

THE PATRIOT

No. 8.—Vol. I.

30 MARCH, 1922.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

REGISTERED AT THE G.P.O. AS A NEWSPAPER.

THE DANGERS OF GENOA—See pages 3 & 6.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Strengthen Those Things That Remain	1	Reviews—	
Letters of A Patriot.—I.	2	“The Red Light”—When Labour Rules	12
Notes	3	Labour Trusts	12
The French Socialist Party	5	Notes from India	12
The German Bolshevik Conspiracy	6	The Engineering “Lock-Out”	13
The Outlook in Ireland.....	9	Correspondence	14
Trade Union Notes	11	A Glossary of Political and Labour Terms—	
Forgotten Things.....	11	No. 8.	15

All communications for the Editor or Manager to be addressed to—The Boswell Printing and Publishing Co., Ltd.,
2, Whitefriars Street, E.C.4.

STRENGTHEN THOSE THINGS THAT REMAIN

Last week we traced a “vein of treachery” through the conduct of recent affairs, and at the same time placed before ourselves a double policy: the first part to lay the conspiracy bare, and the second part to nourish in the national mind a true policy based upon the interest and the security of the nation.

As to the first part, an article in our paper to-day is devoted to the Genoa Conference, which we venture to describe as a blood-clot in the vein of treachery. It is, as the following pages will show, a danger threatening life itself. But even under the imminent threat of this peril, we must not forget our second object, the recovery of our true policy.

And if we called the treason a vein, loaded with poisoned or exhausted blood, we may liken the true policy to an artery through which courses in a life-giving stream a fresh supply of pure blood from the heart of our people.

How shall we find it? Not, certainly, among the catchwords and cant phrases of current politics. We suspect these phrases. During the war a certain Berlin laboratory prepared a culture of the bacilli of anthrax, which was sent up to the Eastern shores of the Baltic by German agents and spread upon lumps of sugar to be given to the horses used by Russia on her overland routes. Our enemies have another laboratory, where they prepare a plentiful culture of a bacilli more dangerous than anthrax, cunning little phrases, “slogans,” as the Communists call them, such as “Self-Determination” and “Internationalism,” which have worked like a delirium in the mind of our people. Let us, at least, keep clear of this floating miasma.

No, if we look for our true policy, we must get down to the interest and the security of the British people. These are what we want to reach. And how shall we reach them? In the history, in the traditions, in the instincts of the nation.

But what, first of all, is the main object of our national policy? The name we have chosen for our paper suggests it. Let us examine the word. Patriotism is abused by the Communists as an “exploded superstition of the bourgeoisie.” That is one of their slogans, and it is one of their lies. For what is patriotism in reality? It is the instinct of self-preservation in the heart of our people. The Communists who want to destroy the British people naturally begin by deriding the instinct of self-preservation. For if you cannot defeat a brave nation, you may, they think, induce it to commit suicide. For that reason they deride patriotism and offer instead Self-Determination, which means death to the British Empire, and Internationalism, which means, in practice, to work for our enemies.

National self-preservation, then, is the object of our policy—in plain words, the security of the British nation. This appears to be elementary, and yet it has been neglected altogether by our political guides. For years the nation has followed demonstrably false ideals of policy. As, for example, wealth, which Adam Smith placed before us as the national end, although Smith, by his famous reference to the Navigation Laws, made the admission, fatal to his system, that security was more important than opulence. Suppose a nation rich beyond the dreams of avarice, but weak and insecure. Does it not thereby bring about its own destruction? Certainly it does, for richness in the weak rouses envy in the strong. The great war was caused as much by England’s preoccupation in wealth as by Germany’s concentration upon strength. Our blind desire for wealth brought about the loss of it. We had to spend our capital to protect our existence because we had set wealth and not security as the end of our national policy.

Another false ideal which our people were tempted to set before themselves was “the greatest happiness of the greatest number.” Would a man



Who pursued only happiness and the procreation of a large family, would he not be almost a criminal if he put these two ends before him to the neglect of forethought, prudence, and security? If a nation merely seeks happiness and numbers its downfall, when it comes, will be the more miserable because of the lack of the philosophy to bear, and the multitude of the population to endure, suffering.

Security, then, is the first end of our national policy. But how is this security to be reached? The diplomatist may say by alliances, the soldier by armies, the sailor by ships. All these have their uses; but the question is not so simple as that. In the Great War we had many allies, but some of them burdened and others blackmailed us. Those which were true to us needed as much support as they gave, and we found that our safety depended on ourselves. As to great armies, Russia had the greatest of all, yet Russia perished. And for navies, we know that, despite our Navy, we were brought to the verge of defeat, bankruptcy, and ruin. Suppose an island with a great navy bought with its wealth but without the steel to supply that navy with guns, and to build fresh ships to replace the old, without the industries and plant to prepare the explosives, without the spirit and resolution to suffer all things for victory. That

was not, but might have been, our case; we came within a hairs-breadth of disaster despite our Navy. Therefore, even the Navy, important as it is, is not the root of the matter.

What is, then, the root of the matter? May we not say that the spirit of the nation, this despised instinct of patriotism, lies at the very heart and centre of our inquiry. Lovers of England, when they consider her spirit, look back, as to the spring and the prime, to "the spacious days of great Elizabeth," when England was conscious in every fibre of her policy and her patriotism. Then Shakespeare expressed this central idea in lines which should be set in the heart and mind of every Englishman:—

Naught shall make us rue,
If England to itself do stand but true.

There we have the secret at last, and it is no secret at all; but it remains (as psycho-analysis is much in fashion) to examine into what this spirit of patriotism is, and of what it is composed. And that is a development of our question which must be considered in a future issue. Sufficient in this to say that if we are to strengthen those things which remain and are ready to perish we must cherish the patriotism of the nation as our dearest possession.

LETTERS OF A PATRIOT.—I.

"His Enemy Came and Sowed Tares."

Sir,—The non-arrival of the better world, which had for so long been foolishly promised by many publicists and politicians, is in itself disappointing; but a deeper feeling than disappointment has been created by the course of events in the last eighteen months. As one danger to the nation after another looms into sight, a lengthening row of spectres afflicts the spirits of the ordinary man and makes him both apathetic and fatalistic. It is a bad and a dangerous mood; and its danger is specially in the open field and encouragement it gives to the enemies of any reform which is not preceded by further destruction. With your permission I should like to endeavour, in a few letters, to point out that the spectres are less fearful when seen clearly than through a mist; and that the people of this country, having faced, and passed, and forgotten, equally ugly objects, are still able—with return of self-confidence and courage—to carry on their great traditions and worthily to sustain the vast Empire of which they are the possessors.

The English can face dangers as well as any race, but they will not anticipate them; and no better illustration of both facts can be desired than the pre-war misjudgment of German aims, and the successful meeting of their attempted execution. To-day dangers to our Empire, our social welfare, and our industries are so evident that the time of anticipation is past, and the time for awakening and resistance has arrived. And this word "resistance" is the keynote we want shouted till the awakened ones take courage. Fatigued by the war, soothed by the word peace, and lulled to sleep by hopes and futile promises, the public have for three years only languidly opened one eye when some nasty jolt of the State car has shown an obstacle passed over. These obstacles have all left serious marks and steady deterioration on the car; and the occupants sleepily say, "What's done can't be helped; the driver is doing his best." But the last jolt has shaken Ireland overboard, bleeding pro-

fusely, and there are clearly more nasty jars ahead.

Shakespeare recognised the force evolved by "damnable iteration"; and the enemies of our only possible method of restoring the welfare and security of the community, have so thoroughly well employed the reiteration of fallacies and mis-statements for years past, that the public mind is poisoned, and the distinction between right and wrong has been almost obliterated. To illustrate—I had occasion in a discussion at a Conservative club, the other day, to express views on the value of a Coalition Government in which only one of the two Coalition sides had any effective control of administration, and quoted the Irish case as an example. An intelligent business man expressed his sorrow that I lacked the "broad-minded view," and failed to recognise the changes wrought by the "progress of the times." Some babbling of mine in reply—about morals, and justice, and courage not having been really abolished by anything improperly called "progress"—was doubtless quite useless, and merely disturbing to complacency. This attitude of mind is widespread, and is not the result of deterioration of the race; it is an artificially induced condition, due to incessant work for years of those who consider everything established as wrong, and any pride of race and love of country as obsolete impediments to international "progress."

The war proved the British race was as good as ever; and three years of ill-employed peace cannot have destroyed its qualities. Counter-propaganda to the poisonous variety has been going on from many centres, none of them comparable with the enemy's strongholds, but now greatly helped by the educating pressure of industrial conditions. The appearance of THE PATRIOT must be welcomed in many centres; and it is my hope that no fear of repetition may handicap the Editor in the essential duty of driving home the basic truths so long concealed.—Yours faithfully,
A. P.

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

What America Knows.

Our readers are aware that the United States have refused to go to Genoa. But do they know why? For that, as we shall see, is also of importance. It has been put about in this country that the American Government have refused because they take no interest in the questions to be discussed. It is not so. Washington takes a very keen interest in Russia. The United States have been at pains almost from the beginning of the Bolshevik Revolution to discover the truth and to make it known to American citizens. Here they have acted in a more creditable manner than our own Government, which has kept the truth from its people. The Americans realise what the Soviet Government is and has been doing. They have their evidence complete: (1) that it began as a conspiracy organised in Germany to destroy Russia, and that it developed into a conspiracy to destroy Western civilisation, including the United States. It is for that reason that they refuse to recognise the Soviet Government.

The Evidence.

The American Government have fought Bolshevism with vigour. In this they have shown themselves faithful to their duty to their citizens. And part of that fight has been to expose the true nature of the conspiracy by the effective plan of publishing not only the evidence, but photographs of the documents of which the evidence is composed. British subjects are, therefore, obliged to turn to American publications for the truth of a conspiracy which concerns them also—which concerns them, indeed, even more than America, since they are nearer the seat of danger. Of these publications the most interesting is the "German Bolshevik Conspiracy" (War Information Series, No. 20—October, 1918), by Edgar Sisson, the Special Representative in Russia of the United States Committee on Public Information. The Bolsheviks and their friends in America made desperate attempts to discredit this report; but utterly failed. And with reason, for it displayed them as a set of vile conspirators, actuated not by any ideals, either love of freedom or of the working classes, but by motives the most disreputable and sordid. It is safe to say that if Mr. Sisson's report had been published in this country, the British Parliament would never allow the Prime Minister to go to Genoa.

Hirelings of German Capitalism.

For what do these documents prove? They prove that the Bolshevik agents were hired by the German General Staff for the betrayal and destruction of Russia, and were acting in the winter of 1917-1918 (when Mr. Sisson was in Russia) according to German orders. So far from having any Socialist ideals, they were at that time engaged in destroying Russian industry in order that German capitalism might the more thoroughly exploit Russia, and they were even taking orders from their German masters to "take immediate steps for the restoration of the rights of German landlords" in Esthonia. For this work of wrecking and destruction they received the modern equivalent of thirty pieces of silver in the shape of large sums from various German banks, the evidence of which transactions they in vain tried to destroy. If the British Government had presented such evidence as this to our working men they would have finished with Communist propaganda at the very start.

