

# MY ANSWER



OSWALD MOSLEY

BY  
**OSWALD MOSLEY**

**SECOND EDITION**

*Is every politician who opposes a war during its progress of necessity a traitor? If so, Chatham was a traitor and Burke and Fox especially ; and in later times Cobden and Bright and even Mr. Chamberlain (Joseph), all these were traitors."*

MR. LLOYD GEORGE  
on politicians who oppose wars  
speaking at Oxford in 1900



AUGUST 1946

*Published by*

**MOSLEY PUBLICATIONS**

*Cromwood House, Ramsburg, Wiltshire*

*Printed, by*

**THE INVICTA PRESS, HOKLEY, SURREY.**

# CONTENTS

PREFACE in answer to a Home Secretary, June 1946

ESSAY IN FOREWORD March 1946.

The Author summarises the argument of this section as follows :—<sup>15</sup> My fellow countrymen are asked to judge . . . whether, in a land which claimed to be fighting for liberty, the Government was morally entitled to hold us in gaol or concentration camps under execrable conditions « . . . whether, in face of subsequent events, our opinions were proved right or wrong . . . whether they do not compare very favourably with the pre-war writings and speeches of many of our present rulers . . . whether these opinions, under the test of experience, do not entitle us to a better hearing, in the present and future, than our gaolers can claim in the light of the situation to which their policy has reduced this country and the world.’\*

Quotations from Mosley’s speeches and from articles in “Action” which support his position in the argument mentioned above, together with quotations from famous statesmen who opposed wars, such as Lord Chatham and Mr. Lloyd George.

A Statement written in prison by Oswald Mosley and sent to the Prime Minister and Members of Parliament. The statement is dated 8th October, 1942, and analyses suggestions made against British Union members, together with the special Regulation under which they were imprisoned— before they were even aware that the new Regulation had been framed by Government and passed by Parliament the evening prior to their arrest.

Gu<sup>r</sup>\*S' m

AN Eighth edition of TOMORROW WE LIVE by

Oswald Mosley, which was first published in 1938, Also the “Objects of British Union ’\* which were published on the foundation of the Movement.

Mosley invites the public to examine what he and his friends stood for before the war, and thus to judge whether they were right or wrong in view of what has since occurred.

## ***Preface in Answer to a Home Secretary\****

May I apologise for the necessity recently imposed upon me to begin this book with the trivial and absurd ? That necessity arises characteristically and inevitably from the presence of the Labour Party in power. Readers of the "Kssay in Foreword," which follows next in this volume, will observe that it was written some three months before this preface. That review of recent years contained some application of the method of analytical psychology to the mind and technique of the Labour Party. It was, therefore, a fortunate coincidence that, in the interval between the writing and the publication of this book, those entirely sub-conscious processes of mob psychology, which, in the Labour Party, are a substitute for thought, should have operated to provide a striking illustration of my theme.

My thesis in this connection was—

- (1) that the Left re obsessed with the desire to suppress by any means an Idea which they fear because they cannot answer it in argument ;
- (2) that they are accustomed to charge against others, with great sound and fury of moral indignation, very similar faults to those which were in evidence in the early history of their own Parties,

It was interesting, therefore, to note that the Home Secretary had this book very much in mind when making what members of his Party described, with premature delight, as a "startling exposure" in the House of Commons on June 6th, 1946. In a reference to me, he observed, "I can only hope this will be an instructive foreword to the book he proposes to publish." Unfortunately, the Foreword was already written for a more serious public than the Home Secretary is accustomed to address, but I respond readily to his courteous invitation by writing this additional short preface on a matter which so strongly supports my previous argument. The statement of the Home Secretary assists me in relation to my first point, because it cannot be held that the issue of this statement, in response to the question of a supporter between the writing and

publication of this book, was exactly designed to secure it a favourable reception. In fact, it might be held that some such occurrence was the only method left to suppress an Idea in advance, by attempted discredit, when the two most widely canvassed suggestions for eliminating that Idea had already been reluctantly discarded as inapplicable. These methods were the introduction of special retro-active legislation and the operation of obsolete Statutes. The difficulty of our opponents in applying either method in pursuit of their ardently desired objective of overcoming our Idea, without facing an argument to which they feel themselves inadequate, is analysed at length in the following "Essay in Foreword.\*\*"

The statement of the Home Secretary also assisted me in relation to my second point, because he was accusing me of doing the kind of thing in which a subsequently elected Leader of the Labour Party appeared to have been mixed up years before, and was attempting to place British Union in a position which bore some points of similarity to a situation once occupied by the Labour Party.

Our authority concerning the history of the Labour Party in this matter was no less a figure in the story of that Movement than the late Lord Snowden, who remained one of their outstanding heroes until he decided in 1931 that the second Labour Government, in which he was Chancellor of the Exchequer, was too incompetent to continue.

The reader will find full detail of the controversy arising from the intervention of the Home Secretary in the House of Commons, between the writing and publication of this book, in the Press of June 7th, 1946 and in the "Daily Herald" of that date, in particular. Any interested person will find—

- (a) The Home Secretary's allegation that letters had been found from the Italian Ambassador in London, among Mussolini's papers, which purported to show that I had accepted funds from Italy on behalf of British Union in the years 1934 and 1935;
- (b) my categorical denial of this statement and dismissal of such evidence as worthless on the grounds that evidence on any subject could now be available at a penny a packet in alleged Italian archives if any ill-disposed person sought to damage me or deceive authority, together with my challenge to the Government to produce any serious evidence from Bank accounts, etc., to which they had long had full access. (It may here be added that it is not long since phrases about the "lie factories" of Europe were current and popular, while the discovery of

“revealing documents” was made the subject of universal merriment : The hilarity of most people is but little diminished if the factories change hands. The self-evident absurdity of these “Tetters” bears the same ingenuous liall-mark as the recently “discovered” and published marriage lines of the German leader, which contained some elementary mistakes in the German language).

- (c) My quotation from Eord Snowden’s Autobiography which cited a communique of Mr. Eloyd George s Government and attacked Mr. George Eansbury when he was editor of the “Daily Herald”; some years before he became the elected leader of the Parliamentary Eabour Party ;
- (d) The “Daily Herald’s” refutation of Eord Snowden and denial of that Government communique as “untrue,” together with their statement that £75,000, in part composed of the sale of Russian Diamonds, had been “transferred” to one Director, but returned by him to the donors of the Communist International when the offer was made known to the other Directors, who unanimously decided not to accept it.

P'ar be it from me to intervene in this celestial conflict between the deceased Eabour Eader, Eord Snowden, and the present “Daily Herald” which is elevated and gilded by the impeccable respectability of High Finance. But, in accepting the “Daily Herald’s” account and rejecting that of Eord Snowden and Mr. Eloyd George’s Government, we yet may note that the enterprising director, named by the “Daily Herald,” recently stepped forth into a more genial sunshine of publicity when he received an honour on the recommendation of the present Eabour Government. This charming and well-deserved tribute to his work in other spheres is only of iuterest to us here in affording some slight assistance when we measure with appropriate solemnity that high degree of moral indignation which moves the Eabour Party at the very thought of any such transaction : Yet more moving, if a deeper emotion were possible, is the cry of the “Daily Herald” that “the story is over a quarter of a century old,” which is a much shorter period in the life of the Eabour Party than 12 years in the life of our Movement. So, even if the completely untrue had any measure of truth, we could yet seek solace with the lamenting “Herald” and murmur the poignant lines of Euripides-torn from a sadly different context—\*\* Ah, youth and the days that were.”

Now we understand that it was just a youthful indiscretion when the "Daily Herald" remarked in the heat of controversy with Mr. Lloyd George, "if we had accepted the offer of £75,000 from Russia, with which this Country has been technically at peace since 1855, though Mr. Lloyd George has starved and tortured its innocent women and children by his infamous blockade we should have done nothing dishonourable, and we should not be at all ashamed of ourselves. As it happens we have not. accepted the offer."

Here we may leave this rigmarole of nonsense about funds on a small heap of damp squibs. The whole silly story of this attack upon us has been all too characteristic of the Labour Party when faced with an argument they cannot answer. We see again the old fuddled technique—on the one hand to represent us as a black and sinister menace rising in the very heart of Britain, and, on the other hand, to depict us as a phenomenon so absurdly un-English that we had no chance of success. Once again, let them answer themselves before we turn to serious things. We may leave this aspect of Labour propaganda to a remark dropped by their leading political journalist in a very frank moment, when past and present political manoeuvres were most remote. Mr. Hannen Swaffer wrote in the "World's Press News," on August 5th, 1943, under the engaging title "Mosley's Thugs Cowed," that "it was left to the War and 18b," and, in a further Paean of "Pink" Thanksgiving, headed "Saved by the War" he added, "Yes, but for the war we might to-day have been a Fascist country." So the Party recipe for "International" salvation seems clear—when your system is bankrupt and you face self confessed defeat at home by fellow countrymen whose case you cannot answer—have a foreign War and suspend the centuries old British Law which preserves liberty, while you prate that you are fighting for liberty. So much for the suggestion that we were so un-English that we had no chance of success, which ever alternated with the concept that we were such an imminent danger to their system that special legislation had to be rushed through Parliament—vide the so-called Public Order Act of 1936, Regulation 18b(1a) which scrapped British Liberty under cover of war, and the various special laws for which the Left still clamours.

In fact, the extraordinary results of our movement were achieved by the self-dedication and financial sacrifices of thousands of ordinary British people who carried on the work, and maintained the finances, of British Union's network of branches, which covered the country on an entirely self-supporting basis. Our headquarters was, also,

## i'REEAC K IN ANSWER

financed by the sacrifices of individuals and, in this connection I have before me a Chartered Accountant's certificate, concerning the origin of our funds for a considerable period before the war, which shews each subscriber to be British. For this period we were able to obtain the permission of each subscriber to include their names ; this was not always possible for the reason that, in the remote past, some people met ruin because they supported British Union, and more feared it. This certificate can be shewn to any Chartered Accountant whom anyone cares to pay to examine it under professional pledge not to reveal the names of subscribers, or any detail beyond ascertaining that they were British. I have always refused to make a parade of my own sacrifices in the manner of politicians, but, as discussion of this matter has been forced upon me, it may be noted that this Chartered Accountant's certificate shews a contribution from me of some £24,000, which I reckon to be about one-quarter of my total gifts in support of my beliefs during my political life. In fact, in my case, the old platform crack had some validity to the effect that, whereas some Labour Leaders of the world entered politics poor and left them rich, I had entered politics rich and looked like leaving\* them poor. But let me hasten to reassure my anxious opponents that my gifts to political purposes were brought to an end by my entry into Brixton Gaol just in time to preserve my complete independence, because I still have quite enough left to save me from any temptation to be bought by anyone !

For the further comfort of my enemies let me add that the strictly commercial basis of my present activities, in these very early days, presents a most flourishing picture. I have long been convinced that the only really healthy basis on which to build an Idea in this country is on the entirely self-supporting foundation of a business enterprise which is subject to the severest commercial tests. This Publishing House, so far, makes good progress under these tests which are unknown to any political party. In fact, we stand or fall by our own abilities— But— “in common humanity”— I must really cease to utter such subversive thoughts before the Labour Leaders have a heart attack !

