

BULLETINS FOR SOCIALISTS

COERCION AND DEFENCE

Price 6d.

NUMBER 6

AUGUST 1939

## COERCION AND DEFENCE

The people of this country are faced with an unprecedented problem. For the first time in their history, they have been compelled to accept the introduction of compulsory military service in peace time. They were not rushed headlong into this decision under the pressure of an unreasoning panic; they were able to review the situation coolly before they made up their minds.

What should be the attitude of socialists in such a situation? Should they admit that conscription is now a necessity of national defence? Or should they disapprove of the coercion involved in all forms of conscription for military service? What meaning can they attach to Freedom and Democracy if conscription is now a necessity? These are urgent questions, and they demand a courageous re-examination of the traditional socialist answers in the light of the facts.

### I. A Totalitarian Age.

It is futile to attempt to review these problems in their traditional setting, for the setting itself has virtually disappeared.

Consider, for example, the question of working class participation in passive defence. Whatever we may think of the actual methods and efficiency of A.R.P.—and there is certainly much to be said on this score—the participation of the civil population in A.R.P. is rendered inevitable by the fact that civilians no less than soldiers have become military targets, and they will decline to be killed off if they can prevent it.

The same is true of coercion. The widely expected resistance of the hundreds of thousands of pacifists in this country to the introduction of conscription did not materialise. There was hardly ever a major issue on which the opposition yielded with so much good will and their supporters acquiesced as readily as on this one. Again the question was decided by the inescapable necessities of active defence, under conditions which make the passive resistance of the home front as essential, if not more essential, than army, navy, and weapons of offence. But once, actively or passively, everybody is engaged in warfare, and the will to self-defence dominates the community, conscription may be not only the most rational but the least oppressive of all methods designed to put that will into effect.

It is obvious that such conclusions imply a challenge to our socialist convictions which cannot be ignored. If the necessities of modern warfare make national unity in defence

a fact beyond our control, what then is the scope and meaning of the class struggle? and if we must resign ourselves to the acceptance of coercion as an inevitable concomitant of modern existence, what is the residuary meaning of Freedom and Democracy?

Before we proceed to the discussion of the far-reaching implications of these questions, we must consider carefully the facts of modern society.

The central fact about modern society is its inherent tendency towards totality. Fascist totalitarianism is but a perversion of this tendency. By totality we mean the increasing integration of society in our time that underlies both fascism and socialism. Modern nations tend to develop into complete and coherent units, with closely inter-dependent parts. This is the basic fact. Self-sufficiency, New Deal, planned economy, and fascist totalitarianism are only isolated aspects of this universal development of individual nations into more closely-knit units.

We have reached the end of liberal society, with its liberal economics and liberal state. The liberal state was more or less separated from and independent of economics: liberalism, in its essence, rejected the unity of society. State and industry, economics and politics were kept apart: the State was supposed to keep strictly to political matters and to govern as little as possible; the industrial system, on the other hand, was allegedly controlled by laws of its own—the sacred laws of the competitive prices. So long as the State did not interfere with these prices, they provided the greatest possible yield of commodities. Such was the theory; but of course this condition of affairs never existed in actual fact. Conditions, however, continued to approximate to this ideal pattern long after Manchester liberalism had fallen into disrepute. The only difference was that instead of a clear-cut separation of industry and Government, there began a mutual interference, which had the most incongruous results. The captains of industry demanded from the State subsidies and bounties, protective tariffs, colonial preference and naval activities, while jealously maintaining the principle of the autonomy of the business world; the State, on the other hand, interfered in all manner of ways with the running of the industrial system, while religiously refusing to be responsible for any part of it. Though the Government was called upon to save industries from the consequences of their own actions, it had no means of preventing them; and while business life was suffering in a hundred ways from the results of indiscriminate government interference, there was no means of co-ordinating the mutually destructive activities of the two artificially separated forces, government and industry.

Unemployment is an instance of the results of this type of mis-integration. A vast amount of unemployment was caused by the normal ups and downs of the trade cycle. In order to alleviate the suffering caused in this way, the government instituted social measures, which by helping to maintain wages actually prolonged the crisis. Both government and industry were providing employment with the one hand, and creating unemployment with the other. But there was no intention, nor even a possibility, of co-ordinating their activities.