Judas Iscariot—Communist.

The Communists would have been compelled to acknowledge Judas Iscariot as their patron saint, and to admit that they were following a pack of scoundrels who were professing the most lofty ideals when they were actually taking pay from German capitalism to destroy Russian industry. That there may be no doubt in the minds of our readers as to the truth of these statements, we publish in another column several characteristic documents from the report, and also a photograph of one of them. We propose also to publish from time to time further such documents, so that no doubt be left in the minds of the British public of the kind of people whom Mr. Lloyd George is now pressing upon this country and upon Europe.

What is Proposed.

The Prime Minister's professed object in the Genoa Conference is disclosed in his memorandum recently published as a White Paper, although written in 1919. It is a policy of universal disarmament, the strengthening of the League of Nations, so as to make it strong enough to keep Germany and Russia in order, and, finally, a policy of trust and generosity towards both Russia and Germany. Part of this programme has already been carried out—we mean that part of it which relates to the disarmament of this country. The British Army has been reduced to "contemptible" proportions; vast stores of arms and munitions have been sold to provide an addition to revenue, and England is again a disarmed country. But the League of Nations is no more fit to be the Policeman of Europe now than it was when it was founded. Germany has also been disarmed to some extent, although the occasional discoveries of secret stores show how little she is to be trusted. But Bolshevik Russia—as we recently quoted figures to prove—has been steadily piling up armaments, and has now many millions of rifles and vast quantities of ammunition at her disposal. Thus, while the West has been disarming, the East has been arming, and it is now proposed to reconcile the East by a public and ceremonial embrace at Genoa.

A Justified Distrust.

But can the Bolsheviks—to say nothing of the Germans—be reconciled in this manner? Are they the sort of people with whom it is possible to deal? We turn for an answer to their own statements. In the appendix to Mr. Sisson's report there is a very interesting intercepted telegraphic conversation between Chicherin (who is speaking from Petrograd) and Trotsky (at Brest Litovsk), the first week of February, 1918. It appears from the conversation that even then the British Government were putting out feelers for such a settlement as they now propose, and Chicherin reports a conversation he had with Mr. Lockhart, whom he suspects as being a diplomatic agent of the British Government:—

At present he is not an official representative, but, *de facto*, he is an envoy having been sent by the War Cabinet. . . . He promises all kinds of favours from England.

Lockhart and Chicherin had a tussle over the Bolshevik proposal to send Petroff ("Peter the Painter") on a mission to England. Lockhart protested that this would spoil their chances of recognition.

He said that no Government would tolerate intervention in its internal affairs. If we are going to raise the British people, if our agents in England will attempt to cause strikes, England will not tolerate this.

Chicherin then explained that the object of the mission was "the clearing up of misunderstanding between two nations." Lockhart thereupon said he was satisfied, and praised the Bolsheviks for their propaganda among the German troops. "We listened to this," says Chicherin, "and laughed up our sleeves."

Chicherin's Policy.

Chicherin is the Bolshevik envoy at Genoa, and we suggest that if he laughed up his sleeve in 1918, he will also laugh up his sleeve in 1922. As it happens we have a very clear exposition of Chicherin's policy in the secret document published in THE PATRIOT of 16th February last. It was a minute addressed to the Bolshevik agents in England, Germany, Italy, and Czecho-Slovakia, and, although dated 6th February, 1921, it clearly foreshadows the present situation. As for example:—

We are rapidly approaching the moment when, by the force of historic logic itself, the capitalistic diplomatists will be inevitably (perhaps consciously) brought to make some stupidity, and all our efforts must be to encourage them to make the stupid mistake.

Here is the thing in a nutshell. The desired blunder is the Genoa Conference, for what more stupid mistake could there be than to give our implacable enemies the encouragement and prestige of recognition?

But let us carry these quotations a little further so as to show—from an authentic document—the true aims of Chicherin as to England and the West. After a reference which suggests that the Bolsheviks (who use as much as they are used by the Germans) are likely to play false with their old pay-masters, Chicherin continues:—

France desires to see our helplessness; we will show helplessness. England wishes to exploit us; we will give her full occasion to do so. It is necessary to transfer the centre of gravity from us to the West; let European diplomatists crack their heads over unsolvable problems. As to us, we will always have time to say our last word.

Again:—

The immediate aims for our representatives are, therefore, to get recognised, to develop trade; slowly to spread propaganda; to enforce our authority and prestige among the proletariat masses.

And that is exactly what Mr. Lloyd George proposes to do.

Carrots for Capitalists.

Chicherin continues:—

"Europe is beginning to endure a very acute period of decline in the values of goods. This explains the feverish attempts to obtain new markets. We must buoy up these hopes by giving them occasion to develop trade agreements. In the hope to seize a new market, the capitalists will throw large quantities of cheap goods into Russia. They will not succeed to seize the market, but meanwhile *we will make use of the cheap goods*. Some of the political leaders, perhaps, foresee all this; nevertheless, economic necessity *obliges them to conclude trade agreements*."

"Anyhow, such trade agreements will have both material and political advantages for us."

"Whilst following a policy of preparation and strengthening, our representatives must also make use of *every occasion arising on nationalistic soil for creating conflicts and contradictions*. In fact, discords must be created and augmented. From this point of view it is most desirable to give full attention to the relations between the Powers of the new Entente. If, perhaps, there may be some talk about the vitality of the Versailles Treaty, there can be no question about the Treaty of St. Germain; the relations of Hungary to her neighbouring

Powers are such that they may be settled only in one way—by war. Such war is sure to affect Italy and to lead to a European conflagration.

Setting Europe by the Ears.

"The activity of our representatives must be directed to lose no occasion to envenom already existing *national dissensions*."

"Nevertheless, to strengthen our position in the West, together with and in the hope that in case of war our affairs are sure to take a most favourable turn, is not enough; it is necessary to help and hasten on events by *adroit and intensive work of a most strenuous nature*."

"At the present moment it is advantageous for us to gain time and prepare the ground. But we must discount that all such preparations are to be finished in the course of the next six months, and that after that it would be harmful for us to delay any longer. Experience has shown that when a certain maximum has been attained, it is never good to delay any longer. All preparatory work must be therefore carried on, remembering that all must be ready for the instant when the whole situation will become favourable. At that instant it will be necessary to begin decisive action."

How to Make Quarrels.

After surveying the situation in the Balkans, as a likely area for the commencement of hostilities, and describing how quarrels may be created between England and Italy over Greece, the manifesto proceeds:—

"Our representatives in England and Italy must more especially see to that. Thus spreading further and further East, further and further problems come within our grasp, leading more and more to divergences between the Powers, and this must always be discounted by our activities in London, in Paris, and in Rome."

"The mutual interests of the Western Powers are at present so closely interwoven that it is impossible to predict what combinations and what alliances may arise. I draw the attention of our representatives to the following possible combinations:—The Anglo-Japanese *rapprochement* may serve as a menace to America; the Anglo-German *rapprochement* as a menace to France; the Italo-Greek *rapprochement* as a counterpoise to the policies of England and France in the Near East; the Franco-Polish *rapprochement* is a direct menace to Germany; the Czecho-Roumanian *rapprochement* is a menace to Hungary; and so on."

In a Nutshell.

These and other documents support the known facts, and prove beyond a shadow of a doubt—

(1) That it is the purpose of Soviet Russia to destroy us.

(2) That its plan of destruction is cunning and formidable.

(3) That the chief elements of this plan are:—

(a) A revolutionary propaganda among the working-class to destroy the upper-class, and so leave the British Empire leaderless and helpless.

(b) Mischief-making among the Great Powers.

For a prestige and for b official recognition are very much to be desired, and Mr. Lloyd George proposes to give the Bolsheviks both prestige and recognition by treating with them at Genoa. As for the "stupidity" which the Bolshevik diplomatist desires, that is already provided in the Prime Minister's many blunders in foreign diplomacy—in particular, his quarrels with France; his failure in Turkey; his support of the Greek adventure, and so forth. In short, if Mr. Lloyd George is allowed to work his will at Genoa, it brings a Bolshevik

revolution in England within the range of practical politics.

Slipping into the Abyss.

The British Government has all along made the cardinal error of mistaking Bolshevism for Nationalism in Ireland. What is happening there is not the creation either of a Dominion or of a Nation, but of a Soviet. First of all we have Michael Collins, who plays the same part as Kerensky in Russia. He has been set up in power by England, as Kerensky was set up by the Allies; he is bolstered with grants of money and gifts of arms; but he has not the experience nor the strength to establish himself upon the only true foundation of government, the foundation of power. The power of the hand, not the power of the tongue, rules in the last resort, and that is where Michael Collins has failed.

The Occult Power.

The true power in Ireland is the power which governs the professional gunmen of the I.R.A., the inner circle of the secret organisation known as the Irish Republican Brotherhood. This occult power is sworn to the destruction of the British Empire, and is certainly in league both with Berlin and Moscow. It is determined not to have peace in Ireland, and has been testing the resolution of Michael Collins in various ways. There was the affair of Limerick (organised from Tipperary, the stronghold of the extremists), and in that affair Michael Collins did not dare to strike; he came to a compromise, which was in effect a local surrender.

The gunmen tried their hand locally in robbery and crime, and Michael Collins pretended to punish them. But it was only a pretence. One day a gunman would be sentenced to five years, the next he would be again a free man. Then there was the great affair of the Ulster Raid. Whether or no Michael Collins was in that business it is hard to say; if he was in it, he was committing treachery to his professions; if he was not in it, then he was powerless or unwilling to prevent it. These trials succeeding, the I.R.A. determined to test the Provisional Government in its stronghold of Dublin.

The Soldiers' Council.

Mr. Griffith proclaimed the Gunmen's Convention as an illegal assembly. He was no doubt tempted to take this step by the belief that the Provisional Government is favoured by the majority in the South and West of Ireland, and even in the I.R.A. These poor people, whose only desire is to be left alone, have a pathetic belief that the Provisional Government may succeed in restoring law, order, and prosperity to Ireland. But in revolutions—and particularly in Ireland—the desperate rule. And the gunmen had the nerve to put the Provisional Government's prohibition to the test. And that is just where, up till now, the Provisional Government has always failed. It is always a trial of strength that decides the destinies of nations: two forces meet, they exchange glances, one side lowers its gaze; the fight is over. So it has been here. If Michael Collins were destined to rule Ireland, he would have seized the 220 delegates and made an end of them. He could have done it, for Dublin was with him, and he had a force of 2,000 armed men. But, so far at least, he has not dared. The armed convention has lorded it over Dublin; has seized public buildings, has proclaimed the boycott of Ulster, which Collins had raised; and has decided to rule itself by a Council of Sixteen—that is to say, to set up a government of gunmen over the Provisional Government, as the Council of Soldiers and Workmen was set up over Kerensky in Russia.