For the rest of our discussion of past and current affairs and of the [rather reaching debate to come, is it too much to hope that the Labour Party can, at last, rise above the personal, the trivial and the merely silly to place principle against principle in a serious argument which is worthy of a great age of high decision ?

**June, 1946**



## ESSAY IN FOREWORD.

My opponents have had their say; No-one, at any rate, will deny that! During years of enforced silence in gaol under Regulation 18B, and during a further long period under "House arrest," politicians and Press were free to abuse me to their hearts' content, without one word of reply. Men, who, before the war, had shown themselves very shy of responding to my repeated invitations to meet me in debate on the public platform, took full advantage of this opportunity for a one-sided controversy. Even after the end of the war and the emergency, which had been used as a reason for the suppression of our Movement and our policy, by the suspension of the effective provisions of the Habeus Corpus Act and every legal and traditional "freedom", many of them continued to agitate for a denial to me of any right even to publish my opinions. The mere suggestion that I might publish books produced a paroxysm of rage and hysteria, almost comparable with their fine frenzy at the end of 1943, when they demanded that I should be kept in gaol, without charge or trial, until I died, in face of an illness which, the doctors affirmed, would be fatal under those conditions.

The general claim to a right thus to assassinate, by mob demand, anyone whom these elements happen to dislike, probably also attracted the attention of others, in its full implication for the future. At the time I was past caring what they said or did; and this present brief review of personal experience serves merely to illustrate a tendency, then latent, which will inevitably assume a more open form, and wider application, as the political situation develops. Retrospect, without lesson for the future, is ever futile, and the sole purpose and justification of this whole survey of the past is to derive warning and direction for that future. However, whatever may be thought of the past, this new agitation to prevent me publishing books, or in any way expressing an opinion, is altogether welcome to me; for nothing could more clearly illustrate the main point which I have to prove. It is the idea which these people fear, and it was the idea which they always feared. They wanted us shut up during the war, not because we were "fifth columnists" or anything of the kind, but because they feared the spread of our opinions. No other suggestion of any seriousness was ever sustained. In particular, it was never, at any time, or in any way, suggested to us by the Government that we had broken any law. But, by every kind of innuendo, if not direct statement, the public outside were led to believe that we might be traitors to our country at war, if we were at large.

It was, of course, impossible to prove any such suggestion to anyone informed of the facts, indeed it was a self-evident absurdity, if the facts and record in the matter were published, to suggest that we desired the defeat of our country, when for seven years before the war we had

led the demand for its Rearmament against any possible danger\* In particular, such a contention would have come ludicrously from politicians who were then conducting the war, but, with few exceptions, had occupied themselves, prior to the war, in depriving Britain of the elementary means of self-defence, to say nothing of effective power to intervene in the remote quarrels which their policy was constantly demanding. (The magnitude and extent of the wars, which their policy required, were ever in inverse ratio to the means which these politicians were prepared to provide for their conduct).

It was thus easier for any conscientious objector of 1914 to become a posturing authority on military strategy in 1940 than publicly and openly to justify the retention of ex-servicemen in gaol, who had demanded national rearmament, while his Party refused even to permit cadets to drill.

So our whole affair was wrapped in mystery, by deliberate decision of every Party in Parliament, while arbitrary power tore up every vestige of the liberty for which it claimed we were fighting\* Again and again from prison, I challenged the 'Government to publish anything they had to say against us and to permit me the right of a public reply; they were silent while the jackals were busy with the whispered lie. For all this I neither seek nor desire revenge; that emotion is the hall-mark of small minds. Our opponents had their opportunity, and they ran true to form; that is all, and, so far as I am concerned, it is the end of that. So, in this matter, I deal only with Governments and Parties, and, in no case, with individuals. The part played by individuals within the system is of no interest to me; they merely carry out the policy which Governments and Parties create, with "collective responsibility"; and, once that policy is made, can do no other. I am not here concerned with men, but with the system which inevitably creates its types as well as its policies.

My motive in writing this book is the feeling that a man should bring to public judgment what he has said in the past before he speaks again, even if it be true that under this test most of our leading figures would be finally eliminated. So, in this book, writings are submitted with some confidence to the judgment of the British people, which were held to be so misguided or reprehensible during the war that the author, and some 800 of his friends, comprising over 85 per cent of the "18B internees" of British origin, were put in gaol or concentration camps, by a combination of all Parties, to prevent the further propagation of such opinion and the continuance of such activity. From this essay, in foreword, and the appended writings,

anyone who is interested may obtain some conception of our mind and attitude at the time of our arrest : a subject which has been so long and violently discussed by the other side.

For those who are further interested to know what I think and feel, and what contribution I have to make, after the vast events which have since intervened, I am writing an entirely new book, which I hope will follow shortly.

In the present book my fellow countrymen are asked to judge whether, in a land which claimed to be fighting for liberty, the Government was morally entitled to hold us in gaol or concentration camps under execrable conditions, whether, in the light of subsequent events, our opinions were proved right or wrong, whether they do not compare very favourably with the pre-war writings and speeches of many of our present rulers, whether these opinions, under the test of experience, do not entitle us to a better hearing, in the present and future, than our gaolers can claim in the light of the situation to which they have reduced this country and the world. But, before we come to this argument, I should deal with a doubt, which may still survive in some minds, as to whether the agitation for our imprisonment had any valid object other than the suppression of our opinion.

It has been stated again and again by Ministers in Parliament that we could not be charged with any offence because we had not broken the law. Our "detention" was described as "preventive", in case on any future occasion we should break the law. What were the grounds for apprehending this? Not our past record, for all of us, who were old enough at the time, had served in the previous war, and, between the wars, had been denounced as ultra-patriots demanding such unreasonable things as Rearmament. It could not either be seriously contended that, in the light of our published policy, we were subordinate to any foreign movement. Our position in that matter had been very plainly defined in the foreword of the last work reprinted in the present volume, which had originally been published early in 1938. Any conception that we were so subordinate could only be sustained by the belief that everything we said was untrue and that my whole career had been a lie. To this the simple answer is that a man who had renounced so much, and passed through so many years of lone struggle, merely at the end to do the opposite of all the policies and principles he had ever proclaimed, was a case for a lunatic asylum rather than Brixton Prison. Whether this alternative was, in fact, more appropriate the readers of these pages must Judge for themselves.

May I now (toe permitted to enquire why, in particular, the Labour Party find it so difficult to believe that anyone could hold the National Socialist or Fascist creed without .betraying his country to movements abroad, which held foreign versions of that creed? Perhaps the explanation can toe found in some speeches and writings of the early days of the Labour Party, during the would-be forgotten Socialist-Communist period, when, soon after the last war, a conflict appeared possible with the Soviet-Communist power of Russia. Subject to something of the same test /between creed and country did the early Labour Party emerge so unscathed? Would all of them dare to republish their speeches and writings of that period, as I am now republishing my speeches and writings of our testing period in the last war?

For we were then subject to a test from which the English, in all the long strain of their history, had emerged always triumphant as we did. When England fought the Catholic Power of Spain, that event did not turn English Catholics into traitors; although it could 'be argued that, in a degree never present in any other case, they were subject to an influence whose centre of gravity was outside these Islands. Never did it cross the mind of a great ruler that Englishmen would succumb to such a test of character. On the contrary, leading Catholics, who happened also to be great sailors, were summoned to primary positions in the struggles of our .early Fleet, which swept Spam from the Seas. What a contrast to the recent war when a retired Admiral, who had been Director of Naval Operations, and Chief of Naval Intelligence, was thrown, without charge or trial, for three and a half years into Brixton gaol, merely because before the war he had dared to advocate Anglo-German friendship.

But England, in the days of Elizabeth, knew not the debased passion of internal distrust, engendered by the alien mind of the new Money power in unholy alliance with international Socialism of the uneasy conscience. When the opposition of Charles James Fox and the Whigs to the Napoleonic Wars endangered the Government of Mr. Pitt, it did not occur to the latter, in the most violent heat of controversy, to accuse his opponents of 'being a "fifth column in those days some sense of honour subsisted (between Englishmen. He knew that, if the French landed, the Whigs would fight for their country. Yet, when we stated our willingness to fight if the Germans landed in 1940, as we had fought in 1914, we were thrown into gaol.

In fact, only a tiny fragment of our previous associates succumbed *io* the test and proved disloyal; their number was infinitesimal in pro-

portion to our membership. They rejected clear instructions on the outbreak of war, which are reprinted on page 40 of this volume, and followed the advice of a man who left Britain before the war began. He was expelled from our Movement as long ago as March, 1937, and attached me and my friends for years before the war, during which he attached this country. Against this insignificant handful can be set the thousands of British Union members who fought for their country, among whom many lost their lives fighting, with the last loyalty, in a war which they had deplored.

Those of us, who fought in the previous war of 1914-18, resolved to persuade our countrymen to make Peace, if we could, in a quarrel which seemed to us no concern of the British people; but, at the same time, to do nothing which could injure our country. In so doing, we were supported in our political activities by some younger men, who were devoted to the same ideal, and preferred imprisonment for their beliefs. As a man, who in one war knew fighting both in air and trench, and in the next war knew his country's goals, I may, at least, be permitted to hold a very definite opinion as to which experience was the harder to endure.

Such was our\* answer to that supreme test of character when creed differs from the policy pursued by country, as expressed by a Government clearly supported by a majority of fellow countrymen. The response of the early Labour Party to that test can be studied in some speeches and writings after the previous war, when a fresh war with Socialist-Communist Russia loomed imminent: a little later, the Labour Party became, for the first time, the Government of the country. In contrast, our response to that test can be studied in the speeches and writings reprinted in this volume which led us to the goals and concentration camps of "Democracy." (When the term "Democracy" is used in inverted commas, I do not mean what Democracy is in theory, but the thing to which it has now been reduced in practice).

There was never a moment's doubt as to our course; on the one hand, to do nothing to weaken or injure our country for whose armament and strength, in a menacing world, we had ever striven; on the other hand, to do everything possible by the open political action, which the law then permitted, to persuade our fellow citizens first to keep the peace, and later to restore the peace. That course was dictated by the profoundest realities of nature which, in this case, are easily comprehended by any who begin to understand her deep laws. A man may not destroy his mother, however mistaken lie may believe her to

be. He may seek by every art of persuasion to restrain her from a dangerous folly. But, if she persists in that course, he may not join with her enemies to destroy her; on the contrary, he must, if necessary, defend her, however wrong, or even wicked, he may think her conduct.

Anyone, who does not understand this, is incapable of grasping the profound and divine laws which govern that small portion of the universe which is discernible by man. It was no doubt a lack of that deep understanding which led an infinitesimal percentage of our former supporters to a course which violated that principle. As noted above, Socialists, who study certain utterances after the last war, during the Russian crisis, may search their consciences as to whether no larger proportion of their ranks failed to grasp this first principle. The present

Left" may further search, with some anxiety, for an answer to the question how substantial a proportion of their members will prove equal to the same test, if another crisis arises in Anglo-Soviet relations!