This is one example among many; but it may suffice to show that the tendency towards unity in modern industrial society is not in itself abnormal--that it is, in fact, the re-assertion of the nature of human society. It was not the unity but the separation of State and industry which was abnormal and artificial, and, in any case, transient. Liberal society is a thing of the past.

But, inevitable though it is, the re-establishment of unity in society is far from being a simple matter. The effective unity of a society as huge and as highly developed as ours is an entirely different matter from the unity of primitive, tribal, or even medieval feudal society. Under tribal conditions, unity could be effectively maintained through customs and traditions. In medieval society, it could be successfully safeguarded by the Roman Church as well as with the help of religious and juridical institutions of a corporative character, such as the guilds, the monasteries, the Estates of the Realm. It was under the conditions of the monarchical despotism of the new territorial states of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries that the unity of society, as expressed in the mercantile system, demanded for the first time the establishment of a central power over a territory as broad as a modern state. During the liberal interlude of the nineteenth century, as we have seen, such an organ of co-ordination appeared to be wholly unnecessary. Now that the liberal experiment has had its day, the need for the co-ordination of the various aspects of social existence asserts itself with overwhelming force. For the vastly increased technological equipment of modern society, its infinitely complicated division of labour, and its rapid means of communication, makes vitally necessary a central co-ordinating power. Without it, society is in danger of annihilation.

This is the decisive reason for the totalitarian trend in modern civilisation. Whether this trend asserts itself in fascist, socialist, or even new deal forms, whether the

governments concerned are capitalist or socialist, makes no difference. Just as fascism and socialism are equally dependent upon highly developed forms of industrial production, involving the use of elaborate machinery, so the tendency towards social integration is common to all industrial countries. It is, indeed, the one universally characteristic development of our time.

The technological factors working towards this consummation are too numerous to be listed. It would be futile to attempt to press them into a system, for there are many independent factors mutually reinforcing one another. There is the progress of science, linking up every activity with some aspect of material production; and it is this which, in the last resort, makes the prosecution of war dependent upon technology and industrial re-organisation. There is the spectacular growth of urbanisation, with the consequent dependence of densely populated cities for their food on transportation. There is the increasing rapidity of communication which makes lightning war possible, while flying removes the sea from the path of the aggressor. The mechanisation of armics and the use of chemical warfare and high explosives make armament industries as essential in war as man power itself, while the emergence of the home front--another consequence of flying and urbanisation--makes the morale of the trenches closely dependent upon the spirit prevailing among the women and children. A development that is so many-sided can only be presented in the most general terms. Science, technology, and modern organisation have integrated the varied activities which constitute human existence in society to such an extent as to make the very existence of independent social spheres such as industry and government illusory.

This is the point which is alone relevant to our argument: for in war the totalitarian character of modern industrial society must inevitably assert itself. The totalitarianism practised by Fascist states such as Germany and Italy is no other than the capitalist distortion of this tendency of the age. Although in peace time the democracies of Western Europe may continue to carry on in their present half-integrated state, at the outbreak of war they would have rapidly to adapt themselves to the necessities of a totalitarian age, if they wished to survive. Even to-day it is obviously the breath of the approaching storm which induces some of these countries to introduce totalitarian measures, at least in questions of defence.

The theory of "total war" is hardly more than an attempt to anticipate actual developments in case of war and to adapt life in a period of ostensible peace to the requirements of an emergency. In view of what has already been said

about these requirements, it should cause no surprise if the results of such an attempt were far-reaching. In its extreme form, the theory of total war asserts:

(i) that the whole of the population, including women and children, must, willingly or unwillingly, participate in the war;

(ii) that the conditions of war determine peace-time conditions;

(iii) that the whole industrial, cultural, and educational system of a country must in peace-time be subordinated to the needs of defence;

(iv) that the methods of shaping public opinion must assume such forms as are adapted to the need for swift decision and united effort;

and (v) that interventionism, whether on social or national grounds, is a normal feature of modern war.

In other words, the present distinction between military and civilian, between the organisation of society in peace and in war, between actual warfare and propaganda, between civil war and international war, ceases to be valid.

