interesting statement from the Prime Minister, and we welcome the decision of the Government to have the terms of the Treaty considered in the form of a Bill. I do not intend to intervene for more than a few minutes. I am sure that not only am I expressing the gratification of the members of the Labour Party and of myself that at last, after nearly five years of war, the Peace Treaty has been signed, but I believe I am at the same time also expressing the gratification of the whole of the people of this country. While I am strongly of the opinion that the Prime Minister could have lightened his labour and his responsibility by giving the people and their representatives a greater share in the fixing of the Peace Terms, at the same time I want to take this opportunity of paying my tribute to the right hon. gentleman for the way in which he has devoted himself to the settlement of this most stupendous task—a task which, I think, is greater than has ever confronted the head of any democratic Government before. With reference to the terms of the Treaty, Labour has always insisted that Germany must make full reparation for the wanton destruction done in all the Allied countries. But there are certain features of the Treaty with which neither I nor the Labour Party agree. For instance, we do not agree with the exclusion of Germany from membership of the League of Nations after she has ratified the Treaty. We want to see the League of Nations become at the earliest day a League of Nations, and not a league of the Allied countries. (The PRIME MINISTER: Hear, hear!)

Again, we regret very much that the Treaty does not contain the machinery whereby conscription would be abolished in the Allied countries as well as in Germany. Neither do we agree with all the territorial adjustments. When the Prime Minister was giving us that in-

teresting and eloquent explanation of his he referred to certain territories that had been taken from Germany, and justified what had been done by the fact that these territories did not belong to Germany originally. With that I think the House and the country will be in general agreement, but there are territories that are dealt with in the terms of the Peace Treaty which are of a different character from those described by the Prime Minister. Again, Labour would have liked to see the question of armaments dealt with in the machinery of the terms of peace in the way certain other matters have been dealt with. (The PRIME MINISTER: It is in the League of Nations.) But not exactly in the way that Labour would like. There are other matters contained in the Peace Treaty with which we are not in agreement, but we will reserve our criticism of these matters until the Second Reading of the Bills which the Prime Minister has intimated, and all I want to say further to-day regarding the matter is that I hope, now that the Treaty has been signed, that the German people will realise that the only chance of a peaceful and orderly development from the old conditions to the new is for them to try to give effect to the terms of the Treaty, while we on our part meet that effort in a spirit of reconciliation. I hope that the spirit which animated the Prime Minister while he was dealing in his speech with the question of the League of Nations is the spirit which will animate the whole of the British people, at least in their efforts to make war an impossibility in the future, and to carry out the ideal which animated our people at the beginning of this terrible conflict, to make this a war against war. If that ideal is to be realised in all its fulness, Britain and Germany must forget, as rapidly as they can, all that has occurred in the course of the last five years, and I hope that, so far as we are concerned, if we show a proper spirit in trying to carry out the terms of the agreement that has just been come to, we will meet them in a spirit of magnanimous reconciliation, and do our best to make their task as light as possible.

### Right Hon. J. R. Clynes :

I join with my right hon. friend who has just sat down in his words of praise and acknowledgment justly offered concerning those whose labours are more or less completed by the Treaty which the House has to consider this afternoon. I am sure the House will not begrudge me the right of adding a word of praise to the very large number of unnamed and unknown men who have also done their share in the war—I refer to the general body of the working classes of this country. I am sure the House will not at any time allow itself to forget the great contribution of our big industrial population because of any occasional lapse into wrong-doing or error that may stand to the account of a section of the workers. I therefore recall the fact that, just as the workers are the greatest sufferers by war, they are perhaps the greatest contributors to the victory which this country now enjoys. Before there was a Conscription Act compelling them to serve, many millions of them had voluntarily joined the Colours. As we have heard very much in this House during the past few days about coal, may I recall the fact that our first

experience of a coal shortage, two and a half or three years ago, was due to too many miners having walked out of the pit and into the trenches in defence of their country. If we set aside the inevitable fact that a number of the working classes did incidentally profit by service on munitions, it still remains that the great majority of the masses of our people, who in a material sense, in the sense of possessions, land, or property, had no country to fight for at all, went out and fought for their country as valiantly as any man.

I am asked to present to the House a few considerations from the Labour Party standpoint in regard to this Treaty. I want to approach it in the spirit of my right hon. friend who has just sat down. We must not give a vote to this Treaty because of certain blemishes in it. We must balance the great gains now enjoyed—which I hope will be perpetuated for the benefit of mankind—as expressed in the Treaty, against the defects that we may consider are within that Treaty. On balance, we must all feel the immense sense of relief that the world has secured by the victory of the Allied arms and, consequently, by the defeat of the military spirit, which itself was the cause of this war. I cannot leave out of account what I know to be the feelings of a very large body of working-class opinion in relation to this Treaty. I believe that spirit has been very eloquently expressed by a man who himself played no small part in the conduct of this war—I refer to General Smuts. Only a few days ago, in regard to this Treaty, he wrote:—

“ I have signed the Peace Treaty, not because I consider it a satisfactory document, but because it is imperatively necessary to close the war, because the world needs peace above all, and nothing could be more fatal than the continuance of the state of suspense between war and peace.”

We, therefore, wish to have Peace concluded, in order to begin the new era which we trust this Treaty symbolises, and to come immediately to all those opportunities for that urgent work of reconstruction which this House has specially elected to take in hand. The Labour Party has had an opportunity of considering this Treaty, and at the Southport Conference a resolution was unanimously passed which expresses the views of the party in relation to this Treaty. It declares:—

“ That the Conference is of opinion, now that Germany has decided to sign the Treaty of Peace, thereby opening up the opportunity of co-operation with the democracies of the world, that its speedy admission to the League of Nations, and the immediate revision by the League of Nations of the harsh provisions of the Treaty, which are inconsistent with the statements made on behalf of the Allied Governments when the Armistice was made, are essential both on grounds of honour and of expediency, and it therefore calls upon the Labour Movement in conjunction with the International to undertake a vigorous campaign for the winning of popular support to this policy as a first step towards the reconciliation of peoples and the inauguration of a new era.”

The Labour Party does not speak in these terms out of any feeling of friendliness for the German people or the German Government. It takes many countries and many different peoples to make a war, and we can put ourselves in a position at times of too great righteousness by



considering that we alone are an influence for good, and that all others in every part of the world are influences for harm, and what we are afraid of in respect of this Treaty is that in the moment of our victory we have committed some of the blunders of victors of previous wars whose battles were well conducted, but whose peace arrangements only laid the foundation for further struggles, and the question we ask ourselves is, "Will this Treaty make in any other part of the world any other Alsace Lorraine for the generations of the future?" We trust it will not, because we can turn to the League of Nations as the international machinery which in the years ahead of us will be able to deal with the blemishes of the Treaty, and acting, as we can see it will, under the influences and the pressure of a more potent democratic body of opinion than has ever previously existed, the defects of this Treaty may in that way be diminished or entirely removed by the machinery of the League of Nations. We are conscious that the crime of the German Government was a colossal one. We are equally conscious that the penalties imposed upon certain sections of the German people may be too heavy for the particular offences for which they were responsible, and we look with some degree of concern and fear upon the fact that the Germans have been parcelled out and put under the authority and government of other Powers, and that the principle of self-determination has not been jealously applied and followed carefully in every one of these instances. If self-determination is so good a gospel as to cause us to preach it as we do, it should be recognised in the case of considerable portions of German territory and of the German people just as well as of the people in any other land. I have here a communication which to-day reached me from the offices of the Labour Party from a body of German workmen, and I do not fear to read it to the House. It is from the Birnbaum Workers' Council. It states that the council represents an almost exclusively German town. It protests against the town and the neighbourhood being ceded to Poland. The town is five kilometres from the proposed frontier:

"We claim the right of self-determination. According to vote there are ninety per cent. Germans who wish to remain united to Germany in her present need. We Socialists and Democrats ask you to help us to protect our new political and social gains."

The PRIME MINISTER: What is the name of it?

Mr. CLYNES: The Birnbaum Workers' Council. I have said the Labour Party's attitude in relation to this Treaty is in no way determined by any considerations of tenderness for the German people themselves. Their crime has been so enormous that the penalty naturally must be severe. But the truer statesmanship will be found in making this Treaty acceptable to all who are affected by it, and thereby preventing the development or growth of that spirit of revolt or revolution which was naturally developed in the case of France, following the German victory in 1870. We can make the mistake of committing excesses now against standards of self-determination and just treatment to a vanquished foe. They must pay for many years to come a heavy and bitter price for the enormity of the offences of which they were guilty. We hardly need to strengthen their case by inflicting any kind of territorial

or other injustice upon masses of people who, collectively or individually, have been in no sense the offenders. I have heard it said in connection with the League of Nations that we must look upon it with suspicion because it has been set up by the victors. It is just for that reason that I think the League of Nations will be all the stronger and all the more welcome to the masses of mankind. The countries of the Allies could have avoided this method of preventing differences between Governments or countries in the years ahead. I am glad this country has played such a leading part and such an effective part in the institution and development of this League of Nations. As an instrument for providing, through the medium of International Courts and international action, an opportunity for considering differences as they arise, it offers to mankind the greatest hope of avoiding future conflict which has ever been afforded to it. If I may single out by name any one man more than another to whom Labour is indebted for a great part played in the development and building up of this international structure, it is the Noble Lord (Lord Robert Cecil). If he has at any time run the risk of forfeiting the good will of Labour, he may feel confident that the great work he has done in this regard entitles him to the respect, and, I hope, the confidence, of the working classes in connection with any public labours in which he might indulge in the future. But we want to consider how soon this League of Nations can get to work and carry out the great labour for which it was created.

**It must not be a League of some nations. It must not be a League of victorious nations.**

A band of conquerors acting together in a league would not at all serve the purposes for which it was intended. I have read somewhere that the representatives of Germany who eventually were delegated to sign this Peace Treaty publicly declared that in doing so they meant to sign in the most real sense possible, and honourably to carry out their undertakings, and they referred to their desire to be admitted to the League of Nations. Probably the right hon. gentleman is fully aware of all their statements on the matter, and we should like to ask when can we be informed as to the admission of the representatives of the German Government to this League? We believe they ought not to be kept out for any mere purposes of vindictive treatment, and that as soon as their Government is composed enough, and as soon as their representatives can act in a responsible manner, the gates of the League should be widely opened to them.

We therefore trust that every inducement, and every invitation, if necessary, will be held out to the representatives of these former enemy nations in order that this League may be made the real and potent force for international peace that we desire it to be.

I cannot leave the subject of the League of Nations without referring to that part of it which is exceptionally welcome to our industrial population. The industrial and economic structure within the League of Nations, as part of the League of Nations, affords Labour in this and other countries a means for making more uniform, and I hope more humane, the industrial and working-class conditions of the great masses

of population in different countries. Whilst we could not consider my right hon. friend (Mr. Barnes) to be an officially appointed Labour representative at the Peace Conference, we have the greatest admiration for the work he has performed. We know of no other man, if it came to a choice of men, who could bring to bear such capacity, such experience, and such sympathy and knowledge as he possesses for a work so delicate and so important as this. I am sure the working-classes of many lands in future generations will bless the name of our right hon. friend for the great work which he has done.

The provisions in this Treaty will be viewed with a great deal of suspicion by the masses of the industrial population unless very soon their minds can be made quite composed and clear upon two points. One is Conscription, and the other is Armaments.

We have by this Treaty killed conscription in Germany. We have insisted upon the German Army, such as it is, being raised upon a voluntary basis. We have limited it to a very small number. All these things are the penalties which a defeated foe must suffer. This country at length accepted conscription as a dire necessity, as the last item in the balance that was to turn the scale in our favour. The House will remember that organised Labour reluctantly consented to a condition of conscription as a matter of the greatest urgency in view of the military situation then existing, but it accepted conscription with the clear understanding that it would be for the duration of the war only, and that it was not to be possible in any way so as to become a permanent part of our military system. The Prime Minister, on account of his business elsewhere, has not been so closely associated recently with opinion in this House or with working-class feeling in the country, but I can assure him that there is a profound suspicion and distrust of the Government arising from this one question alone. The workers joined for the duration of the war, and, though the Armistice was arranged last November, and though Peace was well on its way in the early part of this year and everything pointed to the physical impossibility of Germany being able to resume anything like a fight, the workers did not find themselves liberated from the conditions of enforced military service. (An Hon. Member: "What about Ireland?") Ireland, I am sorry to say, has no part in this Treaty. Therefore, it is outside my theme. I hope during this debate that the Prime Minister will be able to reassure the working-class men upon this very disturbing point.

Finally, I want to touch on the second of these two important matters, namely, armaments. A great deal of distrust of the Government and misunderstanding as to a war like the one we have gone through is arising because of the fact that so much of our armaments in this country were provided at an immense profit to those who manufactured them. I hope I have not fallen so low in my estimate of mankind as to believe that any class would trade in the making of armaments for the purpose of profit and having no other motive in their business than that of seeking wars in order that they may increase their profit. I have never shared that view, but I say with regret that it is a view widely held. Accordingly, we of the Labour Party have reached the conclusion that so far as armaments in a country are necessary for such pur-

poses as future conditions may require—for even the League of Nations, I conclude, will require some strength and some form or manner of physical force behind it, so as to make its decrees effective—no matter to what degree armaments in the future are required, it is essential that they should be made alone under the responsibility and control and ownership of the Government, and not of any private firm. We have in relation to armaments, as well as in relation to conscription, ourselves expressed to Germany a doctrine which I hope the Prime Minister, if he is to speak in this debate, will not entirely ignore, and I should like to draw his particular attention to it. In the twelfth paragraph of the Allied Note in reply to Germany that was published some weeks ago, we speak to the Germans in this language:

“ The German reply also ignores the immense relief that will be caused to her people in the struggle for recovery by the enforced reduction of her military armaments in future. Hundreds of thousands of her inhabitants who have hitherto been engaged either in training for armies or in producing instruments of destruction will henceforward be available for peaceful avocations and for increasing the industrial productiveness of the nation. No result should be more satisfactory to the German people.”

If that is a doctrine which it is good to preach for the benefit of the German nation, it is a doctrine which cannot be bad to preach and practice for our own nation. It expresses the whole philosophy of how much a nation can benefit in material wealth resulting from the energy, the hand and the brain of her people by following what are termed peaceful avocations and the production of the ordinary needs of existence, instead of wasting their energies in the barrack yard, in the armament factory, or in any other way such as a condition of war has always compelled men to do. Therefore, I would like this gospel to be more commonly preached by our principal statesmen, and by public men in this country. It would do no harm if the Prime Minister, either on the floor of this House or on any platform in the land, would explain and emphasise this truth. Indeed, it would help as much as anything to turn the minds of the country to that great work of reconstruction of which so little has yet been done.

I said at the beginning that we have had to balance considerations in relation to this Treaty. Our view is that, with all its defects, with all its blemishes, it is the work of men who, in the circumstances which surrounded it, must have acted with motives of the highest patriotism and with the highest and noblest considerations for human government. We have stated what may seem to some to be rather narrow points of criticism, but I can assure the House that that is not our view. We want not merely our class, but the whole human family to be saved by future provision from any awful and ghastly state of things such as we have recently gone through. We do not begrudge our word of praise to those who seldom are praised from working-class platforms. I refer to the well-to-do men, the favoured, the rich, those who have land, power, authority and affluence, and who set them all aside, turned their backs upon a life of ease in the early months of the war, and went out and led our men and found soldiers' graves, just like the men in the ranks. These

things but show how the great needs of the nation called forth equality of sacrifice and got equality of service. That ought to show all of us now that the war is over, that as the war lasted five years, and in that time all classes fought and struggled together for a common purpose, that if we can only last together for the coming five years, if all classes would think, in the main, in the terms of their country, and be moved, in the main, by those inspirations of real patriotism which caused our men, rich and poor alike, to offer the highest that man can offer—their life for their native land; if only for five years we can allay differences and unite for the purpose of repairing all the ravages of war, we can then, perhaps, begin in a much more enriched condition, certainly in a much more secure position, to engage in those narrower class struggles and, perhaps, selfish demands which both poor people and rich people at the present moment are, in my judgment, pressing too far. We ought not entirely to lose the lessons of this war, and that sacrifice of the men who can only be honoured by silence or by the spoken word should be a signal sufficient for us to begin now to march on and on towards the light, to avoid the calamities which have befallen other countries, to unite as well as we are able for the welfare of our native land, and to make it a place far, far better, especially for the masses of the people, than it ever has been up to the present.

### Mr. Stephen Walsh :

If I might be permitted, with the most complete sincerity, to add the congratulations of my Party to those which the right hon. gentleman must have received in great measure, I would be very pleased to do so. We have really on this occasion, by our country and through the influence of the right hon. gentleman, very largely achieved what is perhaps the most remarkable Peace the world has ever known. One or two hon. Members have said that there is great need for restoring the credit of the nation. In my opinion the credit of this nation never stood higher than it stands to-day. There are some things much greater than finance. People attach value to the sovereign, and regret very much that its value has gone down to 10s. ; but if this nation had not stood to its bond, entered into many years ago, its moral credit would have been so low that the name of Englishmen would have stunk in the nostrils of the world. To-day there is no name higher. And however low our financial credit may be at the moment, our credit throughout the whole world will be constantly upon the increase, and to-day we have nothing to regret in the way of credit. The name of England is higher and nobler to-day than it has ever been before. Something was said about coming well out of this deal. We fall very easily into these slipshod phrases. I wonder what the hon. gentleman meant when he said that. With what had we been dealing? We had the most terrible military organisation arrayed against the freedom of the world, and that military organisation has been broken to bits.

I think we ought to recognise that we are standing on the threshold of a new epoch. This House to-day is considering not so much the horrors of the past as how to prevent their awful repetition in the future. A

solemn duty rests upon every one of us in this House, and out of it, to prevent a recurrence of those horrors from which we have just been delivered. I was more than delighted to hear the speech of the right hon. gentleman the member for Hitchin, when he devoted so many of his remarks to the necessity for the establishment of the League of Nations. Of course, ever so much can be found fault with in the idea of the League. "It may fail here," and "It may fail there," say people; "If you do this or attempt that, you will find yourself up against an impossible proposition." Therefore, I suppose the idea is that we had better not try at all. That kind of argument and plea has been submitted from time immemorial. Is there anything more horrible than the previous conditions—conditions which deluged the world in blood for hundreds of years? Have those conditions to go on for ever? Has this civilisation, of which we are always talking in such high terms, nothing better to offer?

In science, in everything else to which the mind of man can devote itself, tremendous progress has been made. Only on this particular point, in respect of the relations between nations, is the counsel of despair urged. "Old jealousies are perennial; therefore you will always have war"—that is the argument of despair. Not only that. It commits all the generations of the future to the same horrible thing from which we have only just emerged. It is said that the right hon. gentleman was told that in a very little time, when he came out of the unreal world in which he was living, and into the world of fact, he would find himself up against some very serious proposition, and it would prove to him that his idea of the League of Nations had no existence in fact. I wonder if it has or not?

I think it is about 104 years since we were at war with the United States of America; certainly it is well over 100 years. For some years there has been, and I think at this moment there is, a Treaty between the United States and ourselves which prevents any war between us until the whole matter in dispute has been referred to arbitration. I remember very well when there seemed to be tremendous indignation on the part of the British people against the United States, and, indeed, on their part indignation against us. Most of us have some knowledge of the Alabama claim. We know how a privateer went out from a British port and did tremendous damage to northern shipping; and we know also that the slightest mistake on the part of the statesmen of that time would have hurled these two nations into a terrible war. What happened? A great statesman, greatly against the predominant feeling of the time, said, "This matter must go to arbitration." They paid a few millions for the losses inflicted on the shipping of the Northern States of America, and from that day, more than fifty years ago, instead of antagonism, violent and constant, a kindly feeling grew up between the Northern States and ourselves, and to-day, amongst all the great acclamations that are given to famous Generals of recent history, no greater acclamation is accorded to any than that which is given to the American General. And here to-day, between these two great nations, Great Britain and the United States, there is established a friendship largely dating from the time when Great Britain was sufficiently magnanimous to recognise that

she was wrong, and proceeded to arbitration. That, after all, lies at the very basis of the League of Nations—that you shall settle your difficulties, not by blood or violence, not by the drawn sword, but by an appeal to reason. The appeal to reason is the very basis of the League of Nations. In Canada there are, I suppose, between three and four thousand miles of territory from east to west, and between Canada and the United States so many thousands of miles of frontier. One is territory governed under the British flag, and the other belongs to the United States, and I suppose a few frontier police—not more than the membership of this House—guards the whole frontier and preserves order and civilisation in the very highest degree. If that is not a League of Nations, I do not know what it is. Surely, if that can be done for such vast territory when there are constantly conflicting interests, it goes to show that the League of Nations is not that chimera that many people imagine, and that it has a working basis in fact. Not very long ago the remark of one of our greatest admirals was that when you went into battle you must always get your ship to the side of your enemy, and hate the Frenchman as you hate the devil. Do we hate Frenchmen to-day? It is 104 years since we fought against France. We always fought chivalrously, and so did they. I believe most people now recognise that we made a great mistake, in the early seventies and in 1869, in not placing our resources chivalrously on the side of France at that time, but that mistake, great as it was, has been rectified, and to-day there are no truer comrades, and I hope that comradeship may be perpetual between ourselves and that great nation against whom Nelson said we should cherish hatred as we hated the devil. There again is the idea on which the League of Nations is to be founded and to come into force: we must all congratulate the right hon. gentleman the Prime Minister and his friends. If I may be permitted one word of reminiscence, let me mention that I wrote to the right hon. gentleman, many months ago, that I wished him, in the gigantic task she was undertaking, the most complete success.

Everybody who had ever thought of the gigantic difficulties he had to encounter must have felt almost appalled at the obstacles he was undertaking to remove, or at least to ameliorate. He has come back here with a magnificent record of success. The evil-running sore in the side of Europe—Alsace-Lorraine—has at last been healed. It would have been a perpetual source of discord and strife for scores and indeed hundreds of years, and it has been removed from the arena of conflict. I think the whole world must have breathed all the more freely when they saw that that source of discord was ended. We must, I think, congratulate him and his friends in the matter of Poland. Who that has read history at all but must have seen the horrible injustice that had been perpetrated upon that great nation in the back end of the eighteenth century? It is perfectly well known that one of our great poets described the partitioning of Poland as “the bloodiest picture in the book of time.” She is once again regenerated. She is established as a new nation once again in the comity of nations, and we sincerely hope, with him and his friends, that Poland will exercise in the future history of Europe that proper sphere of influence which she is perfectly enabled to accomplish.

There is one thing, I think, however, that we really must ask whether it is possible for more attention to be paid to. My right hon. friend will admit, I think, that I move a very good deal amongst the industrial classes and that I speak quite freely upon this point, because my attitude has not varied one inch from that which I took up many months ago. I refer to Russia. Whatever we may think about her failure—in respect of the assistance that we had a right to look forward to—we must admit that that great people is going through an awful time. Their sufferings have been terrible, and indeed their condition must evoke the heartfelt sympathy of the whole world.

If there is one thing upon which our people feel keenly, it is that no British soldier be utilised to lengthen or prolong the agony of Russia. We never had any right there to begin with, except to redeem those troops who perhaps were there because of us all working together in the early stages of the War, but merely because of a change in government—merely indeed because of the fact that there is no government at all—we have no right to prolong the agony of the Russian people, and I do say this, that the Labour Movement would hail with the greatest possible joy an announcement from the Government that at the very earliest moment and by the most expeditious means possible British soldiers will be removed.

I think it was said by Bismarck ever so many years ago that a certain territory was not worth the bones of one Pomeranian soldier, and we do say this, that there is nothing in the political and there is nothing in the economic condition of Russia that justifies a sacrifice of another British soldier, and we do appeal to the right hon. gentleman. We know the difficulties are great, we know that winter prevented expedition in matters such as this, but we are a little doubtful as to the *bona fides* of many of the folks who have been in charge of these expeditions against the Russian people. After all, the Government of Russia, their policy, their administration, all that belongs to them, are matters for the Russian people themselves. We have no right there, and we ought to get out as quickly as possible.

There is one other point I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman. Some few days ago questions were asked in this House about the mandates that were given in respect of the various colonies, the German colonies in particular. It was stated that those charters were being prepared. Of course, I understand the charters are in preparation. We know that in the Treaty of Peace the annual conference will examine from time to time—every year, or at such intervals as are proper—the conduct of the various mandatories to see that they comply with the charters laid down. What those charters contain we do not know. It is desirable that we should know. After all, we really are at this moment starting on a new condition of things for the world's future, and it is a solemn obligation upon every one of us not lightly to enter upon obligations which may involve the world once again, and at no distant time, in a repetition of the horrors from which we have just emerged. Therefore we have a right to know what the charters do contain. Of course, the general terms in the Treaty of Peace we do know. The Prime Minister himself has put that quite explicitly.



These are the points, and we have a right, before we go from this House to-night, in so far as inquiry can elicit the facts, to know whether we are now settling the peace of the world for future generations, or whether we are really lightly discharging our task, and going away with a possibility of horrors quite as great as those on which we have turned our back. These, after all, are great questions. There is the question of Ireland. When I sat upon the bench opposite with my right hon. friend the member for Manchester, we often thought of the position of Ireland, and we often thought what an unenviable attitude Great Britain would perforce be compelled to take with the wrongs of Ireland not merely unredressed but not attempted to be redressed, and I say the claims of Ireland to-day are more clamant than ever. I know nothing upon which the industrial opinion of Great Britain has so completely veered round as upon the question of Ireland. In the old days there used to be a very great deal of Orange, a very great deal of Catholic, and a very great deal of indifferent opinion, but to-day in the vast mass of the organised labour opinion of Great Britain, without exception, there is absolutely no difference at all as to the immense urgency of a settlement of this question. I was a little sorry to hear the right hon. gentleman talk as though Ireland were two nations. If she is two nations, then I despair, as one almost despairs, of any settlement that can give the slightest satisfaction to any democrat, including the right hon. gentleman himself. After all, in the back end of the eighteenth century Ireland had a Parliament of its own. It is perfectly true to say that it was a Protestant Parliament, but it was an Irish Parliament, and it made laws for the whole nation, and we surely cannot say that, merely because it was Protestant at that time, therefore you can deny the unity of its people. Since then all claims based upon merely religious ascendancy or difference have been banished altogether, and we do say that the only way this terrible problem, which is constant, burning, urgent and clamant, can be settled is by reorganising Ireland as a whole, and by giving such safeguards within a single Parliament as the various differences or sympathies of the people may require. I was in hopes that was the line on which the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues would proceed to the settlement of this terribly burning question, which has lowered our prestige for a hundred years. Wherever an Englishman goes he is an honourable, high-minded, straightforward man—there is no better in the history of the world: but there is always some slight feeling that he is a hypocrite, after all, when he is talking about the freedom of others and of broadening the basis of freedom for everyone else, because here, right against his own door, are people who are deprived of their rights, and deprived of them under conditions which everybody admits to be of the greatest perfidy. We deny to them the same rights for which we plead so eloquently and fight so strenuously on behalf of other people. After all, Ireland must be recognised as a nation. That can be the only way in which the burning question can be solved. Let such safeguards be given within the Parliament as are proper, but let the Parliament be a self-governing unit. On those lines we shall not only achieve peace for the world, as I sincerely hope that the right hon. gentleman and his friends have done, but we shall achieve peace for the sister island which has such a great claim upon us.

## Mr. Tom Shaw :

At the beginning of last year—(Hon. Members: "Divide!")—President Wilson laid down Fourteen Points—(Hon. Members "Divide!")—subsequently modified by a later speech. In the early spring our own Prime Minister made a speech to the troops in France in which he said that Germany could have peace to-morrow on those terms, and the Armistice was definitely arranged on the understanding that the Allies should deal with the representatives of the German people, and that Peace should not be discussed on the Fourteen Points, but should be arranged on them. Is there a right hon. or hon. Gentleman here who will claim that the annexation of the Saar Valley for fifteen years is not a distinct violation of the terms upon which the Armistice was signed? If that be the fact, in what respect are we better than the Germans were when they tore up the scrap of paper? (Hon. Members: "Divide!") Right hon. and hon. Gentlemen may protest. I put the question: Were those the terms on which the Armistice was signed or were they not? I say they were, and those terms have been broken by the Saar Valley provisions.

On the question of Ireland I have only a few words to say. All I have to say about Ireland is that a country which employs the Army to govern and imprisons men for selling extracts from speeches of Cabinet Ministers is not a country that can claim fair play. To vote against the Treaty is a very serious thing, a thing that no thinking man can contemplate without some degree of hesitation. One desires to recognise the difficulties that have stood in the way of our statesmen, and whilst I personally and my Party object very strongly to certain things in the Treaty I doubt very much whether, after all, we shall vote against it, not because we believe in it intact, but because the greater danger is to refuse it.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the question."

The House divided: Ayes, 163; Noes, 4.

---

## Manifesto of the Parliamentary Labour Party and the National Executive of the Party.

The Parliamentary Labour Party and the National Executive, having considered the preliminary Peace proposals, jointly declares that the Treaty is defective not so much because of this or that detail of wrong done, but fundamentally, in that it accepts, and indeed is based upon, the very political principles which were the ultimate cause of the war. The Treaty involves a violation of the principles embodied in Labour and Socialist Conference decisions; it also violates the understanding upon which the Armistice was signed, and is therefore a repudiation of the spirit and letter of the declarations of President Wilson, Mr. Lloyd George, and other Allied statesmen.

Organised Labour throughout the war resolutely opposed all attempts to transform the struggle for the emancipation of peoples into a war of conquest. On the question of reparation, however, Labour always insisted that Germany must make full reparation for the wanton destruction in all the Allied countries, and we consider that the payment by Germany of the sum of five thousand millions is not excessive in view of the damage done.

The Draft Treaty cedes to France "full ownership of the coal mines in the Saar Basin." The terms of the Armistice never so much as hinted at such a possibility. France should undoubtedly receive from Germany a sufficient supply of coal to compensate her for the temporary loss of her own mining resources. This claim can be met without handing over the population of the Saar districts even to a neutral administration. The provision in the Treaty requiring the German Government at the end of fifteen years to buy out at a valuation the mines in any part of the Saar Valley which may be restored to Germany as a result of a plebiscite, would involve a violation of the principles of self-determination equivalent to disguised annexation.

In the delimitation of the frontiers of the new Polish State violence is done to the right of the people to determine their national allegiance. Thus there is a contravention of President Wilson's "Thirteenth Point," which lays it down that the new Polish State should only contain genuinely Polish elements.

In order to secure the concerted abolition of armaments and compulsory Military Service, Labour believes that steps must be taken to prohibit the private manufacture of fresh armaments and to limit existing armaments. The Treaty, on the contrary, is likely to impose fresh burdens of this character upon the peoples as a consequence of the military occupation of the west bank of the Rhine for a period of fifteen years, and possibly longer. In such circumstances it will be impossible to take full advantage of the enforced disarmament of Germany in order to secure general disarmament and demilitarisation.

A League of Nations to be effective should be an organ of international justice, inclusive of all free peoples, and not, as it will be under the Peace Treaty, a restricted instrument of the victorious coalition. This essential aim can best be attained by the admission of Germany to membership of the League as speedily as possible after her signature to the Peace Treaty. The League should also be strengthened by being made more directly representative of peoples and Parliaments.

The peoples want peace, and demand that peace shall be lasting. We therefore call upon the organised workers of all countries to join in an effort to bring the Treaty more into harmony with the working class conception of an enduring and democratic settlement. Only when the menace of further war, which this Treaty does not remove, is lifted from the world can the burdened peoples obtain release from Conscription and begin the work of raising the international standard of life and labour and the inauguration of a new Social Order.

June 1st, 1919.

**THE LABOUR PARTY**

---

10

**THE  
PEACE TERMS**

---

---

BY THE

**Rt. Hon. Arthur Henderson**

(Secretary, British Labour Party).

---

Price 2d. Post free 2½d.

---

22 ECCLESTON SQUARE. LONDON. S.W.1.

# THE PEACE TERMS

BY THE

**Rt. Hon. ARTHUR HENDERSON**

(Secretary, British Labour Party).

---

The National Executive of the Labour Party and the Committee of the Berne International Conference have issued Manifestoes stating that the Peace Treaty is opposed in certain essential particulars to the declarations of President Wilson, the Inter-Allied Conferences, and the Berne Conference, and that its general spirit does not conform to Labour's conception of a Peace of justice and right.\*

The Parliamentary Labour Party and the National Executive have also declared that the Treaty is defective, not so much because of this or that detail of wrong done, but fundamentally, in that it accepts, and indeed is based on, the very political principles or premises which were the ultimate cause of this war, and which must, if adhered to, produce not only other wars, but a perpetuation in peace time of those economic and social conditions which it is the object of the workers to abolish.

The reasons there outlined deserve some more detailed statement. Why precisely is this Treaty fraught with danger to the Labour Movement and the ideals for which it stands? Why has Labour any especial interest in it—an interest distinct from that of other classes of the community?

After the American declaration of war upon Germany, President Wilson made these statements:—

We have no quarrel with the German people. . . . It was not upon their impulse that their Government acted in entering this war. It was not with their previous knowledge or approval. . . . The American people have suffered intolerable wrongs at the hands of the Imperial German Government, but they desire no reprisal upon the German people, who have themselves suffered all things in this war, which they did not choose.

The people of Germany are being told by the men whom they now permit to deceive them and to act as their masters that they are fighting for the very life and existence of their empire, a war of desperate self-defence against deliberate aggression. . . . No one is threatening the . . . peaceful enterprise of the German Empire. . . . The wrongs, the very deep wrongs committed in this war . . . cannot and must not be righted by the commission of similar wrongs against Germany and her allies.

---

\* See Appendices I. and II.

These were solemn assurances, and the Allies confirmed them, by implication at least.

President Wilson was specific as to the two main points upon which the fundamental interests of the German people, too, were to be assured in the settlement. The rights of nationality were to be respected: (the plea that because Germany has not respected them they need not be observed in her case is as inadmissible as would be the plea that the sons of an assassin can be murdered without offence: we are making settlements for future generations); and equality of economic opportunity were to be accorded them. President Wilson said:—

Peace should rest upon the rights of peoples . . . their equal right to . . . a participation upon fair terms in the economic opportunities of the world, the German people, of course, included.

It has come about in the altered world in which we now find ourselves that justice and the rights of peoples affect the whole field of international dealing as much as access to raw materials and equal conditions of trade. . . . Separate and selfish compacts with regard to trade and the essential materials of manufacture would afford no foundation for peace.

With a right comity of arrangement no nation need be shut away from the free access to the open paths of the world's commerce.

The principle of public right must henceforth take precedence over the individual interests of particular nations. We are willing . . . to limit ourselves along with others to a prescribed course of duty, and respect for the rights of others.

Let us examine how in certain specific points of detail—not the gravest defect in the Treaty—these two principles are observed.

#### **THE RIGHTS OF NATIONALITY.**

1. The union of German-Austria with Germany is an inevitable outcome of this principle: a development of the tendency to German unification as natural as was the unification of the scattered Italian States. This right of unification is denied to both Germany and Austria.

2. Millions of Germans are placed under Czecho-Slovak, Polish, and Italian rule. This will create "Irredentist" populations as considerable as those which provoked the Serbian and Italian agitation before the war.

3. The arrangements which nominally place the purely German city of Danzig under the League of Nations, but which give the control of its custom, railways, its foreign relations, and most of its internal administration (including posts and telegraphs) to Poland, would be regarded by any people as merely disguised annexation.

4. The separation of East Prussia from the main body of Germany by a "corridor" containing a large German population adds to the artificiality and probable instability of the new order. The annexation of nearly the whole of West Prussia to Poland places something like a million Germans under Polish rule. The arrangement by which plebiscites in East Prussia are to be carried out after the removal of the German authorities and without representation of Germany on the commissions lacks the necessary element of impartiality.

5. The total German population to be annexed by the New Poland is nearly  $2\frac{1}{2}$  millions.

6. In view of the fact that the evacuation of the occupied territory on the Left Bank of the Rhine after fifteen years is subject to the complete carrying out by Germany of all conditions of the Treaty, and the conditions "resulting from" the Treaty, and that some of those conditions (relating to the future settlements with the former Austrian States, Bulgaria, and Turkey) have to be accepted by Germany in advance without the knowledge of their nature; that the financial obligations can be altered in the future at the discretion of the Allies; that any failure to perform these conditions entitle the Allies to prolong indefinitely the period of fifteen years' occupation, this feature of the Treaty is likely to keep alive the forces of German Chauvinism as much as would outright annexation.

7. The conditions providing for the return of the Saar Valley are similarly defective.

### **EQUALITY OF ECONOMIC TREATMENT.**

1. Far from equality of economic treatment being accorded, the principle which dominates the clauses with reference to such things as tariffs, enemy property, shipping, port and harbour dues, etc., is that they are not to be reciprocal.

2. Assurance of access to necessary raw material, so specifically mentioned by President Wilson in his speeches as the condition *sine qua non* of permanent peace among nations, is conspicuously absent. With the loss of some 80 per cent. of her iron ore, much of her coal, all her overseas sources of raw material, virtually all her shipping, any developed industrial life for Germany will only be possible on the sufferance of her enemies.

3. The indeterminate character of the indemnity demands accentuates this: the fact that the creation of any available wealth by Germany would subject it to seizure by the Allies will not merely act as a handicap on private industry, but will render economical administration of finances by the Government all but impossible.

4. The existence of such immense discretionary powers in the hands of her enemies implies for German populations not alone the risk of "restricted economic opportunity," but of famine. German experience of the blockade under the armistice (in which adequate feeding of the German populations was promised) has shown that a miscalculation on the part of the Allies as to what is necessary for Germany may expose great masses of the latter's population to very great suffering.\*

5. In very many details—like the provisions with reference to the navigation and control of the Rhine and Danube, the construction of canals, the working of wireless stations—which place internal affairs of Germany virtually under foreign control, certain possible interpretations of the Treaty clauses might involve a paralysis of German industry by hampered communications.

6. The nett effect of many of these provisions is to cancel the main economic object of the settlement, i.e., to obtain reparation. "An undefined debt prolonged over an unknown number of years will, a few years hence, be a millstone round the neck of creditors as well as debtors, and to get rid of it a standing incentive to another war on the part of the creditors, if they recover. From the beginning we are faced with the dilemma that a sum such as is vaguely contemplated could only be paid by an extremely efficient and prosperous community, and that such a community is almost certain to find ways of not paying it."†

It is not possible to contend that such a treaty either in its letter or spirit conforms to the Fourteen Points or to the very definite conditions specified by President Wilson in the passages quoted above. Nor is it likely that the President would so contend.

The Treaty is obviously based on a principle which President Wilson has repeatedly repudiated, namely, that peace will best be secured by the mere destruction of German military power and the punishment of the German people. It responds in this to the theory

---

\* Writing five months after the Armistice, the Berlin correspondent of the "Daily Express," which can hardly be accused of pro-Germanism, said:

"The Germans have killed British and French babies, so I suppose one should have no qualms about killing off a few thousand German babies and their mothers in a second state. I made earnest inquiries concerning childbirth among women of the poorer classes of Berlin and I verified the statements I obtained. Seventy per cent. of expectant mothers are horribly under-nourished, and when they are taken to lying-in hospitals they are in a starving condition. Because of their situation they are unable to stand in food lines in order to obtain the small food rations allowed them.

"These women steal all the food they can, and I have seen them rummaging through dustbins to find potato peelings. They have no clothes for their newborn children; one finds them wrapped in pieces of sacking. Thirty per cent. of the German women die in confinement. Thirty per cent. of the children born to married mothers die, and 50 per cent. of those born to unmarried mothers."

† "Westminster Gazette."



naturally popular in war time—and in which we are apt to acquiesce as a perhaps necessary part of war moral—that the main obstacle to permanent peace and a better organisation of the world was German military power and the special wickedness of the German race.

But the actual situation of the world which confronts us now, after the utter and complete destruction of German military power, assuredly proves the inadequacy of such a theory. Although German power has disappeared with a completeness that is one of the most astounding dramas of history, we have neither peace nor disarmament nor the prospect of these things. New wars in which Russians, Italians, Jugo-Slavs, Hungarians, Japanese, and Chinese are likely to be involved; a new naval rivalry which may create a gulf between ourselves and the Americans; vast new campaigns stretching from Archangel to the Caspian Sea; conscription for the purpose of military occupation of millions of square miles of territory; costly military interventions to prevent the trying by other peoples of political experiments of which we do not approve—it is these things which have followed that destruction of German militarism which was to give us permanent peace and a more rational world order.

This fact of itself condemns the whole principle and spirit upon which the Treaty is based. For although the theory of establishing peace by preponderant military power has been so tragically exploded by the results which have followed the German collapse, the democracies are asked to believe that, if only the new German Republic is treated with sufficient severity, if its territory, or much of it, is occupied militarily by half a dozen different countries; if this section of the German race is handed over to the Poles, that to the French, the other to the Czecho-Slovaks, some more to the Italians; if the sources of Germany's wealth are taken from her; if the population, especially the younger part of it, and more particularly the children, are exposed to conditions so severe as to amount to the employment of what Mr. Churchill calls "the weapon of starvation," the world will have peace. Beyond this merely negative and repressive method the Treaty does not in fact go. European history has no meaning if there were the slightest chance of such methods succeeding.

The settlement is supported on the ground that it is and should be punitive; that militarism needs an "example." Such a plea is prompted by the application of a false analogy of persons to states and nations, and is irreconcilable with justice, humanity, or expediency. It is morally bad for two main reasons:—

1. The chief punitive measures—the blockade or economic restrictions—creating want and suffering, will fall mainly upon those who have no possible responsibility whatever for the war: those who are now children or who were unborn when the offences were committed; and upon the politically uninstructed mass of workers who, owing to the control of the press by the Govern-

ment, were honestly convinced that they were going into a defensive war, and were doing nothing less than their duty. These groups will suffer much more punishment than the official and wealthy classes who have the largest share of the guilt. Starvation or restriction will not touch the latter; it will touch the former. Such a result, far from creating a sense of guilt and predisposing to repentance and reform, will create a profound sense of injustice fatal to any "conversion" of the German people, which alone could justify punishment.

2. Even if we accept the idea of 70 millions of men, women, children, invalids, decrepit, all being equally guilty, we know from our experience in dealing with the individual criminal that if no provision is made for enabling him to earn an honest living—his offence once purged—he cannot be won from crime, but must remain an outlaw to the common danger. If the law does not protect even the criminal in his just rights it compels the criminal to protect himself; to take the law, that is, into his own hands. This Treaty makes no constructive provision whatever. As it stands, it justifies the plea of the German militarist that a Germany which is not preponderantly powerful will be crushed by her enemies, and that her only security is in her own strength.

The Treaty is based upon utterly inconsistent principles. The principles of justice and the League of Nations and the 14 points are, it is true, included in the document, but only in the form of generalisations, aspirations, and vague formulæ. Most of the actualities created by the terms, down to the minutest details, are governed by the idea of punishment, of strategy, or the snatching of some economic or territorial advantage for one or other of the Allies. The result of such a settlement can be predicted with certainty.

Many of its provisions are patently unenforceable, e.g., the indemnity. The history of the Treaty of Berlin shows that the existence of impossible obligations guaranteed by the Great Powers is a perpetual source of unrest and of danger to the peace of the world. In so far as the conditions are enforceable, they can only be enforced by the permanent military subjection of Germany or a permanent threat of starvation. No nation of 60 millions can be expected to acquiesce in the violations of nationality and the economic servitude imposed by this Treaty. The Allied Governments and the new League of Nations will therefore have to devote all their energies to the task of "keeping Germany down," and the peoples of the world will live under the shadow of a renewal of the war at the first favourable opportunity. Even if Germany and Russia are not driven into an alliance, every international dispute among the Allied Powers—the question of Fiume already proves this—will attain a dangerous and exaggerated importance as opening an opportunity to upset the unjust terms of this peace. There can be no security, no guarantee of peace, in the

shadow of this settlement. Then the conditions now exposed must have important effects upon the internal situation in Germany. Political and economic chaos is threatening to engulf the whole of Europe east of the Rhine. The recovery of stability and order depends largely upon what happens in Germany during the next six or twelve months. A peace, such as this, which offers the German people no possibility of economic recovery, no guarantee of justice or equality, plays straight into the hands of the reactionaries on the one side and the extremists on the other. The complete economic ruin of Germany will inevitably bring the downfall of the moderates, and a struggle for power between the militarist reactionaries and the extremists. The only certainty with regard to the issue of such a struggle is that it would be fatal to the peace and recovery of Europe.

Even if we view the Treaty only from the limited standpoint of our own nation, without reference to its wider implications for the world as a whole, there is sufficient cause to fear its effects upon the British people. It is difficult, if not impossible, to see how it could be carried out except by the permanent militarisation of the Allied peoples, the continuance of conscription in this country, the lasting organisation of Europe as an armed camp, with all the economic and social results which the predominance of the military over the civil power involves for this country. If there is a hope that these effects will not follow their causes contained in the Treaty, it is because its provisions are unworkable as well as unjust, and because its speedy revision after it has been signed is not merely desirable, but also inevitable as soon as its implications are fully ascertained. The Brest-Litovsk peace was indefensible and merited the unstinted condemnation it received from world democracy. From the beginning it was obvious it could not stand, and the same must be said of the Peace of Paris, for it also in many respects does violence to the fundamental principles of an enduring and just peace.

## APPENDICES.

### L

#### PRELIMINARY PEACE PROPOSALS.

##### Manifesto of the National Executive of the Labour Party.

Throughout the war British Labour at National and Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conferences formulated its war aims and consistently opposed any settlement of the European struggle calculated to prepare fresh conflicts, create new grievances and subject various peoples to the double plague of armaments and war. In the spirit of these declarations, the organised workers supported the proposals of President Wilson, as expressed in the 14 points and his subsequent addresses, which later became the basis of the Armistice. The National Executive of the Labour Party considers that the published summary of the Peace Treaty in some essential particulars is opposed to the declarations of President Wilson, the Inter-Allied Conferences, and the Berne Conference, is very defective from the standpoint of world peace, and bears evidence of compromise influenced by capitalist imperialism which still dominates the European States. In so far as organised Labour was not represented in the Peace Congress which drafted the Treaty, and as its general spirit does not conform to the working class conception of a peace of justice and right, we can accept no responsibility for the violations of principle involved in the settlement. We therefore look to the people, and to the forces of organised democracy, to safeguard and develop the idea of a peaceable community of all nations. Only under the influence of the working class movement, organised in the International, can the imperfections of the present Treaty be completely eradicated and its provisions adapted by the League of Nations to the requirements of a changing European order.

As the war was in part the product of frustrated colonial ambitions, and the Treaty makes no provision for equality of trade conditions for all the nations consenting to the peace, any permanent denial to Germany of the opportunity to become a mandatory under the League of Nations must be a cause of jealousy and unrest, leading to further international strife, whilst the increase of colonial territories under Allied control will involve a corresponding increase of naval, military, and administrative burdens upon the allied peoples.

That Germany should make reparation and pay compensation for damage done to civilian life and property by land, by sea, and from the air, cannot be questioned, but we are of the opinion that she ought to have representation on the Reparation Commission, and the total compensation she will be required to pay should have regard to her obligation to meet the needs of her own population.

We regret that the Treaty, which imposes a drastic measure of disarmament upon Germany, does not include provision for progressive limitation of the armaments of the other signatories to the treaty, with the object of finally arriving at a general total disarmament.

While agreeing that France should have specific rights of pre-emption over the product of the coal mines until her own resources have been re-organised, we protest against any attempt at permanent separation of the Saar territory from the German State, and regard as objectionable the particular form of political and economic control set up by the Treaty.

In order that her claims to these provinces may be confirmed, and a long standing dispute finally removed from the common life of Europe, we hope that France will agree to a consultation of the population of Alsace-Lorraine under the League of Nations. To prevent the creation of another Alsace-Lorraine, a plebiscite under the League of Nations should be taken in Malmedy and the other contested territory between Belgium and Germany before the renunciation of sovereignty by Germany,

rather than that the inhabitants should be left to appeal to the League of Nations against the action of the Allies.

We welcome the application of the plebiscite to the Southern and Eastern districts of East Prussia, but regret that this principle has not been observed in the delimitation of the Polish-German and Czecho-Slovak frontiers.

In accordance with the principle of self-determination, the people of German-Austria should have free and unrestricted right to decide for themselves whether they will become one of the federal states of Germany or remain independent: any other solution would be an act of injustice and repression of national impulses that may imperil the peace of Europe.

Remembering that whoever triumphs the workers of the world must always be the greatest sufferers in international conflicts, we express the earnest hope that even now an effort will be made to bring these preliminary peace conditions more into harmony with President Wilson's declaration that "all well-defined national aspirations shall be accorded the utmost satisfaction that can be accorded them without introducing new or perpetuating old elements of discord and antagonism that would likely in time wreck the peace of Europe and consequently of the world."

8th May, 1919.

---

## II.

### Manifesto of the Committee of Action of the Berne International Labour and Socialist Conference.

The terms of peace now being fixed in Paris are the urgent concern of the democracies of the whole world. Hitherto the nations have never been able to free themselves from war, and every Peace Treaty has been the source of new conflicts. The reason is that peace has never yet been made by democracy in power, and peace treaties have never been drafted to satisfy the unclouded sense of justice of the common people.

The International at its meeting in Berne in February of this year laid down certain great principles upon which alone may be built a just and lasting peace. It placed them in the hands of the President of the Peace Conference, M. Clemenceau, and, on the understanding that they would be considered, it amplified them at Amsterdam.

These principles may be stated as follows:—

1.—Reparation.—The wanton destruction of Belgium, of Northern France, and other invaded countries which followed the declaration of war by the Central Empires, and the acts on land and sea which were contrary to international agreements, should be the subject of compensation and reparation.

2.—Self-Determination.—In re-defining the national boundaries of Europe certain oppressed nationalities should be created into independent states, but peoples should not be transferred from one state to another until the wishes of the population have been shown by their being consulted.

3.—Militarism.—Militarism should be ended and a League of Nations representative of democratic influences should be established to secure peace and give the nations a protection in justice.

4.—Colonies.—The exploitation of native races by colonial imperialism should end. Responsibility should be imposed upon the imperial peoples, and colonial possessions should be shared without distinction amongst all democratic nations which are in a position to accept responsibility; the economic wealth of the Colonies should be put without hindrance at the disposal of all peoples.

The Committee has considered the peace proposals from the point of view of these principles. It recognises that in them certain injustices attributable to past wars have been repaired and the liberation of some of the peoples long kept under

subjection effected, and it welcomes the creation of a League of Nations. It also observes that the prisoners of war will be repatriated from the moment the Treaty of Peace is signed, and that the draft Treaty thus avoids the real slavery which might have resulted from another arrangement.

These points it welcomes. But when the terms offered are judged in their full effect, it is disturbed to find in them so much that is menacing to the future peace of the world. The Committee draws the attention of the Socialist and Labour movements to the following points in particular:—

1.—The League of Nations in its final form retains all the objections taken to it at Berne and Amsterdam. It remains a League of Governments and Executives and not of peoples and parliaments. It does not compel its affiliated nations to renounce totally a recourse to war by accepting its arbitration and decisions. It also seems to be the instrument of a victorious coalition dominated by five great powers rather than an organ of international justice upon which all nations ought to find a place.

Though the League of Nations as at present constituted may be the beginning of a methodical organisation of a continuous régime of peace, the failure to include Germany and Russia must be righted as speedily as possible if the League is to be made effective for preventing war.

2.—The limitations imposed upon German armaments are a necessary condition to that general disarmament which the International has repeatedly declared to be the only hope of national security and peace, and which is made more imperative than ever by the creation of large numbers of new small states. The mere limitation of the German army, however, need not weaken European militarism, and therefore the International calls for a declaration that the Allies themselves propose to abandon their present militarist policy and to reduce immediately their armaments on land and sea. Further, it must be noted that the settlement of frontiers for military reasons and the predominance of strategic considerations in certain of the provisions of the proposed Treaty tend to perpetuate armaments.

3.—In drawing the boundaries of the new Polish State (the creation of which the Committee welcomes) violence is done to the right of people to choose their political allegiance. The division of the German State into two separate parts is dangerous, and will remain a source of trouble and ill-will.

4.—It is just that, owing to the destruction of coal-mines in Belgium and France, Germany should be made to supply to these countries for some time a compensating amount of coal. But the proposals regarding the Saar basin are animated by the spirit of annexation and of capitalist exploitation. The creation of French economic interests in the district, the setting up of a special administrative authority, the plebiscite in fifteen years, justify suspicions that it is not only coal but territory, not only compensation but dismemberment, that is wanted.

5.—The disposal of the German Colonies and the denial of a mandate by the League of Nations will be universally regarded as nothing more nor less than Imperialism satisfying itself with the spoils of war.

6.—Nor must the callous handing over of the Shantung Peninsula with all its resources and the transference of from 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 Chinese to Japanese economic control, be passed over in silence, as it is a frank recognition of the right of conquest.

These faults are serious and make it plain that this peace is not our peace, and that the nations are still menaced by the policy of victors sharing spoils without thought of inevitable consequences.

11th May, 1919.

THE LABOUR PARTY.

TRUSTS  
AND  
THE PUBLIC.

BY  
A. L. B.

---

PRICE 2d.; POST FREE 2½d.

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W.

# PUBLICATIONS OF THE LABOUR PARTY

## Labour and the New Social Order.

A Report on Reconstruction after the War. 2d., post free 3d.; 1s. 6d. per 13; 6s. per 50; 12s. per 100; £6 per 1,000, post free.

## Memoranda on International Labour Legislation.

The Economic Structure of the League of Nations. 1s., post free 1s. 1½d.

## Labour Women on International Legislation.

This pamphlet contains proposals on Women's Employment (by GERTRUDE M. TUCKWELL), the Employment of Children (by Dr. MARION PHILLIPS), and the Prevention of Unemployment (by A. SUSAN LAWRENCE, L.C.C.), and has been issued with the approval of the Standing Joint Committee of Industrial Women's Organisations. Price 3d., post free 3½d.; 2s. per dozen, carriage paid.

## The Labour Party and the Peace Treaty.

This is a Handbook for Speakers and contains a critical analysis of the Peace Terms, comparing its provisions with the pronouncements made by the National and International Labour Movement from time to time. Price 1s. 6d. post free; 13s. per dozen, carriage paid.

## The Peace Terms.

By the Rt. Hon. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P. 2d., post free 2½d.

## Labour and the Peace Treaty.

Containing Parliamentary Speeches by Rt. Hon. W. ADAMSON, M.P., Rt. Hon. J. R. CLYNES, M.P., Mr. STEPHEN WALSH, M.P., and Mr. TOM SHAW, M.P. 2d., post free 2½d.

## Labour Policy and the Famine.

This pamphlet indicates the present economic position of Central Europe and sets out Labour's policy of immediate remedies. Price 2d., post free 2½d.; 1s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.

## The Capital Levy: How the Labour Party would settle the War Debt.

By F. W. PETHICK LAWRENCE. Price 2d., post free 2½d.; 1s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.

## International Economic Policy.

By L. S. WOOLF. Price 2d., post free 2½d.; 1s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.

## Tariffs and the Worker.

By BROUGHAM VILLIERS. Price 1d., post free 1½d.; 9d. per dozen, carriage paid.

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.



# TRUSTS AND THE PUBLIC.

By A. L. B.

WHAT should be Labour's policy in the face of the growing consolidation of capitalist industry? This question has been frequently asked, and has generally been answered on one of two lines. Some have said that the centralisation and co-ordination would make the actual socialisation of industry easier, and that the process should, therefore, be welcomed. Others, however, have maintained that the evil effects of monopoly on the consumer (limitation of choice in the purchase of commodities, high prices and a consequent depression of the standard of living) are such as to necessitate hostility to every form of co-operation between employers. Each of these answers is very superficial and dangerous, as part-truths always are. But they are the best that can be given without a somewhat detailed analysis of the process of trust-formation, in its widest sense. The object of this pamphlet is to indicate the outlines of such analysis, to see what conclusions can be drawn from a general examination of the problem, and to suggest broadly the direction of a possible Labour policy in the matter.

## DEFINITION AND TYPES.

For this purpose we will consider the word "trust" and the phrase "trust movement" to cover all processes which tend towards a monopoly in the hands of one or several employers, or, still more simply, all measures which diminish or eliminate competition between the capitalist producers of goods and services. The particular forms of organisation devised to serve these ends show very many types.

First, we have combines and consolidations, or trusts proper in the narrow sense. In these cases one firm, or group of closely allied firms, will own and control the whole of the productive capital in an industry or a section of an industry. Well-known examples are the manufactures of dyes and of sewing-cotton. Partial trusts exist in other industries, as in banking, where only five large joint stock companies control a very large proportion of the banking operations in this country. A slightly different form of trust is the "vertical consolidation," where there is unified control of enterprises in different industries, the finished product of one being the raw material of another of the consolidated firms. This is exemplified in the network of businesses controlled by or connected with Lever Bros., and in Amalgamated Industrials, a company engaged in coal-mining, iron-mining, pig-iron production, ship-building, transport, and marine insurance.

Then, secondly, we have various devices for identifying the interests of apparently competing firms. One business may hold large blocks of the share-capital in another; the same individuals may be directors of two or more companies, and so on. In these cases the actual processes of production are, however, generally carried on and controlled independently, but the distinction from trusts of the first type is not hard and fast.

Thirdly, we have the large number and the various kinds of employers' associations and federations. A few of the objects which such bodies attempt to achieve may be mentioned: negotiating with Labour, fixing prices, securing and rationing raw-materials, dividing markets for home or foreign trades, standardising products, scientific research, technical education, general propaganda, influencing Ministers or Government Departments, securing of "reforms" in the general trading or banking systems. There is now in this country a very large number of these bodies. Any one federation may exist solely for one of these specific purposes; it may, on the other hand, undertake two or more different activities. It is probably much the most important form of co-operation between employers at the present time in Great Britain. It is not so sensational as the actual formation of a direct trust; for this reason it gets very much less notice in the general Press than the latter process, on the principle of the greater the sensation the better the "copy." It cannot be too frequently or categorically asserted that these associations, whatever the ostensible objects for which they exist, are part of the general movement towards industrial combination. At the very least they assist, by eliminating competition in certain restricted spheres, in creating

an atmosphere of co-operation and solidarity between employers. In many cases, moreover, by a gradual increase in the number of functions undertaken, they may lead to the formation of a body doing so many things under centralised control as to be a trust in fact if not in name. It will be seen later why so much emphasis must, in this country, be laid on organisations of this sort.

### GOOD RESULTS.

We come next to consider the actual effects of the various methods by which capitalist interests are consolidated. To take the first, the effects which are on the whole good from the general labour point of view, it needs to be recognised that even when the monopolistic position of a trust enables it to secure large "unproductive surpluses," the economies effected may themselves be socially desirable. The capitalist system enables the money value of the economies to be diverted into the pockets of private owners, but they are none the less very often—if not generally—definite steps in industrial progress. All schemes which have for their result the elimination of competitive waste—whether in buying raw-material, in advertising, in selling, in actual production, diminish the number of people engaged in socially valueless occupations, and the amount of capital being put to non-productive uses. Similarly, the undoubted economies to be effected in many industries by large-scale production, by standardisation, by co-operative industrial research, are all calculated to make for the greater economic efficiency of the industrial machine. They are, indeed, economies which the workers themselves will have to make, if and when they take over the machinery of production, in those cases where they have not already been effected by the expropriated capitalists.

A further advantage, which is not an invariable accompaniment of trustification, but must probably always ultimately follow the process, is the necessity involved for negotiation through the workers' organisations. No large combine can possibly for long hope to settle its labour problems by individual contract with its employees, and, similarly, the very magnitude of the organisations they have to fight must be a direct stimulus to the Trade Unions in a trustified industry. One of the inherent weaknesses in an industry like, say, printing is the large number of small "non-union houses"—non-union because they are small.

Finally, on this side, it is undoubtedly true that the legislative and administrative processes involved in nationalising an industry whose control is already unified are much simpler than those required in taking over a competitive unco-ordinated industry.

### BAD RESULTS.

The evil effects of capitalist combinations need not be much stressed, as they are fairly obvious. The elimination of the incentive of competition, under an industrial system in which the motive of public service has not yet replaced that of private profit, may result in stagnation—though the "progressive" policy of practically every large trade consolidation seems to indicate the hollowness of the individualist contention that only the fear of his rival keeps the employer up to scratch. The dehumanisation of relationships between employer and employed, which always accompanies large scale industry, only concerns those with whom "industrial peace" seems desirable and possible. The standardisation of products carries with it a certain restriction of choice on the part of the consumer, and may be reckoned as a minor disadvantage of this process.

But the two main evils are much more important and fundamental. The securing of the whole of the monopoly value of all social advantages, such as those mentioned above, whether by the ordinary device of price-raising or by less direct methods, is a permanent potentiality in every trust movement. Its effect on the workers is shown, in some cases, by a direct rise in the general cost of living. This, besides being disastrous from the purely material point of view, also means a continual concentration by the worker on so-called "mere bread-and-butter questions," and consequently his distraction from larger social issues. It may even go so far as to reach the point of a "hunger revolution," and is, therefore, of vital importance to those who wish to see society transformed by non-violent means resulting from a conscious and rational desire for change. In other cases, though the actual price of the "trustified" product may not rise, the monopolistic position created enables the capitalists to divert into private pockets all or part

of, the financial gain achieved. Trustification has, indeed, sometimes been followed by a reduction of price, but the reduction has been not at all proportionate to the economies effected.

In the second place, the consolidation of capital in an industry means a strengthened vested interest. This expresses itself in a far stronger and more effective opposition to all the items in Labour's programme, whether it be nationalisation, taxation, or only the removal of all import restrictions and embargoes and the securing of complete freedom of trade.

### TEMPORARY SAFEGUARDS.

We turn now to the various remedies which have been or may be proposed. Legislation which has for its object the prevention of trust formation has never proved practicable, and would not do so in this country. Anti-trust laws which empower a Government, following a legal decision that a particular consolidation is operating "against the public interest," to cause the disintegration of such a combine, could, if effective, only destroy the advantage along with the disadvantages. Such a method is even less applicable in this country than elsewhere. To be effective, it would have to cope with the problem of employers' associations and federations, to which we have referred above. If this were attempted, it would merely drive such organisations underground; the secret understanding and the "gentleman's agreement" would supersede the minuted or signed agreement, and the wholesome light of publicity would be put out. In any case, for Labour to demand restrictions on the right of combination would certainly be to invite, and as certainly to secure, counter-dennads. We do not want any return to the Combination Laws.

A certain mitigation of the monopolistic effects of trusts can, on the other hand, be secured by an unswerving adherence to complete freedom of trade, national and international. Protection and trade embargoes not only enable trusts to fleece the consumer, but they provide a peculiarly favourable environment for the growth of associations which can cajole or coerce Parliament and Government Departments alike. Clearly, the extent to which, say, the manufacturers of scientific glass ware, federated or combined, can raise prices is intimately affected by the freedom with which foreign competitive goods can enter the country and be sold without restrictions. Again, all protective legislation must stimulate capitalist organisation, if only for the better formulation of the commercial and business interests which have to be consulted and reconciled in carrying out such a policy. It should be noted, however, that this is only a negative measure for mitigating one of the main ills in question; it does not go to the root of actual trust formation, and it becomes less and less effective as trusts assume more and more of an international aspect. That they are already doing so seems clear. The operations of the Harvey Steel Trust before the war are fairly well known, thanks to the publications of Mr. J. T. Walton Newbold. The American Meat Trust has a very firm hold in this country, and is dealt with in some detail in the Report of the Committee on Trusts; it remains to be seen whether its apparent disintegration, following the recent disclosures as to its operations, will be real or permanent.

There are, again, certain positive steps which might be taken to act as a brake on monopoly. All of these are in the nature of "publicity." It should be compulsory for all agreements between firms and associations to be registered and filed in some place to which the public has access. Further powers of investigation should be given to some Government Department—presumably the Board of Trade—to examine the accounts and other documents in any case where a charge of exploitation is made by some responsible person or persons; this investigation might even be made compulsory on demand from Trade Unions, Trades Councils, or Co-operative Societies. In the case of the larger industries, Labour would do well to demand the following of the plan which was adopted for coal mining; there are few better ways of opening the eyes of the man in the street than by the public proceedings of a Royal Commission. It is important, nevertheless, that such measures should partake in no way of the nature of anti-trust legislation. They are to be simply ways of securing publicity, which need not in themselves debar any employers from making any agreements they like. Any legislation to impose penalties for exploiting the public would not be directed specifically against trusts. Extensions of the Profiteering Act, or similar devices,

form no part of this publicity legislation. Whether they are adopted or not depends on Labour's policy with regard to profit-making in general. If adopted, they would naturally follow the holding of particular inquiries, but the legal right to investigate should be established for its own sake, irrespective of any subsequent action taken under other statutes.

### THE ONLY PERMANENT CURE.

For any ultimate freedom from the dangers of capitalist monopoly we must look to the removal of the root-cause, and that is the existence of a comparatively small owning class, who by owning also control industry, and must always ultimately determine the way industry is organised. If they find it profitable to compete with one another, they will compete; as soon as they find it profitable to cease competing, competition will begin to cease. It will be always good policy to press for nationalisation and municipalisation in the industries that show most monopolistic tendencies. In every case where complete monopoly has been reached, Labour's case for public ownership becomes immensely strong and likely to command considerable sympathy.

The actual effect of State and municipally-owned industry working in competition with combines can be very salutary in keeping down the worst evils of profiteering; such a policy has the additional advantages of being part of Labour' general programme and of being on the direct way to the only final solution. The Co-operative Movement is to a considerable extent, and can be to a far greater extent, one of Labour's main defences against the trust movement. By keeping down its own prices, it can prevent an indefinite rise in those industries where it operates; at the same time, it is building up in certain spheres an alternative method of production by and for the workers. But this process can never reach its fruition within the present system. The Co-operative Movement, as long as it is dependent on capitalist industry for most, or even part, of its raw-material, is vitally hampered in its contest. Alongside of the growth of co-operation must be a steady progress towards the nationalisation and workers' industrial control of the main industries. You may cut the claws of capitalism and it will grow fresh ones. It is for Labour to destroy the whole body of capitalism.

### APPENDIX I.

#### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRUSTS.

In the United Kingdom combinations operating in restraint of trade are, though not criminal, unlawful if shown to be against public policy, as public policy is understood by the English Courts, where these words are construed in a somewhat narrow and technical sense.

We are unanimously of opinion that it would be desirable to institute in the United Kingdom machinery for the investigation of the operation of monopolies, trusts and combines, similar to the Commissions and other tribunals created for that purpose in the U.S.A. and the British Colonies above referred to. The problems to be considered, before any just conclusion can be arrived at with regard to the actual existence of abuses tending to the detriment of the public, or with regard to a form of safeguard or control which it would be practical to adopt to prevent such abuses, if proved, are not matters on which it is possible for a Committee such as this to form any final or considered judgment. But we are satisfied that trade associations and combines are rapidly increasing in this country, and may within no distant period exercise a paramount control over all important branches of the British trade.

We are satisfied that considerable mistrust with regard to their activities exists in the public mind, and that the effect of such mistrust may be equally hurtful to the political and social stability of the State, whether or not the public mistrust and resentment be in fact well-founded. We consider that it is desirable that means should be provided whereby the fullest information as to the activities of trade associations may be made available to the public, and complaints may be promptly and thoroughly investigated, so that doubts and suspicions may be dispelled, or, on the other hand, the true facts ascertained as to evils for which a remedy is required. We believe that it will be found necessary ultimately to establish further machinery for promptly and effectively dealing with such abuses as the tribunal of investigation may discover.

We recommend that:—

(a) It shall be made the duty of the Board of Trade, or such department as may hereafter exercise surveillance over trade and commerce, to obtain from all available sources information as to the nature, extent, and development of trusts, companies, firms, combinations, agreements, and arrangements connected with mining, manufactures, trade, commerce, finance, or transport having for their purpose or effect the regulation of the prices or output of commodities or services, produced or rendered in the United Kingdom, or imported into the United Kingdom, or the delimitation of markets in respect thereof, or the regulation of transport rates and services, in so far as they tend to the creation of monopolies or to the restraint of trade.

The Board of Trade shall present annually to Parliament a report upon the nature, extent, and development of such forms of organisations.

(b) It shall be made the duty of the Board of Trade to make preliminary inquiry into any complaints which may be made with regard to the existence or action of any organisation specified in (a).

(c) In the event of the information obtainable by the Board of Trade being, in the opinion of that Department, insufficient to enable it to discharge its duties under (a) or (b) above, or if, in the opinion of the Board, as the result of investigations undertaken on its own initiative or on complaints made to it, there is *prima facie* evidence that the public interest is adversely affected by the operation of any monopoly, combination, or agreement, the Board of Trade shall be empowered to:—

(1) Apply to the tribunal hereafter provided for an order to such companies, firms, or individuals as may be specified in the application, to furnish such information as may be specified thereunder; or

(2) refer the whole matter to the said tribunal for investigation and report.

(d) There shall be established a tribunal consisting of a person of legal qualifications, as permanent chairman, and not less than two, or more than seven, other members selected by him from time to time from a panel appointed for the purpose by the President of the Board of Trade after considering nominations made by representative trade organisations, including the Co-operative Movement and Trade Unions, which tribunal shall have power—

(1) On the application of the Board of Trade, to make orders of the kind specified under (c) (1) above; and

(2) on reference from the Board of Trade, to investigate the operation of any organisation specified in (a), and for that purpose to call for all books and papers, to take evidence upon oath, and to adopt such other measures of inquiry as it may deem necessary to elicit the facts; and when it shall be proved that acts injurious to the public interest have been committed, such facts as are relevant to the particular offence shall be published immediately on the conclusion of each inquiry.

(e) It shall be the duty of the Board of Trade to make recommendations as to State action for the remedying of any grievances which the tribunal may find to be established.

We wish to place on record our appreciation of the great services which have been rendered to the Committee by our Secretary, Mr. John Hilton, whose comprehensive study of combinations we have printed as an appendix to this report.

#### ADDENDUM.

By MR. ERNEST BEVIN, MR. J. A. HOBSON, MR. W. H. WATKINS,  
AND MR. SIDNEY WEBB.

We have signed the above report because we find nothing to disagree with in its recommendations. But we feel that it does not adequately express the gravity of the situation, and that the proposals fall far short of what—in the terms of reference to the Committee—will be necessary to safeguard the public interest.

The fact is that free competition no longer governs the business world. The common assumption that the rivalry of traders affords a guarantee that the price of commodities will oscillate closely about the necessary cost of production—whatever

may have been its degree of truth in the past—is now, in this country, nowhere to be implicitly relied on. It is nowadays open to doubt whether we ever buy anything at the cost of production. We find that capitalist combination, in one or other form, and at one or other stage of production, transportation and distribution, now loads in varying degrees the price of practically everything that we purchase.

Such a conclusion has momentous implications. The consumer cannot be sure that he is charged no more than is required to defray the necessary costs of production and distribution. The wage earner cannot be convinced that any reduction in the expenses which may be effected by labour-saving machinery or other improvements will be reflected in a fall in price to the consumers. The Government has no assurance that any new tax will not be made a pretext for the levy on the public in enhanced prices of much more than the return to the Exchequer. The primary object of combination or association between businesses in a trade is to raise the level of profits by eliminating competition among the various firms. The larger gains which are admittedly thus obtained are attributable mainly to three sources: (1) The saving of wasteful costs of competition; (2) the reduced expenses of production by better technical and business organisation; (3) the monopolistic fixing of prices at "what the trade will bear." We may observe that this last source of gain, involving usually an actual rise in prices, almost always and of necessity involves a lower aggregate production than would have emerged had the arrangement not been made. It amounts, in fact, to restriction of output.

The importance of the first and second gains suffices to explain why combination is not always followed by an actual increase of selling prices, but sometimes even by a reduction. An effective monopoly may sometimes find it more profitable to abstain from a reduction of prices that it could well afford to make than to raise prices, which would cut down its sales and lessen the economy of large scale production. In general, however, it is found that the formation of a combination or agreement is attended by a "regulation" of output and an actual rise of prices, due to the fact that most of the organisations control articles or services so essential to the community that the elasticity of demand is slight.

These surplus gains, whether due to an actual rise of price or to a failure to reduce price in correspondence with reduced costs, are got at the expense of the whole public of consumers, whose interests the Committee is enjoined to safeguard. We believe that they amount, in the aggregate, to a very large sum annually.

We do not suggest that any action should be taken to prevent or obstruct combination or association of capitalist enterprise. Apart from the experience that no such interference can be made effective, we have to recognise that association and combination in production and distribution are steps in the greater efficiency, the increased economy, and the better organisation of industry. We regard this evolution as both inevitable and desirable. It is, however, plain that the change from competitive rivalry to combination calls for corresponding developments to secure for the community, both safeguards against the evils of monopoly, and at least a large share of the economic benefits of the better organisation of industry which it promotes.

It has not been possible for the Committee, in the time and with the means at its disposal, to work out a programme of what will in the near future be required for these purposes. We think that this task should be the first duty of the suggested Trusts and Combinations Department of the Board of Trade. We may, however, indicate the following directions in which, as it seems to us, remedy might be sought.

#### I.

Profiteering may in some cases be kept in check, without preventing the better organisation to be obtained by combination, by the existence of a rival who cannot be persuaded to enter the combination, and who can be relied upon to serve only the public interest. The Co-operative Movement, which returns to its customers in proportion to their purchases all the surplus that it makes over cost, serves incidentally as a check on profit-making combinations, into none of which will it ever consent to enter. The national factories have been found by the Government extremely valuable in this respect during the war. If they could be continued in peace for the production of certain essential commodities, for the protection of the public of consumers, their value in serving as a check upon capitalist combinations might be considerable.

## II.

In considering the prevalence of capitalist combinations in British industry, it is impossible to leave out of account the check upon "profiteering" which may be afforded by foreign imports. This operates, however, only so long as the foreign producers are not also brought within the combination. Whilst the imposition of import duties would increase the power of combinations to raise prices, "Free Trade" is not, in itself, a complete safeguard against it.