THE FRENCH SOCIALIST PARTY

The permutations within the French Socialist Party since the war are rather difficult to follow for the ordinary reader in England. Like every other country, France has been subjected to continual and increasing pressure of forces directed from Moscow. Communism, and the question of the authority of the Third (or Moscow) International, have become the dominant features. A delegation went to Russia in 1920, and was composed of Cachin, editor of *Humanité*, and Frossard, Secretary of the Party. These delegates came home overflowing with enthusiasm for Bolshevism; and at the Tours Congress, in December, 1920, the Socialist Party, by a two-thirds majority, adopted affiliation to the Third International, and became the French Communist Party. The minority, led by Longuet (grandson of Karl Marx) and Renaudel, continued under the name of the French Socialist Party. Since that split, the minority party has gone through a further purification process; and in diminished numbers now represent a theoretical appreciation of Socialism combined with patriotism, which last is a virtue entirely discarded by followers of both the Third and what is called the "Two and a Half" Internationals. In retaining patriotism as a plank in their platform it was necessary to drop Comrade Longuet and others overboard. The organ of the purified group is *Le Populaire*.

The active men in the French Communist Party are Frossard, Loriot, Cachin, Rappoport, Souvarine, Lévy, and Vaillant-Couturier. Messieurs Anatole France and Barbusse are members of the party, and their organs are *Humanité*, *Bulletin Communiste*, and *Revue Communiste*.

This month there has been a Congress in Paris of the French Socialist Party, and its equivalent association in England, the Social Democratic Federation, had a delegate present, as described in the *Figaro* of 19 March, in these words:—

The *Social Democratic Federation* of Great Britain was represented in the *Salle du Globe* by a delegate, whose mission it was to assure the members of the Congress of his inflexible devotion to the *Entente Cordiale* between France and England, and he declared: "We supported the policy of an Anglo-French alliance from the very first, and we have confirmed this policy with the blood of the members of our Federation spilt on your fields of battle."

Following this address, a resolution of the Congress was unanimously passed in these words:—

"That the sentiments he so nobly expressed are those of all our militants. Like himself, the French Party esteems the closest entente between France and England can alone ensure that the war for justice shall produce its necessary and legitimate results. To assist the advent of democracy even in Germany itself, to conquer the Imperialism which still exists in Germany and is still menacing; also to help those who continue to contend against German Imperialism, it is still necessary to maintain that close union between the workers of England and France which will render possible whatever indispensable action may have to be taken."

It is worth noting that the British Social Democratic Federation of to-day is the product of purification processes resulting from violent differences between the patriots and the pacifists of the old-established Socialist Party during the war.

TRADE UNION ECONOMICS.

Mr. Charles Sangster, chairman of the Swift Motor Company, of Coventry, at the annual meeting, said: "In this city a workman was fined by a trade union £10 19s. for doing too much work. I have seen the receipt for the fine paid."

THE GERMAN BOLSHEVIK CONSPIRACY.

MR. SISSON'S REPORT.

In "Notes of the Week" reference is made to the report on the German-Bolshevik conspiracy by Mr. Edgar Sisson, which is unfortunately so little known in this country. Mr. Sisson, as Special Representative of the United States Committee on Public Information, visited Russia during the winter of 1917-1918, and obtained the documents which formed the body of his report. Friends of the enemy in the United States tried to throw discredit on the report; but Mr. Sisson had taken care to support himself with photographs of the actual documents when he had not procured the originals. A Committee of the National Board for Historical Service was nevertheless appointed to test the report, and it found the genuineness of nearly all the documents cited to be established beyond doubt.

This report, owing to the renewed efforts of the Prime Minister to establish official relations with the Bolsheviks, again becomes of crucial importance. It is the most pertinent of all commentaries on the Genoa Convention.

Lenin and Trotsky—German Agents.

The documents, says Mr. Sisson in his introduction, show that the present heads of the Bolshevik Government—Lenin and Trotsky and their associates—are German agents.

They show that the Bolshevik revolution was arranged for by the German Great General Staff, and financed by the German Imperial Bank and other German financial institutions.

They show that the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was a betrayal of the Russian people by the German agents, Lenin and Trotsky; that a German-picked commander was chosen to "defend" Petrograd against the Germans; that German officers have been secretly received by the Bolshevik Government as military advisers, as spies upon the Embassies of Russia's allies, as officers in the Russian army, and as directors of the Bolshevik military, foreign, and domestic policy. They show, in short, that the present Bolshevik Government is not a Russian Government at all, but a German Government, acting solely in the interests of Germany, and betraying the Russian people, as it betrays Russia's natural allies, for the benefit of the Imperial German Government alone.

Russian Workmen Betrayed.

And they show also that the Bolshevik leaders, for the same German Imperial ends, have equally betrayed the working classes of Russia, whom they pretend to represent.

The documents are some seventy in number. Many are originals, annotated by Bolshevik officials. The balance of the others are photographs of originals, showing annotations. And they corroborate a third set of typewritten circulars, of which only two originals are possessed in any form, but all of which fit into the whole pattern of German intrigue and German guilt.

The first document is a photograph of a report made to the Bolshevik leaders by two of their assistants, informing them that, in accordance with their instructions, there had been removed from the archives of the Russian Ministry of Justice the order of the German Imperial Bank "allowing money to Comrades Lenin, Trotsky, and others" for the propaganda of peace in Russia"; and that, at the same time, "all the books" of a bank in Stockholm had been "audited" to conceal the payment of money to Lenin, Trotsky, and their associates, by order of the German Imperial Bank.

This report is endorsed in Lenin's initials,

"V.U." (Vladimir Ulianoff, his real name), for deposit in "the secret department" of the Bolshevik files. And the authenticity of the report is supported by Document No. 2, which is the original of a report sent by a German General Staff representative to the Bolshevik leaders, warning them that he has just arrested an agent who had in his possession the original order of the German Imperial Bank referred to in Document No. 1, and pointing out that evidently "at the proper time steps were not taken to destroy the above-mentioned documents."

Protocol Signed by Leaders.

Document No. 3 is the original protocol signed by several Bolshevik leaders, and dated 2 November, 1917 (Russian calendar), showing that "on instructions of the representatives of the German General Staff in Petrograd," and "with the consent of the Council of People's Commissars," of which Trotsky and Lenin were the heads, two incriminating German circulars had also been "taken from the Department of Counter Espionage of the Petrograd district," and given to the Intelligence Bureau of the German General Staff in Petrograd. On the bottom of the protocol the German adjutant acknowledges receipt of the two incriminating circulars with his cipher signature.

These two circulars apparently had been obtained early in the war by some Russian agent in Germany and transmitted to Russia. The German General Staff evidently wished to get them back in order to remove evidence. By the order of the German General Staff, and with the "consent" of Lenin and Trotsky, they are turned over to the Germans. Why? Because they fit in with other information of Germany's war plans and preparations before August, 1914. Indeed, several weeks before the assassination of the Austrian Archduke, which was made the pretext for war.

And Lenin and Trotsky surrender them in conformity with a working agreement between the Bolshevik leaders and the German General Staff, of which agreement a photograph is included in the series as Document No. 5.

This is dated 25 October, 1917. It is from a division of the German General Staff. It is addressed to the Government of the People's Commissars, of which Lenin and Trotsky were the heads. It begins: "In accordance with the agreement which took place in Kronstadt, in July of the present year, between officials of our General Staff and leaders of the Russian revolutionary army and democracy, Messrs. Lenin and Trotsky, Ras-kolnikov and Dybenko, the Russian Division of our General Staff operating in Finland is ordering to Petrograd officers for the disposal of the Intelligence Bureau of the staff." Among the officers named are Maj. Luberts and Lieut. Hartwig, whose cipher signature, Henrich, is given as it appears on the receipt for the two circulars accompanying Document No. 3. And an endorsement on this letter (No. 5) from the German General Staff records that the German officers assigned to Petrograd had appeared "before the military revolutionary committee" and had "agreed on conditions with regard to their mutual activities."

The Price of Betrayal.

What their "mutual activities" were to be is sufficiently indicated by Document No. 7, which is a photograph of a letter signed in cipher by this

Major Luberts and his adjutant, Lieut. Hartwig. They notify the Bolsheviki leaders, on 12 January, 1918 (Russian calendar), that "by order of the German General Staff," the German Intelligence Bureau "has reported the names and the characteristics of the main candidates for re-election" to the Russian Bolsheviki "Central Executive Committee," and "the General Staff orders us to insist on the election of the following persons." They add a list of Russian leaders satisfactory to the German General Staff. The list is headed by Trotsky and Lenin. They were elected, and the rest of the present Bolsheviki Executive Committee were chosen from the same German list.

Document No. 8 gives evidence of the *quid pro quo*. It is a photograph of a letter from the representative of the German Imperial Bank to the Bolsheviki Commissar of Foreign Affairs. It is marked "Very secret," and dated 8 January, 1918. It says: "Notification has to-day been received by me from Stockholm that 50,000,000 roubles of gold has been transferred to be put at the disposal of the People's Commissars," which is the title of the Bolsheviki leaders. "This credit," the letter continues, "has been supplied to the Russian Government in order to cover the cost of the keep of the Red Guards [the Bolsheviki revolutionary troops] and agitators in the country. The Imperial Government considers it appropriate to remind the Council of People's Commissars of the necessity of increasing their propaganda in the country, as the antagonistic attitude of the South of Russia and Siberia to the existing Government in Russia is troubling the German Government."

The Loot of an Empire.

Four days later the same representative of the German Imperial Bank sent another 5,000,000 roubles to the same address to provide for the sending of a Russian revolutionary leader to Vladivostok to get possession of the "Japanese and American war materials" at that port, and, if necessary, to destroy them. A photograph of his letter is given as Document No. 9.

There were earlier payments, but probably none later than these. None was necessary. By this time the loot of an empire lay open to the Bolsheviki—and to the Germans.

Most significant of all are two photographs of further communications from the German Imperial Bank, given as Documents Nos. 10 and 11. One is a letter addressed to the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, and the other is the "resolution of a conference of representatives of the German commercial banks" received by the Chairman of the Bolsheviki Central Executive Committee, and endorsed by his secretary. Together they give a complete synopsis of the terms on which Germany intends to have control of all Russian industries.

For five years from the signing of peace English, French, and American capital in Russia is to be "banished," and "not to be allowed in the following industries: coal, metallurgical, machine building, oil, chemical, and pharmaceutical." These industries are to be developed under the control of a "supreme advisory organ, consisting of ten Russian specialists, ten from the German industrial organisations and the German and Austrian banks." Germany and Austria are to "enjoy the unlimited privilege of sending into Russia mechanics and qualified workmen." "Other foreign mechanics and workmen . . . are not to be allowed to enter at all" for five years after the conclusion of peace between Russia and Germany. "Private banks in Russia arise only with the consent" of the Union of German and Austrian banks. And so forth.

Conspiracy is Indorsed.

And this conspiracy between German Imperial capitalism and the pretended Russian Reds is indorsed by a Bolsheviki leader, with the recommendation that it should be "taken under advisement" and "the ground prepared in the Council of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies, in case the Council of People's Commissars will not accept these requests."