The relevance of this line of thought to the present situation must be obvious to the socialist. He would naturally expect the forms of war to be largely determined by the technological factor. Nor can it be a new idea to him that the usual comparison of war strength in terms of money and credit is vitiated by capitalist conceptions of wealth. In a totalitarian age, they count for little. The determining factor is not so much financial as economic—an altogether different matter. But economic organisation is itself a compound of two factors, the one material and the other organisational. In total war, the latter would become as important as the former. This does not mean that raw materials, plant, factories and machinery have ceased to be the backbone of industrial power; but it does mean that the co-ordination and unification of these elements may in case of war be decisive. Countries adapted to the needs of total warfare will, other things being equal, be in a favourable position compared with those not so adapted. In so far as such adaptation is rendered necessary by technological and scientific efficiency, it would be a mere reactionary illusion to believe that it could be evaded. From the point of view of the socialist working class movement, the question is simply this: How can this inevitable process of adaptation be made compatible with the ideal of freedom?

Freedom and democracy, civic rights and personal liberty meant two things above all to the British worker: (i) absence of compulsion with regard to military service, and (ii) a similar freedom with regard to his industrial vocation. Apart from the ballot in national and local affairs, it is this unrestricted freedom to make up his mind for himself that he cherished as the safeguard of his integrity.

## II. Socialism and Freedom.

Two forms of social organization are in our time contending for mastery—Fascism and Socialism. The first is based on a technical reform of the capitalist system carried through by the capitalist class and achieved through the final denial of freedom; the second is founded on the common ownership of the means of production and has as its guiding principle the achievement of freedom. But human society cannot survive under Fascism; for the fascist "solution" denies the necessity of an international organization of life and prepares for the maintenance of the nation by means of "total war". Socialism, on the other hand, offers a solution to the international problem. Its ideals demand the establishment of an international polity and its economic organization is adapted to this task. Fascism, in spite of some advantages, is a "degenerative" response to the problem which faces mankind; it provides the semblance of an answer, which postpones a real solution and perpetuates war in its most fatal form.

It can thus be seen that the most topical difference between Socialism and Fascism is their attitude to the problem of war. Their respective assertion and denial of freedom has its counterpart in their respective acceptance and refusal of the postulate of peace—the demand for a permanent organization of international life which would abolish war.

From this vantage point, it is not difficult to discern the element of truth in pacifism: its passionate insistence on the postulate of peace, i.e. on the prophetic realisation that in our epoch, for the first time in history, war could be abolished. At the same time, as we pointed out in Bulletin No.3, the fallacy of pacifism becomes apparent: it consists in the belief that war is merely the outcome of human misbehaviour—original sin, an unbalanced personality, or some other failing of man. It fails to recognise the institutional nature of war, which makes it an inevitable means of settling the boundaries of human communities, in the absence of a supra-national authority. This recognition, which is the result of an historical and sociological approach naturally leads to the insight that war can be abolished only when it is replaced by some other institution which will assume the functions that war possessed in the past. It is precisely because this has become possible in our age that the postulate of peace is an expression of a true insight. But the pacifist postulates the impossible: the demand that war should disappear by a mere act of the will, without some other institution or organisation being substituted for it, is the outcome of an anarchist philosophy, which in the

last resort denies the reality of society. Such a position is an implicit denial of the fundamental assumptions on which the working class movement is based.

Nevertheless, the socialist stands for the principle of freedom. It is the ideal by which he lives. But for it he would not always be able to distinguish between fascist and socialist institutions, owing to the superficial resemblance between what are actually opposite solutions of the industrial problem. How far can he insist on this freedom in the face of the threat of total war? What is the meaning of his opposition to the principle of coercion?

Freedom is the absence of coercion. In individualistic terms it is a condition of things in which one is not being coerced. But in social terms it means more: it is the absence of coercion altogether, whether we are the coercers or the coerced. This idea of freedom underlies the socialist's conception of a free society: he envisages a state of affairs from which coercion has been banished. He wants to be rid of exploitation, whether he is the victim or the agent of it; he wants to be free from compulsion and free also from the necessity of compelling others. This is the meaning of his knowledge that he can be free only when all others are free.