Nor is the objection to the profiteering of capitalist combinations removed by the imposition of a tax which diverts to the Exchequer some or all of what is unnecessarily extracted from the consumer. Such a tax, whilst levied apparently upon profits, may be held to make the Government *particeps criminis* in these overcharges. Such a tax has the further evil that the Government has even an interest in the increase of his gains. It may be better to have an excess profits duty than not to have it, when there are excess profits about, but it would be far more profitable to the community (and, therefore, also to the Exchequer) if there were no excess profits to tax.

## III.

The only effective safeguard against the absorption by a capitalist combination of more than the necessary return appears to be the control of prices. We regard the experience, during the war, of the full and precise "costing" of every part of a commodity as affording valuable suggestions for the future fixing by Government Departments of a maximum price for particular articles which can be standardised. Where, as in the case of gas and electricity, such a prescribed price can be made to vary with the amount of profit taken by the capitalist producers, such a "sliding scale of prices and dividends" appears a useful expedient. It involves, it will be noted, the full application of two principles which may be destined to ever-wider application in business, but to which the business world is at present hostile, namely, publicity and measurement.

## IV.

Where, as is evidently the case in various highly organised capitalist enterprises, competition is being rapidly displaced by combination, largely monopolistic in its structure and powers, and tending to restrict output with a view to raising prices or preventing their fall, we hold that it is contrary to the public interest to allow such enterprises to remain in private hands. In some cases their functions may more advantageously be assumed by the Co-operative Movement. In others their place may be taken by municipal enterprise. Where the enterprise is national in scope, and especially where its product enters into practically universal consumption, we see no alternative to State ownership. But State ownership does not necessarily imply State management. In some cases it may be preferable to lease the enterprise, with prescribed schedules of price and wages, and other necessary conditions, for management either by a local authority, a co-operative society, or a joint stock company. The subject, in our view, urgently needs further study.

(Signed) E. BEVIN. W. H. WATKINS.  
J. A. HOBSON. SIDNEY WEBB.

## APPENDIX II.

The following passages are taken from the Report of the Committee on Trusts or from Mr. Hilton's memorandum, which was appended to the Report.

From a joint memorandum presented to the Committee by "three important associations":—

"In the absence of any association, it is the experience in our various trades that, as the result of unrestricted competition of British manufacturers and of importers, prices are driven down to the lowest possible level, and profits frequently reach a vanishing point."

"The elimination of competition results in a higher level of price and the provision of additional profits, whereby the manufacturers are encouraged and enabled to improve their processes, and, by scrapping old plant, the instalment of new machinery, and the adoption of new methods, to reduce appreciably their costs of manufacture."

Statement by "the Chairman of a number of important associations":—

"In the past it had paid Germany handsomely to export a large part of her steel products at a loss. In the future it will pay this country to do

the same. He had no doubt at all that it would be a sound policy to sell in foreign markets at a loss. It was true that 80 per cent. of their output went abroad, so that it was not any matter of dumping an occasional surplus that the home market could absorb, but a large proportion of their exports went to our own Colonies, and by getting some little preference there and sufficiently good prices at home the industry would be able, as organised in its Conference, to undersell Germany or America in such markets as South America, even if that meant selling at a loss. About 50 per cent. of their output was sold within the Empire and 40 per cent. outside. A slightly increased preferential price on the 60 per cent. would enable them to hold the 40 per cent. against competitors."

From Mr. Hilton's memorandum:—

"Most associations have been formed with the declared or implicit object of raising prices."

"In so far as combinations raise prices they occasion what amounts to a restriction of output."

From the unanimous report of the Committee:—

"We are unable to share the optimism of those representatives of associations who were of opinion that under no circumstances was there any possibility of their operations leading to excessive prices or to the detriment of the public. While fully recognising the honesty with which the great bulk of business in this country is conducted, it is obvious that a system which creates virtual monopolies and controls prices is always in danger of abuse. We are confirmed in this view by a survey of the operations of similar combines and associations in other countries."

### APPENDIX III. SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.

#### 1. GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS:—

- Report of Committee on Trusts. 1919. Cd. 9236. 6d.
- Report of Royal Commission on Shipping Rings. 1909. Cd. 4668. 1s.
- Report of Committee on Bank Amalgamations. 1918. Cd. 9052. 1d.

#### 2. PAMPHLETS, ETC.:—

- The Menace of the Trusts.** By Philip Snowden. (I.L.P.) 2d.
- The Milk Trust and the Community. By R. W. Postgate and A. L. Bacharach. (Labour Research Department Memorandum No. 8.) 3d.
- The War Trust Exposed. By J. T. Walton Newbold. (National Labour Press.) 1d.
- Solidarity Among Shipowners. By J. T. Walton Newbold. (Glasgow Reformers' Bookstall.) 2d.
- Capitalism in the Northern Coalfield. By George Harvey. (Miners' Hall, Pelaw, Newcastle-on-Tyne.) 3d.
- A Scheme of Syndication for the Brass Industry. By Howard F. Smith. (7, Hampton Street, Birmingham.) Free.
- See also Labour Research Department Monthly Circular, section on "Employers."

#### 3. BOOKS:—

- The Movement Towards Industrial Combination.** By G. R. Carter. (Constable.)
- The Evolution of Modern Capitalism. By J. A. Hobson. (Scott.)
- \***Combines and Trade Organisations.** By J. Hilton. (Garton Foundation.) 1s. (Reprinted from the Report of the Committee on Trusts.)
- The Trust Movement in British Industry. By H. W. Macrosty. (Longmans.)
- Industrial Combination. By D. H. MacGregor. (Macmillan.)
- Monopoly and Competition. By H. Levy. (Macmillan.)
- \***The Story of Trusts.** By M. E. Hirst. (Collins.) 2s.

\* Elementary.



# PUBLICATIONS OF THE LABOUR PARTY

---

Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Present Conditions in Ireland (January, 1920).

Price 2d., post free 3½d.

Labour's Russian Policy : Peace with Soviet Russia

Price 2d., post free 3½d. ; 1s. 6d. per dozen, post free.

Trusts and the Public.

Price 2d., post free 3½d. ; 1s. 6d. per dozen, post free.

The Nationalisation of the Coal Industry.

By R. H. TAWNEY, M.A. (Member of the Coal Industry Commission, 1919).  
Price 6d., post free 7d.

Continued Education under the New Education Act.

The Juvenile Worker at the End of the War.

Nursery Schools.

Memoranda prepared by the Advisory Committee on Education. 6d., post free 7d.

The Ministry of Health.

The Organisation of the Preventative and Curative Medical Services and Hospital and Laboratory Systems under a Ministry of Health.

The Position of the General Medical Practitioners in a Re-organised System of Public Health.

Memoranda prepared by the Advisory Committee on Public Health. 6d., post free 7d.

The Labour Woman.

The Labour Woman's Monthly. 1d., post free 2d. ; 2s. per year ; 9d. per 12 ; 8s. per 50 ; 8s. per 100, carriage paid.

Women and the Labour Party.

By various women writers, including Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB, MARGARET LLEWELYN DAVIES, MARY MACARTHUR, MARGARET BONDFIELD, MARGARET McMILLAN, and REBECCA WEST. Edited with an Introduction by Dr MARION PHILLIPS, and a Foreword by the Rt. Hon. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P. 1s. ; post free 1s. 3d. ; 10s. per dozen, post free. (In preparation.)

The Working Woman's House.

By Dr. MARION PHILLIPS and Mrs. SANDERSON FURNISS. (84 pp., illustrated.) 1s. 6d. ; post free 1s. 7½d.

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.



# LABOUR

AND

(12)

# THE NEW SOCIAL ORDER

## A REPORT ON RECONSTRUCTION

(Revised in accordance with the resolutions  
of the Labour Party Conference, June, 1918)

---

PRICE TWO PENCE

---

*[The following Report on the General Policy of the Labour Party on "Reconstruction," prepared by a Sub-Committee of the Executive and submitted by the Executive to the Annual Conference in January, 1918, was specifically referred to the constituent organisations for discussion and submission to the Party Conference in June, 1918, when it was amended and ordered to be issued in its revised form as the programme of the Party.]*

*Further copies of the Report can be obtained at the rate of 1s. 6d. per thirteen.]*

---

THE LABOUR PARTY

33 ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W.1



**National Labour Press Ltd**  
**& 9 Johnson's Court, E. C**  
**also at Manchester**

# LABOUR AND THE NEW SOCIAL ORDER

---

## THE PROGRAMME OF THE LABOUR PARTY ON RECONSTRUCTION.

---

**I**T behoves the Labour Party, in formulating its own programme for Reconstruction after the war, and in criticising the various preparations and plans that are being made by the present Government, to look at the problem as a whole. We have to make clear what it is that we wish to construct. It is important to emphasize the fact that, whatever may be the case with regard to other political parties, our detailed practical proposals proceed from definitely held principles.

### THE END OF A CIVILISATION.

We need to beware of patchwork. The view of the Labour Party is that what has to be reconstructed after the war is not this or that Government Department, or this or that piece of social machinery; but, so far as Britain is concerned, society itself. The individual worker, or for that matter the individual statesman, immersed in daily routine—like the individual soldier in a battle—easily fails to understand the magnitude and far-reaching importance of what is taking place around him. How does it fit together as a whole? How does it look from a distance? Count Okuma, one of the oldest, most experienced and ablest of the statesmen of Japan, watching the present conflict from the other side of the globe, declares it to be nothing less than the death of European civilisation. Just as in the past the civilisations of Babylon, Egypt, Greece, Carthage and the great Roman Empire have been successively destroyed, so, in the judgment of this detached observer, the civilisation of all Europe is even now receiving its death-blow. We of the Labour Party can so far agree in this estimate as to recognise, in the present world catastrophe, if not the death, in Europe, of civilisation itself, at any rate the culmination and collapse of a distinctive industrial civilisation, which the workers will not seek to reconstruct. At such times of crisis it is easier to slip into ruin than to progress into higher forms of organisation. That is the problem as it presents itself to the Labour Party to-day.

What this war is consuming is not merely the security, the homes, the livelihood and the lives of millions of innocent families, and an enormous proportion of all the accumulated wealth of the world, but also the very basis of the peculiar social order in which it has arisen. The individualist system of capitalist production, based on the private ownership and competitive administration of land and capital, which has in the past couple of centuries become the dominant form, with its reckless "profiteering" and wage-slavery; with its glorification of the

unhindered struggle for the means of life and its hypocritical pretence of the "survival of the fittest"; with the monstrous inequality of circumstances which it produces and the degradation and brutalisation, both moral and spiritual, resulting therefrom, may, we hope, indeed have received a death-blow. With it must go the political system and ideas in which it naturally found expression. We of the Labour Party, whether in opposition or in due time called upon to form an Administration, will certainly lend no hand to its revival. On the contrary, we shall do our utmost to see that it is buried with the millions whom it has done to death. If we in Britain are to escape from the decay of civilisation itself, which the Japanese statesman foresees, we must ensure that what is presently to be built up is a new social order, based not on fighting but on fraternity—not on the competitive struggle for the means of bare life, but on a deliberately planned co-operation in production and distribution for the benefit of all who participate by hand or by brain—not on the utmost possible inequality of riches, but on a systematic approach towards a healthy equality of material circumstances for every person born into the world—not on an enforced dominion over subject nations, subject races, subject Colonies, subject classes, or a subject sex, but, in industry as well as in government, on that equal freedom, that general consciousness of consent, and that widest possible participation in power, both economic and political, which is characteristic of a true Democracy. No one to-day can help noticing how very far from efficient the capitalist system has been proved to be, with its stimulus of private profit and its evil shadow of wages driven down by competition often below subsistence level. The Labour Party recognises that it is vital, for any genuine social reconstruction, to increase the nation's aggregate annual production, not of profit or dividend, but of useful commodities and services; that this increased productivity is obviously not to be sought in reducing the means of subsistence of the workers, whether by hand or by brain, nor yet in lengthening their hours of work, for neither "sweating" nor "driving" can be made the basis of lasting prosperity, but in (a) the socialisation of industry so as to secure the elimination of every kind of inefficiency and waste; (b) the application both of more honest determination to produce the very best, and of more science and intelligence to every branch of the nation's work; together with (c) an improvement in social, political, and industrial organisation; and (d) the indispensable marshalling of the nation's resources so that each need is met in the order of, and in proportion to, its real national importance. We do not, of course, pretend that it is possible, even after the drastic clearing away that is now going on, to build society anew in a year or two of feverish "Reconstruction." What the Labour Party intends to satisfy itself about is that each brick that it helps to lay shall go to erect the structure that it intends, and no other.

#### THE PILLARS OF THE HOUSE.

We need not here recapitulate, one by one, the different items in the Labour Party's programme, which successive Party Conferences have adopted. These proposals, some of them in various publications worked out in practical detail, are often carelessly derided as impracticable, even by the politicians who steal them piecemeal from us! The members

of the Labour Party, themselves actually working by hand or by brain, in close contact with the facts, have perhaps at all times a more accurate appreciation of what is practicable, in industry as in politics, than those who depend solely on academic instruction or are biased by great possessions. But to-day no man dares to say that anything is impracticable. The war, which has scared the old Political Parties' right out of their dogmas, has taught every statesman and every Government official, to his enduring surprise, how very much more can be done along the lines that we have laid down than he had ever before thought possible. What we now promulgate as our policy, whether for opposition or for office, is not merely this or that specific reform, but a deliberately thought out, systematic, and comprehensive plan for that immediate social rebuilding which any Ministry, whether or not it desires to grapple with the problem, will be driven to undertake. The Four Pillars of the House that we propose to erect, resting upon the common foundation of the Democratic control of society in all its activities, may be termed, respectively :

- (a) The Universal Enforcement of the National Minimum ;
- (b) The Democratic Control of Industry ;
- (c) The Revolution in National Finance ; and
- (d) The Surplus Wealth for the Common Good.

The various detailed proposals of the Labour Party, herein briefly summarised, rest on these four pillars, and can best be appreciated in connection with them.

### THE UNIVERSAL ENFORCEMENT OF A NATIONAL MINIMUM.

The first principle of the Labour Party—in significant contrast with those of the Capitalist System, whether expressed by the Liberal or by the Conservative Party—is the securing to every member of the community, in good times and bad alike (and not only to the strong and able, the well-born or the fortunate), of all the requisites of healthy life and worthy citizenship. This is in no sense a "class" proposal. Such an amount of social protection of the individual, however poor and lowly, from birth to death, is, as the economist now knows, as indispensable to fruitful co-operation as it is to successful combination ; and it affords the only complete safeguard against that insidious Degradation of the Standard of Life, which is the worst economic and social calamity to which any community can be subjected. We are members one of another. No man liveth to himself alone. If any, even the humblest, is made to suffer, the whole community and every one of us, whether or not we recognise the fact, is thereby injured. Generation after generation this has been the corner-stone of the faith of Labour. It will be the guiding principle of any Labour Government.

### THE LEGISLATIVE REGULATION OF EMPLOYMENT.

Thus it is that the Labour Party to-day stands for the universal application of the Policy of the National Minimum, to which (as embodied in the successive elaborations of the Factory, Mines, Railways, Shops, Merchant Shipping, Trade Boards, and Truck Acts, the Public Health,

Housing, and Education Acts, and the Minimum Wage Acts) the spokesmen of Labour have already gained the support of the enlightened statesmen and economists of the world. All these laws purporting to prevent any Degradation of the Standard of Life need considerable improvement and extension before they can fulfil their purpose of securing to every worker, by hand or by brain, at least the prescribed Minimum of Health, Education, Leisure, and Subsistence, whilst their administration leaves much to be desired. For instance, the Workmen's Compensation Act fails, shamefully, not merely to secure proper provision for all the victims of accident and industrial disease, but what is much more important, does not succeed in preventing their continual increase. The amendment and consolidation of the Factories and Workshops Acts, with their extension to all employed persons and the restriction of the working week to not more than forty-eight hours, is long overdue, and it will be the policy of Labour greatly to strengthen the staff of inspectors, especially by the addition of more men and women of actual experience of the workshop and the mine. The Coal Mines (Minimum Wage) Act must certainly be maintained in force, and suitably amended, so as both to ensure greater uniformity of conditions among the several districts, and to make the District Minimum in all cases an effective reality. The same policy will, in the interests of the agricultural labourers, dictate the perpetuation of the Legal Wage clauses of the Corn Production Act, now enacted only for a term of five years, and the prompt amendment of any defects that may be revealed in their working. And, in view of the fact that many millions of wage-earners, notably women and the less skilled workmen in various occupations, are unable by combination to obtain wages adequate for decent maintenance in health, the Labour Party intends to see to it that the Trade Boards Act is suitably amended and made to apply at once to all industrial employments in which any considerable number of those employed obtain less than 30s. per week. The legal minimum (which will need revision according to the level of prices, and which ought to be the very lowest statutory base line for the least skilled adult workers, men or women, in any occupation, in all parts of the United Kingdom) must be not less than enough to provide all the requirements of a full development of body, mind, and character, from which the nation has no right to exclude any class or section whatsoever.

The Labour Party recognises, moreover, that the changes in the position of women during the war, in which they have rendered such good service, and the importance of securing to women as to men the fullest possible opportunity for individual development, make it necessary to pay special attention in the Reconstruction Programme to matters affecting women; and, in particular, to secure their complete emancipation; to see that they have all franchises and be made eligible for all elective posts, on the same terms as men; to remove all legal restrictions on their entry into the professions; to make systematic provision for their inclusion in all committees and commissions on all matters not of exclusively masculine interest; to adopt the principle of Equal Pay for Equal Work wherever both sexes are employed; to urge trade unions to admit women to membership in all trades in which they have actually secured employment, and to insist, in such cases, that the women shall receive the trade union rates; to obtain full inquiry, as to all occupations previously held to be unhealthy or unsuitable for



women, about the conditions under which the work is done, in order to obtain such improvement of the conditions as will remove the objection or protect the workers from harm; and to demand the immediate repeal of the provision of the income tax law by which the married woman is not treated as an independent human being, even in respect of her own property and earnings.

#### THE ORGANISATION OF DEMOBILISATION.

But the coming industrial dislocation, which will inevitably follow the discharge from war service of half of all the working population, imposes new obligations upon the community. The demobilisation and discharge of the eight million wage-earners now being paid from public funds, either for service with the Colours or in munition work and other war trades, will bring to the whole wage-earning class grave peril of Unemployment, Reduction of Wages, and a lasting Degradation of the Standard of Life, which can be prevented only by deliberate National Organisation. The Labour Party has repeatedly called upon the present Government to formulate its plan, and to make in advance all arrangements necessary for coping with so unparalleled a dislocation. The policy to which the Labour Party commits itself is unhesitating and uncompromising. It is plain that regard should be had, in stopping Government orders, reducing the staff of the National Factories and demobilising the Army, to the actual state of employment in particular industries and in different districts, so as both to release first the kinds of labour most urgently required for the revival of peace production, and to prevent any congestion of the market. It is no less imperative that suitable provision against being turned suddenly adrift without resources should be made, not only for the soldiers, but also for the three million operatives in munition work and other war trades, women as well as men, who will be discharged long before most of the Army can be disbanded. On this latter point, which is the most urgent of all, the present Government has, we believe, down to the present hour, formulated no plan, and come to no decision, and neither the Liberal nor the Conservative Party has apparently deemed the matter worthy of agitation. Any Government which should allow the discharged soldier or munition worker to fall into the clutches of charity or the Poor Law would have to be instantly driven from office by an outburst of popular indignation.

#### THE PROVISION FOR THE SOLDIER.

The Labour Party realises, much more keenly than does any of the other political parties, that, as soon as peace is assured, the position of the soldier or sailor will be one of great peril; that whilst his services to the nation will be effusively praised, and promises will be made for a generous provision for his needs, there is only too much reason to fear that, unless a strong and continuous effort is made, both in Parliament and in the localities, administrative parsimony and red-tape will deprive many thousands of what is justly due to them. The Labour Party accordingly holds that it is imperative that the provision to be made on demobilisation should immediately be worked out in detail and also published for general information, so that omissions may be detected, mistakes rectified, and everyone made acquainted with the steps to be taken.

The Party, moreover, noting the month's furlough, gratuity, free railway ticket, and a year's unemployment benefit if out of work already promised to the soldier, urges that (a) there should be no gap between the cessation of his pay and separation allowance and the beginning of his unemployment benefit, and (b) that this special ex-soldier's unemployment benefit given to all should be additional to any unemployment benefit under the National Insurance Act, to which many men are already entitled in respect of contributions deducted from their wages; (c) that the amount of the employment benefit should not be the present starvation pittance of 7s. per week, but at least approaching to the combined separation and rations allowances; and (d) that, in view of the change in the value of money, the gratuity (which should be made payable through the Post Office Savings Bank) ought to be, for the private, not less than £20.

#### SECURING EMPLOYMENT FOR ALL.

The Labour Party insists—as no other political party has thought fit to do—that what the soldiers and sailors will most seriously look to, is not the sum of money doled out to them, but the provision made for ensuring such of them as are not wholly disabled situations appropriate to their capacities and desires, and that the obligation to find suitable employment in productive work for all these men and women rests upon the Government for the time being. The work of re-settling the disbanded soldiers and discharged munition workers into new situations is a national obligation; and the Labour Party emphatically protests against it being regarded as a matter for private charity. It strongly objects to this public duty being handed over either to committees of philanthropists or benevolent societies, or to any of the military or recruiting authorities. The policy of the Labour Party in this matter is to make the utmost use of the Trade Unions, and equally, for the brainworkers, of the various Professional Associations. In view of the fact that, in any trade, the best organisation for placing men in situations is a national Trade Union having local Branches throughout the kingdom, every soldier and every munition worker should be allowed, if he chooses, to have a duplicate of his industrial discharge notice sent, one month before the date fixed for his discharge, to the Secretary of the Trade Union to which he belongs or wishes to belong. Apart from this use of the Trade Union (and a corresponding use of the Professional Association) the Government must, of course, avail itself of some such public machinery as that of the Employment Exchanges; but before the existing Exchanges (which will need to be greatly extended) can receive the co-operation and support of the organised Labour Movement, without which their operations can never be fully successful, it is imperative that they should be drastically reformed, on the lines laid down in the Demobilisation Report of the "Labour After the War" Joint Committee; and, in particular, that each Exchange should be placed effectively under the supervision and control of a Joint Committee of Employers and Trade Unionists in equal numbers.

The responsibility of the Government for the time being, in the grave industrial crisis that demobilisation will produce, goes, however, far beyond the eight million men and women whom the various Departments

will suddenly discharge from their own service. The effect of this peremptory discharge on all the other workers has also to be taken into account. To the Labour Party it will seem the supreme concern of the Government of the day to see to it that there shall be, as a result of the gigantic "General Post" which it will itself have deliberately set going, nowhere any Degradation of the Standard of Life. The Government has pledged itself to restore the Trade Union conditions and "pre-war practices" of the workshop, which the Trade Unions patriotically gave up at the direct request of the Government itself, and to secure this restoration by effective statutory provisions; and this solemn pledge must be fulfilled, of course, in the spirit as well as in the letter. If it is considered that some of the rules, conditions, and customs are, in the industrial reorganisation that is contemplated, inconsistent with the highest development of production, or, injurious to other sections of workers, it is for the Government, as responsible for the fulfilment of the pledge, to submit for discussion to the trade unions concerned alternative proposals for securing the standard wage and normal day, protecting the workers from unemployment, and maintaining the position and dignity of the crafts. The Labour Party, moreover, holds it to be the duty of the Government of the day to take all necessary steps to prevent the Standard Rates of Wages, in any trade or occupation whatsoever, from suffering any reduction, relatively to the contemporary cost of living. Unfortunately, the present Government, like the Liberal and Conservative Parties, so far refuses to speak on this important matter with any clear voice. We claim that it should be a cardinal point of Government policy to make it plain to every capitalist employer that any attempt to reduce the customary rates of wages when peace comes, for women no less than for men, or to take advantage of the dislocation of demobilisation to worsen the conditions of employment in any grade whatsoever, will certainly lead to embittered industrial strife, which will be in the highest degree detrimental to the national interests; and that the Government of the day must not hesitate to take all necessary steps to avert such a calamity. In the great impending crisis the Government of the day should not only, as the greatest employer of both brainworkers and manual workers, set a good example in this respect, but should also actively seek to influence private employers by proclaiming in advance that it will not itself attempt to lower the Standard Rates of conditions in public employment; by announcing that it will insist on the most rigorous observance of the Fair Wages Clause in all public contracts, and by explicitly recommending every Local Authority to adopt the same policy.

But nothing is more dangerous to the Standard of Life, or so destructive of those minimum conditions of healthy existence, which must in the interests of the community be assured to every worker, than any widespread or continued unemployment. It has always been a fundamental principle of the Labour Party (a point on which, singularly enough, it has not been followed by either of the other political parties) that, in a modern industrial community, it is one of the foremost obligations of the Government to find, for every willing worker, whether by hand or by brain, productive work at Standard Rates.

It is accordingly the duty of the Government to adopt a policy of deliberately and systematically preventing the occurrence of unemployment, instead of (as heretofore) letting unemployment occur, and then

seeking, vainly and expensively, to relieve the unemployed. It is now known that the Government can, if it chooses, arrange the public works and the orders of National Departments and Local Authorities in such a way as to maintain the aggregate demand for labour in the whole kingdom (including that of capitalist employers) approximately at a uniform level from year to year; and it is therefore a primary obligation of the Government to prevent any considerable or widespread fluctuations in the total numbers employed in times of good or bad trade. But this is not all. In order to prepare for the possibility of there being any unemployment, either in the course of demobilisation or in the first years of peace, it is essential that the Government should make all necessary preparations for putting instantly in hand, directly or through the Local Authorities, such urgently needed public works as (a) the rehousing of the population alike in rural districts, mining villages, and town slums, to the extent, possibly, of a million new cottages and an outlay of 300 millions sterling; (b) the immediate making-good of the shortage of schools, training colleges, technical colleges, &c., and the engagement of the necessary additional teaching, clerical, and administrative staffs; (c) new roads; (d) light railways; (e) the unification and reorganisation of the railway and canal system; (f) afforestation; (g) the reclamation of land; (h) the development and better equipment of our ports and harbours; (i) the opening up of access to land by co-operative small holdings and in other practicable ways. Moreover, in order to relieve any pressure of an overstocked labour market, the opportunity should be taken, if unemployment should threaten to become widespread, (a) immediately to raise the school-leaving age to sixteen; (b) greatly to increase the number of scholarships and bursaries for Secondary and Higher Education; and (c) substantially to shorten the hours of labour of all young persons, even to a greater extent than the seven or eight hours per week contemplated in the new Education Act, in order to enable them to attend technical and other classes in the daytime. Finally, wherever practicable, the hours of adult labour should be reduced to not more than forty-eight per week, without reduction of the Standard Rates of Wages. There can be no economic or other justification for keeping any man or woman to work for long hours, or at overtime, whilst others are unemployed.

#### SOCIAL INSURANCE AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT.

In so far as the Government fails to prevent Unemployment—when- ever it finds it impossible to discover for any willing worker, man or woman, a suitable situation at the Standard Rate—the Labour Party holds that the Government must, in the interest of the community as a whole, provide him or her with adequate maintenance, either with such arrangements for honourable employment or with such useful training as may be found practicable, according to age, health and previous occupation. In many ways the best form of provision for those who must be unemployed, because the industrial organisation of the community so far breaks down as to be temporarily unable to set them to work, is the Out of Work Benefit afforded by a well-administered Trade Union. This is a special tax on the Trade Unionists themselves which they have voluntarily undertaken, but towards which they have a right to claim a public subvention—a subvention which was actually granted

by Parliament (though only to the extent of a couple of shillings or so per week) under Part II. of the Insurance Act. The arbitrary withdrawal by the Government in 1915 of this statutory right of the Trade Unions was one of the least excusable of the war economies; and the Labour Party must insist on the resumption of this subvention immediately the war ceases, and on its increase to at least half the amount spent in Out of Work Benefit. The extension of State Unemployment Insurance to other occupations, especially in the case of badly paid women workers and the less skilled men, whom it is difficult to organise in Trade Unions, should be at once undertaken. But the weekly rate of the State Unemployment Benefit needs, in these days of high prices, to be considerably raised; whilst no industry ought to be compulsorily brought within its scope against the declared will of the workers concerned, and especially of their Trade Unions. In one way or another remunerative employment or honourable maintenance must be found for every willing worker, by hand or by brain, in bad times as well as in good. It is clear that, in the twentieth century, there must be no question of driving the Unemployed to anything so obsolete and discredited as either private charity, with its haphazard and ill-considered doles, or the Poor Law, with the utilities and barbarities of its "Stone Yard," or its "Able-bodied Test Workhouse." Only on the basis of a universal application of the Policy of the National Minimum, affording complete security against involuntary destitution, in sickness and health, in good times and bad alike, to every member of the community, can any worthy order be built up.

#### • THE DEMOCRATIC CONTROL OF INDUSTRY.

The universal application of the Policy of the National Minimum is, of course, only the first of the Pillars of the House that the Labour Party intends to see built. What marks off this Party most distinctively from any of the other political parties is its demand for the full and genuine adoption of the principle of Democracy. The first condition of Democracy is effective personal freedom. This has suffered so many encroachments during the war that it is necessary to state with clearness that the complete removal of all the war-time restrictions on freedom of speech, freedom of publication, freedom of the press, freedom of travel and freedom of choice of place of residence and kind of employment must take place the day after Peace is declared. The Labour Party declares emphatically against any continuance of the Military Service Acts a moment longer than the imperative requirements of the war excuse. But individual freedom is of little use without complete political rights. The Labour Party sees its repeated demands largely conceded in the present Representation of the People Act, but not yet wholly satisfied. The Labour Party especially protests against the defects of that Act, which failed to give votes to women under 30 years of age, denied them the right to sit in Parliament, maintained for unmarried women the requirement of legal occupancy and for men an unnecessarily long period of residence as a qualification, excluded some citizens on the ground of their opinions, and omitted any provision which would have prevented the scandal of large sections of the voters remaining unrepresented, whilst Members are returned to Parliament by a minority of the voting constituency. The Party stands, as hereto-

fore, for complete Adult Suffrage; with not more than a three months' residential qualification, for effective provision for absent electors to vote, for absolutely equal rights for both sexes, for the same freedom to exercise civic rights for the soldier and sailor as for the man in civil employment and the same liberty to become a candidate for Parliament for the Civil Servant as for the officer, for the best practicable arrangements for ensuring that every minority has its proportionate, and no more than its proportionate, representation, for Shorter Parliaments, for the complete Abolition of the House of Lords, and for a most strenuous opposition to any machinery for revision of legislation taking the form of a new Second Chamber, whether elected or not, having in it any element of Heredity or Privilege, or of the control of the House of Commons by any Party or Class. The Labour Party unhesitatingly recognises the claim of the people of Ireland to Home Rule, and to self-determination in all exclusively Irish affairs; it protests against the stubborn resistance to a democratic reorganisation of Irish Government maintained by those who, alike in Ireland and Great Britain, are striving to keep minorities dominant; and it demands that a wide and generous measure of Home Rule should be immediately made law and put in operation. Moreover, there must be Devolution in Great Britain. The Labour Party regards as extremely grave the proved incapacity of the War Cabinet and the House of Commons to get through even the most urgently needed work; some early devolution from Westminster of both legislation and administration is required; it suggests that, along with the grant of Home Rule to Ireland, there should be constituted separate statutory legislative assemblies for Scotland, Wales, and even England, with autonomous administration in matters of local concern; and that the Parliament at Westminster should be retained in the form of a Federal Assembly for the United Kingdom, controlling the Ministers responsible for the Departments of the Central Government, who would form also, together with Ministers representing the Dominions and India, whenever these can be brought in, the Cabinet for Commonwealth affairs for the Britannic Commonwealth as a whole. But unlike the Conservative and Liberal Parties, the Labour Party insists on Democracy in industry as well as in government. It demands the progressive elimination from the control of industry of the private capitalist, individual or joint-stock; and the setting free of all who work, whether by hand or by brain, for the service of the community, and of the community only. And the Labour Party refuses absolutely to believe that the British people will permanently tolerate any reconstruction or perpetuation of the disorganisation, waste and inefficiency involved in the abandonment of British industry to a jostling crowd of separate private employers, with their minds bent, not on the service of the community, but—by the very law of their being—only on the utmost possible profiteering. What the nation needs is undoubtedly a great bound onward in its aggregate productivity. But this cannot be secured merely by pressing the manual workers to more strenuous toil, or even by encouraging the "Captains of Industry" to a less wasteful organisation of their several enterprises on a profit-making basis. What the Labour Party looks to is a genuinely scientific reorganisation of the nation's industry, no longer deflected by individual profiteering, on the basis of the Common Ownership of the Means of Production; the equitable sharing of the proceeds among all

who participate in any capacity and only among these, and the adoption, in particular services and occupations, of those systems and methods of administration and control that may be found, in practice, best to promote, not profiteering, but the public interest.

#### IMMEDIATE NATIONALISATION.

The Labour Party stands not merely for the principle of the Common Ownership of the nation's land, to be applied as suitable opportunities occur, but also, specifically, for the immediate Nationalisation of Railways, Mines and the production of Electrical Power. We hold that the very foundation of any successful reorganisation of British Industry must necessarily be found in the provision of the utmost facilities for transport and communication, the production of power at the cheapest possible rate and the most economical supply of both electrical energy and coal to every corner of the kingdom. Hence the Labour Party stands, unhesitatingly, for the National Ownership and Administration of the Railways and Canals, and their union, along with Harbours and Roads, and the Posts and Telegraphs—not to say also the great lines of steamers which could at once be owned, if not immediately directly managed in detail, by the Government—in a united national service of Communication and Transport; to be worked, unhampered by capitalist, private or purely local interests (and with a steadily increasing participation of the organised workers in the management, both central and local), exclusively for the common good. If any Government should be so misguided as to propose, when peace comes, to hand the railways back to the shareholders; or should show itself so spendthrift of the nation's property as to give these shareholders any enlarged franchise by presenting them with the economies of unification or the profits of increased railway rates; or so extravagant as to bestow public funds on the re-equipment of privately-owned lines—all of which things are now being privately intrigued for by the railway interests—the Labour Party will offer any such project the most strenuous opposition. The railways and canals, like the roads, must henceforth belong to the public, and to the public alone.

In the production of Electricity, for cheap Power, Light, and Heating, this country has so far failed, because of hampering private interests, to take advantage of science. Even in the largest cities we still "peddle" our Electricity on a contemptibly small scale. What is called for, immediately after the war, is the erection of a score of gigantic "super-power stations," which could generate, at incredibly cheap rates, enough Electricity for the use of every industrial establishment and every private household in Great Britain; the present municipal and joint-stock electrical plants being universally linked up and used for local distribution. This is inevitably the future of Electricity. It is plain that so great and so powerful an enterprise, affecting every industrial enterprise and, eventually, every household, must not be allowed to pass into the hands of private capitalists. They are already pressing the Government for the concession, and neither the Liberal nor the Conservative Party has yet made up its mind to a refusal of such a new endowment of profiteering in what will presently be the life-blood of modern productive industry. The Labour Party demands that the production of Electricity on the necessary gigantic scale shall be made,

from the start (with suitable arrangements for municipal co-operation in local distribution) a national enterprise, to be worked exclusively with the object of supplying the whole kingdom with the cheapest possible Power, Light, and Heat.

But with Railways and the generation of Electricity in the hands of the public, it would be criminal folly to leave to the present 1,500 colliery companies the power of "holding up" the coal supply. These are now all working under public control, on terms that virtually afford to their shareholders a statutory guarantee of their swollen incomes. The Labour Party demands the immediate Nationalisation of Mines, the extraction of coal and iron being worked as a public service (with a steadily increasing participation in the management, both central and local, of the various grades of persons employed); and the whole business of the retail distribution of household coal being undertaken, as a local public service, by the elected Municipal or County Councils. And there is no reason why coal should fluctuate in price any more than railway fares, or why the consumer should be made to pay more in winter than in summer, or in one town than another. What the Labour Party would aim at is, for household coal of standard quality, a fixed and uniform price for the whole kingdom, payable by rich and poor alike, as unalterable as the penny postage-stamp.

But the sphere of immediate Nationalisation is not restricted to these great industries. We shall never succeed in putting the gigantic system of Health Insurance on a proper footing, or secure a clear field for the beneficent work of the Friendly Societies, or gain a free hand for the necessary development of the urgently called for Ministry of Health and the Local Public Health Service, until the nation expropriates the profit-making Industrial Insurance Companies, which now so tyrannously exploit the people with their wasteful house-to-house Industrial Life Assurance. Only by such an expropriation of Life Assurance Companies can we secure the universal provision, free from the burdensome toll of weekly pence, of the indispensable Funeral Benefit. Nor is it in any sense a "class" measure. Only by the assumption by a State Department of the whole business of Life Assurance can the millions of policy-holders of all classes be completely protected against the possibly calamitous results of the depreciation of securities and suspension of bonuses which the war is causing. Only by this means can the great staff of insurance agents find their proper place as Civil Servants, with equitable conditions of employment, compensation for any disturbance and security of tenure, in a nationally organised public service for the discharge of the steadily increasing functions of the Government in Vital Statistics and Social Insurance.

In quite another sphere the Labour Party sees the key to Temperance Reform in taking the entire manufacture and retailing of alcoholic drink out of the hands of those who find profit in promoting the utmost possible consumption. This is essentially a case in which the people, as a whole, must assert its right to full and unfettered power for dealing with the licensing question in accordance with local opinion. For this purpose, in conjunction with any expropriation of private interests, localities should have conferred upon them facilities, at their own option.

- (a) To prohibit the sale of alcoholic drink within their own boundaries;



- (b) To reduce the number of places of sale and regulate the conditions of sale; and
- (c) To determine, within the fundamental conditions prescribed by statute, the manner in which the public places of refreshment and social intercourse in their own districts shall be organised and controlled.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

The Labour Party is alive to the evils of centralisation and the drawbacks of bureaucracy. To counteract these disadvantages it intends that the fullest possible scope shall be given, in all branches of social reconstruction, to the democratically elected local governing bodies. It holds that whilst the central Government Departments should assist with information and grants in aid, the local authorities should be given a free hand to develop their own services, over and above the prescribed national minimum, in whatever way they choose; that they should be empowered to obtain capital from the Government at cost price, and to acquire land cheaply and expeditiously, for any of the functions with which they are entrusted. The Labour Party holds, moreover, that the municipalities and County Councils should not confine themselves to the necessarily costly services of education, sanitation, and police, and the functions to be taken over from the Boards of Guardians, nor yet rest content with acquiring control of the local water, gas, electricity, and tramways, but that they should greatly extend their enterprises in housing and town planning, parks, and public libraries, the provision of music and the organisation of popular recreation, and also that they should be empowered to undertake, not only the retailing of coal, but also other services of common utility, particularly the local supply of milk, where this is not already fully and satisfactorily organised by a co-operative society. Further, that in view of the great and growing importance of local government, the Labour Party thinks it high time that the Councillors should again be required to submit themselves for election, and that a system of Proportional Representation should be adopted; that, on the first election, at any rate, the whole of each Council should vacate their seats, and that, in order to throw the position open to all persons, rich or poor, all Councillors should be provided with payment for any necessary travelling expenses, and for the time spent on the public service.

By far the most important function of the Local Authorities is the administration of Education. The first step to social reconstruction must be a genuine nationalisation of education, which shall get rid of all class distinctions and privileges, and bring effectively within the reach, not only of every boy and girl, but also of every adult citizen, all the training, physical, mental and moral, literary, technical, and artistic of which he is capable.

The Labour Party cannot be satisfied with a system which condemns the great bulk of the children to merely the elements of schooling with accommodation and equipment inferior to that of the secondary schools, in classes too large for efficient instruction, under teachers of whom at least one-third are insufficiently trained; which denies to the great majority of the teachers in the kingdom, whether in elementary or

in secondary schools (and notably to most of the women), alike any opportunity for all-round culture as well as for training in their art, an adequate wage, reasonable prospects of advancement, and suitable superannuation allowances; and which, notwithstanding what is yet done by way of scholarships for exceptional talent, still reserves the endowed secondary schools, and even more the Universities, for the most part, to the sons and daughters of a small privileged class, whilst contemplating nothing better than eight or ten weeks a year continuation schooling up to 18 for 90 per cent. of the youth of the nation.

The Labour Party accordingly asks for a systematic reorganisation of the whole educational system, from the nursery school to the University, on the basis of (a) social equality, (b) the provision for each age, for child, youth, and adult, of the best and most varied education of which it is capable, with whatever provision by way of maintenance is needed to enable the students to obtain full advantage of the instruction provided; (c) the educational institutions, irrespective of social class or wealth, to be planned, equipped, and staffed according to their several functions, up to the same high level for elementary, secondary, or University teaching, with regard solely to the greatest possible educational efficiency, but without any military training; and (d) the recognition of the teaching profession, without distinction of grade, as one of the most valuable to the community.

But, considering that the shortage of habitable cottages in the United Kingdom now exceeds one million, and that the Rent and Mortgages Restriction Act is due to expire six months after peace, the Labour Party cannot but regard a national campaign of cottage building at the public expense, in town and country alike, as the most urgent of the duties of the Local Authorities.

It warns the Government that, unless steps are taken to insist that the Local Authorities acquire the necessary sites, prepare schemes, plans, and specifications, and obtain all required sanctions, actually before the war ends there is very little chance of the half a million new cottages urgently needed in England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales during the very first year of demobilisation being ready for occupation within that time. Moreover, it is essential that the "Million Cottages of the Great Peace," to be erected during the first two or three years after the war ends by the Local Authorities, with capital supplied free of interest by the National Government, or a grant-in-aid in one or other form at least sufficient to prevent the schemes involving any charge on the rates, should be worthy to serve as models to other builders; and must accordingly be, not only designed with some regard to appearance, not identical throughout the land, but adapted to local circumstances, and soundly constructed, spacious, and healthy; including four or five rooms, larder, scullery, cupboards, and fitted bath; but also suitably grouped not more than ten or twelve to the acre; and provided with sufficient garden ground.

Only on the basis of decent housing of the whole population can any real reform of Public Health be effective. The Labour Party regards the immediate reorganisation, in town and country alike, of the public provision for the prevention and treatment of disease, and the care of the orphans, the infirm, the incapacitated, and the aged needing institu-

tional care, as an indispensable part of any sound social reconstruction; it calls for the prompt carrying out of the Government's declared intention of abolishing, not merely the Boards of Guardians, but also the hated Workhouse and the Poor Law itself, and the merging of the work heretofore done for the destitute as paupers, in that performed by the directly elected County, Borough, and District Councils for the citizens as such, without either the stigma of pauperism or the hampering limitations of the Poor Law system; it feels that only in connection with such a reorganisation of the Local Health Services—urgently required to meet the dangers attendant on demobilisation—can a Ministry of Health be of effective advantage to the nation.

### AGRICULTURE AND RURAL LIFE.

In no part of the present social order has there been a greater failure than in agriculture and rural life. The Labour Party regards the present arrangements for the production and distribution of food in this country, and the life to which many thousands of country dwellers are condemned, as nothing short of a national disgrace, and as needing to be radically altered without delay. What is essential is that the Government should resume control of the nation's agricultural land, and ensure its utilisation not for rent, not for game, not for the social amenity of a small social class, not even for obtaining the largest percentage on the capital employed, but solely with a view to the production of the largest possible proportion of the foodstuffs required by the population of these islands under conditions allowing of a good life to the rural population, with complete security for the farmer's enterprise, yet not requiring the consumer to pay a price exceeding that for which foodstuffs can be brought from other lands. To the Labour Party it seems that this end can probably best be attained by a combination of (a) national farms, administered on a large scale, with the utmost use of machinery; (b) small holdings made accessible to practical agriculturists; (c) municipal enterprises in agriculture, in conjunction with municipal institutions of various kinds, milk depots, sewage works, etc.; (d) farms let to co-operative societies and other tenants, under covenants requiring the kind of cultivation desired, with universal protection, by insurance, against the losses due to bad seasons. Under all systems the agricultural labourer must be secured a healthy and commodious cottage, with sufficient garden ground, the opportunity of getting an accessible allotment, and, when he so desires, a small holding, together with a wage continuously adequate for the full development of body, mind, and character.

But the greatest financial loss now occurs in the distribution of the product. The Labour Party suggests that the distribution of foodstuffs in the towns—from milk and meat to bread and vegetables—should, with equitable compensation for all interests expropriated and persons displaced, be taken out of the hands of the present multiplicity of dealers and shopkeepers, and organised by consumers' co-operative societies and the local authorities working in conjunction, solely with an eye to the common good.

### CONTROL OF CAPITALIST INDUSTRY.

Meanwhile, however, we ought not to throw away the valuable experience now gained by the Government in its assumption of the importation of wheat, wool, metals, and other commodities, and in its control of the shipping, woollen, leather, clothing, boot and shoe, milling, baking, butchering, and other industries. The Labour Party holds that, whatever may have been the shortcomings of this Government importation and control, it has demonstrably prevented a lot of "profiteering." Nor can it end immediately on the Declaration of Peace. The people will be extremely foolish if they ever allow their indispensable industries to slip back into the unfettered control of private capitalists, who are, actually at the instance of the Government itself, now rapidly combining, trade by trade, into monopolist Trusts, which may presently become as ruthless in their extortion as the worst American examples. Standing as it does for the Democratic Control of Industry, the Labour Party would think twice before it sanctioned any abandonment of the present profitable centralisation of purchase of raw material; of the present carefully organised "rationing," by joint committees of the trades concerned, of the several establishments with the materials they require; of the present elaborate system of "costing" and public audit of manufacturers' accounts, so as to stop the waste heretofore caused by the mechanical inefficiency of the more backward firms; of the present salutary publicity of manufacturing processes and expenses thereby ensured; and, on the information thus obtained (in order never again to revert to the old-time profiteering) of the present rigid fixing, for standardised products, of maximum prices at the factory, at the warehouse of the wholesale trader, and in the retail shop. This question of the retail prices of household commodities is emphatically the most practical of all political issues to the woman elector. The male politicians have too long neglected the grievances of the small household, which is the prey of every profiteering combination; and neither the Liberal nor the Conservative Party promises, in this respect, any amendment. This, too, is in no sense a "class" measure. It is, so the Labour Party holds, just as much the function of Government, and just as necessary a part of the Democratic Regulation of Industry, to safeguard the interests of the community as a whole, and those of all grades and sections of private consumers, in the matter of prices, as it is, by the Factory and Trade Boards Acts, to protect the rights of the wage-earning producers in the matter of wages, hours of labour, and sanitation, or, by the organised police force, the householder from the burglar.

### A REVOLUTION IN NATIONAL FINANCE.

In taxation, also, the interests of the professional and housekeeping classes are at one with those of the manual workers. Too long has our National Finance been regulated, contrary to the teaching of Political Economy, according to the wishes of the possessing classes and the profits of the financiers. The colossal expenditure involved in the present war (of which, against the protest of the Labour Party, only a quarter has been raised by taxation, whilst three-quarters have been borrowed at onerous rates of interest, to be a burden on the nation's future) brings things to a crisis. When peace comes, capital will be

needed for all sorts of social enterprises, and the resources of Government will necessarily have to be vastly greater than they were before the war. Meanwhile innumerable new private fortunes are being heaped up by those who have taken advantage of the nation's needs; and the one-tenth of the population which owns nine-tenths of the riches of the United Kingdom, far from being made poorer, will find itself, in the aggregate, as a result of the war, drawing in rent and interest and dividends a larger nominal income than ever before. Such a position demands a revolution in national finance. How are we to discharge a public debt that may well reach the almost incredible figure of 7,000 million pounds sterling, and at the same time raise an annual revenue which, for local as well as central government, must probably reach 1,000 millions a year? It is over this problem of taxation that the various political parties will be found to be most sharply divided.

The Labour Party stands for such a system of taxation as will yield all the necessary revenue to the Government without encroaching on the prescribed National Minimum Standard of Life of any family whatsoever; without hampering production or discouraging any useful personal effort, and with the nearest possible approximation to equality of sacrifice. We definitely repudiate all proposals for a Protective Tariff, in whatever specious guise they may be cloaked, as a device for burdening the consumer with unnecessarily enhanced prices, to the profit of the capitalist employer or landed proprietor, who avowedly expects his profit or rent to be increased thereby. We shall strenuously oppose any taxation, of whatever kind, which would increase the price of food or of any other necessary of life. We hold that indirect taxation on commodities, whether by Customs or Excise, should be strictly limited to luxuries; and concentrated principally on those of which it is socially desirable that the consumption should be actually discouraged. We are at one with the manufacturer, the farmer, and the trader in objecting to taxes interfering with production or commerce, or hampering transport and communications. In all these matters—once more in contrast with the other political parties, and by no means in the interests of the wage-earners alone—the Labour Party demands that the very definite teachings of economic science should no longer be disregarded.

For the raising of the greater part of the revenue now required the Labour Party looks to the direct taxation of the incomes above the necessary cost of family maintenance; and for the requisite effort to pay off the National Debt, to the direct taxation of private fortunes both during life and at death. The Income Tax and Super-tax ought at once to be thoroughly reformed in assessment and collection, in abatements and allowances and in graduation and differentiation, so as to levy the required total sum in such a way as to make the real sacrifice of all the taxpayers as nearly as possible equal. This would involve assessment by families instead of by individual persons, so that the burden is alleviated in proportion to the number of persons to be maintained. It would involve the raising of the present unduly low minimum income assessable to the tax, and the lightening of the present unfair burden on the great mass of professional and small trading classes by a new scale of graduation, rising from a penny in the pound on the smallest assessable income up to sixteen or even nineteen shillings in the pound on the highest income of the millionaires. It would involve bringing into assessment the numerous windfalls of profit that now

escape, and a further differentiation between essentially different kinds of income. The Excess Profits Tax might well be retained in an appropriate form; whilst so long as Mining Royalties exist the Mineral Rights Duty ought to be increased. The steadily rising Unearned Increment of urban and mineral land ought, by an appropriate direct Taxation of Land Values, to be wholly brought into the Public Exchequer. At the same time, for the service and redemption of the National Debt, the Death Duties ought to be regraduated, much more strictly collected, and greatly increased. In this matter we need, in fact, completely to reverse our point of view, and to rearrange the whole taxation of inheritance from the standpoint of asking what is the maximum amount that any rich man should be permitted at death to divert, by his will, from the National Exchequer, which should normally be the heir to all private riches in excess of a quite moderate amount by way of family provision. But all this will not suffice. It will be imperative at the earliest possible moment to free the nation from at any rate the greater part of its new load of interest-bearing debt for loans which ought to have been levied, as taxation; and the Labour Party stands for what is called the "Conscription of Wealth"—that is to say, for a special Capital Levy to pay off, if not the whole, a very substantial part of the entire National Debt—a Capital Levy chargeable like the Death Duties on all property, but (in order to secure approximate equality of sacrifice) with exemption of the smallest savings (say, up to £1,000), and for the rest at rates very steeply graduated, so as to take only a small contribution from the little people and a very much larger percentage from the millionaires.

Over this issue of how the financial burden of the war is to be borne, and how the necessary revenue is to be raised, the greatest political battles will be fought. In this matter the Labour Party claims the support of four-fifths of the whole nation, for the interests of the clerk, the teacher, the doctor, the minister of religion, the average retail shop-keeper and trader, and all the mass of those living on small incomes are identical with those of the artisan. The landlords, the financial magnates, the possessors of great fortunes will not, as a class, willingly forgo the relative immunity that they have hitherto enjoyed. The present unfair subjection of the Co-operative Society to an Excess Profits Tax on the "profits" which it has never made—specially dangerous as "the thin end of the wedge" of penal taxation of this laudable form of Democratic enterprise—will not be abandoned without a struggle. Every possible effort will be made to juggle with the taxes, so as to place upon the shoulders of the mass of labouring folk and upon the struggling households of the professional men and small traders (as was done after every previous war)—whether by Customs or Excise Duties, by industrial monopolies, by unnecessarily high rates of postage and railway fares, or by a thousand and one other ingenious devices—an unfair share of the national burden. Against these efforts the Labour Party will take the firmest stand.

### THE SURPLUS FOR THE COMMON GOOD.

In the disposal of the surplus above the Standard of Life society has hitherto gone as far wrong as in its neglect to secure the necessary basis of any genuine industrial efficiency or decent social order. We

have allowed the riches of our mines, the rental value of the lands superior to the margin of cultivation, the extra profits of the fortunate capitalists, even the material outcome of scientific discoveries—which ought by now to have made this Britain of ours immune from class poverty or from any widespread destitution—to be absorbed by individual proprietors; and then devoted very largely to the senseless luxury of an idle rich class. Against this misappropriation of the wealth of the community, the Labour Party—speaking in the interests not of the wage-earners alone, but of every grade and section of producers by hand or by brain, not to mention also those of the generations that are to succeed us, and of the permanent welfare of the community—emphatically protests. One main Pillar of the House that the Labour Party intends to build is the future appropriation of the Surplus, not to the enlargement of any individual fortune, but to the Common Good. It is from this constantly arising Surplus (to be secured, on the one hand, by Nationalisation and Municipalisation and, on the other, by the steeply graduated Taxation of Private Income and Riches) that will have to be found the new capital which the community day by day needs for the perpetual improvement and increase of its various enterprises, for which we shall decline to be dependent on the usury-exacting financiers. It is from the same source that has to be defrayed the public provision for the Sick and Infirm of all kinds (including that for Maternity and Infancy) which is still so scandalously insufficient; for the Aged and those prematurely incapacitated by accident or disease, now in many ways so imperfectly cared for; for the education alike of children, of adolescents and of adults, in which the Labour Party demands a genuine equality of opportunity, overcoming all differences of material circumstances; and for the organisation of public improvements of all kinds, including the brightening of the lives of those now condemned to almost ceaseless toil, and a great development of the means of recreation. From the same source must come the greatly increased public provision that the Labour Party will insist on being made for scientific investigation and original research, in every branch of knowledge, not to say also for the promotion of music, literature and fine art, which have been under Capitalism so greatly neglected, and upon which, so the Labour Party holds, any real development of civilisation fundamentally depends. Society, like the individual, does not live by bread alone—does not exist only for perpetual wealth production. It is in the proposal for this appropriation of every Surplus for the Common Good—in the vision of its resolute use for the building up of the community as a whole instead of for the magnification of individual fortunes—that the Labour Party, as the Party of the Producers by hand or by brain, most distinctively marks itself off from the older political parties, standing, as these do, essentially for the maintenance, unimpaired, of the perpetual private mortgage upon the annual product of the nation that is involved in the individual ownership of land and capital.

### THE STREET OF TO-MORROW.

The House which the Labour Party intends to build, the four Pillars of which have now been described, does not stand alone in the world. Where will it be in the Street of To-morrow? If we repudiate, on the one hand, the Imperialism that seeks to dominate other races, or to impose our own will on other parts of the British Empire, so we disclaim

equally any conception of a selfish and insular "non-interventionism," unregarding of our special obligations to our fellow-citizens overseas; of the corporate duties of one nation to another; of the moral claims upon us of the non-adult races, and of our own indebtedness to the world of which we are part. We look for an ever-increasing intercourse, a constantly developing exchange of commodities, a steadily growing mutual understanding, and a continually expanding friendly co-operation among all the peoples of the world. With regard to that great Commonwealth of all races, all colours, all religions and all degrees of civilisation, that we call the British Empire, the Labour Party stands for its maintenance and its progressive development on the lines of Local Autonomy and "Home Rule All Round"; the fullest respect for the rights of each people, whatever its colour, to all the Democratic Self-Government of which it is capable, and to the proceeds of its own toil upon the resources of its own territorial home; and the closest possible co-operation among all the various members of what has become essentially not an Empire in the old sense, but a Britannic Alliance. We desire to maintain the most intimate relations with the Labour Parties overseas. Like them, we have no sympathy with the projects of "Imperial Federation," in so far as these imply the subjection to a common Imperial Legislature wielding coercive power (including dangerous facilities for coercive Imperial taxation and for enforced military service), either of the existing Self-Governing Dominions, whose autonomy would be thereby invaded; or of the United Kingdom, whose freedom of Democratic self-development would be thereby hampered; or of India and the Colonial Dependencies, which would thereby run the risk of being further exploited for the benefit of a "White Empire." We do not intend, by any such "Imperial Senate," either to bring the plutocracy of Canada and South Africa to the aid of the British aristocracy, or to enable the landlords and financiers of the Mother Country to unite in controlling the growing Popular Democracies overseas. The absolute autonomy of each self-governing part of the Empire must be maintained intact. What we look for, besides a constant progress in Democratic Self-Government of every part of the Britannic Alliance, and especially in India, is a continuous participation of the Ministers of the Dominions, of India, and eventually of other Dependencies (perhaps by means of their own Ministers specially resident in London for this purpose) in the most confidential deliberations of the Cabinet, so far as Foreign Policy and Imperial Affairs are concerned; and the annual assembly of an Imperial Council, representing all constituents of the Britannic Alliance and all parties in their Local Legislatures, which should discuss all matters of common interest, but only in order to make recommendations for the simultaneous consideration of the various autonomous local legislatures of what should increasingly take the constitutional form of an Alliance of Free Nations. And we carry the idea further. As regards our relations to Foreign Countries, we disavow and disclaim any desire or intention to dispossess or to impoverish any other State or Nation. We seek no increase of territory. We disclaim all idea of "economic war." We ourselves object to all Protective Customs Tariffs; but we hold that each nation must be left free to do what it thinks best for its own economic development, without thought of injuring others. We believe that nations are in no way damaged by each other's economic prosperity or commercial progress;



but, on the contrary, that they are actually themselves mutually enriched thereby. We would therefore put an end to the old entanglements and mystifications of Secret Diplomacy and the formation of Leagues against Leagues. We stand for the immediate establishment, actually as a part of the Treaty of Peace with which the present war will end, of a Universal League or Society of Nations, a Supernational Authority, with an International High Court to try all justiciable issues between nations; an International Legislature to enact such common laws as can be mutually agreed upon, and an International Council of Mediation to endeavour to settle without ultimate conflict even those disputes which are not justiciable. We would have all the nations of the world most solemnly undertake and promise to make common cause against any one of them that broke away from this fundamental agreement. The world has suffered too much from war for the Labour Party to have any other policy than that of lasting Peace.

### MORE LIGHT—BUT ALSO MORE WARMTH!

The Labour Party is far from assuming that it possesses a key to open all locks; or that any policy which it can formulate will solve all the problems that beset us. But we deem it important to ourselves as well as to those who may, on the one hand, wish to join the Party, or, on the other, to take up arms against it, to make quite clear and definite our aim and purpose. The Labour Party wants that aim and purpose, as set forth in the preceding pages, with all its might. It calls for more warmth in politics, for much less apathetic acquiescence in the miseries that exist, for none of the cynicism that saps the life of leisure. On the other hand, the Labour Party has no belief in any of the problems of the world being solved by Good Will alone. Good Will without knowledge is Warmth without Light. Especially in all the complexities of politics, in the still undeveloped Science of Society, the Labour Party stands for increased study, for the scientific investigation of each succeeding problem, for the deliberate organisation of research, and for a much more rapid dissemination among the whole people of all the science that exists. And it is perhaps specially the Labour Party that has the duty of placing this Advancement of Science in the forefront of its political programme. What the Labour Party stands for in all fields of life is, essentially, Democratic Co-operation; and Co-operation involves a common purpose which can be agreed to; a common plan which can be explained and discussed, and such a measure of success in the adaptation of means to ends as will ensure a common satisfaction. An autocratic Sultan may govern without science if his whim is law. A Plutocratic Party may choose to ignore science, if it is heedless whether its pretended solutions of social problems that may win political triumphs ultimately succeed or fail. But no Labour Party can hope to maintain its position unless its proposals are, in fact, the outcome of the best Political Science of its time; or to fulfil its purpose unless that science is continually wresting new fields from human ignorance. Hence, although the Purpose of the Labour Party must, by the law of its being, remain for all time unchanged, its Policy and its Programme will, we hope, undergo a perpetual development, as knowledge grows, and as new phases of the social problem present themselves, in a continually finer adjustment of our measures to our ends. If Law is the Mother of Freedom, Science, to the Labour Party, must be the Parent of Law.

## PUBLICATIONS of the LABOUR PARTY

---

**Labour and the New Social Order.**—A Report on Reconstruction after the War. 2d., post free 3d.; 1s. 6d. per 13; 6s. per 50; 12s. per 100; £8 per 1,000, carriage paid.

**Memorandum on War Aims**, agreed upon by the Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference, February, 1918. 1d., post free 2d.; 1s. per 12; 3s. 6d. per 50; 7s. per 100; £3 per 1,000, carriage paid.

**New Party Constitution.**—1d., post free 1½d.; 9d. per 12; 3s. per 50; 6s. per 100; £3 per 1,000, carriage paid.

**Annual Conference Report (Manchester, 1917).**

**Annual Conference Report (Nottingham, 1918).**

**Annual Conference Report (London, 1918).**

6d., post free 8d.; 5s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.

**The Labour Woman.**—The Labour Woman's Monthly. 1d., post free 2d.; 2s. per year; 9d. per 12; 3s. per 50; 6s. per 100, carriage paid.

**The Aims of Labour.**—By the Rt. Hon. Arthur Henderson, M.P. 1s., post free 1s. 2d.

**Women and the Labour Party.**—By various women writers, including Mrs. Sidney Webb, Margaret Llewelyn Davies, Mary Macarthur, Margaret McMillan and Rebecca West, edited with an Introduction by Dr. Marion Phillips, and a Foreword by the Rt. Hon. Arthur Henderson, M.P. 1s., post free 1s. 2d.

---

### LEAFLETS

**The Labour Party.**—A statement of its objects, with application form for membership attached. 6 page folder, 30s. per 1,000, with particulars of Local Party.

**No. 1—The New Constitution of the Labour Party.**—By Sidney Webb. 4 pages. 2s. per 100; 10s. per 1,000 post free.

**No. 2—Why Brainworkers Should Join the Labour Party.**—2 pages. 1s. per 100; 5s. per 1,000 post free.

**No. 3—Why Women Should Join the Labour Party.**—2 pages. 1s. per 100; 5s. per 1,000 post free.

**No. 4—The Principles of the Labour Party.**—By Sidney and Beatrice Webb. 4 pages. 2s. per 100; 10s. per 1,000 post free.

**No. 5—Men and Women, Look After Your Votes!**—A Summary of Franchise qualifications. 2 pages. 2s. per 100; 10s. per 1,000, with particulars of Local Party, post free.

**The Working Woman's House.**—4 pages, with plans. 1d., post free 2d.; 8d. per 12; 2s. 0d. per 50; 5s. 6d. per 100; £2 per 1,000, post free.

---

THE LABOUR PARTY, 33 Eccleston Square,  
London, S.W. 1

# EDUCATIONAL RECONSTRUCTION

Being the

RECOMMENDATIONS of  
the Workers' Educational Association  
to the Reconstruction Committee

---

13

Price - ONE PENNY

THE WORKERS' EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION,  
14 Red Lion Square,  
London, W.C.

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W.

---

*OTHER*  
**W. E. A. PUBLICATIONS**

*PAMPHLETS*

Trade Unionism in Australia. By Meredith Atkinson ... ..	1/6
English Educational Endowments. By H. T. Wilkins & J. A. Fallows, M.A.	6d.
First Aid to Essay Writing. By Meredith Atkinson, M.A. ... ..	3d.
An Introduction to the Study of Social Problems ... ..	2d.
Tradition, Policy and Economy in English Education. By W. Temple ... ..	1d.
War and the Workers ... ..	1d.
The "Highway" monthly ... ..	1d.
What Labour wants from Education ...	1d.

---

## PREFACE

Educational Reform has become of supreme national importance. This national need offers to working people a great opportunity of winning for their children educational facilities hitherto denied. This opportunity will not recur during "our day and generation." Are working people ready and willing to avail themselves of it? The apathy and indifference of the past suggest to many that they are not. This, however, is but a superficial reading of feelings that lie deeper than words. The greatest spiritual tragedy of working-class life is disclosed in the phrase, "I never had a chance." These terse common-place words, uttered always as expressing a feeling of personal loss, are none the less a stinging criticism of the defects of our educational system.

"In England, out of 2,750,000 boys and girls between 12 and 16, nearly 1,100,000 get no further education after the age of 13. Of the remaining 1,650,000, the great bulk are educated only for a very short time, mostly in the elementary schools, until 14. Only 250,000 go to proper secondary schools, and they are there only for a short time in most cases. . . . Between 16 and 25 there are in England and Wales 5,850,000 young persons, roughly. Of these, 5,350,000 get no education at all; 93,000 only have a full-time course for some period, which is generally a very short period; 390,000 have a part-time course, which may also be a very short period, at the evening schools. Are not these appalling figures—390,000 only out of somewhere near 6,000,000!"\*

Of the 5,636,927 children attending our elementary schools, "not less than a million are so physically defective or disabled as to be unable to derive reasonable benefit from the education which the State provides."

In 1915-16, not less than 60,000 children, mostly between the ages of 11 and 15, left school presumably to enter industry at an earlier age than they would previous to the war.

Classes are over-crowded, schools are under-staffed. Many of our teachers are unqualified to teach.

But, perhaps, nothing reveals so clearly the defects of the system as that after a generation of national education, the appalling wastage of the finest human qualities revealed by these facts, fails to stir public indignation. If British working-class democracy is still somewhat apathetic on this, the most fundamentally important of all the great social questions, it is because the education hitherto made accessible to it, has been so meagre in quantity and poor in quality that it has failed to awaken interest or arouse enthusiasm.

\* Lord Haldane, House of Lords, July 12th, 1916.

To seek to apportion blame is not the purpose of these criticisms. We know that, despite its many defects, the system has been vastly improved, and that the more intimate knowledge of those responsible for its administration places them in vanguard of those who desire change. To them, more than to any other, we are indebted for our knowledge of the facts. But if England is going to rebuild on a sound foundation after the war, these facts must cease to be.

To aid in this work is the purpose of our recommendations. We want to help in establishing a National System of Education that will foster the great human qualities of courage, endurance, intelligence, initiative, self-reliance, self-discipline, and devotion to duty which the war has shown is inherent in the British working class.

In presenting these proposals for their consideration and support we do so with the full knowledge that no educational policy has ever been more democratically considered and approved. They are the outcome of six months of careful inquiry and thought on the part of representative working men and women, aided, to some extent, by the expert knowledge of teachers.

We submit them as being our minimum national need, if a greater Britain is to arise out of the devastations of the war, and as such we believe they ought to be embodied in one Act of Parliament. We know our scheme is big. But the war has taught us that it is the big schemes that are practical and the little schemes that are impractical.

The varied activities of the working-class movement, of which the W.E.A. forms a part, are too often interpreted in terms of bread and butter. Rightly understood, they are attempts to adapt material conditions to spiritual needs. But the greatest need of the human spirit is freedom. Such freedom, however, can only come as the result of an education, that does not aim at material ends, but concerns itself with developing human faculties and fostering growth.

Nature has endowed our little ones with great natural powers which to-day we stunt, thwart, and starve, and by doing so, enslave the human spirit. To evolve a system of education that will unfold these gifts in childhood, foster and strengthen in adolescence, perfect them in manhood and womanhood, and so set free the human spirit, is the task to which the W.E.A. has set its hand.

In this work we seek the fullest co-operation of organised Labour, because we know there can be no true freedom for the workers, individual, social or industrial, until this is achieved.

J. M. MACTAVISH,

*General Secretary.*

Dec., 1916.

# The Highway of Education

## RESOLUTION 1. THE IDEAL.

That the broad principle of free education through all its stages, including that of the University, be accepted.

## PRACTICAL PROPOSALS

### RESOLUTION 2. YOUNG CHILDREN.

- (a) That the age for compulsory attendance at school should be raised to six years and it should be compulsory for the Local Education Authority to establish and control a sufficient number of Nursery Schools for the children within their areas between the ages of two and six;
- (b) That attendance at these schools should be free;
- (c) That the Nursery Schools should be under the special supervision of the School Medical Officer, and attention in them should be mainly directed to the cultivation in the children of good physical habits, and healthy bodily development, play and rest whenever possible in the open air forming an important part in the curriculum;
- (d) That the Nursery Schools should accommodate small groups of children and should be so distributed as to be near the homes of the children;
- (e) That the Head of the Nursery School should be a teacher who has special qualifications for the training of young children.

### RESOLUTION 3. UNIVERSAL FULL-TIME EDUCATION.

We are of opinion that the age for exemption from compulsory full-time attendance at school should be 16, and to this end we recommend:

- (a) That universal full-time education continue to the age of 14, no exemptions being granted under that age, and that no child should leave school until the end of the term, Christmas, Easter, or Midsummer, in which he attains the age of 14;
- (b) That it be compulsory for all Local Education Authorities to raise the leaving age to 15 (without exemptions) within a period of five years and that Local Education Authorities be granted powers forthwith to make bye-laws to raise it to 16;
- (c) That when the school leaving age is raised above 14, Local Education Authorities should be required to grant maintenance allowances to children above that age where necessary;
- (d) That education during the compulsory full-time period, more especially in the upper standards, should be organised with a view to its continuance during adolescence;

(e) That the employment of children for profit or wages outside school hours during the compulsory full-time school period be prohibited.

## **RESOLUTION 4. HIGHER EDUCATION.**

### **I. SECONDARY EDUCATION.**

#### **A.—Part-time education between the age of exemption from compulsory full-time attendance and 18.**

(a) That compulsory part-time education of not less than 20 hours per week (including time spent in organised games and school meals) be provided free for all such young persons as are not receiving full-time education;

(b) That the hours of labour for all young persons under the age of 18 be limited to a maximum of 25 per week;

(c) That the distribution of hours throughout the year upon the above basis should be arranged, where necessary, to meet the needs of seasonal industries and other circumstances;

(d) That the education in such schools should be directed solely towards the full development of the bodies, minds, and characters of the pupils; that it should therefore be intimately related to the environment and interests of the pupils, and should contain ample provision for physical well-being, including organised games and school meals;

(e) That the teachers in such schools should enjoy status and emoluments similar to those of teachers in other secondary schools.

#### **B.—Full-time Secondary Education.**

(a) That all children admitted to a Secondary School should have reached an approved standard of education, the ground of transfer being the fitness of the scholar for the broader curriculum;

(b) That free provision should be made for all who are eligible and desirous to enter such schools, such provision to include a satisfactory maintenance allowance where necessary;

(c) That the number of Secondary Schools of varying types should be largely increased, and that the curriculum be made more variable to meet the interests of individual scholars;

(d) That facilities should be provided for the transfer from part-time to full-time Secondary Education;

(e) That the requirements of a liberal education should be regarded as paramount in the organisation of every type of secondary school;

(f) That the distribution and organisation of secondary schools should be such as to promote equality of access to University education of the highest type for students in every local area.



## II. UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

- (a) That no student should be accepted as an undergraduate of a University or University College who has not previously attained an adequate educational standard satisfactory to the University Authorities;
- (b) That free provision should be made for all who reach this standard, adequate maintenance grants being given where financial circumstances require them, and further, that until such time as free University Education is provided, the number of scholarships, the value of each scholarship and the method of selection should be such that no student should be debarred by financial circumstances from becoming an undergraduate;
- (c) That greater facilities should be provided whereby men and women able to profit by a special period of study at a University should be enabled to do so without an entrance examination;
- (d) That all Universities and University Colleges conforming to Board of Education requirements should receive from the State such grants in aid as will enable them to be efficiently staffed and equipped;
- (e) That it should be a condition of payment of State grants in aid to Universities and University Colleges that they make adequate provision for University Tutorial Classes;
- (f) That since an essential part of the work of a University lies in affording facilities for the advancement of knowledge, more adequate provision should be made for scientific and literary research conducted with this object;
- (g) That workpeople together with other sections of the community should be directly represented on the governing bodies of all Universities and University Colleges.

## III. TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

- (a) That in the interests alike of education and of economic efficiency, a sound general education in childhood and adolescence is the necessary foundation for any specialised course of technical or professional training, both in town and country, and that therefore technical education should be regarded as supplementary to secondary education;
- (b) That, owing to the immense variety of occupations in a modern community, and the wide differences between them, both in the amount of special training necessary to efficiency and the prospects of permanent employment for young workers, it would be impracticable, as well as undesirable, for the State to attempt to enforce any compulsory system of technical education;
- (c) That, since the trades and industries and professions of the country exist in order to serve the needs of the community, technical education should, as far as possible, be divorced from the prevalent atmosphere of commercialism, and regarded as a training in public

service; and that this aspect of the subject should be kept in view in the organisation of the courses of instruction;

(d) That technical schools should be administered by a body on which employers and workpeople chosen by their respective trade organisations should be equally represented, together with members of the Education Authority, and that there should be special advisory committees of employers and workpeople for special trades;

(e) That close contact should be maintained between Universities and Technical Institutes, and between Technical Institutes and schools and workshop practice, and that workpeople should also be represented on the University Committees concerned;

(f) That, subject to the preceding conditions, an extension of technical and professional education is highly desirable in the national interest;

(g) That such education should be free, and that until this is provided there should be a generous provision of scholarships with adequate maintenance grants, so that duly qualified students from the full-time and part-time Secondary Schools and from evening classes in technical schools, whose special bent lies in the direction of scientific and technical work, may pass forward to full-time day courses of instruction (followed by research) in Universities, Technical Colleges, and the larger Technical Schools.

#### **RESOLUTION 5. CORPORATE LIFE.**

Since experience has shown the great educational value of corporate life in schools it is necessary:

(a) That adequate playgrounds and playing fields with the necessary equipment and free transit to them when necessary should be provided for all schools;

(b) That greater freedom of access for children to playgrounds should be allowed out of school hours;

(c) That children should be encouraged to arrange their own games and other activities and that facilities should be given for the development of special aptitudes;

(d) That as far as possible the help of the children should be enlisted in the management of school life.

Further, it is desirable, with a view to the development of corporate life in our schools:

(e) That the greatest possible freedom be given to both teachers and pupils, and that teachers be not required to adhere rigidly to a prescribed time-table or a fixed syllabus;

(f) That the growing practice of a common school meal be encouraged;

(g) That because of the importance of the development of a sense of beauty in early years the school buildings and interiors should be designed with this end in view.

## **RESOLUTION 6. PHYSICAL EDUCATION.**

That in view of the general obligation of the State to safeguard the physical well-being of the children of the nation and of the serious defects of their health revealed by the School Medical Service, ampler provision for the physical well-being is indispensable to the proper working of our Educational System.