But politics are complicated matters, and still more complex and deep-rooted are the philosophies which underlie them; contrary to the current belief that they are the one subject which everyone can understand, with less attention than he gives to selecting his favourite brand of cigarettes. So, may we attempt to reduce the deep principle just discussed to a simple analogy which might arise in every day life?; even if the suggestion of its occurrence in individual cases might create domestic difficulty. Supposing, a man's old mother expresses her firm intention to go down in fighting mood to the "local/\* where a number of tough characters are wont to assemble. He will be alarmed; particularly if his old mother expresses her equally firm intention of slapping "that person's" face, if he does anything of which she disapproves. He may, in fact, foresee a packet of trouble; and his disquietude will be in no way lessened by the fact that his old mother has seen fit to arm herself for the occasion with nothing more formidable than an umbrella and a shrill tongue. But his course of conduct is perfectly clear. He will do his utmost to dissuade her from an undertaking which he feels can bring no good to her or to the family as a whole; if he fails he will not absent himself, but will accompany her. When the inevitable row begins he will do his utmost (1) to protect her, and (2) to extricate her as soon as possible with the minimum possible hurt. Any other course would be contrary to nature and every normal feeling of man. What an appalling conception that the son should be the first, when trouble begins, to stab his old mother in the back. No matter what his opinion of her behaviour, such action from him is inconceivable.

Yet this is precisely the conduct of which our opponents suggested we might be guilty, if left at large during a war which we believed to

be a profound mistake. It matters not, for the sake of this argument, whether we were right or wrong in our opinion; that question will be discussed later. It matters not, in this simple analogy, whether the son's view of his mother's behaviour was in any way valid. All that matters is the acceptance of the principle that, rightly or wrongly, he may profoundly disapprove of her conduct, and yet be inhibited by every law of nature, and every normal feeling, from raising a hand against her, or doing anything except succour and protect her in her difficulty, whatever its origin. He will seek to dissuade her—Yes—But he will never seek to injure her. Such was our attitude to our country in the last war. The reader may, or may not, think it utterly mistaken, for the moment that does not matter—but it is, at any rate, a position which he will understand and accept as honourable.

The acceptance of this simple principle, which is in accord with the whole previous experience of British history and character, shatters the vile and silly suggestion that, in seeking to dissuade our country from war, we sought her downfall. How did a concept arise which was so utterly alien to our national character?; a concept completely foreign to our every experience and tradition, whatever the experience of the Continent. We must revert to the question, whether, since the war of 1914-18, the possibility has arisen for the first time that some Englishmen, in some circumstances, might feel the pull of foreign allegiance, in the event of a clash between Britain and Soviet Russia. For the origin of that suspicion let us seek not only in the speeches and writings of some Socialists, in the crisis with Russia after the previous war, but also in the sharp about-turn of the Communists, in the recent war, when Russia changed sides. It was easy for the latter to entertain such suspicions when their whole policy, even in recent times, had plainly been inspired as much by the vagaries of a foreign Power's policy as to the interests of the land which had afforded all of them hospitality and some of them birth; But the Labour Movement, too now, should have grown beyond these elementary and crude suspicions, born of the early "indiscretions" of their own Party (if we may employ an euphemism in the case of a Party whose own thin skin ever provides a striking contrast with the coarse and brutal jibes they aim at their opponents).

Perhaps a factor was operating in this matter which is well-known to psychologists. The Labour Party had a sense of "guilt," derived from the early associations with Russian interests of certain elements within their Party. Even if the people had forgotten those Socialist performances after the 1914-18 war, the Labour Party had not forgotten them. Some of them may even have re-read, in recent times, the

pages of Lord Snowden's fitter references to those occasions in his Autobiography. Again, as the psychologists well know, a sense of guilt in oneself leads to accusations against others. Particularly, is a man disposed to discern in others a fault which he feels sub-consciously to be his own. With what vigour some parents, for instance, correct their own pet foibles in their children.

So the Labour Party, in fact, denounced, in our young Movement, the offence which had been discernable in the early days of their own Movement. The "guilt" of Labour in those days was visited on us. For, be it noted, the agitation for our imprisonment and, in the case of the extreme section, even for our legalised assassination, came ever from the "Left."

The "Right" had certainly no solicitude for us, and was glad enough to give a knock, when occasion arose, to people who had rendered more effective opposition to certain vested interests than the Labour Party, which, by its whole psychology and structure, was ever doomed to ineffectiveness in the ultimate analysis. But the "Right" scarcely made a show of believing the crude and absurd suggestions made against us and were frequently denounced for their indifference to the "Left." The fault of the "Right" was acquiescence in, rather than commission of, an offence against fellow-countrymen, whom they knew perfectly well to be innocent, not only in act but in intent. They could not engender the heat of the "Left" in this matter, however much they disliked us. For they were free of the "guilt" sensation of the "Left," in that, with all its faults, no elements in the movement of the "Right" had ever, at any time, substituted the interests of a foreign power for those of their country. On the other hand, within the memory of all who were adult at the end of the 1914-18 war, elements of the "Left" had exposed themselves to such a charge, and the "guilt" sensation inherited by the Labour Party from that period still survives, even after the comforting reassurances afforded by the soothing years of long-sought "respectability," which was achieved at last round Tory Dinner Tables.

But perhaps it is an error to diagnose, in psychological terms, so crude a phenomenon of a transient but inevitable historic phase as the Labour Party. Simpler to state that the "Left," in general, had an opponent down, by blow of Fate rather than their own exertions, and it was a good chance to jump on him! Their courage and roughness on such an occasion was, of course, in fair proportion to the frights he had given them on previous occasions! Above all, what an opportunity for the protagonists of "free speech," who were engaged in fighting a world war



in that “sacred” name, to deny free speech to all whose opinions they really feared. Again, in passing, we may note a psychology which always accuses others of a crime which is inherent in their own sense of guilt. For the pursuit of a policy, in private reality, which is the precise opposite of public profession, has ever been a characteristic of certain elements of the “Left.” Notable in this respect has been the denial of free speech to opponents.

For years Conservative meetings were broken up by organised Red violence. This “Left”, which stood so pre-eminently and vociferously for freedom of speech under “Democracy”, and later fought a world war in its name, had for years past denied that freedom at home to all who held contrary opinions. That did not matter much to Conservatism, in an large industrial areas they brought, at any rate, their larger meetings to an end, in favour of the pure formality of ticketed meetings of their supporters. Red violence mattered not to them for they had the vast power of the Press through which to address and convert the Public. We had no such Press or resources. At that time the public meeting, and the platform appeal, were our only means of reaching the ear of the people. We had to preserve that freedom or perish.

The “Left” came to (break up our meetings, as they had done those of Conservatives—after due warning they went out; great was the howl of indignation! By preserving the right to speak at our own meetings we were “denying free speech”; by preserving order, and protecting our audiences from violence at our own meetings, we were “creating disorder.” In paradox so grotesque that it cannot be acceptable even to the traditional “infantilism of the Left,” (as Lenin described it), but only to the petulant imbecilism which its degeneracy has produced, we were finally accused of creating disorder at our own meetings, with the only possible effect of denying ourselves, free speech! So, when the corpse is found with a knife in the back, the only possible explanation is that “it did it itself.”

However, these problems were in time overcome, entirely by our own exertions. Many of our members were seriously injured at their own meetings; my own sojourn in hospital was confined to a week. Whether we had so injured ourselves at our own meetings for the purposes of advertisement, or masochistic satisfaction, was never very clearly explained by our opponents. They, at any rate, hastened to pass legislation to hamper us, as far as possible, in the work of protecting ourselves, and ensuring that audiences, who had come to our meetings to hear a speech, would not be prevented from hearing it by organised violence.

The Old Parties, however, who thus, long before the war, formed a coalition in Parliament against us, did not on any occasion go so far as to enact that if an Englishman, or his wife, were slashed or threatened by a razor, he must not respond with a blow of his fist. Consequently, order was secured, and preserved at our meetings, for years before the war, and record audiences were able to hear the speech they had come to hear in peace and order, as a photograph published in this volume will testify.

We may be assured that all these attacks on meetings were the work of unauthorised hooliganism, and not to do with the respectable elements of the Labour Party. These attacks were, of course, not promoted in any way by the Labour Leadership, but, it must be noted that, within my knowledge at any rate, no responsible Labour leader at that time condemned them, or appealed for order at our meetings. Their only contribution to free speech, in this phase, was to prohibit the use of loud speakers in the London Parks, which they then controlled; directly our meetings began to exceed the size which can be addressed by the human voice and, still worse, to surpass in magnitude the Labour meetings at which they had used these instruments for years. On the other hand, when our vital elements in East London, which contrasted strikingly with the dull ineptitude of the local Labour Parties, had swung, at any rate, the youth of that area—almost solidly to our side \* and an uncontrollable exuberance led to the break-up of Labour Leaders' meetings, public appeals were addressed to me by some of that Leadership to restore order at their meetings! They omitted to note that their Party had combined beforehand with the Conservative Party to pass a strangely-named Public Order Act, whose avowed object, inter alia, was the prevention of discipline and control over our members, which was maintained by the practical method of a distinctive dress that rendered them easily recognisable. Meantime, loud swelled the clamour from Labour platform and Press against "Fascist Thugs"; how<sup>7</sup> quickly and easily they forgot that the meetings of their opponents, whether Conservative or Fascist, had been smashed for years, before ever a word of opposition was spoken at their own meetings.

FOOTNOTE:—In the Municipal Elections of 1937, British Union polled 23 per cent of the votes recorded in one area in East London, and over 19 per cent of the votes recorded in all seats contested in that area. This was, of course, an old people's vote, as few of the young **have** votes in Municipal Elections, and it was the young who **formed our Movement In East London.**

In general, while the break-up of meetings served their purpose, the "Left" was silent; When that instrument turned against them they whined: When their opponents were finally silenced, by other means, they used it as an argument for keeping them in gaol: But these are studies for the pathologist rather than the psychologist; and these relatively trivial matters, which belong to the long past, are only mentioned here for one reason. They serve to illustrate and emphasise one of the main themes of the present work, that it has ever been the consistent and persistent purpose of the "Left" (that warrior champion of free speech at the expense of other people's lives) to deny free speech at home to all opponents and, in particular, to those whom they most feared. Conservatism, to its dishonour, was prepared to join to some extent in the racket for suppressing people it considered dangerous to its interests, even by means which had been used against itself, once it was assured that its Press Power rendered it immune from such methods.

The idea is what the Parties ever feared. Everything else has been merely the barrage of falsehood behind which they advanced to the suppression of the idea. To this end organised attacks were made upon our meetings, while the Press sought to fasten on us, first the charge of creating disorder at our own meetings and, secondly, the charge of brutality, because we dared to restore order by ejecting armed hooligans. To this end, also, not only the Press, but, the Money Power of the "Right" combined with the local power of the "Left" to deny us, for public meetings, many halls throughout the country which were mostly controlled by large interests of the "Right," or toy local authorities dominated by the "Left." These methods, of course were only subsidiary to the main assault, when a coalition of all the Old Parties in Parliament rushed through special legislation, which was aimed expressly at crippling the progress of our Movement, and no other. Yet all failed to arrest an Idea, which, by its whole character, innate truth, historic necessity and vital force, was stronger than all material things.