Various details of the conspiracy between the Bolsheviki leaders and the German General Staff are exposed in documents Nos. 16 to 29. These are photographs of letters which passed between the Bolsheviki leaders and the German General Staff, or the German officers in Russia. Document No. 21 shows that on 1 November, 1917, when Russia was still regarded as an ally of Great Britain, France, and America, the German General Staff was having "the honour to request" the Bolsheviki leaders to inform it "at the earliest possible moment" concerning "the quantity and storage place of the supplies which have been received from America, England, and France, and also the units which are keeping guard over the military stores."

Document 18 shows the German General Staff requiring the Bolsheviki leaders to send "agitators to the camps of the Russian prisoners of war in Germany," in order that they might procure spies to work among the English and French troops and to further "peace propaganda." And this is proposed by the German General Staff as being "according to the negotiations between the Russian and German peace delegations at Brest-Litovsk."

In Document 22 the Bolsheviki leaders and the Germans are arranging to send "agents-agitators and agents-destructors" out of Vladivostok "to ports of the United States, Japan, and British colonies in Eastern Asia."

An Organised Treason.

In Document 16 Trotsky is providing fraudulent passports for German officers who are going to England, France, and America as spies and enemy agents. And Document 17 shows Trotsky indorsing a similar proposal: "To be urgently executed.—L. T."

Three German submarines are to be sent to the Pacific on the trans-Siberian railway by orders of the German High Command in Document No. 23. Lists of German and Russian spies watching the British, French, and American embassies in Petrograd are given in Document No. 25. And, finally, in Document No. 15, the Bolsheviki leaders are warned that information concerning "the connection of the German Government with the Bolsheviki workers" has leaked out and that Russian troops are hearing of it.

Letters are given to show how the Bolsheviki leaders and the German officers arranged for the assassination of Russian Nationalist leaders (Documents 35, 39, and 52), for the destruction of the Polish legionaries in the Russian Army (Documents 40 to 42), for the disorganisation of the Roumanian Army and the deposing of the Roumanian King (Document No. 37), for the substitution of officers satisfactory to Germany in command of Russian troops instead of patriotic Russian generals (Documents 31 and 32), for the suppression of patriotic agitation among the Russian soldiers (Documents 13 and 14), for an attack upon the Italian Ambassador in Petrograd and the theft of his papers (Documents 26 and 27), and for the employment of German soldiers in Russian uniforms against the Russian national armies in the south (Document 35).

Several of the letters are indorsed by Trotsky. Even standing alone, they are complete proof that the Bolshevik leaders were ruling as German agents in Russia, and obeying German orders to act against all Germany's enemies and even against Russia itself.

Helping German Junkers.

Moreover, these Bolshevik leaders acted as German agents by suppressing their own Socialist revolution in the Russian provinces where their doctrines interfered with German plans of annexation. Document 46 is the original letter from the Petrograd Intelligence Bureau of the German General Staff addressed to the Bolshevik Commissar of Foreign Affairs. It reads: "According to instructions of the representative of our General Staff, I have the honour once more to insist that you recall from Esthonia, Lithuania, and Courland all agitators of the Central Executive Committee of the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies." And in Document 47 the General Staff orders the Bolshe-

viki to cease the agitation in Esthonia which had "finally led to the local German landlords being declared outlawed," and to "take immediate steps for the restoring of the rights of the above-mentioned German landlords."

Another group of letters (Nos. 33 to 36) shows how the Germans cheated the Bolshevik leaders in their dealings with the Ukraine, and made a separate German peace with the anti-Bolshevik leaders in that Russian province. And another group shows the Germans assisting both sides of the civil war in Finland (Documents 38, 43, and 53).

The documents, as they follow, are given in the main in the report form in which they were transmitted by Mr. Sisson to Mr. Creel, Chairman of the Committee, with some later data added and carefully indicated. For instance, Mr. Sisson did not learn until several weeks after he had left Russia that the German order (which he possessed) naming the Russian who was to "defend" Petrograd had been obeyed.

TWO DOCUMENTS FROM MR. SISSON'S REPORT.

Photographs are given below of two very important documents included in Mr. Sisson's report summarised above. These are of special importance, as they prove conclusively—

- (1) That the Bolsheviks were agents of German capitalism, and
- (2) That the Germans began to mobilise at least as early as 9 June, 1914.

DOCUMENT NO. 3.

V.K. (Military Commissariat) D. No. 323—two enclosures.

consent of the Council of People's Commissars from the papers of the Department of Counter Espionage of the Petrograd district and the former Department of Police (Okhrana) on instructions of the representatives of the German General Staff in Petrograd.

1. Circular of the German General Staff No. 421, dated 9 June, 1914, concerning the immediate mobilisation of all industrial enterprises in Germany, and

2. Circular No. 93, dated 28 November, 1914, of the General Staff of the High Sea Fleet, concerning the sending into enemy countries of special agents for the destruction of war supplies and materials.

The above-mentioned circulars were given over under signed receipt into the Intelligence bureau of the German Staff in Petrograd.

Authorised by the Council of People's Commissars.

F. ZALKIND.
E. POLIVANOFF.
MERKHANOSHIN
A. JOFFE.

(illegible, but may be)

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

ПРОТОКОЛЪ

Сей протоколъ составленъ нами 2-го ноября 1917 года съ целью окончательной изъяснить, что нами съ согласия Совета Народныхъ Комиссаровъ изъ дѣла Контра-Разведочнаго Отдѣленія Петроградскаго Округа и бывш. Департамента Полиціи, по порученію представителя Германскаго Генеральнаго Штаба въ Петроградѣ извлечены: 1. Циркуляръ Германскаго Генеральнаго Штаба № 421 отъ 9-го Іюня 1914 г. о немедленной мобилизаціи всѣхъ промышленныхъ предприятий въ Германіи и 2. Циркуляръ Генеральнаго Штаба Флота Открытаго Моря № 93 отъ 28-го Ноября 1914 г. о послыльчю въ разныя страны специальныхъ агентовъ для разведки военныхъ запасовъ и матеріаловъ. Указанные циркуляры переданы подъ росписку агентамъ Отдѣленія Германскаго Штаба въ Петроградѣ

полномоченныя Совета Народныхъ Комиссаровъ

[Handwritten signatures]

Одновременно съ этимъ протоколомъ циркуляры № 421 и 93, а также списокъ предприятий, изъ протокола вложенны 3-го ноября 1917 г. Разведочнымъ Отдѣленіемъ В.К. въ Петроградѣ.

Адмиралъ *[Signature]*

Document Number 3 Facsimile of Protocol

ПРОТОКОЛЪ.

This protocol, drawn up by us on the 2nd November, 1917, in duplicate, declares that we have taken with the

GR. GENERALSTAB.
CENTRAL ABTHEILUNG

Section M.

№...
Berlin

CIRCULAR

vom 9 Juni 1914

an Bezirkscommandanten.

Nach 24 Stunden vom Empfang des vorliegenden Circulars alle Besitzer der Industrieunternehmungen telegraphisch zu benachrichtigen die Pakete mit mobilisations-gewerblichen graphischen Darstellungen und Plänen zu eröffnen, die im Circular der Kommission von Graf Waldersee und Caprivi vom 27 Juni 1887 angewiesen sind.

№ 421 Der Mobilisationsabtheilung.

Document No. 3—Facsimile of June 9 Circular

Gr. General Staff—Central Division—Section M No—Berlin.
Circular of June 9th, 1914, to District Commanders.

Within 24 hours of receipt of this circular, you are to inform all industrial concerns by wire that the documents with industrial mobilization plans and with registration forms be opened, such as are referred to in the circular of the Commission of Count Waldersee and Caprivi of 27 June, 1887.

No. 421 Mobilization Division.



THE OUTLOOK IN IRELAND.

Both parties in Ireland took advantage of St. Patrick's Day for a vigorous prosecution of the election campaign. As the entire daily Press is on the side of the Free State, and refers only briefly and for the purpose of denunciation to the Republican meetings, it is hard to form an accurate opinion as to the degree of support which either party is obtaining, but from casual statements which appear, it is obvious that in many cases the Free State party are meeting with considerable opposition. But whatever the attitude of the Press may be, it is beyond all doubt that the general view is that the events of the week-end give serious grounds for pessimism, and the outlook is considered to be becoming daily more menacing, not merely on the Northern frontier, but in most parts of the South.

The Fight to Go On.

Mr. Collins expresses the Free State view: "We have already secured the recognition of that right (i.e., the fundamental right to whatever form of freedom we please), and we mean now to exercise that right," differing little from the views he expressed last autumn. "I said Irish freedom was coming, not because of any action of our enemies, but on account of the strength of our position, and we will not stop until Irish freedom is secured." In other words, the Treaty is in no sense final, and is open to any interpretation that may be convenient, while Mr. de Valera refuses to abandon the position that if the Treaty is accepted the honour of the Irish nation is bound to a strict observation of the terms. He is very explicit: "If the Treaty was accepted, the fight for freedom would still go on, and the Irish people, instead of fighting foreign soldiers, would have to fight the Irish soldiers of an Irish Government set up by Irishmen. They would have to wade through Irish blood in order to get Irish freedom." Language like this, applauded at crowded meetings, must unquestionably have a disturbing effect on the public mind, and give rise to anxiety as to the future which no statement of the Press that the country is solidly in favour of the Treaty can allay.

And it is certain that the fight can be carried on for the present strength of the Republicans, even if below that of the Free Staters, is far beyond the strength of the entire Sinn Fein organisation in 1917-18, and possesses nearly all the brain power that enabled the rebellion to be carried on till the surrender of England was achieved while the Free State party are pursuing the policy of "Freedom by Stepping Stones," which led to the downfall of the Nationalist Party, and is now only saved from repudiation by the war-weariness of the bulk of the population of the South.

The End in View.

The possible results of the election and the effects of a victory of either party is discussed in the Sinn Fein Press.

It is said the Republicans may win, in which case the political division will encourage England to threaten reconquest, which she cannot, it is said, afford either materially or otherwise to carry out; but she may bluff and make a show of violence, but if Ireland holds firm she will get, before there has

been much reconquest, an offer all can accept. A Free State victory, on the other hand, will arouse the fiercest passions to such a degree that the peaceful formation of the Free State will be impossible, for if the Provisional Government cannot make Ireland peaceful now when she has the support of the I.R.A., how can it be expected to do so when it is compelled to disarm and disband the I.R.A. to fulfil the terms of the Treaty?

The third possibility, which is considered by far the most favourable, is that the parties should combine and make a united demand for complete independence. It has always been said that when England was weak enough to offer Colonial Home Rule she would have to go further if forced, and accept the inevitable result of Ireland's determination and recognise the Republic; England is far weaker now than in December last, and her difficulties are greatly increased by the position in India, Egypt, and South Africa. The Articles of Agreement are an enormous asset to the Empire, because they are postponing the struggle in Ireland, and by a certain section accepting the Articles the reputation of England is being whitewashed. The quickest way, then, for freedom to come is for each of the "oppressed" nations—India, Egypt, and Ireland to continue to exert a strong pressure.