With this in view it is necessary :

- (a) That it be compulsory for all Local Education Authorities to set up and maintain such a Medical and Dental Service as will secure adequate inspection and treatment to all scholars attending the schools within the area of the respective authorities ;
- (b) That the system of school meals be so extended and improved as to overcome the evils of under-feeding and malnutrition ;
- (c) That greater facilities for physical training should be provided, including the organisation of games and the use of simple equipment, and also bathing and swimming where possible ;
- (d) That the policy of establishing schools on the outskirts of towns, where facilities for open-air teaching and playing fields can be more easily provided, should be encouraged, with the necessary arrangements for conveyance and common meals ;
- (e) That ample provision be made for the fullest possible education of all children who are physically or mentally deficient.

## **RESOLUTION 7. SIZE OF CLASSES.**

We are of opinion that no class in any school ought to contain more than 30 pupils, and to this end we recommend :

- (a) That the necessary steps be taken immediately to increase the supply of qualified teachers and school accommodation so as to reduce classes to 40, with a view to a further reduction to 30 ;
- (b) That a standard of not more than 30 be adopted for all new and remodelled schools, that a separate class room be provided for each class, and that the present minimum basis of floor space per child be largely increased.

## **RESOLUTION 8. THE SUPPLY OF GOOD TEACHERS.**

To provide an adequate supply of good teachers it is necessary :

- (a) That there be free access to training facilities for the teaching profession, accompanied by adequate maintenance grants where required ;
- (b) That the salaries paid and pensions provided should be such as will induce the best men and women available to enter and remain in the profession, with equal pay for equal service ;

(c) That intending teachers should be enabled to pass through a period of study at a University of at least a year's duration before entering the profession, and that the Colleges where professional training is provided should be closely connected with a University;

(d) That every possible facility should be provided for present unqualified teachers to qualify, and that the appointment of unqualified teachers be discontinued;

(e) That the highest positions in the educational service should be open to teachers who are fitted to fill them.

#### **RESOLUTION 9. PUBLIC LIBRARIES.**

That, in view of the importance of extending and developing the work of the public libraries in town and country, it is desirable that they should be brought into closer connection with the general educational system of the country;

With this end in view the separate library rate should be abolished and the provision and upkeep of public libraries should be entrusted to the Local Education Authority as an integral part of the scheme for its area.

#### **RESOLUTION 10. DISTRIBUTION OF COST.**

(a) That each Local Education Authority be required to submit to the Board of Education a complete scheme of education for its area, together with estimates of the cost;

(b) That 75 per cent. of the total cost of any approved scheme be met by the National Exchequer, but that

(c) The Board of Education be empowered to reduce the grant where :

(1) the teaching staff is insufficient in quality or numbers or the salaries paid are inadequate;

(2) the number of scholars in any class exceeds 40;

(3) the number and variety of educational institutions are not adequate;

(4) the medical inspection and treatment and supply of school meals are not adequate;

(5) the Local Education Authority fails to administer its bye-laws;

(6) where any other part of the scheme is not carried out to the satisfaction of the Board of Education.

(d) That the Board of Education be required to give a special grant to meet the needs of areas where :

(1) the school population is high;

(2) the rateable value is low as compared with the cost of education.

## **RESOLUTION 11. EDUCATIONAL ENDOWMENTS.**

That since the proper use of educational endowments is important to the development of a national system of education, it is desirable:

- (a) That a public and intelligible statement should be made periodically as to the amount of such endowments, the sources from which they are received, and the way in which they are controlled and expended;
- (b) That there should be an inquiry into their origin and history;
- (c) That action should be taken for their better distribution where this would appear after inquiry to be desirable in the interests of the educational development of the country.

## **RESOLUTION 12. WORK OF THE W.E.A.**

That, since the character of British Democracy ultimately depends on the collective wisdom of its adult members, no system of education can be complete that does not promote serious thought and discussion on the fundamental interests and problems of life and society, such as is promoted by the W.E.A.; that while we are of opinion that it is against the best interests and free development of the Association to accept a grant from the State for general purposes, we regard it as necessary, in order that the voluntary contributions to the Association should be free for educational propaganda work, that grants should be made towards the cost of organisation of definite and recognised pieces of work such as University Tutorial Classes and one-year classes. We regard this need as being of national importance; more especially in the difficult period after the war. We therefore recommend:

- (a) That the Board of Education grant to University Tutorial Classes be equal to 75 per cent. of the tutor's salary and 75 per cent. of the proved cost of organisation and administration.
- (b) That the Board of Education grant to one-year classes be 75 per cent. of the total cost of organisation, tuition, and administration.

---

# SOME IMPORTANT BOOKS

## CHEAP EDITIONS

	Usual Price.	W.E.A. Cheap Editions. Post free.
Labour in War Time. G. D. H. Cole ...	2/6	1/4
The World of Labour. " ...	2/-	1/4
The War of Steel and Gold. Brailsford	2/-	1/4
University Tutorial Classes. A. Mansbridge ... ..	2/6	1/4
The War and Democracy. Several Writers ... ..	2/-	1/4
Essay Writing. Henderson & Freeman	1/6	1/4
An Introduction to the Study of International Relations. Various Writers	2/-	1/4
International Finance. Hartley Withers	3/6	1/4
Great Britain after the War. Sidney Webb & Arnold Freeman ... ..	1/-	6d.
Memorandum on the Industrial Situation after the War. The Garton Foundation * ... ..	1/-	9d.
The Industrial Outlook. Edited by H. Sanderson Furniss ... ..	3/6	1/6

---

These Cheap Editions can only be obtained from—

**THE WORKERS' EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION,**  
14 Red Lion Square, Holborn, W.C.

---

THE LABOUR PARTY

---

TARIFFS

AND

THE WORKER

BY

BROUGHAM VILLIERS.

---

PRICE 1d.; POST FREE, 1½d.

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W.1

# PUBLICATIONS OF THE LABOUR PARTY

---

## **Labour and the New Social Order.**

A Report on Reconstruction after the War. 2d., post free 3d.; 1s. 6d. per 13; 6s. per 50; 12s. per 100; £6 per 1,000, post free.

## **Memoranda on International Labour Legislation.**

The Economic Structure of the League of Nations. 1s., post free 1s. 1½d.

## **Labour Women on International Legislation.**

This pamphlet contains proposals on Women's Employment (by GERTRUDE M. TUCKWELL), the Employment of Children (by Dr. MARION PHILLIPS), and the Prevention of Unemployment (by A. SUSAN LAWRENCE, L.C.C.), and has been issued with the approval of the Standing Joint Committee of Industrial Women's Organisations. Price 3d., post free 3½d.; 2s. per dozen carriage paid.

## **The Labour Party and the Peace Treaty.**

This is a Handbook for Speakers, and contains a critical analysis of the Peace Terms, comparing its provisions with the pronouncements made by the National and International Labour Movement from time to time. Price 1s. 6d. post free; 12s. per dozen, carriage paid.

## **The Peace Terms.**

By the Rt. H. M. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P. 2d., post free 2½d.

## **Labour and the Peace Treaty.**

Containing Parliamentary Speeches by Rt. Hon. W. ADAMSON, M.P., Rt. Hon. J. R. CLYNES, M.P., Mr. STEPHEN WALSH, M.P., and Mr. TOM SHAW, M.P. 2d., post free 2½d.

## **Labour Policy and the Famine.**

This pamphlet indicates the present economic position of Central Europe and sets out Labour's policy of immediate remedies. Price 2d., post free 2½d.; 1s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.

## **The Capital Levy: How the Labour Party would Settle the War Debt.**

By F. W. PETHICK LAWRENCE. Price 2d., post free 2½d.; 1s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W.1



# TARIFFS AND THE WORKER.

By BROUGHAM VILLIERS.

Among the various schemes for turning the attention of the people from the necessary task of reconstructing society on a new and democratic basis, none is being pressed with more urgency than the revived movement for a return to Protection. By every means in its power a large section of the employing class is trying to persuade the workers that free imports of foreign manufactures will reduce employment and diminish wages, and that consequently it is to the interest of the workers and of the nation to return to Protection. This is, of course, no new issue, and, except in so far as an appeal is being made to the passions aroused by the war, it is supported by no new argument. Again and again the question has been brought up for the judgment of the nation, and again and again the protectionist forces have been broken by the determined resistance of organised Labour more than by any other power in the country. Yet again, however, the matter is being forced to the front. Again we are asked to consider whether we can solve the unemployed problem by restricting imports, again we have to determine whether protective duties will tend to bring better wages or only higher prices for the manufacturers. This is a Labour question, if ever there was one, and it is certainly necessary for all who care for the welfare of the people to form a considered opinion on the matter.

## **Neither Free Trade nor Protection a Solution for Unemployment.**

Under the present system the wage worker is always subject to the danger of unemployment. Probably few men and women go through life without bitter experience at one time or other of unemployment, while in periods of depression unemployment is widespread in every civilised land, whether under Free Trade or Protection. It is important to remember this. The Tariff Reformer, when he attempts to persuade people that Protection will solve the unemployed problem, is not advocating a new and untried remedy which may or may not serve the purpose; he is speaking of an expedient that has been in force in almost every country under the sun, including our own at one time, and has never yet cured unemployment. There are no complete statistics of unemployment for the various countries on which to base a satisfactory comparison, but one or two facts may be given that will suffice to prove this point. The last great depression in trade, that of 1908 and 1909, was first felt in the United States. In July, 1907, the trade unions of New York returned 5.4 per cent. of their members as unemployed, the returns for the British trade unions at the same date being 3.1 per cent. From that time the amount of unemployment steadily rose in both countries till in December the British rate was 5.6, and that of the United States no less than 30.5 per cent. ! In February, 1908, unemployment reached its highest point, 35.9 per cent., in New York, and in October in this country, when the trade unions reported 9.5 unemployed. Even allowing for the fact that these statistics are not strictly comparable, it is nevertheless an undoubted fact that American unemployment is very much heavier than unemployment in this kingdom. There was also great unemployment in Germany at the time. Speaking in the Reichstag in November, 1908, Herr Molkenbuhr said that the unemployed in October had been about 420,000 more than is usual at that time of year. The following spring the Berlin Municipal Council reported 70,000 out of work through no fault of their own, while the number of applications received at the German Labour Bureaux for every 100 situations vacant rose from 172 in March, 1908, to 330 in December of the same year.

### What Free Trade Can Do.

In short, to advance either Free Trade or Protection as a cure for unemployment is political quackery of the worst kind. It does not follow, however, that the tariff question has no bearing on the unemployment problem. It is safe to assert that, other things being equal, there will be more employment in a Free Trade country than in one under Protection. There are more people employed relatively to their area and resources in Free Trade Britain and Holland and in lightly tariffed Belgium than in any high Protectionist country in the world. These three are the most densely peopled countries in the Western world, a tribute in itself to the vast amount of industry it has been found possible to concentrate within their narrow borders, under conditions of free or nearly free trade. If by any means the amount of trade in these countries were reduced to the level of that prevailing in similar areas in the most prosperous protectionist countries an appalling amount of unemployment would ensue.

There are, of course, other causes co-operating to produce the great concentrations of industry and population in the free or virtually free trade areas of Britain, Holland, and Belgium. As these countries are the largest importers per head of the population, the enormous amount of employment they give in proportion to their natural resources is on the face of it difficult to reconcile with the Protectionist idea that imports tend to reduce employment. The Protectionist, however, will contend that it is only manufactured imports that create unemployment; this contention requires examination. The following tables dealing with the periods of depression and improvement of trade during the last forty years will throw some light on this contention:—

Year.	FIRST PERIOD.	
	Gross Imports of Manufactures in Millions of £s.	Trade Union Returns of Unemployment per cent.
1877	69.9	4.40
1878	69.1	6.25
1879	66.5	10.70
1880	76.4	5.25
1881	74.0	3.55
1882	77.3	2.35
1883	79.0	2.60
1884	77.3	7.15
1885	77.5	9.55
1886	76.8	9.55
1887	77.8	7.15
1888	87.2	4.15
1889	90.6	2.05
1890	89.9	2.10

From 1890 onwards the Board of Trade enable us to give the *net* imports of manufactures, after deducting the amount re-exported every year. Our second table, giving the depressions and subsequent revivals of trade in the years following the South African War, is based on the imports of manufactured goods retained for home consumption.

Year:	SECOND PERIOD.	
	Imports of Manufactures retained for Home Consumption. Millions of £s.	Trade Union Returns of Unemployment per cent.
1902	115.1	4.60
1903	115.7	5.30
1904	115.9	6.50
1905	121.6	5.40
1906	130.4	4.10
1907	128.1	4.20
1908	119.8	7.8
1909	123.0	7.7
1910	129.5	4.7
1911	137.2	3.0
1912	156.4	3.2

Now it is utterly impossible to explain these figures on the theory of the Tariff Reformer. It will be seen that whenever our imports of foreign manufactured goods were stationary or declining the amount of unemployment increased, and that whenever such imports increased the rate of unemployment decreased. This knocks the bottom out of the Tariff Reformer's case that imported manufactures are the cause of bad trade and unemployment, but it would not be exactly correct to call them the cause of good trade. They are not the cause; they are a necessary accompaniment of good trade. This the Free Trader can explain, though the Tariff Reformer cannot.

Before the workman can get employment he must have tools with which, and material upon which, to work. If he is to compete successfully in foreign markets, the materials must be reasonably cheap and the tools or machinery up to date. Whether a new invention or a new material originates at home or abroad, he must be supplied with it on as good terms as his foreign competitors, or he will be at a disadvantage. Now the great bulk of our "manufactured" imports are nothing more or less than the raw materials of our more advanced industries or the tools and machinery required to work them up. It would be hard to find a more glaring example of mischievous ignorance than the Tariff Reform contention that the importer of foreign "manufactures" is "doing the British workman out of a job." In many cases the foreigner is simply sending the stuff without which the job could not be done at all. In 1907 the Government issued a White Paper showing that out of £130,400,000 worth of manufactured goods imported during the previous year only £51,400,000 worth were completely manufactured and ready for the consumer. Even this comparatively small sum included finished machines, tools, etc., required by our factories, but, accepting it as it stands, let us consider what chance it had of swamping our industries and spreading unemployment over the land. In that year our total net imports amounted to £522,786,000; out of a pound's worth imported from abroad two shillings consisted of completed manufactures and eighteen shillings of food stuffs or materials of industry, either raw or half-finished. We do not know the exact amount of wealth produced in the country in 1906, but in the following year the compilers of the Census of Production estimated the value of goods produced for personal consumption in the United Kingdom at somewhere between 1,248 to 1,408 million pounds, while the value of goods exported was £464,000,000. Thus the total amount of foreign manufactures which can come into competition with our own is as ninepence to a pound. It must not be supposed that even this proportionately small amount of manufactured imports is without its influence on the national life as a whole, only this influence is not what the Tariff Reformer attributes to it. It does not decrease the demand for labour as a whole, as will afterwards appear, though it may modify the direction in which labour is applied; but it can and does keep a very effective check on the prices charged by the manufacturer. We have had bitter experience during the last five years of the advantage the home manufacturer can take when he is freed from foreign competition. It is not that he can do more trade and employ more labour, for he does over nineteen shillings in the pound of the trade in articles ready for consumption as it is, but that while employing the same labour he can get twenty-nine or thirty-nine or forty-nine shillings for his nineteen shillings worth of goods. It is true that under war conditions, with millions of the best workmen mobilised and withdrawn from the labour market on the one hand, and an enormous artificial impulse given to the demand for labour in the munition factories on the other, there has been throughout the war a period of good employment and rising wages, but these conditions are in their nature temporary, and if we are to return to normal conditions in the labour market the people

simply cannot afford to let go their check provided by foreign competition against manufacturers' extortions.

### High Prices Injurious to Labour.

Good trade gives an opportunity to manufacturers to charge high prices; they are an effect, not a cause, of good trade. As when trade is good prices tend to rise and employment is more plentiful, the evil of high prices is less felt than it would be, but in themselves high prices are a restraint on trade, not a help to it. Why this is so is readily seen when we remember that in a very real sense we all cause labour to be employed. All commodities embody labour in their production, and when we buy a commodity we pay among other things for the labour employed in making it. The more commodities we buy the greater demand for labour, and the cheaper commodities are in price the larger quantity, other things being equal, a man can afford to buy. Thus, if a workman, who goes out with a sovereign in his pocket intending to buy a pair of boots which he expects will cost that sum, discovers (no doubt to his surprise) the way things have been lately, that the price of boots has fallen and he can get them for 15s., he will be able to spend the remaining five shillings, we will suppose, on a cap. Decidedly this is better for him, but it also creates employment. He has paid not only for the labour embodied in the boots, but for that of the capmaker as well; his increased consumption, rendered possible by the fall in prices, has resulted in an increased demand for labour. Let the same process go on throughout the whole of industry and there will be fewer capmakers among the unemployed, a better opportunity for the capmakers' union to strengthen its organisation, a better opportunity for the capmakers to get a rise in wages.

The thin stream of foreign manufactured goods that comes into this country tends greatly to keep down prices, because the home manufacturers know that any attempt to increase unduly the prices of the vastly greater number of manufactures made at home would certainly be followed by a very large increase in imports and in loss of business to themselves. This keeping down of prices enlarges the purchasing power of the people, enabling them to obtain more commodities for a given wage, and consequently increasing the demand for labour. As long as this safety valve is open, the British manufacturer is compelled to keep the foreigner out by efficiency of production and by selling at moderate prices instead of by a tariff. He has been fairly effective in doing this, seeing that not five per cent. of the manufactured goods consumed in Great Britain come from abroad and over ninety-five per cent. are produced at home.

### Our Semi-Manufactured Imports.

By far the larger part, however, of the goods imported into this country under the Board of Trade heading "Articles wholly or mainly manufactured" are not really for consumption but are raw materials of some industry or other. By far the larger part of our imports consist of food or raw materials, while the great bulk of our exports are manufactures. To take the figures for 1913, the last year of peace:—

Net Imports of Manufactures, 1913.	Exports of British Manufactures only 1913.
---------------------------------------	---

£164,414,156	... ..	£411,363,353
--------------	--------	--------------

Thus, if, as the Tariff Reformers say, our market was "flooded" with foreign manufactures, we "flooded" the foreigners' markets to between two and three times that extent. But the Board of Trade class nothing as a "raw material" that has had any process of manufacture applied to it whatever. Thus metals in all stages except crude ores, yarns, leather (dressed and undressed), chemicals and dyes, bark for tan-

ning, seed cake for cattle, dressed skins, slates and stones, are classed as "manufactures," though it is obvious that these things are simply materials with which the metal workers, spinners, shoemakers, tanners, and the building trade operatives must be supplied before they can get work. To stop, by tariff or embargo, the import of such articles would be to throw thousands of British workmen out of their jobs.

### Goods Pay for Goods.

We have seen that the small stream of foreign manufactured goods which comes annually into this country, while it bears a very small proportion to the total consumption, nevertheless serves to moderate prices. It makes trusts and other combinations of capital more difficult to organise than in protected countries, and even when they are formed, greatly hampers their power to keep up prices. By limiting prices, it enables the consumer to buy more things with his money; it raises his standard of living and, incidentally, increases the demand for labour. This would certainly more than compensate for any loss that might conceivably occur through the importation of foreign manufactures, even if Tariff Reformers were right in attributing unemployment to such imports. Before inquiring how far, if at all, such a contention is justified, it is desirable to make two important deductions from the fifty millions or thereabouts of imported manufactures. Even these imports include a large number of things—machinery, tools, scientific implements, etc., needed by our manufacturers, and if, through a tariff or otherwise, their cost were raised, the industries using them would be handicapped in the same way as by an increase in the cost of "raw materials." Again, it does not follow in the least that because the foreigner sends a cheap line of manufactures to this country our factories in the trade lose an equivalent amount of work. A large part of such imports find a sale, not by damaging an old market, but by making a new one. If the cheap American watches had never come in, more English silver levers might have been bought, but certainly nothing like as many as have been sold of "Waterburys" or "Ingersolls." The same applies to Ford motor-cars; they find a market for the most part among people who could not afford the more expensive cars, and, in so far as they do this, do not displace British motor-cars. Again, a new line of foreign goods may be an absolute novelty, due to some invention made abroad, which it may or may not subsequently be found possible to produce at home. Very often it is so, for the general comparative cheapness of materials in a Free Trade country gives the British manufacturer a permanent advantage—and at once, if the new invention is not patented, and ere long even if it is—the introduction of a foreign manufacture ends in giving a new industry to the United Kingdom.

It will be seen clearly by this that the amount of our imported foreign manufactures that can possibly displace British labour is very small indeed; it remains to be seen to what, if any, extent even this can do so. Assuming that a tax on some foreign material resulted in placing an order which would otherwise have gone abroad with a British firm, and did not simply prevent business altogether,\* it is obvious that this would give additional employment in the trade concerned. And if only one trade were "protected," and those in it allowed to buy all that they wanted in a cheap, free trade market, while able to exact from the British consumer the highest price he could be induced to pay for their commodities rather than do without, no doubt you could make

---

\* This would, of course, often happen. It does not at all follow because a man will buy a thing at sixpence that he will pay a shilling for it rather than go without. Under much Tariff Reform talk lies the inference that no matter what the price of a thing the same amount will be sold.

*that particular industry*, a gold mine to the capitalist. You can by tariffs favour this or that industry at the expense of others, but that is all you can do; you cannot by them increase the total volume of trade or the general demand for labour. This is not a gold-producing country; all the gold in the country has been imported into it; in normal times there is a steady influx of gold in excess of the exports of it. We pay for the goods and services supplied to us by the foreigner, not with gold, but with the goods and services we supply to him. We buy large quantities of food and raw material, and smaller, though considerable, supplies of manufactures from abroad, and pay for these by the export of small quantities of food, some coal and other raw materials, and the greatest export of manufactures of any country in the world, coupled with the vast earnings of our shipping, insurance, banking, and other services, to say nothing of dividends from investments abroad. Goods pay for goods.

### Imports and Unemployment.

The Tariff Reformer, in attributing unemployment to imports of foreign manufactures, has found a mare's nest. You cannot increase the total volume of employment by any tariff jugglery. But, of course, it is true that an influx of foreign imports may displace labour in the particular industries concerned. This, however, is not a problem by itself, but a part of a much wider one, which requires a great deal more real sympathy with Labour and a much wider knowledge of the social question than the Tariff Reformers possess usually. The matter is not one of imported manufactures only, but of raw materials and food-stuffs as well; and not even only of imports, but of all novelties in industry, whether coming from home or abroad. The discovery of richer veins of ore, whether at home or abroad, will disturb employment in the mines, just as much as an improvement in the manufacture of bicycles in America will disturb the cycle trade. And incomparably the larger part of such displacement of British labour originates at home and not abroad. The invention of new machinery, devices of all kinds to save labour, amalgamations of capital and many other devices, in themselves devised to make industry more efficient, displace at least for the time being incomparably more labour than do foreign imports. When, as sometimes happens, the new, disturbing factor comes from abroad the plan is, not to try to settle the matter by stopping the competitive goods coming in and so provide employment in one trade at the expense of labour as a whole; we must realise that the trouble is one of the inherent evils of modern capitalist industry and to be solved by treating the unemployed problem, from whatever cause arising, as a whole. This none but the Labour party has ever proposed to do. Liberal Free Traders and Tory Tariff Reformers have alike neglected the question, and the Protectionists are, to say the least of it, quite as much to blame as their rivals.

### What the Protectionist Movement Means.

The wage-worker will do well to disabuse his mind of any idea that the Tariff outcry is motivated by any desire to find more work or better wages for him. He may be perfectly certain that if Tariffs were not expected to bring higher prices and larger profits to capitalists and landlords the movement would not last a week. Not that even the capitalist class, as a whole, would gain by tariffs; as a matter of fact the shipping and exporting trades would suffer heavily by the change. To other trades, however, a protective tariff offers the only means of continuing during peace the profiteering which has been one of the greatest scandals of the war. War in itself, by cutting off communication with foreign lands, is a form of protection, and as we all know to our cost enables the

manufacturer to exact unheard-of prices from the public. Enormous fortunes have been made during the war, in spite of the fact that, from a capitalist point of view, there was a fly in the ointment. The war not only reduced supplies and stopped the little stream of imported manufactures which in time of peace served to keep the capitalists in check, but it also depleted to an unexpected extent the available supply of labour. If war prices can by any means be maintained in time of peace after millions of demobilised men have returned to compete in the Labour market, the "protected" capitalist will have everything his own way.

### War Prices in Peace Times.

That under these circumstances we should be faced with a strong demand for Protection is only a case of history repeating itself. Before the outbreak of the Napoleonic wars the Free Trade movement was making considerable headway in this country. Pitt was greatly influenced by Adam Smith, and in 1787 concluded a commercial treaty with France, which besides providing for freedom of navigation between the two countries effected considerable reductions in tariffs. The outbreak of war changed all this, and with war and increased duties we had a time of inflated prices. *You cannot have war without war prices*, and it is hardly likely that those who profit by them will relish the return to peace prices when the war is over. That was not so in 1815; it is not so in 1919. The price of wheat, in spite of the fact that only a small part of our supply came from abroad, rose to famine prices during the Napoleonic War. Rents rose and landlords became richer every year. With peace, however, in the natural course of things, would have come a gradual return to peace prices, had it not been for the imposition of the new Corn Law in 1815 and the retention of Protection. Protection, however, enabled the landlords and capitalists, then omnipotent in Parliament, to maintain to a great extent the high prices of war time. As far as prices were concerned, we had modified war conditions preserved for the first thirty years of peace, to the terrible loss of labour and to the profit of landlordism. And wherever a similar cause exists we may confidently predict a similar demand will follow. At bottom, the present demand for Protection is simply a demand to retain war prices during the coming years of peace.

As such, it should be resisted by Labour by every means in its power. To maintain high prices is just one way of keeping down the real wages of Labour. The real wages that a man obtains for his work consist of the various commodities he can buy with the money he receives. If money wages remain the same and the prices of food and clothing are reduced, while rents, railway and tram fares, admission to places of amusement, books, newspapers all become cheaper, the effect for the wage worker is exactly the same as if he had received an increase of wages, while an equivalent rise in the cost of these things unaccompanied by a corresponding increase in money wages is tantamount to a reduction in wages.

### International Aspects of the Question,

Judged as a matter of domestic politics, Protection cuts directly across the path of Labour. The direct and righteous aim of the Labour movement is the improvement of the standard of life for the mass of the people. This elevation of the standard of life is an end in itself, for which, if they were necessary, we would consent to accept losses of foreign trade and increases of home prices. We would consent, if need were, to a reduction in the total wealth of the country, if by a better distribution of the remainder we could abolish or reduce the poverty of the common people. But Protection, by raising costs and prices in a country so largely dependent on foreign trade as our own, would

weaken our power to export to neutral markets, while lowering the purchasing power of our people. Whether we look at the matter, therefore, from a personal or from a national point of view, the wage worker is compelled to oppose it. But there is another aspect of the matter which calls for consideration before closing this pamphlet. The economic and domestic aspects of the Labour movement are not more important, as we are now learning, than the spiritual and international ones. In spite of its apparent impotence in 1914, the international Labour movement is one of the most wonderful and striking creations of our generation. Through it alone can the ruin of four years of war be repaired; through it alone can the hatreds born of the war be reconciled. And this can only be done by a resolute determination to carry into domestic politics the spirit of the International; to allow no law of ours to deal harshly or with unfair discrimination against the foreigner. It is recognised everywhere now that the greatest interest of the world is peace, and it follows from that, wherever legislation has any bearing on the question at all, it should be so designed as to aid the cause of peace and international good will. Now protective tariffs, however little the framers of them may realise it, are a continual source of friction between nations. They start off from the assumption that the foreign trader is to be treated differently and worse than the home trader, in commercial matters at any rate. In so far as they are effective in checking imports, they hinder the growth of that intercommunication between the nations which is the truest basis of mutual understanding and friendship, and in so far as they are ineffective, the working of tariffs causes trade to be carried on under unjust and irritating conditions. Tariffs are the foundation of international ill-will and of wars. They lead to a struggle to obtain control over and monopolise new markets to the exclusion of foreign nations, who, on their part, naturally resent such exclusion. There has been far more international friction over the comparatively small colonial empire of France, where the mother country has striven to monopolise the markets by means of "preferential" tariffs, than over India and the Crown Colonies, where the markets are under the control of the home Government and have been left equally open to all the world. It is safe to say that had we maintained throughout the Empire such a system of preference as France enforces in hers, the rest of the world would have been long since arrayed in alliance to break down our monopoly.

### CONCLUSIONS.

To sum up. Though neither Free Trade nor Protection will solve the unemployed problem, all experience goes to show that, other things being equal, employment is steadier and better under Free Trade.

The import of foreign manufactures does not cause unemployment, for the amount of unemployment is always greatest when few foreign manufactures are being imported.

Tariffs tend directly to reduce the quantity of employment by raising prices and thus limiting the effective demand for goods and the labour embodied in them.

All trade is exchange, and goods imported from abroad have to be paid for by goods produced at home. The foreigner gives us nothing for nothing. We have to work for all we get from him.

Protection is not really designed to provide employment, but to raise prices. This it effectively does, to the advantage of the "protected" capitalist, but to the injury of the worker.

Lastly, Protection promotes international friction, and is a mischievous promoter of war and the ill-feeling that leads to war.



# PUBLICATIONS OF THE LABOUR PARTY

---

## **International Economic Policy.**

By L. S. WOOLF. Price 2d., post free 2½d.; 1s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.

## **Continued Education Under the New Education Act.**

### **The Juvenile Worker at the End of the War.**

### **Nursery Schools.**

Memoranda prepared by the Advisory Committee on Education. 6d., post free 7d.

## **The Ministry of Health.**

### **The Organisation of the Preventative and Curative Medical Services and Hospital and Laboratory Systems under a Ministry of Health.**

### **The Position of the General Medical Practitioners in a Re-organised System of Public Health.**

Memoranda prepared by the Advisory Committee on Public Health. 6d., post free 7d.

## **The Labour Woman.**

The Labour Woman's Monthly. 1d., post free 2d.; 2s. per year; 9d. per 12; 3s. per 50; 6s. per 100, carriage paid.

## **Women and the Labour Party.**

By various women writers, including Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB, MARGARET LLEWELYN DAVIES, MARY MACARTHUR, MARGARET BONDFIELD, MARGARET McMILLAN, and REBECCA WEST. Edited with an Introduction by Dr. MARION PHILLIPS, and a Foreword by the Rt. Hon. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P. 1s.; post free 1s. 2d.; 10s. per dozen, post free.

IN PREPARATION.

## **The Working Woman's House.**

By Dr. MARION PHILLIPS and Mrs. SANDERSON FURNISS. 1s. 6d.

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W.1

**THE MINES FOR THE NATION.**

**Workers' Control**

— IN —

**The Coal Mining Industry.**

BY

**FRANK HODGES,**

Secretary of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain.

---

**PRICE ONE PENNY.**

---

Published by

**THE MINES FOR THE NATION CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE,**

REPRESENTING

**THE PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE TRADES UNION CONGRESS.**

**THE MINERS' FEDERATION OF GREAT BRITAIN.**

**THE LABOUR PARTY.**

**THE CO-OPERATIVE UNION LIMITED.**

**32 and 33, Eccleston Square, London, S.W. 1.**

**NOW READY!**

**"The Mines for the Nation"**

A Reprint of a series of "Daily Herald"  
articles by the Labour Members of the  
Coal Industry Commission.

"A Miner's Life and Work,"

By HERBERT SMITH.

"The Public and Nationalisation,"

By FRANK HODGES.

'Nationalisation as a Consumer's Policy,"

By SIR LEO CHIOZZA MONEY.

"The Black Tiger,"

By SIDNEY WEBB.

'The Case for Industrial Freedom,"

By R. H. TAWNEY.

"The Miners' Bill,"

By HENRY H. SLESSER.

"Invested Capital against Human Life,"

By ROBERT SMILLIE.

---

---

Price, 3d.

Post free, 4d.

---

---

THE MINES FOR THE NATION CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE,  
32 and 33, Eccleston Square, London, S.W. 1.

# WORKERS' CONTROL

... IN THE ...

## COAL MINING INDUSTRY.

By FRANK HODGES

(Secretary of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain).

---

I propose to establish a case for self-government of the coal mining industry. This question has a very practical import at the present moment. The discussion about the industry has passed beyond the mere academic, and so have the proposals for its reconstruction. In dealing with it one has to remember it is rather a question of immediate politics, and any scheme that one would initiate has to bear relation to practicability. It is no use now to try to describe the industry under Guild Socialism. That would savour perhaps of the academic. The practical thing is to discuss proposals for the government of the industry *now*, in the light of our own views as to how the industry might ultimately be governed

### The Importance of Coal.

The coal industry is the most important in the country, other than agriculture. Agriculture is placed in the premier position because it carried along our social life before coal was discovered, and it will do so after coal has been fully exploited. Strictly speaking, therefore, coal occupies the second place in our national life, and all modern industries now in a state of mechanical development depend upon coal. It is true to say that its existence as an industry of first-class importance is to some extent threatened. Oil is a realised fact, and if there are sufficient quantities of oil in the earth, with the application of scientific minds to its production, it might hasten the passing of the coal era in a shorter period than we are prepared to admit.

### The Achievement of Private Enterprise.

Coal mining is an industry which, on the whole, has been fairly efficiently managed under private ownership. That must be said, with some qualification, however, because an industry can never be managed with thorough efficiency under private ownership; but within its limitations it has been to a large extent a success. For example, on the productive side, it has managed to produce 287 million tons per annum, a remarkable achievement in the British coalfield. The industry cannot be said to be a failure when production has reached such a tremendous figure. Mining is really a difficult occupation. Coal is not easy to exploit, and has to be wrung out of the earth at great cost. Credit must be given to private capitalism for having brought the technique of the industry up to a point where it was capable of producing such an output.

## **The Breakdown of Private Ownership.**

In the year 1913 it apparently ceased to expand, and that is the point at which, I think, capitalism in the industry broke down. There are many who will say "Yes, that was due to the War." Apparently that was so, because the War brought into existence rather new factors, or gave point to factors already in existence, which have made for this departure from expansion, this contraction in the industry. In six years production declined by practically 70 million tons. There were many contributions to that decline. There has been a decline in technique, a decline in the physical means of producing, a decline in machinery, in rolling stock, in the character of the underground workings. There has not been the same maintenance in the underground workings to make possible the continuance of output at the pre-war figure, but the most marked factor making for decline since 1914 has been the awakening consciousness among the men engaged in the industry. After giving full weight to all factors, physical and technical, the most remarkable, and one which has been accentuated during the War, is the growing consciousness that all is not well in the industry: that the men now engaged in the industry, and their fathers before them have been bereft during the whole of their lives of anything like a voice in the direction of the industry. That fact has left the workman in a state of antagonism towards the existing system of control.

## **The New Antagonism.**

This should be emphasised as the principal factor which has made for the decline in the industry. It is true there has been a reduction in hours; the output per unit engaged is down; but one could give reasons for that, apart from this growing feeling which is more individual in its character than anything else. It is the sense of lack of position and responsibility in the industry which has left this feeling of antagonism. If co-operation between the technical people and the manual workers cannot be secured in any industry, increased productivity need not be expected. For some time that feeling has been expressed very definitely in many ways. Recently a very remarkable scheme was propounded by some South Wales miners for the future control of the industry. It was the work of extremely thoughtful men, and one could perceive in it a spirit of bitterness, because of the complete detachment from the control of the industry by the men engaged in it. I studied that scheme, but could not accept it. At the same time, however, it was an expression in a more or less concrete form of the desires of men who have quite a distinct ambition for an effective control in the industry itself. It is evident that, until this desire has secured adequate expression, the output will not materially increase. It is true it will increase to some extent, because of the slight improvements that must take place in the technical and physical conditions of the industry; but output will never reach the pre-war level until avenues are provided for this desire now so manifest among men in the industry. This South Wales scheme is an illustration of what is going on among the men, but this desire for control has also found expression in much broader aspects. It has been officially expressed by the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, which has embodied a scheme of control in a definite Bill for presentation to the House of Commons.

The Miners' Federation has refused the Government offer to appoint workmen on the Boards of Directors under the capitalist system. They will not put workmen on the directorate either of a National Council or of a District Council. They do not wish minority control with private ownership.

## The New Scheme of Control.

I think for the first time in its history there is a scheme which makes provision for complete governance of the industry by the people engaged in it. I do not know of any other industry that has yet evolved so complete a scheme. It is true the scheme has not been accepted by the Government. The scheme suggested by Mr. Justice Sankey is by no means as complete as the miners' scheme, although it is a step towards it. The scheme outlined in the Miners' Federation Bill, is a scheme which divides the industry up into parts, with a view to removing it entirely from the domain of bureaucratic influence. The industry is national in its character, and, therefore, the machinery for its governance must also be national. It is suggested that the industry, in the first place, should be treated as a national asset, owned by the nation. The Government have already decided that *minerals* shall be owned by the nation, presumably because that did not conflict with the capital interests existent in the industry. If it had it is doubtful whether the Government would have been quite so ready to nationalise other people's property. But they have rejected the scheme for the national ownership of the *industry* as an asset on the productive side. That is the basis upon which the whole of the miners' scheme rests—that the mines as well as the minerals must be national property. Unlike the syndicalist proposal, it is not intended that the industry should be owned by the people engaged in it. That method is anti-social in character, and, if effected by force, would sooner or later break down.

## The Futility of Syndicalism.

For syndicalism the majority of British workers have no desire. If the workers exploited the national need of such a particular commodity as coal for the purpose of holding up the community and smashing the industrial system at one stroke, the result would be that some substitute commodity would be found. The workers prefer a series of steps leading towards a definite goal to a catastrophe that would cause universal suffering. The social aspect of the miners' scheme is founded in the fact that the industry and the coal—the raw material—must be treated as national assets, but the production must not be controlled and determined by the Government. On the contrary, the Government will have by no means a controlling voice in the industry. The miners suggest that one-half of the National Mining Council should be people directly appointed by the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, the other half to be composed of technical experts and commercial men, with one or two nominees of Parliament itself. There will be a definite link between Parliament and the industry through these Parliamentary nominees and through the Minister of Mines. Now that, of course, presupposes a good deal.

## The Management Staff.

The Miners' Federation of Great Britain is not at present sufficiently powerful or comprehensive to have within its ranks the technical workers engaged in the industry. It has only made provision so far in a limited way for managerial staffs. There has been great prejudice against managerial staffs in the past, warranted to some extent by the pressure constantly brought to bear upon the managers by interfering Boards of Directors. I am not quite sure even now whether the Miners' Federation of Great Britain are sufficiently removed from that old influence to permit of the technical staff, the brain workers, having complete membership in the Federation. This is a regrettable fact, which must be taken into consideration. The technical workers of the Mining Council could not

at present be directly appointed by the Miners' Federation. Sooner or later, however, we shall arrive at the stage when technical men, men of great ability, due to their natural qualities and to their careful and elaborate education, will be able to associate with the Federation. When such provision is made, all sections will then be jointly in a position to nominate the personnel of the National Council. Even if the miners' scheme came into operation, the appointment of the technical staff would have to be left very largely to the Managers' Associations, as they exist to-day, small and ill-defined in character, or, alternatively, to the Ministry of Mines. It must be agreed that it is a weakness in any scheme if the technical men have to be appointed by bodies outside the industry.

### **The Sankey Scheme.**

The Sankey scheme, on the other hand, does not permit of anything like similar representation, even of the Miners' Federation, upon the Council. It makes provision for the National Mining Council, and seeks to remove the influence of capital from the industry. It also provides for a Minister of Mines, but as the Miners' Federation could not appoint the technical workers, the National Mining Council would not be composed as to one-half of representatives of the workers in the industry and the other half of the nation. The men actually engaged in the industry would compose less than a half of the Council, which would have a preponderance of Government nominees representing the consumers. The Government urge that if they appoint people to act on the National Mining Council they will be there in a representative capacity and will represent the consumers, but I am not prepared to make that inference from previous appointments of Government nominees. Anyhow, even under the Sankey scheme, which the Miners think should be adopted, there is provision for the election of representatives of the workers in the industry to the National Council, both on the manual and the technical side. If this were realised it would represent the greatest step forward yet attained, because these changes could only come into existence upon the established fact that the influence of capitalism is eliminated. It might be argued that the Sankey scheme is more social in its character than even the Miners' Federation Scheme, for a preponderance of the consumers' or Government's representatives would indicate that the industry itself was controlled by, and subject to, the decisions of the people not engaged in the industry, and, therefore, of a very definitely social character.

### **Is the Miners' Scheme Anti-social?**

The criticism that the Miners' Federation scheme is anti-social is met by the argument that as the workers, both technical and manual, secure definite control of any great industry, possessing such preponderance of power, they realise their dependence and inter-dependence upon other industries. They would also realise that any movement they might initiate, having for its object the raising of the condition of those engaged in their particular industry, at the expense of men and women engaged in other industries, would be calculated to fail in operation, and their consciousness of such prospective failure would grow with their increasing responsibility.

After all, the miners cannot consume the coal they produce. It must be exchanged for the material things that go to make up a miner's life, and if the miners, because of their preponderating influence, ever wanted to take advantage of the community, the retaliation would be so immediate that they would not proceed. They would quickly realise the inter-dependence of their industry on other industries in the country.

## **The Delegation of Responsibility.**

If the National Mining Council represented all the actual control miners were going to secure, one would say it would be little different from what they have at present. The election of five representatives out of over 1,100,000 men does not secure effective control. It would be found that the delegation of their responsibilities by 1,100,000 men to five representatives would not provide anything like sufficient personal interest to the mass. In any scheme that may be propounded, one is faced all the time by an apparent willingness to delegate responsibility to others. It is natural that should be the case, yet it is deplorable. To note the readiness of men to delegate responsibility to others, and at the same time to criticise those others for not carrying out their work efficiently, often makes for pessimism. Happily, however, this is not the limit of the contemplated control. In the miners' scheme of control for the governance of this industry, devolution is provided, because only with it can you secure individual freedom to the individual man.

Theorists have spoken of various motivations for work—"the motive of public service," "the incentive of citizenship in an industrial democracy." These excellent ideals will only be realised after many years of universal education. The incentive on which the Miners' Federation rely is more practical than these. The miner realises increasingly the need of producing coal, in order to exchange it for other commodities which he wishes for a good life. His interest is not in raising wages with prices constantly rising and outdistancing wages. His interest is in working out such a relationship with all other workers as will bring in to him a flow of goods in return for his own product. The maximum of production, in relation to short hours and health, is to his interest.

What the miner wishes, if I understand him aright, is a moral relationship to his fellows. That means security, status, and a system whereby the product of his work goes to other men and women for their use and their products come to him, for the creation of a good life for all. For true property—the property which a man's personality inhabits, such as home and heirlooms—the miners have a strong desire; they are curiously lacking in any acquisitive instinct, any desire for heaping up possessions.

## **The National Mining Council.**

The functions of the National Mining Council would be in the direction of determining how the industry is to be developed, to determine such things as national surveys of the coalfields, and, through the medium of their experts, to allot certain areas in the country in which new pits had to be sunk. They would be the persons to determine the annual output of coal, to determine the price of the coal, and to determine the various qualities of coal that have to be consumed in particular ways. They would also deal with the finance of the industry. It is contemplated that the finances would be determined by the National Mining Council as distinct from the Exchequer. It is also suggested that a sinking fund should be founded by the National Mining Council to meet the depreciation of machinery, &c. It would also determine, through representation from the authorities beneath, what economies of a national character could be effected in the industry, and what surplus, after the sinking fund had been established, could go into the National Exchequer to provide social amenities. In a word, the National Council would be the connecting link between the Industry and the Nation.



## The District Councils.

The second stage in the scheme is the creation of District Councils. These should be more or less in keeping with the existing district or geographical areas. For example, there would be District Councils for South Wales, for the Midlands, Yorkshire, North Wales, &c. These District Mining Councils would be largely composed in the same manner as the National Mining Council, *i.e.*, one-half directly elected by men engaged in the District—and as an Industrial Union is not an immediate possibility, the other official Unions would expect to have a voice in deciding who should represent them technically. There would also be representatives of the National Mining Council on the District Mining Councils. These Councils would be responsible for carrying out the broad policy laid down for them by the National Mining Council. They would know the output expected to be produced from their respective areas; they would know how the different classes of coal in their areas should be directed into the different channels of consumption. There would be no interference by the National Mining Council in the internal administration of the Districts. There would be no overbearing interference from the central authority because the general terms agreed to by the National Mining Council would have been already agreed to by the people forming the District Councils. They would be left largely to work out for themselves the efficient production of coal in their own particular areas. They would be responsible for mechanical improvements in the mines in their districts, and would make suggestions as to the types of machinery that should be used. They would have regard to the adaptability of certain positions of the coalfield to certain types of exploitation, and would determine where central pumping stations or central generating stations should be erected. They would not determine wages, but would see that the wages in their respective areas corresponded. The co-ordination of wages would be a function of the National Mining Council.

The same criticism applies to the District Mining Councils as to the National Mining Council. In South Wales there are 250,000 men engaged in the mining industry. If a District Council were comprised of ten elected representatives of the workers, exclusive of the technical representatives, it could not be regarded as a satisfactory degree of control for these 250,000 men. It is the desire to get away from the notion that other men should govern for the majority that is constantly being insisted upon.

## The Pit Councils.

Behind the District Mining Councils, fifteen of which I think would largely cover the industry, there would be Pit or Colliery Committees. The Pit Committees are the best and the most democratic means by which the mass of the workers can express themselves. Without these Committees they might express themselves only once in three years when they were electing their nominees to sit upon the National Mining Council, and only once a year when they appointed their representatives on the District Councils. Under part of this scheme, however, they can express themselves at the colliery every day. For at every colliery it is contemplated there should be set up a Pit Committee comprised exclusively of the managerial, technical, and manual workers.

The manager by legislation has been made legally responsible by the Government to the Government for the "governance of the mine." His powers and duties are explicit in the matter of safety. The manager, under workers' control, would be responsible to the Pit Committee.

On a disputed matter he would have the right of appeal against the workers to the District Council. He would be the elected, the delegated representative of the workers, under their executive control. He would have the same sanctions, the same authority, which the Trade Union official has to-day: the responsibility and the authority of the delegated person.

Jointly, the Pit Committee and the Manager would be responsible for the good governance of the mine. They would work to try to get their particular pit to come up to the productiveness, under the regulations, laid down for it by the District Mining Council. For instance, if a District Council were to decide that a pit with six seams of coal in operation, could produce 1,500 tons of coal a day, and that, after due consideration had been given to its geographical position, the disturbance in the coal seams and strata generally, that particular mine could produce coal at a definite cost, the Pit Committee concerned would have for its object the production of coal up to that amount and at that cost. There would be no need to produce above the output indicated, because that might disturb the general productivity for the area, with the result that having produced an excess for that area the cost per ton, later on, would have been increased because of the depreciation caused by unnecessary idle days at the colliery. The Pit Committees would be a joint body responsible not only for production but for the safety of the workers in the mine. Instead of the present practice of the Government appointing Mines' Inspectors to see that a mine is being properly conducted in accordance with the Mines Regulation Act, and instead of the managers of collieries having to appoint what are known as "deputies" or "examiners" to see that a mine is working in such a way as to give the maximum security to the men, consistent with production at the maximum profit, it would be the business of the Pit Committee, working with the men, to see that every man is responsible for his own safety, or to appoint Safety Inspectors responsible to the Committee.

## The New Era.

As they were invested with the responsibility, so the men would be educated to understand that, in an ever-widening circle, they had a particular task to perform, and they would then soon understand the essential purpose of their task. They would see that it was their business to get their fixed quota of coal from their own particular colliery, with a maximum security for their own lives and limbs, at the minimum cost of production. It may be urged that this is too much to hope for—that the men are only interested in drawing their wages, that they do not mind what the output is, that they are not concerned as to the general conditions of safety, that they do not mind the cost of production. How can we expect them to change from that mental attitude to the one described? To elect their Pit Committees, to put forward ideals, both on the managerial side and on the manual side—how can such a change take place without considerable chaos? Personally, I do not think the transition would be quite so sudden, because of the lack of self-reliance on the part of the miners, due, let it be said, to no fault of their own. As a matter of fact miners, as a class, are as well educated as most workers, if not rather above the average, but they have not yet been blessed with the opportunities of getting the kind of education that could lift them out of the influence of the wage-system mentality. It will be a question of time before the most insignificant man at a colliery can be persuaded to take an active part or to assume active responsibility in his work. That will take time, ten, fifteen, twenty years, maybe, but, after all, that is not much in the

history of the working class, and certainly it is a short period compared with the history of the wage system. First of all, no doubt, there would be a ready willingness on the part of the miners to delegate responsibility to the Pit Committees, but as they grew in experience of the Committees' work, so would their social outlook develop, and, in turn, their willingness to accept responsibility and their general interest would increase. Sometimes I feel that there is a great mountain of indifference even in the Mining Movement, but I know the reason for that indifference. It can be reduced to smaller and smaller proportions, even though men act blindly in the initial stages in electing men to control their pit. Out of the most deplorable willingness to delegate responsibility to others will come an increasing reluctance to delegate responsibility to others. There will never be a state of society where responsibility will not be delegated, but it will grow, in my judgment, smaller and smaller. The old willingness to delegate must be expected to manifest itself under this scheme, but it will gradually disappear. That may be optimism, but it accounts for all my faith in the Labour Movement. Labour will get further away from the slave idea of delegating responsibility, but as long as the working class has that outlook they will be slaves. •

### **Workers' Control is a Means—not an End.**

Work in the modern industrial world is unpleasant for the majority of workers. They will find their expression as human beings outside the working hours—in the use of leisure for family life, education, recreation, hobbies. They will use control to get efficient management and machinery; to shorten hours to the minimum consistent with the essential work of high production; to save them from the waste and insecurity and long hours of the present system, which leaves no secure and creative leisure. They will use control to obtain a minimum of work consistent with a production which will give sufficient commodities for a good life for all workers. But control will never of itself be an answer to the instincts now thwarted by standardised machine industry. That answer will be found outside of working hours.

I am quite sure that in this scheme for control of industry which I have had to sketch in very general terms, it will be seen how near it is to a concept of Guild Socialism. It is an attempt to establish such a system, though it would certainly not result in Guild Socialism, but in a Guild. All the nation's essential industries must be organised as Guilds before Guild Socialism can be secured. Progress will be accelerated in the other industries in proportion as this scheme is successful. The scheme must inevitably be successful, though much trouble may be encountered before the goal is reached. I would have people consider these definitely constructive ideas as applied to coal-mining, because they have for their object the bringing into the industry the active participation of every man engaged in it. These ideas are of a social character, not anti-social in any way, and only along these lines can the nation achieve real Industrial Democracy.

THE LABOUR PARTY:

16

---

# TAXATION

BY

JOHN A. HOBSON.

---

PRICE 1d.; POST FREE 1½d.

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.

# PUBLICATIONS OF THE LABOUR PARTY.

---

---

## Handbook of Local Government.

Paper Edition, 3s. net., post free 3s. 2½d.  
Cloth Edition, 5s. net., post free 5s. 5d.

## Labour and the New Social Order.

A Report on Reconstruction after the War. 2d., post free 3d. : 1s. 6d. per 13 : 6s. per 50 ; 12s. per 100 ; £6 per 1,000, post free.

## Memoranda on International Labour Legislation.

The Economic Structure of the League of Nations. 1s., post free 1s. 1½d.

## Labour Women on International Legislation.

This pamphlet contains proposals on Women's Employment (by GERTRUDE M. TUCKWELL), the Employment of Children (by Dr. MARION PHILLIPS), and the Prevention of Unemployment (by A. SUSAN LAWRENCE, L.C.C.), and has been issued with the approval of the Standing Joint Committee of Industrial Women's Organisations. Price 3d., post free 3½d. ; 2s. per dozen, carriage paid.

## The Labour Party and the Peace Treaty.

This is a Handbook for Speakers and contains a critical analysis of the Peace Terms, comparing its provisions with the pronouncements made by the National and International Labour Movement from time to time. Price 1s. 6d. post free : 12s. per dozen, carriage paid.

## The Peace Terms.

.By the Rt. Hon. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P. 2d., post free 2½d.

## Labour and the Peace Treaty.

Containing Parliamentary Speeches by Rt. Hon. W. ADAMSON, M.P., Rt. Hon. J. R. CLYNES, M.P., Mr. STEPHEN WALSH, M.P., and Mr. TOM SHAW, M.P. 2d., post free 2½d.

## Labour Policy and the Famine.

This pamphlet indicates the present economic position of Central Europe and sets out Labour's policy of immediate remedies. Price 2d., post free 2½d. ; 1s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.

## International Economic Policy.

By L. S. WOOLF. Price 2d., post free 2½d. ; 1s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.

## The Capital Levy How the Labour Party would settle the War Debt.

By F. W. PETHICK LAWRENCE. Price 2d., post free 2½d. ; 1s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.

## Tariffs and the Worker.

By BROUGHAM VILLIERS. Price 1d., post free 1½d. ; 9d. per dozen, carriage paid.

## Irish Nationalism and Labour Internationalism.

By BERNARD SHAW, with Foreword by J. R. CLYNES, M.P.  
Price 3d., post free 3½d.

## Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Present Conditions in Ireland (January, 1920).

Price 2d., post free 2½d.

---

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.

# TAXATION.

By JOHN A. HOBSON.

---

A modern democratic State needs a constantly increasing income in order to perform efficiently its public services. A portion of the required income may be derived from the sale of certain services such as those rendered by the Post Office or the Railways, where these are in State hands, or in some countries from lands, mines, forests and other public properties. If the British State could acquire, operate, or lease on advantageous terms, our railways, mines, electric plant and other services and industries hitherto left to private enterprise, it is possible that it might obtain considerable revenues from these remunerative services. After due consideration for the interests of the workers in these specific services, and of the consumers, some rents or profits might be available to defray part of the cost of the non-remunerative services, such as defence, police public health and education.

But, at any rate for some time to come, by far the greater part of the revenue of our State must be got by taxation. The legacy of debt left over by the war and the large immediate needs of social reconstruction, make demands upon the State so heavy as to involve a revenue probably five times as large as the pre-war amount. This gives great urgency to the issue of a tax policy. Before the war, Labour concerned itself little with such matters, except to resist the threatened attack upon its standard of life by Tariff Reform. But there devolves upon the Labour Party now, the double duty, of resisting direct and indirect attacks upon the money or real wages of the workers, and of devising sound methods of raising, from sources possessing a true ability to bear taxation, the large tax-revenue that is needed.

Having regard to the present revenue requirements, which mount up to something like 1,000 millions, even if the bad foreign policy of the Government with its extravagant expenditure on armaments is reversed, it will be necessary to discover and to tap all available sources of taxation. Setting aside for the moment the emergency proposal of a Capital Levy,\* and turning to the regular sources of annual taxation, we have first to bear clearly in mind the fact that such regular taxation must be derived from the income of the year, that is to say, it must direct from private to public possession a part of the year's product by taking through taxation the money that it represents.

## WHO PAYS THE TAXES?

All ordinary taxation falls upon the income which individual citizens get from the labour of their brains or muscles, or from the rent, interest and profits, derived from the land and capital of which they are the legal owners. Even where taxes are laid upon commodities and are said to fall on "the consumer," they do so by raising prices and so reducing the "real" income which his money income purchases for him.

In seeking to comprehend clearly processes of taxation, it is best to ignore the common distinction made between taxes borne by producers' incomes and those borne by consumers, and to treat all taxes as being, what in the last resort they are, deductions from income. The reason for doing this is that it focuses our interest sharply upon the crucial issue, what incomes have and what have not an "ability to pay"?

---

\*See separate pamphlet, "*The Capital Levy*," by F. W. Pethick Lawrence, The Labour Party, 2d.

## ABILITY TO PAY.

How badly this issue was realised even by so great a pioneer in Tax Theory as Adam Smith, is seen in the first of his *Maxims* which declares that "The subjects of every State ought to contribute towards the support of the Government, as nearly as possible, in proportion to their respective abilities; that is, in proportion to the revenue which they respectively enjoy under the protection of the State." If ability to pay is to be reduced thus, then every citizen, whatever the size of his revenue or income, must make a contribution. This view is persistently expounded by well-to-do economists and publicists who attach to it a high moral value. "Every citizen who enjoys the protection and other services of the State, should feel that he is making some direct personal sacrifice for the upkeep of this State."

Now this view rests on the false assumption that every owner of an income has "ability to pay." Incomes which consist of payments necessary to sustain and to evoke the productive use of any factor of production, have no ability to pay. Such elements of income are necessary costs of production and any attempt to put a tax upon them reduces productivity. The chief of these necessary costs is wages. The standard wage in an industry seldom exceeds what is required to enable the worker to maintain himself and his family in full economic efficiency. This physiologically necessary income, may be said to have an absolute inability to bear taxation. For any tax which was laid upon it must, unless it were shifted, cause a reduction in the taxable body of wealth. Even where a standard wage contains some provision for conventional class comforts, any attempt suddenly to reduce it will have the same effect. It will either reduce the effective supply of labour and so reduce the product, or, if labour is strongly organised enough, it will force a rise in money-wages, which will shift the tax, either on to the employers' profits, or on to some other income with real ability to pay.

## CAN WAGES PAY ?

There are, no doubt, wage-incomes containing large recent increases, not yet firmly incorporated in a standard of life, which have some ability to pay. But, speaking generally, standard wages in such a country as Great Britain, consist entirely of necessary costs of production, and any tax, direct or indirect, imposed upon them is a bad tax. Bad, if it lies, because it depresses production. Bad, if it is shifted, because the shifting process is wasteful, vexatious and uncertain.

What is true of wages is true of certain other payments made to the owners of other factors of production. Where such payments, or incomes, are under existing circumstances necessary, in order to evoke the full economic use of the factor, whether it be business or professional skill or capital, such income has not ability to bear taxation. Note the qualifying words "under existing circumstances." They apply both to the remuneration of capital and of brain labour in its more profitable spheres. So long as capital is supplied wholly or mainly by private individuals out of that part of their income which they save, or do not spend, it will be necessary to secure to them some inducement in order to evoke this saving. No doubt a certain amount of saving would be made out of large incomes, if interest sank to zero, but not enough for the quantity of fresh capital required by a nation with growing population and growing needs. So long, therefore, as industries are run by private enterprise, a minimum payment of interest is as economically necessary as a minimum wage. And it has the same inability to bear a tax.

The same applies to incomes paid to business men, professionals, officials, &c., whether the income be called profit, salaries, or fees, or wages of management. Much of the work done by these people is socially productive, and the minimum payments necessary to evoke and sustain it must be secured to them. These minimum payments are costs of production.

## THE CAPITALIST'S "SURPLUS."

But the differences between the capacity of the wage-earners and the recipients of interest, profits, rents and salaries to bear taxation, is of vital significance. For, whereas almost the whole of wages is necessary to evoke the use of labour, the payments made for the use of land, capital and the more remunerative kinds of ability contain elements of surplus, due to natural or contrived scarcity or to other favourable economic positions enjoyed by the recipients. It is unnecessary to dwell upon the incomes derived by land-owners under the form of rent. So far as rent consists of payment for the use of unimproved land, it is wholly surplus, and has entire "ability to pay," as all economists admit. So far as recent "improvements" are included, rent contains some element of interest, and a minimum interest, as we recognise, must rank as a "cost" without true ability to pay.

While land-values contribute largely to the taxable surplus they cannot, as single-taxers contend, be treated as comprising that surplus. The greater part of the surplus in such a country as Britain consists of interest, profit, salaries and fees, which exceed the payments necessary to evoke the use of the capital or ability that is involved. This surplus emerges at a thousand different points in the processes of bargaining for payment by which industry and commerce are conducted. This surplus, thus variously composed, may properly be regarded as an income which is social, in the sense that it is not required for the support of individual effort, and upon which the State may properly draw to support the social work it undertakes.

## INCOME TAX AND DEATH DUTIES.

But this distinction between "costs" and "surplus," though theoretically sound, does not furnish a simple practical basis of taxation. For the detection and measurement of the innumerable separate bits of surplus which enter into incomes are not feasible. Only in the case of land-values may it be possible to assess the surplus separately, and even there the fact that much property will have exchanged hands under conditions which have not distinguished it from other forms of property will make any special taxation seem inequitable. On these and other grounds it is best to retain and improve the existing instruments of income-tax and death duties for securing as much of the surplus as the State requires. The defence of this policy rests upon the generally sound assumption that the larger an income is the larger the proportion of surplus it may be assumed to contain. The exemptions, deductions and allowances, progression and super-tax in our present system are an admission and a partial application of this principle. But a series of important reforms are needed to enable the income tax to do what is required.

## THE EXEMPTION LIMIT.

1. The exemption limit should be such as to secure from all taxation the economic subsistence of the wage-earner, and should vary with variations in the price-level of the articles entering into that subsistence.

In order to make good this exemption, a more liberal interpretation should be given to those "expenses necessarily and exclusively incurred for the purpose of the employment" which are supposed to be taken into account in assessing wage-incomes for purposes of the income tax. In particular (1) Travelling expenses to and from work, and allowances for tools, clothing and other items of cost incurred in connection with employment should receive more liberal treatment; (2) Trade Union contributions and sick and accident fund contributions should be deducted from taxable income.

## FAMILY INCOMES.

2. Since all income needed for the maintenance and improvement of a worker and his family ranks as costs, it is clear that the taxable surplus which any family income contains, varies with the size and needs of the family. This justifies a large extension of the



present inadequate allowances for wife and children by the adoption of the principle thus formulated by Mr. Sidney Webb, that " Family Incomes should, for income tax purposes, be divided by the number of members of the family (husband, wife, children, step-children, father and mother, or grandparents only) actually maintained therefrom. There could then be allowed from the combined Family Income, in respect of the persons maintained therefrom, whatever abatement each portion of such income would justify, if it were that of one person only."

### A CURVE OF VALUATION.

3. With these provisions made for the lower grades of income, it would be well to do away with the allowances, abatements, and supertax of the present system, and replace them by a single progressive curve of valuation, according to which every taxed income would pay a different rate of taxation according to its size. The present method contains two grave faults. The first is the sudden jumps in the tax-rate at a number of arbitrary points in the rise of taxable income. Each of these sudden jumps arouses a sense of grievance and evokes under-declaration of income, especially in the lower level of incomes, where the jumps are greatest. The second fault is the slowing down of the rate of progression in the higher incomes. While a rate of 9s. in the £ is reached at £14,000, the rate at £40,000 is only 10s., and at £150,000 the maximum rate is no more than 10s. 4d. Since almost the whole of the highest grades of income is pure " surplus " this depression and ultimate stoppage of the rise in tax-rate is exceedingly wasteful. The greater part of the increased income that the State requires for improved social services, should be got by raising the rates upon the high levels of income.

4. In order to make the income-tax a completely effective instrument of public revenue, everything that rightly ranks as income should come under its survey. Before the war farmers' profits, assessed at the ridiculous amount of one-third of the rental, virtually escaped all taxation. Even now, though the ordinary basis of assessment has been raised to double the rental, prosperous farmers are in most instances much undertaxed. Moreover, the excess-profits tax has never been applied to agriculture, though considerable fortunes have been made out of food-shortage and subsidised prices.

### HOW TAXES ARE EVADED

During the war, many firms doing war-work have been permitted to apply a large proportion of their profits to extensions and improvements, instead of distributing them as dividend, thus escaping taxation on these gains. Though the large reserves which have been created by many lucrative businesses do not escape ordinary taxation, they escape super-tax by distribution under the head of " bonus shares." The great bulk of the gains made during the war by shipowners, from increases of the capital value of ships and compensation for lost ships, amounting in all to several hundreds of millions, have wholly escaped taxation. The same applies to other large enhancement of capital values in agricultural lands, breweries and other values, which can be used as income by their owners, though they have paid no tax. Many large gains made by selling shares and other properties at enlarged war values have similarly escaped taxation by failing to figure in the income of any year.

### THE TAX ON INHERITANCE.

Though a reformed Income Tax will be the chief instrument of taxation, it needs to be supplemented by Death Duties which tap the capital wealth from time to time. For, though it may be feasible to get considerably more revenue by better progression of the tax on the higher levels of income, it is expedient that the income-tax shall not be so heavy as to interfere with the saving of the classes that can afford to save. An income-tax, beyond a certain point might check production or saving, or both, and this under existing circumstances would be socially injurious. We have seen that a great deal of increase of wealth

escapes taxation by not figuring as income. It can and should be heavily taxed when it passes at the death of the owner to persons who have certainly done nothing to create it.

War finance has done very little to exploit this source of revenue. For though the yield from Income Super-taxes was raised five-fold between 1914 and 1918, the yield from Death Duties was increased by no more than some 15 per cent. A considerable increase of revenue should be obtainable from this source by a general raising of the tax and a sharper progression in the larger estates. Public opinion everywhere is favourable to this mode of raising revenue. It must, however, be remembered that though income-tax and death duties are complementary, they are also substitutional, in the sense that a high income-tax reduces the accumulation of property, while a high death duty reduces the subsequent income of the heirs and legatees.

### INDIRECT TAXATION.

Indirect taxes are generally bad, being secret and injurious in their incidence and expensive in collection. Having regard to the necessary imperfection of any income-tax as a measure of ability to pay, I find a strong case for reinforcing it by a few taxes on luxuries. Foremost I would place an Inhabited House Tax, reconstructed, better graduated, and confined to dwellings where accommodation in space and number of rooms was more than adequate to the hygienic and other reasonable needs of the occupants. The existing license duties upon motor-cars and carriages, men servants, game licenses, and such other minor luxuries as armorial bearings might be maintained and increased, though the total yield from such sources could not be large. A few of the license duties of wider incidence such as those on guns and dogs, might be retained, less for revenue, than as checks upon unnecessary expenditure.

The only important indirect taxes, however, that an intelligent State would retain are those directed to the control and restraint of a few important popular luxuries, the large consumption of which is detrimental to personal health, morals or public order. Alcoholic drinks and tobacco, in their present excessive use, may reasonably be taxed under this head.

The other indirect taxes, under the heads of Customs or Excise, Licence or Stamp Duties, should be removed as injurious interferences with liberty of life or commerce. The so-called "Breakfast Duties" upon tea, coffee, cocoa, sugar &c., are an utterly indefensible secret assault upon the incomes of the poor.

### THE CASE AGAINST TARIFFS.

It is not practicable here to discuss at length the impudent attempt of certain business interests to raise prices and tax consumption by means of prohibitions and duties upon imports entering the country. The endeavour to lay the foundations for a full protectionist policy by protection of "key industries" and war-made industries, anti-dumping regulations and imperial preferences, is not likely to be very successful at a time when everywhere supplies are short and prices high. But it is well to remember that any concessions to specious pleas of protection against "dumping" will put the consumers of this country at the mercy of the strongly established combines and trusts which are everywhere asserting their control of markets.

As a means of revenue, a tariff is the worst of instruments. It is very costly to collect and for every pound it brings to the revenue, it costs several pounds to the consumer, who pays a higher price, not on the imported goods only, but on the home-made goods as well. Nobody now advocates a tax upon imported foods and raw materials, in view of the world-shortage likely to exist for some years to come. But a tariff upon "wholly or mainly manufactured" goods would not yield more than a net 27 millions (upon the corrected import values for 1913), even at a high average duty of 20 per cent. Nearly all of this would eventually be drawn from consumers, i.e., from the real incomes of taxpayers in this country, and by raising prices would cause a reduction in the yield of direct taxes.

\*See separate Pamphlet, "Tariffs and the Worker," by Brougham Villiers, The Labour Party, 2d.

## TAXES AND THE CAPITAL LEVY.

In no way could the yield of a protectionist tariff make any substantial contribution to the great revenue our State requires for its post-war needs. If the nation is to find for next year, a tax-revenue not far short of 1,000 millions, it will find it practically impossible to raise so large a sum by the methods of ordinary direct taxation here discussed, without recourse to an emergency levy. To load upon the ordinary expenditure so heavy a sum as 400 millions, for the service of the debt, would, I hold, be likely to make a demand which the annual taxation could not bear. At least a half, and if possible, three quarters, of this charge should be redeemed by a levy upon capital. Bad war-finance and profiteering have brought enormous accessions to the monetary wealth of the well-to-do classes. Dr. J. C. Stamp, a leading official authority, conjectures that a net addition of £5,250 millions has been made during the war to the individual wealth which would be subject to a capital levy. This takes account of the falls in certain values and sets them off against the gains. It is impossible here to present even in a summarised form, the arguments by which Mr. Pethick Lawrence in his book, "A Levy upon Capital," has established the feasibility and desirability of a levy. I would merely add that, even were the dangers and difficulties attending a levy graver than its opponents have shown to exist, it would still be better to confront and overcome them, than to break down the ordinary taxing system, by putting upon it a heavier burden than it can bear. Public finance stands to-day in a difficult position. Risks and dangers meet it whatever course is adopted. It is not an issue between high taxation and a capital levy. In no case can high taxation be avoided. The capital levy is necessary to prevent high taxation from becoming excessive and impracticable.

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS.

Labour's policy in the sphere of Taxation, therefore, includes, besides the Capital Levy, the following essential proposals:—

1. Taxation must be based upon "ability to pay," that is, it should be levied upon the "surplus" beyond what is necessary to maintain a reasonable standard of life.
2. The main expedients should be the retention and development of income tax, and death duties, with a higher exemption limit corresponding to the increased cost of living, and allowing to the worker a reasonable standard of life before taxation begins to be levied.
3. Allowances for expenses incurred on tools, travelling, clothing, &c., should be on a liberal scale, and Trade Union and "friendly" contributions should be exempt from taxation.
4. Family incomes should, for income tax purposes, be divided by the number of persons dependent upon them.
5. Allowances, abatements, &c., should be replaced by a single system of more steeply graduated taxation, and increased revenue should be secured by raising the rates on the larger incomes.
6. Everything that is really income should be liable to tax, and steps should be taken to defeat such methods of evading super-tax, &c., as the creation of bonus shares.
7. Death duties should be increased and the principle of resuming a large proportion of big accumulations at the death of their owner fully recognised.
8. Indirect taxation should be restricted to taxation on luxuries, and indirect taxation on necessities should be abolished.
9. Tariffs, including specious attempts to protect so-called "key industries," should be opposed as taxes upon consumption, which place the consumer at the mercy of combines and trusts, and also because they are very costly to collect and involve huge waste, and, by increasing prices, cause a fall in the yield of direct taxes.

# THE LABOUR PARTY.

---

If you wish to study the Capital Levy  
more fully, buy

## “A LEVY ON CAPITAL”

BY

F. W. PETHICK LAWRENCE.

---

Crown 8vo. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net ; Paper Covers, 1s. 6d. net.

---

*The Daily Herald* says :

“ If you are interested, read it ; if you're not, read it just the same ;  
you will be before you have finished.”

*The New Statesman* says :

“ An extremely useful volume, full of valuable information and  
suggestions.”

*The Manchester Guardian* says :

“ The best statement, set forth in cold, clean, exact argument,  
with statistical evidence, yet made of the case for ‘A Levy  
on Capital.’ ”

*The Labour Leader* says :

“ This volume is the authoritative text book on the subject,  
and should be read by all who are interested, and certainly by  
all who speak or write upon the question . . . . This whole  
subject is dealt with in a captivating manner, and the book is  
heartily commended to our readers.”

# THE LABOUR PARTY.

---

## Handbook of Local Government

FOR ENGLAND AND WALES.

---

“The Labour Party, of 33, Eccleston Square, Westminster, S. W. 1. have issued a most useful little handbook under the above title at the modest price of 5s. net. We sincerely hope that it may attain a very considerable circulation, which it certainly deserves. . . . The amount of information contained within the pages of this modest little book is amazing. . . .

Taken as a whole, the book appears to us to be admirably adapted to fulfil the purpose for which it is intended, and newly elected, and even experienced, councillors will find it both informing as to their duties and interesting in itself, as, in spite of the large number of different contributors, it is written throughout in a style which is exceedingly easy to read and in every way suited to non-technical minds.”

*Local Government Chronicle, May 1st, 1920.*

“The book is well worth having for reference by all councillors or people who are intelligently interested in local governing bodies, whatever their politics. For we know no better description of the powers and duties of such bodies, and the Acts conferring these powers are admirably summarised. An enormous amount of inquiry and labour have gone to the making of this book, and in issuing it the Labour Party has rendered a public service which those of us who do not belong to that Party ought not to hesitate to recognise and appreciate.”

*Western Daily Press, May 4th, 1920.*

# PUBLICATIONS OF THE LABOUR PARTY.

---

---

## **Labour's Russian Policy Peace with Soviet Russia.**

Price 2d., post free 2½d. ; 1s. 6d. per dozen, post free.

## **The Empire in Africa : Labour's Policy.**

Price 2d., post free 2½d.

## **Taxation.**

By JOHN A. HOBSON. Price 1d., post free 1½d.

## **Trusts and the Public.**

Price 2d., post free 2½d. ; 1s. 6d. per dozen, post free.

## **The Nationalization of the Coal Industry.**

By R. H. TAWNEY, M.A. (Member of the Coal Industry Commission, 1919).  
Price 6d., post free 7d.

## **Industrial Legislation.**

Price 2d., post free 2½d.

## **Labour and the Milk Supply.**

With Preface by J. R. CLYNES, M.P.  
Price 3d., post free 3½d.

## **Continued Education under the New Education Act.**

## **The Juvenile Worker at the End of the War.**

## **Nursery Schools.**

Memoranda prepared by the Advisory Committee on Education. 6d., post free 7d.

## **The Ministry of Health.**

## **The Organisation of the Preventative and Curative Medical Services and Hospital and Laboratory Systems under a Ministry of Health.**

## **The Position of the General Medical Practitioners in a Re-organised System of Public Health.**

Memoranda prepared by the Advisory Committee on Public Health. 6d., post free 7d.

## **The Labour Woman.**

The Labour Woman's Monthly. 1d., post free 2d. ; 2s. per year ; 9d. per 12 ; 3s. per 50 ; 6s. per 100, carriage paid.

## **Women and the Labour Party.**

By various women writers, including Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB, MARGARET LLEWELYN DAVIES, MARY MACARTHUR, MARGARET BONDFIELD, MARGARET McMILLAN, and REBECCA WEST. Edited with an Introduction by Dr. MARION PHILLIPS, and a Foreword by the Rt. Hon. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P. 1s. ; post free 1s. 2d. ; 10s. per dozen, post free. (In preparation.)