Then, they had their war, and that gave fall the little stay-at-home people of all varieties, their supreme opportunity. The idea could be suppressed, and its protagonists silenced in prison, by the whispered suggestion that they must be traitors to their country, because they were unnecessary. We were at war and that was the excuse for everything. Any little man who had ever failed to answer our argument, and never dared to meet us in Public Debate, could stand with "security" the other side of the prison bars grimacing his defiance and jabbering his insults. Every little man, with a "hush-hush" job, could flatulate his innuendoes over the cocktails, which he could never afford, in such

inspiring quantities, when his own abilities in business had to pay for them, instead of a salary provided by the taxpayer. 'What a chance for every mediocrity and dunce on the fringe of politics; for every little "Tadpole" and "Taper," to strut his little hour. Serious critics were all in gaol, and even the Communists were singing "Rule Britannia," because "Holy Russia" was on our side, and bleeding out a stolid resistance to the vast bulk of the German Armies, Fine was that evening and deep the heady draughts of "democratic" wine. What mattered the morrow?—when Stalin was so matey and the supplies were getting through to Archangel 1

All, in this phase, was easy going for those elderly gentlemen who are ever ready to die vicariously for the right of others to express their opinions, as long as their own particular opponents can be put in gaol, whenever they become really inconvenient. To such purpose was evolved the ingenious technique of keeping the Habeus Corpus Act on the Statute Book, as a monument of British Liberty, but suspending its chief provisions in any testing period, when its operation could serve the very purpose for which it was originally designed. It was easy going during the war because any opponents of their policy could be represented as a menace to the "Security of the State," in the inevitable hysteria of the period.

Since the war was over, things have not been quite so easy for the "freedom lovers." The plea of keeping men in gaol for "security" reasons could scarcely be sustained when "security" was plainly beyond doubt, as a consequence of overwhelming victory. The plea that men should be kept in prison, because they wanted Peace and Friendship with Foreign Governments, could scarcely be maintained when those Governments had ceased to exist. The suggestion, as grotesque as it was insulting, that a "fifth column" could menace this country, would hardly hold water when all other columns had plainly been destroyed.

(This insult might at least have been retracted at an earlier date, when the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, observed on November 5th, 1940, three years before my release: "Fifth Column activities—if there were any over here, and I am increasingly sceptical—would prove wholly ineffective." Although his Government kept us in gaol it does not appear that he thought he had a "fifth column" then! On the other hand, it seems that he is very certain he has got one now! For he said at Fulton, U.S.A. on March 5th, 1946: "However, in a great number of countries far from the Russian frontiers and throughout the world, Communist fifth columns are established and work in complete unity and

absolute obedience to the directions they receive from the Communist centre.” Such is Nemesis!)

So the great excuse, founded on the great lie of the “Left.” came to an end, and the prison gates swung open with a reluctant clang.

Our opponents of the “Left” were then faced with a necessity which they have ever found painful—within the limited means at their disposal—the necessity of thinking again. The result of this process produced both its cruder and subtler manifestations. It was stated earlier in these observations that I was obliged for the new agitation to prevent me from publishing books, because it illustrated the point I had to prove. Such an agitation when the war is over, tears to shreds the suggestion that these people desired our imprisonment, and silence, for any other reason than the desire to suppress our opinions. It would prove for me my point—that this was the reason behind the agitation for our imprisonment—without me uttering another word; so far as this controversy goes I could merely write Q.E.D., across the latest effusions of my opponents. For this new agitation, after the war, is plainly directed to this end, and to no other; in fact, it can have no other purpose, and not even the most credulous could believe that it had. These opponents are now driven to abandoning all excuse and innuendo: they have come out, openly and brazenly, on the grounds that they dislike and fear our opinions—so they must be suppressed. Thus at last we are all agreed at least on one point; their consistent motive throughout is now revealed, beyond a shadow<sup>7</sup> of a doubt. Therefore, I repeat, for the new agitation I am much obliged to them.

The new campaign takes two forms. The first is very simple; we must be debarred from expressing our opinions merely because we are ourselves. The Executive should be given the power, by Order, at least to prohibit any right of expression to anyone whom the majority in Parliament, at the time, regard as a danger to their ideas. What the difference is between this system and the ideas they allege they have been fighting against, these warrior philosophers have not yet seen fit to explain. In the light of all recent protestations such an attitude is, of course, a little too crude for the subtler minds among our opponents. It is difficult for anyone with a sense of the ridiculous to assume this position, when he has assured the world for some years that he was fighting a world war to affirm Voltaire’s principle—“I may detest what you say, but will die to defend your right to say it.”

So they reject the idea of new laws, in favour of a good rummage through the dustbin of discarded statutes. And, let it be observed,

almost anyone in the country could be locked up for the breach of some law which has never been repealed, but has fallen into desuetude. Reference is made here to laws of the past and long past, not merely to the host of incomprehensible war-time regulations, by which the new bureaucracy still retains the power to imprison anyone it wishes, on some charge or other. On the subject of old statutes, I have even heard it suggested (without ever verifying it) that anyone can be imprisoned who does not go to Church every Sunday. At any rate, few modern thinkers and philosophers would remain long at large if, for instance, the Blasphemy Laws, still on the Statute Book, were literally applied. Certainly the many laws protecting the Royal Family could not only have placed in gaol their vicious assailants among the Communists in the present century, but, also, the serious leaders of Republican Movements, like Chamberlain and Dilke, during the last century, who afterwards rose to be pillars of the State without that classic but painful prelude to greatness! Somewhere a law exists to put anyone in gaol; it is a happy thought for some minds.

The situation of our opponents, however, was not so felicitibus as may at first appear. For the stalwart protagonists of class war, with characteristic lack of all sense of humour, emerged triumphant, from profound researches, with lines culled from the book of old statutes, which indicated that it was an offence "to raise discontent or disaffection among His Majesty's subjects, or to promote feelings of ill-will or hostility among different classes of such subjects." Perhaps, when we call these industrious students "protagonists of class war," we may have to qualify this description by adding that they merely supported the Party when it had become safe and respectable, after its foundation had been securely laid in "class war" by its pioneers! The idea, as usual, came to the above-mentioned "stalwarts" from elsewhere, as it so happened that some gentleman of whom I know nothing, and who may have nothing whatever to do with the Labour Party, or any interest in the matter beyond a disinterested study of the laws of his country, wrote to our leading "intellectual" weekly suggesting this form of words. His idea was soon widely canvassed in "Pink" circles, and taken up with avidity by the above mentioned stalwarts of the class war. The correspondent, in pursuit of his academic point, had offered to subscribe a few guinea's for p. prosecution under these words and as he used the term "Fascist" we can only presume that he possibly meant us! I wrote promptly to this journal offering to add a few poor guineas of my own to the good cause, as no-one, had been more frequently assailed on grounds of class! The journal in question is ever ostensibly a paragon of fair-minded impartiality, in matters of free speech, but their intellectual probity was strained, apparently a little too far at the idea of permitting a brief

reply to a Fascist, and the letter did not appear. So great was the glee of the enemy, unhampered by any necessity for dealing with any retort; a very fair and “democratic” position.

But the words in question rippled far beyond the narrow “intellectual” circle of their origin. The old heroes of class war woke again; the speeches of the late Mr, Bob Williams (then a member of the Labour Party Executive, and later elected Chairman of that Party) rang again in their ears; and they remembered the cheers of the faithful, when he threatened to “run up the Red Flag on Buckingham Palace.” The great slogans of the past thrilled again in their hearts, the fervent denunciations of “capitalist wars”; the roaring shouts against the “bloodsucking class” of “capitalists,” who exploited the “workers”; “down with the landlords”; down with the “classes” (whatever they were); down with everybody and everything, so long as the Labour Party could climb up! Someone had inadvertently provided the Labour Party with an idea and great was the enthusiasm (as it was a silly one). So forth rushed the warriors of class war to tell the world that, if Mosley dared move, he would be prosecuted under existing law for promoting “hostility between classes.”

A normal interpretation of the words in question would appear applicable to their own performances in the past and, on occasion, to their antics in the present, but not to what they had in mind for the future; because they had ever defined “Capitalists” as a class (ever since Old Whiskers wrote “Das Ka-pital”; which became a bible to the few of them who could understand it, and a “Totem” to the rest); but no-one, to my knowledge, has ever defined the Jews as a class.

For my part, anything which I ever have to say about the Jewish problem, will be a sober and serious discussion of a matter which is universally discussed. No law has yet been enacted to secure that anything may be discussed from the Crown to Religion except the Jewish problem. If ever such a law is passed the British Public will draw their own conclusions.

As for the past, I ask my readers to judge from chapter six of <sup>M</sup> TOMORROW WE LIVE” reprinted in this volume to enable them to give their judgment on the question, whether or not it was true to suggest that I, or my friends, stood for “torture and murder” of Jews, or for “racial persecution.” They will see from this official policy of our Movement, published in 1938, that such a suggestion was not merely a travesty of what we said, but a complete contradiction of it. To

suggest that the Jews should have a National Home where they could become a Nation was, in our view, the way to end racial hostility, and even persecution, which was liable to arise from the situation then existing. Even exchanges in the heat of controversy, when we had been bitterly attacked by various Jewish elements, never suggested anything of that kind.

I speak here, of course, in this whole matter in respect of the policy of the British Union—not for that “lunatic fringe” of Fascism, which found expression in various small independent societies of infinitesimal membership and inflated egotisms. Remote from the struggle and dust of the arena, they divided their time between abusing us who had carried our cause not through back drawing rooms, but through public meetings to a great national movement, and publishing crude absurdities about Jews, which could have no other effect than to swing the average Englishman to their side. The deficiency of these people arose from the head rather than from the character; they were honest but incredibly stupid; their only fault of character was a vanity out of all proportion to their capacities. Quite unwittingly, therefore, they served the cause which they most detested. No weapon in English politics is more effective than caricature, and no caricature is so effective as a living caricature. These people were walking caricatures of a Fascist Movement, and, of course, our opponents took every opportunity to parade their “idiosyncrasies.” If they had paid the greatest living caricaturist ten thousand a year to caricature a Fascist Movement on paper, they could not have served this purpose so effectively as by merely reproducing, on appropriate occasion, something which these curious creatures had said or done.

No references to the Jewish problem, other than those previously published at the beginning of 1938 in *TOMORROW WE DIVE* will appear in this volume, as I desire that our story in this matter should be considered objectively, and with the minimum of passion, in order that fair-minded readers should decide for themselves, whether it was fair to suggest that our policy in this respect meant “murder.” Then, if they are further interested in the subject of murder, let them study the attitude of those who led the mobs which howled for my assassination in prison. Further studies in murder may be suggested by later reflections of the present essay.