England the Enemy.

The possibility of this course being adopted is by no means remote, for if Mr. de Valera carries on his fiery campaign with any degree of success large numbers will come to his side, who, seeing that a conflict is imminent, would naturally prefer to the horrors of civil war a war carried on against a "foreign" enemy, for whom the bitterest hatred is still being sedulously fostered.

Another inducement is that, while a civil war, from the bitter animosities that would arise, would be a fight to a finish, a war with England could reasonably be expected to result within a short time in a complete surrender to Irish aims. The probability of some such combined effort is increased by the desire for unity in the Sinn Fein ranks, as exemplified in the Ard Fheis agreement and on other occasions, the presence of many genuine Republicans among the Free State supporters, and the undoubted identity of the real aims of both parties, for it cannot be too strongly emphasised that the only difference between the two is in the means of attaining their end, for, while the Republicans advocate the open and straightforward method of gaining their ends at once and by force, if necessary, the Free Staters are prepared to reach their goal by the acceptance of and the subsequent repudiation of the Treaty when once evacuation has been completed.

Mr. Churchill's Threat.

The present attitude of the British Government affords strong grounds for the belief that this course would have a very fair prospect of success. The alternative to the non-acceptance of the Treaty was at first war, but now, according to Mr. Churchill, the alternative is to be the exercise of economic pressure; in other words, the Government propose in that case to assist Sinn Fein in what has always been a prominent feature of their policy, to make Ireland economically independent of England.

Whether this part of Sinn Fein's policy is feasible or not is immaterial, but it is certain that the weakness and vacillation of His Majesty's Government, and their failure to make a clear and definite pronouncement that the terms of the Treaty, if accepted, are to be rigidly adhered to, and are incapable of modification, is playing into the hands of those fomenting discord in Ireland, and is rapidly bringing the country to the verge of civil war.

The Rule of the Gunmen.

It is not merely the course of the election campaign that is causing anxiety. Reports come in of conflicts between the I.R.A. and Free Staters, while from different parts of the country accounts are received of episodes similar to the occupation of Limerick, which, though unsuccessful, are thought to point to the fact that a trial of strength between the rival factions in the army is imminent.

The proclamation by the Free State Cabinet of the Convention of the I.R.A. is causing considerable ill-feeling. The grounds for the suppression are that "it was proposed to endeavour to remove the Army from under the control of the Government elected by the people, which is Dail Eireann," the result of which would be the creation of a military dictatorship. The resolution which was to have been moved was, "That the army reaffirms its allegiance to the Irish Republic," and "that it shall be maintained as the army of the Irish Republic under an Executive appointed by the Convention." The attitude of the "Cabinet" is hard to explain in the light of the statement in the House of Commons that nine-tenths of the I.R.A. obeyed the orders of the Provisional Government, for if this statement had been really true, the safest course in the present transitional period would surely have been to have allowed the Convention to take place, and trust to the overwhelming majority of loyal Free Staters to rout the malcontents, thereby winning a very considerable victory for the Treaty. Now it is openly stated that the suppression was only announced when the delegates had been selected and it became apparent that a large majority of the army were opposed to the Treaty. Now that the Convention has taken place in spite of the proclamation, the Government is openly humiliated and a "military" dictatorship or Soldiers and Workmen's Council is the almost certain result.

An Automocracy.

The I.R.A. will be governed by their own Executive, in the same way as when they were volunteers and had not sworn allegiance to the Dail. The position the army will hold in the future is a matter for the Executive, which will have the power, if it chooses to exercise it, to use force to prevent the elections, and if the elections result in a victory for the Free State, to decide whether the army will continue the fight for the Republic.

The Executive of the I.R.A., then, will be the sovereign power in the South, and it will also control the I.R.A. forces operating in Ulster. The truth is that the greater part of the South of Ireland is in a smouldering state needing only a spark to produce a huge conflagration, and it is impossible to attribute the great change that has taken place in the last two months to any other cause than the advance of Republicanism, yet the Lord Chancellor is ready with the confident assertion that Republicanism is beaten, and that the Treaty must win. He made no attempt, however, to produce the evidence on which his assertion was based, though shortly before he had made a startling admission of the impotence of the Provisional Government in

their failure to secure the release of the Clones "specials" still held in custody by the I.R.A. It is merely necessary to ask the question: Why, if Republicanism is dying out so rapidly, are the Free Staters compelled day after day to adopt a more Republican interpretation as to the meaning and effect of the Treaty?

The Attack on Ulster.

Great as is the likelihood of an outbreak in Southern Ireland, it is in the North that the real danger of civil war lies. The daily increase in the tension on the frontier, which Ministers state to be exaggerated and residents minimised in the daily Press; the constant raids and destruction of loyalists' property; the troubles in Belfast; and the resentment in the South at the proposed measures of the Northern Parliament to check disorder, all point in the one direction. In fact, it is now being urged that the whole South and West should sink their differences and take united action on behalf of the persecuted Nationalist victims of tyrannous legislation.

The attitude of the Government in the recent debates bears out the view attributed to one of the Committee at present drafting the Constitution that the Treaty "is tantamount to an agreement with England to bring economic pressure to bear on such of the North-East as survives the Boundary Commission." As no "amendment or improvement in the financial condition or political status of Northern Ireland can be effected without the consent of the Free State," it is on the Boundary Commission that reliance is placed for the final ruin and consequent submission of the Six Counties. It is probably safe to say that a decision of this Commission not in favour of the Free State will inevitably lead to civil war, if it does not come sooner. If civil war should come, what attitude will England adopt?

History Repeating Itself.

The Lord Chancellor said that in no case would England return, and if there was to be a war it would be with Irish blood and Irish money, and that it is satisfactory for England to be able to get Irish leaders and Irish forces to put down the turbulent population. In plain language, England is to be a monkey which, to save its own paw, uses the paw of a cat (Griffith and Collins) to draw the roasting chestnuts out of the fire, a truly undignified position for a great Empire, but one absolutely in accordance with the Sinn Fein view of British policy. The Prime Minister, on the other hand, said, speaking of separation, "It would lead Ireland to the most cruel and terrible civil war that Ireland has ever seen. And help would rush in from all sides, from every part of the world, to assist the parties that were fighting out the battle. We cannot witness a civil war of that kind at our door. It would involve our own people throughout the Empire and other peoples as well." Yet when the danger is imminent, and the safety of the Empire is thereby in jeopardy, the Government can stand idly by.

It is remarkable how history repeats itself in Ireland. Parliament, in the reign of Charles I., for the sake of its own party squabbles, refused to take measures for the relief of Ireland or to check the rebellion, though the "land was weltering in blood." If Parliament then was open to the charge of one of its supporters of "conniving at the rebellion," surely the same charge can be justly levelled against the conduct of Irish affairs in recent years and at the present time. Then a Cromwell was necessary to restore law and order; if and when the necessity arises will there be a Cromwell at hand?

TRADE UNION NOTES.

Sir,—Referring to the concluding paragraph in my notes last week in connection with the establishment of a compulsory secret ballot of trades unionists—after the manner of Parliamentary ballots—before any action is taken which would affect the nation generally, I have this last week made special efforts to find out what is the real feeling of as many of my fellow trades unionists on this matter as I possibly could, and I have found that there are a very large number indeed who are of opinion that the rank and file ought to be consulted on vital questions. This refers not only to railwaymen, but to many other important unions whose opinions I have been able to gather, and all agree, not only that there should be a ballot, but that the ballot should be secret, and this is one of the items that we are applying ourselves to accomplish.

It is a curious state of affairs that while an individual vote (for what it is worth) of the members of the miners and transport section of the Triple Alliance is necessary before these societies can call a general strike, the Executive Committee of the National Union of Railwaymen have power to call out the railwaymen without consulting them, and I remember very well being informed during the miners' strike, when there was a possibility of the railwaymen being brought out, that "we must be prepared to act on any instructions from headquarters in London of the N.U.R." I am quite certain, and I know there are many more of the same opinion, that when the Executive of the N.U.R. were given this power it was never intended that they should use it in that manner. This power of the Executive is looked upon with alarm by many members who believe in constitutional and democratic government, and the time has now arrived when the members should be consulted as to whether this should continue, and an opportunity given us to state definitely whether we still agree that the Executive should still be allowed to exercise this power. Things have moved very fast since they were given it, and it is essential today that our members should insist that their views should be ascertained before any action is taken, equally with the miners and transport workers, and also that the ballot should be secret.

Some few months ago, after a conversation with a number of my colleagues, I wrote a letter to the Press under the heading, "No Strike Before Ballot," appealing to my fellow trades unionists who favoured a ballot being taken before any drastic action was decided upon to communicate with me, the result being that I received a large number of letters and postcards from members of important trades unions in various parts of the country, many of them agreeing that not only was it necessary, but it ought to be made illegal for any strike to be called without every man in the union being consulted. We have been told that "the government of a trades union is upon lines similar to the government of the country. The majority rules through its executive or appointed leaders." But the election of the people's Executive to Parliament is carried out in a much more democratic manner than the election of the executive or appointed leaders in a trades union.

What is absolutely essential in order to bring about the establishment of a secret ballot is that it shall emanate from the rank and file themselves. That the desire for this is existent I have no doubts, but it is only at times when serious trouble arises and all sorts of things are threatened that one hears very much about any needed reform. It took a war to rouse many men, and when our

existence as a nation was threatened we did wake up, but it was after a long sleep, and many are again dozing off. What we are endeavouring to do is to stimulate sufficient interest in as many trades union branches as possible, in order that a resolution may be put (and passed) that, in the opinion of the branch, it is necessary that before any action is taken committing the members and affecting the community generally a ballot, and that a secret one, shall be taken of all members. That is all that is needed: A sufficient number of these sent from branches throughout the country to headquarters would soon have the desired effect. But there must be a demand from the members themselves, and the Executive Committee would soon act; if they did not, well, they would not be on the Executive Council next year. We must also bear in mind that while we are working to bring about these ballots there is also a movement on foot by the extremists for the abolition of such ballots as are now in force in some trades unions. In trades unions where now it is necessary to consult the members an agitation is on foot to make it competent for the executive to call a strike without consulting the rank and file, and I know that this is not an isolated case, but is part and parcel of a piece of engineering that will give greater power to executives.

We know that there has been a Trades Union Ballot Bill before the House of Commons during the last two years, but the rank and file of trades unions knew little, if anything, about it. No doubt it was a good Bill, but it was brought in by the wrong parties. It ought to have had as sponsor representatives of the workers, as it might have had, and had it been backed by the elected representatives of trades unions it would have received much more respect and support, and probably before now we should have had a "Trades Union Ballot Act" on the Statute Book, which, we are hoping, will be an accomplished fact before long, and it all rests with the rank and file, who, after all is said and done, are the only real masters of the situation.

(Guard) W. E. LOVEDAY, N.U.R.

FORGOTTEN THINGS.

Sir,—May I claim your hospitality to press two points upon the Government?