## **The Working Woman's House.**

By Dr. MARION PHILLIPS and Mrs. SANDERSON FURNISS. (84 pp., illustrated.) 1s. 6d. ; post free 1s. 7½d.

---

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.

NOW READY.

# THE LABOUR PARTY'S HANDBOOK OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

FOR ENGLAND AND WALES.

---

---

## SYNOPSIS.

PREFACE. By F. W. JOWETT.

- PART I. Local Authorities and their Powers. The powers of the various authorities are set out in tabular form, classified under subject-headings, with a rubric of the Acts of Parliament from which these powers are derived. This is followed by a short description of the constitution and powers of local authorities.
- PART II. Procedure and Finance. An article on "The Complete Councillor" sets out briefly what the aims of a local Councillor should be. A chapter on Local Government Finance describes the processes of rating and valuation.
- PART III. Special subjects of particular importance at the moment. These are: Housing, Town Planning, Milk Supply, Maternity and Child Welfare, Education, the Profiteering Act, and the administration of Naval and Military War Pensions. These articles outline the Labour policy in regard to these important matters, which are treated fully in a manner that should make the Handbook one of wide general interest.
- PART IV. An Alphabet of Local Government Services. This section covers the principal remaining functions of Local Government, such as allotments, libraries, hospitals, &c. These are dealt with in short paragraphs, arranged for convenience of reference under alphabetical subject-headings.

Bibliography is also arranged under subject-headings, with short notes on the scope of the books given.

An article on "The Fighting of a Municipal Election" describes the process of electioneering and makes suggestions of practical value.

Finally, the Handbook contains a Directory of Trades Councils and Local Labour Parties.

---

PRICES: Paper edition, 3s. net; post free, 3s. 2½d.  
Cloth edition, 5s. net; post free, 5s. 5d.

For Quantities of less than 100:

27s. per dozen of 13, paper.

45s. per dozen, of 13, cloth.

# ORGANISATION OF WOMEN

WITHIN

## THE LABOUR PARTY

---

### The Work of the Women's Sections

---

#### I.—CONSTITUTION OF WOMEN'S SECTIONS.

**T**HE Constitution of the Labour Party provides for the establishment of a Local Labour Party in each borough constituency and in each urban district of a county constituency. The Women's Section in each consists of the individual women members of the Local Labour Party. Any woman accepting the principles and agreeing to abide by the rules of the Labour Party may join a Local Labour Party as an individual member on payment of the subscription fixed by the rules of the Party, which must not be less than 6d. a year. Members of associations such as trade unions which are already affiliated to the Local Labour Party are also eligible to become individual members on payment of the subscription.

In County Divisions there must be a Divisional Labour Party covering the whole constituency, and in each Urban District a Local Labour Party which will be represented on the General Council of the Divisional Labour Party. In the Rural Districts of County Divisions there are Polling District Committees which men and women join, and it is advisable to form a Women's Group in each Rural District in order to promote organisation amongst them. In Divided Boroughs (i.e., Boroughs consisting of more than one constituency) the Constitution provides for the establishment of a Central Labour Party, on which the Local Labour Party in each constituency will be represented. In a Central Labour Party it may be well to form a Women's Association consisting of all the individual women members of all the Local Labour Parties, which will help to carry out in all parts of the Borough the work of political organisation amongst women. By thus joining all the forces of the women greater stimulus will be given to educational political work amongst them. In a similar way the County Divisions might arrange for the formation of such an Association linking up the women of the Local Labour Parties and the rural Polling District Committees.



## II.—FINANCE.

The Women's Section forms part of the Local Labour Party, and the method of financing it must be a matter for decision by the Local Labour Party itself, which will, of course, discuss the matter with the Section. It may be decided to pay all contributions from individual members into the Local Labour Party funds and to have the expenses of the Section met from those funds as need arises. Another method would be to give the Women's Section a certain proportion of each contribution. In either case it may be found advisable to allow the Women's Section to raise special funds for its own purposes. The Local Labour Party should, however, provide for a meeting place out of its funds and also for the ordinary expenses of stationery and postage. It must, however, in any case be remembered that the Section must abide by the decision made by the governing body, that is, the General Committee of the Local Labour Party, upon which it is represented.

The financing of the Associations is a matter entirely for local arrangement, and their needs must be met by contributions (1) from the Central Labour Party or the Divisional Labour Party, or (2) from the Local Labour Parties and Polling District Committees, or (3) by a special contribution paid to the Association by each member.

## III.—ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SECTION.

Where there is any group of organised Labour women the Local Labour Party Executive should invite them, together with representatives of other industrial women's organisations both affiliated and not affiliated, to act as a provisional committee for forming a Women's Section. It is of great importance that representatives of other women's organisations should be included in order that the full support of bodies such as the Women's Co-operative Guild, the Railway Women's Guild and the women's trade unions may be gained. In districts where there are mixed unions or other bodies eligible for affiliation which contain a number of women, representatives of these should also be included. Such a provisional committee should at once set about the work of getting new recruits and arrange with the Local Labour Party to hold a special meeting to form the Women's Section.

When the Section has been established its members should without delay select representatives up to the number agreed upon by the Local Labour Party in accordance with its rules for the General Committee. The Secretary of the Section should send to each meeting of the General Committee a short report of the work of the Section, together with any proposals made by the Section as to action which should be taken by the Local Labour Party.

#### IV.—OFFICERS OF THE SECTION.

The Women's Section should elect its own Secretary, Chairman and Vice-Chairman, Literature Secretary and Committee and any other officers which it thinks necessary to carry on its work. It may be advisable in the first place to elect all the officers and representatives on the General Committee for a short period only, say three months. By that time the Section may have grown a great deal, and it would then be possible to bring into office some of the new members.

The Section must hold an Annual Meeting for the election of its representatives on the General Committee of the Local Labour Party. At this meeting it would be advisable to elect its other officers also.

#### V.—MEETINGS.

The Section should meet once a week or once a fortnight. In some districts it is found convenient to have meetings alternately afternoon and evening, as many women cannot get away easily in the evening. At these meetings the Section's business should be discussed and a point made of always having some matter of general interest discussed also. Whenever possible, lectures should be arranged and visitors invited to hear them. Social functions, too, should not be despised and sewing parties, besides helping to raise funds, are useful in drawing members together and in bringing in new ones. It must always be remembered that politics are new to many women, and to come into them by means of social intercourse is an easy way. A section, therefore, should have:—

- (1) Business Meetings.
- (2) Educational Meetings, either combined with business meetings or as separate meetings to which outsiders may be invited.
- (3) Propaganda Meetings. Wherever possible these should be held in conjunction with the Local Labour Party.
- (4) Tea Parties, Dramatic Entertainments, and Socials, with short speeches explaining what the Labour Party is.
- (5) Sewing Meetings for those who like to meet and chat over the affairs of the Party.

At all meetings, membership forms should be available for new members.

In choosing the subjects for the meetings it must be remembered that women join the Party who have very varied interests, and it is best to choose matters which give all a full opportunity. Sometimes a trade union question should be discussed, sometimes a question dealing more especially with the home. "The Labour Woman" has from month to month suggestions for lectures in citizenship which would make subjects for an evening's discussion.

## VI.—BUSINESS MEETINGS.

At these meetings representatives on the General Committee should report and delegates who may have been sent to any Conference should give their account of the proceedings. Representatives on other committees, to which reference is made later, should also give their regular reports.

## VII.—REPRESENTATIVES OF THE WOMEN'S SECTIONS ON OTHER BODIES.

As the Women's Section forms part of the Local Labour Party it will not be able to send direct representatives to serve on Committees, etc., unless specially asked to do so by the Local Labour Party. It will, however, be found an advantage if women representatives on Maternity and Child Welfare Committees, National Kitchens Committees, Local Pensions Committees, Local Food Control Committees, and women Councillors or Guardians keep in very close touch with the Women's Section and report to it on the proceedings of the body with which they are connected. It is always in the power of the Local Labour Party to ask the Women's Section to make nominations for such appointments, or for the Women's Section to put forward their nominations through their representatives on the General Committee. The closer the touch that is kept between such representatives and the Section the greater will be the interest felt by women in the work of Labour.

The same applies to representatives sent to attend Conferences; where women representatives are sent it will be useful if they give a report to the Women's Section as well as to the Local Labour Party.

## VIII.—ELECTION WORK.

A very important part of the work of the Section is to help in organising for Local and Parliamentary elections. They have not only to prepare themselves to become candidates but also to help in getting support for Labour candidates in the constituency. Most of their work will be done on the Ward Committees and Polling District Committees where they will work with the other members of the Party in organising the constituency. Women's Visiting Committees should undertake the special task of visiting women electors and distributing literature explaining the work of the Party and also the registration of electors and the qualifications needed by women. In addition to these Visiting Committees, Cottage Meetings will be found useful—five or six women meeting together to discuss what the Labour Party stands for and how to work for it. In this way a large number of women will be reached who will be willing to go to their neighbour's parlour to a small gathering, but would not like to go far off to a bigger meeting. New members will be gained in this way and public opinion amongst women will be influenced. In all election work the help of the women will be greatly needed and cordially welcomed by the election agent.

## IX.—LITERATURE.

The Labour Party publishes every month a journal called "The Labour Woman," dealing especially with questions in which women are most interested. This paper costs 1d., and is supplied to Sections at 9d. per dozen, post free. The Literature Secretary should make it her duty to get as many subscribers as possible and arrange for members of the Section to deliver the paper to subscribers as soon as it reaches the Secretary. She should also try to get volunteers who would sell the paper at meetings and take it round from house to house seeking new subscribers. Other literature is published by the Labour Party and lists of new publications appear from time to time in "The Labour Woman." Whenever a new leaflet comes out it is well to get some copies and ask one member to make a special study of it and discuss it at a Section meeting.

## X.—TRADE UNION ORGANISATION.

The Women's Section should maintain especially close relations with all trade unions having women members and assist them in the work of getting new members and in any industrial crisis that may arise.

## XI.—OTHER ORGANISATIONS OF WOMEN.

The Women's Section should exercise great care when asked to affiliate to any organisation outside the Labour Party. If they should decide to affiliate their decision must be endorsed by the Local Labour Party before it can be carried out. It is specially necessary to be careful now about joining any non-party political organisation, for this may serve to turn the interests and energies of the members into other channels and draw them away from the more important work of organising within the Party. It is, however, often advisable to join with other organisations of either a party or non-party character for some special object such as the organisation of National Kitchens, the extension of open spaces, or some such specific purpose.

## XII.—CONFERENCES WITH OTHER WOMEN'S SECTIONS.

It will be found valuable in stimulating organisation amongst women to hold from time to time District or County Conferences at which all the Women's Sections are represented and questions of organisation amongst women and other matters of special interest such as Housing, Education, Night Work for Women, Equal Pay for Equal Work, Woman as Domestic Worker, etc., etc., may be discussed. The best method of establishing such Conferences would be for a Women's Section, or a Women's Association, with the consent of the Local Labour Party, to take the initiative in calling a Conference of all the Sections within an area which is conveniently arranged for railway communication. At such a Conference a District Committee could be

elected to take in hand the arrangement for future gatherings, either half-yearly or quarterly. The expenses of the Conference could be met either by a contribution made by each Women's Section or Local Labour Party, or by a fund raised by some special effort amongst the Sections concerned. These Conferences might be arranged on a county basis, or by one or two counties joining one another, and other organisations eligible for affiliation might be asked to send women delegates. Where there is a federation of Local Labour Parties the area of the federation would probably be the most convenient one to take, and in that case the expenses of such a conference might be met by the federation. A delegate's fee of 1s. would probably cover the greater part of the expense other than fares.

### XIII.—VISITS OF NATIONAL ORGANISERS.

The National Executive has appointed women organisers to assist in establishing the Sections and to help<sup>o</sup> in their development. These organisers make short visits to the constituencies and it is intended that they should give a stimulus to organisation and not do the spade work necessary in the constituency itself. The chief burden of such work must necessarily fall upon the people resident in the locality. It may be advisable for a constituency to appoint a resident woman organiser to help and direct such work as this. The visit of the national organiser can do no more than set things going, or give special encouragement when once they have been started. In arranging for the visit it is desirable that on the first day in the constituency she should meet the Executive of the Local Labour Party and discuss with them the conditions of the district. Arrangements for her to meet the women members either for the establishment of the Section, or who have already formed the section, should be made beforehand.

Where the Women's Section has not yet been established it would be well to arrange for a social gathering with a speech from the organiser. This should be followed by a meeting to inaugurate the Section and to appoint a committee. The organiser would discuss with the Committee the work which lay before them, and if possible, arrangements could be made for her to return at a later date. A Conference for women might be arranged for her return visit on a subject such as Housing, which is of general interest, and another meeting at which she would discuss with the Section the business side of their organisation. If before her visit the Women's Section is already in being, a Conference on the organisation of women would be most valuable. It is important to impress upon all Local Labour Parties whose constituencies are being visited that meetings of the organiser should be well advertised beforehand, in order that the short time at her disposal may be used to the best advantage. Part of her time might be occupied in visiting trade union branches which contain women members, or important organisations of women, such as the National Union of Railway Women's Guilds and the Women's Co-operative Guild.

It is important that large branches of Trade Unions, even though they contain only male members, should be visited in order to impress upon the men the need of interesting their wives in political matters. The delegate meetings of the Labour Parties give a good opportunity for the organiser to get into touch with all the affiliated organisations and she should be invited to address them. It is also advisable in holding public meetings to invite men as well as women, for it is often easier for husband and wife to attend together, and it is desirable to interest the men in women's questions.

As soon as a Section is formed the Secretary is invited to communicate with Dr. Marion Phillips, The Labour Party, 33 Eccleston Square, London, S.W.1, who will at all times be glad to give advice and help in the conduct of the work, to suggest subjects for discussion, to tell her of suitable literature, and to send information on the work of various Local Government bodies in which the Section may be interested.

---

**PUBLISHED BY**  
**THE LABOUR PARTY, 33 ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON,**  
**S.W.1.**

**Price 1d. each, or 9d. a dozen.**

# PUBLICATIONS of the LABOUR PARTY

THE following publications will be found useful by women interested in the work of the Party:—

**Women and the Labour Party.**—By various women writers, including Mrs. Sidney Webb, Margaret Llewelyn Davies, Mary Macarthur, Margaret McMillan and Rebecca West, edited with an Introduction by Dr. Marion Phillips, and a Foreword by the Rt. Hon. Arthur Henderson. 1s., post free 1s. 2d.

**Labour and the New Social Order.**—A Report on Reconstruction after the War. 2d., post free 3d.; 1s. 6d. per 13, carriage paid.

**Memorandum on War Aims,** agreed upon by the Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference, February, 1918. 1d., post free 2d.; 1s. per dozen, carriage paid.

**New Party Constitution.**—1d., post free 2d.; 9d. per dozen, carriage paid.

**Labour Year Book, 1916.**—Cloth edition, 5s.

**Labour Year Book, 1919.**—Cloth edition, 5s., Paper, 3s. 6d. Ready shortly.

**The Labour Woman.**—The Labour Woman's Monthly. 1d., post free 2d.; 2s. per year.

**The Aims of Labour.**—By the Rt. Hon. Arthur Henderson. 1s., post free 1s. 2d.

**The Position of Women after the War.**—Report of the Standing Joint Committee of Industrial Women's Organisations, presented to the Joint Committee on Labour Problems after the War. 2d., post free 3d.; 5s. for 50, carriage paid.

## LEAFLETS

**The Labour Party.**—A statement of its objects, with application form for membership attached. 6 page folder, 30s. per 1,000, with particulars of Local Party.

**Why Women should Join the Labour Party.**—2 pages. 1s. per 100; 5s. per 1,000, post free.

**Men and Women, Look after your Votes!**—A Summary of Franchise qualifications. 2 pages. 2s. per 100; 12s. 6d. per 1,000, with particulars of Local Party, post free.

**The Working Woman's House.**—4 pages, with plans. 1d., post free 2d.; 9d. per dozen; 5s. 6d. per 100; £2 per 1,000, post free.

**To the Woman in the Home.**—2 pages, 1s. per 100; 5s. per 1,000, post free.

**Why Labour Supports a League of Nations.**—2 pages, 1s. per 100; 5s. per 1,000, post free.

To be obtained from—

**THE LABOUR PARTY, 33 Eccleston Square,  
London, S.W.1**

• The National Labour Press, 8 & 9 Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, E.C.4.  
Also at Manchester.

THE LABOUR PARTY.

---

# THE CAPITAL LEVY

(HOW THE LABOUR PARTY WOULD SETTLE THE WAR DEBT)

BY

F. W. PETHICK LAWRENCE.

---

PRICE 2d.; POST FREE 2½d.

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.



# **PUBLICATIONS OF THE LABOUR PARTY**

## **Labour and the New Social Order.**

A Report on Reconstruction after the War. 2d., post free 3d.; 1s. 6d. per 13; 6s. per 50; 12s. per 100; £6 per 1,000, post free.

## **Memoranda on International Labour Legislation.**

The Economic Structure of the League of Nations. 1s., post free 1s. 1½d.

## **Labour Women on International Legislation.**

This pamphlet contains proposals on Women's Employment (by GERTRUDE M. TUCKWELL), the Employment of Children (by Dr. MARION PHILLIPS), and the Prevention of Unemployment (by A. SUSAN LAWRENCE, L.C.C.), and has been issued with the approval of the Standing Joint Committee of Industrial Women's Organisations. Price 3d., post free 3½d.; 2s. per dozen, carriage paid.

## **The Labour Party and the Peace Treaty.**

This is a Handbook for Speakers and contains a critical analysis of the Peace Terms, comparing its provisions with the pronouncements made by the National and International Labour Movement from time to time. Price 1s. 6d. post free; 12s. per dozen, carriage paid.

## **The Peace Terms.**

By the Rt. Hon. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P. 2d., post free 2½d.

## **Labour and the Peace Treaty.**

Containing Parliamentary Speeches by Rt. Hon. W. ADAMSON, M.P., Rt. Hon. J. R. CLYNES, M.P., Mr. STEPHEN WALSH, M.P., and Mr. TOM SHAW, M.P. 2d., post free 2½d.

## **Labour Policy and the Famine.**

This pamphlet indicates the present economic position of Central Europe and sets out Labour's policy of immediate remedies. Price 2d., post free 2½d.; 1s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.

## **The Capital Levy: How the Labour Party would settle the War Debt.**

By F. W. PETHICK LAWRENCE. Price 2d., post free 2½d.; 1s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.

## **International Economic Policy.**

By L. S. WOOLF. Price 2d., post free 2½d.; 1s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.

## **Continued Education under the New Education Act.**

## **The Juvenile Worker at the End of the War.**

## **Nursery Schools.**

Memoranda prepared by the Advisory Committee on Education. 6d., post free 7d.

## **The Ministry of Health.**

## **The Organisation of the Preventative and Curative Medical Services and Hospital and Laboratory Systems under a Ministry of Health.**

## **The Position of the General Medical Practitioners in a Re-organised System of Public Health.**

Memoranda prepared by the Advisory Committee on Public Health. 6d., post free 7d.

## **The Labour Woman.**

The Labour Woman's Monthly. 1d., post free 2d.; 2s. per year; 9d. per 12; 3s. per 50; 6s. per 100, carriage paid.

## **Women and the Labour Party.**

By various women writers, including Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB, MARGARET LEWELYN DAVIES, MARY MACARTHUR, MARGARET BONDFIELD, MARGARET McMILLAN, and REBECCA WEST. Edited with an Introduction by Dr. MARION PHILLIPS, and a Foreword by the Rt. Hon. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P. 1s.; post free 1s. 2d.; 10s. per dozen, post free. (In preparation.)

## **The Working Woman's House.**

By Dr. MARION PHILLIPS and Mrs. SANDERSON FURNISS. 1s. 6d.

# THE CAPITAL LEVY.

## HOW THE LABOUR PARTY WOULD SETTLE THE WAR DEBT.

By F. W. PETHICK LAWRENCE.

There is confusion in the mind of John Bull. With the war came high prices, high taxes, high profits, high money-wages, in an ever-increasing circle. The peace, he argued, would therefore reverse the process; prices would fall, taxes would go down, wages would cease to go up in money but would buy more in goods. None of these things have happened! Prices are still rising, the Budget cannot be balanced unless taxes are increased, profits are still enormous, and wages continue to go up in £ s. d. but the worker is not better off. Why is it?

The root of the matter is that as a nation we are still refusing to face reality. We have taken hundreds of millions of bits of paper and have called them £1 notes and thousands of millions of bigger bits of paper and called them war certificates, or war bonds, or something like that, and individuals have put these bits of paper into their pockets, or locked them up in their safes, or deposited them with their bankers, and have said to themselves that they were wonderfully wealthy. And they are spending on this basis. And the Government continues to spend on wars all over the world, and to print more pieces of paper to pay for them.

These pieces of paper are, however, really all I.O.U.'s. Each piece is a debt. Who owes this debt? The State. Who is the State? The citizens of the country. Reality will not be faced until the citizens realise that the country as a whole is poorer owing to the war, and that they individually are therefore poorer, and that their wealth must be written down by the whole amount of the State debt. This "writing down" can only effectively be accomplished by means of a levy on capital.

### A FEW FACTS AND FIGURES.

Suppose you were to add together the value of all the wealth owned by all the citizens of the country—the land, the houses, the shops, the factories, the machinery, the ships, and shares in railway companies, banks, mines, and in other companies and businesses all over the world, and were to add to this the amounts held by British citizens of paper money, war bills, bonds, and certificates and also the wealth of corporate bodies, and of the municipalities of the country, it is probable that you would reach a total of something like 20,000 millions of pounds. This may be conveniently written as £m 20,000. On the other hand, if you were to compute the net debt of the State after making all allowances you would not be far wrong if you put it at £m 6,000 (6,000 millions of pounds). That is to say, the citizens own between them £m 20,000, and owe between them £m 6,000. Facing reality means writing the £m 6,000 off the £m 20,000, and so reducing it to a genuine £m 14,000 with the State debt wiped away.

If you work out the sum, you will find that £m 6,000 is 30 per cent. of £m 20,000, so that if every person who owned any form of wealth were made to pay at an equal rate, each would be called upon to give up 30 per cent. of what he or she had got at the present time. But no one is so silly as to suggest that this should actually be done. No one proposes, for instance, to impose the levy on a man whose whole wealth consists of a little household furniture and make him give up one bedstead, two tables and chairs and some of his kitchen utensils to the Government. Just as there is an exemption limit (far too low to-day in the view

of the Labour Party) for incomes below which income tax is not paid, so there will be an exemption limit for total wealth below which no levy will be exacted. The actual exemption limit will have to be a matter of discussion when the right time comes, but the view of the Labour Party is that it should certainly not be less than £1,000, and no one who has less than the limit will have to pay any of the levy at all.

Further, no one suggests that even above the exemption limit everyone should pay at an equal rate on their total wealth. The rate will be graduated so that the big fortunes will pay more in proportion than the small, just as at the present time the big estates have to pay death duties at a much higher rate than the little ones.

Finally, in order to meet hard cases there will have to be certain allowances and concessions. Some old people and others who are incapacitated from earning any money just manage to live at present on the interest of a few hundred pounds saved up. It would evidently be quite unfair to impose any levy upon them, even if the total amount of their capital exceeds the exemption limit. In all such cases where the income pays no tax because it is below the exemption limit of income the capital also will be exempt from the levy on capital until after the death of the owner.

#### A SCALE TO RAISE £2,000,000,000.

If it were decided to raise £m 2,000 (two thousand million pounds) it could be produced by adopting the following scale:—

Part of capital below	£		Free
	1,000	and 1,500	
" " between	1,000	1,500	5 per cent.
" " "	1,500	2,000	6 "
" " "	2,000	3,000	7 "
" " "	3,000	5,000	8 "
" " "	5,000	7,500	9 "
" " "	7,500	10,000	10 "
" " "	10,000	15,000	11 "
" " "	15,000	20,000	12 "
" " "	20,000	30,000	13 "
" " "	30,000	50,000	14 "
" " "	50,000	75,000	15 "
" " "	75,000	100,000	16 "
" " "	100,000	150,000	17 "
" " "	150,000	200,000	18 "
" " "	200,000	300,000	19 "
" " "	300,000	500,000	20 "

and so on at increasing rates.

It is important to realise that under this scale the rate of the levy given in the last column is not imposed on the whole of a man's wealth but only on that part of it which is over a certain figure, while the other parts pay at lower rates.

Thus a man whose total wealth is £1,100 would only pay 5 per cent. on the hundred pounds between £1,000 and £1,100, while his first £1,000 would go free, so that his total payment would be £5.

A man with £2,000 would have to pay altogether £55. (Nothing on the first £1,000; £25 on the next £500; £30 on the next £500). That is to say he would be paying at the rate of 2½ per cent. on his whole wealth, or, in other words, he would be paying a levy of about 6½d. in the £.

A man with £10,000 would pay altogether £760, i.e., at the rate of about 7½ per cent. on his whole wealth, or 1s. 6d. in the £.

A man with £100,000 would pay altogether £13,760, i.e., at the rate of about 13½ per cent., or 2s. 9d. in the £.

A man with £1,000,000 would pay £197,760, or about 19½ per cent., or 3s. 11½d. in the £.

#### A SCALE TO EXPUNGE THE DEBT.

Unfortunately, the sum of £m 2,000, though enormous, is only one-third of the whole net debt, which is about £m 6,000; and, therefore, in order to wipe out the whole net debt a very much higher scale will have to be adopted. Unless a somewhat different graduation be preferred, the necessary amount could be obtained by multiplying each one of the rates in the last table by three.

Under this scale a man with £1,500 would have to pay three times as much as before, i.e., £75. In other words, he will be called upon to pay 5 per cent. or 1s. in the £ on his total wealth.

A man with £10,000 would pay 23 per cent. or 4s. 6d. in the £ on his total wealth.

A man with £100,000 would pay 41 per cent. or 8s. 3d. in the £.

A man with £1,000,000 would pay 59 per cent. or 11s. 11d. in the £.

#### THE ALTERNATIVES TO THE CAPITAL LEVY.

The figures in the foregoing paragraph show that the capital levy will involve a severe sacrifice of wealth on the part of the very rich. And, consequently, though it will still leave them in possession of fortunes which to lesser men seem enormous, the proposal is likely to meet with their strenuous opposition. It will be well, therefore, at this stage, before going into more minute details, to consider what alternatives there are to the adoption of the capital levy.

In the first place, everyone who thinks about it knows that the country's finances are to-day in a rotten condition. In spite of the present high taxes upon food and other things, in spite of the 6s. income tax and graduated super-tax and death duties, the Budget not only does not balance but shows a huge gap between receipts and payments.

For the current year (1919-20) the deficit is almost certain to exceed £m 400, and even in the "normal" years following, after allowing for rigorous cutting down of expenditure, it will amount to hundreds of millions of pounds on the present basis. This cannot go on. If it be not speedily corrected it will lead straight to national bankruptcy and general ruin.

Some means or other must therefore be found of restoring solvency. Apart from the capital levy, the principal suggestions for doing this are: 1, repudiation; 2, a levy on war fortunes; 3, a general increase of ordinary taxation.

#### REPUDIATION.

Repudiation of the war debt sounds off hand a simple proposal, but, as a matter of fact, it would be fraught with the most disastrous consequences. In the first place, morality apart, it is a very dangerous thing for any Government to repudiate obligations openly incurred by its predecessors. Such action destroys all confidence and sense of stability, for people know that promises of the new Government are likely themselves to be broken by a Government coming subsequently into power. The new Government is therefore deprived of all credit and confidence.

Again, the proposal is grossly unfair as between different individuals. If A has his money in War Loan it takes away all he has, while it leaves B, who has his money in some other form, in full possession. B may be a very rich man, who has made heaps of money out of the war, while A may have lost money and be comparatively poor.

Further, repudiation would upset the whole basis of business credit and bring the present business world to bankruptcy. Finally, the proposal would exasperate foreign creditors and lead to such hostility abroad as very likely to cause war. A similar result in the case of Russia has already led Lenin to offer to meet the foreign creditors of Russia.

Needless to add, repudiation would be more stoutly resisted by the wealthy classes than the capital levy itself.

### THE TAXATION OF WAR FORTUNES.

The proposal to place a special levy on fortunes made out of the war is one which needs to be more carefully examined than is possible in the limited space of this pamphlet. It is quite clear, however, that in any case such a tax could not produce sufficient to wipe out the whole debt, and that, therefore, even if it be adopted it would not be as an alternative, but as an auxiliary to a general levy on capital.

### THE LEVY OR INCREASED ORDINARY TAXES?

If all heroic proposals are rejected the Chancellor of the Exchequer will be thrown back on the increase of existing taxation. This will mean higher taxes on food and drink and tobacco, an income tax of 7s. 6d. or more in the £, with a stiff super-tax in addition, so that the very rich will be paying away altogether 60 or 70 per cent. (12s. or 14s. in the £) of their incomes in taxation to the State. These heavy burdens will continue annually for 50 years or more until at last the Sinking Fund has paid off the debt.

On the other hand, if a capital levy be imposed and the whole debt be thereby swept away, it will be possible to reduce existing taxation lowering the taxes on food, etc., and, roughly, halving the present rate of income tax. Some idea of how these alternative methods of dealing with the situation will work will be gathered from the following examples of representative men and women:—

I. Aged workman, no longer capable of working, who has saved £1,200, with which he has bought a little property, from which he derives £75 a year, which is his only source of income. This man pays no income tax to-day as his income is below the exemption limit. For the same reason he will be entitled to the special concession referred to above, and will not pay any share of the capital levy during his life, even though his capital is over £1,000. The levy will not, therefore, directly affect him, but he will benefit indirectly by the reduction in general prices that the levy will bring about.

II. Workman, with total wealth £100, wages £5 a week. This man will not be called upon for any contribution to the levy on capital, even if part of his £100 be in War Savings Certificates. If, on the other hand, the Budget deficit be met by higher taxes he will have to pay more income tax and high prices for what he buys.

III. Small shopkeeper, with capital £1,400 and personal effects £100, obtaining an income of £500 a year. He will have to pay a levy of £75, which will cost him, if he cannot pay it at once, about £4 per year. (If he has saved £100 and put it into War Loan he will be able to pay the levy out of this.) At the same time,

however, his income tax will be only \*£31 a year. If instead of the capital levy ordinary taxes are increased he will have to find £67 10s. a year in income tax, and, in addition, the cost of living will be dearer. He will, therefore, be much better off if the levy be imposed, and could if he liked pay off his whole share of the levy in a couple of years out of his saving in income tax alone.

IV. Business man, with capital of £9,000 and personal effects £1,000, obtaining an income of £1,200. He will have to pay a levy of about £2,300, which he can, if he likes, pay annually in the form of interest of about £120 a year.† At the same time his income tax will be £113 instead of £270, so that he will be considerably better off, having a net income of £967 instead of £930.

V. In the same way professional men and all those who are earning a salary or profits by their own exertions will have their position improved.

VI. The only people whose income will be reduced will be those of great wealth and those living without personal exertion on the proceeds of investments. But even in their cases the great reduction in annual taxation will make the burden of the levy much less than it seems at first sight.

There will, of course, be hard cases. Some of these are unavoidable, whatever method be adopted for dealing with the war debt, but in many cases it will be found possible to alleviate hardship by special concessions. One of these—that to the old or incapacitated—has already been mentioned. A discussion of others would be too detailed for the present pamphlet.

#### THE CASE OF CORPORATE FUNDS.

Much of the wealth of the country is not held in the first instance by individuals, but by corporate bodies, and the question is often asked as to how these will be affected by the capital levy. To answer this question it is necessary to distinguish between different kinds of such bodies,

In the first place, there are the railway companies, banks, breweries, manufacturing concerns, etc. These will not pay the capital levy as companies, but the individuals who own their shares and debentures will have to include them at market price in the list of their own total wealth and pay accordingly.

In the second place, there are the municipalities. These also will pay no contribution to the levy. But, of course, individual holders of municipal stock will have to pay on the value of their holding.

In the third place, there are a number of institutions and associations possessing wealth which is not represented by any shares held by individuals. Such bodies, for instance, are: the City of London Companies, clubs, churches, chapels, universities, mutual assurance societies, co-operative societies, trade unions, friendly societies, etc. At present, some of these pay income tax on the whole or part of their property, but do not pay super-tax or death duties; others are exempt altogether.

Generally speaking, those bodies which are exempt from income tax to-day will, for the same reason, be exempt from the levy, while those that pay income tax will have to pay some contribution to the levy. But the case of each one of these bodies ought to be considered afresh when the capital levy is imposed.

\* The calculations are based on the assumption that without a levy on capital the flat rate of income tax will have to be 7s. 6d. in the £, but that instead a levy is imposed to sweep away the whole net debt of £21,600, and that the income tax is then reduced to 3s. 6d. with correspondingly lower rates for persons of incomes less than £2,500.

† Of course, if he elects also to pay off the levy in instalments, his annual payment will be greater, but he will then be improving his future position.

Co-operative societies are in a special position, as their so-called profits are really the savings of mutual trade. They are therefore exempt to-day from income tax except in the case of holdings of land. For the same reason, the Labour Party, which was entirely opposed to their wrongful assessment to excess profits duty, is of opinion that co-operative societies should be exempt altogether from the capital levy.

As the effect of the capital levy will be to give relief from other forms of taxation, including such income tax as they actually pay, the result to co-operative societies will be a reduction in the burden they have to bear.

### **CAN THE LEVY BE PAID?**

The principal objection brought forward against the levy on capital is that it would be quite impossible to raise so large a sum of money as £m 8,000 (six thousand millions), and that if the Government were so foolish as to try to do so the only result would be that everyone would rush to sell their securities for cash; there would, it is said, be many sellers and no buyers, prices of shares would fall and fall, and the money would not be forthcoming.

There would be something to be said for this objection if the State actually wanted money to spend. But what it really wants is to cancel its indebtedness, and for this purpose the title deeds of property are just as useful as money itself. Accordingly, it will be stated in the law by which the levy is imposed that it may be paid in "kind" if the taxpayer prefers. Of course, not every "kind" of wealth will be acceptable to the Treasury. A man could not pay in armchairs, or pictures, or racehorses, or worthless securities. His option will be limited to such forms of wealth as the Treasury would care to possess. For instance, the Treasury would accept:—

1. War Loan Shares, War Bonds, War Certificates, Consols, or other forms of Government security. These, on receipt, will simply be cancelled and destroyed and the debt correspondingly reduced.

2. Railway shares and debentures, mining shares, interests in land, bank shares, etc. By receipt of these the State will become part owner of the railways, mines, land, banks, etc. Of course, in so far as the levy is paid in these forms of wealth, the amount of the debt will not be reduced, but its character will be changed. It will no longer be a dead weight debt, but a reproductive debt, like that incurred by a municipality for gas works or tramways, and the State will have the profits on these enterprises with which to meet the interest on it.

3. Municipal loans, colonial or foreign loans, other reliable stocks and shares, etc. The possession of these by the State will provide interest with which to meet the interest on the debt.

In other cases where the taxpayer can neither pay in any of these forms, nor find cash down, he should have the option of paying in instalments over a number of years. This will apply to business men whose whole capital is locked up in their own business (the case of companies will be met by individuals handing over some of their shares), and will resemble the payment of income tax.

### **OTHER OBJECTIONS.**

1. It is said that the levy will cut down the capital of the country when it is most needed.

The levy will not cut down capital; it will merely transfer the title deeds of ownership. The Government does not want money but to cancel indebtedness, and this is merely a bookkeeping transaction where the country as a whole is concerned.

2. It is said that the assessment will present insuperable difficulties, and cause endless delay.

Each individual will be obliged within six months of the passing of the Act to make a complete valuation of his capital as at the date of the introduction of the Act. He will pay on this valuation. Subsequently, his statement will be checked and his payment adjusted. Most of the information required for this is already available in the shape of income tax and super-tax returns, probates, etc.

3. It is said that the levy is a repudiation of the debt.

This is not true. The citizens of the country are in any case jointly liable for the State debt. There is no essential difference between asking them to pay off the capital out of their total wealth and asking them to pay off the interest on it out of their income.

4. It is said that the levy will discourage thrift, for though it is imposed for the purpose of wiping out the debt, people will fear its repetition.

In so far as there is any weight in this argument, it is more than counter-balanced by the fact that the alternative to the levy is increased ordinary taxation, including a heavy income tax. Those who argue that the levy will discourage thrift must therefore recognise that on the same lines a heavy income tax would discourage exertion—a still more serious danger.

5. It is said that it is unfair to throw on those who have saved wealth the burden of the debt.

This is a matter of opinion. To most people it will seem much more unfair if the soldiers and sailors, when they come home, find themselves burdened down— they and their children—with debt to those who have stayed at home.

#### THE RESULTS OF THE LEVY.

The levy will have the following important consequences:—

1. It will be possible to balance the Budget and to reduce, instead of increasing, other taxation. If the levy be large enough to sweep away the whole net debt, the Government may expect to be able to abolish the taxes on food, and to reduce the income tax to about half the present figure instead of increasing it to 9s. or 10s. to which it will otherwise have to go.

2. The nation will acquire a partial ownership of such public utilities as land, railways, mines, banks, insurance, and shipping.

3. Prices will fall. Moreover, this will happen simultaneously with the extinction of the debt. If there be no levy the burden of paying the interest on the debt will probably be felt much more heavily 20 years hence than now, for then prices are likely to be lower and the fixed money interest on the debt will be equivalent to a larger quantity of things, and will therefore be a greater drain on the productivity of the nation.

4. The distribution of wealth will be less unequal. At present a tiny class, who with their families are only 2 per cent. of the population, own between them two-thirds of the whole wealth of the country and also have the bulk of the shares in War Loan. They are thus in a position to have a great part of the productive effort of the nation turned into making luxuries for their special benefit. The levy will fall mainly on this class.



### WHAT THE LEVY IS NOT.

The levy does **not** penalise the man who invested in War Loan, but applies to all citizens in accordance with their total wealth.

The levy will **not** depreciate the price of War Loan but will tend to maintain its value on the market.

The levy is **not** to be imposed only on business capital but on all forms of wealth.

The levy is **not** an annual instrument of taxation, but a special measure to wipe out the debt.

The levy will **not** bring about any reduction of the total wealth of the country, for it does not involve loss of capital to the country as a whole, but merely the transference of the title deeds of capital from individuals to the nation.

### GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.

It is for the people to choose. If there be no levy they will have a permanent rich class of bondholders who will sap the life-blood of the country and leave the rest of the citizens poor and burdened down with debt. Prices will be ruinously high. Production will be directed to making luxuries for the few, while the many go short.

If there be a levy it will do injustice to no man. Every man who has wealth above a certain limit will pay according to his means, and so set the citizens free. The millstone of debt will be removed. Prices will fall. The people will produce, and the people will enjoy the fruits of their production.

If you wish to study the subjects dealt with in this pamphlet more fully, buy

# "A Levy on Capital

BY

F. W. PETHICK LAWRENCE.

---

Crown 8vo. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net; Paper Covers, 1s. 6d. net.

---

*The Daily Herald* says :

"If you are interested, read it; if you're not, read it just the same; you will be before you have finished."

*The New Statesman* says :

"An extremely useful volume, full of valuable information and suggestions."

*The Manchester Guardian* says :

"The best statement, set forth in cold, clean, exact argument, with statistical evidence, yet made of the case for 'A Levy on Capital.'"

*The Nation* says :

"Mr. Lawrence moves from point to point with unerring exactness . . . and never straining or extenuating evidence to make a case . . . Mr. Lawrence's simple and lucid setting will bring that almost æsthetic pleasure which belongs to a fine exposition of a necessarily complicated subject."

*The Financial Times* says :

"Mr. Lawrence has an agreeable style and makes himself understood."

*The Economist* says :

"Mr. Lawrence puts the pros and cons, especially the pros, with pleasant lucidity."

*The Labour Leader* says :

"This volume is the authoritative text book on the subject and should be read by all who are interested, and certainly by all who speak or write upon the question . . . This whole subject is dealt with in a captivating manner, and the book is heartily commended to our readers."

---

MESSRS. GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN,  
RUSKIN HOUSE, 40, MUSEUM STREET, LONDON, W.C. 1.

THE LABOUR PARTY.

---

**THE EMPIRE IN AFRICA:  
LABOUR'S POLICY.**

PRICE 2d. ; POST FREE, 2½d.

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.

# LABOUR PARTY PUBLICATIONS.

## 1d. Pamphlets.

*Post free, 1½d.; 9d. per dozen carriage paid.*

**Taxation.**

By JOHN A. HOBSON.

**Tariffs and the Worker.**

By BROUGHAM VILLIERS.

**Workers' Control in the Coal-Mining Industry.**

By FRANK HODGES.

**Constitution of the Labour Party.**

**Constitution and Rules for Local Labour Parties in Single and Undivided Boroughs.**

Set A.

**Constitution and Rules for Local Labour Parties in County Constituencies.**

Sets B and C.

**Constitution and Rules for Local Labour Parties in Divided Boroughs.**

Sets D and E.

**How to Form Polling District Committees and Local Labour Parties.**

**Organisation of Women within the Labour Party.**

The Work of the Women's Section.

## 2d. Pamphlets.

*Post free, 2½d.; 1s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.*

**Labour's Russian Policy: Peace with Soviet Russia.**

**Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Present Conditions in Ireland.**

(January, 1920.)

**The Empire in Africa: Labour's Policy.**

Memorandum prepared by the Advisory Committee on International Affairs.

**Industrial Legislation.**

Memorandum prepared by the Advisory Committee on Industrial Policy.

**The Present State of the Poor Law.**

By C. M. LLOYD, with Foreword by GEORGE LANSBURY.

**Trusts and the Public.**

By "A. L. B."

**Labour and the New Social Order.**

A Report on Reconstruction after the War.

**The Peace Terms.**

By the Rt. Hon. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P.

**Labour and the Peace Treaty.**

Containing Parliamentary Speeches by the Rt. Hon. W. ADAMSON, M.P., Rt. Hon. J. R. CLYNES, M.P., STEPHEN WALSH, M.P., and TOM SHAW, M.P.

**Labour Policy and the Famine.**

This pamphlet indicates the present economic position of Central Europe and sets out Labour's policy of immediate remedies.

**The Capital Levy: How the Labour Party would settle the War Debt.**

By F. W. PETRICK LAWRENCE.

**International Economic Policy.**

By L. S. WOOLF.

# THE EMPIRE IN AFRICA: LABOUR'S POLICY.

## I.—INTRODUCTION.

As politically Labour becomes better organised and more powerful it is being necessarily compelled more and more to consider and to formulate a policy with regard to a number of problems not immediately connected with industrial and economic domestic questions. The time may be not far distant when Labour will be called upon to assume responsibility for the Government of the country. It must therefore be prepared with a policy, worked out in some detail, applicable to all the wider problems of our society and government. Such a policy should in each case be most carefully considered; it must spring directly from the broad economic and political and social principles and ideals of Labour, and it must be worked out in sufficient detail, and in a practical manner, so that Labour may, as soon as it has the power, take the first steps to put it into operation.

One such problem, to which Labour has hitherto naturally given little detailed attention, is the Empire. About a quarter of the earth and over one-quarter of the earth's inhabitants are included within the British Empire. Of the 435 million inhabitants of the British Empire only about 65 millions, in the United Kingdom and the Dominions, enjoy any kind of responsible government; the remaining 370 millions have practically no control over their governments, which are ultimately responsible to the British Cabinet, the imperial Parliament at Westminster, and the electorate of the United Kingdom, which numbers about 21 million persons. The government which has been applied to the various Dependencies, Crown Colonies, and Protectorates in Asia and Africa differs considerably from place to place. Politically, Labour must now have an imperial policy, springing from Labour principles and applicable in each locality. In this pamphlet we shall consider the problem of what should be the policy of Labour with regard to the Empire in Africa. But we shall consider only those parts of our African Empire which are governed as Crown Colonies or Protectorates. In other words we shall omit the Union of South Africa, since it is a self-governing Dominion, and we shall omit Egypt, since the problem of its government is in Africa unique, and should either be considered separately or in conjunction with the problem of Indian government.

Over one and a-half million square miles of African territory and some 28 million Africans are subject to British rule in Crown Colonies and Protectorates.\* The

\*The following were the African Crown Colonies and Protectorates in 1914:—

A.—WEST CENTRAL AFRICA.	Area, sq. miles.	Population.
Nigeria .....	836,000	17,125,000
Gold Coast, Ashanti, and Northern Territories.....	80,000	1,503,386
Sierra Leone.....	24,915	1,403,132
Gambia .....	4,504	200,000
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>445,419</b>	<b>20,231,618</b>
<b>B.—EAST CENTRAL AFRICA.</b>		
British East Africa.....	246,822	2,807,000
Uganda .....	109,119	3,361,117
Zanzibar .....	1,020	196,738
Somaliland .....	68,000	800,000
Nyasaland .....	89,578	1,200,000
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>464,534</b>	<b>7,864,850</b>
<b>C.—SOUTH AFRICA.</b>		
Bechuanaland .....	275,000	125,000
Basutoland .....	11,716	405,908
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>286,716</b>	<b>530,908</b>
<b>D.—RHODESIA .....</b>	<b>340,000</b>	<b>1,854,000</b>
<b>E.—THE SOUDAN .....</b>	<b>984,500</b>	<b>3,000,000</b>

administration in this vast area and over these 28 millions is absolutely autocratic. We propose in this introduction to indicate the general character of this administration and to consider what Labour's attitude should be towards it, if it follows out in Africa the principles and ideals which it has professed in Europe. In later chapters we shall consider in greater detail the more important aspects of the problem and attempt to show how Labour should proceed to apply its policy in detail.

Practically the whole territory of this African Empire was acquired between 1880 and 1900. It was acquired, therefore, during that virulent outbreak of economic imperialism which afflicted all the Great Powers of Europe during the last 20 years of the 19th century. The objects of the acquisition were quite clearly stated by Mr. Chamberlain and other exponents of this imperialism; they were economic, the provision of markets for the products of British industry, sources of raw materials for British industry, and profitable fields of investment for British capital. The keynote of this imperialist policy was therefore the exploitation of tropical possessions for the benefit of British capital and British industry.

It should be remarked, however, that until quite recently there have been notable divergencies in the actual interpretation of this imperialistic policy. They are indicated in greater detail below. But it may be here stated that while in British East Africa, Nyasaland, and Rhodesia the exploitation of the land, its resources, and the labour of the native peoples for the benefit of the white immigrant and capitalist, has been the rule, it has been the exception in British West-Central Africa. The character of British policy in West-Central Africa has been determined by various considerations, some of which redound to the credit of the Colonial Office and of local administrators, and it is important to note that the native population of these areas exceeds in numbers the native population of the whole of the rest of British Africa. It is necessary to emphasise the relative excellence which has marked British policy in West-Central Africa for two main reasons: first, because it furnishes conclusive evidence that an economic relationship between these African peoples and the outer world is not incompatible with just and humane government; secondly, because there is at present a marked tendency—of which the palm kernel ordinance is symptomatic—on the part of the Colonial Office, at the dictation of capitalist interests, to modify, in a reactionary direction, the policy hitherto pursued, a tendency which Labour must strenuously resist.

It should be borne in mind that of the 32 million inhabitants of these territories only a few thousand are white men, and these, apart from Government officials, are either capitalists, planters, miners, and settlers, as in East Africa, Nyasaland, and Rhodesia, or, as in West-Central Africa, chiefly merchants and miners. The central organ of government is entirely in the hands of the white men. Except in the West African Dependencies, where a few natives are nominated by the Governor to serve, the unofficial representatives upon the central organ are composed entirely of white men engaged upon various enterprises in the Dependencies. A very large portion of the revenue is everywhere expended upon the salaries and establishment of the officials of the administration. In East Africa, Nyasaland, and Rhodesia direct taxation, far exceeding that levied upon the white population, is imposed upon the native population, which has been deprived of its best land, sold and leased at very low prices to white men. Everything is then done by taxation and administrative pressure to compel the native to work for extremely low wages for the white planter or capitalist who has dispossessed him of his land. Little or nothing is done in any portion of British protected Africa to educate the native to take his place as a free man in the economic or political system which the European has imposed upon Africa.

The principles of government described in the last paragraph are clearly contradictory of two of Labour's most fundamental principles and ideals. Labour is opposed to any social or political system which allows the exploitation of one class or one individual by another class or individual. At home Labour is attempting to substitute a system of equal economic opportunity and industrial democracy for a system based upon the economic exploitation of the worker by the capitalist. In Africa the policy of Labour must follow the same lines; it must aim at substituting a system based on the

common economic interests of the inhabitants for the existing system based on the economic exploitation of the native by the white man. At the same time Labour must aim at substituting a political system of responsible and representative government for the existing autocracy. In a word Labour's policy, if based upon Labour principles, must be the abolition of economic exploitation and the education of the native so that he may take his place as a free man both in the economic and political system imposed upon Africa.

## II.—LAND AND LABOUR.

The questions of land and of labour in Africa are intimately connected. The whole territory in question is predominantly agricultural. Hence unrestricted use and enjoyment of the land is vital to the native population for three main purposes: (1) To provide for its sustenance, (2) for purposes of internal trade and commerce, and (3) for export trade where such has been or could be developed. Native use and enjoyment of land, therefore, means that the native works on his own land either to produce his own food or to produce marketable products. Conversely, if the native be dispossessed of his land in favour of Europeans, who in the tropical climate of Africa cannot themselves do the work of cultivation, a labour problem immediately arises. The European, in order to exploit the land, requires the native to work for him as a wage-earner; the native, without the means of subsistence, is compelled to work for wages or to starve.

### ORIGINAL LAND SYSTEM IN AFRICA.

When Europeans first descended upon Africa they found the following system in force in most places:—

Ultimate rights in the land were vested in the community, variously termed "kingdom," "tribe," "clan," or "house," "village," "family," according to the degree of development and expansion of the unit. The individual enjoyed fixity of tenure and the benefit of his improvements, subject to the performance of his social and political obligations. He could not permanently alienate the land he occupied, which reverted to the community at his death. He could be expelled from his holding by the heads of the community for grave misdemeanour. Buying and selling of land was not recognised under native law. Unoccupied land was allotted by the heads of the community as the needs of the latter expanded with the increase of population and of cultivation.

### THE TWO LAND POLICIES IN AFRICA.

Labour, in working out its own policy, must first realise that there are two administrative policies to-day actually in conflict with regard to the economic development of the African tropics. The first, which is based upon the original land system and aims at developing native use of the land, may be called the African Policy; the second, which is based upon European capitalist exploitation or ownership of the land, may be called the European Policy.

1. **THE AFRICAN POLICY.**—This policy favours the preservation of native rights in the land, assisting the native population to develop the resources of the land by growing crops or gathering products for export. It aims at promoting a native community of agriculturists and arboriculturists, and at fostering the growth of large native industries. It does not seek to exclude European enterprise and capital, but to confine them within the limits where they can be usefully exercised without infringing the liberties or arresting the progress of the native peoples. It encourages the European merchant, and issues licences to Europeans for the collection of certain forest products for a term not exceeding ten years, the native communities, which are consulted as to the issue of the licence, being credited with a portion of the fees. Subject to the discretion of the native community affected, and to the supervision of the executive authority, leases are issued to Europeans for purposes of cultivation, not exceeding one square mile in area per applicant, and with the proviso that no one person or group of persons shall hold more than three square miles.

The basis on which this policy rests is that the land belongs to the native communities which inhabit it, and that the paramount object of Government must be to encourage and assist those communities in the beneficial use of the land for their own advantage and profit. This is the policy generally followed in British West Africa (see A in above footnote).

2. **THE EUROPEAN POLICY.**—This policy favours the economic development of the country by European syndicates and planters through "hired" or forced native labour. It confines the native population to "reserves," and gives to that population no security of title even within the "reserves." Outside the "reserves" it sells or leases to European syndicates and individuals immense areas of land. It encourages and assists European syndicates and individuals to procure native labour. It does next to nothing to encourage and assist the native population to make beneficial usage of the land for its own profit. It does not aim at the creation of a self-respecting race of African producers secure in their possession of the land, but at the evolution of a race of servile labourers in European employ divorced from their land.

The territories to which this policy applies are British East Africa, Nyasaland, Rhodesia, and parts of South Africa (see B, C, and D in above footnote).

#### FUNDAMENTAL CHARACTER OF THE CONFLICT OF THE TWO POLICIES.

This conflict of policy is not confined to the portion of tropical Africa under British protection. It is going on all over the African tropics. The future of the tropical African peoples and of their relationship with civilisation is bound up with it, and will be settled, for good or evil, in accordance with the triumph or the defeat of the schools of thought which these policies respectively represent. The problem is one from which Labour cannot dissociate itself, for, sooner or later, Labour as the Executive Power in the British State, will be called upon to take decisions in regard to it.

The question to be determined is whether the "African policy," in force to-day over the bulk of the British Protectorates in tropical Africa, shall be deflected from its course by the "European Policy" at present confined to East Africa and Nyasaland (and practically all the colonies of other nations), or whether the latter shall be modified in accordance with what experience has shown to be just and wise elsewhere.

#### RESULTS OF THE TWO POLICIES.

Before considering what should be Labour's policy towards these problems it is necessary to consider what have been the effects of these two existing policies upon (a) the economic development of African territories (b) upon labour and the social conditions of the African population.

##### (a) *Economic Results of the Two Policies:—*

The European Policy is always defended on the ground that the native communities, if left in undisturbed enjoyment of the land, cannot make a beneficial use of it. The natives, it is argued, are too uncivilised, indolent, and unenterprising to develop the economic riches of their country, and they cannot be allowed to stand in the way of Europeans developing those riches for the good of the world, and, of course, incidentally, of Europeans.

This argument is accepted by most people as proved. The facts, however, go to show that it is founded upon untrue premises, that the native, if left in possession of his land and if he receives the necessary encouragement from the administration, can exploit the land as well as, or even better than, the European capitalist. Here are the facts:—

In Nigeria and West Africa generally we have in operation the African Policy, under which native communities work their own land, as free men, with no other stimulus to labour than that supplied by their natural commercial aptitude. They cultivate, gather, prepare, and sell to European merchants palm kernels, cocoa, cotton, shea-nuts, rubber, ground-nuts, etc. In British East Africa and Nyasaland, under the European Policy, the most fertile land has been alienated to European



companies and planters, who employ natives to produce cotton, hides and skins, coffee, oil, seed, copra, sisal, rubber, ground-nuts, etc. A comparison between the exports of these territories shows that the economic exploitation of the land under the African Policy compares favourably with that under the European Policy:—

#### AFRICAN POLICY.

	Area, sq. miles.	Population in 1,000 s.	Exports 1913, in £'s.	Exports per head of population.
Nigeria .....	336,000	16,500	7,352,377	8s. 10d.
Gold Coast .....	80,000	1,500	5,427,106*	£3 12s.
Gambia .....	4,500	200	867,187*	£4 5s.
Sierra Leone .....	24,195	1,403	1,731,252	£1 3s.

#### EUROPEAN POLICY.

British East Africa .....	246,322	2,800	1,039,252*	7s. 1d.
Nyasaland .....	39,573	1,200	234,317	2s.

\* Excluding bullion and specie.

It is, of course, true that the natural wealth of British tropical Western Africa is far greater than that of East Africa. But when due weight has been given to this fact it is clear from these figures that the economic exploitation of African territory under the African Policy is more successful than under the European Policy. The reason for this becomes obvious as soon as one examines—

#### (b) *The Social Effects of the Two Policies:—*

##### 1. NATIVE GOVERNMENT AND THE LAND UNDER THE AFRICAN POLICY.

Native polity and social economy are inseparably connected with the preservation of the native system of land tenure, which is the basis of the social structure. The chiefs in council hold the land in trust for the people. This trusteeship is the foundation stone of their authority. The administration of the country throughout British West Africa has been hitherto conducted through the existing mechanism of native government, which it has been the object of the Executive to maintain and improve. If the authority of the chiefs in council as trustees for the land, adjudicators in disputes, and allotters of unoccupied land were destroyed the native mechanism of Government would fall to pieces, and an entirely new mechanism would need to be created at great cost.

##### 2. LABOUR UNDER THE EUROPEAN POLICY IN EAST AFRICA.

In British East Africa the effect of the European Policy in creating a Labour problem can be seen most clearly. Most of the best land has been alienated to Europeans, and the natives have been relegated to reserves. The natives have no secure title in the reserves, and pressure is continually put upon the Government by the white settlers to oust the native from fertile land when it is included in a reserve. This pressure has already been successful in several cases, notably when the Masai were ejected from the best land in the Rift Valley and the land alienated to white men. But the white men, having obtained the natives' land, are now confronted with the difficulty of obtaining labour to work the land. All Labour in British East Africa is nominally free. There is no slavery, and no native is compelled to work. But our occupation is creating a large and discontented landless proletariat which is a danger to the country and to the British occupation, and works in conditions which in some respects reproduce or even exaggerate the evils of slavery.

The main causes of this are (1) the ownership of immense areas of land by Europeans; (2) the acceptance by the Government of a duty to help European owners in the development of land; (3) the system of direct taxation. To pay the tax the native has to earn money. Money can be earned (a) by sale of commodities; (b) by sale of labour. The first is prevented by lack of sufficient land, absence of markets, ignorance of what to grow. The native, therefore, has to sell his labour. The lack of land is due to the size and situation of land grants to Europeans. In some cases (e.g., Kenia, Kavirondo) the native lands are overcrowded, and these

occupy the areas of natural overflow; in others (e.g., Kikuyu) European freeholds actually include the ancestral homes of thousands of natives.

The trend towards employment under Europeans is further assisted in Nyasaland by taxation, since the native who stays at home pays double the tax paid by the native employé. There is no such differentiation in British East Africa. But the policy of the planter in British East Africa has been to force the Government into the position of a recruiter of native labour for them, and this has affected the policy of the Government in spite of the vigorous opposition of a number of officials. When labour was short there the Government was induced by the settlers to step in. Magistrates were accordingly instructed to "encourage" labour migration by "moral suasion." Some magistrates ignored the instruction and were attacked by the settlers and their representatives. Others sent police or tax-collectors to get men. Others appealed to the chiefs; a procedure which was effective, but undermined the position of the chiefs with their own people. It is inevitable that the "advice" of officials reaches the individual native in the form of compulsion.

As a European cannot, in tropical Africa, put the land to fruitful use by his own exertions, the policy of expropriating the native communities from their land can only be pursued for the deliberate purpose of stultifying native progress, and forcing natives into the employ of European syndicates and individuals.

Once administration is directed to this end and the native is looked upon not as the rightful owner of the soil but as a predestined labourer in the interests of Europeans, compulsion in various forms follows as a matter of course.

Pressure is incessantly brought to bear upon the Administration to procure cheap and abundant supplies of native labour. Pressure is exercised by the Administration upon the chiefs, who, in turn, are compelled to put pressure upon their people. Licences are granted to recruiting agents who have behind them the authority, whether openly exercised or not, of the officials. The Administration's first care, under such a system as this, is not, and cannot be, the welfare of the native, but the interest of the European exploiter of the soil.

Innumerable evil results follow. Native society is broken up. Native cultivation of food crops suffers. The labour obtained is indifferent in quality, sullen, and unresponsive. Punishments in the shape of fines and floggings are constant. In due course, native uprisings occur with the inevitable loss of life and financial expenditure.

The evils of employment under European settlers may be summed up as follows:—

1. The natives get worse food than they get in the villages.
2. In many plantations disease is prevalent.
3. The sanitary and moral conditions are bad generally.
4. As a result the physical condition of the labourers deteriorates.
5. Severe punishments inflicted by employers.
6. All these evils are credited by the natives to the Government, not to the settlers, and actually the Government does nothing except to send an inspector occasionally to see that the contract rates of pay are observed.
7. Surrender of personal freedom.

The results of this system and policy are:—

1. The quality of the labour is bad; much deliberate idling, hence frequent fines, flogging, and much bad feeling, leading to sedition and general dislike of the British occupation.
2. Economic confusion. Labour is withdrawn from cultivation, hence scarcity of food. Money is given as wages in response to no economic need, hence a superabundance of cash which further raises prices.
3. Frequent desertion—a heavily punished criminal offence.
4. Matters have been made worse recently by the explicit compulsion of porters for war service, who have died in tens of thousands. However necessary, this has finally destroyed our claim to protect natives against war with natives, and has produced, even in Nyasaland, a general desire that our occupation should cease.
5. There is now grave danger of insurrection.

## A POLICY FOR LABOUR.

Labour now has to consider how it can apply its principles in a definite and detailed policy to the conditions in East and West Africa which we have briefly described above. Labour's principles may be described as:—

- (1) No economic exploitation of one class (native) by another class (white man).
- (2) The Government must secure for the native the opportunity of developing, as a free man, the economic resources of the land for the benefit of the native communities.

In applying these principles Labour has to remember that the conditions in British territory on the East and West Coast are different because in the East the European policy has already been largely applied, the land taken from the native, his tribal institutions destroyed, while in the West attempts to introduce this system have in the main been resisted by the Government. Although, therefore, it is possible to outline a general policy for Labour to apply to all African tropical possessions, it will be necessary to apply special provisions in East Coast territory where the European policy has already alienated the land to Europeans and created a landless native proletariat.

The general policy of Labour, if it is to apply the two principles, must be as follows:—

### (a) LAND.

1. The land should be treated by the administration as the property of the native community or communities.
2. Native rights in land and in the land's natural and cultivated products should be given secure legal sanction, and should be adequately protected and safeguarded by the home and local Governments. Native land tenure should be maintained and, where necessary, strengthened by legislative enactment.
3. Definite alienation of land, alike to Europeans or to natives, should be prohibited for any purposes whatever.
4. Every native family should be assured sufficient land for its support, with security of tenure.
5. Where native cultivation and production of economic agricultural products are possible without the use of large capital they should be maintained and encouraged by Government. Where costly machinery, experts, etc., are required, Government should supply the necessary capital, encourage the use of such machinery by the natives, and educate the natives to make the most economic use of the land. In general, native communities should in every way be encouraged and assisted in developing their land and in improving their live stock.
6. Concession of land to Europeans for purposes of cultivation and grazing should, when granted, take the form of short time leases and should be only granted over restricted areas and after careful inquiry and with the consent of the native community affected and under Executive supervision. Licences granted to Europeans for the harvesting of natural products should only be granted after careful inquiry and with the consent of the native community affected.
7. Mineral products should be treated as the property of the local administration in trust for the communities. Mines, railways, and any large-scale industries should be run by the State.

### (b) LABOUR.

**SLAVERY.**—Every form of slave-trading and slave-owning should be prohibited. The prohibition should be absolute of the sale, gift, transfer, or introduction into any territory of slaves, including the system of "pawning" persons, and of adoption in circumstances analogous to slavery. The status of slavery should not be recognised in any court of law, and all Governments should permit any person, over whom rights as a slave are claimed by any other person, to assert and maintain his or her freedom forthwith. The onus of proof of any debt or

obligation alleged to be due from the person claimed as a slave by reason of such debt or obligation should be on the person claiming it, and should be justiciable in a court of law without prejudice to the free status of the defendant.

**FORCED LABOUR.**—The prohibition of compulsory labour should be absolute, except for purely native purposes of public utility, and then only when demanded in accordance with native law and custom within tribal areas. Tribal rulers should not be permitted to assign any powers they possess for calling out tribal labour. All voluntary labour should be paid by a wage in cash to the labourer and not to the Chief or any other third party. All taxation discriminating between the natives engaged upon indigenous industry and those in the employ of immigrants or white men, or between those who work and those who do not, should be prohibited.

**CONTRACT LABOUR.**—No labour contracts should be enforceable under the sanctions of criminal law. All labour contracts should be made before a magistrate or other officer of the administration. The labour contract should be a civil contract, breaches of which should be remedied by civil process only. No labour contract should be valid for a period exceeding six months, at the termination of which the labourer should be free to offer his services to any employer or none.

**THE COLOUR BAR.**—In all territories no barrier resting solely upon colour should be erected against any section of the community. All occupations should be open to every man and woman regardless of race, creed, or colour.

A policy such as that sketched above would continue and develop the African Policy pursued in West Africa and prevent any extension of the European Policy now pursued in the East. The following special provisions would be required in order gradually to introduce Labour's policy into territory on the East Coast, where alienation of land to Europeans has already introduced the European Policy:—

(a) LAND.

1. In order to give to every native family sufficient land for its support, the Government must, if necessary, re-enter upon alienated land. The Government must take power to cancel, revise, or repurchase concessions of alienated land in order to provide land for the natives.

2. The Government must stimulate and organise village production, and thus show the natives that money can be earned in the villages. This will not only stem the dangerously rapid disintegration of village life, but also improve the quality of labour generally.

3. The Government must encourage tribal self-government in whatever form natives themselves wish. Where tribal authority has fallen into decay, European officers should have the duty of (1) reviving it, whether in old or in new forms, and (2) provisionally allocating land among families.

(b) LABOUR.

1. The Government must make labour free in fact as well as name everywhere.

2. The Government must prohibit every kind of influence by magistrates and other Government agents in obtaining labour, and persuade the natives that the supply of labour to settlers is no concern whatever of the Government. The Government should publicly announce to all native authorities that all pressure to persuade natives to work for wages is forbidden.

3. Public Departments, when they have occasion to employ labour, must treat labour as entirely free, adjusting wages to supply.

(The effect of this will be (i.) at first labour will be scarce and dear; (ii.) increased wages will be balanced in time by increased output of the labourer; (iii.) if the attractions offered are sufficient, free labour will be as plentiful in the end as forced labour is now.)

### III.—GOVERNMENT AND SELF-GOVERNMENT.

#### (a) THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT.

Though there are differences in the form of the Central Government of the various dependencies, they are in their main outlines the same. Usually the Central Government consists of a Governor appointed by the Crown, an Executive Council composed of officials, and a Legislative Council nominated by the Governor and consisting of official and unofficial members, the officials being in a majority. The unofficial members are representatives of European commerce, European planters, and in some cases missionaries. Laws are made by the Governor in Legislative Council. In Nigeria there is no Legislative Council, but there is an advisory and deliberative body, the Nigerian Council, consisting of the Governor, the members of the Executive Council, other official members, three European members representing commerce and industry, four European members nominated by the Governor, and six native members nominated by the Governor. In Uganda there is no Executive or Legislative Council, the administration of the native kings or chiefs having been retained; in some parts the king is assisted by native ministers and a native assembly. In British East Africa the Legislative Council has a majority of officials, but there are elected representatives of the whites, two or three Indian nominees are supposed to look after the interests of the Indians, and some nominated missionary may presently be appointed to look after the cause of the natives of the country.

It will be seen that in every case responsibility rests at present with the Colonial Office officials, and that in no case is there any representation of the natives in the European sense of that term. Whereas in West-Central Africa local government is carried out by the existing native mechanism of government (native councils, emirates, etc.), recognised by the Central Government, steps should be taken to secure direct representation for the larger units upon the central administration with the object of developing and extending those powers of self-government inherent in native society. Labour principles require that we should constantly have as our ultimate aim, first the establishment of genuine representation both for natives or native Councils and Indians on the Legislative Councils, and secondly the gradual transfer to these Legislative Councils, after education has spread and representation has become established, of responsibility. It is important that representation should come first, in order to prevent legislation in the interest of the exploiters before the natives have an effective voice more commensurable with their numbers. Responsibility should begin in the municipalities and in the government of the smaller areas, in the supervision of sanitation, irrigation, roads, and possible education. Only after experience of this should responsible government be extended to wider areas.

#### (b) LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

Where the native system and institutions of local self-government have been retained they should be encouraged and developed, care being taken that the development is in the direction of popular rather than autocratic control. Where as in parts of East Africa they have been destroyed, the administration must develop new institutions of native local self-government in accordance with the needs and desires of the population.

In this connection attention must be directed to the question of revenue and finance. The revenue of a dependency should be expended upon services which serve the needs and interests of the native population. In many dependencies this is not the case; revenue is expended almost entirely upon public works and departments which serve the economic interests of the white population, and nothing is done to develop, e.g., roads, bridges, in native areas. Besides the provision of native schools and education, an adequate part of the revenue should be put at the disposal of local authorities for the development of roads, bridges, etc., in native areas.

## (c) INTERNATIONAL CONTROL.

The adoption of the mandate system under Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations makes it necessary to consider even in the case of British dependencies the possibility of some kind of international control. Under Article 22 the mandate system is, of course, applied only to the late German colonies. But it is applied because the Peace Conference adopted a principle which has already been put forward by Labour, namely, that the "well-being and development of" the peoples of African territories is "a sacred trust of civilisation," and that the European State administering the territories must be considered only as a trustee or mandatary answerable for its trust to the rest of the civilised world. It is essential that the obligations and rights of the mandatory power and of the native inhabitants should be defined in the mandates. But once this is done, and if the professions of Article 22 are honestly carried out by the League and its mandataries, the system must have great effect upon the status of European States in non-mandated African tropical territory. The implications of the mandate system and its honest fulfilment must be so important that it would be not only inconsistent but practically impossible for any State to refuse to accept in non-mandated territory the same obligations as are accepted under the mandates. In a word, the principle of trusteeship under a League of Nations cannot be confined arbitrarily to particular pieces of territory; it must be extended to cover all tropical Africa, and the right of the community of nations to supervise the due carrying out by the trustee of the obligations of its trust must be frankly recognised.

## IV.—EDUCATION.

The paramount importance of education in tropical Africa must already have become apparent to the reader of the previous pages. The European has introduced into Africa his own civilisation, his own form of government, and his own economic capitalist system. Unless the Labour principles for the government of these African territories be adopted, the native social and governmental system must inevitably be destroyed, and the native will be subjected to a Government which he can neither understand nor control, and to an economic system which exploits him. European Governments have nowhere in Africa made a serious attempt to give the African the knowledge which alone would make him capable of understanding and controlling the circumstances which those Governments impose upon him. Europeans have, indeed, in many cases deliberately kept the natives uneducated and ignorant in the hope that they may be more docile under economic exploitation. In Nigeria the revenue for 1916 was £2,830,000, the expenditure on education was £46,000; in British East Africa the revenue was £326,000, and the expenditure on education £1,250.

We have seen that Labour principles require that the British system of administration shall be altered and shall aim at conditions in which the native will take his place as a free man in the economic system, reaping for himself and his community the riches of his own country, and will also take his place as a free citizen controlling his own government. Both these results depend ultimately upon education, and the first duty of the Governments of the various dependencies must be to put into operation a deliberate and detailed educational scheme to carry out these two objects. The broad outline of such a scheme must in every dependency include the following provisions:—

1. Primary education must be accessible to all children of school-going age, i.e., the Government must provide a primary school accessible to the children in every town and village.

2. Training colleges must be provided for teachers.

3. There must be technical colleges providing for a curriculum in arts and science specially adapted to African territories.

4. An African University must be provided, with a curriculum which need not—probably should not—be that of the American or European Universities, but broad enough and high enough to secure recognition by the professional authorities in Europe and America.

5. By providing experimental and model farms, agricultural machinery, expert advisers and instructors, technical agricultural education, etc., the Government must aim at educating native communities to make the most economic and advantageous use of their own land. We have already referred to the necessity of Government providing capital where the preparation or cultivation of some agricultural product requires expensive or intricate machinery or can only be undertaken on a large scale: such services should be regarded as essentially of an educational nature.

Finally, a word of warning may usefully be added with regard to the ends of a Governmental educational programme in Africa. That continent has in most places quite enough African lawyers; her great need to-day is for scientific agriculturists, forestry experts, doctors, sanitary officials, and accountants. Africa needs scientific agriculturists in thousands, to teach the people how they may grow two cocoa pods where one grows to-day, to educate millions of people in the value of artificial manures and insecticides. Africa needs doctors and a sanitary service sufficiently adequate to fight victoriously against mosquito and tsetse fly, to break through—as only native doctors can—the dense fog of native ignorance and superstition, so that Africa may no longer be the breeding ground of plague and disease. Africa needs thousands of trained accountants to teach the natives the principles of finance, and the individual African how to take care of his own money and—what is equally if not more important—other people's money.





# LABOUR PARTY PUBLICATIONS.

---

---

## 3d. Pamphlets.

*Post free, 3½d. ; 2s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.*

### **Irish Nationalism and Labour Internationalism.**

By BERNARD SHAW, with Foreword by the Rt. Hon. J. R. CLYNES, M.P.

### **Labour and the Milk Supply.**

With Preface by the Rt. Hon. J. R. CLYNES, M.P.

### **Labour Women on International Legislation.**

This pamphlet contains proposals on Women's Employment (by GERTRUDE M. TUCKWELL), the Employment of Children (by Dr. MARION PHILLIPS), and the Prevention of Unemployment (by A. SUSAN LAWRENCE, L.C.C.), and has been issued with the approval of the Standing Joint Committee of Industrial Women's Organisations.

### **The Mines for the Nation.**

Reprint of a Series of *Daily Herald* articles by ROBERT SMILLIE, HERBERT SMITH, FRANK HODGES, SIR LEO CHIOZZA MONEY, SIDNEY WEBB, R. H. TAWNEY, and HENRY H. SLESSER.

---

---

## 6d. Pamphlets.

*Post free, 7d. ; 4s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.*

### **The Nationalisation of the Coal Industry.**

By R. H. TAWNEY, M.A. (Member of the Coal Industry Commission, 1919).

### **Continued Education under the New Education Act.**

### **The Juvenile Worker at the End of the War.**

### **Nursery Schools.**

Memoranda prepared by the Advisory Committee on Education.

### **The Ministry of Health.**

### **The Organisation of the Preventative and Curative Medical Services and Hospital and Laboratory Systems under a Ministry of Health.**

### **The Position of the General Medical Practitioners in a Re-organised System of Public Health.**

Memoranda prepared by the Advisory Committee on Public Health.

# LABOUR PARTY PUBLICATIONS.

---

---

## 1s. Booklets.

### Women and the Labour Party.

By various women writers, including Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB, MARGARET LLEWELYN DAVIES, MARY MACARTHUR, MARGARET BONDFIELD, MARGARET McMILLAN, and REBECCA WEST. Edited with an Introduction by Dr MARION PHILLIPS, and a Foreword by the Rt. Hon. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P.

*Post free, 1s. 2½d.*

### Memoranda on International Labour Legislation.

The Economic Structure of the League of Nations.