But the reader, who studies our policy, in this or in other matters, may be moved by a favourite line of attack upon us to say “Oh, yes, that is all right, but it is only a policy to get power, and afterwards



they would have done the opposite.” Perhaps “guilt” sensations again invade the psychological 'background of the “Democrat” who makes the charge. 'He is sub-conscious of the election pledges given in Britain during the election of 1935, and during the last Presidential Election in America, before that country entered the w<sup>T</sup>.ar. Let anyone who is interested in the technique of Obtaining power, by promising exactly the opposite of what is afterwards done, study the pledges of those two occasions, in the light of what subsequently occurred. In making this charge, the so-called “democrat” is once again merely judging others by himself, and accusing them of intending to do what his own leadership has done already. In the absence of the test of fact, we can only ask people to judge us by our\* character and record. If any man thinks I have .gone through so much in order, at the end, to do the opposite of anything I have ever said, and to betray everything for which I have ever stood, I can only reply that he will never understand me, and I shall never understand him; our paths, therefore, lie in different directions.

But let us return briefly, before considering the results of the policy which we opposed, to the unfortunate dilemma of our opponents, which arose when they could no longer keep us in gaol for “security” reasons. We found the more intelligent searching legal dustbins for obsolete laws whose application, only a generation ago, would have placed some leaders of their own Movement in gaol; while the less intelligent demanded what amounts to “retrospective” tests, with a view to removing the right to publish our opinions.

This latter point is worth examining further before we leave the subject, as we have already seen something of it. and it still echoes in the w-orld. This new “burning of the books,” or more effective modem version of the process by suppressing them before they are published is, of course, to apply only to “Fascists”; that is, to anyone whose opinions they fear will, fundamentally and effectively, challenge their own. A fine liberality of “free speech” is, naturally, still to be accorded to those who do not differ with them about anything that really matters! What is their definition of a “Fascist”?; it is, of course, anyone who at a certain date belonged to a certain organisation. Although, at the date in question, this organisation was perfectly legal and no-one ever questioned, or can now question, the legal right to oelong to it, our new witch hunters now suggest that such membership should incur certain penalties in the future.

Tlir pi'iin.Uy is, in one way or another; (preferably by the direct .I'-fm n ni new law and, if not, by indirect pressure) to prevent a person,

who has been a member in the past of a perfectly legal organisation, from expressing his opinions in the future. Let us reduce the proposition to its logical absurdity. In July 1939, it was perfectly legal and indeed commonplace to walk down Piccadilly wearing a moustache. But anyone who took advantage of the freedom so universally accepted at the time, and, indeed, then widely advertised to the world at large, must now incur certain penalty. If, in fact, he walked down Piccadilly in 1939 wearing a moustache, he must, in 1946, refrain from walking out at all. At any rate, to mark the popular displeasure he might be debarred from walking out with his trousers on!

Such are the clowning absurdities which can be reached, once we push, to its logical conclusion, the principle of retrospective disability for something which at the time was perfectly legal and proper. Who knows today, in perpetrating the most innocent action, that he will not incur penalty or disability tomorrow, if such retrospective principles are enshrined in Law? It is for this reason that British Law, and 'all other law founded on that massive basis whose values have survived the stern tests of two thousand years of European civilisation, have rejected any suggestion of the retrospective principle. And, to be fair to them, all major parties of the State in recent times have rejected in Parliament all suggestions of introducing the retrospective principle into the Law of Great Britain. While Law survives that principle cannot enter, for its entry replaces Law by the unfettered whim of arbitrary power. When Law is set aside it enters inevitably; for instance, when Habeus Corpus was effectively suspended in favour of 18B, such considerations at once arose—Before the war you knew so and so, and stood for such and such—We will keep you in gaol for it. It was useless to reply that Mr. Chamberlain had seen them since I had, and that he was not locked in gaol for it! Arbitrary will, in retrospective survey, had replaced law; the same action could be right in one person and wrong in another.

Take my own case, further, as an illustration of what might happen to anyone under such a dispensation, (well, anyone, perhaps it should be added, of lively temperament and energetic habits). I had met the German leader twice in my life, in April 1935 and October, 1936. On both occasions he invited me to lunch and we discussed at some length the interests of Britain and Germany, with the result that we came to the conclusion that no inherent reason existed for friction or conflict between them. It is not too much to say that these two lunches and two conversations contributed substantially to my 3½ years sojourn in gaol. The Italian leader I had also not met since 1936, but, although

he never invited me to lunch, knowing him, too, was much held against me! Your fault, my critics will reply, for not foreseeing that three years later we should be at war with these two Powers, and the Old Gang would get you under 183. I must plead guilty to not possessing second sight, but also affirm that, as someone who got about a bit, I seemed bound to be caught one way or the other by this principle if I was unpopular enough with the ruling parties to -make my imprisonment desirable in their eyes.

In the last few years before the war I was pinned at home by the immense and continuous labours which the great growth of our Movement imposed on me. In my earlier days, and particularly before the birth of the Fascist Movement, I had seized every opportunity to travel, not only because it interested me, but, also because it appeared desirable that anyone in active politics should know as many as possible of the Foreign Statesmen with whom he might one day be called upon to deal. Personal contacts and friendships have broken in our time and sight the barriers of many difficulties; therefore, when time allowed, throughout my life I have travelled much. So the reader must sympathise with the hopelessness of my position, or of anyone like me, in any situation of war, if Habeus Corpus were always suspended and a retrospective 18B probe applied in the absence of Law, on the simple and now familiar lines—You knew so and so, we are at war with his country, and we think you are a menace anyhow; so off to gaol you go! This principle would nearly always have caught me whoever we were fighting, except perhaps, in the case of war with Russia, where my notorious dispute with the Communists would, presumably, save me.

If, for instance, we had been fighting America in 1938, instead of Germany, my situation might have been even worse. For some years before, I had not merely lunched with Mr. Roosevelt, but had accompanied him on a protracted fishing trip in his boat down the Florida Keys. My long retrospective offence would no doubt have been enhanced by the fact that I had always considered the idea of a conflict between Britain and America to be a fantastic crime. Ah!, but you were a National Socialist or Fascist, and the countries with which we were at war were also National Socialist or Fascist—retorts the bright-eyed critic—that vi<sup>a</sup>s different. So now I reply that, after so much comment upon it, he might do us the honour of reading our policy even eight years after it was published; a little information sometimes restricts eloquence, but a grasp of the facts is also a fair substitute for a loose tongue. How much bearing that last, and frequent, observation had either on the situation or on our patriotism, the

critic, and also the impartial reader, can study for themselves in the Foreword to TOMORROW WE LIVE, reprinted in this volume after a first publication in 1938.

These simple reductions to absurdity of "Democratic" war-time practices, merely illustrate the difficulty and the anger which arises when Law is set aside in favour of some retrospective principle. It is not so funny when you do 3 *k* years in the gaols or concentration camps of "Democracy" because, in a moment of passion and hysteria, such a principle had temporarily replaced British Law. So we should note carefully when even a small movement within a large Party, seeks to introduce such a provision into the normal and permanent structure of our Law. All should note it carefully because, once established, that principle can be used to destroy anyone.

But it is not enough for an Englishman merely to look at home, now that the Law of Britain has again replaced the arbitrary creation of retrospective offence. Let him look, also, abroad, in the consciousness of his obligations before History, during a period which, he is frequently assured, reposes in his hand supreme power and influence. The ordinary man may not know the intricacies of International Law, which is a matter for those learned in the Law. I do not myself profess to understand them. But he can instruct his statesmen and representatives to ensure that, in no circumstances, shall the first principles of Law be violated by the creation of retrospective offences. What was legal at the time a thing was done remains legal; it only becomes illegal in the future if new law is created, and proclaimed, so that all may be aware of it. Then a man, who violates existing law, is rightly subject to whatever penalties are laid down. But if a man is punished for something which was legal at the time he did it, the crime is committed not by him but by the Parties who create retrospective offences and penalties. If a man is killed because he did something which, under established and existing law, was legal, this act, by every law which in our consciousness is known to God, and by every law so far known to man in the long and majestic traditions of British and European Law, is murder, and bears no other name.

For my part, I repeat, I do not profess to know or to understand International Law, and no-one, not learned in the Law, can make such a profession. I do not possess the expert knowledge necessary to determine, with certainty and proof, whether things done in Europe during these times are in accord with International Law, or whether that Law, and the basis of all Laws, has been violated by various

Governments in the political creation of retrospective offences. We only know that historians versed in these matters will search the records of these times for centuries. If, in fact, men are found to have been killed for doing what was legal at the time they did it, the verdict of History will be murder. I would save my country, if it were possible, from any chance of such stigma and, therefore, I ask my fellow countrymen, even in moments of savage passion, to instruct their representatives to ensure that, not only at home, but also abroad, where British influence and honour counts for anything, no retrospective offence shall not be created by political action in violation of Law. The application of existing Law is not our business but that of a Court, whose actions we cannot criticise, and which merely carries out the laws laid down by Governments and Parties; but the creation of new Law is our business, and every citizen has the right and the duty to discuss it.

To return now to the origin of this essay, the reader was asked at the beginning to judge for himself, from the works published in this volume, whether during the recent war we could rightly be put into prison or into concentration camps, because we held these opinions. That judgment I leave with confidence to all fair-minded readers of this volume. But another question was posed at the beginning of this essay—"whether, in the light of subsequent events, those opinions were proved right or wrong?" In dealing with this matter I must not be led into a study of the present and the future, because that is the subject of another book, which I hope will be ready soon after the present volume. The present book is intended entirely as a retrospect; it deals with the past alone and should not touch the present and the future.

So, in answering here, the question whether this policy was "proved right or wrong," I will not speak myself, but will give place to words spoken while I write by the main architect of the policy I opposed. In fact, when I read those words I was tempted to set aside this essay and to publish instead extracts from Mr. Churchill's speech at Pulton, Missouri, with the sole observation—"that is my case." I had to "give silence for Mr. Churchill" during the war, and I willingly "give silence" for him now; when he reviews the results of the policy which I was gaoled for opposing

"Nobody knows what Soviet Russia and its Communist International Organisation intends to do in the immediate future, or what are the limits, if any, to their expansive and proselytizing tendencies."

The reader of any of the works in this volume, whether published before or during the last war, will have observed our constant argument

that to fight Germany, where no British interest was involved, would be to create a RussiaOommunist danger to threaten every British interest. The reader will further have noted the recurrent theme that to join with Russia against Germany in the name of liberty, on an issue such as the return to her of the German city of Danzig, where that factor was actually inverted, would he finally to place European liberty at the mercy of Russia. But further silence for Mr. Churchill:

“Prom Stettin, in the Baltic, to Trieste, in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the Continent.”

(The creation of an “iron curtain” across the Continent appears a rather more serious matter than the abolition of a “corridor” across East Prussia).

“Behind that line lie all the capitals of the ancient States of Central and Eastern Europe — Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest, and Sofia. All these famous cities and the populations around them lie in the Soviet sphere, and all are subject in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence, but to a high and increasing measure of control from Moscow.”