But it is Utopian to suppose that a society can exist in which coercion is altogether absent. It is true that the exploitation of one class by another is not inevitable. There have been societies in the past which have been innocent of this particular form of coercion; and socialists look to the establishment of a society in the future, where, as in Soviet Russia, economic exploitation will have ceased to exist. This great aim gives meaning to their lives. But this in no manner implies that a socialist society could abolish coercion altogether, for it is inherent in human society itself. To some extent we cannot help living on one another. The phenomena of power and value are such that they must necessarily emerge wherever human beings live in society; and both power and value mean indirect coercion of human beings by others. A state of freedom which would overcome the possibility of coercion is incompatible with society.

The demand for absolute freedom is an inheritance of the liberal age; it is an outcome of the denial of the underlying unity of society. Such freedom means only the possibility



of acting "freely" in the political sphere; the industrial sphere is left out altogether, and removed, as it were, from society. It is completely ignored that in the latter sphere the organisation of production in factories necessarily implies acting under orders, and that the great mass of the people act under the orders of a small group of owners. The illusion of absolute freedom is thus acquired by limiting the idea of society to the narrow field of politics, and by removing from the picture the life of man as a producer. Liberal freedom is "absolute" at the price of irrelevancy; for every worker knows from his own experience how much coercion he undergoes in his daily life as a producer that cannot be remedied by the use of his vote at general elections. It is not surprising that to him freedom has come to mean freedom to choose or to refuse a job. That is why a powerful Trade Union movement is his only safeguard and remedy to-day. But here again the facts must be faced.

Those who compare Western Democracy with Fascism or Socialism frequently emphasise the lack of a free Trade Union movement under both alternatives. But this bracketting of fascist and socialist institutions is again misleading. Under Fascism industry is run by capitalists as a class, and the interference of the state merely serves the ultimate interests of that class. Any real expression of the will and interest of the employees is regarded as treason and dealt with accordingly. The individual capitalist, it is true, is no longer allowed to run his business as he likes: it is under the effective control of the Trade Association, which in turn is well advised to listen to the officials of the state and party. There is no reason why the working class should not be fairly comfortable, if circumstances allow; but ultimately the only fixed point of policy is that Labour should neither starve nor revolt. This is why the working class is not allowed to achieve anything by its own efforts; for once this was permitted, there could be no absolute safeguard against revolt. In other words Fascism is a reform of capitalism under the aegis of the capitalist class. The coercion to which the individual worker is subjected is the inevitable result of his exclusion from the formation of the policy which deals with his vital interests.

Under Socialism, the position is reversed. No class of owners exists; the means of production are under the control of the producers themselves. No private interest intervenes. The benefits of industry accrue to the community as a whole. Under such a system, Trade Unions are not the representatives of one class against another, but of one function of citizenship against another. Socialism knows no unemployment for work is as unlimited as the needs of man. Consequently, the organisation of labour in the community entails but little coercion--infinitely less, indeed

than under capitalism, where unemployment makes the freedom to choose employment a mere illusion. But while coercion under capitalism is camouflaged under "freedom of contract", freedom under socialism takes the form of conscious planning.

Nothing is more injurious to the ultimate interests of the workers than the overrating of the freedom that can be secured by Trade Unions. While the fostering of an illusory freedom makes the working class accept the indirect coercion to which it is subjected under capitalism, the same illusion makes it incapable of transcending capitalism on account of the unreasoning prejudice it arouses against coercion. It is of the essence of democracy that the inevitable coercion should be open: both the reasons for which it is deemed necessary and the reasons for which it is accepted by those concerned should be conscious to the community. Man is free when he willingly accepts what is necessary for reasons he recognises as valid. Under capitalism he is made to acquiesce in a loss of freedom which is unnecessary; under socialism he is accepting that measure of coercion which is the price of the freedom obtainable in society.