*Post free, 1s. 1d.*

### Report of the Annual Party Conference (Scarborough, 1920).

*Post free, 1s. 6½d.*

### Report of the Annual Party Conference (Southport, 1919).

With Voluminous Appendices on International, General Election, and other valuable information.

*Post free, 1s. 6d.; 10s. 6d. per dozen, post free.*

---

## 1s. 6d. Booklets.

*Post free, 1s. 8½d.*

### The Labour Party and the Peace Treaty.

This is a Handbook for Speakers and contains a critical analysis of the Peace Terms, comparing its provisions with the pronouncements made by the National and International Labour Movement from time to time.

### The Working Woman's House. (Illustrated.)

By Dr. MARION PHILLIPS and Mrs. SANDERSON FURNISS

---

## HANDBOOK OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT FOR ENGLAND AND WALES.

*Paper Edition, 3s. net; 3s. 4½d., post free.*

*Cloth Edition, 5s. net; 3s. 9d., post free.*

### THE LABOUR WOMAN.

The Labour Woman's Monthly.

*1d., post free, 2d.; 2s. per year; 9d. per 12; 3s. per 50;*

*6s. per 100. Carriage paid.*

THE LABOUR PARTY.

---

LABOUR'S  
RUSSIAN POLICY

PEACE WITH SOVIET RUSSIA.

---

PRICE 2d. ; POST FREE 2½d.

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.

# PUBLICATIONS OF THE LABOUR PARTY

---

## Labour and the New Social Order.

A Report on Reconstruction after the War. 2d., post free 3d.; 1s. 6d. per 13; 6s. per 50; 12s. per 100; £6 per 1,000, post free.

## Memoranda on International Labour Legislation.

The Economic Structure of the League of Nations. 1s., post free 1s. 1½d.

## Labour Women on International Legislation.

This pamphlet contains proposals on Women's Employment (by GERTRUDE M. TUCKWELL), the Employment of Children (by DR. MARION PHILLIPS), and the Prevention of Unemployment (by A. SUSAN LAWRENCE, L.C.C.), and has been issued with the approval of the Standing Joint Committee of Industrial Women's Organizations. Price 3d., post free 3½d.; 2s. per dozen, carriage paid.

## International Economic Policy.

By L. S. WOOLF. Price 2d., post free 2½d.; 1s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.

## The Labour Party and the Peace Treaty.

This is a Handbook for Speakers and contains a critical analysis of the Peace Terms, comparing its provisions with the pronouncements made by the National and International Labour Movement from time to time. Price 1s. 6d. post free; 12s. per dozen, carriage paid.

## The Peace Terms.

By the Rt. Hon. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P. 2d., post free 2½d.

## Labour and the Peace Treaty.

Containing Parliamentary Speeches by Rt. Hon. W. ADAMSON, M.P., Rt. Hon. J. R. CLYNES, M.P., Mr. STEPHEN WALSH, M.P., and Mr. TOM SHAW, M.P. 2d., post free 2½d.

## Labour Policy and the Famine.

This pamphlet indicates the present economic position of Central Europe and sets out Labour's policy of immediate remedies. Price 2d., post free 2½d.; 1s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.

## Labour's Russian Policy: Peace with Soviet Russia.

Price 2d., post free 2½d.; 1s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.

## Trusts and the Public.

Price 1d., post free 1½d.; 9d. per dozen, carriage paid.

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.

# THE LABOUR PARTY

---

## LABOUR'S RUSSIAN POLICY:

PEACE WITH SOVIET RUSSIA.

---

- I.—Poland and the Eastern Border States.
  - II.—Russia and the Middle East.
  - III.—The Blockade.
- 

Appendix:—

“Complete and Immediate Peace with the Soviets!”

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.

# LABOUR'S RUSSIAN POLICY

---

THERE are three points from which the present Russian situation and policy must be regarded : 1. The position in Poland and the east of Europe. 2. The position in the Middle East. 3. The Blockade. In the following pages the facts relating to each point are dealt with in detail. The most important points may be summarized as follows :

## 1. Poland and the Eastern Border States.

Poland is being armed and financed by France and Britain. It is at the same time being encouraged to attack the Russian Government and invade Russian territory. "The Poles," to quote the *Westminster Gazette*, "have taken the unfortunate step of advancing into Russian territory." There is no doubt that the step has been encouraged and incited by the Allies. The consequences may be immense and disastrous. We are bound by treaty to defend the independence and territorial integrity of Poland, and if Polish aggression provokes the Russian Government to retaliation and Poland meets with military disaster, we shall be called on to embark in a first-class war with Russia in Eastern Europe. Half the Press is already talking of "Bolshevik attacks upon Poland," and it is not difficult to foresee how those who want such a war will misrepresent the true facts to the peoples of the Allied countries.

## 2. The Middle East.

An attempt to play the same kind of trick is being made in the Middle East. By our blockade and military assistance to Denikin and Koltchak and Judenich, we are virtually at war with the Russian Government. The only place where that Government can strike back and where we are vulnerable is the Middle East. Naturally as we are forcing the Russian Government to fight for its life against us, it strikes back at us where it can. By our imperialist policy in Asia since the armistice, we have pushed the frontiers of the British Empire forward so that we now dominate against the wishes of the inhabitants an enormous stretch of territory, including Afghanistan, Mesopotamia, and Persia, from northern India to Southern Russia. Our imperialist policy is uniting the Mohammedans of the Middle East against us, and they now look to the Russian Government to aid them against us. Those who want a war with Russia are trying to force one on in the Middle East and Caucasia, and they count on inducing the people to support it by raising the cry that the Bolsheviks are attacking India and the British Empire. But there is no reason to believe that the Bolsheviks have any desire to attack India or the British Empire in the Middle East unless we attack them. If such a war is forced upon them and upon the British people, it will be one of the most cruel and terrible wars in history : it will ruin the peoples of the Middle East who are just struggling towards freedom and will not improbably lead to the break-up of the British Empire. Such a war would be a crime against civilization, for it can be avoided by ceasing to attack the Russian Government and by honestly making and keeping peace with them.

## 3. The Blockade.

The policy of blockading Russia is indefensible. We must either make war with her or peace with her ; and if we make peace we must make it honestly. The effect of our blockade is, besides the untold misery which it inflicts upon Russians and neutral peoples, simply to exacerbate the feelings of the Russian people against us, and to force their militarization. But if the blockade is to be lifted, it must be lifted honestly, and every restriction upon trade between this country and Russia which is not imposed upon trade between this country and, e.g., France must be abolished.

In view of these facts, the following proposals have been formulated by the Labour Party :

1. Complete raising of the Blockade and a complete peace with Russia. Such a formal recognition of a Government would no more imply moral approval of it than did our formal recognition of the Tsar's Government. Raising the blockade implies that no restriction or control should be applied to Russian trade which is not also applied to, e.g., French or Scandinavian trade.

2. The Border States and Poland should be encouraged to make peace with Russia on the basis of mutual disarmament. It should immediately be made clear to Poland that no assistance or support will be given to her if she continues to invade Russian territory. Financial and economic assistance to States of eastern Europe should be made conditional on guarantees that such assistance is not used for the purposes of armaments and military adventures. Provisional frontiers should be settled and delimited without delay and arrangements made for free economic intercourse.

3. Attempts to attack the Russian Government in the Middle East must be immediately abandoned. This will also involve the abandonment of the attempt to set the small States against Russia. It will further imply—1, a settlement and agreement with the Russian Government; 2, a sincere attempt to encourage a peaceful settlement of all questions between the States of the Middle East; 3, an abandonment of our imperialist policy in the Middle East, a revision of the Persian treaty, and a reconsideration of our policy in Mesopotamia.

4. The Labour Party declares that it will resist and oppose, by every means in its power, war, or an attempt to create a war, between this country and Russia.

## I.—POLAND AND THE EASTERN BORDER STATES.

SINCE the elimination of Admiral Kolchak and the crushing defeat of General Denikin, the chief danger to the peace of Europe is in the rôle which French policy has assigned to the Borderland States and, in particular, to Poland. On December 23rd, in a speech to the Chamber, M. Clemenceau vehemently rejected any suggestion of peace with Soviet Russia, and announced that Poland, Rumania, Czecho-Slovakia and Jugo-Slavia would play the part of a fence of "barbed wire." The expression must have implied more than passive defence, for of these four States, the territories of the two latter nowhere touch Russia. The enumeration of the whole four in some detail can only have implied a plan for combined aggressive operations. It is doubtful whether the three latter States are prepared to do much, if anything, to realize the French plan, and Rumania has steadily resisted, for over a year, the pressure applied to her.

Poland, on the other hand, has been engaged in intermittent hostilities with Soviet Russia since first she existed as a State. Repeated overtures for peace have been made to her from Moscow. One of these, accompanied by acts of courtesy, calculated to appeal to Polish national feeling (the return of historical and artistic treasures stolen by the Tsars), was made in February, 1919. The last of the series was made by Tchitcherin on December 22nd, and was a proposal to start immediate negotiations. The Poles gave their answer by advancing, after a long period of quiescence, on their northern front. They took the important town of Dvinsk, in company with the Letts (see *Times*, January 7th), driving out the Russian garrison, and have since advanced somewhat further along the railway towards Petrograd. They have also pushed forward in the south into the Ukraine towards Kieff. The appeals of the *Times* on their behalf, and the fact that daily trains laden with munitions are said to be crossing Germany from Paris to Warsaw, point to the probability of a big Polish offensive in the early future.

The peculiarity of Poland's position is that she has no recognized frontier on the East. The Peace Conference defined her boundaries on the west, but has not, to this day, concerned itself with the eastern territories which she has been gradually acquiring. Between Poland proper and Russia proper stretches a wide belt of country, which had been Polish in the remote past. Here the landed class is still Polish and Catholic, but is a small minority of the population. The inhabitants, largely Jewish in the towns, are in country Lithuanians, White Russians, and Ukrainians, and the two latter belong to the Orthodox Church.

This population, for racial, religious and economic reasons, is normally hostile to the small Polish Catholic land-owning element. Most of this wide belt of country, stretching from 100 to 150 miles eastwards from the country that is racially Polish, was devastated by the Grand Duke Nicholas in the retreat of 1916, when the Cossacks burned the villages and drove most of the Orthodox population with them into Russia proper. The Poles have occupied this desolate and famine-stricken region with little resistance either from the inhabitants or from the Red Armies. Polish military administration has been harsh, especially towards the Jews, and their intention is to keep this foreign territory permanently, and to colonize it with their own peasantry. So far as is known, the Bolsheviks are not greatly interested in recovering this territory, but plainly they cannot allow the Poles to push on indefinitely. Some recognized frontier there must be, even if it be only provisional.

Southwards, in the Ukraine, the position is still more nebulous and no less dangerous. What the real wishes of the Ukrainian population are no one dare say. Some are Bolsheviks. Few, if any, adhere to Russian Imperialism as represented by Denikin. Many are Nationalists, who desire an independent Republic, radical, or mildly socialistic, but anti-Bolshevik in its political colour. This section, led by General Petloura, has been at war during the past year equally with the Poles, the Reds, and Denikin. This incessant war has reduced a rich country to anarchy and ruin; the big Jewish element has been impartially massacred by all but the Reds, while the descriptions of the ravages of typhus recall those of the medieval plague. The last phase of this terrible chapter of history is that the remnant of Petloura's army and government have sought the alliance of the Poles, who, accordingly, claim some kind of right to conquer and occupy this vast and normally wealthy country as a protecting power.

The plight of the Poles themselves is in startling contrast to these vast pretensions. They are reviving all the shadowy claims to empire of their romantic past, and seem to be bitten with a passion for military glory. They have contrived, during the past year, to involve themselves in little wars with all their neighbours—the Czechs, the Germans, the Letts, the Lithuanians, the Ukrainians, and the Bolsheviks. Their finances, in consequence, are in ruins. Their mark, nominally a shilling, which was worth 5d. in March last, has fallen to a  $\frac{1}{2}$ d., and their Budget shows an expenditure eight times their revenue. In most of their towns the working class suffers from long-continued unemployment. Wages do not keep pace with prices. The clothes of all but the rich are mere rags, and the children in the towns are in a case little better than those of Vienna. Typhus is endemic, and latterly has taken a violent epidemic form. The Socialist Party (though very moderate and very nationalist in its opinions) has again and again called vehemently for peace, but attempts to enforce peace by demonstration strikes have been savagely repressed. Whatever sober elements there may be in the middle-class parties are overborne by pressure from France, which supplies the munitions of the army and virtually commands it with her military mission.

The army itself, in spite of its undoubted gallantry and endurance, suffers from lack of greatcoats and every other necessity of campaigning in a cold climate; nor is it even yet adequately equipped for modern warfare. Strategically, Poland is not favoured by nature. The country is an almost featureless plain, and the "corridor" connecting it with the sea at Danzig depends on the passivity of the Germans, who naturally have no goodwill to a State which has annexed over two million of their fellow-countrymen. Though the Poles are Catholic, Nationalist and anti-Russian, there is, of course, a Communist Party among them, which would rise if the army were defeated by the Reds. Needless to say, the "loyalty" of the Jews, Germans and non-Polish Slavs, annexed against their will, who together are over one-third of the population, could not be trusted if the army were in difficulties.

France has thrust on this weak State the onerous rôle of a barrier between Germany and Russia. It could not stand against either of them alone: it would be crushed to atoms between the two together. Yet under French instigation it has behaved with a provocative imprudence which invites attack from all sides. If it will not make peace, or even conclude



an armistice with Russia, it is probable enough that the Red Armies, released from the campaigns against Denikin and Koltchak, may counter-attack it before long.

What would be our situation in the event of a Polish defeat? We should be reminded that Poland is a member of the League of Nations, and that Article X of the Covenant binds us to ensure her independence and territorial integrity. Already the *Times* compares her to Belgium, and pretends that Lenin is about to "attack" her "as the Kaiser attacked Belgium." Such hypocrisy would deceive only the ignorant; none the less, the obligation to defend Poland remains. It cannot bind us morally if Poland courts disaster by wanton aggression, as she is doing. But this aggression, let us remember, is prompted by the Allies, or at least by France. Unless we are able, before early spring, to defeat these schemes we may find ourselves confronted by an accomplished fact, and involved in a Continental War against Russia infinitely more serious than the little entanglements at Archangel. There is no way out of this difficulty unless the Allies tell Poland plainly that she must at once accept the invitation of Moscow to conclude an armistice, and to negotiate for a permanent peace. Until some frontier line, however temporary, is fixed and respected by both sides, this danger of a Polish war will hang over us. It would not be confined for long to Poland; even Germany might not be excluded from it. We may, indeed, find ourselves face to face with nothing less than a renewal of a universal war, and the total ruin of what is left of European civilization.

## II.—RUSSIA AND THE MIDDLE EAST.

THE question of peace with Soviet Russia will undoubtedly be affected by forecasts as to the future relations between Russia and the British Empire in the Middle East, where the two Powers have come into much closer territorial contact with one another as a result of the war. (*N.B.*—This contact has been created not by Russian aggressiveness, but by the British Government's imperialism; it arises out of our "treaty" with Persia, which, in turn, was engineered in anticipation of a "mandate" in Mesopotamia.) We have to consider (1) whether Russia can attack us in this quarter; (2) whether (if so) she is certain to do so, whatever efforts for peace we may force the British Government to make; and (3) whether (in case an eventual attack by Russia here is judged inevitable) a "preventive war" has any justification.

It may be said at once that the British Government probably have no secret information about the Russian Government's plans. All we can tell from the recent official statements is that the British Government are divided on Russian Policy, and that each faction is trying to exploit this Middle Eastern "stunt" as propaganda.

### CAN RUSSIA ATTACK US?

There is little doubt that she can. For example, if we take the northern frontier of Persia as being the new boundary of the British Empire which the Government would call on us to defend (under the formula of treaty or League obligations), we find a well-planned network of strategic railways (made by our old ally the Tsar) in the adjoining Russian territories in Central Asia and Trans-Caucasia, by which Russian troops could be thrown into Persia and Afghanistan. One Russian railway even crosses the frontier and runs to Tabriz. There is nothing corresponding to this on the British side. The strategic railways built by us in Mesopotamia and Baluchistan during the war stop at the western and south-eastern frontiers of Persia respectively, and the experiences of the "Dunsterville Force" in 1918 show how difficult it is, under present conditions, to operate in Northern Persia from a Mesopotamian base. Strategically, then, Russia would have the whip hand.

\* This was a British force which marched to Baku, from Mesopotamia through Persia, but was unable to maintain its position and had to retreat, losing heavily.

She could also count on the superior morale of her troops, for she could tell them that this was the surest way of breaking the blockade, while it is pretty clear that the British Army would not be inspired to enthusiasm by a war for maintaining the blockade and Lord Curzon's Persian Treaty. Of course, this depends partly on whether the new Paris scheme is genuine or not, but that would hardly affect the morale of the Indian troops. The War Office, to avoid trouble in England, would probably employ as large a percentage of Indians as possible. That seems to have been their policy since the armistice, in picking their garrisons for Mesopotamia; they would resort to it *a fortiori* if they had to raise much larger forces for an unpopular war. The Indians are bound to resent this unfair distribution of military burdens. They would all feel that they were being made to fight the foreigner's battles, and the Moslem Indians would feel that they were being made to fight against their own cause.

The Islamic factor is probably the Soviet Government's strongest card. This is not due to some unscrupulous and superhumanly successful propaganda directed from Moscow (the amount of Bolshevik propaganda among Moslems has been greatly exaggerated—partly to stoke up the anti-Soviet feeling in England, partly out of simple sensationalism). Propaganda is superfluous, for the facts are so patent that the most unintelligent Moslem can take them in. During the war the last independent Moslem communities have gone under, and through whose aggression? England has reduced Persia to the status of pre-war Egypt, Egypt to the status of Nigeria; she has conquered Mesopotamia; she has taken all the Chiefs of Arabia in tow, including (though she dare not admit it) the Guardian of the Holy Cities; in order to buy the acquiescence in all this of her ally France (who, in the East, is her traditional rival) she has abandoned to her the Syrian Arabs, whose independence she pledged herself to uphold, and who are the most advanced politically of all the Arab peoples; and she may even let France step into Germany's shoes in what is left of Turkey, as a set-off to her own scoop in Persia (the Persian Treaty was made without the knowledge of the French Government, and they were very angry). And an incidental result of the settlement may be the collapse of the Turkish Caliphate, which most Moslems looked on as a political rallying point, even if their ecclesiastical allegiance went elsewhere. Wherever they are being discomfited, Moslems find England at work, and it is natural that they should begin to regard her as their arch-enemy. Not much of our unpopularity is likely to be deflected to France, even though her imperialism is less camouflaged than ours, because France is so obviously a secondary agent. British, not French policy, is determining the political destiny of Islam as a whole.

But there is one offset. Certain Moslem peoples that were in subjection before the war have recovered their independence, and this in Russia—by voluntary concession on the part of the Soviet Government. To Moslem eyes, as they reviewed these facts, Russia and England must be changing their traditional parts. Once we were the Moslems' friend; then we unwillingly abetted their Russian enemy; and now, when Russia has repented, we come out in the old Russian colours. Russia, on the other hand, has given practical proof of her change of attitude towards Moslems, and the fact that she has gone over at the same time to a "proletarian" form of government will tell in her favour—not because the Middle East is attracted by socialism, but because the Russian workman can say to the Persian or Egyptian of whatever class: "The European bourgeoisie is our common enemy."

The preceding lines are meant to explain, not to glorify, the Moslems' point of view. Their positive ambitions, beyond the negative desire to get rid of foreign domination, would certainly be more barbaric and more disastrous than those of our own imperialists. In this pamphlet, however, we merely have to consider the new British Imperialism and Russian renunciation of Imperialism in the East, the effect on Moslem feeling, and the consequences for the strategical situation.

To sum up: in lines of communication, morale of troops, and support from the native population, the Russians would have a great advantage over us, and could attack us with good prospects.

### WILL RUSSIA ATTACK US WHATEVER HAPPENS ?

It is very unlikely ; provided we raise the blockade and make peace (i.e., allow Russia to resume with other countries *all* the customary relations between nations at peace with one another, since nearly all these relations are necessary for the conduct of international trade).

It is argued that "you cannot make peace with the Bolsheviks" because their programme is a world revolution, and Russia is only a jumping-off ground for attacking bourgeois society elsewhere. It is also argued (by the same people) that you cannot make peace with them because they are really a camarilla of Tsarist generals trying to carry out the old aims of Russian imperialism. Possibly texts can be quoted from Lenin and Trotsky's writings, or from the Soviet Government's proclamations while it has been fighting for its life, which would support these people's interpretation of Bolshevik theory ; and it is also likely that the power of ex-Tsarist professional soldiers in Soviet service to influence the policy of the Soviet Government has been increased by the continuance of the war and the inevitable militarization of Soviet Russia. But whoever the Soviet Government are, and whatever their theories may be, it is clear that they cannot do anything at all without a minimum degree of acquiescence on the part of the Russian people. Russians may stand more from their governments than most Europeans, but it is a question of degree. After all, they overthrew the Tsardom after three years of war, and that is sufficient proof that their patience is not inexhaustible. They were goaded then by the economic misery arising from the war ; in 1920 the wish to escape from that misery must be a great deal stronger than in 1917, for the suffering has been cumulative. It is therefore probable that the Soviet Government could not stand to-day if it were convicted of deliberately refusing the chance of peace for the sake of socialism, imperialism, or any other theory. Like all governments, the Soviet Government want to remain in power ; they have a definite constructive programme in Russia itself, and must have peace before they can get on with it ; and even if they have ulterior aims, whether revolutionary or imperialistic, against other countries, they would lose all prospect of realizing them if the Russian people turned them out of power.

It is, therefore, reasonable to forecast that if peace is genuinely offered them they will agree, in return for the reopening of trade, to abstain from hostile action in the Middle East ; and also that they will not bring down the blockade on Russia again by breaking such an agreement after peace has been made ; because in both cases, if they took the opposite action, they would run a great risk of being overthrown. In other words, the power of blockade gives us sufficient security for negotiating peace with the Soviet Government, even on the assumption that the destruction of the British Empire in the East is a positive aim of theirs. But it is far more likely that, if they really are preparing to attack us in the East just now, it is merely with the military object of inducing us to make peace. The burden of proof lies on the British Government, who were the aggressors in this war. The Russians have much more reason than we have to ask for guarantees.

### MIGHT A " PREVENTIVE WAR " BE JUSTIFIABLE ?

This question presupposes that the Soviet Government's determination to attack us sooner or later in the East has been proved, and the whole argument in the preceding paragraphs is against the likelihood of this. But supposing it were proved, would the Churchill policy be justifiable ? Surely not. For this Anglo-Russian war in the Middle East would be more horrible than the European War, and worse in its effect on our home politics. The Georgians, Azerbaijanis, Armenians, and other small peoples, who are now being bribed and threatened into joining the cordon, would be wiped out ; there would be a racial and religious war of extermination ; and the atrocities that would be committed on English women and children resident in the East would produce the same ferocity in England, as they did at the time of the Indian mutiny. These evils simply must not be let loose, and if a Russian attack on our new position in the Middle East were really proved to be inevitable, the proper policy for the Labour Party would be to get rid of that position.

India has led us into Egypt and Mesopotamia, Mesopotamia into Persia; if Persia is going to lead us into a Middle Eastern War with Russia, let us give it up. We are not wanted there, and Soviet Russia's power to attack us in the East rests on the fact that we have established ourselves in Persia and in a number of other Oriental countries against the wishes of their inhabitants.

Finally, the question must be considered of what the alternative in the Middle East is to peace with the Soviet Government. The alternative to a Soviet Government in Russia is the restoration of a Tsarist Government, and in any case the danger to the British Empire and British interests in Asia would be far greater under the latter than under the former. The Russian reactionaries and monarchists always have been and will be imperialistic in the Middle East. On the other hand the Soviet Government have a vast constructive domestic policy which must absorb all their attention and energy for many years to come: there is at least a very good chance that, if we cease to attack them and offer them a real and an honest peace, they will have too much to do in connection with their domestic programme and internal difficulties to think of military adventures and external aggression.

### III.—THE BLOCKADE.

LIKE all announcements of policy in our relations with Russia, the statements concerning the conditions upon which trade is to be permitted are lacking in precision. The communication made by the Supreme Council from Paris announces that it will "permit the exchange of goods on the basis of reciprocity between the Russian people and allied and neutral countries." It will be noted that the phrasing seems to exclude the ex-enemy countries. Neutral countries, moreover, seem to anticipate that, in practice, restrictions will be maintained to exclude their trade.

The following is Reuter's Text (January 17th) of the communique issued by the Supreme Council:—

"With a view to remedying the unhappy situation of the population in the interior of Russia, which is now deprived of all manufactured products from outside Russia, the Supreme Council, after having taken note of the report of a Committee appointed to consider the reopening of certain trading relations with the Russian people, has decided that it would permit the exchange of goods on the basis of reciprocity between the Russian people and Allied and Neutral countries.

"For this purpose it has been decided to give facilities to the Russian Co-operative organizations which are in direct touch with the peasantry throughout Russia, so that they may arrange for the import into Russia of clothing, medicines, agricultural machinery and the other necessaries of which the Russian people are in sore need, in exchange for grain, flax, etc., of which Russia has surplus supplies.

"These arrangements imply no change in policy of the Allied Governments towards the Soviet Government."

It should therefore be kept in mind, with reference to the announced change of policy, that (1) there is no general raising of the Blockade at present; (2) even the limited authority given for relations with Russian Co-operative organizations is at present (January, 1920) only at the stage of a proposal, and like many proposals in our relation with Russia during the past two years may be frustrated by influences hostile to the pacific policy it represents; (3) the raising of the Blockade may of itself make very little economic difference (the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has for months taken the position that no Blockade existed!) unless it is accompanied by equitable arrangements in the matter of shipping, transport through the ports of Border States, etc.; (4) even if the new policy is sincerely adopted by the Allied Governments, an effectual blockade may still be maintained through commercial or administrative sabotage by commercial and financial interests hostile to co-operative trading, or by political interests hostile to the political results of a state of peace; (5) trading controlled by Governments hostile to the Soviets might be employed for the purpose of strengthening the political opponents of the latter.

It should be remembered that it is more than a year ago since Mr. Lloyd George very definitely condemned the policy of blockade as both inhuman and politically unwise. So far he has been completely frustrated in his efforts to translate that conviction into policy. It will be seen therefore how necessary it is to scrutinize the activities of those groups which will certainly attempt to achieve a like frustration in the future.

That may be accomplished in a variety of ways. Shipping may be withheld, certain large interests may resent the intrusion of co-operative enterprise in foreign trade, and render it difficult to secure those things which Russia most needs; while in certain cases there may be administrative sabotage in the matter of granting necessary permits. It is quite conceivable that the pressure of the Blockade, having failed as an instrument of coercion, a new method, involving what are in effect commercial preferences, may be attempted. The granting of permits, shipping facilities, credit, might conceivably be held out to certain of the co-operative societies as an inducement to oppose politically the present Soviet power. The new policy might thus be made a means of increasing instead of decreasing the friction between the West and Soviet Russia.

Political intrigue of the above nature is likely to centre particularly round Poland, Finland, and the other Border States. It was British policy during the alliance with Tsarist Russia to acquiesce in the suppression of autonomy in those States, as witness our acquiescence in the repression of Finnish autonomy. But now that the counter revolutionary forces have been defeated, we have adopted, not only for Finland, but for a round dozen of small republics on the borders of Russia, the policy of self-determination—complete “independence.” Yet access to Russia, both from Western Europe and the Central Empires, must be through those States. They have, moreover, within their borders raw materials—minerals, coal, petroleum—indispensable to the restoration of Russian economic life. By pressure upon States and using apparently democratic watch-words like “self-determination,” the economic development of Russia can be grievously retarded or strangled.

The representative of the Soviets in Copenhagen recently made a statement concerning the relations of Soviet Russia with the Border States, as follows :

“If these States are permitted by the Allies to follow the demands of their own people, and the dictates of their own interests, and to conclude formal peace with Russia, the use of these routes and ports will certainly not be denied. But if the Allies continue their present policy of compelling the Border States to remain in a state of hostility, they will, in effect, still be blockading Russia.”

It will be seen from the foregoing how meaningless even a complete raising of the Blockade may become unless the nominal freedom of intercourse is accompanied by a state of real peace. A negative policy of so-called free intercourse on the basis of a number of completely independent small States, each having the nominal right to make its own rules with reference to transport, raw materials, tariffs, etc., can only produce an impossible situation. Anarchy of that kind must give place to a more constructive policy: agreement upon a certain economic code with reference to tariffs, transport in, and across, foreign States, access to raw materials, and some general rules governing their distribution in the order of vital need.

There must be the beginnings of a common code for these stricken countries. However tentatively, we must attempt to construct an economic bill of rights.

A constructive policy of this kind might well embody two main features: (1) A free trade union between all the States that were once Russia, even adding, perhaps, those that were once the Austrian Empire. (2) Such a union might be endowed with an economic council commissioned to establish the facts of the economic situation, to make recommendations as to the economic needs of the respective States, and the equitable distribution of financial aid, raw materials, etc. It might constitute a sub-committee of the Supreme Economic Council. But in any case should be fully accessible to co-operative and labour representation.

There is a large field for the activities of the industrial co-operative societies in re-establishing the economic life of these devastated States, as co-operative methods will best meet

the conditions created by an utterly disorganized currency ; and the attention of those interested in co-operative work everywhere should be drawn to this fact. One element in the situation they should not overlook : progressive disorder has created great distrust in the minds of the peasantry of these regions, concerning promises to deliver goods in the future. In order to obtain a proportion of some of the very large crops which the Russian Government has managed to produce in some of its territory at least, it will be necessary to show the peasantry that actual goods are there for delivery in exchange for their products.

As regards this country, if the Co-operative Movement is to play, as it should, any large part in re-establishing the economic life of Russia and other countries of Eastern Europe, this can only be achieved by the Co-operative Wholesale Society. The C.W.S. has already shown, by exporting to South Russia and other countries, where the machinery of international trade had broken down, that international co-operative trade has great practical advantages. The Labour Movement should support and encourage the C.W.S. greatly to develop this experiment in the immediate future, and should demand that every assistance and facility for its development should be given by the Government.

The whole problem is vitally related to the high cost of living at home and to our own economic reconstruction. The failure to settle the relations with Russia adequately and sincerely will involve burdens upon us in two ways : firstly, by increase of military commitment ending, it might well be, in the disastrous drain of continual or intermittent warfare ; and, secondly, by helping to perpetuate the high cost of living. For the Blockade against Russia is just as much a blockade against ourselves. It deprives us of timber—so great a factor in the housing problem—of grain, flax, and other produce, adding heavily to their scarcity and cost.

A word should be added as to the part played by the Blockade in the famine and disorganization in parts of Russia.

We are frequently told that the maintenance of the Blockade of Russia can have nothing to do with the food shortage in that country, because Russia has normally a surplus of food which she exports.

But famine, whether in Russia or Central Europe, is not caused by the absence of the natural elements of wealth, but by the breakdown of the economic co-operation necessary for turning those elements to human use. Europe has to-day the same soil, minerals, climate that she had when she was relatively flourishing and well-fed before the War. What has happened to Russia, Poland, Austria, Hungary and the other famine areas, is that the co-operation of mine, railroad, factory, bank and farm has broken down owing to the destruction and disorder of war-time, followed by the erection of artificial political barriers and general insecurity.

A blockade which withholds locomotive spare parts, drugs and medical supplies may, in the case even of agricultural countries, condemn children to death for lack of milk, and whole populations to loathsome epidemics from lack of disinfectants.

One specific case will illustrate the condition. Throughout the whole of the new States the railroads are disorganized for lack of locomotives and wagons. Vienna possesses one of the greatest locomotive works in the world and might supply much of what is needed. The works are virtually closed down because they cannot get coal from Czecho-Slovakia, which is now a foreign country ; the feeding of millions of children, the restoration of credit, the restarting of normal life and industry is in consequence rendered more difficult over thousands of square miles of territory.

The reference to epidemics deserves a concluding word. The mortality from typhus has, in the last few months, greatly increased. That disease is taking a more virulent and fatal form. Unless the disorganization of European life is arrested, that epidemic, sooner or later, is almost certain to creep westward, and we may yet see a repetition of some of the "black deaths" of the Middle Ages.

## APPENDIX.

**" COMPLETE AND IMMEDIATE PEACE WITH THE SOVIETS! "**

The following Manifesto, signed by twenty-one members of the political and industrial working-class movement, was addressed to the public on January 29th, 1920 :

"There have been so many and such violent changes in our Russian policy that there is no assurance that the recent more pacific tendency will be permanent, unless public opinion now makes itself heard unmistakably. It is for this reason that the undersigned, who do not subscribe to the political and social theories on which the Soviet Government is based, desire, at what may be the parting of the ways in our relations with Russia, to outline the considerations which cause them to favour a policy of complete and immediate peace with the Soviets.

"It should not be forgotten that more than a year ago, as certain official Minutes of the Peace Conference, published by the Inquiry Commission of the Senate of the United States, show, Mr. Lloyd George expressed himself opposed to the continued blockade of Russia, as both inhuman and politically unwise. Yet the attempt—as to the projected meeting at Prinkipo—to give effect to this conviction failed. It may fail again. And just as a flash of momentary military success by Koltchak led to the defeat of attempts at Peace more than a year ago, so some momentary success of anti-revolutionary forces in Russia may cause a revival of the policy announced by M. Clemenceau, of exercising pressure upon Poland, Rumania, and the Baltic States (stricken though they may be by starvation, and at our mercy by reason of their need of economic help) to engage in hostile operations against Russia.

"Decisions of this kind are still taken in secret. The country is completely in the dark as to the facts underlying the policy which led us into war with the Soviets; to support in turn, Korniloff, Koltchak, Yudenitch, Denikin; to impose the blockade or remove it; to forbid the Border States to make Peace with the Moscow Government; or to encourage Polish, German, or Rumanian military operations against it. Such official communications as have been made by the Government have been almost completely falsified by events.

**SOVIETS' MILITARY SUCCESS.**

"The Soviets were represented as of burlesque incompetence, and incapable of effective military resistance; they have utterly defeated the armies raised, as Mr. Churchill boasted, at our instigation and equipped at our expense. At varying intervals they have been described officially as on the point of collapse; they have consistently extended their power. Koltchak, and then Denikin, were described as the real democratic forces in Russia; their collapse is now explained in part by the hostility of the populations they ruled to their autocratic methods. Where personal testimony is contradictory, we must accept the testimony of events, and events discredit what we have been told during two years.

"Certain facts, like that now generally admitted, of the presence in the Soviet armies (even on the General Staff) of large numbers of Russian officers of the old régime, are inconsistent with what we have been told as to the attitude of the bourgeois population. Terrorism might explain the mere presence of the officers in the army—though it would be great imprudence on the part of the Russian Government thus to entrust its armies to its political enemies—but it inadequately explains why they continue to win campaigns. If men and officers alike ardently desire, as we are told, the overthrow of the Soviet power, why do they so consistently defeat the 'deliverers' who would accomplish it? The fact has the first importance in considering war upon Russia.

### WAR AGAINST RUSSIAN PEOPLE.

"If we enter upon war against the present Russian Government—or use our economic and diplomatic pressure to compel others, or give mandates to Asiatic powers like Japan so to do—for it is realized that British and French soldiers would refuse to fight in such a cause—that war will be upon the Russian people, not merely upon a tyrannical Government. It will be Russian peasants whom our shells or poison gas will kill; Russian women and children whom the operations will exterminate or expose to the invasion of Asiatic or alien armies.

"We are told that the Russian people are burning to welcome us—the British—as deliverers. Perhaps. But we do not propose to go; we propose to send others. Will the Russian people be more likely to accept the government of Japanese, Finns, Rumanians, Poles, Germans, than to defend a Government of its own, which, whatever its past offences, has already held and greatly extended its power during two years, that has undoubtedly modified its worst features, softened its Communistic dogmatism, reconciled large sections of the bourgeoisie and made peace with the National Church?

"The alien armies of satellite States that we propose to use as the instrument of our Russian policy, sanctioning or compelling their prosecution of wars which we know our own soldiers have refused to wage, would be fighting in a vast continent against a population in a position to use guerilla tactics and threaten the necessarily long lines of communication. Military history is eloquent on the cost and risks of such a project. And if the Polish army is to be the chief instrument it must not be forgotten that Poland has Germany in her rear.

"One recent plea of justification in entering upon this war is Bolshevik propaganda in Asia. It is certain that the Russian Government is causing us everywhere it can the maximum of embarrassment since we have refused to consider any offer of peace whatsoever and announced our intention of accepting nothing short of its complete destruction. The Soviets are wicked enough to defend themselves by any arm they can use. But the continuation of war does not stop these intrigues. It stimulates them. And the expenditure of British resources in enabling a bankrupt Poland, with its mark at less than a halfpenny, to carry on a long and costly Russian campaign would not increase our economic capacity for facing trouble in our own Asiatic Empire. Nor would the military success of the campaigns so subsidized necessarily stop the propaganda and agitation. The Polish capture of Moscow and the flight of those who have created the Soviet Government into Asia Minor, Persia, China, Egypt, or other parts of the Near or Far East, would still leave these mysterious forces at work.

### COMPLETE PEACE THE BEST POLICY.

"The course of least risk all round is complete peace. If it be true that the Soviet Government has really failed to reconcile its people, and still imposes its power over a territory and population as great as the United States merely by tyranny, it must be because the people are cowed and spiritless by privation and hunger. A state of war will perpetuate that condition, and will do so even though the blockade be raised. A state of war, moreover, increases the autocratic powers of the Government, even as it does in the Western democracies. Peace would mean a greater chance of food and normal resistance to tyranny. And that revival would mean the confronting of the Soviet Government, always supposing that its power rests upon force and terror, with problems nearer at home than propanganda in India and Asia Minor.

"The Polish Army is already in occupation of Russian territory. If its invasion of Russia is repelled by the Soviet forces, we shall undoubtedly be told that this is an attack upon Poland, and that it is our duty to stand by the State we have created. We should then be committed to support this war, not owing to any policy sanctioned by the country, but to acts of the Polish Army instigated by obscure diplomatic intrigues.

"The whole results of the war which we have just fought, and the victory we have gained—the end of militarism, the reduction of armaments, the firmer establishment of democracy,



openness in diplomacy, a more unified Europe, a more secure peace—all are menaced by those intrigues. We shall do our best to oppose Britain's entrance into any war that this may give rise to. We do not believe that the Labour Party, if it should come to power, or wield a determining influence during the next year or two, will regard itself as bound by these military and diplomatic commitments, made in secret, and in defiance of the general policy in foreign affairs to which the party is pledged. It may be possible for the powerful autocracy which at present in Paris manages the affairs of Europe to begin a new war; but since it would be necessarily a long war it will rest with the forces of Labour to see whether it shall be continued."

The Manifesto is signed by the following :

- Rt. Hon. T. ASHTON, formerly General Secretary, Miners' Federation.  
 Rt. Hon. C. W. BOWERMAN, M.P.; Secretary of the Trades Union Congress.  
 Rt. Hon. W. BRACE, M.P., Miners' Federation; formerly Under Secretary for Home Affairs.  
 Mr. J. T. BROWNIE, Chairman Amalgamated Society of Engineers.  
 Rt. Hon. J. R. CLYNES, M.P., President General Workers' Union, formerly Food Controller.  
 Mr. W. J. DAVIS, Secretary of the Brassworkers' Union.  
 Mr. C. DUNCAN, Secretary of the Workers' Union.  
 Mr. F. W. GOLDSTONE, National Union of Teachers; formerly Labour M.P. for Sunderland.  
 Mr. FRED. HALL, M.P., Yorkshire Miners' Association.  
 Rt. Hon. JOHN HODGE, M.P., British Steel Smelters' Association; formerly Minister of Labour and Minister of Pensions.  
 Mr. WALTER HUDSON, National Union of Railwaymen; late Labour M.P. for Newcastle-on-Tyne.  
 Mr. W. H. HUTCHINSON, Amalgamated Society of Engineers. Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Labour Party.  
 Mr. J. W. OGDEN, Amalgamated Weavers; Chairman of Trades Union Congress, 1918.  
 Mr. W. F. PURDY, Ship Constructors and Shipwrights' Association; Chairman Labour Party Conference, 1918.  
 Mr. T. SHAW, M.P., Secretary International Congress of Textile Workers.  
 Mr. H. SKINNER, Typographical Association; member of Parliamentary Committee Trades Union Congress.  
 Rt. Hon. J. H. THOMAS, M.P., General Secretary National Union of Railwaymen.  
 Mr. A. G. WALKDEN, Secretary of the Railway Clerks' Association.  
 Mr. R. B. WALKER, Secretary of the Agricultural Workers' Union.  
 Mr. JAS. WIGNALL, M.P., National Organizer of Dock, Riverside, and General Workers' Union.  
 Mr. ROBERT YOUNG, M.P., Amalgamated Society of Engineers.

## LABOUR'S REPLY TO CRITICISM.

In reply to criticisms of the Labour Manifesto, published in the *Times*, Rt. Hon. J. R. Clynes, M.P., sent the following letter :

Sir,—Neither the criticisms directed by yourself editorially, nor by correspondents, at the recent Labour Manifesto on Russian policy signed by twenty-one union officials, have dealt with the specific reasons therein brought forward for supporting the policy it recommends.

It is objected that peace with the Soviets would condone their atrocities. Did then peace with the Tsar's Government or with the Sultan of Turkey condone atrocious crimes of which both undoubtedly were guilty? I would put this definite question to critics who stress atrocities: do they deny that those Allies of ours were guilty sometimes of atrocious cruelty? Did they make those cruelties a ground for refusing to maintain ordinary political relations with the Tsar's Government or the Sultan's.

There are other questions that must be answered by critics. They are these :

1. Do they deny that the only practical alternative to making peace is the support of Polish, Japanese, Rumanian, Finnish, Lettish, and Esthonian attacks upon the Russian Government?

2. Do they deny that the occupation, however "temporary," of extensive Russian territory by Polish, Japanese, and Rumanian armies would rally nationalist feeling to Lenin's Government, and do for him what a similar policy did for Napoleon: make him the master, not of a revolutionary party, but of a united nation?

3. What reason do they urge for believing that future interventions will be any more successful than those already undertaken in North Russia, in the Baltic States, in South Russia, in Siberia, which have all, from the point of view of securing a peaceful and stable settlement, been dismal failures?

4. Where do the advocates of such a policy propose to find the funds necessary for putting intervention into effect? Poland is bankrupt and starving. We should have to find the funds. The only other source would be Japan.

5. If Japan became the main source of economic support, is there any reason to suppose she would not become, whether we liked it or not, the preponderant power in great areas that were once Russia?

6. Do they look with equanimity upon an Asiatic (and incidentally, non-Christian) power assuming this new rôle, and its probable repercussion over not only the vast non-Christian populations, already a very grave problem in our Empire, but upon future Australian and American susceptibilities?

7. How do they propose to face even our share of the economic drain of financing a long Polish war in Russia, given the present financial chaos, and the famine and utter disintegration of society resulting therefrom which already menaces great areas in Central and South-Eastern Europe?

One word more. We of the Labour Movement are continually being appealed to by the Government and its supporters to impress upon the workers the menacing gravity of the present economic and financial situation, and the need for production and saving of the most intense kind, in order to prevent irretrievable bankruptcy. Yet in the next breath we are asked to sanction the financing of vague and ill-defined military commitments of quite indefinite extent, that may land us in vast and incalculable expenditure; and to do it on the assurances of those whose past assurances concerning the Russian situation have been utterly falsified.

I submit that these points have not been adequately dealt with by our critics, and until they have been, and are disposed of, the policy outlined in the recent Manifesto represents the only sane and statesmanlike course.

Yours, etc.,

J. R. CLYNES.

# PUBLICATIONS OF THE LABOUR PARTY.

---

## The Nationalization of the Coal Industry.

By R. H. TAWNEY, M.A., Member of the C.  
Price 6d.; post free 7d.

## The Capital Levy: How the Labour Party Debt.

By F. W. PETHICK LAWRENCE. Price 2d., post free 2½d.;  
dozen, carriage paid.

## Tariffs and the Workers.

By BROUGHAM VILLIERS. 1d., post free 1½d.

## Continued Education under the New Education Act

## The Juvenile Worker at the End of the War.

## Nursery Schools.

Memoranda prepared by the Advisory Committee on Education. 6d., post  
free 7d.

## The Ministry of Health.

## The Organization of the Preventative and Curative Medical Services and Hospital and Laboratory Systems under a Ministry of Health.

## The Position of the General Medical Practitioners in a Re-organized System of Public Health.

Memoranda prepared by the Advisory Committee on Public Health. 6d.,  
post free 7d.

## The Labour Woman.

The Labour Woman's Monthly. 1d., post free 2d.; 2s. per year; 9d. per  
12; 3s. per 50; 6s. per 100, carriage paid.

## Women and the Labour Party.

By various women writers, including Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB, MARGARET  
LLEWELYN DAVIES, MARY MACARTHUR, MARGARET BONDFIELD, MARGARET  
McMILLAN, and REBECCA WEST. Edited with an Introduction by Dr.  
MARION PHILLIPS, and a Foreword by the Rt. Hon. ARTHUR HENDERSON,  
M.P. 1s., post free 1s. 2d.; 10s. per dozen, post free.

## The Working Woman's House.

By Dr. MARION PHILLIPS and Mrs. SANDERSON FURNISS. (84 pp. illustrated).  
1s. 6d., post free 1s. 7½d.

# THE LABOUR PARTY.

---

## THE PRESENT STATE OF THE POOR LAW

By

**G. M. LLOYD.**

With **FOREWORD** by **GEORGE LANSBURY.**

---

PRICE 2d.; POST FREE 2½d.

1/6 PER DOZEN, CARRIAGE PAID.

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.

# THE PRESENT STATE OF THE POOR LAW.

---

## Foreword.

---

C. M. Lloyd is one of the very few men in the Labour Movement who is able to speak from first hand knowledge on the subject of the Poor Law. Those of us who have been engaged for many years in the actual work of administration, find ourselves more or less swamped in the details of the work, and as we are able to secure small improvements here and there, are apt to think that the Poor Law itself and its administrators are not such helpless failures as the general public believe. But C. M. Lloyd has been able to see us from the outside as a whole, and is therefore in a position to give a much more impartial estimate as to our failure, and as to the necessary requirements for a complete reconstruction of the whole system.

Bumble is one of the memories of our youth, at least for those of us who were brought up when Dickens and his great work "Oliver Twist" were first heard of. Although much has been done to modify conditions, it certainly is still true that nobody, unless compelled to do so by sheer necessity, would ever dream of accepting the hospitality of a casual ward or a workhouse. We may remove all the franchise disqualifications we please, but in the long run public assistance rendered through the Poor Law does leave a nasty taste in the mouth.

It is, however, the almost numberless, overlapping authorities for the relief of the poor which are the great evil. During the last twelve months the Ministry of Health, by the issue of circulars, has implored the local health authorities to distribute milk and other necessaries to necessitous mothers, expectant mothers and young children.

In some of the poor districts the effect of these circulars has been to increase public health expenditure by tens of thousands of pounds per year! The extraordinary thing is that in every public health district there is also a Board of Guardians whose express duty under the statute is to give exactly this kind of public assistance. The result is that there are the relieving officers (men and women), the child welfare visitors, the public health nurses, the sanitary officers, together with the Poor Law doctor and the medical officer of health, all of them competing with each other to do the same job. This is a sample of the sort of thing which is going on in every department connected with the administration both of the Poor Law and of Public Health.

In this pamphlet an effort has been made to show this and other evils quite clearly and also to point the way for reform.

I speak from continuous experience for a period of almost thirty years, and I can tell my friends of the Labour Movement that it is a hopeless business patching up the Poor Law. A workhouse will always be a prison and even the best Poor Law school will remain a Poor Law establishment. I believe the school of which I am one of the managers is

the best in the kingdom, but all the same I would rather the children were either in their own homes or in the homes of friends. The worst mother is better than no mother, and my whole experience teaches me that there is but one thing to do if we are ever to get rid of poverty and the effects of poverty, and that is to adopt the one word, prevention.

It seems to me it should be the duty of all local authorities to prevent destitution and all the evils that come from destitution; that people should be taken hold of long before the destitute stage is reached, and that all children, no matter who their parents are, should be treated by one authority—that is, whenever either central or local authorities have anything to do with them.

In this connection I would like to say that I hope the day will soon come when there will be no question of legitimate or illegitimate children coming under the care of the education authorities: all should be treated alike, and the children of the nation treated as one big family.

I very heartily commend the pamphlet to the attention of the Labour Movement and hope that the result will be a great campaign to destroy, root and branch, the workhouse system, together with Boards of Guardians, and the other overlapping authorities, which at present make for inefficiency and worse throughout the length and breadth of the land.

May, 1920.

GEORGE LANSBURY.

# THE PRESENT STATE OF THE POOR LAW.

By C. M. LLOYD.

---

## I.—POSITION IN 1914 AND DURING THE WAR.

The Poor Law at the outbreak of the War remained in all essentials as it was described in the Reports of the Royal Commission published in 1909. Some tinkering modifications were made between 1904 and 1914 by various Boards of Guardians and by the Local Government Board. But the President of the Local Government Board, Mr. John Burns, was a staunch defender of the system against the indictment of the Royal Commission. He wanted no newfangled ideas. His motto, as he himself proclaimed, was

“ Let fools for forms of government contest ;  
Whate'er is best administered is best ! ”

And, generally speaking, the Poor Law was, he held, admirably administered by himself and the Guardians.

The public, however, did not share this opinion. It had been profoundly moved by the revelations of the Royal Commission, and the strenuous agitation set on foot by the National Committee for the Prevention of Destitution made drastic reform of the Poor Law a burning political question. The Labour Movement was whole-heartedly in favour of a complete break-up on the lines of the Minority Report, as also was a very large section of Liberal opinion, and a considerable number of Tories. The milder reforms proposed in the Majority Report had a certain number of adherents. The only real support for the system as it stood came from the vested interests—the Poor Law officials, the old-fashioned Guardians, and their reactionary friends in Parliament. But this opposition, though bitter, was fighting a losing battle, and the Government was expected to legislate.

With the war, the situation was, of course, changed. Immediate legislation was out of the question, and after the first few months the “ problem of destitution ” receded into the background. The number of paupers greatly decreased owing to the absorption into the Army or into industry of many of those who would normally have received Poor Relief either for themselves or their dependents. A number of the Poor Law institutions—workhouses, infirmaries, and the like, were used as military hospitals, the diminished pauper population being transferred to other buildings, or boarded out in neighbouring Unions. At the same time, of course, there was a large residuum of sick, feeble minded, aged and child paupers.

The following figures will give an idea of the decrease resulting from the war conditions.

Persons receiving relief in England and Wales at end of September Quarter :—

	1914.	1915.	1916.	1917.	1918.	1919.
Ordinary Paupers (in workhouses, institutions and on outdoor relief) .. ..	641,028	566,725	516,876	483,438	446,565	463,009
Casuals .. ..	5,587	3,799	3,321	1,849	1,195	1,857
Outdoor Medical Relief..	17,521	14,238	14,169	13,661	13,794	12,274
Lunatics .. ..	100,941	102,975	100,182	97,350	90,718	83,172
Total .. ..	765,077	687,737	634,548	596,298	551,262	560,312

## II.—POSITION AFTER THE WAR.

The figures for 1919, it will be seen, show an increase. This is due to the unsettlement consequent upon the Peace—industrial disputes (e.g., the Yorkshire Miners' and the Iron Moulders' strikes), unemployment, &c. The number of vagrants has risen and is still rising: the professional tramp, in fact, is returning to his old job.

The latest statistics (March, 1920) show that, generally speaking, the volume of pauperism is going back to its pre-war proportions. The total of indoor paupers in 31 of the most important districts in the Kingdom shows an increase of 435 (or  $\frac{1}{4}$  per cent.) in March over that of February, and of outdoor paupers an increase of 1,595 (or  $1\frac{1}{4}$  per cent.). Compared with March, 1919, the increases were, in the case of indoor paupers, 6,302 or 6·2 per cent., in the case of outdoor, 12,736 or 11·2 per cent.

The present situation may be summarised as follows :—

There are (in England and Wales alone) something like 600,000 persons under the Poor Law, and the total is tending to rise.

The administration is in the hands of 636 separate Boards of Guardians.

Some of these have comparatively decent methods of treatment, many are no better than when they were denounced by the Royal Commission 11 years ago. Few, if any, give really adequate relief.

Scales of outdoor relief have been raised, of course, but in comparison with the cost of living they are generally insufficient.

The new Birmingham relief scale, for instance, which is generous as compared with that of many other Unions, is as follows :

	<i>Per head (plus allowance for rent).</i>	
Single aged person .. ..	..	12s. 0d. per week.
Aged couple .. ..	..	10s. 6d. "
Widow (or other woman) with 1 child ..	..	12s. 0d. "
" " " 2 children ..	..	10s. 0d. "
" " " 3 " ..	..	10s. 0d. "
" " " 4 " ..	..	9s. 0d. "
" " " 5 " ..	..	8s. 6d. "
" " " 6 " ..	..	8s. 0d. "
" " more than 6 " ..	..	7s. 6d. "



As regards " reforms," there have been in the last 10 years :—

- (a) A slight improvement (in some Unions) of classification of paupers ;
- (b) A slight improvement in medical relief ;
- (c) A supposed rise in status by the substitution of the name " Institution " for that of " Workhouse " ;
- (d) The removal of the pauper disqualification for the franchise by the Representation of the People Act (but a person is still not allowed to vote whilst an inmate of an institution) ;
- (e) The establishment of County Vagrancy Committees (*i.e.*, combinations of Boards of Guardians) and the grouping of the London Casual Wards under the Metropolitan Asylums Board.

But fundamentally the Poor Law is what it was—a number of unco-ordinated authorities, sometimes parsimonious and sometimes wasteful, relieving instead of preventing destitution, with no common policy, with inadequate means of treating the medley of sick, aged, feeble-minded, children and able-bodied unemployed who comprise their patients, and overlapping in their work with other public authorities to an appalling extent.

### III.—PROPOSALS FOR REFORM.

When reconstruction came to be thought about, it was clear that the condition of things due to the war was merely temporary, and that the problem would have to be tackled after the Peace. In July, 1917, the Ministry of Reconstruction appointed a Committee " to consider and report upon the steps to be taken to secure the better co-ordination of Public Assistance in England and Wales and upon such other matters affecting the system of Local Government as may from time to time be referred to it."

The members were : Sir Donald Maclean, M.P. (Chairman), Mr. R. J. Curtis, Mr. Robert Donald, Sir G. Fordham, Lord George Hamilton, Mr. G. Montagu Harris, Mr. Spurley Hey, the late Sir Robert Morant, Mr. R. C. Norman, Mr. H. G. Pritchard, Sir Samuel Provis, Dr. John Robertson, Mr. A. V. Symonds, Mr. J. H. Thomas, M.P., and Mrs. Sidney Webb.

The Committee issued its Report (Cd. 8917, 1918, commonly known as the " Maclean Report ") in December, 1917. The Report was unanimous (with certain reservations, which are not of serious import, by one or two members), and the following is the substance of its recommendations :

- (1) Boards of Guardians and Poor Law Unions should be abolished and all their functions transferred to the Councils of Counties, County Boroughs, and Boroughs and Urban Districts with populations over 50,000.
- (2) Provision for all the sick and infirm (including infirm aged and maternity and infancy) should be made by the Councils of these Authorities under the Public Health Acts suitably extended.

(3) The Ministry of Health should have power, on the application of any Borough with over 10,000 population, or any Urban District with over 20,000, to "direct that such functions as the Ministry may determine" shall be exercised by the Town or Urban District Council instead of by the County Council.

(4) The children should be dealt with by the Local Education Authorities, the mentally deficient by the Lunacy Authorities

(5) Every County or County Borough (or Borough or Urban District Council with populations over 50,000) should set up (a) a "Prevention of Unemployment and Training Committee" (on the lines of the Education Committee, and including representatives of employers and Trade Unions);

(b) A Home Assistance Committee (on the lines of the Education Committee), to inquire into the economic circumstances of all applicants for public assistance, to supervise them, to administer all relief given in the home, to recover expenses for maintenance, treatment, &c., and to keep a private register of all such applicants and their families and the assistance given.

(6) County Councils should appoint Committees for County Districts or combinations of Districts, to which various functions of the Home Assistance Committee on the Prevention of Unemployment and Training Committee would be delegated.

These District Committees would consist of (a) members of the County Council, (b) Town or District Councillors, (c) persons experienced in the work to be done.

(7) London should have a special scheme in which the duties would be divided between the L.C.C. and the Metropolitan Borough Councils.

(a) The Borough Councils would appoint Home Assistance Committees, and would also carry out vaccination and registration of births and deaths.

(b) The L.C.C. would exercise the rest of the functions transferred (through its Public Health Committee, Education Committee, Asylums Committee, and Prevention of Unemployment and Training Committee). It would also appoint a Central Assistance Committee, which would lay down policy and rules of local administration for the Home Assistance Committees in the Boroughs.

(8) Poor Law officials should be transferred to the Local Authorities (provided both they and the Local Authorities agreed) and compensated for any pecuniary loss which they might suffer by the change.

(9) The cost of all functions transferred should fall on the new Authority (the County, County Borough, Borough or Urban District), and in London mainly on the County, except for Home Assistance, which would be a charge on the Borough (but the L.C.C. would repay two-thirds of this, if satisfied of the efficiency of the Borough's staff and administration).

These recommendations represent a compromise between the Majority and Minority sections of the Royal Commission of 1909, though leaning heavily to the side of the Minority. The Majority in 1909 stood for the retention of "ad hoc" destitution authorities (in the shape of hybrid Statutory Committees of the County and County Borough Councils) whilst the Minority advocated the complete break-up of the Poor Law system and the distribution of the Guardians' functions among the appropriate Committees of the Local Authorities (except for the treatment of the able-bodied unemployed, which was to be the business of a National Authority).

The Maclean Report was accepted by the Government as a mandate and a basis for legislation. As late as September last, Dr. Addison, writing in Mr. Lloyd George's notorious broadsheet, "The Future," referred to this pledge, and said that "the Bill which is needed for the purpose will be introduced by the Government as soon as possible."

The chief reasons, why nothing has yet been done, appear to be the pre-occupation of the Ministry of Health with the Housing question, the pre-occupation of the Prime Minister with the affairs of the World at large, and the absence of any strong popular feeling.

#### IV.—WHAT LABOUR OUGHT TO DO.

The continuance of the present state of things now depends mainly upon the public. If a demand for the break-up of the Poor Law makes itself heard, the Government will act. The Ministry of Health is quite alive to the need of action in one matter at any rate—the provision of more hospital accommodation. This need is well-known, and it is not necessary to dilate on it. But it is well to remember that one of the ridiculous anomalies of the present situation is that there is a great deal of accommodation in Poor Law Infirmarys or ex-Workhouses which ought to be handed over to Local Health Authorities, but cannot be without an Act of Parliament. At Bradford, Birmingham, and elsewhere this question has arisen in an acute form. The Guardians, on their part, in some districts are appealing to the Ministry of Health to allow rate-payers to come into their Poor Law Infirmarys as paying patients.

It is clear that something will have to be done very speedily to solve this difficulty. The question then arises whether the necessary legislation is to take the form of a comprehensive measure, abolishing the whole Poor Law and distributing its functions among the Local Authorities, or of a smaller measure, confined to the sphere of Public Health, or perhaps to hospital treatment alone. The answer to that question depends mainly on the Labour Movement throughout the country.

If the workers show unmistakeably that they wish to be done with the Poor Law, the Poor Law will go. The forces that oppose its abolition are small, but vocal. They are the Poor Law officials and reactionary Guardians. These doughty warriors have been, and are still, expressing their violent hostility to the Maclean Report, both through their organisations (such as the Association of Poor Law Unions and the Poor Law Officers' Association) and individually at periodical Poor Law Conferences. They have denounced the "revolutionary and impracticable proposals of the Ministry of Health, which portend" they say, "a serious moral and financial danger." They have made bitter references to the proposed

scrapping of the "splendid machinery" of the Poor Law, which, they boast, does a great and efficient work at the small cost of about £15,000,000 a year. They have demanded a separate Government Department "exclusively for the supervision of legal relief and public assistance." And they are in favour, apparently, of what they call "genuine reform" in the shape of re-adjusting the local Destitution Authorities for the purpose of "co-ordinating public assistance." In other words, their aim is to make glorified Boards of Guardians, and enhance the power of the Poor Law!

Their main strength is the general public apathy. If public opinion—and above all Labour opinion—chooses to assert itself, their opposition will count for little.

Why, then, should the Labour Movement not assert itself now? Is it satisfied with the Poor Law? The Labour Party is the party of the working-class, and it is members of the working-class who are condemned to the miseries and degradation of the Poor Law. It is idle to deny that "pauperism" is a degradation, even though the Workhouse is now called the "Institution," or that the whole Poor Law system is utterly incompatible with our conception of democracy to-day. Moreover, the Poor Law system is an absurd travesty of all sound principles of administration. It is impossible for a single authority to deal properly with the needs of the sick and the aged, children of school age and infants, congenital idiots and starving widows. The attempt to do it is a costly failure, and it would not be any less a failure, if Labour were in a majority on every Board of Guardians in the country. It rests, therefore, with the Local Labour Parties to rouse public opinion and to put pressure upon Parliament and the Government. If they bestir themselves, there is no reason why the Poor Law should not be abolished before the year is out.

# THE LABOUR PARTY'S Handbook of Local Government FOR ENGLAND AND WALES.

---

"The Labour Party, of 33, Eccleston Square, Westminster, S.W. 1, have issued a most useful little handbook under the above title at the modest price of 5/- net. We sincerely hope that it may attain a very considerable circulation, which it certainly deserves. . . . . The amount of information contained within the pages of this modest little book is amazing. . . . .

"Taken as a whole, . . . . . the book appears to us to be admirably adapted to fulfil the purpose for which it is intended, and newly elected, and even experienced Councillors will find it both informing as to their duties and interesting in itself, as, in spite of the large number of different contributors, it is written throughout in a style which is exceedingly easy to read and in every way suited to non-technical minds."

*Local Government Chronicle, May 1st, 1920.*

"The book is well worth having for reference by all Councillors or people who are intelligently interested in local governing bodies, whatever their politics. For we know no better description of the powers and duties of such bodies, and the Acts conferring these powers are admirably summarised. An enormous amount of inquiry and labour have gone to the making of this book, and in issuing it the Labour Party has rendered a public service which those of us who do not belong to that Party ought not to hesitate to recognise and appreciate."

*Western Daily Press, May 4th, 1920.*

---

## PRICES :

Paper Edition, 3/6 net, post free 3/10; Cloth, 5/- net, post free, 5/9

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.

THE LABOUR PARTY.

---

INTERNATIONAL  
ECONOMIC POLICY

BY

L. S. WOOLF.

---

PRICE 2d.; POST FREE 2½d.

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.

# PUBLICATIONS OF THE LABOUR PARTY

---

## Labour and the New Social Order.

A Report on Reconstruction after the War. 2d., post free 3d.; 1s. 6d. per 13; 6s. per 50; 12s. per 100; £6 per 1,000, post free.

## Memoranda on International Labour Legislation.

The Economic Structure of the League of Nations. 1s., post free 1s. 1½d.

## Labour Women on International Legislation.

This pamphlet contains proposals on Women's Employment (by GERTRUDE M. TUCKWELL), the Employment of Children (by Dr. MARION PHILLIPS), and the Prevention of Unemployment (by A. SUSAN LAWRENCE, L.C.C.), and has been issued with the approval of the Standing Joint Committee of Industrial Women's Organisations. Price 3d., post free 3½d.; 2s. per dozen, carriage paid.

## The Labour Party and the Peace Treaty.

This is a Handbook for Speakers and contains a critical analysis of the Peace Terms, comparing its provisions with the pronouncements made by the National and International Labour Movement from time to time. Price 1s. 6d. post free; 12s. per dozen, carriage paid.

## The Peace Terms.

By the Rt. Hon. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P. 2d., post free 2½d.

## Labour and the Peace Treaty.

Containing Parliamentary Speeches by Rt. Hon. W. ADAMSON, M.P., Rt. Hon. J. R. CLYNES, M.P., Mr. STEPHEN WALSH, M.P., and Mr. TOM SHAW, M.P. 2d., post free 2½d.

## Labour Policy and the Famine.

This pamphlet indicates the present economic position of Central Europe and sets out Labour's policy of immediate remedies. Price 2d., post free 2½d.; 1s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.

## The Capital Levy: How the Labour Party would settle the War Debt.

By F. W. PETHICK LAWRENCE. Price 2d., post free 2½d.; 1s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.

# INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY.

By L. S. WOOLF.

The permanent international policy which this country adopts with regard to commerce, industry, and finance is of the very highest importance for Labour. The position of Labour at home will be undermined or consolidated in accordance as that international economic policy is contrary to or in conformity with Labour's aims. The history of the years 1880 to 1914 clearly prove this, and should be an object lesson and warning to Labour. Imperialist policy is fundamentally an international economic policy, for Imperialism has its roots in capitalism and the desire for profits and exploitation in undeveloped regions of the world. The 35 years from 1880 to 1914 were pre-eminently an age of Imperialism, of international economic rivalry and hostility, of continually growing armaments, and the perpetual shadow of the threat of war. Over and over again during that period the attempts of Labour to improve its own position and to create better social conditions at home were, both in this and every other country, thwarted by the inevitable results of this international economic policy of all the Great Powers of Europe. It will be the same again if Labour allows the same conditions to grow up again, and if it does not consciously work out and persistently pursue an international economic policy consistent and compatible with its own domestic aims and ideals.

There are three main divisions of international economic policy, which, though at points they overlap, are in the main distinct. There is first the policy of State interference with the flow of foreign trade into and out of the home territory with a view to influencing the nature or output of the home industries. This policy may be defined generally as Protectionism and its negation as Free Trade. Secondly, there is the distinct question of the policy with regard to the Empire, Colonial possessions, and dependencies, and non-adult countries outside Europe. Thirdly, there are the new international conditions created by the League of Nations, and in the development of the economic side of the League there are possibilities of a new economic international policy. In addition to these three divisions, there is a separate question in the possibilities of the development of international co-operative trade and industry. In considering international economic policy from the Labour standpoint, these four questions must be treated separately.

## PROTECTIONISM AND FREE TRADE.

The object of Protectionism is to influence either the nature, output, or profits of home industries. It seeks to do this by using the power of the State, through taxation or other methods, to alter either the volume or direction or content of the flow of foreign trade. Under Protectionist policy, if successful, the commodities themselves which enter this country, or their quantities, or their place of origin, would be different from what it would have been if the State had not interfered with the flow of foreign trade. The principal methods of State interference, either adopted or proposed, are: (1) Prohibitions, embargoes, or tariffs; (2) Differential railway and shipping rates, and other administrative methods of interference.

### (1) Prohibitions, embargoes, and tariffs.

If Labour is to have an international economic policy, it must spring directly from the social and international aims of Labour. There is no real dispute over the



general social and economic aims of Labour; they have been frequently and authoritatively defined: Labour aims at maintaining and improving the standard of life of the non-capitalist classes, and this entails as an immediate and practical programme a more equal distribution of the national income, increase in the rates of wages, decrease in the hours of labour, protection against unemployment, increased efficiency in the organisation and management of industry. The general international aims of Labour are also not in dispute: they are peace and co-operation between nations, and, therefore, the avoidance of anything making for international hostility, and the development of international co-operation in the League of Nations. Any general international economic policy, proposed for approval by Labour, must be tested in the light of these general aims of Labour.

### OBJECTS OF PROHIBITION AND TARIFFS.

The ultimate objects of prohibitions, embargoes, and tariffs are two. They aim at either producing some economic advantage to a national industry or industries or at increasing the nation's power, health, etc., by encouraging the establishment or growth of particular industries. An embargo or tariff imposed upon foreign made playing cards is an example of the first, for its object is simply to increase the economic advantages of those who in this country make playing cards by preventing foreign competition; on the other hand, a prohibition or tariff upon optical instruments may have as its object the encouragement of a British optical instrument industry in order that, in the event of war, the nation may not find itself dependent upon foreign nations for its supply of instruments.

### TARIFFS AND LABOUR'S DOMESTIC POLICY.

Prohibitions, embargoes, and tariffs, imposed for economic purposes, conflict both with the general social and the general international aims of Labour. The effects of a protective policy of this kind are (1) to increase the profits of the protected industry; (2) to raise the price of the commodity in the home market; (3) to favour the creation of capitalist rings, combinations, and trusts. All these effects are contrary to the interests of Labour. It is true that where the workers are strongly organised in a protected industry they may be able to exact from the capitalists some part of the increased profits in the form of higher wages, but all experience of countries which have adopted tariffs proves that the major part of the tribute levied upon the consumer goes to the small group of capitalists in the protected industry. Labour has no desire to share in any such advantages which must inevitably be gained at the expense of the whole community. Embargoes and tariffs directly increase the inequality in the distribution of national income and wealth, and conflict on this account with the general aims of Labour policy. The same effect results from a rise in prices, particularly where the protected commodity is a necessary or widely used. Any such rise in the price, as was clearly shown in the war, hits the poorer classes relatively harder than the more well-to-do classes. For instance, a rise in the price of tea immediately causes a more unequal distribution of wealth as between the man with an income of £3 a week and the man with an income of £2,000 a year.

What is true of Protection applied to a particular trade is still more true of a general protective policy of this kind; it strengthens the position of the capitalist against the worker and increases the inequality in the distribution of wealth. And all tariffs tend to become general, because in practice it is found impossible to deny the "protection" granted to interests in one trade to the powerful interests in other trades. And this process disposes of the argument by which the Protectionist relies mainly for getting the support of Labour. "We cannot,"

they say, "pay high wages and work short hours in the leather trade, if you allow the competition and dumping of cheap foreign-made leather goods." Now, it is true, as we have said, that if the workers in the leather trade could get a tariff restricting the importation of foreign leather, they might secure higher wages and a larger volume of employment. Even so they would not get an increase of employment equivalent to the quantity of goods they kept out. For the higher prices charged by the home manufacturer would check the demand and so diminish employment, and though they would gain something from those higher prices, the gain would be made mostly at the expense of other workers. But the root fallacy of Protectionism consists in arguing that what is good for each trade taken by itself is good for industry taken as a whole. If the leather trade were the only protected trade, the workers in it might be able to retain some of the advantages of the higher price of leather in the form of higher wages or shorter hours. But no one imagines that Protection can be confined to a single trade or even to a small number of trades. And every trade which got Protection would snip a bit off from the advantage which a tariff brought to the leather manufacturers. For every extension of Protection to another trade would cause a rise in price of the protected commodity, and this would not only raise the cost of producing leather, and thus raise its price and restrict employment in the leather industry, but the progressive raising of the prices under a general tariff would lower the real purchasing power of wages in the leather and all other trades.

It follows that Protection in so far as it aims at and succeeds in raising the price of protected commodities in the home market is directly contrary to Labour interests and Labour policy. In so far as foreign competition is concerned, the only interest of Labour is to see that the cheapness of imported foreign goods is not due to sweated conditions of foreign labour. The right way to attain this is, however, not the roundabout and indiscriminate method of a tariff, nor prohibition, which inevitably opens the door to indiscriminate "Protectionism," but by international agreement as to Labour legislation which will make an international standard of wages, employment, etc., and abolish sweating.

### TARIFFS AND FOREIGN POLICY.

Protectionism also conflicts with the international aims and policy of Labour. The policy of Protectionism is based on and promotes international hostility. It belongs to an age of the world and a condition of society which are both dead—and that is the reason why it has such a wide and persistent appeal. It is based on the assumption that in foreign trade what is one nation's gain must be every other nation's loss, an assumption which is at the root of the policy of international hostility and rivalry. The Protectionist crudely assumes that if Sweden gains by exporting matches to us, that import of matches must be a loss to us, in the sense at least that we should be better off if we manufactured the matches for ourselves. He implicitly denies that "as a nation" we may gain by not manufacturing matches, but by manufacturing cotton goods to exchange against Swedish matches. The policy of Protection is, therefore, based upon a theory of the divergence of interests among nations and upon international hostility; it actually, by a vicious circle, creates this divergence of interests and hostility. The imposition of a tariff designed to keep out foreign goods is regarded in other countries as a hostile act and is almost invariably followed by retaliation in kind. A Free Trade country, suddenly adopting a protective tariff, cannot hope to escape such retaliation; for countries which already have a tariff can always strike at it by increasing that tariff and by refusing the most favoured nation clause. What is sauce for the international goose is also sauce for the international gander, and if we hit the foreigner and help

ourselves by putting a tariff on leather, the foreigner must, and will, hit us and help himself by putting a tariff on cotton goods. Our tariff on leather restricts his foreign market and counteracts any gain which he may make by protecting his home cotton market, and his tariff on cotton restricts our foreign market and counteracts any gain which we may have made by protecting our home leather market. International trade becomes a vast and intricate field of international warfare, in which operations vary from the raids and guerilla warfare of partial tariffs manipulated by capitalist interests to the great pitched battles of tariff wars.

In this way, Protection is one of the most powerful engines of international enmity, and it is particularly powerful because it is admirably fitted for use by small and powerful capitalist groups who in each country can make large profits out of this international hostility. It is extremely doubtful whether any system of international co-operation and peace, such as that of a League of Nations, could co-exist with an international economic policy of Protectionism. Consequently, the policy is completely inconsistent with the international aims of Labour. And in one of its forms it has internationally a peculiarly pernicious effect. Where Protection takes the form of a differential tariff discriminating between the goods of different nations, the effect is inevitably disastrous to international relations. For such "hostile discrimination" naturally channels the hostility bred by tariffs into a particular hostility between two nations, and the tariff becomes an economic weapon to be used in and to embitter and sometimes even to create political differences and disputes. Bad as a tariff is, its evil is greatly increased if it allows of differential duties and discrimination between different nations.