(1) The attempt to compass conciliation by tolerance signally failed; there is probably no case in history in which moderate counsels have triumphed in the midst of licence and disorder.

My friends and I warned the Government in June, 1917, that further release of Sinn Feiners would have a disastrous effect; we protested in October against the Republican doctrines which were being preached with impunity, and we have more recently pointed out that the release of hunger-strikers—of whom it is believed some 200 have eluded punishment in three months—made the law a farce and made the magistrates and police the sport of law-breakers. The success which has attended the firm stand taken by the Government in the last fortnight is the best comment on our contentions, but do the Government realise that their genuine desire for an Irish settlement coupled with inaction would have imposed on a new Irish Government, if formed, the odious task of restoring the law which they had allowed to lapse? No one was more conscious of this than the late Mr. Redmond.

(2) The only way in which the Government can help towards the happy result of Irish concord, which they and we desire, is to hold unflinchingly that persons sent for trial be tried, that persons sentenced shall serve their sentence, and that the law be applied to leaders as well as dupes. By this course a noisy minority of Irishmen will cease to cajole or terrorise a majority, and opportunity will be given to moderate men of all parties to join in countering a movement which is a reproach to Ireland and a danger to Great Britain, and which, if left unchecked, will frustrate the effort of the wisest statesmen to secure any amicable settlement of the Irish difficulty.—Yours, etc.,

Dublin, March 12, 1918.

MIDLETON.

REVIEWS.

"THE RED LIGHT"—WHEN LABOUR RULES.

"The Red Light" is a small book, written by Mr. Ernest E. Williams as a criticism of a work by the Rt. Hon. J. H. Thomas, M.P., called "When Labour Rules." Mr. Williams is a barrister, and used to weighing words and men, so that his interpretation and views on Mr. Thomas's Utopia are worth consideration. "The Red Light" is sold at 2s. 6d. by the *Freedom Association, Amberley House, Norfolk Street, W.C.2*, and some quotations from it given below will show its character:—

The leaders of the Labour Party are looking forward to control of the Government. During the war one or two of them were taken into the Government, but the party now aims at something much more ambitious than modest participation of that sort; it proposes to take complete control of the Governmental machine. One of its leaders, the Rt. Hon. J. H. Thomas, M.P., regards the fulfilment of that ambition as so near, that he has produced a book, in which he sketches out the policy which a Labour Party Government will pursue when it seizes the reins. . . . From the standpoint of the public desirous of learning the mind and methods and purpose of the Labour Party the choice of author is not altogether a happy one. Mr. Thomas has two voices—an extremist and a moderate voice. Usually the moderate voice is heard, but there are bewildering quick changes. It is the moderate voice that breathes through the book; but is it, I will not say the real, but the permanent voice? There is in the decoration of the volume a funny little symbol of what I mean. . . . The loose cover which enwraps it blazons forth a red flag. There you have Mr. Thomas.

The Labour Party's programme is not a programme of improvement of the existing order, it is a proposal to subvert the existing order. Mr. Thomas says: "*What is a revolution? I maintain that it is not necessarily a violent and bloody revolt, an orgy of outrage and assassination, an affair of red caps and barricades. A revolution may be perfectly bloodless and peaceful, and I maintain that we are in the midst of such a revolution at the present moment.*"

It is important to lay stress on this, because there are so many in the public of this country to-day—perhaps the great majority—who confuse revolution and violence; and because they see no imminent sign of the latter, blissfully assume that the former is a mere bogey. And thus they remain quiescent while the first battles of revolution are being fought and won, and the strategic positions are being occupied under their noses, making ultimate resistance the harder. . . . I have always dated the revolution from the occasion during the war when Mr. Asquith, then Prime Minister, called together trade union leaders, discussed the position of the war with them, and gave them information which he had not given to Parliament, and was withholding from the general public; thus sanctioning virtually the existence of a sort of unofficial and rival Parliament, unknown to the Constitution, contrary to the first principles of the Constitution, and representing a section of the nation only . . . a forerunner of the preposterous Council of Action.

Nationalisation

is the chief item in the programme of the Labour Party. It is the "*Socialisation of the Means of Production, Distribution, and Exchange*" (to quote the stock Socialist formula), which distinguishes our new political saviours from all others. . . . There is only one way by which the State could get more money out of the railways than is at present obtained, and that is by stealing them. Mr. Thomas says: "*The man whose money has been put into the mine will have similar objections (in handing it over for the good of the community), and even though he be bought out, he knows very well that he will, under Labour government, at all events, find himself heavily taxed, possibly by a capital levy. Suppose I own £100,000, and am told that out of that I must pay £25,000 as a levy. What the State does is to take £25,000 of War Stock that I hold and cancel it. It is only tearing up a few scraps of paper, after all, because, of course, the whole debt is one of paper.*" The compensation scrip to be awarded as purchase-money . . . will be handed out with one hand, and a demand for its return, as capital levy, with the other.

Should Labour Rule?

If the reader is not prepared to go at least as far as Mr. Thomas, he had better abandon any thought of supporting the Labour Party; and his policy is often unjust, often

impracticable, not infrequently incoherent. If this is the best platform which the Labour Party can erect, it is a structure which can only be condemned. . . . Let us grant that, at any rate, the most convenient method of government is by party. That does not justify a Labour Party. . . . Instead of intellectual sparring concerning measures and methods of government you then get hostile camps, whose mottoes are generated, not in thought, but in open and unabashed self-interest, and between whom there is real deadly warfare. That is what a Labour Party means. . . . If Mr. Thomas and his friends want a party of their own, let them have a Socialist Party. Socialism and Individualism are contrasted principles; and in view of the poor case for Socialism which Mr. Thomas has made in his book, it might be hoped that the adherents of that party would not be hurriedly called upon by the nation to rule it.

LABOUR TRUSTS.

A pamphlet with the above title, written by Major Theodore Rich, and for sale at 6d. by the Boswell Printing and Publishing Co., Ltd., of 2, Whitefriars Street, E.C.4, is a very instructive statement about modern trade unions: "their pretensions, their methods, and their influence on the State."

The treatment of the subject is original and impartial, because monopolies and trusts, whether of employers or of employees, are exposed and condemned, as against public interest. It is fashionable and intentionally misleading to perpetuate the old idea that trusts and monopolies are a wickedness peculiar to the employer class; and the pamphlet brings into light clearly the abuses and the destruction of liberty, which have been developed by the corruption of trade unions, through leadership which has quite other aims in view than the present betterment of labour conditions for the members of the unions. The public have been so misled on all matters connected with labour and trade unions that there cannot be too many of issues like this pamphlet for the gradual re-adjustment of the distorted perspective in which everything labelled "Labour" is viewed.

NOTES FROM INDIA.

An Englishman's Opinion.

At the annual meeting of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, Sir Robert Watson Smyth, the President, made interesting reference to the working of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms:—

"We have now had one year's experience in the working of the new Councils under the Reform Scheme, and I am afraid that the best that can be said on the subject is that the results might have been worse. The Council of State have given us a fairly dignified lead, as might be expected from men of that standing, but their powers are small, and though the sentiments which they have expressed from time to time are moderate in view and in expression, they have not been of any great assistance towards governing India during the past year. The Legislative Assembly, from which so much was expected, and by which so much must be done if the Reforms are to be anything but a farce, have been a disappointment. The bulk of their time has been taken up in discussing resolutions, many of a highly controversial and racial character, and the time and ability of the best men in the Assembly, both unofficial and official, have been utilised, not in trying to solve the problems of government, but in trying to keep extremists within limits. Weighty legislation is passed with comparatively no discussion at all. Government by resolution is a hopeless task, and the length to which this has been carried during the past year makes one's heart sink at the thought of these assemblies and councils ever being fit to govern this country. But the Legislative Assembly seem to be extremely pleased with their efforts, for with only a few months of experience, during which time their actual achievements were nil, they stoutly passed a resolution to the effect that, in their opinion, they had become so efficient that their ten years of probation should be waived, and that they were now ready to proceed with the next step towards complete self-government. Can any resolution be conceived that is more fatuous than that? Can any better proof be shown that the Legislative Assembly have not even begun to learn the lessons which the Government of India Act considered ten years was necessary for them to master?"

The Ilbert Bill Over Again.

On the subject of the attack upon the Europeans' right to trial by jury of their own countrymen, the President said:—

"The second danger ahead of us is the attack that is being made on our privileges and our liberties, better known as the Ilbert Bill controversy. There are possibly none of us here who remember the Ilbert Bill uproar in the early eighties, but there are some of us who came to India not long afterwards when the echoes of that trouble were still ringing in the air. That the Legislative Assembly should have roused all these old passions again within the first year of its existence is, to say the least of it, a great error in tactics. At the back of our minds—those of us, I mean, who openly declared for the Reforms, and promised to make them as much of a success as we could—there was always an uneasy feeling that we might be prejudicing our own rights, but I do not think that any of us ever thought that the attack would come at once within the first few months of the constitution of the Reformed Assembly.

"My advice to you, therefore, when the result of this committee comes out, unless it is favourable, is to show your teeth as soon as possible. I have been asked what we can do, or what we are going to do. My answer is that we are going to do everything that lies within our power. I am not, of course, going to give our plans away prematurely, nor am I going to indulge in threats, but I can assure the Legislative Assembly that if they pursue this course they are taking on a good deal more than they probably bargain for. In addition to what we can do out here, the public at home are at last rousing themselves to some interest in India, and they are beginning to see that law and order here is not as certain as it should be, and the lives and liberties of their kith and kin are not as safe as they ought to be.

The Treatment of the Indian Police.

The devotion of the Indian police to duty is one of the redeeming features of the present situation in India. Faced with grave dangers, overwhelmed with abuse, and subjected to intolerable and constant annoyance, the men of the force have shown courage and loyalty which are worthy of the highest praise. These men, who deserve so well of the community for their efforts to maintain order and protect the law-abiding, notoriously receive low pay, and suffer in most provinces, notably Bengal, from other serious disabilities. Yet we are told that no fewer than 19 non-official members took part in the general debate on the Budget in the Bengal Legislative Council on Monday, and "suggested all-round retrenchment, especially in the Police Department." Yet Bengal is the province in which the police have been suffering from inadequate food, owing to the smallness of their pay, and still suffer from the attacks of malaria and other diseases because of bad housing conditions and want of decent amenities.

The Bengal Legislative Council has distinguished itself by another exhibition of irresponsibility. By a majority of 20 it carried, against the opposition of the Government and in spite of cogent arguments adduced by Sir Henry Wheeler, a resolution in favour of a joint committee of inquiry into allegations of excesses by police and civil guards in Calcutta. It is this sort of thing, says the *Pioneer*, that makes Englishmen both in India and at home who are in sympathy with Indian political aspirations and with the policy laid down in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report and the Government of India Act almost despair of its ultimate success.

THE ENGINEERING "LOCK-OUT."

MAINTENANCE OF RIGHT OF EMPLOYERS TO EXERCISE MANAGERIAL FUNCTIONS.