Again, such “increasing measure of control” over entirely foreign peoples, who were relatively independent before we fought for “liberty,” would appear to be a rather more serious matter than pre-war German efforts to get “control” of purely German populations; to say nothing of the extent of the present area of conquest and subjection, which is far greater than anything even in question before we gave Poland her guarantee (what reading that guarantee makes now I) £But let Mr. Churchill further describe the manner in which our war aims have been realised:

“The Communist Parties, which were very small in all these Eastern States of Europe, have been raised to pre-eminence and power far beyond their numbers, and are seeking everywhere to obtain totalitarian control.” (“Comrades,” not “Quislings,” now!) “Police Governments are prevailing in nearly every case, and so far, except in Czechoslovakia, there is no true democracy.” (Call it 18B and make it respectable, if you don't want to offend Comrade Stalin!). “Turkey and Persia are both profoundly alarmed and disturbed at the claims what are made upon them, and at the pressure being exerted by the Moscow Government.”

Really my task is done; controversy is made too easy when our opponents thus describe their own handiwork. Long ago I went out of

business as a satirist when confronted Toy the Labour 'Government of 1931; feeling that man cannot gild the lily; you cannot make more ridiculous what nature has created in the image of perfect absurdity. Now, in the present situation, not of Comedy but Tragedy, I feel impelled to cease even the role of pedestrian political commentator, when our darkest prophecies of 1939 are painted in even more sombre lines (by the master hand whose political triumph created the scene which he now depicts. In fact, every instinct of self-preservation should now impose upon me a voluntary silence; for, if this goes much further, the English will never forgive me for having been so right. Nevertheless, we must follow Fate through to the end, so let Mr. Churchill conclude:

“Whatever conclusions may be drawn from these facts—and facts they are” (Yes, facts at last). “This is certainly not the liberated Europe we fought to build up. Nor is it one which contains the essentials of permanent peace.”

Once again, I know that I should merely write Q.E.D. across the page of ingenuous confession, but who could resist, on such an occasion, a quotation from Mr. Eden, who blinked his (bewilderment in the House of Commons on Thursday, March 14th, 1946, with the observation:

“We would all of us have hoped that this debate could have taken place in a smoother international setting. Six or nine months ago I could never have thought that that setting could be such as it is tonight/”

Yet readers of this book will observe that it was possible to foresee that situation not merely six or nine months ago, but six or nine years ago. For this not one jot of credit is claimed by the author of this volume. Any child should have been able to foresee it; provided, of course, that he had the opportunity to devote his time to the study of politics and was not engaged, like the mass of the people, in other occupations which left them only sufficient leisure to be deceived by Press and Politicians.

Be that as it may, Mr. Churchill now faces the facts, and, as he puts it, “facts they are.” Either friend or opponent must recognise him as a man of genius; to deny that quality in a man, merely because he is an opponent, is to admit the possession of a small, mean character, animated chiefly by a gnawing inferiority complex; e.g., those Socialists who ran to him to save them when they were frightened out of their silly wits, and covered him with abuse so soon as the danger was past.

Genius will not permit a man to ignore the main tendencies of his age, whether the policy he devises to meet them is entirely mistaken or, by some strange accident, right.

What of the vastly inferior character and intellect of the Socialist Leadership, with which "Democracy" hastened at the last election to replace a degree of will and talent that, within such a system, can only temporarily be tolerated, during the crisis and disaster of its own creation. The Socialist Leadership, of course, refuses to face the facts. They are, in fact, to be found in a very characteristic position; their muffled voices are heard dimly from the very deep sands, where their heads repose, repeating one of those monotonous chants of magic incantation which ever occur to them and other primitive organisms in moments of danger: "Uno, Uno, Uno, Uno." We can only reply that "we do know"; in fact, we have had some before—lots of it—packets of it. We even remember the League of Nations! So, as usual in the affairs of the present system, broad farce masks tragedy until once again supreme crisis tears through the mummery.

It has been my fixed purpose to write these words without passion. How great a strain that imposes may be conceived by those who regard with our eyes the picture presented by our country, and by that Europe which shares with us the sublime heritage of culture whose resplendent rays shone forth from Early Hellas, not only to illuminate the centuries of European History, but to tinge with glory all that is fine and noble in the thought of the American Continent. Let my passion not intrude, but let Mr. Churchill speak again on the results of this war:

"When I stand here this quiet afternoon I shudder to visualise what is actually happening to millions now -and what is going to happen in this period when famine stalks the earth. None can compute what has been called <sup>4</sup> the unestimated sum of human pain."

For my part I feel, in all that humility which a sense of vast tragedy imposes, some pride in having striven to avert that dreadful "sum of human pain." Let us again follow the gaze of Mr. Churchill to the centre of that agony: where the tragic succession of the system operates once more, and ineptitude follows malice to complete by mass starvation the ruin which the bomb began.

"The Russian dominated Polish Government has been encouraged to- make enormous and wrongful inroads upon Germany, and mass expulsions of millions of Germans on a scale grievous and undreamed of are now taking place."



Undreamed of, no doubt, in the days when a few frontier adjustments in Eastern Europe and relatively trivial transfers of population in the orderly fashion of peaceful times, might have satisfied German requirements for living space, if one-tenth of the energy and good-will had been devoted to finding a solution of her problem in 1919, or long before, that is now being given to "appeasing" the Soviet. If it be replied that she would never have been satisfied, I make the simple answer, why, at any rate, could it not have been tried? Few will deny that it would have been more sensible to strive to the last for Peace, while arming to the utmost against the possibility of war, than to discard both armaments and efforts for Peace; which was the pre-war policy of the "Left" and much of the "Right."

Then it was a question, at most, whether Germany should be permitted to bring leadership and order to regions in which no British interest was involved, but from which backward and anarchic populations had constantly threatened European Peace. The suggestion, so shocking to some characters, was made, that a higher civilisation should guide a lower. (Here I am aware of greatly offending much current opinion by suggesting that a higher and a lower can exist in cultural achievement, or even in nature. To follow that opinion to its logical end we have to affirm that Isaac Newton was in no way a higher type than a circus clown, or even than the inmate of a lunatic asylum. This "complex," for it cannot be described as a process of thought, originates from a system which often gives privilege to the unworthy, instead of affording position and honour only to those whose abilities merit that opportunity and distinction, and whose energies deserve it).

However, now that the position in Eastern Europe is reversed, and it is rather a question of the domination of the higher by the lower, a different view is naturally taken by certain psychological types whose deepest instincts are thereby satisfied. To subject the Teuton to the Slav gives to such people a sense of deep, spiritual satisfaction, relieving many well-founded complexes of inferiority in their own psychologies. Take the land which is elevated by a long line of illustrious names in literature, philosophy, science, music and poetry, who, with the understanding of kinship, reach through the glory of our own Elizabethan age to the original Hellenic inspiration of the European tradition roll that land in the mud, let the Moujik dance on their culture while you shout that they never had any; that process affords a deep contentment of the soul to types whose psychology permits of easy analysis. But to anyone with no feeling of inferiority, who is conscious not only of our Shakespeare and our Poetry, but of

## ESSAY IN FOREWORD

the whole great range of British Philosophy, Literature, and Science, whose names require no recitation to the educated Englishman, that spectacle must bring disgust, or the deeper emotion which I feel. Here and now I affirm simply this: the land and the people who share with us not only blood, but also the cultural heritage of Europe—the fairest gift mankind has known—cannot lie there. If that were the future Europe would lose her soul; and that shall not be.

But let us return to that limited sphere, which, in myopic vision, is wrongly regarded as the whole range of politics. We can now easily observe how simple has been the trick through which European civilisation has been wrecked. Pre-war reference will be found, later in this volume, to the virtual alliance which subsisted between the Soviet and the Democracies before the war, dating from the time of the Franco-Soviet Pact. Readers will remember the abrupt termination of that arrangement in favour of the transient Russo-German understanding, which carved up Poland while we stood as impotent spectators. Who can doubt that Russia's change of sides did much to precipitate the clash 'between the Democracies and Germany by encouraging the latter to think that her Eastern expansion, in agreement with the Soviet, would be a relatively easy matter which, at worst, would involve a one-front war, without any serious power of the West to interfere in her Eastern plans. Russia's temporary arrangement with Germany set the match to the whole powder magazine.

Yet to some extent the Soviet miscalculated; they probably reckoned that the great antagonists in the West would bleed each other to death on the lines of the 1914-18 war, and that their consequent exhaustion would leave Europe as easy prey to the Soviet "expansive and proselytizing tendencies" which Mr. Churchill now again discerns. It did not work out like that at the time, because Germany won too easily in the West for the concepts of the Soviet to fructify in the summer of 1940. Temporarily, at any rate, Germany could turn to the East with her back free in the West. In the final clash Russia was only saved by Anglo-American intervention on the Continent, coupled with a steady stream of supplies, which she could not produce for herself, and the ceaseless activity of the Money Power in building up fresh Continental coalitions on traditional lines.

By what right of power, or of superior culture, then does Russia aspire to dominate a large area of the Continent; not merely to lead it by example or achievement? Let us imagine the position in the recent war reversed, with only 90 million Russians, in the middle of Europe, facing

## MY ANSWER

170 million Germans on one side of her and the combined powers of Britain and America on the other. Would the struggle have lasted a month? That is the brief answer to Russian pretensions in terms of power. As for any claim to cultural leadership, I invite anyone who has reached, let alone surpassed the elementary school stage, to place the Literary, Philosophic and Scientific production of the Slav ibeside that of the Englishman or the German, not to mention the combined achievement of European civilisation in the last 2,600 years. (Hush-hush! I know that the King of the cannibal Islands is just as good as Locke or Kant, and far superior to any classic Greek, because he is so much more “modern,” and that a backward child can give instruction to any schoolmaster). Yet the fact remains that, largely by the exertions of the great Democracies, Russia has been given a position of Partial European hegemony, which .may extend to completion, unless Britain and America are prepared to stay for longer than they wish in armed might on the Continent.

Such is the result of the policy we opposed; and the success of that policy could never have produced any other result. Its full effect is, for the time being, mitigated Iby no virtue or achievement of the politicians. It so happens that Anglo-American scientists were the first to develop the “Atom Bomb.” That is an event which cannot be ascribed wholly to chance, because it is more probable that our civilisation would lead in scientific matters than the SovietnSlavonic system. But the contingency of the emergence of that weapon at this moment in our hands was not seme thing which could be foreseen by politicians when they began this business. So far as they are concerned they were saved iby luck, and nothing else, from far worse things. It was their particular fortune to have as their assistants scientists of genius at a decisive moment, when the cool, clear ray of the scientific future for the first time illuminated, with calm and blessed finality, the tortured human scene.

If they had to meet the Soviet system merely with ma 11-power for man-power on the Continent, at the present time, what would have been the outcome in the present mood of the Democracies? Would their superior power have operated, or would “we want to go home” have prevailed? Or what would have happened, as Mr. Churchill again put it, “had the position been reversed” and some Communists had produced the Atom iBomb? Happily scientists, of the first order, are naturally loyal in entirety to their own countries, which by equal lav/ of nature are numbered among the higher nations. Further, men with such genius for creation are, in any case, likely to hope for some higher emanation of the European mind and spirit than those first,

relatively crude, reactions to the breakdown of an obsolete system, which are called Communism. The word of Spartacus was never yet the last; still less in an age when brain at length replaces brawn, and mind begins to prevail over mass and matter.