#### KEY INDUSTRIES.

So far we have considered Protectionism as an international economic policy aiming only at economic results. But tariffs and embargoes are also recommended with the object of producing not economic but political results. The best example of this proposed use of tariffs is "key industries." The protection of key industries aims at "national safety," the increase of national power for defence (and offence). If, therefore, Protectionism with this object is found to be inconsistent with the aims of Labour, it is hardly likely that any tariff with a less vital political object will prove consistent. The doctrine of key industries lays it down that any industry manufacturing goods important in time of war should be protected in order that the nation may itself produce such goods and rely for its supplies upon foreign countries. The doctrine should be considered in the light of what has happened to the doctrine of contraband of war. The doctrine of contraband was based upon the assumption that you could define and catalogue before war broke out those goods which were important to nations for the conduct of war. This assumption has been proved a delusion, and the doctrine of contraband has been exploded. Articles included in lists by the Great Powers as non-contraband and of no importance in the conduct of war have turned out to be of the most vital importance. The fact is that five years hence, if war breaks out, any article, owing to some new invention, may prove to be vital for the "national safety," and any industry may prove to be a key industry. It follows that, if we are to protect key industries, we must protect all industries; we must attempt to make ourselves as a nation self-sufficient and self-contained. But in the first place it is quite impossible to make either the British Empire, or still more, the British Isles, self-contained. There are a large number of the most vital raw materials unavailable in sufficient quantities. Moreover, there is actually a danger, particularly with the modern submarine warfare, in limiting the area from which the nation can draw its supplies of raw materials, and the Royal Commission on Supply of Food and Raw Materials in Time of War, therefore, reported in favour of drawing supplies from as many sources as

possible. But apart from its practicability, such a policy is entirely contrary to the general aims of Labour. The policy of "key industries" presupposes, and is based on a policy of perpetual state of war and preparation for war. It is really part of a gigantic munitions policy, and in effect would convert national industry primarily into an engine for manufacturing munitions of war. Its object is military self-sufficiency, and this could ultimately be attained only by complete prohibition of foreign raw materials and commodities. Labour holds that self-sufficiency is an unsound policy striking at the root of commercial prosperity in peace and failing to provide security in war. It is, in fact, the old policy of Germany, and it has failed. It has failed so signally that in Germany itself there is a considerable party who are demanding that Germany's future policy shall follow more nearly the Free Trade policy of Britain.

## 2. Differential railway rates, shipping rates, and administrative methods.

The objections to protective prohibitions, embargoes, and tariffs apply equally to all differential railway and shipping rates, and all administrative regulations intended to protect home industries by raising the price of foreign goods on the home market. The effect of such differentiation or administrative methods are precisely the same economically as that of an embargo or tariff. Labour policy should aim at the universal introduction of the principle that goods of foreign origin, whether for import or in transit, should be subject to the same transport rates as similar goods of home origin, and that no administrative regulations with regard either to goods in transit or for import shall be applied other than those necessary to prevent the spread of diseases or to guard against accidents. In this connection it should be remarked that the system of licences is entirely contrary to Labour's international economic policy. The only possible object of licences to import articles in time of peace is to introduce Protectionism or hostile discrimination under veiled forms. Apart from this, the system encourages dishonest favouritism and other abuses. It should be completely abolished.

## THE EMPIRE AND EXPLOITABLE COUNTRIES.

The international economic policy to be applied to the Empire's Colonial possessions and dependencies, and to exploitable countries like China and Persia, must be considered separately. But the particular question of what is called Imperial Preference is really the same as that of Protectionism discussed in the preceding paragraphs. Imperial Preference seeks to regard the Empire as the territorial unit of international economic policy and then to apply to it and to its industries a policy of Protectionism. But the economic objections, from the standpoint of Labour, apply with even greater force to an attempt to protect the industries of the Empire than to an attempt to protect those of the United Kingdom. As we saw, if only one industry is protected, it is possible that some economic advantage may be gained for the workers in that industry, but for every industry to which the tariff is applied, some part of the economic advantage of the tariff is cut off. Thus even in the limited industrial area of the home territory anything like a general tariff must prove disastrous to the interests of Labour. Still more disastrous would be an attempt to draw up a tariff to satisfy all the different interests in an Empire which includes not only the highly industrialised home territory but Australia, Canada, India, South Africa, and immense tropical possessions. But internationally this proposed system is still more fundamentally opposed to Labour policy. Labour's interests are opposed to Imperialism, war, and the armed peace. Now the armed peace which preceded the war and the war itself had their origin in Imperialism.

### IMPERIAL PREFERENCE.

The last 50 years has been notable for the acquisition by a few Great Powers of Europe of immense empires outside Europe. Each Great Power feared that the others would attempt to exploit their empires economically for their own European subjects, and by preventing the access to raw materials or by closing their imperial markets to foreigners by tariffs or preferences strike a blow at the economic life of their "rivals." Hence the scramble for territory in Africa and Asia, the hostilities engendered by that scramble, the huge armaments, and, finally, the doctrines of Pan-Germanism and Pan-Slavism which led to the outbreak of war. It is certain that what prevented the European war breaking out earlier, between 1880 and 1914, was that the British who owned by far the largest Empire refused, despite the persistent efforts of a small but powerful Imperialist-Protectionist group, to adopt the policy of exploiting the Empire for the economic advantage of small groups in the home territories and self-governing Dominions, or to shut out the other nations from the raw materials and markets of half the world. It is equally certain that another world war will result if the other nations see us adopt the policy of attempting to reserve the riches of this Empire for exploitation in the interests of 40,000,000 inhabitants of the United Kingdom and a few million inhabitants of the self-governing Dominions. Imperial Preference is completely incompatible with any kind of lasting peace.

### THE OPEN DOOR.

The removal of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions, to quote President Wilson, must be the aim of Labour's policy everywhere. But as applied to Imperial territory such a policy is absolutely essential. In non-self-governing Possessions and Dependencies within the Empire, and in exploitable countries like China, Labour must insist upon definite and rigorous guarantees for the application of this policy. These guarantees can only be obtained if the League of Nations establishes and enforces the principles of Free Trade and the Open Door in all non-self-governing Colonial Possessions and Dependencies and in non-adult countries. The policy of the Open Door is of peculiar importance. If applied rigorously under international guarantee and supervision, it would certainly go far towards ensuring "the removal of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions." No attempt has been made to include it in the stipulations of the League Covenant. Conditions are to some extent different in Colonial possessions and exploitable countries. With regard to the first, what is required is that members of the League should pledge themselves to comply with the following obligations in all their non-self-governing possessions and in all mandated territories, and that powers of inquiry and supervision should be given to a commission of the League.

#### 1. Export and Import Duties.

All differential duties on exports and imports should be forbidden, and no advantages should be given to any country, including the sovereign or mandatory country, which are not accorded to all.

#### 2. Shipping and Navigation, and Railways.

The subject and flags of all nations should be treated on a footing of absolute equality, free access should be given to the flags of all countries; all differential dues on shipping and merchandise and differential railway rates or privileges should be forbidden; free access to all rivers and canals and on all railways should be assured; no exclusive privilege of navigation or railway transport or warehouse or wharf accommodation should be accorded to any company, corporation, or private person.

### 3. Transit Duties.

Transit duties (i.e., duties on goods in transit across a territory for importation into another territory) should be forbidden.

### 4. Monopolies and Privileges.

The Congo Act, which attempted to apply the principle of the Open Door to tropical Africa, provided that "no Power . . . shall be allowed to grant . . . a monopoly or favour of any kind in matters of trade." This would appear to forbid the grant of concessions to nationals and "privileged (national) companies" (e.g., the French Congo companies), unless similar concessions were also given to foreigners. This is a provision which it is clearly very difficult to enforce. The granting of a concession must be left to the Government exercising sovereignty. It is an administrative act of that Government, and, whatever the general rule, it is difficult to see how discrimination can be made impossible if the Government wished to practise administrative favouritism and protectionism with regard to concessions. One safeguard which might be adopted would be a provision that sales or leases of land and mining rights and concessions should be by public auction or by public call for tenders, the upset price being fixed by the Government exercising sovereignty, and that where the upset price was above a certain value or where the sale was to be made outside the possession, the sale should be advertised in every country which was a member of the League. The sale itself might, in fact, in such cases be conducted by the commission of the League. The same, or, if possible, even more rigorous, restrictions should be placed upon mandatory governments. Such governments are in the position of trustees under the League, and the League should retain adequate powers for seeing that mandatory territory is not treated as a preserve for the concessionaires of the mandatory Power.

All the four provisions mentioned above as necessary for maintaining the Open Door in Colonial possessions also apply to exploitable countries like China. Thus there can be no "establishment of an equality of trade conditions" or of the Open Door in the spheres of interest in China and other Asiatic countries unless the above provisions with regard to export and import duties and shipping and railways are applied under the sanction and supervision of the League. But in such countries the question of concessions raises peculiar difficulties. In China, for instance, before the war, the Open Door tended to become more and more a question of concessions (mining and railway construction) and opportunities for the investment of capital; and a solution seemed to be coming not so much by ensuring free competition as by syndicating "recognised" financial groups of the different Powers in common enterprises and concessions. The most likely policy would be to develop this tendency and to provide that the consortium of the State-supported banks which loaned capital to China should be transformed into a consortium of the lending States in the League. Loans and concessions of a certain magnitude in exploitable countries would then only be made by and to the League, every nation having option to participate.

We have so far considered the international economic policy with regard to Colonial possessions and exploitable countries in so far as it affects the industrialised and possessing or exploiting nation in Europe. But there is another side which it is vital for Labour to consider, namely, policy in so far as it affects the non-adult, exploited, non-European populations. The exploiting of these tropical and sub-tropical peoples is, apart from other considerations, directly contrary to Labour ideals and interests. In Europe, thanks to the industrial and political organisation of Labour, the position of the capitalist class has been seriously weakened in the last 30 years. But what that class has lost in Europe to the workers it has more

than gained in Asia and Africa through its economic and political power over the subject races. It is in Asia and Africa that capital now looks for high profits, and it gains those profits by exploiting non-adult races. The exploitation is carried on by depriving the native population of its land, or by imposing specially devised forms of taxation, and thus indirectly forcing it to work at low wages for European planters and landowners, or by obtaining concessions which are then worked and developed with cheap labour. The point to notice is that it pays these small groups of capitalist exploiters to maintain a low standard of wages and living in these countries. It is directly contrary to the interests of labour, of industry, and of the world. It is to Labour's interest in Europe that the standard of living in Africa and Asia should be raised to the highest possible point in order that increased demand and consumption in those parts may encourage an exchange of commodities between Europe and Asia and Africa. The low wages of the African negro and the system by which he is forced to work for them make the fortune of the individual exploiter; they strike a direct blow at Labour in Europe by consolidating the power of capital and by restricting the possible market for European manufacturers and the free interchange of commodities throughout the world. Labour's international economic policy should demand that:—

1. Throughout Africa and Asia the land should be declared the inalienable property of the native races wherever a European Government has acquired sovereignty.

2. That no native shall be forced, either directly or indirectly, to work for wages.

3. That the revenue of the country shall be expended on the education of the native inhabitants and the development of the country in the interests of those inhabitants, the object being to train the natives so that they may be capable of taking part in the government of the country and of themselves developing the resources of the country.

### THE ECONOMIC LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

The international economic policy which we have so far treated as in conformity with Labour's interests and ideals is largely negative. The policy of Free Trade as opposed to Protectionism and even the Open Door is mainly negative; it merely forbids or prevents certain kinds of interference with the flow of trade. That is not, as Protectionists and Imperials often assert, a defect in the policy. If Labour is to protect its own interests, safeguard the rights and liberties of non-adult races, and prevent the outbreak of the wars of economic Imperialism, it must persistently and resolutely oppose any "economic barrier" and any interference with equality of trade conditions in any part of the world.

In doing this Labour is fighting against a positive international policy of international hostility and competition and capitalist exploitation. But there is also a positive and constructive policy of international co-operation and of the development of the common economic interests of the world which it is essential that Labour should pursue. For the first time the world has at its hand in the League of Nations an adequate instrument of such a policy. The original idea of the League was to provide the means, the machinery, and the atmosphere in which nations could co-operate with one another in settling differences and developing common interests. No differences and no interests are so vital to peace and war and to the relations of the States and peoples of the world as are international economic interests. Unless, therefore, Europe is to drift again into the rivalries of capitalism-Imperialism-Protectionism which poisoned international relations between 1880 and 1914, an economic side of the League must be developed which will not

only see that economic barriers are removed and equality of trade conditions are maintained, but will also work out a constructive policy of the development of common economic interests. The whole subject is vast and complicated, and only the outlines of a possible development can be indicated.

During the war Inter-Allied organisations showed how in one direction a League of Nations must work. These organisations were a signal example of international economic co-operation among the Allies. Instead of allowing the world's supplies of food, raw materials, manufactured goods, tonnage, and finance, to be scrambled for internationally and divided up in accordance with the ordinary rules of competition and the theory of international rivalry and hostility, they apportioned them in accordance with national needs and on the principle that the economic strength of one nation is a gain to all the other nations. The conditions of a world shortage and of dislocation of trade which made this imperative during the war will continue for a long time to come. That France should be without coal, that Italian industries should be starved of raw materials, that Poles and Czechoslovaks should be without food, is no gain to the nations and peoples of Britain and the U.S.A., though these conditions may be the means of making large profits for individuals and small groups. It is, in fact, a common interest of all peoples that all other peoples and nations should be fed and prosperous, and that industries should be restarted in all countries in order that there may be the maximum exchange of goods and flow of trade throughout the world. The existing Supreme Economic Council must therefore be developed into a World Economic Council of the League which will apportion the supplies and credit according to need, and place them freely at the disposal of all nations in order to restore the world's economic life.

But even when the world's economic life is restored and something like normal conditions return, this kind of co-operation should continue and become a permanent function of the Economic Council of the League. Among the permanent functions of this Council in normal time would be:—

1. The maintenance of credit, i.e., purchasing power, in the various countries at such a level as will ensure (a) a fair allocation of supplies of materials, etc.; (b) stimulation of supply of important materials by promoting production in the various countries; (c) providing against unnecessary disturbance of world conditions through a breakdown of purchasing power in a particular country owing to preventable causes.

2. The development of international lines and means of communication either where the interests of two or more nations are concerned, e.g., Bagdad Railway, or where a supply of raw materials or a market of world importance could be opened up by the co-operation of nations in providing credit or labour or technical skill or other resources.

3. The regulation of loans and concessions, as suggested above, in undeveloped countries, and the safeguarding of such countries from unfair exploitation or monopolisation by particular interests or nations.

4. The co-ordination and development of the work of public international unions dealing with common economic interests, e.g., the International Institute of Agriculture. The Economic Council of the League should not only use such unions as sources of expert advice, but should, in conjunction with them, work out schemes having as their object world economic interests. e.g., the international organisation of agriculture and of the distribution of agricultural products, international insurance of crops.

It should also, in this connection (a) ascertain the true facts as to the world's supplies of foodstuffs and raw materials, so as to enable action to be



taken in time to deal with a shortage or prevent the cornering of food supplies, and (b) collect and publish accurate international, economic statistics.

5. The promotion of international economic conventions based on the widest measure of international co-operation, e.g., commercial treaties, Labour conventions, traffic agreements.

6. Supervision of and enforcement of international economic conventions, especially in the matter of the removal of economic barriers, the establishment of equal trade conditions and the open door, and the prevention of evasion through secret rebates, concessions, and administrative manipulations. Further, the prevention of exploitation by trusts, operating in the world market, whether of interests concerned in production, transport, or distribution, and the control of operations of international firms and combines.

7. The promotion and creation of international conferences or councils in various industries and economic groups, in order to secure the greatest possible measure of co-operation in each group.

#### INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATIVE TRADE.

The development of international economic trade and industry is of peculiar interest to Labour. In finding a working alternative to the present profit-making capitalistic economic system, the objection is often made that the whole machinery of foreign trade requires the competitive, existing method. The co-operative system, which abolishes the capitalistic profit and competition, has already to some extent developed the machinery of foreign trade, and it is therefore of great importance that the further development and organisation of this machinery should form part of Labour's international economic policy. This is particularly necessary during the period of world shortage following the war. Any distribution of the world supplies according to needs by the Economic Council of the League should be entrusted, wherever possible, to the co-operative movements, in order to make it certain that there will be no profiteering at the expense of populations suffering from the shortage. Again, the credit of the co-operative movements, wherever they exist, should be used for restarting the machinery of exchange which has broken down during the war. Labour should therefore insist upon the machinery of the co-operative movements being used to the utmost possible extent where international action is taken to apportion world supplies, and also upon every encouragement being given to the organisation and development of inter-co-operative trade. On the other hand, Labour should promote the efforts now being made by co-operators to develop and perfect a machinery for international co-operative trade. This can only be done by an international organisation of the different co-operative movements, and particularly of the various national wholesale societies. Labour in the various countries can do a great deal to encourage and assist the creation of such an international organisation. What is required is that either all wholesale societies should become members of one another, or that for the purposes of international trade they should federate in an international wholesale society. By this unification each various national movement would be able to ascertain what wants of the other movements it could supply by its industries, and a great development both of co-operative industry and of international co-operative trade might result. The importance of such a result for Labour lies in the fact that its general aims can never be attained while foreign trade remains under the control of the capitalist and competitive system.



# **PUBLICATIONS OF THE LABOUR PARTY**

---

## **International Economic Policy.**

By L. S. WOOLF. Price 2d., post free 2½d.; 1s. 6d. per dozen, carriage paid.

## **Continued Education under the New Education Act.**

## **The Juvenile Worker at the End of the War.**

## **Nursery Schools.**

Memoranda prepared by the Advisory Committee on Education. 6d., post free 7d.

## **The Ministry of Health.**

## **The Organisation of the Preventative and Curative Medical Services and Hospital and Laboratory Systems under a Ministry of Health.**

## **The Position of the General Medical Practitioners in a Re-organised System of Public Health.**

Memoranda prepared by the Advisory Committee on Public Health. 6d., post free 7d.

## **The Labour Woman.**

The Labour Woman's Monthly. 1d., post free 2d.; 2s. per year; 9d. per 12; 8s. per 50; 6s. per 100, carriage paid.

## **Women and the Labour Party.**

By various women writers, including Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB, MARGARET LLEWELYN DAVIES, MARY MACARTHUR, MARGARET BONDFIELD, MARGARET McMILLAN, and REBECCA WEST. Edited with an Introduction by Dr. MARION PHILLIPS, and a Foreword by the Rt. Hon. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P. 1s.; post free 1s. 2d.; 10s. per dozen, post free. (In preparation.)

## **The Working Woman's House.**

By Dr. MARION PHILLIPS and Mrs. SANDERSON FURNISS. 1s. 6d.

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.

THE LABOUR PARTY.

---

23

LABOUR POLICY  
AND  
THE FAMINE.

---

Price 2d. ; post free, 2½d.

---

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.

•

**LABOUR PAMPHLETS ON THE  
PEACE.**

**The Peace Terms.**

By the Rt. Hon. Arthur Henderson, M.P.  
(Secretary of the Labour Party).

**Labour and the Peace Treaty.**

Containing Parliamentary Speeches by—  
Rt. Hon. W. Adamson, M.P.,  
Rt. Hon. J. R. Clynes, M.P.,  
Mr. Stephen Walsh, M.P.,  
Mr. Tom Shaw, M.P.

---

Price 2d. each; post free, 2½d.

---

THE LABOUR PARTY, 33, ECCLESTON  
SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.

## **LABOUR POLICY AND THE FAMINE.**

In the Memorandum on War Aims of the Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference of 1918 occurs the following passage:—

“This Conference insists that, in view of the probable world-wide shortage, after the war, of exportable foodstuffs and raw materials, and of merchant shipping, it is imperative, in order to prevent the most serious hardships, and even possible famine, in one country or another, that systematic arrangements should be made, on an international basis, for the allocation of the available exportable surpluses of these commodities to the different countries, in proportion not to their purchasing powers, but to their several pressing needs; and that, within each country, the Government must for some time maintain its control of the most indispensable commodities, in order to secure their appropriation, not in a competitive market mainly to the richer classes in proportion to their means, but, systematically, to meet the most urgent needs of the whole community on the principle of ‘no cake for anyone until all have bread.’”

Contained in this passage are two things: a prophecy and an outline of policy. The prophecy has been fulfilled and the proposed policy justified by that fulfilment.

Europe is faced by famine, and there is only one way adequately to deal with it, and that is to make a thorough and sincere application of the policy for which Labour stands.

It is because the forces hostile to that policy so far have triumphed that we face such a famine as we do. If we could imagine that condition getting worse the hopes which Labour bases upon an extended international co-operation of the workers must utterly collapse; if capitalistic as distinct from Labour remedies are applied in dealing with the famine, then forces hostile to Labour will have been greatly strengthened; Labour will have suffered a very great political defeat, a set-back which may embarrass the effectiveness of its programme for a generation.

These seem at first glance sweeping propositions. Let us examine them.

We would note at the outset that the very fact of the famine—its extent and character will be dealt with presently—is justification enough for Labour's special interest in this question. With whatever indifference “statecraft” may accept hunger and suffering and disease and pestilence raging over great surfaces of the earth as a mere incident of high politics, the workers, if they are wise, will not do so.

### **LABOUR'S PROTEST AT THE SOUTHPORT CONFERENCE.**

This determination was reflected in the resolution voted at the Annual Labour Party Conference (1919) at Southport:—

“This Conference enters its emphatic protest against the method of starvation, especially when used against women and children, as an instrument of Government policy, and views with grave anxiety the effects of the blockade on Central Europe in bringing the horrors of famine upon the great masses of the population in those countries. It protests further against the failure to provide in the Peace Treaty either for the restoration of industry throughout Europe with equality of fiscal treatment or for any adequate international control of raw materials and food. It urges that the administration of the Supreme Economic Council dealing with the distribution of raw materials and

food supplies and the management of finance should be made more democratic by the inclusion of representatives of the international working-class movement, and that full publicity be given to its proceedings."

The Labour Party has put the simple, decent, humane aspect of this thing first, before any political consideration whatsoever. It refuses to sanction the starvation of children, old men and women, the weak and ill, as an "instrument of policy." And it may justly be proud of its stand on that point. It is one, let us hope, needing no argument. All that Labour needs on such a question is to be sure of the facts.

What are the facts?

We propose to review them briefly as they have developed in Germany—next to Russia the largest of the areas affected by famine. But the situation in Austria and in Hungary, and even in some degree in the small Allied states, exhibits the same evils both in the development of famine and distress itself and in the inadequacy of the methods used in dealing with it. The differences are those of degree.

Dealing primarily, then, with the conditions prevailing among the German people, we may note that (1) the Allies in the Armistice terms (November 11th, 1918) practically undertook such provisioning of Germany "as should be found necessary"; (2) no food at all was allowed into Germany till nearly five months later, and meantime Germany's provisioning of herself was made far more difficult by several measures not foreshadowed in the Armistice, e.g., the prohibition of sea-fishing and the extension of the blockade to the Rhine; (3) the Brussels Agreement was at length arrived at (March 15th, 1919) as the direct result of General Plumer's message to the Peace Council warning them that his soldiers could no longer endure the sight of women and children starving.

#### THE INTERVENTION OF OUR SOLDIERS.

A very strong report by a Commission of 14 British officers was made in February, 1919. They found the following conditions in Germany (a) conditions of starvation telling severely on children, women, and the sick, and on the working capacity of labour; (b) rapidly increasing unemployment, caused by lack of raw materials and lack of transport due to the deliveries under the Armistice terms; (c) the rapid spread of Bolshevism, as the direct result of so much misery. Captain Roddie (from Leipzig) reported "the policy of continuing starvation . . . is not only senseless but utterly harmful to ourselves." Captains Roddie, Bell, and Tennant (at Berlin): "The nation has lost nearly all its powers of resistance to illness and infection and its energy for work. Women in childbirth are dying on a terrible scale." Captain Bell (at Cassel): "The poor are suffering horribly . . . the mortality amongst women, children, and the aged has been awful for years past, and is at its worst to-day." Captain Roddie: "Germany is on the brink of a volcano . . . it would be foolish to suppose that the ensuing disaster would be confined to us." Not one of these English officers disputed the reality of the distress, and their statements only confirmed the repeated warnings of neutral as well as German authorities, statements invariably scoffed at by our Press and disregarded by our rulers.

The food supplies in Germany were then rapidly diminishing, and were expected to be exhausted in May. The Brussels Agreement (March 15th) allowed Germany to import a maximum of 370,000 tons of cereals and fats per month, provided she could find the means of payment and transport. The first ration of U.S. flour was distributed in Hamburg on 3rd April.

The maximum of 370,000 tons per month itself represented less than two-thirds of what neutral as well as German medical authorities calculated to be the minimum required to maintain health and strength. Quantities to restore the enfeebled health of large sections of the population would have needed to be much larger. By the end of June the amount actually allowed would have been over 1,000,000 tons. Owing to the financial difficulty, however, Germany had only succeeded in importing about 655,000 tons.\* Mr. Hoover severely blames German capitalists for unwillingness to give up their foreign securities to provide payment for food imports. Apart from this difficulty, Germany's power to import was restricted by her power to provide goods for export, and the blockade, by cutting off supplies of raw materials, had paralysed industry. Moreover, the fall of the mark to one-third its pre-war value trebled price in Germany. This stops many goods coming in at all, or if they do so, renders prices prohibitive to the poor (e.g., rationed meat and bacon have cost 8 to 11 marks a lb.; by illicit trade a great deal more).

The production of goods for export was also seriously hindered by strikes, especially among coal miners. The strikes themselves, however (see reports of British officers), result largely from hunger conditions. Meanwhile, the complications caused by the strikes are used in Germany to discredit Trade Unionism and Socialism.

#### DISTRESS OF THE GERMAN WORKING CLASSES.

In March, Mr. Villard, the editor of the well-known New York weekly, the "Nation," made a personal investigation of the situation in Germany, and cabled to America: "No one can live on the ration allowed. . . . One workman I saw earns 100 marks a week, but has had no clothes since the war began, and is literally in rags. His two children are dead, and his wife is dying from consumption." Similar cases of the practical wiping out of working-class families, through tuberculosis and other troubles, directly due to malnutrition, can be found in great

---

\*The Finance Minister, Gothein, explained Germany's difficulty in finding means of payments for imported food, as follows:—

"Now we are at last allowed to import food, but we are deprived of the means of acquiring it. We can only pay with our own products. But our enemies have crippled our industrial production. First of all, by taking away our transport. . . . Repairs, too, are enormously in arrear (lack of materials). We are asked to deliver coal to neutral countries and to Belgium and France, but we have no means of doing so.

"We are to deliver iron but the ores of Lorraine and Luxemburg—our main supply in the past—are forbidden to us . . . and our harbours are closed by the blockade. One after another our furnaces must be let out, and steel works and rolling mills and foundries closed. Our electrical industries used 263,000 tons of copper, mostly American. The world cries aloud for their products, but our factories are empty and silent, for copper is forbidden to us. . . . After England, Germany was the best customer of America for cotton. In 1913 we imported 369,000 tons, worth £23,000,000. Most of our factories are standing still, the workmen idle and losing their skill. We cannot provide for a fraction of our own needs, to say nothing of export, and meanwhile the American planters are at a loss what to do with their cotton. In peace time the English spinners used to send us 39,000 tons of cotton and woollen yarn, value £17,000,000. . . . So also with the Italian and French raw silk and Indian jute. Our rubber industry is also idle, while the plantation owners are at a loss where to dispose of their products.

Long continued unemployment brings degeneration and loathing of work. The habit grows of dependence on public support, and the more meagre, the more insufficient the food obtained, the greater the discontent and the responsiveness to wild and fantastic ideas—to the idea that all must be ruined in order that a better future may arise out of the wreck."



numbers in the records of German child welfare and other charitable societies. As Mr. Villard went on to explain, "No special diets are possible, and physicians are unable to build up their patients after fever or when the shock of an operation is over." The lack of milk especially still reduces doctors, nurses, and parents to despair.

The adjoining neutral countries are at the present time (summer and autumn, 1919) making great efforts to rescue German children. Even fishermen, poor railway employes, and peasants, scantily rationed themselves, are opening their doors to them. A Swedish article ("Stockholm Dagblad," May 31st, described the "tragic aspect" of a trainload of German and Austrian children; "their faces were thin and pale, or sallow or sunken, like those of old and sick persons. Hunger and privation told their own tale." An appeal for help against starvation, sent to the Swiss Government by the Swiss colonies in Germany, mentioned 800 as the daily death-roll in Germany due to the "hunger blockade" (May, 1919).

Journalists of English papers of the most varied hue, from the "Daily News" to the "Daily Telegraph" (see articles of Mr. Philip Gibbs), bore witness as to the intensity of distress, and their accounts and those of other English investigators varied little between December, 1918, and August, 1919. To give a few examples:—

On May 5th the Berlin correspondent of the "Daily Express" writes—

"Thirty per cent. of the German women die in confinement. Thirty per cent. of the children born to married mothers die, and 50 per cent. of those born to unmarried mothers. I have encountered dozens of children 2 years of age who have never tasted milk. Children born since Armageddon was let loose on the world are shrivelled-up creatures."

Mr. Garvin, in the "Observer," on May 18th, writes—

"Nearly six months after the Armistice the blockade is still inflicting some of the most frightful miseries of war, especially on the women and children. . . . It works most on women and on the young. . . . Tuberculosis, scrofula, skin diseases, intestinal disorders, anemia, in a way that will leave its mark on more than one generation, are grinding out the health and vigour of millions who are the least guilty, the poorer of the German masses."

On Christmas Eve, 1918, Mr. Nevinson wrote from Cologne of the "lines of babies" in the largest hospital, "fevered for want of food, their limbs wasted to sticks," "staring about them with ape-like and hopeless faces." At the end of June the same hospital was visited by another Englishman, who found "the same babies that Mr. Nevinson had seen, along with many others born since, who seemed to me in far worse condition. . . . I begged to be shown no more."—(Letter to Emergency Committee, June 28th.)

Scepticism as to the existence of distress has at times been freely expressed by certain individuals whose experience of German conditions is limited to the occupied districts. It does not seem to be generally known that in April the Inter-Allied Military Commission for Food Supply, apparently owing to pressure from the soldiers, decided themselves to increase the German ration of food value 1,400 calories to one of 2,400 calories for the occupied districts.—("New York World," May 1st.) This increase is at the expense of the rest of Germany.

The significance of the facts touched on above lies not only in the effect already produced on the future physique, morale, and political outlook of the German people, but in the fact that these conditions of destitution, disease, and unemployment are to be indefinitely prolonged as the result of the terms of peace.

## THE RESULTS OF THE PEACE TREATY.

Germany's position is, to a lesser degree, that of Britain: an enemy who can prevent foreign trade can starve the country. And that interdiction of trade need not be done, in the case of Germany (or German-Austria), solely by the use of the blockade. The Allies have taken her ships, most of her iron ore, much of her coal, her fertilisers, her railway rolling stock, her agricultural live stock, a large part of her best corn-growing districts; they control most of the overseas raw material (like cotton and rubber) which she needs for her industries; control her access to foreign markets, and, finally, through the Reparation Commission, control her financial relations with the outside world: she can send no money abroad save by our permission. So the situation is this: we say to Central Europe:—

"Your people are starving; we have raised the blockade. You are free to buy foreign food; but you must send no money abroad, since it is needed by the Reparation Commission. You are free to work; but we shall most narrowly limit your supply of coal and of raw materials. You may engage in foreign trade; but we shall take all your ships and allow you none of ours. Your children may have milk; but we shall take your milch-cows, although we have access to the world's stock, which you have not. You may re-establish your iron industries; but France and Poland shall be free to say on what terms you shall have iron."

The statement of Count von Brockdorff-Rantzau that the Peace Treaty would force millions of people to emigrate or starve has been endorsed by Mr. Hoover, the Director of the American Food Administration. In his statement of June 10th he points out that 25 or 30 million Germans (in Austria and Germany) "lived before the war by trade . . . and these cannot be supported on the land." It is possible that "ten or twelve millions of this population may emigrate . . . under the economic pressure which will be their fate at the best."

It needs no explaining that "economic pressure" strong enough to drive ten or twelve millions of people from their homes implies conditions of destitution, death, and despair which would cause the death probably of as many millions as would finally succeed in emigrating. This was what happened at the time of the great famine in Ireland.

The Peace now imposed does, in fact, spell destruction for millions of humble homes, and for millions of others indefinite prolongation of squalor and the sordid scramble for joyless existence. It is a Peace which passes sentence of death upon, it may be, the only surviving child, upon countless men and women, old and young, who so far have just managed to hold out against the cumulative effects of privation.

One of the very earliest effects of the Peace Treaty will be the death of large numbers of babies, who, owing to the cession of 140,000 milch cows, will be entirely deprived of the milk which even now provides only the scantiest ration for children up to 4, and for serious cases of illness.

In April a Commission of neutral doctors reported that it was impossible to cope with the appalling spread of tuberculosis and rickets, owing to the dearth of milk.

In August, 1919, an official White Paper (Cd. 280), drawn up by British scientific and medical experts, confirms the earlier neutral and enemy reports. The death rate from tuberculosis has increased from two-and-a-half to six times, according to locality. "The shortage of milk has already told heavily on the children, . . . and the parents are already driven to distraction in their efforts to provide food which will keep life in the bodies of their children." (The White Paper urges an alternative to the cession of cows; see page 22.)

To Germany, whose own food supplies in June were approaching exhaustion, the alternative of signing or not signing the Peace presented itself as the alternative

of a slow death or a more rapid one. Switzerland, indeed, and the other neutrals (at considerable risk to themselves) refused to be parties to the renewed application in its extremist form of "the starvation weapon," which has been described by Mr. Churchill himself as falling "mainly on the women and children, the old, the weak, and the poor." Nevertheless, it was only the immediate necessity of escaping from the blockade which induced Germany to accept the Peace, which they regard as the death-blow to their country.

### THE HUNGER SCOURGE: NEW USE OF AN OLD WEAPON.

The use of economic pressure by the ruling class is by far the most powerful political weapon at their disposal, and is familiar to all workers. The new feature now is its application internationally, and on a scale so vast that the life of once mighty nations, and the continued existence of our whole civilisation, is involved. Some further illustrations may here not be out of place. On April 12th the Vienna Government were "officially and expressly" informed by the British military plenipotentiary that "if riots should occur in German Austria the import of food and raw materials would be entirely stopped at once." On April 17th the Italian Mission at Salzburg gave the same warning in the event of a "Communist or Bolshevik rising." The chief Vienna paper hastened to remind the Viennese that Vienna would have "literally nothing" (Austrian supplies had been exhausted in January), and "the two million people who inhabit this town have only one common duty . . . salvation from bestial, merciless hunger." The hunger at this time was already so intense that old and young were being attacked by a disease hitherto hardly known, in which the bones go soft and the patient becomes crippled and deformed.

That the Bolshevik evil for which the Entente proposed the remedy of hunger was in Vienna, as in Germany, the direct result of hunger was obvious to other observers. The correspondent of the Italian Radical paper, the "Stampa," wrote (April 22nd): "Yesterday's disturbances are nothing but Vienna's yell of famine and the last appeal of German Austria for some generosity on the part of the victors . . . the famished, horrible reality in Vienna has only one word to express itself—desperation."

Again, in Socialist Budapest, we have had a perfect example of what Mr. Harmsworth calls "the most powerful and at the same time the most merciful weapon" of the blockade! The population was, and still is, being decimated by the diseases due to famine and dirt. For nine months past even the hospitals have been destitute of the most primitive necessities of coal, soap, sheets, swaddling clothes, bandages, disinfectants, medicines, and milk. Mothers and new-born babies perish together on the soiled and lice-infested mattresses, unprotected either by sheet or blanket. And where Hungarians perish in their thousands, the Russians, in like case, perish in their hundred thousands. "There are no babies under 2 left in Petrograd," said Dr. Nansen, already in April.

In Moscow hospitals 80 per cent. of women die in childbirth, and 90 per cent. of the infants perish likewise.—("Novaya Jizn," May 28th.)

On 19th May the Supreme Economic Council announced that the "blockade of Hungary will be suspended as soon as a Government is installed which gives some assurance of settled conditions," or of "law and order," the phrase used on another occasion. British workers, who know something of what hunger, or the menace of it, means, might well have asked, "How many more babies must perish; how many mothers must be driven desperate; how many more men be infected with the sickness bred of hunger and the anarchism bred of despair before the "settled conditions" demanded by the Entente were realised?"

THE VICTORIOUS MARCH OF DISEASE AGAINST US.

The blockade is indeed a most potent weapon, but it is a financial expert, recently after month was taken up at Paris in the work of allocating millions (see "News," May 29th) in indemnities, and other fruits of victory. But if a long view is taken, Europe is not going to get the value of these assets was jeopardised by the spread of social pestilence, and, above all, by the paralysing effect on industry throughout Europe). production which the delay involved. of food supplies."

Disease is the inevitable bye-product of a successful blockade. In the European countries above mentioned, all the countries of Europe and the already ravaged by disease as a result of war conditions and the blockade. Famine and fatigue produce a condition of lowered resistance to the absence of soap, disinfectants, etc., favours its spread, and the reproduction of the epidemics of the Middle Ages. The menace was already so great that Red Cross delegates from Hungary, Roumania, Czecho-Slovakia, the Ukraine, and the Balkans confer at Budapest. They urgently have appealed to the Allied Powers. Some of the Governors of the new Red Cross

"Right now there are 275,000 people in the Baltic and the Black Sea, and the war between the United States knew the distress in the Middle East. The people of New York World," April 23rd, 1919.) sleep."—"New

And again:—

"I would not give a damn for all the Peace Conferences in the world if something is not done to relieve the incredible, the unbelievable distress that exists in the world to-day."

"In Russia there are terrible typhus and small-pox epidemics, against which there is not the slightest possibility of protection. The Government has no means to fight or stop these epidemics." "It cannot even procure wood enough for coffins. just as little as it can organise the transport of the corpses to the cemeteries. Survivors must wait several days before they can succeed in burying the victims." —(The Danish paper "Politiken," April 13th.)

In March the International Red Cross appealed to the Peace Conference for a lifting of the blockade on account of the "unspeakable miseries" of the hospitals in the countries of Eastern Europe, which make them simply foci of epidemic diseases. The almost total absence not only of medicines, anaesthetics, and all sorts of medical appliances, but of the most elementary necessities, such as coal, soap, linen, sheets, etc., created a "desperate" situation. In April another manifesto described disease as spreading with "agonising rapidity."

An Allied Conference of the Red Cross reported ("Times," April 14th) that "unless active measures are now taken in Eastern Europe a much greater epidemic may be feared there in the autumn, especially owing to the famished condition of the populations."

"Europe is a good place to avoid just at present" is the moral drawn by an American paper.

Typhus is an epidemic carried by fleas and lice. To quote Mr. Davison again, "Having had to fight men with bullets, it looks now as if the world would have to mobilise to fight—lice." Meanwhile the hotbed of infection created by the effects of our blockade in Hungary, Austria, and Russia remains unremedied. In August English doctors cabled home imploring help for the still "desperate" situation in Budapest and Vienna hospitals.

Not only Russia, but the whole of Europe is crumbling under the Russian writer's appeal to "At the same time, they collect the effect of the blockade."

MS. 11.1.19

## of a slow death. MORAL DEBACLE AS RESULT OF FAMINE.

(at considerable physical health, but civilisation itself and the most primitive morality in its extremity the unnatural stress of prolonged suffering. An account given by a Mr. Churchill applies equally to other countries. He explains (in the Danish weak, and the April 23rd) that after a time the spectacle of misery ceases to make from the block sympathy. It only avails to make the instinct of self-preservation as the death-bl

THE RIGHT of those who are most miserable, people only think how they it make provision to escape a similar fate. They must see to it that The use of more foodstuffs; they must take care to hide them still more politically. . . . Hopelessness is the feeling that dominates all and everything. And it is no doubt this feeling that there is no way out that each day is so changing the character of the people. And when one considers that the character of children and young people is being formed in this morass one shudders at the thought of the probable consequences."

Is it any wonder to us then that the peasant hoards, that the profiteer clutches his profits! That parents steal to save the lives of their starving children, and children to help their parents? "Virtuous German women," wrote a British soldier to his family, "are selling themselves to provide food for their families." The truth of this was confirmed to the writer of this memorandum a few weeks later by a Swiss girl who had been living in Germany.

## THE DIFFICULTY OF TRANSPORT AND FINANCE.

But before passing on to the question of remedies it is necessary to answer the question, Was not the world shortage of food and transport so great as to render the evils described partly inevitable?

The "New York Times" wrote of America early this summer, "If ever there was a country distressed by excess of materials for food and clothing, this is one." There was, in fact, last spring a glut of corn and other foodstuffs in the United States, and this summer's crops, though not so large that "we shall have wheat to burn" (as a U.S. paper put it), are large enough to meet the needs of Europe. Whether shipping and inland transport difficulties can be overcome is really a question of how much will there be to overcome them. In the last months shipping, which might have carried flour for starving children, has been freely used to bring superfluities to England for the rich (e.g., the embargo on the import of wine was removed), and to carry munitions to Russia. Ultimately the question resolves itself into this: What efforts and sacrifices is the crisis really worth? The same applies to the far more serious financial difficulty. If Europe is to be saved she must be allowed to purchase her necessities mainly on credit.

The extreme seriousness of the crisis in Europe finds confirmation, if more were needed, from the fear repeatedly expressed by leading men, both here and in the U.S., that repercussions may reach ourselves. On July 8th Lord Robert Cecil stated: "The economic situation in Europe was as serious as it possibly could be. People were unable to get sufficient food, and there was a general breakdown of all transport. The whole system of credit—a vital point—was seriously injured or absolutely destroyed. The most urgent problem of foreign affairs was to try to set right that economic position, and for that purpose, even in our own interests, we must be prepared, if necessary, to come to the assistance of Europe—and we must in particular so frame our Peace policy as not to hinder the economic recovery of Europe. If we hindered it we must not be surprised if revolutionary ideas developed which would ultimately engulf, if not ourselves, at any rate every other country in Europe."

### A CRISIS WHICH INVOLVES OURSELVES.

Similarly, Mr. Frank Vanderlip, a great American financial expert, recently created a "profound impression" ("Times" and "Daily News," May 29th) in America, by pointing out that the industrial crisis in Central Europe is not going to stop there. "A responsible (English) Minister had told him that unless the European demand was re-established (that is, our markets throughout Europe), 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 Englishmen must be got nearer the sources of food supplies." ("Times," May 28th.) In other words, unless we can "rehabilitate the European markets" which our blockade has destroyed, England will not be able to support her present industrial population.

The "rehabilitation of the European markets" is a question of restarting the industrial machine, which has first been paralysed by the blockade and then by the bankruptcy which is the legacy of the blockade. The White Paper referred to above (Cd. 280) shows that the output of the German worker has been reduced in many cases 55 per cent. by malnutrition; the productivity of the starved soil 50 per cent. If Germany can only maintain her present rations and the resultant "miserable state of nutrition of the people" this must be attended "with a constant increase in the incidence of sickness and mortality, and with a continually diminishing efficiency of the workers. Thus the country will be unable to produce sufficient wealth to pay for the imported food, and still less to discharge any portion of its debts in the way of reparation to the Allies." Unless Germany (and similarly German-Austria) can be provided with sufficient food and raw material on credit, she "stands face to face with a catastrophe which may involve the death of millions by famine and disease" (page 12). Side by side with the conclusions of these impartial Englishmen, the authors of the White Paper, let us set the verdict of Mr. Hoover himself, who maintains (to quote the summary of the "Times," August 13th) that "the continuation of the blockade, after the Armistice, has destroyed enterprise even in open countries, and prevented any recovery in enemy countries. . . . Unless productivity can be rapidly increased there can be nothing but political, moral, and economic chaos, finally interpreting itself in loss of life on a scale hitherto undreamed of," and "production cannot increase if political incompetence continues the blockade, embargoes, censorship, mobilisation, large armies, navies, and war."

It is this "political incompetence" of which we have sketched the story. Having established the facts, let us now consider the policy which is to meet them.

### THE ISSUE FOR LABOUR.

The reasons why Labour, apart from humanitarian considerations, should concern itself with conditions in the famine areas, and with the measures employed to remedy them, are:—

1. Labour's acquiescence—if such a thing could be imagined—in a policy which, resulting in the starvation of millions, and the destruction, both economically and physically, of whole nations would be a cause of future war—and all that war means to the worker in the way of helpless submission to military and autocratic governments, the suspension of Labour's efforts towards a better social order, and the collapse of International Socialism.

2. The arrest of productivity in Central Europe, due partly to previous prolonged famine and partly to disabilities imposed by the Peace Treaty, which, *inter alia*, perpetuate famine, must powerfully contribute to world-shortage and universal high prices, and restrict demand for the products of British industry.

3. Famine must mean obviously reduction or extinction of the payments due from those areas for restitution and reparation—a loss for which groups of capitalist traders could find compensation in the “captured” German foreign trade which would result from measures like depriving the enemy countries of raw material.

4. Famine must mean over large areas in Europe a reduced standard of living, servile condition of Labour, and perhaps forced emigration, which would increase everywhere the difficulty of maintaining labour standards.

5. All these concomitants of famine will greatly increase the difficulties in the way of the international co-operation of Labour and militate against the success of its international plans.

If the whole question is left in the hands of capitalist groups and interests (as it is now being left) what will be the result?

1. The virtual control of the world's shipping, credit, much of its raw material and food will pass from public bodies to private capitalist “rings” operating internationally.

2. This power can be used to defeat the apparent gains of Labour by the manipulation of prices in freights, raw materials, etc.

3. And by this, and the manipulation of credit, to discriminate powerfully against Socialist or Workers' Governments, wherever they may be established.

#### IMMEDIATE MEASURES AND PERMANENT POLICY.

What, then, in brief, is Labour's policy? Apart from the revision of the Peace Treaty (see above), the immediate needs are:—

1. A complete raising of the blockade *everywhere*, in practice as well as in name.

2. Granting credits to enemy and to liberated countries alike, to enable them to obtain food and raw materials sufficient to put them in a position where they can begin to help themselves.

3. Measures for the special relief of children *everywhere*, without regard to the political allegiance of their parents; and the provision of hospital necessities.

Labour, however, has a more permanent and far-reaching policy.

It is indicated in the Labour Party's “Memorandum on International Labour Legislation” (Section XIII., “The Economic Structure of the League of Nations”) in these terms:—

“For the emergency period, at least, it is vitally necessary that from the Supreme Economic Council of the Allies should emerge a World Economic Council, with the function of rationing the nations with supplies while the world shortage and dislocation of normal trade conditions continue. This is essential, not only because both raw materials and foodstuffs and the tonnage necessary for their transport are largely in the hands of Great Britain and the United States, but also because purchasing power and credit are largely concentrated in the same hands. There can be no speedy restoration of the world's economic life unless supplies and the credit necessary to obtain them are placed freely at the disposal of all nations. Failure to do this, which will mean a scramble for supplies between the nations, coupled with a stagnation in most of the markets of the world, even where the need for supplies is greatest, would merely ensure the perpetuation of old economic antagonisms between the nations and the rapid creation of new ones, even among the countries at present in alliance. This would clearly be fatal to every possible hope of a real League of Nations.”

### CONTROL OR LAISSEZ-FAIRE?

Three facts demand special attention in connection with the above policy.

1. No measure short of the complete re-establishment of the normal economic life of the countries concerned—which means their access to credit, shipping, raw materials—can, as Mr. Hoover declares, ensure these populations against starvation.

2. The restoration of industrial activity throughout the world can take place, broadly, along one of two lines. The methods which were applied to the worst crisis of the war—to the shortage of munitions, the distribution of food and transport—can be extended and applied to the purposes of peace; or we may revert to the older methods of making the production of things simply depend upon the prospect of private gain, and their distribution respond simply to the varying degrees of ability to pay on the part of those who want them. This system had to be abandoned during the war simply because under it the nations and the Alliance would have collapsed.

3. This last method will be increasingly applied to the famine situation unless Labour makes itself heard.

### THE BEGINNINGS OF AN INTERNATIONAL ORDER.

It should be noted here how rapid has been the reversion to laissez-faire methods since the termination of the war, although individualist laissez-faire happens to be the system against which the Labour Movement, alike on its purely Trade Union and on its Socialist side, is in revolt. This reversion has taken place not only in home affairs, but in the international field. During the period of the war we had great international bodies for the control and distribution of shipping, credit, and raw material in accordance not with capacity to pay, but with vital need. Only so could the common enemy be met.

There was in these arrangements the beginnings of an organised economic government of the world, a real international society, subjecting to a common control those things essential to the common life. Here was a world-government actually in being. And immediately the war was over it was ruthlessly pulled to pieces, mainly in obedience to pressure exercised by private capitalist organisations. Shipping, banking, trading, and manufacturing concerns naturally desired to revert to the untrammelled and uncontrolled exploitation which characterised trade and industry before the war.\*

In speaking of this reversion to the laissez-faire regime, an important distinction has to be made. If it were a real freedom, even of competition, if all economic

---

\* Whilst constantly creating new dangers, the capitalist system has proved itself incapable of meeting the existing crisis. Thus, while for some months past the Government has given every opportunity for trade with South Russia and Siberia, private industry and commerce have proved unable, largely owing to the difficulties of the exchange, to take advantage of the opening. Meanwhile the Co-operative Wholesale Society has come to an agreement with the corresponding productive and trading organisation of Russian Co-operative Societies, under which the British movement will ship manufactured goods to the Rostov district, and will receive in exchange raw materials and food. An agreement such as this is full of promise for the future. It is to be hoped that co-operative trading will be conducted on a large scale by wholesale societies organised on a national basis, or possibly by the creation of an international wholesale society for the purpose of international trade.

Apart from the advantage of finding together the democracies of the different countries by definite economic bonds, there are two main reasons why trading by



barriers were in process of disappearance, all Governmental restrictions being withdrawn, there would be a great deal to be said for it. But that is not what has taken place. International control for the purpose of assuring an equitable distribution according to need has disappeared. But national control of foreign trade, exercised through administrative order, has been maintained, and maintained at a time when administrative powers are at their very height.

Their realisation has for the time being been left to Roumanian bayonets and a Hapsburg Archduke!

### FINANCE AND INTERNATIONAL POLICY.

Licences to trade, to export or to import to or from this or that country, are granted at the entire discretion of Governmental Departments. What forces guide the decisions of Olympian Governmental Departments in these matters of high international finance and foreign trade? What influences determine that trade in certain things shall be permitted with, say, Constantinople or Berlin and denied to Budapest or Petrograd? The Trade Unions and Labour organisations do not have very much to say to these particular matters of policy. So far, indeed, they have not shown much interest in the matter. The relation of hours and wages to an authorised banker's loan to a new kingdom in Arabia or a Provisional Government in Esthonia or Finland is not always very clear. The relations between British Siberian companies, capitalised at several millions sterling, with the British Government on the one hand, and the relations of that Government to a Siberian dictator who has confirmed the concessions granted to the British companies on the other; the bearing of both these relationships upon licences granted to certain cargoes to Vladivostock are perhaps even still more obscure.

It is thus clear that the abolition of international control merely means that the field is left clear for private capitalism to influence the various national Governments for its own ends. International control must be re-established and in a more democratic form than before. The policy of Labour is not to destroy the system of international regulation which the Governments have created for the purpose of the war. It is to demand that the system shall be maintained, but to insist at the same time that its defects shall be remedied and its function enlarged and democratised for the purpose of peace. These bodies, however autocratic and bourgeois in character during the war, constitute the beginnings of an organised economic government of the world. They represent at least a departure in principle from the old order of individual competition in favour of one of international co-operation on a basis of real need and common welfare. They should be made the beginnings of a constructive international society.

---

co-operative organisations is more appropriate to the present scale of the world's development than trading by capitalist groups, and is destined, therefore, to a great future:—

1. Co-operative organisations are agencies for consumption as well as for production and distribution. They can receive goods in exchange for the foods they sell, and consume these goods. They do not need to receive money, or to sell the goods they receive to someone else. Transactions like that between the British and Russian Co-operative movements form, in reality, a process of barter. The result is that co-operative organisations can avoid all the difficulties caused by the disorganisation of currencies, and of international finance, which have at the present moment thrown the whole capitalist machinery out of gear.

2. They eliminate profiteering. They even eliminate that suspicion of profiteering which is found in all countries to-day, and which is at the bottom of a great part, at least, of the social unrest of the time.

# Memoranda on International Labour Legislation.

---

## THE ECONOMIC STRUCTURE OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

---

- I. Uniformity of Workmen's Rights when working abroad.
- II. Obligation to prevent Unemployment.
- III. Provision for Relief of the Unemployed.
- IV. Inspection.
- V. A Uniform Minimum of Factory Legislation.
- VI. International Regulation of Hours of Labour.
- VII. Recognition of the Right of Combination.
- VIII. The Mercantile Marine.
- IX. Asiatic and Other Problems of Native Labour.
- X. International Labour Legislation: Methods of Enforcement and International Machinery.
- XI. A Parliament of the League of Nations.
- XII. The Economic Functions of the League of Nations.
- XIII. The Economic Structure of the League of Nations.
- XIV. Questions of Special Interest to Women.

### APPENDICES.

- I. The Labour Charter adopted by the Berne International Labour and Socialist Conference, 1919.
- II. Report of the Commission on International Labour Legislation to the Peace Conference, with a Draft Convention creating a permanent organisation for the Promotion of the International Regulation of Labour conditions.  
Price 1s. By post, 1s. 1½d.

### IN THE PRESS:—

#### LABOUR WOMEN ON INTERNATIONAL LEGISLATION

containing—

- I. MEMORANDA ON WOMEN'S EMPLOYMENT  
by Miss Gertrude M. Tuckwell.
- II. THE EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN  
by Dr. Marion Phillips, D.Sc. (Econ.).
- III. THE PREVENTION OF UNEMPLOYMENT  
by Miss A. Susan Lawrence, L.C.C.



# THE LABOUR PARTY.

---

---

THE ORGANISATION OF THE PREVENTA-  
TIVE AND CURATIVE MEDICAL  
SERVICES AND HOSPITAL AND  
LABORATORY SYSTEMS  
UNDER A MINISTRY  
OF HEALTH.

THE POSITION OF THE GENERAL MEDICAL  
PRACTITIONERS IN A REORGANISED  
SYSTEM OF PUBLIC HEALTH.

THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH.

---

## MEMORANDA

Prepared by the Advisory  
Committee on Public Health

---

Price 6d.; by post, 7d.

33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.

# THE LABOUR PARTY.

Memoranda Prepared by the Advisory Committee on  
Public Health.

## I.

### The Organisation of the Preventative and Curative Medical Services and Hospital and Laboratory Systems under a Ministry of Health.

**MEMBERS.**—Right Hon. John Hodge, M.P. (Chairman), G. P. Blizard (Secretary), Mr. J. Bacon, Dr. Ethel Bentham, Dr. Bygott, Mr. G. W. Canter, Mr. P. W. Cole, Dr. F. Lawson Dodd, Dr. David Forsyth, Dr. Greenwood, Dr. Somerville Hastings, Dr. Leonard Hill, Mr. G. A. Isaacs, Dr. Kerr, Mr. W. Leach, Dr. Benjamin Moore, Miss Enid Orange, Dr. C. Parker, Mr. W. C. Robinson, Dr. W. Salter, Mrs. E. N. Salmond, Dr. Lauriston Shaw, Dr. Jane Walker, Mrs. Sidney Webb, and Lieut.-Colonel J. Knyaston.

## PART I.

The reorganisation of the whole mechanism of medical service will be one of the most important duties to be undertaken by the Ministry of Health in order that the greatest possible use may be made of medical science, not merely for the treatment and prevention of disease, but for the inauguration of those systems of living, working, and enjoying leisure which experience and scientific research show to be capable of producing the greatest happiness for all.

It may be pointed out that while infant mortality has been greatly lowered by educational means in the last decades, nothing comparable has been done to extend the average expectation of life of adults. The present industrial conditions shorten life very markedly. From the Registrar-General's Decennial Supplement it may be deduced that, of those who survive 15 years of age, the average period of life of purely industrial workers is 49-50 years, of purely agricultural workers, 67. The National Service cards show that in several trades 50 per cent. of the workers over 40 years of age are graded as unfit for military service. Insurance statistics show that in certain occupations from 30 to 40 per cent. may be unable to work for some period in each year owing to illness. The number of deaths from consumption is 70,000 a year, a destruction of life emulating that of the war. In large cities, such as Glasgow, 48 to 50 per cent. of the population live in one or two-roomed tenements, and 50 per cent. of the children of the poor are found to be suffering from rickets. In Finsbury\* the death rate per 1,000 of infants has been found to vary from 41 in well-to-do districts to 375 in the slums. Venereal disease is widely prevalent, and fills hospitals and asylums with cases of disease which might be almost wholly prevented.

\* Report on the Public Health of Finsbury, 1906, p. 28.

The clinical teachers of the practitioner, the consultants in the hospitals and medical schools, and those practising among the wealthy know but little of, and have failed to protest against industrial and housing conditions, due largely to the exploitation of land, which have led to the most serious deterioration of national health and happiness. The instruction of medical students in preventive medicine is very inadequate. The general practitioner has little opportunity to study or uphold the principles of preventive medicine, and improvements in these directions are urgently necessary.

In the matter of diagnosis and treatment of disease, the science of medicine is so vast that no one man can effect what can be done by a group of men, each trained in special lines and provided with adequate equipment. Thus the poor who go to a hospital with a medical school often secure a more accurate diagnosis and more skilful treatment than the patients of a private doctor. So much of the practitioner's time is spent on the *art* of medicine, in visiting, humouring, and encouraging his patients, that too little remains for acquiring and practising the *science* of medicine. Devoted attendance and kindly endeavour cannot compensate for ignorance of the advances of medical science, but they often cloak failure to prevent illness and loss of working capacity, or to save life.

A State Service should be under democratic control, both at headquarters and at every local centre. There must be nothing in the scheme to take away the choice of doctor from the patient, but rather to widen and amplify that very restricted choice he now possesses (see Section 11 of Scheme proposed in Part II.). It must be the aim of the service to put every discovery of modern medical science, every class of specialist, every comfort of the best type of nursing-home, sanatorium, or hospital, within the reach of all—rich and poor—and not least of all the men and women who are neither one nor the other. The present hospital and panel system must be radically reformed, and the coming Service must not be bureaucratic, but one more resembling the chapters or lodges of a skilled craft. It must not prevent private practice, and no practitioner or patient must be forced to take any part or share in it against his desire. The new system must win on its merits, and be judged with perfect freedom by each individual, who will freely take up his own attitude towards it.

The country should be divided into areas of sufficient size to allow of complete medical organisation. The hospital of each area or sub-area should form the headquarters and consultative centre of the unit; its laboratories the home of scientific diagnosis and research. The doctors within the area, **and not the single practitioner**, would together form the unit.

Each medical unit would have control over its own local professional affairs and be linked up to all other units within the area. Together with the local lay Health Committee (see our previous report, "A Ministry of Health"), it would be responsible for the health of the area it served. The staff of the unit would not stay in its headquarters awaiting disease to knock at its doors, but would set about investigating the origins of disease, would teach the laws of healthy living to its community, and would see that healthy conditions were maintained wherever human beings congregate. It would try to ensure that supplies of food were wholesome and adequate, and that adulteration and sophistication were prevented, that weakly individuals were not overworked when ill or requiring relaxation, that infected individuals were not infecting others, and that young infants and children were being reared in a sensible way and on suitable food.

In order to carry out this scheme for evolving a healthy people, it will be necessary to inaugurate several activities of the National Health Service, but these must form part of one organic whole, they must necessarily interlap and communicate

with one another, their personnels may be interchangeable, and it must be possible to modify the working details of each unit according to experience and to the needs of the locality. The several activities of this National Health Service should all pivot upon the local hospital as an Institute of Health.

## ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE.

1. **THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.**—This service would continue the work of the existing municipal or county Public Health Services as at present administered by the Medical Officers of Health, their assistants, and Inspectors of Food and Nuisances. It would deal largely with material environment and infection, but its personnel, both medical and lay, would require to be largely augmented to render effective the work of carrying out much wider powers which ought to be conferred upon it. All existing laws relating to public health administered by this branch require to be codified, and, where antiquated or defective, amended.

2. **THE DOMICILIARY AND NURSING SERVICE.**—This will direct its attention to the care of expectant and nursing mothers, infants, and young children before school age, and the general care of cases which are usually treated at home. At present this service is incomplete, and every year many thousands of infants die who would otherwise live and become quite healthy citizens, while others grow up ill and stunted to form citizens of low grade health, who often perish from phthisis and other chronic diseases as soon as the strain of employment begins to tell. A complete service of doctors, health visitors, nurses, and midwives working on preventive lines would save a great number of infant lives annually, and prevent the lifelong suffering of mothers from defects acquired at childbirth, and at present neglected.

For serious cases, and for part of its clinical work, this Service would have a section of the health centre, where mothers and children would be seen. Uncomplicated cases of labour would be attended by a doctor or a qualified midwife, and instruction in infant feeding and care would be given by the nurses of the branch in the homes, under medical supervision. The mother would be assisted in the work of the house before and after the birth of the infant. This Service would also be one of the chief instructing agencies in the hygiene of the household and the proper care of children. Mothers would be encouraged to seek medical advice from the qualified medical officers of the Service in their own homes, and much latent disease would be detected and checked in early stages.

Other practitioners of this Service will render domiciliary treatment as hitherto, but will be enabled, whenever it is deemed expedient, to transfer cases from the home to the health centre for institutional treatment.

3. **THE SCHOOL HEALTH SERVICE.**—This would be organised much on present lines but much more amply provided with trained nurses to undertake treatment under the direction of the doctors. All school children should be taught, as a fundamental part of their education and as a most interesting subject, something authentic about their own bodies and the simple laws of health. To this end all teachers ought to be thoroughly instructed by medical officers of this Service. The environment of the school-room and everything making for health at school should be under the care of this branch. Disease should not merely be inspected and codified; it should be properly treated with all possible speed. More serious cases should be transferred to the hospital service, others should be treated at the school clinic. Schools for tuberculous children and for those suffering from other diseases benefited by open-air treatment should be increased until sufficient to accommodate and give relief to all sufferers.

4. **THE INDUSTRIAL HEALTH SERVICE.**—Prior to the war the Home Office, which is the Government Department responsible for factory hygiene, and thereby for the health of some 12,000,000 persons engaged in industry, possessed only *three* whole-time medical officers, all others being part-time medical men called certifying surgeons, who only participated in the administration of certain factory laws regarding “dangerous machinery,” “industrial diseases,” and “employment of young persons.”

It is obvious that no real supervision of the health of the industrial population has been going on, and this is one of the causes for our low-grade population amongst the urban males of the country. Urban males die from phthisis at nearly twice the rate of urban females, although both are housed alike, and rural males and females die at almost the same rate.

An Industrial Health Service, by seeing that healthy working conditions are established in every factory, and by detecting disease early, can alter all this. There should be established in all factories, workshops, and offices committees composed in equal proportions of representatives of the employers and the workpeople, to study the causes of sickness and accidents in the works, to appoint “accident inquiry” sub-committees, to inquire into and report on *all* accidents, to make regular periodical but frequent inspections, to make recommendations, and to suggest and advise suitable means for prevention of sickness and accidents. These committees should be established as an integral part of an extended system of industrial accident insurance, based upon the prevention of avoidable accidents.

Such committees should have the guidance and assistance of the works doctor, or one or more medical members of this Service, which would require a medical staff of at least 1,000 men, aided in the larger factories by welfare supervisors. If such a service were instituted and illness caught in its early stages, there would occur such a decrease in prolonged illnesses that the whole system would soon pay for itself. Certain medical services under the Ministry of Munitions furnish proof of this statement, and have paid their own expenses in increased output and efficiency of the workers.

The Industrial Health Service should not enter upon this work in any spirit of arbitrary dictation, but as friend and health adviser to both employers and employed. The members of its staff ought to receive special training in physiology and hygiene, and make special study of the causes of fatigue, periods and rates of working, for their work will not be limited to picking out early failure of function or disease, but will consist, in addition, in teaching the best methods of operation from the physiological point of view.

5. **THE RESEARCH SERVICE.**—To establish an efficient Research Service with all the necessary branches is one of the most difficult tasks ahead, requiring many years of work. Money must be spent freely, but this alone will not provide the genius capable of original research, which is even more important than money. Means must be found for seeking out the right type of person, and the first step should be a radical alteration in the whole system of medical education and in the method of selecting those who are to be the doctors and scientists of the future. It must be remembered that there is no monopoly of genius in any one class of the community, and that the science of medicine owes much of its present broad basis to Louis Pasteur, the son of a French peasant. If sufficient men and women endowed by nature with power to advance science are to be found, the doors of our universities and medical schools must be thrown more widely open.

6. **THE HOSPITAL AND CLINICAL SERVICES.**—No public medical service can be efficient that does not provide an adequate number of hospital beds for those requiring institutional treatment. One reason for the inefficiency of the medical



service under the National Insurance Act is that it has no hospital accommodation which it can call its own. At the present time, practically the only accommodation for accidents and general diseases is in the so-called voluntary hospitals, and the number of beds in those hospitals is nothing like the number required. As far as can be ascertained from somewhat inadequate records, in not one county in England is the number of beds available as much as two per thousand of the population, whereas the number required for general purposes is reckoned to be from two to five per 1,000, according to the character of the locality. Exclusive of Ireland, there are now probably between 27,000 and 30,000 beds supported by voluntary contributions, and the number required, even for the minimum of two beds per 1,000 of the population, is 80,000. The voluntary method of supporting even the existing hospitals has quite failed to keep them free from financial difficulties, and the only possible method of coping with the urgent necessity for increased accommodation is for local health authorities to establish their own hospitals, to which all patients requiring institutional treatment would have a right of admission.

Public hospitals when established should become the health centre or institute of each local health authority, and should provide accommodation within their walls for all medical activities. Whenever possible, the offices of the Public Health Service should be transferred to the hospital, so as to encourage co-operation between preventive and curative medicine. School clinics, when not held at the schools themselves, maternity and child welfare centres, and dispensaries for the prevention of venereal diseases, should be housed within the health centre, and all doctors connected with the service should have their consulting rooms at this and other convenient centres, instead of at their own houses. District midwives and nurses should also have their headquarters there. At the larger hospitals there should be diagnostic laboratories and research departments. Finally, at all the health centres there should be physical training rooms for the correction of infirmities and deformities and a lecture-room for teaching the patients and the public generally the laws of healthy living.

It is important that at each health centre there should be a sufficiently large staff of medical officers to avoid the present serious loss of time on the part of patients whilst waiting to be seen, and to enable each patient to be instructed how to co-operate intelligently in his own recovery. Further, there must be a sufficient number of senior medical officers to supervise the work of house surgeons, house physicians, and other members of the junior staff.

7. VOLUNTARY HOSPITALS.—All the present voluntary hospitals should eventually be merged into the public hospital system and should be supported and administered by the health authorities for the following reasons:—

(a) Voluntary efforts have failed to keep pace with modern hospital requirements and their increasing cost, hence some of the present hospitals are not as efficiently equipped as they should be.

(b) A dual hospital system is bound to create difficulties and cause waste and overlapping and, as a public hospital service is in any case necessary and should eventually provide more than double the present accommodation of the voluntary hospitals, the latter ought to be absorbed by the former.

(c) For the sake of the individual and of the community, medical aid and hospital accommodation should be the right of every citizen, and no one should be asked to accept them as charity.

At first the voluntary hospitals might be given the choice of remaining on an entirely voluntary basis, or of being taken over by the health authorities, or of receiving subsidies from the rates provided that on inspection they proved to be efficiently maintained.

## AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL INSURANCE ACT.

The medical section of the National Insurance Act suffers from complexity and enormous cost of administration, inadequacy of the facilities for advice and treatment, and the incompatibility of any public medical service free and open to all with insurance for medical aid by one section only of the community. It should, therefore, be repealed and additional powers given to local health authorities, through the Ministry of Health, to enable them to organise a general scheme for the provision of medical services to the whole community. The first steps in this direction are suggested in Part II. under the heading "The Transition Stage."

## FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE SERVICE.

The cost of the health services should be a charge upon communal funds, but seeing that the health of the nation is quite as much of national as of local concern, the Ministry of Health should make very substantial grants in aid to the local authorities. Special help should be given to large industrial areas where the population is large, the hygienic conditions bad, and the rateable value low. As the health service gets into working order and the preventive, clinical, and institutional arrangements become efficiently organised, the necessary expenditure on health will fall, and what is more important, the average period of disability of all workers through illness will decrease. This would be a national asset, and would soon mean an increased production of wealth, more than counterbalancing the whole cost of the health services.

## A STATE MEDICAL SERVICE SHOULD BE FREE AND OPEN TO ALL

Because:—

1. Disease is no respecter of persons, and science in dealing with its prevention and cure cannot afford to be so.
2. Health is of national concern, and disease is a national danger, hence the health of every individual, rich or poor, is of national importance, and its preservation should be undertaken by the nation collectively.
3. Any service limited to the poor is bound to be inefficient and unpopular, e.g., the Poor Law service.
4. Modern methods of diagnosis and treatment are becoming so elaborate and costly that only the rich can afford to purchase their advantages.
5. The importance of institutional treatment is becoming more and more recognised, and under present conditions most of the middle classes are excluded from its benefits. They cannot afford nursing homes, and they are not eligible for the voluntary hospitals.
6. The medical service should be in a position to treat disease in its earliest possible stages, to preserve health, and to watch over contacts in cases of infectious diseases, all of which are impossible under any system of private practice in which the doctor has to await the call of the patient, who may be far advanced in illness and possibly a danger to others before he thinks fit to send for help. Many a patient has lost his life through trying to save a doctor's bill.
7. Under the system of private practice an enormous amount of ill-health and physical defects have remained undetected, and therefore not prevented, as shown by the results of medical inspection of school children (vide Sir George Newman's reports), and by the medical examination and classification of recruits for the Army.

8. Consequently it is only by means of a public medical service, free and open to all, that the health of the individual can be preserved, disease prevented, epidemics controlled, and the physical welfare of the community promoted. In making the service free and open to all, means must be provided whereby there may be the fullest possible co-operation and mutual help between all practitioners in a given area (co-operation and competition cannot go hand in hand), a good distribution of doctors according to the needs of each locality; a proper regulation of the hours of work and adequate holidays for all doctors. Every doctor must also have adequate "study-leave" in order to revisit centres of learning at home or abroad, so as to keep himself abreast with the advance of knowledge and with modern methods of diagnosis and treatment. Further, all medical men must be in a position to give unbiased advice in all matters of importance to the public health, and divided interests between public and private work must be prevented.

## PART II.

### THE SCHEME.

#### GENERAL.

1. The public medical services should be free and open to all sufferers irrespective of their financial or social position.
2. The service should be so organised as to attract to the profession the best brains of the community.
3. The scale of remuneration should be adequate to the importance of the services rendered, and there should be compensation for any disturbance of office, and a reasonable pension on retirement.
4. There should be effective safeguards against the oppression of public medical officers for the faithful execution of their duties.

#### PRINCIPAL MEDICAL OFFICERS.

5. In each local health area there should be a "principal medical officer" selected for his scientific and organising capacities from any branch of the services.
6. Under the Principal Medical Officer there shall be a "Chief Clinical Medical Officer" and a "Chief Public Health Medical Officer" of equal pay and status, selected from their respective branches for their scientific and organising capacities.
7. To each sub-committee set up by the local Health Committee for dealing with specific matters, such as mental disorders, sanitation, housing and factory conditions, maternity, and child welfare, sanatoria, hospitals, pensions, or domiciliary treatment there shall be appointed a whole-time Chief Medical Officer, who shall be responsible for the whole of the work covered by the sub-committee to which he is appointed.
8. A whole-time Industrial Health Service, of officers not engaged in private practice, shall replace the present "certifying surgeons."

#### MEDICAL STAFF.

9. The duties of the preventive staff should be those connected with preventive medicine generally in the area, such as the compiling of vital statistics, the prevention of the spread of infectious diseases, and investigation and research into the causes of preventible diseases.

10. The duties of the clinical staff should include everything connected with prevention and treatment of disease in **individuals**, both domiciliary and institutional.

11. The clinical staff to each local Health Authority (or to a combination of local health authorities) should therefore be composed of the following whole-time officers:—

- (a) Principal and Chief Medical Officers, as above;
- (b) General practitioners;
- (c) Visiting consulting Medical Officers, specialists and dentists.
- (d) The Medical Staff of the local hospital (see Hospitals);
- (e) Scientific consultants in pathology, bacteriology, physiology, hygiene, and allied sciences.
- (f) Resident Medical Officers of the hospital and other local institutions;
- (g) Medical Officers in charge of special clinics and treatment centres.

12. Provision should be made for the regulation of the hours of work, and for holidays similar to those of the Civil Service and for special "study leave" at the expense of the service.

13. There should be some form of examination or other test open to those returning from "study leave," the successful passing of which should carry with it an increase of salary, and should count for promotion.

14. **HOSPITALS.**—There should be four varieties of hospitals, namely:—

- (a) National;
- (b) County;
- (c) Local or cottage;
- (d) Receiving stations.

15. **NATIONAL HOSPITALS.**—Hospitals in London, Edinburgh, and other university towns, which enjoy a national, and even international, reputation, and which draw their cases from all over the country, should be national in character, and should be maintained and administered directly by the Ministry of Health, and should not be a charge on the local rates; they should be the chief centres of medical education, and should be important centres of research.

16. **COUNTY HOSPITALS.**—In every area there should be one or more large county hospitals, according to the geographical nature and the size of its population. Each should be fully equipped with surgical, medical, and special departments of all varieties, and manned with the necessary medical officers. They should not only serve the town in which they are situated, but should receive cases referred to them by the local cottage hospitals within the area, with which they should keep in close touch. The medical and surgical consultants and specialists should not only attend cases admitted to these hospitals, to which they are attached, but should act in a consultative capacity to the general practitioners within their area, visiting the local hospitals and patients in their homes at the request of general practitioners.

17. **LOCAL OR COTTAGE HOSPITALS.**—In every town of about 6,000 inhabitants and over, there should be a local or cottage hospital containing two beds for every 1,000 of the population. The staff should be composed of the general practitioners of the neighbourhood, and each member of the staff should be entitled to admit and attend to his own cases. These hospitals should be in telephonic communication with the county hospitals, and arrangements should be made for the easy transference of patients from the one to the other. The staff of a local hospital should have the right to advice and help from the staff of the county hospital.