The *Engineering and National Employers' Federations* have issued a statement of their position in the present dispute, and their general argument can be understood from the following extracts:—

Briefly stated, our position is this. We are responsible for carrying on this industry, which is as vital to the economic welfare of the country as any other; and since no one else offers to carry it on or is capable of doing so, we must, if it is to be carried on at all. But we find ourselves so hampered in the performance of this function that it is

becoming impossible to carry on in the present difficult circumstances.

The following typical instance demonstrates the difficulties under which the management are carrying on their establishments:—

The duties of a director of a firm took him frequently into the works. A shop steward objected to the director spending so much time in the works. A formal protest by the shop steward was lodged with the directors, the protest being accompanied by a detailed list of the time spent by the director in the shop.

1. A firm introduced a certain machine and took a man off another machine of the same class to operate it. The man raised no objection at first, but on the suggestion of the shop steward demanded a higher rate of pay, which was refused. He then demanded to be put back on the old machine, and on this being refused the rest of the men ceased work. In order to obviate unemployment it was arranged later that he should go back and that the new machine should stand idle. This dispute lasted ten months.

Semi-Skilled Men.

2. In another case a firm was prevented from employing semi-skilled men on machines, although similar machines in another department of the works doing exactly the same class of work had been operated by semi-skilled men for very many years. Union representatives intimated that if semi-skilled men were put on the machines or in the event of any of the semi-skilled men on the machines being taken ill, or leaving for any reason, and another semi-skilled man being put on to operate the machine in accordance with the firm's established practice, the skilled men in the employment of the firm would refuse to handle the work coming from such machines.

3. In a similar case eleven new machines lay idle for more than a year because the engineers would not allow them to be operated by machine-men perfectly competent to do so.

4. The fitters, erectors, turners, and machine-men employed by a firm ceased work because the firm refused to refix electric radiators on overhead cranes.

5. The pattern-makers employed by a firm ceased work because a new man had been taken on pending the settlement of a wages dispute; they had placed an embargo on the employment of new men.

6. The union refused to allow a man to work two machines in accordance with previous practice. Several such cases have recently occurred.

7. A union refused to allow their members to work on night shift unless the prior consent was obtained. In consequence a number of men who were unemployed were prevented from obtaining employment. The refusal to allow their members to work on night shift is not confined to one union or to one district.

8. In another case a firm requested moulders to go on night shift so that a particularly urgent job on which further orders depended might be expedited. The men declined to go on night shift, stating it was quite impossible for them to do so as it was against the instructions of the union, and if they did so they would be liable to a heavy fine.

9. Employers in many cases report that they have to be satisfied if moulders can be prevailed upon to work overtime of ten to thirty minutes to pour or feed a casting.

None of these cases, it will be observed, have to do with overtime. They are examples of interference with arrangements made for carrying on the ordinary work, and are constantly recurring in many forms. In some cases the union demands a return to pre-war practice and in others refuses it.

With regard to overtime, instances of refusal to allow it have recently become very numerous, and they include cases of repairs, breakdowns, and other urgent jobs which are exempted from restriction by the Agreement of September, 1920, and are supposed to be removed from the present dispute.

How Industry is Strangled.

A firm had a breakdown to an engine when running on a test bed. The men saw the necessity of working overtime and did so, but they were fined 10s. each by the district committee, and the fine was confirmed on appeal. The same firm had another breakdown during completion of a very important engine, for which a ship was waiting, and which would have brought more work to the district. The men were willing to work any overtime required, but were told by the local officials that they would be fined if they did so.

A firm had got very much behindhand with certain work—the delivery dates being long past and the clients pressing because the work had to pass through a particular machine which formed a "bottle-neck" in the process of output. Two hours' overtime on this machine would have enabled them to employ several more fitters and get the work done;

but permission was refused. It was impossible to get another machine or to put on a night shift.

In a similar case, the refusal of five turners to work overtime necessitated the discharge of 43 fitters, and, later, of 12 more fitters and 9 turners employed on different machines.

A firm report that their moulders are all obeying the union and refusing to work overtime. As a matter of fact, they all left the works one evening with a ladle full of molten metal in the crane.

A Moderate Demand.

We do not desire to "smash trade unionism." On the contrary, we are glad to work with the unions, and we do so regularly. All that we desire is an arrangement with them that will allow us to carry on the work. After protracted negotiations we came to such an arrangement with the executive of the Amalgamated Engineering Union last November, but it was rejected by the recent ballot, in which less than one-fourth of the members voted.

We do not claim the right to exercise autocratic and arbitrary control or to "reduce the unions to impotence"; nor did the November agreement do so. To assert that it does is to accuse the executive and the national and divisional organisers of totally abandoning the function of protecting the interests of their members. We have the most complete system that it is possible to devise for hearing and discussing objections or grievances on the part of the men, from the individual workman, who is heard at once, upwards through all the stages of discussion by his representatives to the appeal court of a national conference.

This system is in constant operation. What we ask is to be relieved of arbitrary interference with the execution of work in progress. It is generally recognised that this is incompatible with the conduct of any business.

CORRESPONDENCE.

NOTE.—While inviting correspondence, the Editor takes no responsibility for the opinions expressed.

To the Editor.

COMMUNISM IN THE UNIVERSITIES.

Sir,—Sufficient attention has not been paid to the action of Dr. Farnell, Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University, in relation to Communism, nor has it been adequately appreciated. Dr. Farnell is a discerning, prescient, and courageous man, and he has set a fine example to all men who occupy public positions of responsibility.

Emboldened by the too great tolerance mistakenly extended to the Labour Party in the Universities (from which it ought to have been excluded from the very first), certain undergraduates began to propagate Communist ideas, first in "New Oxford," the organ of the Oxford Labour Club, and afterwards in "Free Oxford." The whole movement was simply an impudent attempt to corrupt the youth of Oxford University by spreading the dishonest, revolutionary, and filthy tenets of Communism.

"New Oxford" supported the coal strike, preached revolution in its most extreme and violent forms, and insulted the King by comparing him, not to his advantage, with George Lansbury! The Labour Club promptly disowned the editor and his words and works, but the University authorities, again foolishly lenient, overlooked the offence, flagrant as it was. Whereupon the dismissed editor started another paper, "Free Oxford," which pelted the Vice-Chancellor with vulgar personal abuse. Dr. Farnell was then driven to do what he ought to have done at first, to take drastic action, and the two undergraduates mainly responsible were expelled from the University. And serve them right! They suffered no injustice at all—in fact, they were let off too lightly.

Yet certain supposedly reputable newspapers have denounced the Vice-Chancellor as a mediævalist because he has attempted to purge the University of the corruptions of Communism, and to keep it free from that loathsome disease; and they have attacked him as an enemy of free speech and a free Press, and as a political obscurantist and tyrant. This is a palpable misrepresentation of the facts, so gross a perversion indeed as to constitute a virtual falsehood.

For the issue was not political at all; to call it so is a misuse of terms. Communism is not a political system; it is a condition of anarchy, corruption, and destruction. The issue was Order v. Anarchy, Morality v. Immorality, Civilisation v. Savagery.

What are we to think of editors who constitute themselves the champions of these ill-mannered and violent young

revolutionists, and denounce the Vice-Chancellor for doing what was obviously his bare duty—and doing it tardily? Have such men any sense of responsibility at all? Do they care for anything under the sun except to titillate and captivate the ears of the too gullible public, and to increase their circulation and their revenues?

It is a lamentable fact that all our Universities are becoming infected with Socialism and Communism, and that in many of them the most violent propaganda against capital is allowed to go on unchecked. At the same time nearly every University is appealing to capitalists for help. Rich men would do well to turn a deaf ear to all these appeals until University authorities can clear themselves of all complicity in these attempts to confiscate property and upset social order.—I am, etc.,
ANTI-JACOBIN.

"A QUESTION TO BE ASKED."

Sir,—In the House of Commons on the 20th, Mr. Chamberlain was asked if the recent revolution on the Rand had been traced to Russian Bolshevik activities, and he replied that he knew nothing about it. On the same day Mr. Cecil Hammsworth said he knew nothing about the number of people executed by the Soviet authorities, though the Soviet report placed them at 1,766,000. Do the Government know anything?
H. W. W.

Torquay, March 21, 1922.

A CONSERVATIVE LEADER.

Sir,—I should like to join Mr. E. James in suggesting to the Duke of Northumberland that he errs in expecting salvation to come from the rank and file. He might just as well assume that the ranks are to blame for the present lack of leadership. No, sir; there is needed a sterling man who knows how to marshal the forces under him and carry through a sound policy without deviation; and I suggest that a real man would make the head swiveller and his attendant gimbals gyrate into the seclusion of their orbital verbiages with a national acceleration, sudden and complete. Conservatives keep getting in, the voting grows conservatively, people are curbing their ideals—the facts of the situation are being realised. But the leader lags.

May I ask his Grace for his suggestions? He is a real good protagonist.—Yours faithfully,

W. W. STRAFFORD.

Parkbrooke, Hampton-on-Thames, 27 March, 1922.

Sir,—May I say how heartily I endorse the views expressed by Mr. James in his letter to you of the 13th inst. At the present moment the "Diehards" alone represent the opinion of the constitutional party in this country. They have done, and are still doing, service of such value to the cause of honour and patriotism as to inspire one with feelings of the strongest gratitude and respect. Can they not add to their already great work by seeking for, and finding, a leader who will know how to "inspire" the constitutional party in its conflict with the disguised and undisguised forces of treachery, disloyalty and anarchy?

I think there is little doubt that the Lord Chancellor and Mr. Austen Chamberlain have so lost the confidence of the constitutional party that their influence amongst the ranks of true and loyal Conservatives is dead. Speaking for myself, I know that I should never vote for any candidate who is in the remotest degree associated with their opportunist policy of surrender and betrayal. The genuine Conservatives, who love their country above all personal interests, will not fail at the next election to mark the contempt they feel, not only for the so-called Conservative leaders in the House of Commons, but also for the rank and file, who have time after time in the division lobby betrayed the principles they were elected to uphold. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that a man should be found to give the lead in these troubled times.

" . . . A man with heart, head, hand,
Like some of the simple, great ones gone
For ever and ever by,
One still strong man in a blatant land,

Who can rule and dare not lie."

—Yours faithfully, S. H. LYNN (Colonel).

Sydenham Manor, near Bridgwater, Somerset.
March 25, 1922.

THE MISUSE OF PUBLIC HALLS.

Sir,—Is it not high time that society should cease to allow the Labour Party to use its machinery in the shape of public halls, newspapers, etc., as weapons of attack against society itself?

The scandal of the public halls is particularly flagrant, the latest instance being the prostitution of the St. Pancras Town Hall to the propaganda of Communism. Who is responsible for this outrage—this insult to the ratepayers of St. Pancras as a whole? Presumably the town hall is the property of the entire body of the citizens. Why, then, should it be let to revolutionists, whose aim is to disrupt and overturn society? Surely, there are citizens in St. Pancras patriotic and public-spirited enough to call to account those who have thus betrayed the interests of the community.