There we may leave the European scene, for purpose of this retrospect, with the observation that we do not owe even this uneasy equilibrium to the foresight or will of our politicians. Let us just remember that it all began when Germany 'wanted back in her territory the admittedly German city of Danzig. How rapidly such acorns grow into oaks if manured with sufficient stupidity and malice!

As already suggested, the purpose of this volume is not to provide a policy for the present or future, but to justify our position in the past. In relation to the present and the future some of the writings here reprinted are, of course, out of date, although a surprising amount of TOMORROW WE LIVE written eight years ago, remains very relevant. But, on the whole, the intervening years have brought vast developments which no dynamic mind can ignore. It is my hope that readers of my next iBook will agree that my thought has developed in pace with events; it is my ambition to go some way beyond them. Any man whose thought has not developed in recent years has plainly ceased to think.

It- has been justly remarked that science -has crowded into the last five years as much development as usually takes place in fifty. This, surely, provides one of the most tragic reflections of our time, and poses a most pressing question; why do .such great bounds in human thought and action only occur under pressure of war? Why are such bright blossomings of the mind and spirit only evolved in the bitter blast? Why is destruction rather than construction the dominant stimulus? It is not enough to reply that they will only pay for science when they are scared (by war into taking an interest in it; e.g., they refused my request for a million pounds a year for medical science in the Labour Government of 1929, but later thought nothing of spending five hundred times as much on the Atom Bomb. To find the complete answer we must dig deep, not only beneath the structure of present society, but into the depths of that curious twisted psychology which this Society has produced. If we i go deeper still into Nature—OPhysis—herself, and the minds of her greatest students, we may find an answer yet more inimical to current thought. Not until we have found the answer to these, and many other, questions can the creative action of the future be rightly directed.

All such matters must await another **boon**, which by its whole **character** must go far beyond anything more than suggested in this book. Some slight advantage has accrued to me in recent years in that I have been afforded ample opportunity for reading and reflection! As a result, the view occurred to me that it would be a good thing if men of action always retired for a considerable period in the middle of their lives for purposes of study and pure thought. At 49 I feel some benefit from that experience. It is curious and encouraging that the efforts of our opponents to destroy us sometimes have the reverse effect to that intended, at any rate, in the sphere of the mind and the spirit. This book, therefore, is certainly not my contribution to the present or to the future, and purports only to be a retrospect of the past.

In certain respect, however, the reader must be warned against too hastily regarding some sections of the writings here reprinted as obsolete, particularly in the region of economics. Let us take two examples, in which a superficial view might quickly dismiss certain passages as without relevance to the present. For instance, throughout the economic section of *TOMORROW WE LIVE* I was dealing with the economics of surplus, and we are now confronted with the economics of shortage. Then the question was, how to find a market for which we could produce; now the question is, how to produce enough to live on any reasonable standard. The politicians had never, in practice, found an answer to the first question, which I suggested lay in the increased power of the people to consume what they produced, within a new system of the State designed to secure that increased power in an orderly, but not bureaucratic, economy. (The "order" of industrial self-government, within the broad delimitations laid down by the State, is the opposite of Bureaucracy; yet within the present system they cannot conceive "planning" without (Bureaucracy).

Temporarily, however, the problem was solved in a manner all too typical of the present system. Six years of war turned a surplus into a shortage. Any fool can burn down a house if he does not want to furnish it, or has not the energy to paint the walls. That was their solution, quite inadvertent, of course, like all their actions. But the same situation will inevitably recur, even after the ravages of war, when a yet further increase in productive power has got into its stride, and has functioned during a sufficient period. Then we shall again see the destruction of wealth because it cannot be "sold," and science restricted because it can "produce too much"; unless a modern system to meet scientific facts emerges from economic chaos.

Another point arises, for example, in the economic argument, which may cause superficial misunderstanding. Much attention was concern

frated in my writings on the “mobility” of capital at that period, and the power thereby conferred upon it, not merely to dominate the economic system, but also politics and Governments. As a result of war that power appears to the casual observer largely to have disappeared. Certainly, in this respect, the legacy of war has afforded to the present Labour Government an advantage which was not available to their predecessors, and is in no way due to their own courage and energy in facing High Finance.

With what speed, however, did they hasten to discard the weapons which Fate had thrust so fortuitously into their Inadequate hands! For they at once began to ask the British people to sign international agreements, which deprived British Government of that new power and freedom in financial matters that previous Governments had lacked. So, while their ability to dominate the scene had been largely removed from financiers within the country, by necessary wartime measures like exchange control, an almost complete power over our economy has now been accorded to financiers outside the country. This has arisen from the war exhaustion of our resources, coupled with the Labour Government’s typical reaction to the situation, in relying on an American. Loan and signing the (Bretton Woods Agreement which, again, subordinates our Empire economy to Finance—this time external.

In short, as a result of the war and the inability of British Governments to organise self-help, within the Empire, power passed from the City of London to Wall Street, New York. Labour Chancellors no longer glance nervously toward the City of London, as they did during my time as a Minister of the Crown, when I was trying to get things done within the system.\*

They can now even afford to put up a show of being rude to the “City” ! Labour Chancellors, however, must now look with respect amounting to a helpless sycophancy across the Atlantic, if their international economy is not to crash. The greater the difficulties, the more complete must become the “dependence” of any Movement with the policy, structure and character of the Labour Party. Such stern tests

\* I resigned from the second Labour Government in May, 1930, because I was not allowed to introduce sufficiently drastic measures to deal with the Unemployment Question, which was my particular task. The present Prime Minister, Mr. Attlee, was then offered, and accepted, the office in the Government which I vacated. He continued a member of that Government until its collapse some 18 months later. During this period much was added to the unemployment figures.

differentiate sharply (between different characters; the dynamic, in testing times, strives still harder for a vital independence; the lethargic just fumbles for the supporting hand of a strong friend. (Lethargy must be the characteristic of any Government operating within the inhibitions of the system, and born of its psychology; although a variation in type can occur for a short time in war, because temporarily the system is set aside. For an earlier example of this, study Athens under Pericles. Yet inevitably, before long, the temporary virtues vanish and the permanent vices return). Meantime, striking reason for giving that helping hand came from the other side of the Atlantic, when an American Minister, giving evidence in favour of the loan, observed that rejection would "pull the Empire closer and closer together. The British would produce films, feeding stuffs and machine tools. A Buy British Campaign would not be necessary. There would be only British goods to buy." Our American friends need have no fear; now, even more than in the past, it is quite beyond a Government of the present system to develop from that quarter of the Globe, which is British Empire (containing every raw material which industry can require), a system capable of affording a decent life to the British people, without dependence on Foreign Finance. Their whole system, character and psychology, combined with the crushing legacy of difficulty which their war has left, give to them only the alternatives of dependence or disaster.

The third course of self-help in the vast undertaking of Empire development is not open to them; if they attempted it, within the inhibitions of their system and the psychology it has created, they would only make a hopeless mess of it; and they know it. Dependence on the stronger is ever the destiny of such types and so, after a few of the usual postures and dissident braggings, they will accept that inevitable position in the new hierarchy of Nations to which their past blunders and present character have reduced them. Those with some feeling for community of blood and culture will cleave to America; those with little natural feeling in anything will cleave to Russia. The latter will be fewer, at any rate, until things have gone further, as the second category are still a minority in this country.

So, when the struttings of the platform, and the bleats of "Left" journalists, have subsided again into the customary torpor, they will all go quietly to bed and repeat in their dreams, if not in their waking hours, "Thank God for Uncle Sam, and the Atom Bomb."

Great is the power of America in the present scene; but she too in the end will be confronted by the developments of the future with

another version of the same situation—and with the same Alternative, On that day we shall not be divided in spirit from those original elements of American civilisation, to whom she owes her present greatness.

Meantime, sombre is the scene, and bitter will be the disillusionment of yet another returning generation, who were told, as we were in 1914, that a new world would be born of their sacrifice. Once again, that world of mirage fades into a morass, where politicians flounder in the inevitable results of a policy whose end was always plain to those with eyes or time to see. All questions will be canvassed but nothing done; and universal jabber will make confusion worse confounded. The union of war will give place to the divisions of peace; The shrill voice of a thousand little egos will again drown clear command, and inhibit resultant action; the ignoble will again overwhelm the noble; achievement, if only for destruction, will again yield to purposeless babel. The young will wonder why, as once we wondered; when we too were young, and brushing from our eyes the blood and dust to glimpse a fairer world.

This thing must take the course of history and destiny; it will not be long. The old must be worked out to the end before new life can begin; this is the law of that nature which rules the lives of men within the will of God. When next, together, we turn our eyes toward the future, we may discern—rising like Phoenix from these ashes—the undying soul of England and the European man.



## QUOTATIONS

Extracts from Mosley's speeches and from papers supporting British Union, which define British Union attitude during the war, and prove that, for several years before the war, he and his friends had pressed for National Rearmament.

MOSLEY'S message to all British Union members—1st September, 1939—on the outbreak of war:—

“To our members my message is plain and clear. Our country is involved  
“in war. Therefore X ash you to do nothing to injure our country, or  
“to help any other Power.

“Our members should do what the law requires of them, and if they  
“are members of any of the Forces or Services of the Crown, they  
“should obey their orders, and, in particular, obey the rules of their  
“Service.....

“We have said a hundred times that if the life of Britain were  
“threatened we would fight again . . . .”

ARTICLE BY MOSLEY in “ACTION”, 9th May, 1940.

“According to the Press stories concerning the invasion of Britain are  
“being circulated . . . . In such an event every member of British Union  
“would be at the disposal of the Nation. Every one of us would resist  
“the foreign invader with all that is in us. However rotten the existing  
“Government, and however much we detested its policies, we would  
“throw ourselves into the effort of a united nation until the foreigner  
“was driven from our soil. In such a situation no doubt ever existed  
“concerning the attitude of British Union.”

The Author was arrested a fortnight later, on May 23rd, 1940.

“Action”, 14th March, 1940.

British Union's attitude, before and since the war, has to be:—

- (1) We want peace and do our utmost to persuade the British people to declare their will for peace:
- (2) We are determined by every means in our power to ensure that the life and safety of Britain shall be preserved by proper defences until that Peace can be made”

**Air Defence Scandal,**

1"Action disagrees with Mr, Churchill on nearly every subject under  
 "the sun, and particularly in recent years with his foreign policy,  
 "But we agree with his indictment of the gross neglect of British  
 "defences. British Union pressed rearmament upon the Government  
 "long toe-fore they toegan lit, and long before even Mr. Churchill  
 "advocated it. British Union believes that Britain should be in a  
 "position to defend herself against the attack of any nation in the  
 "world"

**"Action", 15th October, 1938.**

**So early as 1933.**

"We are not prepared to leave Great Britain in the helpless position  
 "which we occupy today, in face of the overwhelming air strength of  
 "other countries. Either their air strength must come down, or our  
 "air strength must go up."

**"Blackshirt", June 24th, 1933.**

**MOSLEY'S OLYMPIA SPEECH.**

"We will immediately mobilise every rei&ource of the nation to give us  
 \*an Air Force equal in strength to the strongest in Europe. We will  
 "modernize and mechanise our Army, and at the end of that process  
 "our Army will cost less, but will be the most modern and effective  
 "striking force in the world".