18. **TREATMENT CENTRES.**—In every town of less than about 6,000 inhabitants and in certain selected village centres, there should be receiving stations comprising a well-equipped surgery or treatment centre, a staff of district nurses, and two, three, or four beds for the reception of acute cases and accidents, and of cases requiring careful observation for a day or two only. Patients should be transferred from receiving stations to the nearest cottage or county hospital when their condition renders it advisable, and with as little delay as possible.

19. At each hospital, whether county or local, there should be a sufficient number of consulting rooms to accommodate the local general practitioners using them. There should be special departments for all classes of cases which it is deemed best to deal with separately, such as school children, infants, mothers, tuberculosis and venereal diseases.

20. Special maternity wards or hospitals should be available for all patients whose home conditions render confinement unusually dangerous, or who require operative treatment of a major character.

21. In areas where it is necessary there should be well-equipped treatment centres in close touch with the hospitals.

22. All county hospitals, cottage hospitals, and other institutions within the National Health Scheme should be linked up with the national hospitals, and form part of an extended system of medical education.

23. There should be an ample service of ambulance cars for the easy transfer of patients by road or rail from one hospital to another, and a good service of motor cars for the use of general practitioners, consultants, and specialists.

24. **FREE CHOICE OF DOCTORS.**—The general practitioners should work in groups round a hospital or treatment centre, the size of each group ranging from four to 20, according to the needs and distribution of the population.

25. No practitioner should be called upon to have under his charge more than 3,500 persons in urban districts, or 2,000 in rural districts.

26. All inhabitants within the area administered by any one group of medical practitioners shall be entitled to choose any practitioner within that group as his medical attendant, provided always that it does not involve the practitioner exceeding the allotted number of persons under his charge.

27. **LABORATORIES.**—Every county hospital should have well-equipped and staffed clinical and pathological laboratories, to the help of which for diagnosis and treatment every practitioner within the county should be entitled.

28. In addition to the county hospital laboratories there should be others attached to the larger cottage hospitals, so as to keep general practitioners in touch with laboratory methods, and to expedite the treatment of patients where such depends upon the results of laboratory investigation.

29. All laboratories should keep in touch and work in co-operation with one or other of the research departments connected with the national hospitals, and the work should be carried out not merely for the purposes of diagnosis and treatment, but as comprehensively as possible, having for its goal the nature, causation, and prevention of disease.

## THE TRANSITION STAGE.

This Committee recognises that it may be impossible to carry into effect the whole scheme herein suggested at once, but it considers that immediate progress might be made in the following ways, some of which would require legislation :—

1. By the transference of the administration of the medical benefits of the National Insurance Act from the Insurance Commissioners to the Ministry of Health, and through the Ministry of Health, to the local Health Authorities—as recommended in this Committee's previous report.

2. By the provision of really "adequate medical treatment" by the appointment of medical and surgical consultants, specialists and dentists, by providing X-ray and pathological facilities, and, as quickly as may be, sufficient hospital accommodation.

3. By making the provision of medical benefits a charge on public funds.

In connection with these necessary changes, the county Health Authorities, in conjunction with the Ministry of Health, should separately, or in combination, appoint the following medical officers:—

(a) Whole-time salaried pathologists and hygienists, making immediate arrangements for laboratory accommodation.

(b) Consultants and specialists, who, as far as possible, should be whole-time salaried officers.

(c) General medical practitioners in the proportion of at least one to every 3,500 of the population in urban districts and at least one to every 2,000 in rural districts. All competent practitioners should be given the option of joining the service, either as whole-time or part-time officers. The terms for service should be fair and generous, including compensation for loss of private practice where incurred and provision for retirement under a superannuation scheme.

(d) A sufficient number of dentists, midwives, nurses, and dispensers, all of whom should devote their whole time to the service and be remunerated by salary.

2. Organise at once as many treatment centres as may be necessary to meet the needs of their respective areas.

3. Put in hand at once the provision of the necessary hospital accommodation by:—

(a) making arrangements for complete or partial use of existing voluntary hospitals;

(b) acquiring and remodelling existing Poor Law infirmaries;

(c) arranging to take over some of the existing temporary military hospitals directly they are no longer required for military purposes;

(d) new construction.



the country, and the demand for hospital treatment by many of those now accustomed to obtain treatment in their homes who will in future be unable to do so owing to lack of service and accommodation which are required when private nurses are employed in a sick person's house. To keep this demand within reasonable bounds it will be necessary to increase existing facilities for domiciliary treatment, both by general practitioners and specialists, so as to avoid the extravagance of utilising hospital beds for the purpose of obtaining treatment not otherwise obtainable under existing conditions, although so far as the nature of the case is concerned it could equally well be given in the patient's own home, the additional accommodation must be secured partly by extension or transformation of existing institutions, and partly by the establishment of new institutions.

While from the point of view of the individual sick person all hospital treatment must be regarded as having as its sole object the speedy and effective cure of his disease or injury, from the point of view of the community generally the hospital has various functions. Roughly these are: (i.) To secure an increase of knowledge of disease and its treatment so that advances in methods of prevention and cure may be constantly made; (ii.) to secure the education of the future practitioners of medicine so that they may be skilled in the prevention, the diagnosis, and the treatment of disease; (iii.) to secure the progressive experience of all specialists and medical practitioners, either upon the staff or working in the neighbourhood, so that they may maintain and increase their power of serving their patient. To secure these aims for the community without detriment to the interests of the individual patient, it will be necessary to maintain a distinction between different types of hospitals:—

(i.) The hospitals to which medical schools are attached, usually to be found in university cities.

(ii.) The hospitals in capital towns of smaller size, of sufficient importance to attract to their staffs men practising as specialists.

(iii.) The hospitals in smaller towns and villages (usually called cottage hospitals) staffed by local general practitioners.

Group (i.).—In view of the great importance of the educational and research work of the hospitals with medical schools, and of the present connection of many of them with the Board of Education, it is desirable that their educational work should at least remain primarily under the Board acting through the local university. In so far as the local Health Authority provides any subsidy to secure adequate accommodation in such hospitals for the public for whose treatment it is responsible, it would be necessary for it also to obtain some measure of control. This public control could best be arranged both for the university and the local authority by means of the right of inspection and the right of nominating of representatives upon the Governing Board.

Groups (ii.) and (iii.).—These hospitals should either be under the joint control of the local authority and of the existing Governing Board, or under the sole control of the local authority. In many districts it will be necessary to found new institutions which would probably be under the sole control of the authority. As opportunity arises the local authority would transform Poor Law infirmaries into hospitals either of type (ii.) or (iii.).

The local authority will secure to all medical men practising in the area under adequate safeguards the right to admit suitable cases into the beds of these hospitals, and will secure to such medical men as desire it, the right to retain the treatment of their own patients when so admitted. The right should also be secured for medical men practising in the area served by the hospital to elect representatives to the Medical Committee entrusted with the professional administration



of the institution and with the formulation of schemes of co-ordination between the domiciliary and institutional treatment in the area.

When there are hospitals of different or even of similar type within the local Government area, co-ordination between their work should be secured by means of liaison officers or inter-representation upon the respective committees, so that transfer of suitable cases can be duly arranged, and so that the services of specialists upon the staff of one hospital may be available at any other hospital not having specialists, or the required specialist, upon its staff.

As the Public Health Department at the Town or County Hall is recognised as the centre of all activities connected with communal health, so the hospital, or the chief of the group of hospitals, in the area should become the centre of activities connected with individual health. As the general practitioner should be encouraged to apply to the M.O.H. for assistance in stamping out epidemics or securing sanitary surroundings for his patients, so he should apply to the chief administrative officer at the hospital for consultative advice or assistance in the treatment of his individual patient, either by admission into the appropriate institution, or by investigation at the consultative out-patients' department, or by the visit of a consultative specialist at the patient's home.

It is also essential that for the medical treatment of all patients for whose maintenance in the hospital the local authority accepts responsibility, payment on a scale agreed upon between the local authority and the local profession shall be made to the practitioners rendering professional service.

If a scheme for the co-ordination of the individual health service in each area can be established by linking up the hospitals together, and these again with local practitioners under the general supervision of the local authorities' chief clinical officer, great advances in public health would be secured by close co-operation between this service and the service protecting the communal health. The Medical Officer of Health could bring pressure upon the staffs of teaching hospitals to give greater prominence to preventive medicine in the curriculum. On the other hand, the records of the hospital would be open to him for statistics and other researches into local housing and industrial conditions as the causes of disease. His influence would lead to an attempt to convert the hospital notes into continuous health records of a considerable number of the inhabitants of the area indicating the persistence of factors inimical to health, and the effect of new factors with advancing age.

The success of such co-operation would prove that it is neither necessary nor desirable to secure a complete domination of all health activities by the point of view of the sanitarian. Better results will be secured by two equal departments working hand in hand. It is believed also that by the proposals set out above it may be possible to bring at once the great voluntary hospitals into a co-ordinated scheme without arousing the opposition which would ensue upon a proposal either to abolish or supersede these institutions, or to bring them at once under the complete control of the State or the local authority.

These suggestions are not intended to be exhaustive. They indicate broadly the main lines of possible and immediate advance, whilst still leaving it possible for more thorough schemes to be considered at a later stage. But the scheme outlined would in itself make a revolution in medical science and public health. The health of the people would assume a new importance in the work of the State. The social causes of disease would be carefully diagnosed and dealt with. The science of preventive medicine would make rapid strides. Sound medical advice and treatment would be brought within reach of all. The fatal drain on national life and vitality would be arrested, and over a given number of years it would be possible to build up gradually a far more healthy population.

## THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH.

The Ministry of Health Sub-Committee held eight meetings, and considered the main problems in connection with this matter. The conclusions reached represent the general mind of the Committee, though individual members would be ready to recommend a more drastic policy. It is felt, however, that the steps outlined in this report do not preclude wider developments in the future, should these be found necessary and desirable.

The members of the Sub-Committee are at one in believing a Ministry of Health to be urgently necessary in order to secure greater co-ordination and efficiency in respect of public health. They are at one also in recommending that the best medical science and advice should be freely open to all.

They believe that any scheme to be effective must carry with it the co-operation and goodwill of the medical profession as a whole, especially of the general medical practitioner. To this end it is necessary that over-centralisation and bureaucracy should be avoided, that local and popular control should be ensured, regard being paid to local circumstances, and that the medical profession should have direct representation on the authorities for the promotion of public health, and full opportunity for a collective expression of their views.

There should be established by legislation a Ministry of Health having a general supervision over all matters relating to health, with a Minister responsible to Parliament, and having a seat in the Commons.

A skeleton Bill to be clothed afterwards by regulations and Orders in Council will not meet the case. The scope and functions of the new authority should be defined in some detail in the Parliamentary Bill.

With respect to the transfer of the health functions now undertaken by other Government Departments, the following recommendations are made:—

**1. Local Government Board.**—All the health functions of the Poor Law should be transferred to the Ministry of Health, and it should undertake such other functions of the Local Government Board as concern Infectious Disease and Public Health Acts; vaccination; port sanitation and quarantine; appointments of officers of local authorities under Public Health and Vaccination Acts; law relating to food and sale of drugs, milk, and meat; purity and sufficiency of water supply; Provisional Order under Public Health Acts; the whole provision as to the campaign against tuberculosis; bye-laws under Public Health, Highways, Housing, Burial, and other Acts turning on sanitation; congresses and conferences.

**2. National Insurance Commission.**—The administration of all the functions of the National Insurance Commission other than those relating to the disbursement of Sickness, Disablement, and Maternity cash Benefits, and to Unemployment Insurance, should be transferred to the Ministry of Health.

3. In addition it should take over and co-ordinate other health services such as:—

(a) **Home Office.**—Board of Control in relation to lunatics and feeble-minded, inebriates; alien immigration, lead, phosphorus, and other industrial poisoning; Factory Acts (eliminating therefrom the distinction between factories and workshops);

(b) **Board of Education.**—The medical side of school work and of schools for mothers;

(c) **Privy Council.**—Nominations to the Council governing the medical profession and midwives;

(d) **Ministry of Pensions.**—Medical treatment of discharged and disabled sailors and soldiers;

(e) **Ministry of Munitions.**—Continue the health functions performed by the Ministry during the war in connection with occupational diseases;

(f) Certain services in other Departments which specifically relate to health.

4. **Housing.**—The Ministry of Health should have the supervision and control of the health aspect of housing.

5. **Research.**—One of the main duties of the Ministry of Health should be the direct prosecution of medical research by the Ministry and also its encouragement, financially and otherwise, in universities and other independent institutions.

#### LOCAL ADMINISTRATION.

The following suggestions are offered on the question of local administration:—

The local authority should be the one Health Authority, but it is desirable that the local Health Committees should be **reorganised and strengthened**, especially by direct representation of the medical profession, in order that they may carry out efficiently the policy of the Ministry of Health. A cardinal principle of this policy should be the laying down of a national minimum, at the same time offering every encouragement to progressive authorities to go beyond this.

**Poor Law Authorities.**—The health functions of these authorities, whether institutional or domiciliary, should be transferred to the local Health Authority.

**Insurance Committees.**—The functions of the Insurance Committees should be transferred to the Health Authority.

**Local Government Areas.**—As to areas for local health administration, the Sub-Committee agreed to the following policy:—

1. That clinical and curative medicine cannot be administratively divorced from preventive medicine, both being parallel and co-ordinate branches of State medicine.

2. That in regard to England and Wales (excluding London) the County Councils and County Borough Councils\* be appointed by Parliament to be directly responsible to central Government. Departments for all medical, sanitary, clinical, preventive, domiciliary, and institutional administration in

\* The duty of appointing a Health Committee, with such sub-committees as are found necessary or desirable, shall also be incumbent on such non-county boroughs or urban districts or combination of such as may be approved by the Ministry of Health, provided that the population of such an area shall not be less than 150,000.

their respective areas, and that they severally appoint a Principal Medical Officer to advise them on general administrative problems. It should be recognised that some of these health functions are more suitably exercised by large areas and others by smaller areas.

3. That County Councils and County Borough Councils shall separately or in combination appoint thoroughly efficient and representative Health Committees, and these should set up sub-committees to deal with specific matters, such as asylums and mental deficiency, sanitation and housing, maternity and child welfare, industrial, social welfare and pensions, sanatoria and hospitals, insurance, and domiciliary treatment. The sub-committees should each have the duty of appointing a chief medical officer who shall independently be responsible for the whole work covered by the respective sub-committees.

4. In order to establish and maintain a high standard of efficiency in the Public Health Service of the country it is essential to have a uniform national scheme which will make it possible for changes in local personnel to take place without injustice either to the public interest or to the officer concerned; to secure officers against capricious dismissal; and to provide that any change of an officer from one area to another shall not render him liable to loss of pension rights or status in the service.

5. That the powers and duties of Insurance Committees and of War Pensions, etc., Committees be transferred to County Councils and County Borough Councils.

6. That as soon as Poor Law authorities are finally abolished the analogous administration, both domiciliary and institutional, in connection with an increased public provision of medical treatment as part of the health organisation of a county shall be transferred to County Councils and County Borough Councils.

### **ADVISORY COMMITTEE OR BOARD OF HEALTH.**

After discussion it was decided to recommend the formation of—

#### **(1) A NATIONAL HEALTH GUILD.**

This body, while not connected legislatively with the Ministry of Health, could focus public opinion on matters needing attention. It should exercise critical, constructive, and educational functions; have branches throughout the country; and bring pressure to bear both centrally and locally when necessary.

#### **(2) AN ADVISORY COUNCIL OR BOARD.**

This should be a statutory body of such a size as to include representatives of all interests having a claim to representation thereon, including the medical profession. The members should be appointed by the Minister upon the nomination of the bodies concerned, and should hold office for a limited number of years, meeting at frequent intervals. It should have the right not only of advising the Minister, but, in addition, of reporting to Parliament on such questions as is thought desirable to treat in this way; and all or certain members thereof might be paid for actual expenses incurred or service rendered. Similar advisory bodies should be appointed in each local area.

In connection with the formation of a Ministry of Health such problems as the position and work of the general practitioner, the policy in regard to hospitals, and the scope and administration of National Health Insurance require further detailed consideration.

# The Labour Party.

---

*MEMORANDUM.*

ON

## International Labour Legislation.

---

THE ECONOMIC STRUCTURE  
OF  
THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

---

Price One Shilling.

---

LABOUR PARTY, 33, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON,  
S.W. 1.

# MEMORANDA

ON

# International Labour Legislation.

---

## THE ECONOMIC STRUCTURE

OF

## THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

---

### INTRODUCTION.

The memoranda reprinted in the following pages were prepared with the help of the Labour Research Department by the various Advisory Committees, which now form part of the organisation of the Labour Party. They represent not so much a definite programme of proposals as convenient summaries of the facts and the position with regard to the subjects dealt with. They are now published for the information of the Labour Movement.

The adoption by the International Labour and Socialist Congress of a definite programme of International Labour Legislation (reprinted at the end of this publication), together with the decision of the contemporaneous Peace Congress at Paris, that the League of Nations is to be provided with a permanent Labour Commission of international character for dealing with the subject through periodical international conferences representing not the governments but the Trade Unions and associations of employers of the various nations, indicate the progress in the idea of international Labour legislation since the Berlin Labour Congress of 1890. That Congress, which was not without its usefulness, resulted directly in little actual legislation in any country, and in the very minimum of approach to international uniformity in the conditions of employment prescribed in the several nations. It was exclusively a Congress of governments, and whatever may have been said at Berlin by the assembled diplomatists, when these returned home to their respective capitals, the several Labour or factory Departments proved to be much more intent on demonstrating that the existing legislation in the various States was all that was required, than in bringing it everywhere up to the standard of the most advanced nation. In the United Kingdom, for instance, the only reforms that resulted were the meagre and unsatisfactory Factory Acts Amendment Acts of 1891 and 1895. Not for a whole generation—to this day not yet in force throughout the whole kingdom—was the school leaving age raised even to 14.

The declarations unanimously agreed to at Berne in 1919 by the representatives of the organised Labour and Socialist Movements of a score of different nations—the United States, Switzerland, and Belgium being the only important absentees—were at once officially presented to the Peace Congress, and will be remitted to the Standing International Commission that is to be promptly established. These declarations of policy in international Labour legislation will be brought up by the Trade Union representatives at the very first International Conference on Labour conditions, which it is the duty of that Standing Commission to summon. The weight that they will have in that Conference, and the attention that they will receive from the governments, will depend, very largely, on the extent to which, in the course of the next twelve months, they receive the backing of the organised wage earners in this and other countries. What is required is not necessarily identity of legislation but, with suitable applications to local circumstances, the substantial equivalence of the Labour laws of all industrially advanced States.

If the conditions of employment asked for by the International Labour and Socialist Congress were promptly embodied in the legislation of the several countries and effectively enforced they would constitute a valuable international minimum below which the standard of life of no section of any community, however helpless, would be allowed to descend. But it would be a minimum only; a basic level adopted not so much in the interests of the wage earners themselves as for the economic advantage of the community, which stands to gain by its deliverance from the social disease of "sweating." It is clear that we must not allow this quest for a common international standard to be anywhere used for reaction. What we are after is a general levelling up of all the countries, in all the numerous prescriptions and applications of the standard, so that there is nowhere any backwardation, and each country advances its own legislation at those points in which it lags behind the best that exists anywhere, up to the desired international common level. It is a delusion to suppose that our own laws are, at all points, better than those of other nations. There will be as much for the United Kingdom to do to come up to the international standard as there will be for Germany or the United States; as much for Holland and Belgium as for Bohemia and Hungary; as much for Italy as for France. The shortage is greatest at different points in the various countries, but none of them yet attains the standard. It may even be added that each of them can, from its special experience, teach even the wisest of the others something in factory legislation, education, or social insurance. The common standard to be prescribed will really be an international product.

The prescribed national minimum of health conditions and rest time, education, and subsistence in each country, even when made substantially equivalent in all advanced industrial communities by international legislation, can never be more than a minimum designed to prevent social disease. It need hardly be said that this minimum has nothing to do with the wages of organised labour, or with the various occupational rates that particular Trade Unions are able to obtain for their trades. A nation must be very badly diseased if by means of Trade Union organisation the great majority of

its workers do not stand far above the legally prescribed national minimum, which ought, in any progressive community, to come into operation for an ever-dwindling minority of exceptionally helpless folk. Likewise the prescribed national minimum of health conditions, rest time, education and subsistence has plainly no relation to the actual remuneration of the workers, or to the proper share of the manual working classes in the aggregate product. Man does not live by bread alone—not even the workingman—and the national minimum (which is necessary for social health) in no way represents the Labour Party's programme, based on the demand that all should share equally in the widest, fullest, and free-est life.

SIDNEY WEBB.

## I.

### UNIFORMITY OF WORKMEN'S RIGHTS WHEN WORKING ABROAD.

One of the Labour grievances which might well be remedied at the Peace Congress—seeing that it can be remedied only by international action—is the loss suffered by those workmen who cross a frontier to take employment by reason of the differences between the various State systems of provision for the workmen's needs.

This loss occurs particularly with regard to:—

- (a) State insurance for sickness, accident, invalidity, old age, and unemployment.
- (b) Compensation for accidents.
- (c) Eligibility for the provision made by the State, apart from insurance, for medical and hospital treatment, pensions in disablement and old age, the care of maternity and children, and relief of the unemployed.

In most cases the State insurance systems make no provision either for a continuance of eligibility whilst employed outside the State territory or for an equitable transfer from one State insurance system to another. The alien workman often finds himself simultaneously (a) rendered ineligible for benefits from the insurance system of his fatherland; (b) subjected to compulsory assessment to the insurance system of the country in which he is working; and (c) allowed from that system either no benefits at all or less than are given to the native workmen.

The laws do not always allow to alien workmen the same remedies by way of compensation for accidents as they do to natives.

The provision made from public funds, apart from insurance systems, whether by way of hospitals, schools, asylums, etc., or by way of the services of a public staff of doctors, etc., or by way of relief in unemployment or other distress, are often not open to aliens, or open only with restrictions.

These differences are a special grievance of the large numbers of workmen of various kinds who frequently work, now on one side of the frontier, now on the other. The Italians who take service in France, Switzerland, and Austria; the Spanish who take service in France, Holland, and Germany; the Dutch who take service in Germany and Belgium; the Swiss who find employment in France, Germany, Austria, and Italy afford the most notorious and perhaps the most numerous examples. But no country is unvisited by alien workmen in pursuit of employment; and there is no nation from which there are not constant streams of temporary as well as of permanent emigrants, the great majority of whom find themselves, whilst in exile, at a great disadvantage. This grievance will be aggravated by such territorial changes as may be effected on the left bank of the Rhine and on the north-east frontier of



Italy, which will increase the need for emigration, whilst the setting up of new States in Poland, Bohemia, and Jugo-Serbia will give it a new acuteness.

Such temporary migrations of workmen should not be discouraged. The ebb and flow of industry has little respect for national frontiers. If mobility of labour is restricted the effect must necessarily be to increase the frequency of unemployment and to augment the difficulty of preventing unemployment, first on one side of the frontier and then on the other.

The most satisfactory way of remedying the grievance would be to bring all systems of providing for the common needs of the wage-earners up to the level of the most satisfactory social provision made in any European State; and to maintain, for the future, as near an approach to uniformity in the way of social provision, as for factory legislation. There seems no reason why the Peace Congress should not adopt a clause emphasising the desirability of such uniformity, and make it the subject of an International Bureau of Social Provision, as it may do with regard to factory legislation.

Failing some such uniformity in social provision, and at least, pending its actual establishment, it seems desirable that a provisional remedy should be found in a great extension of eligibility (aliens being put on the same footing as natives) and transfer (the emigrant being enabled to take with him the equivalent of his accumulated rights).

The Peace Congress might perhaps be urged to adopt a clause emphasising the necessity for everywhere admitting temporary denizens, so far as the social provision for sickness, accident, invalidity, maternity, and schooling is concerned, to the same rights and privileges as natives; together with reciprocal arrangements relating to unemployment and old age.

[It is highly desirable that, in addition to these international provisions by the various States, the Trade Unions in the various countries, through their International Federations or otherwise, should make similar provision for the transfer of membership and membership rights in respect of benefits from one country to another.]

---

## II.

### OBLIGATION TO PREVENT UNEMPLOYMENT.

There is good ground for making the prevention of unemployment a matter of international concern. The local distress that arises from involuntary unemployment, and the method of its relief, may be essentially a matter for each State. But the fact of widespread or prolonged unemployment, in any nation, however complete may be the relief of distress, operates like a local famine on the rest of the world. The very existence of unemployment in one country affects the purchasing power of its people so directly and so gravely that it creates unemployment in every nation that habitually exported commodities to the country in question. Thus widespread or prolonged unemployment in Italy—like a famine in India—very promptly causes "short time" in Lancashire. Serious unemployment in France causes stoppages in the Yorkshire mills making woollens for export. The lessened earnings of the Lancashire and Yorkshire operatives lead, in their turn, to smaller purchases of imported articles, which diminishes employment in other countries. Any widespread or prolonged unemployment in one country nowadays "reverberates," like the "Spanish influenza," all round the world. Nor can these evil effects be prevented by even the best system of relieving the unemployed. It is essentially the stoppage of production that does the mischief, not the local distress that it may cause. If the local distress is relieved, the purchasing power of the operatives may, indeed, to some extent, be maintained, though probably not their purchases of imported articles. But this is only effected, in systems of relief, by transferring to the distressed operatives part of what would have formed the purchasing power of other people. With any stoppage of production in a country there is almost certain to be a diminution in the demand for imported articles, and hence an adverse effect on employment in the exporting countries.

It is accordingly to the interest of all nations—and especially to that of the wage-earners—that unemployment should be, as far as possible, not merely relieved, but actually prevented, in all countries whatsoever. The *Memorandum on War Aims* of the Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference points out that the occurrence of unemployment can be prevented, so far as regards any widespread or prolonged involuntary unemployment, by the Government taking steps to keep at an approximately uniform level the aggregate demand for labour within the country from month to month, and from year to year. Each Government can do this, as all available statistics indicate, by simply taking care to give out the orders and contracts for all the various works and commodities that the Government itself requires, and must anyhow obtain, at such dates, and subject to such conditions as to execution as will cause these public works and orders to fill up the temporary falling-off of the works and orders of the private capitalist, so as to keep the aggregate of the private and public demands for labour at all times as nearly uniform as possible. This has never yet been deliberately and wholeheartedly done by any Government. The result has been that Government orders are often given just when private enterprise is most busy, with the consequence of overtime and excessive pressure in one year, or in one season, to be followed by an equally great extreme of unemployment when the “slump” follows the “boom.” Half-a-century ago the Government works and orders were, as a rule, too small relatively to the works and orders of the private capitalists, to permit of any such “equalisation” as is required. But the works and orders of the Government Departments and local authorities, not merely in the United Kingdom, but in all civilised States, are now so extensive and so varied that (as the statistics prove) it is quite possible, by nothing more drastic than their rearrangement in inverse ratio to the ups and downs of commercial enterprise—even after leaving out of account orders and purchases of an urgent nature—to keep the aggregate volume of demand for labour in any country at an approximately uniform level from month to month and from year to year. There need not be, nowadays, in any civilised country any great ebb and flow, in the aggregate, of employment.

In view of the international importance of involuntary unemployment being prevented, it is suggested that, following the lead of the *Memorandum on War Aims*, the Peace Congress should be pressed to adopt a clause specifically putting an obligation upon each of the contracting Governments to take the necessary steps, not merely to put in force whatever measures it may think desirable to relieve the persons who may be involuntarily unemployed, but actually to prevent the occurrence of any widespread or prolonged unemployment, by so distributing the orders for works and commodities, which the central and local governments have necessarily to place, as to keep at an approximately uniform level, from month to month, and from year to year, the aggregate volume of demand for labour in capitalist and public employment together.

---

### III.

#### PROVISION FOR RELIEF OF THE UNEMPLOYED.

It may be thought desirable to press upon the Peace Congress the importance of putting an obligation upon all Governments to make some systematic provision for the relief of the involuntarily unemployed. This, it need hardly be said, is quite another matter from taking steps to prevent the occurrence of unemployment. But whatever is done to prevent the occurrence of unemployment will still leave inevitable at all times a certain number of individual cases of persons falling out of employment in ways which no Government can prevent—the waxing and waning of the business of particular firms, particular districts or particular industries; bankruptcies; changes of process; new inventions, etc.—for whom it will not always be possible for the most willing Government using the most efficient system of Employment Exchanges to find new situations without a delay which may, if adequate provision is not made for their maintenance (and for their occupation, where such is desirable), often be personally disastrous to themselves and their families, in *physical* and *moral*, and therefore calamitous to the community.

During the present century, accordingly, systematic provision for the relief of the involuntarily unemployed has been instituted in various European countries, notably Belgium, Switzerland, France, and the United Kingdom. It is to be

regretted that this provision of succour for the unemployed has been put forward as a substitute for or as an alternative to, the prevention of the occurrence of unemployment, with which it has nothing in common. The Labour Movement should not imitate the Governments in this mistake. What is wanted is a continuity of work at wages, not relief. But, for the reasons above stated, systematic provision for the succour of the unemployed has its place, even if the best possible arrangements are made for the prevention of unemployment. It is accordingly desirable that all Governments should (as with factory legislation) be brought up to the same high level in the matter.

The provision of help for the unemployed takes, in different countries, the following principal forms:—

#### I.—REGISTRATION.

The efficient registration of vacancies and candidates for employment, so as to minimise (a) the intervals between jobs; and (b) the trouble and expense of bringing the vacancy and the candidate into connection.

This is done by Employment Exchanges which are in the various countries:—

1. Provided by private enterprise (as was formerly the case in the United States and France—both now moving towards superseding the private employment agencies by public ones—and partially in Germany).

2. Provided by local authorities in most cases, with special ones in particular trades maintained by the employers' associations, Trade Unions and friendly societies often making a similar provision for the benefit of their own members. This is the system that prevails in Germany.

3. Provided by the national Government as a general system for the State as a whole. This is the system in force in the United Kingdom during the past decade, the Trade Unions in some cases also keeping vacant books for their own members.

There can be no doubt that, as the perpetual waxing and waning of the volume of employment has no respect for municipal boundaries, and no special connection with particular industries, or even with the membership of particular Trade Unions, a national system of vacancies and candidates is the most efficient form. Such a system should not be left (like the domestic Servants' registry offices) to be run for private profit, with all its opportunities of extortion and subservience. But what should be insisted on is the effective supervision of the working of each Labour Exchange by its own local committee, of which one-half of the members should be elected by the local Labour organisations, taking care that the skilled operatives, the labourers and the women workers are separately represented. Complete registration of wages and other conditions of employment whenever a vacancy is filled should be required by law. (This is already the case in the United Kingdom with regard to all employment in the mercantile marine and in fishing boats, for which the Mercantile Marine offices under the Merchant Shipping Acts act, virtually, as employment exchanges).

It is sometimes urged that Employment Exchanges ought to be prohibited from helping to fill vacancies below the Trade Union standard rates. But to make such a demand at this point is to put the cart before the horse. So long as employers are allowed to engage wage earners, when they please, below the standard rates, it is better that they should do so in the open, through the Employment Exchanges, where the facts can become known to the Trade Unions concerned, rather than they should not use the Employment Exchanges and be free to take on workers secretly, without revealing either the fact of the engagement, the names of such workers, or the rates at which they are taken on.

But Employment Exchanges ought to be required effectively to make known the standard rates and conditions in all industries, and all other available information, and they should be required to permit inspection of their registers by Trade Union officials.

There seems more to be said for making it compulsory that employers should notify all vacancies to the Employment Exchange, and register there all engagements of labour whether entered into, at, or through the Exchange offices. This is, in the United Kingdom, already law with regard to employment in the mercantile marine

and in fishing boats, where all engagements have to be made through Mercantile Marine offices, full particulars of wages, etc., being registered in each case. This has been found extremely useful and effective, and should certainly be insisted on for young persons.

Where any conditions of the wage contract are legally obligatory (such as eligibility for particular employments by age or sex, terms as to notice, maximum hours of work, or minimum wages), the Employment Exchange should, of course, not connive at any breach of the law, and should not only (as the Mercantile Marine offices do) refuse to register any engagement that is not in compliance with the law, but should also notify the facts to the Department responsible for inspection, and for prosecution in case of breach.

## II.—PECUNIARY PROVISION FOR MAINTENANCE.

The unemployment benefit which has, for a couple of centuries, been a feature of the most effective Trade Unionism, falls short of what is required because (a) it falls, even where Trade Unionism is most highly developed, to cover more than a small proportion of industry; (b) it never provides for those who do not belong to the Trade Union, and their distress is both as dangerous to the maintenance of the standard rate and as costly to the community as a whole as that of the Trade Unionist; (c) even where it prevails it is insufficient not only in weekly amount but also in its duration—men "run out of benefit"; and (d) it is a heavy tax on the Trade Unions themselves, towards which they may justly ask some relief. In no country have the Trade Unions of unskilled workers or women been able to make such provision.

Unemployment benefit has accordingly begun to be provided from public sources in various parts of Belgium, Holland, Scandinavia, Switzerland, and France; and during the past decade, for certain great industries in the United Kingdom.

The public authority may be municipality or State; it may deal only with particular industries or with all; it may work through Trade Unions where they exist, or may ignore them; it may find the necessary funds wholly from general taxation (as in the United Kingdom at this moment in respect of the demobilised soldiers and discharged war workers), or from an insurance fund fed by compulsory contributions from employers and employed and supplemented by a grant from general taxation.

It is suggested that, from whatever sources the funds are drawn, the following features of any scheme of publicly managed unemployment benefit, from the standpoint of Labour, are as follows.—

(a) Wherever a Trade Union exists, it should have the right to deal with the public unemployment benefit as regards its own members, becoming, in effect, the agent of the fund for this purpose;

(b) the scheme should include a contribution towards the Trade Union's own unemployment benefit at least equal in proportion to any contribution made from general taxation to the unemployment fund;

(c) the administration of the public unemployment benefit should be, at the Employment Exchanges, under the effective supervision of the local committees, of which one-half the members are elected by the local Labour organisations, with separate representation for skilled men, labourers, and women;

(d) the unemployed worker should have a statutory right to receive the benefit, not for a limited period, but so long as the Employment Exchange is unable to offer him a situation which he ought to accept rather than remain longer unemployed. It should be statutorily provided that no worker should be required to accept a situation (i.) not in his own accustomed craft or vocation; (ii.) below either of the recognised standard rates of the district in which he has been residing and of that in which the work is to be done, whichever is the higher; (iii.) at such a distance from his home as to make acceptance unreasonable or actually uneconomical; (iv.) at any establishment at which any trade dispute is pending. Provision should be made for appeal without any expense to an easily accessible, and promptly adjudicating local Court of Referees, composed to the extent of one-half of members elected by the local Labour

organisations, duly paid for their attendances. Where such Court of Referees holds that a person is obstinately refusing to work for his living they may discontinue his benefit.

It would be an advantage to make provision for enabling the workers, whilst unemployed and in receipt of unemployment benefit, to get access, without payment of fees, to opportunities for continuing their education and improving their qualifications. This is specially desirable in the case of young persons. It should be the normal arrangement for young persons that, whenever unemployed, they should be required to continue their education at centres to be provided by the Local Education Authority.

#### OTHER SYSTEMS OF RELIEF OF THE UNEMPLOYED.

None of the other systems by which the unemployed have been relieved can be said to have justified themselves, and they should not be recommended. They include (a) charitable funds dispensed as doles; (b) Poor Law Relief, either "outdoor," to workers in their homes, or by way of payment for a task of work "in the stone-yard," or "indoor," by admission to and maintenance in the "workhouse"—the whole Poor Law system being now condemned, in the United Kingdom, to early abolition; (c) relief works, on which men are employed, not at their own trades but at some common task, which has always to be that of unskilled labour, and usually some form of digging the earth, which experience has proved to be always extraordinarily costly and inevitably demoralising; (d) enforced emigration to other countries.

#### RECOMMENDATION.

It is for consideration whether the Peace Congress should be pressed to adopt a clause requiring all Governments to institute systematic provision for the relief of the unemployed on the above lines.

### IV.

#### INSPECTION.

The value of law is not greater than the means of enforcing it. A common standard of inspection is an essential part of international law. Indeed, no international agreement or treaty on labour questions would be assured of its effect which did not set up a supernational department of supervision or inspection. The object of this memorandum is to describe briefly the machinery of inspection in the various countries. Public health and State insurance laws are not included in this reference.

#### UNITED KINGDOM.

Inspection in relation to labour laws is carried out in this country under the following Acts of Parliament:—

##### 1.—FACTORY AND WORKSHOPS ACT (1901).

The Act refers to the safety and health conditions of the factory or workshops, including special provisions in dangerous trades, the regulation of hours of work, meal times, and holidays of women and young persons, the protection of women after childbirth, school children, home workers, and pieceworkers in connection with the "particular" clause. Further provisions as to "welfare" have been included by special orders since the war.

The Home Office is the principal authority, and the Secretary of State, with the approval of the Treasury, may appoint (or remove) such inspectors "as he thinks necessary for the execution of the Act." A person who is an occupier of a factory, or employed in or about a factory or workshop, must not act as inspector. The Chief Inspector has at present working under him a staff of about 200 inspectors, of whom 36 are women (including 15 temporary appointments made during the war). Of the 200 inspectors, some 20 are former manufacturers or Trade Union officials, most of the latter being appointed as "assistants" with a lower degree of literary qualification. The country is divided into districts, and each district is in charge of a district officer. The women inspectors, who work under the supervision of the Chief Lady Inspector, are organised, however, on a different plan and, except in two instances of

women district inspectors appointed since the war, they are attached to no particular district, but move from place to place as occasion arises. The women inspectors are supposed to visit all factories and workshops employing women. The salaries of inspectors range from £200 to £1,500, Chief Inspector, or £400, Chief Lady Inspector (1916).

An Inspector may enter by day or night a factory or a workshop when he believes any person to be employed, and may enter by day any place he may believe to be a factory or workshop. He may also enter a school in which he believes that children employed in a factory or workshop are being educated, and he may make examinations and require declarations in a workshop, factory, or school. He cannot take a constable with him unless he apprehends serious obstruction, but he can take with him into a factory or workshop the Medical Officer of Health, Inspector of Nuisances, or other officer of the District Council. He may also, if so authorised in writing by the Secretary of State, prosecute, conduct, or defend, before a Court of Summary Jurisdiction, or Justice any information, complaint, or other proceeding arising in the discharge of his duty as inspector. In most instances, the inspector conducts his or her own case, and a solicitor or counsel is not called in. Any person obstructing an inspector in the discharge of his duties is liable to a fine not exceeding £5. If a factory or workshop is not kept in conformity with the Act, the occupier is liable to a fine not exceeding £10, or in the case of a second or subsequent conviction within two years, not less than £1 for each offence. In the case of death or injury resulting to the worker a fine may be imposed not exceeding £100. Further, if the occupier fails to comply with the order of the court, he is liable to a fine not exceeding £1 for every day on which the non-compliance continues. For a deliberate false statement, the penalty is a fine not exceeding £20, or a term of imprisonment not exceeding three months with or without hard labour.

In addition to the staff of inspectors, the chief inspector may appoint a sufficient number of medical practitioners as certifying surgeons. The present number of appointments is about 2,000. The duties include the examination of young persons for physical fitness or persons employed in injurious trades, and special inquiries in cases of accident and occupational disease. But beyond the one examination, young persons employed in factories are not subject to any form of medical supervision.

At the end of 1913 (the year preceding the outbreak of war) there were some 300,000 works under inspection, in addition to docks, wharfs, quays, warehouses, and buildings in course of construction. Some 425,000 effective visits of inspectors were made and nearly 200,000 cautionary notices issued. Prosecutions were instituted in 3,872 instances. Since 1897, the number of unsuccessful or withdrawn cases has been only between 3.4 and 6.3 per cent. The Act covers some 6,000,000 workers, of whom about one-third are women.

## 2.—TRUCK ACT (1831).

The Act is administered, together with the Factory and Workshops Act, by the same staff of inspectors. The maximum penalty under the Truck Act is a fine of £100.

## 3.—SHOP HOURS ACT (1912).

The Act relates to the regulation of hours of work and meal times, the closing of shops for holidays, and the provision of seats for female shop assistants. The County or Borough Council is the principal authority, and may appoint suitable persons as inspectors. The powers and duties of inspectors and the penalties to which the occupier are liable are identical to those under the Factory and Workshops Act (1901). In the London area, the staff of inspectors includes eight men and two women, and they carried out 67 successful prosecutions during the first eight months of the working of the Act (no figures are published since 1912).

## 4.—COAL MINES REGULATION ACT (1911).

The Act refers mainly to the safety and health conditions of the mines (including the provision of baths for miners), but also to restrictions on female and child labour, the place and method of paying wages, and the hours of work of certain classes of miners. The Home Office is the principal authority, and may

appoint (or remove) "any fit person" as inspector. The chief inspector has at present working under him a staff of some 50 inspectors of various grades. The mining districts are mapped out in divisions, and each division is in charge of a divisional inspector. The salaries of inspectors range from £150 sub-inspectors to £1,500 chief inspector (1916).

An inspector may enter, inspect, and examine any mine at all reasonable times by day or night, but so as not to impede or obstruct the working of the mine. He has similar powers to those under the Factory and Workshops Act (1901), including the right to institute legal proceedings, and in addition may make requirements apart from the general law. The owner is also liable to similar penalties, and, in some cases, these are severe. Fines are imposed up to £50. The penalty for a deliberate false statement is a term of imprisonment not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour.

In addition to H.M. inspectors, the workmen employed in a mine may, at their own cost, appoint two of their number, or any two persons not being mining engineers, who are or have been practical working miners and have not had less than five years' experience of underground work, to inspect the mine, and the persons so appointed are allowed once at least in every month, or after an accident, accompanied by the owner or his agent if he thinks fit, to go to every part of the mine for purposes of inspection or ascertaining the cause of the accident, and the owner is bound to forward a copy of their report to the divisional inspector. But in practice the end of this provision is alleged by the miners' unions to be often defeated, owing to the fact that the persons appointed are liable to dismissal by the owner.

The Act covers about 1,100,000 workers, including a few thousand women employed at the pit heads.

#### 5.—METALLIFEROUS MINES REGULATION ACTS (1872 AND 1875) AND QUARRIES ACT (1894).

These Acts are administered together with the Coal Mines Regulation Act. The staff includes a senior inspector of metalliferous mines and six assistant inspectors of quarries. The inspection of quarries was carried out at one time under the Factories and Workshops Acts (1878 and 1891).

#### 6.—MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT (1894).

The main provisions of the Act relate to the regulation and safety of merchant shipping, but clauses are included dealing with the rights of seamen in respect of wages, the notification of accidents or casualties among the ship's crew, the provision of proper accommodation, and the furnishing of anti-scorbutus. The Board of Trade is the principal authority, and may as and when it thinks fit appoint any person as inspector to report whether the provisions of the Act have been complied with. Such an inspector may go on board or enter and inspect any ship or shipping premises, and, for the purposes of his report, carry out examinations, summon witnesses, and administer oaths. The Board of Trade, in addition to their powers of holding special inquiries, may institute legal proceedings and recover fines under the Act.

#### 7.—REGULATION OF RAILWAYS ACTS (1848-1894).

The main Acts relate to the regulation and safety of traffic, but provisions are included dealing with the notification and prevention of accidents among railwaymen and the regulation of hours of work. The Board of Trade is the principal authority, and may appoint any person as inspector for the purpose of enabling the Board "to carry the provisions of any General Act relating to railways into execution, provided that no person so appointed shall exercise any powers of interference in the affairs of any company." The powers of entry are on the same lines as those under the Merchant Shipping Act, and the Board of Trade may institute legal proceedings in the usual way for the recovery of fines.

#### 8.—TRADE BOARDS ACT (1909).

The object of the Act is the setting up of Trade Boards for the fixing of minimum rates of wages in "sweated" trades. The general administration was transferred in 1917 from the Board of Trade to the Ministry of Labour. The Minister

may appoint such officers as he thinks necessary for securing the proper observance of the Act, and may also, in lieu or in addition, arrange with any other Government Department for assistance being given in carrying the Act into effect, either generally or in special cases.

The powers of entry and prosecution are similar to those under the Factory and Workshops Act (1901); and the non-observance of the rate may involve a fine in respect of each offence not exceeding £20 and a fine not exceeding £5 for each day on which the offence is continued after conviction thereof. In addition to these fines, the employer may be adjudged to refund the worker any sum by which the wages received by the latter fall short of the minimum rate to which he is entitled. The number of prosecutions, all successful, was seven in 1915 (February to December), ten in 1916, nine in 1917, and ten in 1918 (January to September). The present staff of inspectors includes seven women and three men, at salaries ranging from £150 to £400 a year. The Act covers between 400,000 and 500,000 workers, mostly women.

The Coal Mines Minimum Wage Act (1912) differs in important respects from the Trade Boards Act. The awards of the district boards have the force of law, and the worker may recover the amount due to him in a civil suit, but boards composed of representatives of the employers and workers have no legal powers of inspection or prosecution. The French Act of 1915 shows the same defect. Penalties are imposed for failure to observe technical regulations, such as the keeping of registers, etc., but an employer cannot be prosecuted by an inspector for failing to pay the minimum wage.

In the United Kingdom the immediate need is for a large increase in the number of inspectors. This need is especially great in the case of women factory inspectors. It is probable that the temporary appointments made during the war will be continued as permanent. But, even so, the number is lamentably few. The small staff of inspectors is handicapped again by inadequate clerical assistance. Another desirable movement is towards a closer co-operation between inspectors and the Trade Unions. A well-developed system of works committees, active and knowledgeable, would seem to offer the best machinery and channel for complaints. The opportunities of promotion should also be improved for working-class "assistants." A further reform constantly advocated by educationists is the transfer of the medical care of young persons from the surgeon, who has no permanent interest in their welfare, to the school medical officer. With the advent of compulsory attendance at continuation schools, the reform is immediately practicable.

#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

The Labour laws vary in each State, but follow broadly the same lines as in this country. Every State has a department of industrial inspection and a bureau of mining inspection, with powers of entry and prosecution. In some cases the powers are far-reaching. Thus, in several States, inspectors may place upon machinery a notice forbidding its use until specified safety measures have been taken. In other States mines may be absolutely closed, and in 1915 legislation in Montana and in Delaware extended the same principle to certain factories and workshops. According to the Delaware statute, a cannery violating the law may upon a third conviction be closed by the court, and the person convicted may be prohibited from engaging in the cannery business until a further court order. According to an American authority, the best results in the enforcement of mine safety and health legislation have been achieved in States where, as in Illinois, joint conferences of miners and mine owners have been brought together for the administration as well as the drafting of the laws. On the other hand, the difficulty in securing convictions appears to be greater than in this country. Thus, in New York in 1908, according to a statement by the Commissioner of Labour, in 32 cases of illegal employment and overtime work of women and children tried before juries in a period of three months, not a single conviction was obtained, although it was shown in one instance that a woman was working 17 hours in one day, and in another that a child was only 7 years old. In the same State the inspectors' report (1907) showed that in one-half of the 294 cases where conviction was secured the court remitted the fine, and in most of the other cases only the minimum fine was imposed, averaging about 26dols. a case. Other States show a similar leniency.



Other difficulties arise in connection with the rival claims of political factions or bodies of employers and Trade Unions to appoint inspectors. The best results are said to be reached where, as in New York, the appointments are made by a Civil Service Commission assisted by a Joint Council of the Employers and Trade Unions.

The Minimum Wage Commissions, appointed in some dozen States, have similar powers of inspection and enforcing their rulings. Most of the States provide fines of 10dols. to 100dols. for employers who fail to pay the minimum wage or who violate any sections of the Act or any Commission ruling. It has also been found necessary to penalise by a fine of 25dols. to 1,000dols. employers who discriminate against employees because they have testified in wages investigations or served on Wage Boards. In Massachusetts and Nebraska, however, the Commission must rely on the compulsion of publicity to enforce its wage rulings. Publishers in either State refusing to print the name of offending employers are liable to a fine of 100dols. In all other States employés who have not been paid the legal minimum rate may recover the unpaid balance through a civil suit.

### CONTINENTAL EUROPE.

The following figures and facts relating to factory inspection in 1909 are taken from the First Comparative Report on the Administration of Labour Laws (1911) presented by the Bureau of the International Association for Labour Legislation:—

#### ESTABLISHMENTS SUBJECT TO INSPECTION.

	Inspectors.	Women Inspectors.	Establishments.	Persons.
United Kingdom.....	200	18	263,749	5,177,500*
France .....	139	18	548,069	4,122,227
Germany .....	654	29	358,302	5,394,460
Russia in Europe .....	268	nil	14,710	1,831,396

\* 1907.

Percentages of establishments subject to inspection which were actually inspected in a given year:—

	Establishments.	Persons employed,
United Kingdom.....	79·7	—
France .....	30·8	64·1
Germany .....	53·6	81·6
Russia in Europe .....	61·9	—

Before the war the general administration of the Factory Acts was carried out, in each country, from the central Government, but the authority was shared in Germany between the legislatures of the imperial and federal states, and delegated in Russia to six "regional" authorities. Germany had before the war comparatively many more inspectors than any other country. But mere figures are sometimes misleading. For instance, in France much of the work done by factory inspectors is carried out here by the sanitary authority. In order to qualify for appointment as inspector, candidates in all countries have to pass certain examinations in literary and technical subjects. The tests are least severe in France. In Prussia the qualifications include at least three years' technical training, one and a-half year's study of law and political science and the certificate of a nine grade secondary school. In every country, as here, the powers of entry extend to all industrial establishments, excepting those where only members of the occupier's family are employed. But, in Russia, the definitions are vague. In France, before the war, women inspectors visited only in workshops (ateliers) and not in factories (fabriques). Powers to take legal proceedings and recover fines correspond also to those in this country. In Germany, however, the relations between the industrial inspectors and the local Police authorities are left to be determined by the federal States, and upon the co-operation of these authorities the inspectors are largely dependent. For, although the law confers on them all the powers of the Police authorities, they are forbidden by their instructions to make use of the right to impose Police penalties, or of their powers of coercion except in case of emergency. The maximum penalty is 2,000 francs and six months' imprisonment in France, 3,000 marks, or two years' imprisonment in Germany, and 300 roubles in Russia. In Germany, the inspectors are said to be in constant communication with the workmen's organisations, and the reports of the inspectors show the importance and accuracy of the information

supplied by the Trade Union secretaries. In France, before the war, the most radical proposal of reform was for the appointment of workmen as labour inspectors without examination. In Russia, the agitation was for the abolition of the "regional" authorities. In all countries the demand was the same for an increase in the number of inspectors.

In order to reach a common standard of inspection the following important points must be covered :—

1. Number of inspectors in relation to the scope and area of inspection and the number of persons or establishments subject to inspection must be adequate to provide for regular and efficient inspection.

2. The methods of appointment and the qualifications and salaries of inspectors must be such as to ensure (a) efficiency of service, (b) sympathetic consideration of Labour grievances, (c) a satisfactory status for the inspectors.

3. Security of tenure and consequent independence of action must be secured.

4. An adequate number of women inspectors must be secured by law, and their sphere of action clearly defined.

5. Methods of inspection, viz., both routine inspection of a periodical character and inspection following complaints or notification must be provided for.

6. Powers of entry and prosecution and adequate means for obtaining convictions must be ensured.

7. Publicity of information must be secured by the periodical issue of reports.

8. Co-operation between separate authorities, viz., between the factory and the sanitary authority, must be secured.

9. Co-operation between inspectors and the Trade Unions, and the participation of Trade Unions in inspection, must be specially ensured by statute.

All these principles must be laid down in the Charter and endorsed by the League of Nations as principles to be incorporated in the laws passed by the various countries; but, in view of the wide differences between countries, it is not practicable at present to lay down more definite standards on an international basis.

## V.

### AN UNIFORM MINIMUM OF FACTORY LEGISLATION.

In the past factory legislation arose, not from any philosophic or reasoned theory of the functions of the State in regard to industry, but as a series of efforts to remedy abuses of a specially startling character. At no time has there been placed before this country, or other countries, any comprehensive scheme of right conditions of employment which should secure to every industrial worker full protection from occupational disease, exhaustion, and overwork; still less have statesmen dreamed of positive, constructive measures to make industrial environment a means of healthy development, physical, mental, moral, and social. What has happened has been that certain humane persons, struck with pity and sympathy by specially crying evils, such as the labour of quite young children, or grossly insanitary conditions, have endeavoured to get these evils remedied by legislation.

In the early days of their efforts the reformers were often met by arguments that such measures of reform were impossible, because, in the unfortunate ignorance of economic and industrial science that prevailed in those days, it was supposed to be commercially profitable to carry on industry by forcing down the standard of life of the workers by low wages, long hours, and by the employment of children and young persons. And the agitators for factory reform were constantly forced into an apologetic attitude, taking the line that the measures they proposed would not put so great a burden on industry as the opponents suggested, and using every piece of evidence they could find that beneficial conditions would improve efficiency and thus eventually be profitable.

In the century or so that has elapsed since factory legislation began to be considered, enormous masses of evidence have accumulated to show that the reformers were right, and indeed were even more right than they knew. There was no need for an apologetic tone, for

it is now well established that good wages, good hygienic conditions, and relatively short hours, all tend to an increased output. The experience of war has brought out another fact not previously realised, or not realised in anything like its full range of application, viz., the enormous elasticity of production. Given sufficient stimulus to improved management and improved machinery, and production can be increased to a point that would easily supply all reasonable peace-time needs, without the slightest need for exploiting child labour or any class of labour or overworking juveniles. It therefore becomes apposite for those in favour of reform to drop the tone of apology and state the minimum requirements of industrial control from the standpoint of certain fundamental human rights. From such a standpoint the existing factory codes are sadly below what is needed for a high standard of civilisation.

1. AGE OF BEGINNING WORK.—Childhood is the time for growth, play, education, not for wage-earning. It may be laid down as fundamental that no state with a high conception of civic rights and duties would permit any kind of wage-earning under the age of 16. It is also essential that between 15 and at least 18, every young person should continue his or her education. It is, however, extremely difficult to suggest an age-limit that could at once be imposed on different countries. In some climates maturity comes earlier, in others later; in countries where poverty is greater and more widespread, the restriction of child-labour imposes a heavy immediate burden on parents, although in the long run undoubtedly the irregulated use of child labour tends to keep wages low and to perpetuate the poverty which it temporarily relieves. It may be suggested, therefore, that an uniform rule could not be imposed suddenly; the more advanced countries might agree to adopt the prescribed minimum age, and the more backward to raise their existing limit by a year or two, to be followed by further restrictions at varying terms of years to come.

2. NIGHT WORK FOR WOMEN was prohibited by the International Convention of 1906; further regulation is needed to prevent night work by male young persons, which is still permitted to suit the exigencies of certain industries in which some degree of night work by men is indispensable. It is altogether repugnant to humane feelings that the immature frames of boys in their teens should be subjected to the strain of work at night, and it cannot fail to injure the prospective health and efficiency of these young people. Moreover, it is highly desirable that night work by grown men, unfortunately inevitable in some departments of industry, should be reduced to what is really necessary, and this result can be forwarded by preventing the employment of boys at night.

3. INDUSTRIAL DISEASES.—The use of white phosphorus in match-making was prohibited by the International Convention, 1906. Similar regulations could probably be made by agreement in regard to other industrial diseases, either by prohibiting the use of a special noxious substance, or by requiring the use of particular safeguards advised by the best expert opinion. The use of lead glaze in potteries is a case which is particularly ripe for legislation. Industrial workers who risk their health in working for the community have a right to the best precautions that can be taken to protect their health. It may be remarked that raising the *general* standard of cleanliness, sanitation, ventilation, and dust elimination is a great help in the prevention of specific disease, as well as in the general improvement of industrial hygiene.

4. HOURS OF LABOUR OF YOUNG PERSONS.—Better care of adolescent workers and a more drastic limitation of their hours of work are among the most urgently needed industrial reforms. In old times attention was largely concentrated on the shocking abuse of the employment of quite small children; the adolescent was in the Factory Act placed in the same category with the grown woman, and allowed to work the same hours. This is extremely unsatisfactory, the law permitting in the United Kingdom ten hours' daily work in textiles, ten and a-half in non-textile factories and in workshops. This is a great strain on young people at the critical time of life when they need rest, recreation, and time for study. In the near future attendance at continuation classes is to be made compulsory on young workers, and unless their hours of work are reduced by a larger amount than the time allowed off for school, they will still be subjected to a long and fatiguing day.

It is extremely important that young people employed otherwise than in factories and workshops should be brought under regulations similar to those of the Factory Act for hours and conditions of labour.

It is suggested that for young persons the working shift should be not longer than half the adult shift, e.g., four hours when the adult shift is eight hours; and that to meet the difficulties of seasonal trades, such as agriculture and fishing, it should be laid down that in special cases the hours of young persons may be fixed for the week or for the year. In such cases the weekly or yearly hours should not be more than half the legal maximum weekly or yearly hours for adults (excluding overtime); and no overtime or night work for young persons should in any case be allowed.

## VI.

## INTERNATIONAL REGULATION OF HOURS OF LABOUR.

## I.—EXISTING REGULATION.

The only international agreement which exists relating to hours of labour is the decree providing for a minimum of eleven hours' night rest for women, signed at the Berne Convention of 1906. At that time seven States wished the minimum to be twelve hours; but as the Conference wished to secure unanimity, eleven hours' minimum was finally adopted. At the fourth delegate meeting of the International Association for Labour Legislation, held in Geneva, resolutions were carried to the effect that:—

1. "The determination by law of a maximum period of daily work is of the highest importance for the maintenance and promotion of the physical and intellectual welfare of workmen and employees."

2. "Over and above limitation of hours of work brought about by the efforts of Trade Unions, the intervention of the legislature is necessary in order to set a limit to daily hours of work in general."

These resolutions were amplified at the Lucerne and Lugano meetings by resolutions suggesting international conventions to regulate the hours of labour for women and young persons, and delegates were instructed to collect information upon the state of the law in their several countries; but no international agreement has as yet resulted.

Several countries have, however, established a maximum working day for all workers, or workers in some particular industry, and many more have regulated the legal working day for women.

This Memorandum is concerned only with the question of the legal limitation of hours for all workers; but in industries where men and women work side by side, the establishment of a maximum working day for women sometimes has a considerable effect upon the normal working day of the men. (The French Factory Acts are a case in point.)

In Great Britain, the Miners' Eight Hours Act of 1908 provides for an eight-hour working day in the mines, and an eight-hour day has been promised to the railwaymen. (The Factory and Workshop Acts, which relate only to women and young persons, limit the normal day to ten hours in textile and ten and a-half in non-textile factories.) An eight-hour day is, of course, in force in many other cases, such as the Post Office; and the Agricultural Wages Board have announced that they intend to fix a maximum working week; but none of this is at present enforceable at law.

In the United States there is a steady trend in the direction of State regulation of hours, for the most part in particular industries, e.g., 24 States and three territories provide, either by constitutional amendment or by statute, for an eight-hour day for all public work, including contract labour on public work; 13 States have established an eight-hour day in mines, and one a ten-hour (eight of the States extend the regulation to smelters as well); for telegraph and telephone operators, train despatchers and signalmen there is a legal limit of eight hours in eight States and of nine hours in four others; and a number of other States have passed laws limiting the number of hours in a variety of industries. (See, for instance, the New York ten-hour day in bakeries.)

Of more importance is the Oregon law of 1915-1916, limiting the daily hours of employment in all trades to ten; and the Adamson Eight-Hour Law of September, 1916, providing that in the railway service eight hours should be deemed a day's work. Both of these laws were challenged as unconstitutional, but were upheld by the Supreme Court. This in itself is a sign of the times, for not so long ago the courts made a practice of regularly annulling all such laws.

In France the law prohibits, since 1904, the employment of women and young persons below 18 for more than ten hours a day. It has also fixed a maximum ten-hour day, with certain exceptions, for men employed in the same place as women and children. This clause has in practice led to much litigation and much evasion of

the law, as manufacturers have contended that by simply segregating women and children in one room and men in another, they were fulfilling all the demands of the law, and could then work the men as long hours as they pleased. Further, by a law of 1848, the hours for men employed in factories and workshops are limited to twelve. Men employed underground in coal and anthracite mines have had since 1910 a working day of eight hours, seamen one of ten hours in port and twelve hours at sea, while for railway drivers and firemen the hours are fixed by a complicated system of maxima and minima, which aim at a working spell of ten hours.

Other States which have fixed maximum working hours include New Zealand (eight and a-quarter hours, with eight and three-quarter hours in woollen textile factories), Switzerland (eleven hours for textile workers), Belgium (nine hours in mines), India (twelve hours for textile workers), Tunis (ten hours for all workers). All these States, and a great many others, have also fixed a maximum working day for women and for young persons; in fact, the States which have no protective legislation of any kind with regard to hours are mostly confined to Asia, Africa, and Central America, with a few black spots in Europe.

This survey is necessarily very brief. In particular, it takes no account of rest-pauses or of the legal limitation of overtime, in both of which cases the practice varies very much from State to State, and even from industry to industry. One State (Sweden) enjoins rest-pauses, but allows their number and duration to be fixed by the employer; other States fix a maximum number of hours which may be worked in any one week or any one year (New Zealand); others again leave the duration of overtime to be fixed by the administrative authorities (Switzerland). Both of these points are of considerable importance in fixing an international working day; but it would take up too much space to give full details here.

## II.—DIFFICULTIES OF INTERNATIONAL REGULATION.

Most of the objections to an international fixing of hours fall under one of three main heads:—

(a) The great differences existing between country and country in the matter of hours. Thus, a general ten-hour day would be a great advance for Japan, but a retrogression for England; and it is argued that either the limit of hours fixed would be impossible to enforce in even the less backward countries, or that any forward movement in the more progressive countries would be hampered.

(b) The varying conditions as between State and State and industry and industry. The problem of one, two, or three shifts, and of "continuous" industries has been one of the greatest difficulties of the conferences on international labour legislation.

(c) The problem, in countries mainly non-industrial, of the home worker and the *petite industrie*.

(d) Legal difficulties, such as that provided by the constitution of the United States.

(a) **AN INTERNATIONAL MAXIMUM.**—The first argument can be pressed too far, to the extent of excluding all legislation of a general character. General legislation for labour must always partake, more or less, of the nature of the Trade Boards Acts; it must aim at stamping out sweating and bad conditions, and the legislator must realise that really good conditions in any industry can only be obtained by the strength of the workers' industrial organisation, or in some cases by the "progressivism" of the employers or an exceptionally sensitive public conscience. But the fact that the miners are now ripe for a six-hour day does not mean that an universal Eight-Hour Act in England would be necessarily a bad thing, and there seems no reason why one country should not advance its legislative beyond that of others (as was the case in Switzerland in 1877), or why Trade Union action should not gain advances here or in Russia which it would be powerless to secure in Honduras. At the same time to fix the maximum too high would make it ridiculous, and would simply encourage sweating. The best way would seem to be to fix an international maximum to be passed into law by every State as a national Eight, Nine, or Ten-Hour Act, either immediately, or within, a very short time, extending, however, a

certain number of years' period of grace to States which could show to the satisfaction of the international authority that their industrial conditions were such as to make an immediate reduction of hours to the international maximum an impossibility. The international standard would, of course, be, a maximum, so that any country might fix a lower national maximum for its own industry. This method seems preferable to that of classifying countries according to their degree of development and fixing differential maxima, which might have the effect of stereotyping conditions in the countries in each particular class. It is also better than making an international agreement applicable to only a few of the most advanced countries, and leaving the others out. Even if the exclusion of one or two countries were found to be inevitable, such exclusion should be clearly recognised as exceptional and undesirable, and they should be brought in with all possible speed. It might, however, be recognised that in certain of the hotter countries maturity comes more early than it does in the North, and that certain modifications of the general rule might be introduced with caution upon good cause being shown.

The essential thing is to establish the international standard as a maximum, regarding all other cases as exceptional, and to revise the international standard at frequent intervals. As to the actual maximum to be fixed, it seems probable that a working day of nine hours (subject to the special agreements mentioned below) is the shortest that could possibly be achieved at present, if it is to cover all countries. If, however, the operation of the agreement is restricted, say, to the Western countries, a shorter day is obviously possible.

**ADMINISTRATION.**—Within the several countries, in order to get over the difficulties produced by varying types of occupation, it would probably be necessary to pass an Act laying down the international maximum day in very general terms, and leaving the application to separate industries to be determined possibly by Boards of Commissioners. Seasonal industries, such as fishing and agriculture, and "continuous" industries obviously need special treatment, which could not be provided for under a general Act. Overtime and rest pauses, the question of a maximum week or a maximum year, must also clearly be settled separately for each industry. (It is also clear that the value of any international agreement depends very largely upon the provisions for enforcement and inspection made by the several States; but this point is dealt with in another Memorandum.)

(b) **SPECIAL AGREEMENTS FOR SEPARATE INDUSTRIES.**—Whatever agreement is reached, the putting into operation of any Act covering the whole of the working population must necessarily be a lengthy business, even in those countries in which conditions are best; and there are also in almost all countries industries and trades which are particularly advanced, whose development should not be retarded by their having to wait for the slower members of industry. Some industries are also more ripe for international legislation than others. We, therefore, suggest that along with the universal maximum there should go international agreements regulating hours in particular trades, which might vary from trade to trade, but should in no case be worse than the recognised maximum. Several agreements of this kind might come into operation immediately. The American seamen are already demanding an international charter for seamen; and there seems no reason why similar charters should not now be drafted for postal workers and other State employees, miners, and railwaymen. Factory workers present a more difficult problem; and in their case some delay is probably necessary. But the aim should be to secure international industrial charters in every occupation. The concluding of any number of industrial agreements, however, should not absolve any State from passing a General Hours Act of its own, either immediately or as soon as required to do so by the international authority; the industrial agreements should rather represent an effort by each industry to raise itself from the ruck—efforts which would both stimulate and be stimulated by international Trade Union organisation, as in the case of the American seamen quoted above.

**HOME-WORK AND PETITE INDUSTRIE.**—The problem of home-work and small workshops is almost impossible of solution by any form of international legislation. In England, where home-work normally means sweated work, the task of protecting the home-worker has been one of extraordinary difficulty; and even in countries where small industries are the rule and conditions approximate more to English conditions before the industrial revolution, these conditions are a matter of luck rather than

cunning, and are not to be created or preserved by legislative action. The most that can be done is rapidly to extend legislation over the sphere of mines, railways, factory, industry, and the like, to do all that is possible in the way of enforcement in small workshops, etc., and to draft laws in such a way as to afford the fewest possible loopholes. (Even an attempt at an international code of hours, whether it succeeded or not, might at least encourage some countries to amend their own factory laws in the direction of greater clearness and definition.)

4. With the legal difficulties in the carrying out of this programme I am not competent to deal. It seems to me, however, that a Memorandum might usefully be drafted on the question.

**ENFORCEMENT.**—The question of enforcement, and of the penalty, if any, to be imposed on recalcitrant States, comes outside the scope of this Memorandum, and can only be dealt with in connection with all the points covered by an international Labour Charter. It should, however, be remembered that, even were there no penalty and no provision for enforcement there would yet be a certain value in even a declaratory Charter.

In particular, better and more accurate statistical information as to hours and conditions in different countries is urgently needed. The American Bureau of Labour Statistics has done what it could, but its information has not been nearly full enough, and is not known nearly as widely as it should be. The publication over a wide area of the facts about industrial conditions all over the world, together with a declaration by an international Congress of what it considered to be the proper limit of working hours, might, if all else fails, go some way towards creating the international conscience which could bring pressure to bear upon recalcitrant national States (as was in fact the case with Holland) to amend their Labour laws. It might, at any rate, by comparative studies in Labour legislation, induce States to make good laws rather than bad laws, watertight laws rather than laws as leaky as the French Factory Acts, and if the Peace Conference or the League of Nations fail to produce any international Labour legislation, this and Trade Union action are the only possibilities.

## VII.

### RECOGNITION OF THE RIGHT OF COMBINATION.

There are at present wide differences, even among civilised States, in the measure of recognition, and even of toleration, accorded to Trade Unions. In Japan, for instance, Trade Unionism is not tolerated at all, while in India the attempts which are now at last being made to organise the mill operatives are meeting with strong political opposition. European countries also differ greatly in the measure of toleration and recognition accorded. France cannot be said to do more than tolerate Trade Unions, and forbids them among nearly all classes of public employees, e.g., the dissolution of the teachers' organisations by the Government some years ago. In many European countries and in the U.S.A. there are drastic restrictions on the right of combination among public employees, and these restrictions are becoming more and more important as more industries pass under national ownership. There are in many cases legislative restrictions, but in other cases the same results are produced by administrative opposition to organisation, and also by judicial methods such as the "injunction."

Recognition in any full sense of organisations among public employees hardly anywhere exists; and, even where some measure of recognition is nominally conceded, the attempt is often made to limit this to organisations consisting entirely of public employees, or even of a particular craft or section of public employees; and, further, to prevent the organisations tolerated or recognised from linking up with the rest of the Labour Movement, even by federal methods.

Moreover, in most countries, even where Trade Unionism in general is tolerated, the laws relating to Trade Union action impose very drastic restrictions. "Picketing," for instance, is seldom legalised, and it is rarely that any special protection is accorded to Trade Union funds.

• Full recognition of Trade Unionism cannot be said to exist in any country, though the effect of the war has been greatly to increase Trade Union representation on Government bodies and advisory Committees affecting Labour interests, and a measure of recognition and even of public assistance to Trade Unions has been extended in a few countries in connection with State provision of benefits to the unemployed.

The question which should be considered by the International Labour Conference is the form in which the right and recognition of free combination should be incorporated in the proposed Labour Charter. It seems to be necessary to safeguard the following points:—

1. The obligation should be imposed on each Government to permit free combination among all classes of wage and salary earners, and free federation or amalgamation of the various combinations among different groups.

2. In particular, each Government should bind itself to recognise these rights in the case of its own employees, and to make their recognition a term in Government contracts.

3. "Peaceful picketing," security for Trade Union funds, and the other safeguards for Trade Union action which are necessary if the recognition of the right of combination is to be real, should be legalised in every country.

4. No legislation denying the right to strike shall be enforced in any country.

5. The participation of Trade Unions in the control of all public measures for dealing with unemployment and other working class questions should be encouraged, and provisions for securing this object should be included in any statutes or administrative schemes dealing with such questions. This point should be safeguarded in other clauses of the Charter.

6. No restrictions should be placed in the way of political combination among the workers, or of the effective participation of Trade Unions in political combinations or political action.

7. The right of the international combination of labour, both industrially and politically, should be recognised by the League of Nations, and incorporated in its constitution, and the League of Nations should make full provision for regular consultation on working class questions, with the representatives of international Trade Unionism and Socialism.

## VIII.

### THE MERCANTILE MARINE.

The Mercantile Marine stands in a position different from that of any other industry in that it is essentially international. This is true at least of the ocean-going services both for passengers and for cargoes, and in practice conditions in the ocean-going services have a considerable effect in determining the conditions of seamen engaged in coastwise traffic, at any rate upon the larger vessels.

Every maritime country has a code of legislation relating specially to the control of shipping and the mercantile marine, and the two most important codes, those of Britain and America, have such close points of resemblance that their further assimilation presents no great difficulty. The French law, on the other hand, is considerably behind even that of the United Kingdom, while the most advanced codes are found in Australia and New Zealand. Their codes would be even more advanced had not certain laws passed with a view to their further improvement been disallowed by the British Government. (See appendix).

The International Seamen's Union of America is now putting forward the demand for a uniform World Code for seamen, embracing not only the questions regulated by such measures as the Merchant Shipping Acts, and the corresponding foreign enactments, but also wages and other questions of conditions. Such an international code is obviously desirable, and also obviously prevents special problems apart from those common to other forms of industrial legislation.

The main questions with which a seamen's Charter would have to deal seem to be the following:—

1. **WAGES.**—The American seamen are demanding an international rate or series of rates for the various grades of seafarers, and are suggesting that the existing American rates should be taken as a basis. These rates are very much higher than the British rates, but not, apparently, so high as those of Australasia. British rates have been regulated during the war by the Maritime Board under the Ministry of Shipping, but these rates lose their compulsory character with the cessation of Government control. An international compulsory rate would accordingly require Parliamentary sanction in each country, unless its adoption were made a condition of the enjoyment of the "freedom of the seas" under the League of Nations. It should be pressed for, but as a minimum rather than as an international standard.

2. **MANNING, HOURS, AND WATCHES.**—The existing provision as to manning is very defective in all countries, and varies with the different classes of vessels dealt with. The American provision is most stringent as regards vessels carrying the



mails, and there is also better provision in several countries for ocean-going than for coastwise traffic. It seems necessary to provide not merely for the legal enforcement of adequate manning in general terms, but also for a crew adequate to supply those full watches, and corresponding shifts for the engineers' and stokehold departments. This must include regulation of the number of officers as well as of crew, and also of the proportion of crew who must be fully qualified, and of the terms of qualification. Apprenticeship must also be regulated.

3. **FOREIGN SEAMEN.**—The employment of Asiatic seamen—Lascars, Chinese, etc.—at extremely low wage rates and under very bad conditions forms one of the principal grievances of the seamen in practically every maritime country. Regulation, where it exists, has usually taken the form of prescribing the proportion of Europeans (or U.S. subjects) to Asiatics to be employed. British ships in 1913 employed 212,570 British seamen (all grades, including officers, engineers, etc.), 32,639 foreigners of European races, and 46,848 Lascars. The most effective way of dealing with the employment of foreigners—and also the best way—would seem to be that of enforcing a high minimum rate for all ocean-going traffic, and making this apply all round to Asiatics as well as Europeans.

4. **ACCOMMODATION.**—The standard of accommodation on board ships under almost every flag is appallingly low, and the regulations enforced are for the most part very lax. The cabin space given to accommodation of crews is in most cases drastically cut down in favour of tonnage space, though the new standard ships are a great improvement in this respect on previous types. As improvements of accommodation are always resisted on the ground of their probable effect on international competition, the adoption of an international minimum standard of accommodation (including stokehold as well as berthing, etc.) is eminently desirable and also perfectly practicable.

5. **SAFETY.**—The question of safety arises both in connection with the actual sea-worthiness of the ship, the adequacy of the crew and equipment, and the "load-line" and safe stowage of cargo. All civilised countries make some provision for inspection in these respects, usually including inspection of foreign vessels which come to their ports. This last fact serves to emphasise the need for an uniform international standard, including an international "Plimsoll line" and international bye-laws dealing with inspection, stowage, equipment, notification of accidents and casualties, etc.