Unless the working class accepts the implications of a totalitarian age, it is in very grave danger of losing its freedom altogether through an unwitting support of Fascism. For the illusory freedom which was maintained under liberal capitalism is doomed to disappear. That type of freedom was merely an accessory of liberal economics and has passed away together with them. The coercive character of society is coming to the surface-- society itself cannot survive unless some measure of coercion is willingly accepted by its members. Unwillingness to face this issue must inevitably lead to the fascist solution which is radically hostile to freedom and makes use of the need for some measure of coercion to force general slavery upon the working class.

There are more ways than one in which this danger could materialise. Our analysis has disclosed the outstanding characteristic of our age--the tendency of individual states to develop into more complete and coherent units; and perhaps the most powerful force working towards that consummation is the total character of war. But a capitalist country faced with the threat of war must necessarily develop fascist traits. This is fairly obvious. Under the threat of "lightning war" the home front must be in a state of permanent readiness, day and night. Unless production is to suffer interruption every time the alarm is sounded--maybe a dozen times a day--passive defence must be centred on the factories and workshops; but the continuity of production is as important as the safety of the persons engaged on it. Complete protection for the workers may be incompatible with continuity of production; but inadequate protection would also be damaging to this continuity. The place of work is thus doubly important: it becomes a vital point both for passive defence and for continuity of production.

Consequently A.R.P. is unavoidably based in part on the factory. Under these conditions the person responsible for the carrying on of production must necessarily have a say in the organisation of A.R.P. The two organisations—production and defence—cannot be entirely separated, and there must be considerable overlapping. In the factories they must be under a joint command. For practical and decisive reasons, both the personal and the material equipment must in effect be under the control of the factory owners. The owners of the means of production will therefore inevitably play a major rôle in the defence system of the country.

The inclusion of factory defence units in A.R.P. is not the only example we could cite of the natural growth of capitalist influence under conditions of war preparation. The necessity of organising industry by branches in order to achieve maximum output tends in the same direction. The branch as such must take charge of the productive tasks if they are to be effectively performed. Standardisation, shadow factories, duplication of sites, pooling of experience, exchange of experts and improvements, husbanding of raw material and many other aspects of armament production demand the administration of war industries by the industries themselves, unless they are nationalised outright. Partial nationalisation, as long as capitalist influence prevails, might, as in Germany, tend to intensify the fascist character of the system by providing the state with an added opportunity of controlling the individual capitalist. In the Third Reich the nationalised parts of the armaments industry are used as a whip, with which the state can, when necessary, bring to heel any recalcitrant individual capitalist who refuses to conform to the class line.

The industrially advanced countries would naturally be in an advantageous position. But "advanced" does not only mean technological **efficiency**; it refers also to the organisation of whole branches of industry on a national scale. The countries whose industry most nearly approximates to a national system will be superior to those who have not so advanced. The tendency of capitalist countries towards fascist forms of organisation will therefore be strengthened by any preparations for defence.

On the other hand, the struggle for the maintenance of democratic liberties and of working class influence gains a new ~~opportunity~~ <sup>meaning</sup> ~~ity~~. For precisely those reasons which make it impossible for the working class to avoid participation in defence, it is also impossible to exclude the working class from this participation. Technological war makes industry of equal importance with the army, if not simply a part of it. Because factory defence must be entrusted to industry, the factory worker will play an essential rôle in the defence organisation. The omnipresence of industry and technology in modern war make the worker also omnipresent. The distinction

between army and industrial population become artificial—a distinction without a difference. The inherent tendency towards fascism can thus be counteracted by political and industrial action of a socialist working class movement.

The refusal to recognise the need for coercion would to-day involve the working class in a reactionary line.

The conception of freedom is fundamental to socialism; but neither of the two present expressions of this conception—the pacifist and the Trade Unionist outlooks—will survive the change from a liberal to an integrated state of society. The problems of unemployment and war cannot be solved in liberal society. The question at issue is whether the reconstruction of society should take place under the leadership of the workers in order to achieve freedom under socialism, or whether it should come about under the dictatorship of the capitalist class to arrive at slavery under fascism. Under socialism the freedom possible in society is achieved; under fascism freedom is done away with. In either case the present illusory freedom will cease to operate.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Orders for further copies of this Bulletin (Price 6d) and for future issues may be sent to:

(Mrs.) Mary Muir,  
395, Otley Road,  
Leeds, 6.