The proprietors of the Albert Hall, the Memorial Hall, and the Central Hall have been flagrant sinners. The Central Hall belongs to the Wesleyans, and the Memorial Hall to the Congregationalists, and they were built mainly by the contributions of capitalists, who now see these buildings utilised by Socialists and Communists for their infamous propaganda. It is known to me that many Congregationalists and Wesleyans, both lay and clerical, are grieved and indignant that their property should be misused in this way.

In some respects the case of the Albert Hall is the most scandalous of all. If there is a building which should have been kept free from the polluting touch of Communism and revolution it is clearly this, which is peculiarly associated with the Royal Family by its name, and which has been an especial resort of the aristocracy, the upper and middle classes. The building represents an enormous amount of capital, and it is owned by capitalists. Why the directors and shareholders permit it to be perverted and degraded by letting it to the enemies of society is a mystery. They certainly deserve public reprobation.

Cannot THE PATRIOT take up this matter in earnest, and devise measures for putting an end to this scandal and for bringing home to those who have the charge of these buildings a sense of their responsibility?

LEXOPHILUS.

[We understand that the directors of the Albert Hall were threatened with a stoppage of their electric light unless they let their hall to the Bolsheviks. Failing any satisfactory assurance of protection from the Government, they were fain to submit.—Editor, THE PATRIOT.]

Sir,—I am standing as a candidate for the St. Pancras Guardians for Ward II at the election of April 5.

I am glad to see you complain of the action of the Labour Party in letting the Town Hall to the Communists. We are making a very strong point of it in our campaign.

I shall be most grateful if, through the medium of your paper, you will allow me to invite any St. Pancras ratepayers who oppose Bolshevism to help us in our fight to turn out the Labour Party.

I am very thankful that people of good intent have started THE PATRIOT, because I think it is time we should join together to defend the honour of our country.—Yours truly,

(MRS.) JOSEPHINE M. CAMERON.

4, Huddleston Road, N.7, 24th March, 1922.

Sir,—The letter by "R. H. G." in your issue of the 16th of March on "Communist Terrorism in London," and his article in THE PATRIOT of the 23rd of March on "The Communist Congress" confirms my desire to press on your consideration, and appeal, in your noble columns, to the Die-Hards and to loyal Conservatives to discountenance representatives of Britain proceeding to Genoa, and to take immediate steps to urge upon Parliament further drastic prohibition to the constant flow into this distracted country of all alien Jews and criminals from Europe and America as since the Armistice.

Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Shortt, and Mr. Churchill, with the Jewish cabal ("Vein of Treachery") in our Government, have deliberately encouraged this influx of foreign Jew agitators amongst our people here, as well as in Africa, Ireland, and other parts of the Empire.

The immigration of foreign Jew agitators is part of the plan of the alien conspiracy to disturb all Christian countries towards the accomplished fate of Russia under Jew atrocity autocracy; it is one of the main roots of our industrial troubles in Great Britain.

The eighty-four signatories to the Manifesto of Conservative Principles of Government might take speedy action to bring the necessary drastic prohibition, by an amending Bill, into effective practice.

I venture to urge this appeal, being a subscribing member to the National Constitutional Association, through your columns, to members of the House of Lords and to Colonel Page Croft, C.M.G., M.P., Sir Herbert Nield, K.C., M.P., and other members of the House, if only for the sake of our beautiful English women, wives, and granddaughters.—I am, yours faithfully,

A. TOULMIN SMITH (A.I.P.).

The Farmer's Club, 2, Whitehall Court, S.W.1,
and Oxford and County Club, Oxford.

27th March, 1922.

A GLOSSARY OF POLITICAL AND LABOUR TERMS.

NO. 8.

As there is a demand for definition of many terms recently introduced in journalism, the following will be continued week by week.

R.

Reconstruction.—The effort to recover from the material losses of the war and the demoralisation of the social and industrial systems. It has been calculated that the actual indebtedness of the country to-day, huge as it is, is no heavier burden, relative to the wealth and productive capacity of the nation, than was the public indebtedness after the Napoleonic wars. On the conditions to be faced in the past, Macaulay wrote in one of his Essays of 1829: "We see in almost every part of the annals of mankind how the industry of individuals, struggling up against wars, taxes, famines, conflagrations, mischievous prohibitions, and more mischievous protections, creates faster than Government can squander, and repairs whatever invaders can destroy. . . . How small will that distress (1829) appear when we think over the history of the last forty years: a war compared with which all other wars sink into insignificance; taxation such as the most heavily taxed people of former times could not have conceived; a debt larger than all the public debts that ever existed in the world added together; the food of the people studiously rendered dear; the currency imprudently debased and imprudently restored. Yet is the country poorer than in 1790? We firmly believe that, in spite of all the misgovernment of her rulers, she has been almost constantly growing richer and richer." The recovery of the United States from the losses of the great Civil War was far more rapid than the recovery of other nations in previous ages. To-day the impoverishment of the world is great; and competition industrially between countries very severe; and all efforts for recovery are handicapped by Socialist opposition, trade union corruption, and revolutionary internationalism.

Red Flag.—The banner of all who propose to destroy existing social order: a war-song of the English-speaking revolutionaries and extremists. It was sung in Court in May, 1917, at the trial of eight shop-steward instigators of munition strikes by their sympathisers. The first verse is:—

The people's flag is deepest red; It ahrouted oft our martyr'd dead,

And ere their limbs grew stiff or cold, Their hearts' blood dyed its every fold.

Chorus:

Then raise the scarlet standard high! Within its shade we'll live and die;

Though cowards flinch and traitors sneer, We'll keep the Red Flag flying here.

Red Press.—(See list of revolutionary papers at end of Glossary.)

Red Sunday Schools.—Schools for the teaching of Socialism and class-war and undermining religious influence.

Right to Work.—A theory that the State must find work for all wanting it, or support them—a policy which, whenever put in practice, means bankruptcy for the State, and increasing idleness for the people. (See **Commune**.)

S.

Sabotage.—Destruction of property; spoiling or destroying work secretly. Advocated by the I.W.W. as an addition or alternative to the strike.

Salariat.—The body of workers who are paid for their labour or services by the month or the year. When the payment is by the day or week it is described by some people as "wage-slavery."

Scab.—One who takes less than trade-union wages, or does too much work per day, or takes the place of a trade unionist on strike.

Shop-Stewards.—The establishment of these is part of the **Rank-and-File Movement**, which came into public notice early in 1916, and was worked chiefly by the I.L.P., assisted by all the revolutionaries in the country. It was a movement to destroy the authority of the old trade union leaders; to undermine discipline; to work on the wilder members of the unions; and to start strikes locally all over the country and then force the Government into concession after concession so as to secure the domination of labour; and if possible, compel the nation to ask for peace on any terms from the Germans. Some of the strikes forced the Government to threaten conscription of the strikers who did not return to work; and in one case eight of the Shop-Steward officials were arrested and tried, but let off with a warning; later one of them was imprisoned for six months for seditious language at the Albert Hall. The general effect of the policy of those controlling the movements has been to make it impossible to bargain with trade unions, for their regular officials cannot bind the rank-and-file, who are under revolutionary influence. No contracts are binding, all sense of honour is destroyed, and restriction of output has become firmly established. The organisation of Shop-Stewards and Workers' Committees is in close co-operation with the anarchic I.W.W., and in communion with the Bolshevik **Third Internationale** of Moscow.

(To be continued.)

THE PATRIOT

No. 8.—Vol. 1.

30 MARCH, 1922.

PRICE SIXPENCE.
REGISTERED AT THE G.P.O. AS A NEWSPAPER.

THE PATRIOT.

THE PATRIOT was started on 9th February, 1922, and is published weekly, on Thursdays, at 6d. per copy, or 7d. post free. Readers finding any difficulty in procuring copies can either order through the usual agents or direct from the publishers—

THE BOSWELL PRINTING & PUBLISHING CO., LTD.,
2, Whitefriars Street, London, E.C.4.

Back numbers can still be supplied, either direct or through the trade at the original price.

DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND'S FUND.

The following Publications can be obtained free on application from the

PUBLICITY DEPARTMENT,
THE BOSWELL PRINTING & PUBLISHING CO., Ltd.,
2, Whitefriars Street, London, E.C.4.

LIST OF PAMPHLETS.

- The Conspiracy Against the British Empire.
- The Truth About the Coal Strike.
- The Revolutionary Aspect of the Miners' Strike.
- Some Leading Facts of the Conspiracy Against the British Empire.
- The Plot Against Trade Unionism.
- The Plot Against Britain (By John Briton).
- The Attack on the Empire.
- The Government's Irish Policy.
(Speech by the Duke of Northumberland at Newcastle on 29th October, 1921.)
- The League of Nations (By John Briton),
with introduction by the Duke of Northumberland.

LIST OF LEAFLETS.

- The Coal Strike. What is Behind it?
To British Workers.
- Ireland.—Finding of the Royal Commission.
- Federalism Perverted (By Richard Jebb).

BOOKS TO BE READ.

- | | PRICE. |
|--|--------|
| The Limits of Pure Democracy - | 15/- |
| Author—W. H. Mallock. Publishers—Chapman & Hall. | |
| Democracy at the Crossways - | 15/- |
| Author—F. J. C. Hearnshaw. Publishers—Maemillan & Co. | |
| The Red Light - - - - | 2/6 |
| Author—Ernest E. Williams. Publishers—Freedom Association. | |
| Red Terror and Green - - - | 6/- |
| Author—R. Dawson. Publishers—John Murray. | |
| Disloyalty - - - - - | 6/- |
| Author—Harold Owen. Publishers—Hurst & Blackett. | |
| Unpopular Opinions - - - - | 6/- |
| Author—Harold Owen. Publishers—Erskine Macdonald, Ltd. | |
| The French Revolution - - - | 21/- |
| Author—Nesta H. Webster. Publishers—Constable & Co., Ltd. | |
| The World Revolution - - - | 18/- |
| Author—Nesta H. Webster. Publishers—Constable & Co., Ltd. | |
| The World at the Cross Roads - | 12/6 |
| Author—Boris Brasol. Copies from The Britons,
62, Oxford Street, W. | |
| The Saving of Democracy - - - | 1/- |
| Author—Rev. Prebendary A. W. Gough.
Publishers—National Review. | |
| The Coal Crisis - - - - - | 1/- |
| Author—W. Livesey. Publishers—Simpkin Marshall. | |
| Lest We Forget - - - - - | 6d. |
| A Pamphlet published by Vacher & Sons, Ltd. | |
| Labour Trusts - - - - - | 6d. |
| Author—T. Rich. Publishers—Boswell Printing & Publishing
Co., Ltd. | |

SECRET HISTORY

OF

“THE INTERNATIONAL” WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION.

Price 2/6.

Being a reprint of a book written in 1871 by the late Mr. William Hepworth Dixon, and containing many interesting and little-known facts about the activities of Karl Marx in the interest of Germany and against the interests of England and France.

Copies on application to

THE BOSWELL PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO., LTD.,
2, Whitefriars Street, E.C.4.

Telephone CENTRAL 2109.