6. **FOOD AND MEDICAL SERVICE.**—The inadequacy of the food provided on board ship is a frequent cause of complaint, and its amount and quality have been the subject of national regulation in several States. This also applies to the provision of medicines, while it is compulsory in several countries for certain classes of vessels to carry a doctor and a qualified cook. Here also international regulation is clearly desirable.

7. **DISCIPLINE** on the high seas presents many difficult features. The captain is under almost all codes absolutely master of the crew while on the high seas; but the civil rights of the crew on return to port in respect of offences committed by the captain on the high seas differ considerably in different countries. There seems no reason against an international code of discipline for the merchant service, though it would probably be impossible to make seamen's rights completely uniform in view of differences in the civil codes of the various States.

8. **RIGHT OF COMBINATION.**—The right of combination at sea is, we think, nowhere recognised, and could hardly be made a matter for international regulation at the present stage, except in so far as the collective rights of the crew could be safeguarded in the international code dealing with discipline, in which collective rights of representation might be assured.

9. **TERMS OF ENGAGEMENT.**—At present both the United States and Great Britain have systems of registration of all engagements of seamen, and insist upon written terms of engagements deposited at a Government office. This also includes compulsory engagement of seamen in a foreign port before a consular officer of the State under whose flag the ship sails. Standard terms of agreement, drawn up by the Government Department concerned, exist in this country. Shipowners are, however, allowed to add terms of their own, and it is a frequent complaint that, although these have to be read to the men before they sign, there is usually no reasonable opportunity of considering them. Clearly, if these additional terms

are allowed, (a) they should not be passed by the Government official registering the engagement unless they are reasonable, (b) a seamen's Trade Union official should be present with the men and advise them before they sign. So far, the various States have only gone so far as to make certain specially unreasonable terms of engagement illegal, e.g., agreements to forego statutory rights to wages in case of shipwreck, salvage, etc. An international standard form of engagement, with internationally agreed regulations forbidding the insertion of unreasonable terms in the standard form, seems to be obviously desirable.

10. LEAVING THE SHIP.—Most countries prevent "industrial" seamen's labour by limiting the term for which a contract may run; but the American and British codes differ in respect of the seamen's right to leave the ship on arrival in port.

International regulations dealing with this matter seem to be eminently desirable.

CONCLUSION.—There seems to be every reason for, and no reason against, an elaborate international code regulating the conditions of the mercantile marine under every flag. This code would probably deal with many commercial matters falling outside the scope of this Memorandum, as well as with the seamen's questions dealt with above. It would clearly have to be worked out by a special Maritime Commission of the League of Nations, in close consultation with the national and international seamen's organisations. Moreover, this Maritime Commission would have to be permanent, as new points would continually arise, and it would be necessary to have some international organ to which appeals could be made. International inspection and policing of the seas for the enforcement of the code might well follow the creation of such machinery.

NOTE.—This Memorandum deals only with the permanent aspects of the problem, and omits entirely the special claims of seamen arising out of the war.

#### APPENDIX ON THE MERCANTILE MARINE IN THE BRITISH DOMINIONS.

Australia and New Zealand have attempted to legislate with a view to:—

(a) Excluding ships which pay rates of wages lower than the local standard.

(b) Excluding ships which refuse to comply with local laws re equipment, e.g., number of crew, accommodation, food, and sanitary arrangements.

The special aim of the legislation was to prevent the competition of Lascar crews working at about 4½d. per day, compared with 6s. to 7s. in Australia and New Zealand. (Figures given in Merchant Shipping Conference, 1907) and under much worse conditions. New Zealand attempted (in the Disallowed or "reserved" Act of 1911) to enforce provisions with regard to wage standards so far as concerned ships plying from New Zealand to any port within Australia by providing that where such ships are manned, wholly or partly by Asiatics, passengers and tickets issued for passages from New Zealand and bills of lading on shipping documents for cargo shipped in New Zealand shall be liable to extra stamp duties of 25 per cent.; to be refunded if the regulation (re wages) are complied with by the ship.—(Imperial Conference, 1911, p. 402.)

Australia and New Zealand Bills were "reserved," i.e., disallowed, owing mainly to the influence of British shipping companies, who protested loudly about "British subjects," etc.—foreign countries will retaliate on United Kingdom as well as Dominion shipping—which is a possibility. It is probable the Dominions will insist on these powers.

#### U.K. REGULATION OF FOREIGN SHIPPING.

General principles of international law: Every sovereign State has complete legislative control—

(1) Over its own ships, i.e., flying its flag, whether in home waters or open sea;

(2) over its own ships in foreign waters, but subject to local law;

(3) over seamen and passengers on its own ships, subject to the local law when in foreign waters;

(4) over all foreign ships, with their seamen and passengers, while in national waters. Foreign vessels (save for innocent passage through them) may enter national waters only with the assent of the nation, and must while there obey all local laws. If such laws are thought to be unfriendly the question must be raised diplomatically.—(EWART, K.C., of Canada.)

It appears from this that New Zealand and Australia would have perfect right to impose their regulations if they were independent States in a legal sense. But such restrictions may involve retaliations. Hence United Kingdom in her restriction is very careful not to offend. Her regulations are at the same time fairly stringent, and have had the effect not of provoking retaliation but raising the world's standard.

The Merchant Shipping Act, 1906, expressly applies to foreign ships the British load-line provision, authorises the detention of foreign ships when unsafe owing to defective equipment, etc., provides as to the loading of grain cargoes on foreign ships, applies to all foreign shipping within any port of the United Kingdom certain rules as to life-saving appliances, regulate the loading of timber on foreign vessels which enter British ports, includes foreign steamships under the definition of passenger steamships, and so forth.—(A. B. KEITH, *Jour. Sov. Comp. Legis.* V. 9, p. 202-3. Date (?) before 1910 (?).)

**But regulation of wages not attempted by any country.**

"No foreign country attempts to enforce her own rates of wages or manning scales or crew space, etc., on the vessels of another country trading to her ports from abroad; nor does the Imperial Government interfere with the arrangements on board of a foreign ship while in a port of the United Kingdom, except in matters relating to safety, such as cases of overloading, and insufficient life-saving appliances, etc."—BUXTON, President of the Board of Trade, at 1911 Conference, p. 413.)

---

## IX.

### ASIATIC AND OTHER PROBLEMS OF NATIVE LABOUR.

To pass from Europe and America in the attempt to standardise industrial conditions is to approach a wholly different problem. In general there are no Trade Unions, and even where a rudiment of political democracy exists, there is as yet no working-class representation. For any improvement in the conditions of labour in Egypt and India we have to trust to the spontaneous motions of the bureaucracy, subject to stimulation from home, but also to opposition from capitalists on the spot. The native nationalist movements in India and Egypt are as yet purely middle class, and take little or no interest in the conditions of the workers, save when a racial issue is raised, as it was by the grievances of Indian immigrants in South Africa. It is obvious that the pace of amendment might be greatly quickened by the action, whether national or international, of organised Labour at home. Echo in the silent bureaucratic world of the East is apt to magnify a very modest noise of agitation at home. Failing this pressure from organised Labour at home, decades may pass before there can be even a beginning of effective action on their own behalf by the workers of India, Egypt, Japan, and China.

The relative importance of the things which we should demand for these Eastern workers is not that of our Western scale of values. We ought perhaps to begin by demanding free and compulsory elementary education, a thing which in India exists only in some native States, and in Japan is very imperfectly carried out. Until some proportion of the workers is literate, it is difficult to secure the effective right of combination. On that right, invariably denied in Japan and not yet effectively recognised in India, we ought to lay special stress. The demands made for measures of hygiene, protection from or compensation after accidents, prohibition of noxious substances in processes of manufacture, ought not to differ as between East and West. The most crying evil in the new industrial world in the East is undoubtedly the long working day and the exploitation of children's and women's labour. Children are employable under the Indian Factory Act from the age of 9, and in fact they often go to work much earlier. The demand for the raising of the age of lawful employment ought to be coupled with the demand for free and compulsory State schools. Allowing for the earlier maturity of the Eastern physique, we should do well if we could fix the age for half-time work at 12. Especially in India, where total illiteracy is so common, the "young person" must be required to attend school. Women's night work is still legal in Indian and Japanese textile factories, in twelve-hour shifts. It ought to be entirely prohibited. The general limit of hours for all adults fixed by law in India in factories is now

twelve hours, while in Japan, during the next 15 years, twelve hours is the normal, and 14 hours, subject to license, the tolerated period of work even for young girls. It would be a great advance if we secured a ten-hour day with Sunday rest, or a week of 55 or 60 hours. There is no assignable climatic or physiological reason which can excuse an unreasonably long working day in the East.

Our Western charter includes no demand for a legal minimum wage. Given the absence both of Trade Unionism and of political action in the East, the extreme intellectual immaturity of the workers and the almost indefinite supply of cheap and easily exploited labour, there is a strong case for insisting on some action to raise wages. Obviously, in view of the wholly different standard of life, we cannot demand a parity of money wages between East and West. In India the Government's subsistence allowance for an adult in time of famine was 1½d. a day in pre-war times. That may be the sum just required to keep the body alive. There ought, however, to be some more or less general ratio between the wage and the cost of living. If the customary unit of cereal food be taken as a measure, then a 30s. minimum weekly wage in England to-day is worth just 40 loaves at 9d. We might take an equivalent food value in rice, and say that the minimum in the East ought to approximate to the same ratio. Some allowance ought, perhaps, to be made for the cheapness of the necessary clothing. It might be a recommendation of the Conference that a small permanent International Commission be charged with the task of establishing a formula by which an Eastern minimum wage might be fixed, based on the price (say) of rice and cotton cloth. It would then be a recommendation of the League to all Eastern Governments that this wage be the minimum for all unskilled work in Government establishments and in contracts, and, further, that they be asked to consider its adoption as a statutory minimum.

While the League of Nations may only be able at first to recommend industrial reforms to the various Eastern Governments, a more imperative procedure might be followed, if it appoints certain Powers as its "mandatory" to administer certain areas, e.g., Syria, and Mesopotamia in the East. It might be laid down as a condition to be accepted by these Powers that they will carry out in these areas every recommendation on Labour legislation, made by any Council, Conference, or Commission of the League. In other words, what the League recommends as an ideal to other Powers should be imposed as an obligation upon "mandatory" powers in "trustee" areas. If that principle could be established, our best strategy would then be to demand that the older Dependencies of the colonising Powers should also be brought under the "mandatory" system.

The Conference should insist that all forms of forced labour, and all taxes expressly designed to drive the native from his own land into the labour market be abolished in all colonies and dependencies under the League. A plausible argument may be advanced for a *covvee* in the more primitive parts of Africa, if it be regarded as a form of taxation and applied solely to useful public works. But even public works in African colonies are apt to include such items as a golf course for the white inhabitants, and the adoption of forced labour, even for genuine public utilities, means that private contractors will find paid labour more difficult to obtain. Let us ask for a simple prohibition: Governments will be only too ready to suggest exceptions.

It would be tempting to take an equally uncompromising stand against every form of indentured and contract labour and against the compound system which usually goes with it. In bad cases, which are apt to be the common cases, the worker shut up for some years in a compound, is overworked and exploited without hope of redress, and since he cannot sell his labour in a free market, the better employer has no advantage over the worse. In principle the system is temporary slavery, and, in fact, experience in Assam, Fiji, Japan, and elsewhere tells almost uniformly against it. On the other hand, some form of contract seems inseparable from any large organisation of immigrating labour, and that seems inevitable in the present condition of many African, Asiatic, and Oceanic settlements. Secondly, the provision of compounds may be necessary, especially where the labourers are either men only or women only. The worst abuses seem to occur where, as in Fiji, a small number of women immigrate with a large number of men. The most insoluble problem is presented by the semi-tropical colony with a resident white population, which

will not tolerate a coloured population as free immigrants or settlers. Perhaps these tentative propositions may be laid down:—

1. The contract system is wholly without justification in such cases as the Japanese silk mills, where the women travel only at no great outlay from the villages to the towns, and are then interned in compounds for three years at the mercy of an employer from whom they cannot get free.

2. Only where there has been a long and costly journey, involving considerable expense, is there any case for the contract system. In these cases (1) the recruiting ought to be done by the home Government at the cost of the importing Government; (2) the transport ought to be carried out by the home Government at the cost of the importing Government, so that it shall be responsible for abuses directly to native opinion; (3) the contract should be with the importing Government, and not with any private employer or syndicate; (4) the costs of transport should be recovered by the Government from the employers; (5) the immigrant worker once arrived must be free to sell his labour freely from plantation to plantation on short term employments; (6) the home Government or the League of Nations must appoint inspectors on the spot at the charge of the importing Government.

No system of this kind will in the long run be tolerable unless the immigrant labourer brings his family and is free to settle. Every approved scheme ought to contain arrangements for the grant of free land to native settlers, for use if not for ownership. West Indian experience shows that healthy society of mixed colour is to be expected only when the workers of the simpler race have a basis of independence as peasant cultivators. With adequate instruction and Government aid peasant cultivation by natives can be made economically more satisfactory than the big plantation. In short, in so far as immigrant labour is provided for plantations at all it should only be as a preliminary step to colonisation by the imported workers. Where, as in Queensland, the white population will not tolerate coloured settlers recourse should be had to Italians or other Europeans who can do manual labour in a warm climate. These must enter, of course, as free colonists on equal terms. Mining presents a special problem. It might be worth while to experiment in order to ascertain whether, with quick transport, villages under natural home conditions could be built up for the immigrants near the mines. Chinese traditions are probably too rigid for this, and African tribesmen would not welcome anything like permanent transplantation. In these cases the direct management of the compound by the State would be an obvious advance upon the present system.

Finally, the Conference might propose (1) a permanent International Commission for the special study of Asiatic, African, and kindred labour problems, in which Indian and Japanese members and European Labour representatives should sit; and (2) a Commission of Inquiry nominated and financed by the International Socialist Bureau itself, to study all questions and carry out investigations on the spot.

It is important that no investigation into questions of coloured labour should treat Labour problems in abstraction. Over great regions of Africa, especially the West Coast, production is not yet on a capitalist basis. If the native retains his land under communal tenure, is free to exchange his produce, and is protected from rings of exporters, there is no reason why he should ever sink into mere "wage-slavery." At present he works for himself and not for the white man. We may be able to prevent an acute Labour problem from arising by protecting the natives' rights in the land. The Conference should also propose that the League of Nations Labour Commission should promote certain medical investigations into tropical labour, e.g., (1) into miners' phthisis in South Africa as affecting both blacks and whites; (2) into the ability of certain African tribes to endure underground labour; and (3) into the ability of the African physique to endure long hours for protracted periods, a question which bears closely on contracts.

#### APPENDIX OF FACTS.

EGYPT.—The first Factory Act was passed in 1909. No details are obtainable as to its enforcement; the penalties are nominal. Before its passage a working day of 15 hours was common for women and children in the cotton ginning mills, and even young children worked nightshifts of twelve hours. Wages ranged from 7d. to

10d. a day for adults. There were no health regulations, and foremen regularly used canes.—(See Brailsford, "The War of Steel and Gold," p. 114.)

**INDIA.**—Conditions in 1908 are described in a Minority Report by Dr. T. M. Nair, the Medical Member of the Factory Labour Commission. Hours in textile factories ranged from 13 to 15. In emergencies days of 17 to 22 hours were not uncommon in ginning and rice mills and in printing works. An adult male textile worker earned 15 to 20 rupees a month (£1 to £1 6s. 8d.), an average of about 10d. a day, women about 7d., and children between 9 and 14 years 2½d. a day. The execrable housing conditions of the Bombay textile workers are described in Nevinson's "The New Spirit in India," p. 286. The Indian Factory Act of 1911 fixed the working day in textile factories for men and women at twelve hours, and children's hours at six. Night work, even in textile factories, is allowed in shifts, but Sunday rest is prescribed. The provisions for ventilation, water supply, sanitation, and lighting seem satisfactory, but the maximum fine is only £13.—(The World's Labour Laws, May, 1911, Vol. 1, No. 1.)

**JAPAN.**—The governing facts are that the franchise is based on a high property qualification, that no Trade Unions exist, and no Labour Press. Strikes are treated as seditious conspiracies, but do none the less occur. The average wage in agriculture was in 1914 for men 7½d., for women 5d. to 6d. a day; in spinning mills it was 10d. for men and 6½d. for women. The hours were in silk spinning, chiefly done by young girls, 13 to 14, and in weaving 14 to 16. In other trades ten to twelve hours was the usual day. (See International News Letter, January 9th and July 10th, 1914.) The textile mills are commonly run by indentured women workers, who contract for three years, are housed in compounds belonging to the employer, and usually work on alternate night and day shifts of twelve hours. Mr. R. P. Porter ("Japan the New World Power," p. 332) describes some of these compounds. The dining-rooms were sheds, with leaking roofs and pools of water on the earthen floor; in the dormitories the workers sleep on matting, 50 or 100 in a room. There are, however, some better specimens. The factory child seems to escape compulsory education. "At times," says Mr. Porter, the factory girls are "given a holiday and are allowed to go outside the compound."

The first Japanese Factory Act was passed in 1911, but came into force only in 1915. It is a mere sketch, for all regulation of contracts, terms of notice, and compensation for accidents is left to be fixed by administrative orders. All the vital clauses are open to exceptions, which local authorities may allow. Child labour is first prohibited under 12 years, and then permitted by local regulation over 10 years. The working day is first fixed for women and young persons under 15, at twelve hours, but for 15 years local authorities may extend these hours to 14. Night work, again, while first prohibited for women and young persons, is allowed in shifts. Even on paper it will be seen that the Act makes no real change in the customary conditions.

**CHINA.**—Conditions vary greatly, and there is no regulation. Labour is relatively dear in Shanghai, and women in silk weaving made in 1910 from 4d. to 6d. for an eleven-hour day. In the Upper Yangtse coal mines miners get 3½d. a day and ½d. worth of rice and meal. In Sianfu 1½d. a day is the usual wage of an unskilled man. "Speaking broadly," says Professor E. A. Ross (The Changing Chinese, p. 118) "in any part of the empire, willing labourers of fair intelligence may be had in any number at from 8 to 15 cents (4d. to 7½d.) a day."

## X.

### INTERNATIONAL LABOUR LEGISLATION: METHODS OF ENFORCEMENT AND INTERNATIONAL MACHINERY.

It is probable that for a considerable time to come all International Labour Legislation will be in effect unification of national labour legislation, i.e., it will consist of International Conventions in which the various States bind themselves to interfere either administratively or by legislation with national conditions of industry or labour. It follows that no international administration or executive action will be possible or necessary of the kind with which we are familiar in the Danube Commission or the International Sanitary Councils.

But what will be undoubtedly required is some kind of international action for seeing that the international conventions, once they are signed and ratified, are carried out. Nothing is clearer in the history of international government than that its failures in the past have been largely due to the absence of any organs and methods for ensuring the application, and, if necessary, the enforcement, of international conventions.

The supervision and enforcement of Conventions dealing with International Labour Legislation should be part of the duties of a permanent League of Nations. The Conventions would, in the first place, be guaranteed by the League. (The nature of its guarantees will be considered later.) The duty of watching over the carrying out of the Conventions would be delegated to the Labour Section of a Permanent International Economic Commission of the League. This Commission should have, at least, two functions—(1) Inquiry and inspection; and (2) report and recommendation to the Conference or Supreme Council of the League. An organ with these functions is essential if the provisions of International Conventions are to be really carried out, let alone enforced. For instance, the Advisory Committee is urging that at the Peace Conference the "more advanced countries should agree to adopt the prescribed minimum age—of beginning work—and the more backward should raise their existing limit by a year or two, to be followed by further restrictions at varying terms of years to come." If such a convention be signed, it is essential that there should exist some official international body entrusted with the duty of supervising its application. The Commission should take note of whether the various States introduced and passed the national legislation to which they had pledged themselves, and also whether that legislation was in fact being effectively enforced. It would require powers of inquiry, of hearing complaints, and ultimately of inspection.

The Commission ought at stated intervals to make public reports with regard to the carrying out of International Labour Legislation to the supreme organ of the League. This in itself would probably go some way to ensuring the enforcement of the conventions. But cases might arise in which States obstinately neglected to conform to their obligations under the conventions. The question then arises whether and, if so, how the League should provide methods of enforcing them. It is clear that in the case of some obligations a failure to carry them out would be more serious than in the case of others, and a different procedure would be desirable in the different cases. In an unimportant case of failure to carry out an obligation, it might well be left to the Commission to draw the attention of the State at fault to its failure and to urge it either to pass the necessary legislation or to administer the law which it had passed. If this hint were not accepted, and if the obligation were a really important one, the Commission should have the power to lodge a formal and public protest against the State in default. But a still further and stronger sanction for such International Conventions is possible. It may be argued that the obligations under International Labour Legislation Treaties are economic obligations accepted by the various States, the States which are members of the League will enjoy certain economic rights and privileges (e.g., possibly the "Open Door," most-favoured-nation treatment, and economic rights of way): it is not unreasonable to propose that in the last resort these rights and privileges should be made dependent upon a faithful compliance with the obligations. In that case the League would have the power where there was an obstinate breach of an important economic obligation, to suspend some or all of these economic rights and privileges. The power should only be used in serious or flagrant cases, and a suitable procedure can be suggested. Where the Commission had in such cases lodged a formal and public protest against the State in default, and where the protest remained unanswered and neglected, the Commission might then notify the State that if within a certain time it did not comply with its obligation the Commission would report the matter to the Conference or Supreme Council of the League with a recommendation that the economic rights and privileges of the State in default should be suspended until such time as it complied with its obligations. If the State still refused to comply, the Commission would then make its report and recommendation, and the supreme organ of the League, after investigation, and if it found that there was obstinate and inexcusable breach of treaty obligations, would suspend the economic rights and privileges of the State in default. This would constitute the League's ultimate guarantee of International Labour Legislation.

It may be added that part of the duties of the Commission might well be the study and preparation of schemes for extending the scope of International Labour Legislation. It should also have the power of submitting draft conventions to the legislative organ of the League.

## A PARLIAMENT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

The development of practical internationalism during the War has forced the idea of a League of Nations far beyond the original conception of an organisation to ensure peace. Apart from its functions as a legislator and an arbitrator, its administrative tasks will make it in a real sense a World Government. If it rations the daily bread and the raw materials of the earth it will by that alone become both to Labour and Capital the most terrific concentration of power in the world. Add to this the probability that it will control the work of those Powers who act as its mandatories in disturbed or immature regions and the risk that it may continue to act on such precedents as the Allied intervention in Russia. It is hardly necessary to point out that any use of the power to ration food and raw materials as an instrument of diplomatic pressure, would make the Powers which dominated the Executive of the League the arbiters of mankind.

It may be assumed that the Executive of the League will be composed primarily of the Premiers or other official delegates of the Cabinets of the Allied Great Powers, though one hopes that some delegates from other States may be added. In any event, the Executive will certainly speak only for Governments, and probably only or mainly for the Great Powers. Governments again will nominate the delegates who compose the General Conference of the League, and its powers will probably be legislative. In this plan there is no body which can act as the critic of the Executive, or bring its conduct of the world-administration to the test of public opinion. General Smuts, for example, explicitly says that the Conference will deliberate only on matters referred to it by the Executive.

It will be said that each national Parliament can call its own Ministry to account for its action on the Executive. Judging from the analogy of alliances that is not a hopeful prospect. Each Government will answer that it is only partly responsible, and will plead loyalty to colleagues and the necessary secrecy of the Council as a reason for stifling discussion. It is conceivable that the Commissions of the Executive might play into the hands of world-trusts, that every nation and every Parliament might be seething with discontent over the distribution of some essential food or raw material, and yet in all of them the responsibility would be evaded. If a joint Cabinet is to administer, it seems to follow that a joint Parliament must be created to criticise its work.

So long as international action is confined only to Governments, it may be doubted whether we shall ever escape from the obsession of force. It is a fiction that any Premier or Foreign Secretary represents a nation. He represents the nation as Power. It does not think unanimously. It acts, however, as a single force because its army, fleet, and Treasury obey a single command. The real divisions of class and opinion which make the life of the nation are obliterated before this artificial unity is achieved. The result will be that on these councils of Cabinets the true solidarity of human masses, which think alike across frontiers, will not be reflected. There will be coalitions based, after bargaining, on assumedly national interest, i.e., on the interests of the ruling class, but there will be no genuine associations based on common principles. The real basis of internationalism, the common thoughts and interests of populations, will not be reflected.

The only organ which could give this reflection would be a genuine Parliament based on proportional representation. That would at once bring together common opinions and common interests across national frontiers. A Socialist Party would at once be formed, then, perhaps, a Clerical Party, and gradually other shades would coalesce. The result would be to diminish the importance of the State as power, and to emphasise the sovereignty of opinion. The class line of cleavage would be seen to be international, and a great step would be gained in emancipating the workers from the obsessions of a narrow nationalism. Precisely for this reason our opponents will resist, and we ought to promote the idea.

Two methods of choosing the League's Parliament are conceivable. One is by direct election, proportionally, on a basis of population, with very large constituencies, which might be entire nations. By far the easier plan would be that the popular House in each national Parliament should elect the national delegation by proportional representation. Thus each national delegation would reflect the composition of the Parliament. If the Parliament itself were fairly elected, the result would be a reasonably exact mirror of national opinion.

It might be convenient to create European, American, and Asiatic Chambers of the League's Parliament, from which large delegations would be sent to compose the World-Parliament.

The assembly so constituted would at first be deliberative only. It should have the right to call before it spokesmen of the Executive of the League, and of all its Commissions, to receive their reports, to question them, to interpellate them, and to record its opinions by vote. It ought also to have the right of initiative to suggest new administrative departures to the Executive, or to draft new proposals of legislation, for submission to the Conference of Governments. Certain limits to its powers are obvious. It could not dismiss



the Executive (though it might censure it), for it could not overturn the Cabinets of the constituent States. Neither could it tax, unless the League should invent certain international sources of revenue. Nor could it legislate, though it might propose legislation to be afterwards ratified by the national Parliaments. It would, none the less, exert an enormous moral power, and more swiftly than any association of Governments, would mould opinion to accept the international idea. Eventually, after a long period of evolution, it might become strong enough to set up its own Executive and transform the League into a true federation.

Our "Internationale" would remain a powerful instrument of organisation and agitation. It could never control the League, however, unless indeed, we look forward to the revolutionary triumph of the Soviet idea. Those who reject that conception are bound to work for the democratic evolution of the League of Nations on the basis of Parliamentary forms.

#### RECOMMENDATION.

That the Conference shall propose the inclusion in the governing machinery of the League of Nations of a Deliberative International Parliament, composed of delegations chosen by proportional representation from each national Parliament. Its functions should be to create an international public opinion, to bring it to bear upon the Executive and Commissions of the League in their administrative action, and to prepare drafts or suggestions of international legislation for the Conference of the League.

## XII.

### THE ECONOMIC FUNCTIONS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

It is of the utmost possible importance, if the League of Nations is to be a reality and not merely an association of diplomatists, that its economic structure should receive fully as much attention as its political structure. The League of Nations that is required is not merely an *ad hoc* association for the prevention of war by conciliation or arbitration, but at least the groundwork of a real system of international co-operation in peace as well as in the prevention of disputes. This means that the economic functions of the League must be clearly defined, and that every effort must be made to preserve those forms of war-time co-operation which are at once valuable and capable of being incorporated in the permanent structure of the League.

This is essential even if a narrow point of view is taken and the problem is considered only in its bearings on the proposed international Labour Charter. International Labour legislation has little chance of real success unless it forms a part of a wider system of international economic co-operation.

During the war, the nations have for the first time co-operated closely on the basis of their common needs. This co-operation has, of course, not been world-wide, but the co-operation of the Allied Powers has been close and constant, and the Allies have also had to take account of the needs of neutral countries. So far as Allies and European neutrals are concerned, there has been developed during the war a system of international co-operation in the securing, allocation, and transport of supplies of vital foodstuffs and raw materials. Besides the Inter-Allied Munitions Council, which is essentially a temporary body, there have grown up international Councils dealing with food and shipping, as well as numerous lesser bodies dealing with the supply of particular commodities. Moreover, there has been created a supreme Economic Council which, with the bodies mentioned above, has largely superseded the previous Commission Internationale de Ravitaillement.

The vital questions which international Labour, as well as the various Governments concerned, has to face are (1) whether this machinery of international co-operation is to be maintained and developed on a world-wide basis during the emergency period which has now begun; (2) whether machinery based upon it is to be retained permanently as a part of the structure of the League of Nations.

The first point admits of no argument, since the very circumstances force upon the world the continuance, for some time at least, of an international system in the allocation of supplies. This should involve also international control of tonnage, which is vital to the provision of supplies, but both in Great Britain and in America the shipping interest is vehemently opposing any continuance of control, and here at least its campaign appears to be meeting with a success which may well be fatal to hopes of international economic co-operation.

For the emergency period at least, it is vitally necessary that from the supreme Economic Council of the Allies should emerge a World Economic Council with the function of rationing the nations with supplies while the world shortage and dislocation of normal trade conditions continue. This is essential, not only because both raw materials and foodstuffs and the tonnage necessary for their transport are largely in the hands of Great Britain and the United States, but also because purchasing power and credit are largely concentrated in the same hands. There can be no speedy restoration of the world's economic life unless supplies and the credit necessary to obtain them are placed freely at the disposal of all nations. Failure to do this, which will mean a scramble for supplies between the nations, coupled with a stagnation in most of the markets of the world, even where the need for supplies is greatest, would merely ensure the perpetuation of old economic antagonisms between the nations and the rapid creation of new ones, even among the countries at present in alliance. This would clearly be fatal to every possible hope of a real League of Nations.

It is not, however, enough to ensure the continuance of economic co-operation during the emergency period, except in the sense that such continuance will go a long way to ensure the permanence of the machinery when once its benefits have been generally appreciated. It is also necessary to make this international machinery an integral and permanent part of the structure of the League of Nations. This does not mean that systems of international rationing of materials must be retained when the supplies are enough for all, and when the credit position is such that they are actually being fairly allocated without international interference. But it does mean that the League of Nations must have permanent machinery for ensuring that these conditions are maintained. Among the necessary functions of this economic section of the League would be the following:—

1. To assist in the maintenance of credit, i.e., purchasing power, in the various countries at such a level as will ensure (a) a fair allocation of supplies of materials, etc.; (b) stimulation of supply of important materials by promoting production in the various countries; (c) no unnecessary disturbance of world market conditions through a breakdown of purchasing power in a particular country owing to preventable causes.

2. To prevent exploitation by trust, operating in the world market, whether of interests concerned in production, transport, or distribution, and to control the operations of international firms and combines.

3. To regulate the granting of concessions in undeveloped countries, and to safeguard such countries from unfair exploitation or monopolisation by particular interests.

4. To secure the enforcement of international conventions, in the matter of the open door and other matters, and to prevent their evasion by secret rebates, concessions, etc.

5. To promote international economic conventions based on the widest possible measure of international co-operation, e.g., commercial treaties, Labour conventions, traffic agreements, and so forth.

6. To undertake the international allocation of supplies of which there is a shortage, or which are in danger of being monopolised by a particular nation or interest to the detriment of others.

7. To promote the formation of international conferences or Councils in various industries and economic groups, in order to secure the greatest possible measure of co-operation in each industry or group.

Bound up with all this is the problem of ascertaining the true facts as to the world's supplies of foodstuffs and raw materials, so as to enable action to be taken in time to deal with a shortage. Attached to the League of Nations organisation there should be a statistical bureau on the lines of the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, and a Conservation Commission, with special sub-committees, should be set up to watch and make recommendations on the present and prospective resources of the world.

There are, no doubt, many other functions which the economic section of a League of Nations would have to undertake. Those mentioned above, however, are enough to show the enormous importance which such a section would possess in

the promotion of world co-operation in the economic sphere. If, as has been suggested, the methods of enforcing its decisions adopted by the League were mainly economic in character, the creation of an economic section on the lines suggested would acquire an additional importance.

Moreover, it is plain that if any international Labour Charter is to be effective, it will be closely bound up with the general economic proposals. The circumstances of international economic intercourse very largely condition the status and material position of Labour. This point is developed in a separate memorandum. It makes the economic structure and function of the League of Nations a matter of vital and immediate importance to Labour, even from a narrowly industrial point of view.

### XIII.

#### THE ECONOMIC STRUCTURE OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

There is an inclination in some quarters to press for the establishment of a Labour section of the League of Nations, entirely divorced from any economic section which may be established to deal with trading and economic questions generally. To adopt this policy would be a great mistake, and would doom the Labour section to comparative ineffectiveness. As soon as any attempt is made to establish by means of an international Labour Charter minimum Labour conditions and rights in all countries, it is seen that each proposal made raises intricate economic questions which go far beyond the narrower sphere of merely Labour legislation. For instance, the question of international competition at once arises, and it is impossible to get States to agree to reasonable Labour conditions as long as international economic policy is conducted on lines of unrestricted competition and virtual "warfare" between the various States. Labour questions cannot be divorced from questions of markets, and the only basis upon which an effective international Labour Charter can be built up is that of international co-operation in the economic sphere as a whole.

Moreover, many of the questions that are most important from the point of view of international Labour legislation arise not generally but in relation to particular industries, or at least can only be effectively dealt with in relation to particular industries. In such cases, the only machinery on which effective regulation can be built is an international council representing the various national interests concerned in that particular industry.

The structure, therefore, of the economic section of the League of Nations should be, broadly speaking, constructed on the following model, which is largely based upon the actual system that has been gradually evolved by the Allies during the war:—

1. There should be an economic section of the League of Nations with an economic secretariat drawn from the various countries, acting under the supreme authority of the League of Nations itself.

2. Under this section should be separate conferences or councils dealing with particular industries or industrial or economic groups, including in their functions both Labour questions affecting each particular group and economic questions not of a directly Labour character.

3. Under the economic section there should be a special Labour department, dealing with Labour questions of a general character, and with matters referred to it by the economic section as a whole, or by any sub-section in a particular industrial group.

4. As Labour questions would arise on every one of the above bodies, and as Labour is also closely concerned in general economic policy, Labour should be directly represented in each case.

5. Each of these bodies, including both the economic section itself, and the various industrial councils, and also the Labour department, should be furnished with efficient statistical equipment.

Thus (1) On the economic section itself, there would be direct representatives of Labour and co-operation from the various countries.

(2) Each industrial council would include not only State and capitalist representatives from each country, but also co-operative representatives and representatives appointed by the Trade Unions in each country, either directly or through their international federation (e.g., miners, textile workers, etc.).

3. The Labour department would include Labour representatives from each country, drawn either from the national Trade Union centres, or from the international federation of Trade Unions.

In this way provision would be made for the separate consideration of Labour questions by the Labour department, but any question specially concerning a particular industrial group could be specially referred to the international council of that group. Far more progress would be made in this way with international regulation of Labour questions than through any general Labour section of the League acting apart from special industrial associations. It would also be impossible to divorce the consideration of general economic questions in the particular industrial groups from that of specifically Labour questions, and highly undesirable to do so in the general structure of the League.

#### XIV.

### QUESTIONS OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO WOMEN.

#### STATEMENT PREPARED BY THE STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE OF INDUSTRIAL WOMEN'S ORGANISATIONS.

The Standing Joint Committee of Industrial Women's Organisations has had under consideration questions which will be discussed at the Conferences which are to meet in Switzerland. They desire to draw the attention of the British representatives, and through them the attention of the Conference, to certain matters upon which organised women feel deeply, and they hope that their representatives will specially bear in mind the importance which they attach to them. They consider it unnecessary to deal with questions of a general kind upon which the Labour Movement has already expressed an agreed view. They do not, therefore, say anything of the principles which should guide the questions of territorial adjustment, nor of the demand for the abolition of conscription and the reduction, with a view to the final abolition, of armaments. With the principles laid down in the War Aims Memorandum of the Labour Movement the Standing Joint Committee are in entire agreement. Further, they do not think it necessary to deal with the general principles of the League of Nations, upon which the whole Labour Movement is so fully in agreement. They would, however, like to point out that the League of Nations to which they are looking forward is a League which shall represent not Governments and diplomats, but the people themselves through their democratically constituted authorities.

The questions with which the Committee propose to deal fall into two main divisions. In the first place there are reforms which may be carried out as a result of international agreement. These are economic, political, and industrial in kind, and each needs separate treatment. In the second division come those reforms which may be recommended for national action, and upon which it is important for the Labour Movement in all countries to have a common aim and a common policy.

#### I.—REFORMS WHICH MAY BE CARRIED OUT BY INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT.

##### (a) Economic.

The people of all countries must now realise the peril in which they are placed by the growth of capitalistic combinations which menace the peace between nations and the liberty of all the workers. It is of the first importance that essential food supplies and raw materials throughout the world should be secured for all peoples, and with this object in view it is desirable that a democratically constituted League of Nations should make it one of its first objects to maintain international control of such important commodities as wheat and wool. In doing this the present inter-allied control might be developed into a great international organisation whose task

would be to maintain equality of supply and a reasonable basis of cost. In addition to this, however, steps should be taken by the united forces of the workers of all countries to develop and extend the People's Co-operative Movement, in order that profit making may be abolished, and the workers' economic power to undermine and resist capitalism be increased through co-operative banking and trade. The Labour charter to be agreed upon by the Conference should include provisions upon the following lines:—

1. The Co-operative Movement should be recognised in national and international administration as an important part of the economic structure.
2. That international agreements should be made to safeguard the Co-operative Movement, which is a democratic and non-profit-making organisation of consumers in every nation, and recognition should be given to the fact that its progress would be hindered by tariffs and any other forms of protection which would restrict plentiful supplies at low prices.
3. That in the event of any schemes of rationing being set up by the League of Nations the Co-operative Movement should be accepted as the most appropriate instrument for their administration.

#### (b) POLITICAL.

1. In order to create the necessary force behind the League of Nations, all nations should agree to accept equal suffrage for all men and women of adult age.
2. Agreement on the question of the nationality of married women should be made. A woman should not be compelled on marriage with an alien to take her husband's nationality, but should have the right to decide whether she shall continue a member of her own nation or become a member of his.
3. There should be covenants between nations, with the object of abolishing the white slave traffic. Towards this end the League of Nations should set up a Commission of Inquiry to find out how this aim could best be carried out.

#### (c) INDUSTRIAL.

The Committee is of opinion that it will not be possible to establish under the Treaties of Peace themselves definite international agreements on industrial questions, but they consider that the Peace Treaty in establishing the League of Nations should lay down as one of its most important duties that of setting up a permanent international Industrial Commission. Such a Commission would include representatives of the workers and of employers as well as representatives of Government Departments, and it is important that women should be included amongst all these classes. It is not proposed to go into details of constitution here, but we suggest that the following matters should be specially referred to such a body, and that its establishment should be demanded in the Labour Charter to be drawn up by the Conference in Switzerland:—

1. **THE PREVENTION OF SWEATED LABOUR IN ALL COUNTRIES** by establishment of minimum wage legislation in every country, with effective guarantees for its enforcement. This means also the consideration in a detailed form of the standard of life in different nations.

2. **HOURS OF WORK AND NIGHT-WORK.**—The Committee believe it to be most important that, in addition to shortening the hours of work, there should be a general prohibition of all night-work for both sexes in all countries, allowing only such exemptions as are proved to be necessary. The shortening of hours is of fundamental importance both to the woman at home who looks after the family and to the wage-earners themselves. Nightshifts disorganise the whole of the family life as well as the social life of the people concerned. The arrangement as well as the length of the working shifts should be regulated by social and family needs as well as industrial advantages.

3. **HEALTH CONDITIONS OF FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.**—An endeavour should be made to raise the standard of environment and to agree upon the minimum necessary for safety, health, and decency in all factories and workshops.

4. **CHILD LABOUR.**—It is unnecessary to lay stress upon the importance of this subject, and it should be possible to arrive at an international agreement, the less developed races being gradually brought up to the higher standard of the most civilised and best educated—both as to the provision of free national education, the

raising of the school-leaving age for full-time education, and development of continuation schools for all adolescents. Child labour should be abolished in all countries.

5. **INDUSTRIAL DISEASE AND INJURIOUS PROCESSES.**—Common agreement should be reached between the nations for the prohibition of the use of poisonous materials in manufacture. Such agreement was made before the war with regard to the prohibition of the use of white phosphorus in the manufacture of matches. Proposals were on foot for the prohibition of the use of lead in pottery, with opportunity for exemptions. Such beginnings need development, and should be made the subject of a wide inquiry. Similar action is necessary to obtain international regulation to prevent the spread of industrial diseases.

6. **EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN IN CERTAIN TRADES.**—The employment of women has up to the present been restricted in certain countries in certain employments, on the ground of unsuitability. The Standing Joint Committee made proposals for a National Inquiry upon this subject of the suitability of employment, and recommended the formation of a Committee of Inquiry, consisting of representatives of Trade Unionists (including women), of doctors (including women doctors), and persons experienced in the inspection of factories and the employment of women (also including women). Such a Committee, formed on an international basis, should now be set up, and make recommendations to the various nations. Inquiry should be made not only into the question of suitability under present conditions, but whether the unsuitability is dependent upon unhealthy processes or conditions which should be altered, whether men or women are employed.

7. **IMMIGRATION.**—International regulation is needed here to allow of free circulation of labour and reciprocal arrangements concerning insurance for unemployment and compensation for accidents, and any other forms of social legislation, while much can be done to do away with the defects surrounding the immigration of labour of a lower standard by making all industrial laws equally applicable to immigrants.

8. **COLOURED LABOUR.**—In addition to the abolition by wage agreements of sweated labour, it is essential that there should be immediate action with a view to preventing the industrial exploitation of backward races.

## II.—REFORMS RECOMMENDED FOR NATIONAL ACTION.

The basis of security in the future must depend more than anything else on the mental development of the peoples concerned. The abolition of poverty, ill-health, and bad housing on the one hand and the development of education on the other are equally necessary. The burden of the helpless members of the community, such as the sick and aged, must be more equally spread over the whole of the people, and not be left upon the shoulders of the individual family. Moreover, the suffering due to overwork and lack of care which is the lot of the mothers in every nation must be dealt with on broad and generous lines, and the care of maternity and of the health of the community must become one of the foremost national concerns, and can be greatly assisted by international co-operation in the study and prevention of disease. Much can be done here by the exchange of international information and the propaganda which the Labour Movement can develop. Of those problems of health and social welfare, housing is one of the most important, and a general programme of Labour organisations on questions of land and landlords, as well as municipal and national enterprise in building, would be a great step in advance.

There remains the great instrument of education. Workers should make clear in an international statement their demand that educational opportunity from the earliest stages in nursery schools through to the university should be open alike to all citizens, girls and boys, rich and poor. The Committee wish to draw the attention of the delegates to two subjects upon which international agreement might be reached:—

1. The abolition of militarist training and teaching throughout the educational system of every nation.
2. The encouragement and development of a system of exchange of university students between the peoples of all nations.

(Signed)

MARY R. MACARTHUR, Chairman.

MARGARET LLEWELYN DAVIES, Vice-Chairman.

MARION PHILLIPS, Secretary.

## APPENDICES.

## I.

## BERNE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR AND SOCIALIST CONFERENCE, 1919.

## THE LABOUR CHARTER.

Under the wage system the capitalist class endeavour to increase their profits by exploiting the workers in the greatest measure possible, such methods which, if unchecked, would undermine the physical, moral, and intellectual strength of the present and future generation of workers. They impede the development and even endanger the very existence of society. The tendency of capitalism to degrade the worker can only be completely arrested by the abolition of the capitalist system of production. Meanwhile the evil can be considerably mitigated, both by the resistance of organised workers and by the intervention of the State. By these means the health of the workers can be protected and their family life maintained. They make it possible for them to obtain the education necessary to enable them to fulfil their duties as citizens in a modern democracy.

The degree in which capitalism is restricted varies to a very great extent in the different States. Through the unfair competition of backward countries, these differences endanger labour and industry in the more advanced States. The adjustment of national differences in the legal protection of Labour by a system of international Labour legislation has long been a pressing need. It has been rendered doubly urgent by the terrible upheavals and awful destruction of the vital forces of the people brought about by the war. At the same time, however, the war is bringing about the possibility of satisfying this need by the formation of a League of Nations, which now seems certain.

The Berne Conference demands that the League of Nations as one of its primary tasks shall create and put into execution an International Labour Charter. Having taken into consideration the resolutions adopted by the International Trade Union Conferences of Leeds and Berne, and without prejudice to any more far-reaching resolutions which may be adopted by the Trade Unions, the Congress demands that the following minimum requirements, which are already partially carried out in some countries, shall be converted into a Code of International Law by the League of Nations on the conclusion of peace:—

1. Primary education shall be compulsory in all countries, and a system of vocational and general technical education be established.

Higher education shall be free and accessible to all. It is not right that the capacities and aspirations of young persons should be thwarted by the material conditions in which they happen to live.

Children under 15 years of age shall not be employed in industrial occupations.

Young persons between 15 and 18 years of age shall not be employed for more than six hours a day, with a break of one and a-half hours after a maximum spell of four hours' work.

At least two hours' instruction in technical and continuation classes shall be given to young persons of both sexes, daily, between the hours of 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. Young persons should be allowed "time off" to attend the classes.

The employment of young persons shall be prohibited—

- (a) Between the hours of 8 p.m. and 6 p.m.;
- (b) on Sundays and holidays;
- (c) in especially unhealthy trades; and
- (d) in mines below ground.

3. The hours of work of women workers shall not exceed four on Saturdays. They shall not be employed after midday on Saturdays. Where exceptions are necessary in certain occupations the women workers concerned shall be allowed an equivalent half-holiday on another day of the week.

Women shall not be employed during the night. The employer shall not give women further work to do at home after their regular day's work.

As a general rule, women shall not be employed in especially dangerous trades where it is impossible to provide for sufficiently healthy conditions, nor in mines below ground.

Before and after child-birth women shall not be allowed to work for ten consecutive weeks altogether, four previous to and six after confinement. In every country a system of maternity benefit shall be introduced, providing compensation at least equal to the sickness insurance benefit payable in the country concerned.

Equal pay shall be given to both sexes for equal work.

4. The hours of work shall not exceed eight per day or 48 a week.

Night work between the hours of 8 p.m. and 6 a.m. shall be prohibited by law in all forms of employment, except in so far as it may be unavoidable for technical reasons or from the nature of the occupation. Where night work is necessary the rate of pay shall be higher than for day work.

The Saturday half-holiday shall be introduced in all countries.

5. Workers shall be allowed a continuous weekly rest of at least 36 hours between Saturday and Monday morning. Where the nature of the occupation involves Sunday work the weekly break of 36 hours shall be given during the week.

In continuous industries the shifts must be so arranged that the workers have at least every other Sunday free.

It is understood that these regulations shall be adapted to those countries and persons which have a different day of rest.

Night work and Sunday work shall be paid at a higher rate.

6. With a view to the protection of health and the prevention of accidents, the daily hours of work shall be reduced below eight hours in dangerous trades, according to the degree of danger.

The use of poisonous material shall be prohibited in all cases where it is possible to procure substitutes for them. An international schedule shall be kept of all industrial poisons which are to be prohibited. The use of white phosphorous in the manufacture of matches and of white lead in painting and decorating work (both indoor and outdoor) shall be prohibited immediately.

An identical system of automatic coupling, adaptable to all wagons, shall be introduced on the railways of all countries within five years.

7. All laws and orders dealing with the protection of workers shall apply in principle to home industries.

Social insurance laws shall be extended to home industries.

Home work shall be prohibited--

(a) In the case of work liable to give rise to poisoning or to serious injury to health; and

(b) in the case of food industries, including the making of bags and cardboard boxes for packing articles of food.

In home industries notification of all infectious diseases shall be compulsory. Work in dwelling-places where there is infectious disease shall be prohibited, suitable compensation being paid to the workers. All countries shall introduce medical inspection in the case of young persons employed in home industries, as well as inspection of the dwelling-houses.

It shall be agreed that compulsory lists of all workers and middlemen in home industries shall be kept and inspected, and that all workers shall have wages books. In all districts where there are home industries wages boards, representing both employers and workers, shall be instituted, with the object of fixing legal rates of wages. The rate of wages shall be posted up in the work-places.

8. Workers shall have the right of combination and association in all countries. Laws and decrees (domestic service laws, prohibition of combination, etc.) which place certain classes of workers in an exceptional position, in relation to other classes of workers, or which deprive them of the right of combination and association, and of the representation of their economic interests, shall be repealed.



Immigrant workers shall enjoy the same rights as native workers as regards joining and taking part in the work of Trade Unions, including the right to strike.

Any interference with the exercise of the right of combination and association shall be a punishable offence.

Every foreign worker shall have the right to the wages and conditions of work agreed to between the Trade Unions and employers in his trade. Where no such agreements exist a foreign worker shall have the right to the wages and conditions customary in his trade and district.

9. Emigration shall not be prohibited.

Immigration shall not be prohibited generally. This rule shall not affect—

(a) The right of any State to restrict immigration temporarily in a period of economic depression, in order to protect the workers of that country as well as the foreign immigrant workers;

(b) the right of any State to control immigration in order to protect public health, and, if necessary, to prohibit immigration for the time being; nor

(c) the right of any State to require that immigrants shall come up to a certain minimum standard in reading and writing their native language, so as to maintain the standard of popular education of the State in question, and to enable Labour legislation to be effectively applied in those branches of industry in which immigrants are predominantly employed.

These exceptions can, however, only be permitted in agreement with and under the control of the Commission provided for in Art. 15.

The contracting States undertake to introduce, without delay, laws prohibiting the engagement of workers by contract to work abroad, putting a stop to the activities of professional employment agents in this matter and prohibiting the admission of workers engaged by contract.

The contracting State undertake to compile statistics of the state of the Labour market, based on the returns of public Labour Exchanges, and to exchange such statistics, at as short periods as possible, through an international centre, so that workers may avoid going to countries offering few opportunities for work. These reports should be especially accessible to the Trade Unions of the various countries.

No worker shall be expelled from a country on account of Trade Union action. Appeals against such deportation shall be dealt with by the ordinary courts.

10. In cases where the average earnings of the workers (men or women) are insufficient to provide a proper standard of living, and it proves impossible to bring about agreement between the workers' Trade Unions and the employers, the Government shall set up wages boards, on which employers and workers shall be equally represented, with the object of fixing legal minimum rates of wages.

Moreover, the contracting States shall convoke, as speedily as possible, an International Conference charged with the duty of taking effective measures against any lowering of the purchasing power of wages and guaranteeing their payment in money whose value has not depreciated.

11. In order to reduce unemployment the Labour Exchanges in every country shall be linked up in such a manner that prompt and, as far as possible, complete information as regards the demand for and supply of Labour may be obtained.

A system of unemployment insurance shall be set up in every country.

12. All workers shall be insured by the State against industrial accidents. The claims of workers and their dependents shall be determined in accordance with the law of the country in which the injured workman was employed. Laws for the insurance of widows and orphans and for old age, sickness, and disablement, shall be introduced, and shall apply equally to natives and to foreigners.

A foreign worker (who has been injured), when leaving the country in which he has been employed, may be given a sum down instead of an annual pension, if an international agreement has been made to this effect between his native country and the country where he was employed.

13. A special international code shall be established for the rights and protection of seamen. This code shall be drawn up with the collaboration of the seamen's unions.

14. The enforcement of these provisions shall, in the first place, rest with the Labour Department of each State and its factory inspectors. These inspectors shall be appointed from the ranks of technical, hygiene, and economic experts, and of worker employees of both sexes.

The Trade Unions shall assist in the effective enforcement of the Labour laws. Employers who employ at least five foreign-speaking workers shall be required by law to post up, in the mother tongue of these workers, all Labour regulations and other important notices, and also to make arrangements, at their own expense, for such workers to receive instruction in the language of the country.

15. With a view to the carrying out of this treaty, and to the further development of international Labour legislation, the contracting States shall appoint a permanent Commission consisting in equal parts of representatives of the States which are members of the League of Nations and of the International Trades Union Federation.

In order to promote international Labour legislation, this Commission shall prepare for and convoke annual Conferences of the representatives of the contracting States. One-half of the voting members of the Conference should consist of representatives of the organised workers of every country. The Conferences shall have the power to adopt binding resolutions within the limits of the powers conferred on them.

The permanent Commission shall co-operate with the International Labour Office in Basle and with the International Trades Union Federation.

## II.

## PEACE CONFERENCE.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL LABOUR  
LEGISLATION.

## TERMS OF REFERENCE.

The Commission on International Labour Legislation was appointed by the Peace Conference on the 31st January, 1919. The terms of reference were as follows:—

“That a Commission, composed of two representatives apiece from the five Great Powers, and five representatives to be elected by the other Powers represented at the Peace Conference, be appointed to inquire into the conditions of employment from the international aspect, and to consider the international means necessary to secure common action on matters affecting conditions of employment, and to recommend the form of a permanent agency to continue such inquiry and consideration in co-operation with and under the direction of the League of Nations.”

At a meeting of the other States on the 27th January, 1919, it was agreed that Belgium should nominate two representatives on the Commission, and Cuba, Poland, and the Czecho-Slovak Republic one each.

The Commission was composed of representatives of the following countries: United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy, Japan, Belgium, Cuba, Poland, and Czecho-Slovak Republic.

The following were appointed officers of the Commission: President, Mr. Samuel Gompers (U.S.A.); Vice-Presidents, The Right Hon. G. N. Barnes, M.P. (British Empire), Mr. Colliard (France); General Secretary, Mr. Arthur Fontaine (France); Assistant General Secretary, Mr. H. B. Butler (British Empire); Secretaries; Baron Capelle (substitute, Count de Grunne), Belgium; Mr. Di Palma Castiglione (Italy), Mr. Oyster (U.S.A), Mr. Yoshisaka (Japan).

## DRAFT CONVENTION.

A DRAFT CONVENTION CREATING A PERMANENT ORGANISATION FOR  
THE PROMOTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL REGULATION OF LABOUR  
CONDITIONS.

## PREAMBLE.

Whereas the League of Nations has for its object the establishment of universal peace, and such a peace can be established only if it is based upon social justice;

And whereas conditions of labour exist involving such injustice, hardship, and privation to large numbers of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperilled; and an improvement of those conditions is urgently required: as, for example, by the regulation of the hours of work, including the establishment of a maximum working day and week, the regulation of the labour supply, the prevention of unemployment, the provision of an adequate living wage, the protection of the worker against sickness, disease, and injury arising out of his employment, the protection of children, young persons, and women, provision for old age and injury, protection of the interests of workers when employed in countries other than their own, recognition of the principle of freedom of association, the organisation of technical and vocational education and other measures;

Whereas also the failure of any nation to adopt humane conditions of labour is an obstacle in the way of other nations which desire to improve the conditions in their own countries;

The High Contracting Parties, moved by sentiments of justice and humanity, as well as by the desire to secure the permanent peace of the world, agree to the following convention:—

## CHAPTER I.—ORGANISATION.

## ARTICLE I.

The High Contracting Parties, being the States members of the League of Nations, hereby decide to establish a permanent organisation for the promotion of the objects set forth in the Preamble, and for this purpose hereby accept the provisions contained in the following Articles:—

## ARTICLE 2.

The permanent organisation shall consist of (i.) a General Conference of Representatives of the High Contracting Parties and (ii.) an International Labour Office controlled by the Governing Body described in Article 7.

## ARTICLE 3.

The meetings of the General Conference of Representatives of the High Contracting Parties shall be held from time to time as occasion may require, and at least once in every year. It shall be composed of four representatives of each of the High Contracting Parties, of whom two shall be Government delegates and the two others shall be delegates representing respectively the employers and the workpeople of each of the High Contracting Parties.

Each delegate may be accompanied by advisers, who shall not exceed two in number for each item on the agenda of the meeting. When questions specially affecting women are to be considered by the Conference, one at least of the advisers should be a woman.

The High Contracting Parties undertake to nominate non-Government delegates and advisers chosen in agreement with the industrial organisations, if such organisations exist, which are most representative of employers or workpeople, as the case may be, in their respective countries.

Each delegate may be accompanied at each sitting of the Conference by not more than two advisers. The advisers shall not speak except on a request made by the delegate whom they accompany and by the special authorisation of the President of the Conference, and may not vote.

A delegate may in writing addressed to the President appoint one of his advisers to act as his deputy, and the adviser, while so acting, shall be allowed to speak and vote.

The names of the delegates and their advisers will be communicated to the International Labour Office by the Government of each of the High Contracting Parties.

The credentials of delegates and their advisers shall be subject to scrutiny by the Conference, which may, by two-thirds of the votes cast by the delegates present, refuse to admit any delegate or adviser whom it deems not to have been nominated in accordance with the undertaking contained in this Article.

## ARTICLE 4.

Every delegate shall be entitled to vote individually on all matters which are taken into consideration by the Conference.

If one of the High Contracting Parties fails to nominate one of the non-Government delegates whom it is entitled to nominate, the other non-Government delegate shall be allowed to sit and speak at the Conference, but not to vote.

If in accordance with Article 3 the Conference refuses admission to a delegate of one of the High Contracting Parties, the provisions of the present Article shall apply as if that delegate had not been nominated.

## ARTICLE 5.

The meetings of the Conference shall be held at the seat of the League of Nations, or at such other place as may be decided by the Conference at a previous meeting by two-thirds of the votes cast by the delegates present.

## ARTICLE 6.

The International Labour Office shall be established at the seat of the League of Nations as part of the organisation of the League.

## ARTICLE 7.

The International Labour Office shall be under the control of a Governing Body consisting of 24 members, appointed in accordance with the provisions of the Protocol hereto.

The Governing Body shall, from time to time, elect one of its members to act as its Chairman, shall regulate its own procedure, and shall fix its own times of meeting. A special meeting shall be held if a written request to that effect is made by at least ten members.

## ARTICLE 8.

There shall be a Director of the International Labour Office, appointed by the Governing Body, who shall, subject to the instructions of the Governing Body, be responsible for the efficient conduct of the International Labour Office and for such other duties as may be assigned to him.

The Director or his deputy shall attend all meetings of the Governing Body.

## ARTICLE 9.

The staff of the International Labour Office shall be appointed by the Director, who shall, so far as is possible with due regard to the efficiency of the work of the Office, select persons of different nationalities. A certain number of these persons should be women.

## ARTICLE 10

The functions of the International Labour Office shall include the collection and distribution of information on all subjects relating to the international adjustment of conditions of industrial life and labour, and particularly the examination of subjects which it is proposed to bring before the Conference with a view to the conclusion of international conventions, and the conduct of such special investigations as may be ordered by the Conference.

It will prepare the agenda for the meetings of the Conference.

It will carry out the duties required of it by the provisions of this convention in connection with international disputes.

It will edit and publish a periodical paper in the French and English languages, and in such other languages as the Governing Body may think desirable, dealing with problems of industry and employment of international interest.

Generally, in addition to the functions set out in this Article, it shall have such other functions, powers, and duties as may be assigned to it by the Conference.

## ARTICLE 11.

The Government Departments of any of the High Contracting Parties which deal with questions of industry and employment may communicate directly with the Director through the representative of their State on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, or failing any such representative, through such other qualified official as the Government may nominate for the purpose.

## ARTICLE 12.

The International Labour Office shall be entitled to the assistance of the Secretary-General of the League of Nations in any matter in which it can be given.

## ARTICLE 13.

Each of the High Contracting Parties will pay the travelling and subsistence expenses of its delegates and their advisers and of its representatives attending the meetings of the Conference or Governing Body, as the case may be.

All the other expenses of the International Labour Office and of the meetings of the Conference or Governing Body shall be paid to the Director by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations out of the general funds of the League.

The Director shall be responsible to the Secretary-General of the League for the proper expenditure of all moneys paid to him in pursuance of this Article.

## CHAPTER II.—PROCEDURE.

## ARTICLE 14.

The agenda for all meetings of the Conference will be settled by the Governing Body, who shall consider any suggestion as to the agenda that may be made by the Government of any of the High Contracting Parties or by any representative organisation recognised for the purpose of Article 3.

## ARTICLE 15.

The Director shall act as the Secretary of the Conference, and shall circulate the agenda to reach the High Contracting Parties, and through them the non-Government delegates when appointed, four months before the meeting of the Conference.

## ARTICLE 16.

Any of the Governments of the High Contracting Parties may formally object to the inclusion of any item or items in the agenda. The grounds for such objection shall be set forth in a reasoned statement addressed to the Director, who shall circulate it to all the High Contracting Parties. Items to which such objection has been made shall not, however, be excluded from the agenda, if at the Conference a majority of two-thirds of the votes cast by the delegates present is in favour of considering them.

If the Conference decides (otherwise than under the preceding paragraph) by two-thirds of the votes cast by the delegates present that any subject shall be considered by the Conference, that subject shall be included in the agenda for the following meeting.

#### ARTICLE 17.

The Conference shall regulate its own procedure, shall elect its own President, and may appoint committees to consider and report on any matter.

Except as otherwise expressly provided in this convention, all matters shall be decided by a simple majority of the votes cast by the delegates present.

A vote shall be void unless the total number of votes cast is equal to half the number of the delegates attending the Conference.

#### ARTICLE 18.

The Conference may add to any committees which it appoints technical experts, who shall be assessors without power to vote.

#### ARTICLE 19.

When the Conference has decided on the adoption of proposals with regard to an item in the agenda, it will rest with the Conference to determine whether these proposals should take the form: (a) of a recommendation to be submitted to the High Contracting Parties for consideration with a view to its being given effect by national legislation or otherwise, or (b) of a draft international convention for ratification by the High Contracting Parties.

In either case a majority of two-thirds of the votes cast by the delegates present shall be necessary on the final vote for the adoption of the recommendation or draft convention, as the case may be, by the Conference.

A copy of the recommendation or draft convention shall be authenticated by the signature of the President of the Conference and of the Director and shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. The Secretary-General will communicate a certified copy of the recommendation or draft convention to each of the High Contracting Parties.

Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes that it will, within the period of one year at most from the end of the meeting of the Conference, bring the recommendation or draft convention before the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies for the enactment of legislation or other action.

In the case of a recommendation, the High Contracting Parties will inform the Secretary-General of the action taken.

In the case of a draft convention, the High Contracting Party will, if it obtains the consent of the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, communicate the formal ratification of the convention to the Secretary-General and will take such action as may be necessary to make effective the provisions of such convention.

If on a recommendation no legislative or other action to make such recommendation effective is taken, or if the draft convention fails to obtain the consent of the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, no further obligation shall rest upon the High Contracting Party.

In the case of a Federal State, the power of which to enter into conventions on Labour matters is subject to limitations, it shall be in the discretion of the Government of such State to treat a draft convention to which such limitations apply as a recommendation only, and the provisions of this Article with respect to recommendations shall apply in such case.

(In regard to the interpretation of this Article reference should be made to the Protocol.)

#### ARTICLE 20.

Any convention so ratified shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, but shall only be binding upon the States which ratify it, subject to any conditions which may be contained in the convention itself.

#### ARTICLE 21.

If any convention laid before the Conference for final consideration fails to secure the support of two-thirds of the votes cast by the delegates present, it shall nevertheless be within the right of any of the High Contracting Parties to agree to such convention among themselves.

Any convention so agreed to shall be communicated by the Governments of the States concerned to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall register it.

#### ARTICLE 22.

Each of the High Contracting Parties agrees to make an annual report to the International Labour Office on the measures which it has taken to give effect to the provisions of conventions to which it is a party. These reports shall be made in such form and shall contain such particulars as the Governing Body may request. The Director shall lay a summary of these reports before the next meeting of the Conference.

#### ARTICLE 23.

In the event of any representation being made to the International Labour Office by an industrial association of employers or of workpeople that any of the High Contracting Parties has failed to secure in any respect the effective observance within its jurisdiction of any convention to which it is a party, the Governing Body may communicate this representation to the State against which it is made and may invite that State to make such statement on the subject as it may think fit.

#### ARTICLE 24.

If no statement is received within a reasonable time from the State against which the representation is made, or if the statement when received is not deemed to be satisfactory by the Governing Body, the latter shall have the right to publish the representation and the statement, if any, made in reply to it.

#### ARTICLE 25.

Any of the High Contracting Parties shall have the right to file a complaint with the International Labour Office if it is not satisfied that any other of the High Contracting Parties is securing the effective observance of any convention which both have ratified in accordance with the foregoing Articles.

The Governing Body may, if it thinks fit, before referring such a complaint to a Commission of Inquiry, as hereinafter provided for, communicate with the State against which the complaint is made in the manner described in Article 23.

If the Governing Body do not think it necessary to communicate the complaint to the State against which it is made, or if, when they have made such communication, no statement in reply has been received within a reasonable time which the Governing Body considers to be satisfactory, the Governing Body may apply for the appointment of a Commission of Inquiry to consider the complaint and to report thereon.

The Governing Body may adopt the same procedure either of its own motion or on receipt of a complaint from a delegate to the Conference.

When any matter arising out of Articles 24 or 25 is being considered by the Governing Body, the State against which the representation or complaint is made shall, if not already represented thereon, be entitled to send a representative to take part in the proceedings of the Governing Body while the matter is under consideration. Adequate notice of the date on which the matter will be considered shall be given to the State against which the representation or complaint is made.

#### ARTICLE 26.

The Commission of Inquiry shall be constituted in accordance with the following provisions:—

Each of the High Contracting Parties agrees to nominate within six months of the date on which this Convention comes into force three persons of industrial experience, of whom one shall be a representative of employers, one a representative of workpeople, and one a person of independent standing, who shall together form a panel from which the members of the Commission of Inquiry shall be drawn.

The qualifications of the persons so nominated shall be subject to scrutiny by the Governing Body, which may by two-thirds of the votes cast by the members present refuse to accept the nomination of any person whose qualifications do not in its opinion comply with the requirements of the present Article.

Upon the application of the Governing Body, the Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall nominate three persons, one from each section of this panel, to constitute the Commission of Inquiry, and shall designate one of them as the President of the Commission. None of these three persons shall be a person nominated to the panel by any State directly concerned in the complaint.

## ARTICLE 27.

The High Contracting Parties agree that, in the event of the reference of a complaint to a Commission of Inquiry under Article 25, they will each, whether directly concerned in the complaint or not, place at the disposal of the Commission all the information in their possession which bears upon the subject matter of the complaint.

## ARTICLE 28.

When the Commission of Inquiry has fully considered the complaint, it shall prepare a report embodying its findings on all questions of fact relevant to determining the issue between the parties and containing such recommendations as it may think proper as to the steps which should be taken to meet the complaint and the time within which they should be taken.

It shall also indicate in this report the measures, if any, of an economic character against a defaulting State which it considers to be appropriate, and which it considers other States would be justified in adopting.

## ARTICLE 29.

The Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall communicate the report of the Commission of Inquiry to each of the States concerned in the complaint, and shall cause it to be published.

Each of these States shall within one month inform the Secretary-General of the League of Nations whether or not it accepts the recommendations contained in the report of the Commission; and if not, whether it proposes to refer the complaint to the Permanent Court of International Justice of the League of Nations.

## ARTICLE 30.

In the event of any of the High Contracting Parties failing to take within the specified period the action required by Article 19, any other of the High Contracting Parties shall be entitled to refer the matter to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

## ARTICLE 31.

The decision of the Permanent Court of International Justice to which a complaint has been referred shall be final.

## ARTICLE 32.

The Permanent Court of International Justice may affirm, vary, or reverse any of the findings or recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry, if any, and shall in its decision indicate the measures, if any, of an economic character against a defaulting State which it considers to be appropriate, and which other States would be justified in adopting.

## ARTICLE 33.

In the event of any State failing to carry out within the time specified the recommendations, if any, contained in the report of the Commission of Inquiry, or in the decision of the Permanent Court of International Justice, as the case may be, any other State may take against that State the measures of an economic character indicated in the report of the Commission or in the decision of the Court as appropriate to the case.

## ARTICLE 34.

The defaulting State may at any time inform the Governing Body that it has taken the steps necessary to comply with the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry or in the decision of the Permanent Court of International Justice, as the case may be, and may request it to apply to the Secretary-General of the League to constitute a Commission of Inquiry to verify its contention. In this case the provisions of Articles 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, and 32 shall apply, and if the report of the Commission of Inquiry or decision of the Permanent Court of International Justice is in favour of the defaulting State, the other States shall forthwith discontinue the measures of an economic character that they have taken against the defaulting State.



## CHAPTER III. GENERAL.

## ARTICLE 35.

The British Dominions and India shall have the same rights and obligations under this convention as if they were separate High Contracting Parties.

The same shall apply to any colony or possession of any of the High Contracting Parties which on the application of such High Contracting Party is recognised as fully self-governing by the Executive Council of the League of Nations.

The High Contracting Parties engage to apply conventions which they have ratified in accordance with the provisions of the present convention to their colonies, protectorates, and possessions, which are not fully self-governing:—

1. Except where owing to the local conditions the convention is inapplicable, or
2. Subject to such modifications as may be necessary to adapt the convention to local conditions.

And each of the High Contracting Parties shall notify to the International Labour Office the action taken in respect of each of its colonies, protectorates, and possessions which are not fully self-governing.

## ARTICLE 36.

Any State not a party to this convention, which may hereafter become a member of the League of Nations, shall be deemed ipso facto to have adhered to this convention.

## ARTICLE 37.

Amendments to this convention which are adopted by the Conference by a majority of two-thirds of the votes cast by the delegates present shall take effect when ratified by the States whose representatives compose the Executive Council of the League of Nations and by three-fourths of the States whose representatives compose the body of delegates of the League.

## ARTICLE 38.

Any question or dispute relating to the interpretation of this convention or of any subsequent convention concluded by the High Contracting Parties in pursuance of the provisions of this convention shall be referred for decision to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

## CHAPTER IV.—TRANSITORY PROVISIONS.

## ARTICLE 39.

The first meeting of the Conference shall take place in October, 1919. The place and agenda for this meeting shall be as specified in the schedule annexed hereto.

Arrangements for the convening and the organisation of the first meeting of the Conference will be made by the Government designated for the purpose in the said schedule. That Government shall be assisted in the preparation of the documents for submission to the Conference by an International Committee constituted as provided in the said schedule.

The expenses of the first meeting and of all subsequent meetings held before the League of Nations has been able to establish a general fund, other than the expenses of delegates and their advisers, will be borne by the High Contracting Parties in accordance with the apportionment of the expenses of the International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union.

## ARTICLE 40.

Until the League of Nations has been constituted all communications which under the provisions of the foregoing Articles should be addressed to the Secretary-General of the League will be preserved by the Director of the International Labour Office, who will transmit them to the Secretary-General of the League when appointed.

## ARTICLE 41.

Pending the creation of a Permanent Court of International Justice, disputes which in accordance with this convention would be submitted to it for decision will be referred to a tribunal of three persons appointed by the Executive Council of the League of Nations.

PROTOCOL TO ARTICLE 7.

The Governing Body of the International Labour Office shall be constituted as follows:—

Twelve representatives of the Governments.

Six members elected by the delegates to the Conference representing the employers.

Six members elected by the delegates to the Conference representing the workpeople.

Of the twelve members representing the Governments eight shall be nominated by the High Contracting Parties which are of the chief industrial importance, and four shall be nominated by the High Contracting Parties selected for the purpose by the Government delegates to the Conference, excluding the delegates of the eight States mentioned above. No High Contracting Party, together with its dominions and colonies, whether self-governing or not, shall be entitled to nominate more than one member.

Any question as to which are the High Contracting Parties of the chief industrial importance shall be decided by the Executive Council of the League of Nations.

The period of office of members of the Governing Body will be three years. The method of filling vacancies and other similar questions may be determined by the Governing Body subject to the approval of the Conference.

PROTOCOL TO ARTICLE 19.

In no case shall any of the High Contracting Parties be asked or required, as a result of the adoption of any recommendation or draft convention by the Conference, to diminish the protection afforded by its existing legislation to the workers concerned.

SCHEDULE REFERRED TO IN ARTICLE 39.

FIRST MEETING OF ANNUAL LABOUR CONFERENCE, 1919.

The place of meeting will be Washington.

The Government of the United States of America is requested to convene the Conference.

The International Organising Committee will consist of seven members, appointed by the United States of America, Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Belgium, and Switzerland. The Committee may, if it thinks necessary, invite other States to appoint representatives.

Agenda:—

1. Application of principle of eight-hour day or of 48-hour week.

2. Question of preventing or providing against unemployment.

3. Women's employment—

(a) Before and after childbirth, including the question of maternity benefit.

(b) During the night.

(c) In unhealthy processes.

4. Employment of children—

(a) Minimum age of employment.

(b) During the night.

(c) In unhealthy processes.

5. Extension and application of the International Conventions adopted at Berne in 1906 on the prohibition of night work for women employed in industry and the prohibition of the use of white phosphorus in the manufacture of matches.

CLAUSES PROPOSED FOR INSERTION IN THE TREATY OF PEACE.

The High Contracting Parties declare their acceptance of the following principles, and engage to take all necessary steps to secure their realisation in accordance with the recommendation to be made by the International Labour Conference as to their practical application:—

1. In right and in fact the labour of a human being should not be treated as merchandise or an article of commerce.

2. Employers and workers should be allowed the right of association for all lawful purposes.

3. No child should be permitted to be employed in industry or commerce before the age of 14 years, in order that every child may be ensured reasonable opportunities for mental and physical education.

Between the years of 14 and 18, young persons of either sex may only be employed on work which is not harmful to their physical development and on condition that the continuation of their technical or general education is ensured.

4. Every worker has a right to a wage adequate to maintain a reasonable standard of life having regard to the civilisation of his time and country.

5. Equal pay should be given to women and to men for work of equal value in quantity and quality.

6. A weekly rest, including Sunday, or its equivalent for all workers.

7. Limitation of the hours of work in industry on the basis of eight hours a day or 48 hours a week, subject to an exception for countries in which climatic conditions, the imperfect development of industrial organisation or other special circumstances render the industrial efficiency of the workers substantially different.

The International Labour Conference will recommend a basis approximately equivalent to the above for adoption in such countries.

8. In all matters concerning their status as workers and social insurance foreign workmen lawfully admitted to any country and their families should be ensured the same treatment as the nationals of that country.

9. All States should institute a system of inspection in which women should take part, in order to ensure the enforcement of the laws and regulations for the protection of the workers.