1a

1a

Bulletin Nr. 5.

Compulsion and Defence.

With the establishment of socialism in the U.S.S.R. mankind has entered upon a new phase of its development, the era of the establishment of socialism. The international crisis of our time centres upon this fact. The Fascist movement is vain effort to prevent the coming of socialism and the aggression of the Fascist countries is ultimately directed against the U.S.S.R., the country of socialist construction.

The socialist working class movement must reconsider its policy in the light of this new condition of affairs. The working class movement has been thrown into a state of confusion by the victory of socialism in Russia. It is being forced to reformulate its policy in the face of actual achievement of socialism in one country, though this country be a whole continent. While remaining a revolutionary force in respect to the rest of the world, it is now in respect to the U.S.S.R. the working class movement is now conscious of being a conservative force, while having to remain a revolutionary force in respect of the rest of the world. This reformulation must necessarily take account of the essential fact which is that the working class movement of the world must orientate itself upon the defence of the U.S.S.R. as the country of socialism. The national working class movements in capitalist countries are thus compelled to concentrate on the international situation and not to allow purely internal issues to take precedence over the international one. As at the time of the 1. International founded by Karl Marx in London, the outlook of the socialist working class movement is dominated by external affairs. It is on the international sphere that the decision between Fascism and socialism must fall and the several national working class movements must never lose sight of this fact. The class war, though carried on nationally, is directed in our time, towards international ends. The international character of the socialist working class movement was at no time as essential as in our time. For at no time was the international solution offered by socialism as clearly and as definitely the answer to the objective needs of the world.

The other fact of which the working class movement must take account is that national life for us today is a whole. Now that the spurious internationalism has broken down, the essentially national character of capitalist states reasserts itself with a vengeance. This is the meaning of Fascist totalitarianism, which is necessarily antagonistic to internationalism. But even the socialist and democratic countries

24

25

... form to-day a whole in much realer sense than before. ~~the~~ And of all forms of national ~~existence~~ existence it is war which is eminently total in our time. The national ~~limitations~~ ~~of~~ ~~capitalist~~ ~~development~~ ~~assert~~ ~~themselves~~ ~~at~~ ~~this~~ ~~point~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~total~~ ~~way~~. ~~It~~ ~~stands~~ ~~with~~ ~~an~~ ~~unprecedented~~ ~~force~~.

The establishment of socialism in the U.S.S.R. and the total forms of ~~national~~ national defence ~~are~~ are the two fundamental facts which must determine the reformulation of ~~the~~ ~~working~~ ~~class~~ ~~policy~~ in our time.

It is from this point of view that ~~the~~ we must reconsider the meaning of traditional outlook on a number of questions. Some of them have obviously lost their ~~meaning~~ meaning. ~~Issues~~ Issues have become obsolete; others have changed their reference. Only an unprejudiced analysis of the whole position will serve the purpose. ~~The~~ ~~present~~ ~~Bulletin~~ ~~will~~ ~~deal~~ ~~with~~ ~~two~~ ~~outstanding~~ ~~problems~~: ~~What~~ ~~should~~ ~~the~~ ~~attitude~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~socialist~~ ~~working~~ ~~class~~ ~~movement~~ ~~be~~ ~~on~~ ~~the~~ ~~question~~ ~~of~~ ~~national~~ ~~defence~~ ~~and~~ ~~compulsion~~?

TOTAL WAR.

On the question of war as on so many other things, the Fascist countries are far ahead of the ~~other~~ other capitalist countries, whether conservative or democratic. ~~In~~ In comparison with ~~the~~ ~~other~~ ~~capitalist~~ ~~countries~~ they appear merely as reactionary. This is most conspicuous on the question of war. While the Fascist countries developed the idea and ~~the~~ the methods of total war, the military men in other capitalist countries declared it always to be merely a slogan of no substance. In reality total war is an inevitable feature of warfare under modern industrial ~~conditions~~.

Total war implies

- (1) that the whole of the population, military and civilian, the latter including women and children, willingly or unwillingly participate in the war
- (2) that the ~~conditions~~ conditions of warfare determine the conditions of peace time; the distinction between war and peace loses very much of its reality;
- (3) that the economic, financial, industrial/ ~~and~~ and organization of the countries is subordinated to the needs of warfare: cultural and educational ~~are~~ ~~also~~ ~~subordinated~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~needs~~ ~~of~~ ~~warfare~~;
- (4) ~~that~~ that the political institutions of the countries ~~are~~ ~~transformed~~ ~~into~~ ~~instruments~~ ~~of~~ ~~warfare~~ to the point of transformation from the ~~state~~ ~~into~~ ~~instruments~~ ~~of~~ ~~warfare~~;
- (5) that the formation of public opinion ~~tends~~ tends to take up new forms determined by the ~~need~~ need for swift decisions, a united effort, and a strong emotional appeal; this implies ~~the~~ ~~use~~ ~~of~~ ~~all~~ ~~possible~~ ~~methods~~ ~~of~~ ~~propaganda~~ ~~including~~ ~~the~~ ~~use~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~competition~~ ~~of~~ ~~news~~ ~~service~~ ~~etc.~~ ~~all~~;
- (6) restrictions on liberty being imposed on the citizens in the interests of the successful carrying on of war.

The most important ~~conclusions~~ <sup>Conclusions</sup> to be drawn from this are:

- (1) the working class cannot "keep put" of the war; even complete refusal to serve or to be conscripted for the purposes of war industries would not save the workers from being attacked and destroyed;
- (2) that the organisation of the defence of the country passes into the hands of the actual owners of industry, for they are necessarily entrusted with the organisation of the economic forces and even with actual military defence (A.R.P.)
- (3) war in capitalist country therefore means the introduction of totalitarian methods under capitalist control; this is synonymous with ~~the~~ a Fascist development.

It is under these conditions that the question of compulsion and defence must be considered.

A. Coercion and Compulsion.

Show that the traditional British attitude on freedom from compulsion is closely linked with the military and industrial ~~conditions~~ which allowed this country to avoid conscription and to develop strong Trade Unions.

Liberty of conscience and absence of compulsion in matters concerning ultimate convictions became the most valued content of traditional British democracy.

a Conscription. Not much of the absence of conscription left under the conditions of total war. A.R.P. - active and passive defence - civilian services - home front - moral discipline and preparedness - The possibility of isolation very much reduced and the reality of ~~isolation~~ the isolation which is possible becoming doubtful.

The two ~~main~~ <sup>main</sup> fields of compulsion / There widely different reference; <sup>apparently</sup> Pacifism and

I. Pacifism i.e. the objection ~~is~~ to compulsion in questions of national defence, especially to conscription for military service.

We cannot deal here with the issue of pacifist policy i.e. the persons who believe that wars do not solve the national problem; that defence is more effective when non-violent; that war "solves nothing"; that as a means to an end it tends to violate the ends and make the means dominate over the original ends.

The true meaning of this position. The POSTULATE OF PEACE. Cf. Bulletin Nr. 3.

It is the religious pacifist alone who has consistent case. But not consistent insofar as he ~~denies~~ <sup>denies</sup> claims political advantages for his attitude. The truth is that ~~his~~ his religious position is illusory.

claims is the realisation of an illusory freedom.

The freedom he ~~claims~~ <sup>claims</sup> is the realisation of our social responsibilities. It means being conscious of the social consequences of our individual actions. This freedom is limited

to our freedom to choose amongst ~~two~~ alternatives; and to take upon ourselves the consequences of this choice. The ~~more~~ clearer the nature of the relationships of human beings to one another become, the greater is this freedom.



4.

of have to chose

The freedom/ not to chose , is merely ~~freedom~~ illusory. By standing for this freedom we stand for nothing, for the thing we stand for does not exist. ~~But~~ By doing so, we lose ~~our~~ our real freedom which consists in taking upon ourselves the responsibility for the social consequences of our individual lives. The sphere of the truly individual is beyond ~~the~~ the limitation of society. We reach it if and when we have made our relations to one another ~~as~~ responsible and ~~we~~ have ~~made~~ as taken upon ourselves the responsibility for the actual consequences of our actions and ~~be~~ "resigned" ourselves to the fact that this is freedom.

*Re*

*ff*