**"Blackshirt", June 15th, 1934.**

**MOSLEY, speaking at Brighton, on July 12th, 1934.**

"A Blackshirt Government would raise a national defence loan for  
 "three purposes:—

"To give Britain immediate air strength,

"To modernise and mechanise our Army,

"To put the Fleet in proper condition to defend our trade routes . . ."

**"Blackshirt", July 5th, 1935.**

See also same policy in Mosley's Book, "Fascism, 100 Questions  
 Answered", published, March, 1936.

**MOSLEY, writing in "Action", 15th October, 1938.**

"Modern wars are won by airmen and mechanics, not by masses of  
 "barrack square infantry".

Editorial, "Action", May 21st, 1938.

"The policy of British Union is to make peace with Germany, hut not to "accept a position in the air, or in any other sphere, inferior to her "or any other country in the world".

#### QUOTATIONS FROM BRITISH

##### STATESMEN ON THE SUBJECT OF OPPOSING WAR.

These extracts make nonsense of the suggestion that a man must be a traitor to his country, because he opposes a war.

Mr. Lloyd George, on politicians who oppose wars. Speaking at Oxford in 1900, he said:—

"Is every politician who opposes a war during its progress of necessity "a traitor? If so, Chatham was a traitor, and Burke and Fox especially; "and in later times Cobden and Bright and even Mr. Chamberlain "(Joseph), all these were traitors"

Earl of Chatham in 1777, when opposing a war he thought unnecessary. History supports his view.

". . . . It is a shameful truth, that not only the power and strength of "this country are wasting away and expiring, but her well-earned glories, "her true honour and substantial dignity, are sacrificed.

". . . . In a just and necessary war to maintain the rights or honour of "my country, I would strip the shirt from my back to support it. But in "such a war as this, unjust in its principle, impracticable in its means, "and ruinous in its consequences, I would not contribute a single effort, "nor a single shilling. I do not call for vengence on the heads of those "who have been guilty: I only recommend to them to make their retreat, "let \*them walk off; and let them make haste, or they may Ibe assured "that speedy and condign, punishment will overtake them"

He 'would have got something worse than 18B in our time!

Extract from a letter of Mr. Ramsay Macdonald to "Leicester Pioneer" 8th August, 1914, just before he opposed the war of 1914-18.

"There is no doubt whatever but that, when all this is over and we turn "back to it in cold blood and read it carefully so as to ascertain why "England has practically declared war on Germany, we shall find that "the only reason from beginning to end in it is that the Foreign Office "is anti-German and that the Admiralty was anxious to seize any "opportunity of using the Navy in battle practics"

The reader is asked to contrast the tone and attitude of this politician, who was afterwards elected Labour Leader and twice became Prime Minister of Britain, with any utterances of the author of this volume which the reader cares to select.

**OPENING PASSAGE OF "THE BRITISH PEACE"**

**BY OSWALD MOSLEY—Published October, 1939.**

The British people want peace. Anyone with any sense wants peace. 'The only question is whether peace can be won on conditions that are 'satisfactory. Before they make Peace the British people require to 'know that they can face the future with honour, with security, and 'with the prospect of a fine life. It is the purpose of this pamphlet to 'show that such a peace can now be made at any time the British 'people decide. British Union asks our people to make peace on the 'terms for which we have always stood before and since the war. Those 'terms are not improvised and changed in the manner of the Political 'Parties to meet emergencies of their own creation. Our terms of 'settlement are based on our whole philosophy of politics and life. 'For such an idea we have fought for the seven years of British Union's 'existence . . . ."

"First I will give the reader the four points of the "British Peace", "summarised in the popular slogans, "Mind Britain's Business" and ""Briton's Fight for Britain Only" :—

**"FOUR POINTS".**

- (1) We have no interest in the East of Europe, which is no concern of the British Empire; therefore we should cease to intervene in any Eastern Europe quarrel.
- (2) We are determined at all times to defend and to maintain British Empire, but we have no interest in "Mandated Territories" which do not belong to British Empire.
- (3) Britain can and must be strong enough to defend herself from any attack by any nation in the world, but should never intervene in foreign quarrels which do not concern Britain or the Empire.
- (4) We desire a permanent peace and understanding among the great nations of the West of Europe, leading to the final security of all-round disarmament.

"Few, at any rate, will deny that the announcement of such Peace "terms by a British Government, created by the declared will of the "British People, would bring immediate peace. It would bring peace "lor the simple and obvious reason that nothing would be left to fight "about"

Earls- Court Meeting, July 16th, 1939, reported to be the largest indoor meeting ever held in any country.

The Exhibition Hall at Earls Court had never been used before for a political meeting until it was crowded for a Peace meeting at which Mosley was the sole speaker on July 16th, 1939. It is over three times the size of the Albert Hall, which was the largest hall previously used for political meetings in Britain. It is also much larger than the Madison Square Hall, New York, or the Deutschland Hall, Berlin.

Earls Court was taken for this meeting after four previous meetings at the Albert Hall, which showed that hall was quite inadequate for the crowds desiring to attend.

At the Earls Court Meeting on July 16th, 1939, a mass demonstration of quite extraordinary enthusiasm occurred in favour of Peace. Yet a few weeks later, a united Press enabled a coalition of the Old Parties to take the country into war. So much for the "Voice of the People" under Financial Democracy. But the reader is asked to await Mosley's next 'book: "The Alternative" for an answer, , , , born of these experiences , , , to the problem how the will of millions to live a fairer life can win through in face of the Money Power.

The closing' passage of MOSLEY'S speech at Earls Court Exhibition Hall, Sunday, July 16th, 1939—photograph opposite

A prophecy that was wrong because the author claimed that the British People would have the will and power to prevent war.

"I ask this audience to-night whether or not we are going to give "everything we have within us, not only material resources but our "moral and spiritual being, our very life and our very soul, in holy "dedication to England that she shall not perish, but shall live in greatness. We are going, if the power lies within us—and it lies within us "because within us is the spirit of the English—to say that our generation and our children shall not die like rats in Polish holes. They 'shall not die but they shall live to breathe the good English air, to love 'the fair English countryside, to see above them the English sky, to 'feel beneath their feet the English soil. This heritage of England, by 'our struggle and our sacrifice, again we shall give to our children. 'And, with that sacred gift, we tell them that they come from that 'stock of men who went out from this small island in frail crafts across '-storm-tossed seas to take in their brave hands the greatest Empire 'that man has ever seen; in which to-morrow our people shall create "the highest civilisation that man has ever known. Remember, we say 'to our children, those who have gone before you. Remember those

“who through the centuries have died that Britain might live in greatness, in beauty and in splendour. Remember too that, in the spiritual values that our creed brings back to earth, these mighty spirits march beside you and you must be worthy of their company.

“So we take by the hand these our children, to whom our struggle shall give back our England; with them we dedicate ourselves again to the memory of those who have gone before, and to that radiant wonder of finer and nobler life that our victory shall bring to our country. To the dead heroes of Britain, in sacred union, we say: “like you we give ourselves to England—across the ages that divide us—across the glories of Britain that unite us—we gaze into your eyes and we give to you this holy vow—we shall be true—to-day—to-morrow—and for ever—England lives”

Statement written in Prison by Oswald Mosley and sent to the Prime Minister and Members of Parliament.

The Statement is dated 8th October, 1942.

and analyses suggestions made against British Union members, together with the Regulation under which they were imprisoned; before they were even aware that the new Regulation had been framed by the Government and passed by Parliament the evening prior to their arrest.

No reply was received from the Government.

I write this statement because some 86 per cent, of the British subjects of British origin, arrested under the 183 Regulations, were members of British Union with my leadership (vide figures in Hansard, Vol 376, Cols. 858 and 860). For nearly two and a half years many of us have been held in gaols or camps, with the result that a number of people have been led to believe that we have done something disloyal to our country. In fact nothing of the kind has been alleged against us by the Government; because they have never suggested that we have done anything since the war except conduct a political campaign in favour of a negotiated Peace. Further, no one has contended that we have ever broken any law.

Prior to the war we were denounced as an ultra-patriot organisation. For 7 years before this war we maintained an unceasing campaign to obtain the proper armament of our country, in the air, on the sea and on land. We opposed this war, but we strove for a British Empire strong against any possible attack; we stood for peace but also for strength. If any one really suspects that we desire to bring about the defeat of our country, it may be replied that a 7 years campaign to secure re-armament against defeat is a strange beginning to that design.

To any one who says that it is disloyal to oppose a war the test reply may be made in the words of Mr. Lloyd-George when he was opposing the Boer War:- "Is every politician who opposes a war during its progress of necessity a traitor? If so, Chatham was a traitor and Burke and Fox especially, and in later times Cobden and Bright."

We can also summon to our aid the whole experience of British History in our reply to the insinuation that we may be rendered disloyal to our country by adherence to our National Socialist and Fascist creed, which—in a "character, policy, form and method suited

to this country alone”—we have long striven to persuade our fellow countrymen to adopt. The fact that they were fighting the catholic Power of Spain did not render British Catholics disloyal to their co-untry in the age of Queen Elizabeth. The fact that the ideas of the French Revolution were, in many respects similar to their own ideas, did not make distinguished British Radicals disloyal to their country during the wars with Napoleon. Still less does our creed, whose first tenet is love of country, make us disloyal to our own country in the modern age. Those who allege such a change in the character of Englishmen, impute a decline to which denial has been given' in a practical form by very many of our members who have served throughout the present war in the Forces, and have fought bravely. It should also be stated, that, within my knowledge, all of us in these gaols who were old enough to fight in the last war did in fact fight for our country in that war. For instance, beside me in this gaol is a man who won both the D.S.O. and M.C. in the last war, but has served, with his wife, two and a half years in prisons and camps during this war, because he was a member of British Union.

The loyalty of our members to our country is the natural result both of our creed and of our policy since the conflict 'began. For instance, after the declaration of war I published the following message to members of British Union:- “Our country is involved in war. Therefore I ask you to do nothing to injure our country, or to help any other Power. Our members should do what the law requires of them, and if they are members of any of the Forces or Services of the Crown, they should obey their orders and, in every particular, obey the rules of their Services.” Such a message was the natural expression of our policy: “on the one hand we wanted Peace; on the other hand we wanted Peace with Britain undefeated.”

It was never suggested to us in the spring of 1940 that we had no right to exercise full freedom of speech. The Press supporting us did not receive the warning for which provision is made in the present law. Instead, the Government requested Parliament to pass a new Regulation which was apparently specifically designed to enable members of our organisation to be imprisoned (vide Hansard, 21st July, 1942, Col. 1518). On the following day, 23rd May 1940, we were thrown into gaol by virtue of this new Regulation of whose very existence we were unaware. We were not arrested under the original Regulation 18B (1), which provides, inter alia, for detention on account of alleged “acts prejudicial to the public safety.” We were arrested under the ad hoc Regulation 18B (1) (a), which provides for the detention of anyone who was a member of an organisation whose leaders “have had



association” with the leaders of countries with which this country is now at war. That I had “\* associations,” before the war, of a perfectly legal and proper character, I have certainly never denied. I held it to be my duty, by personal contact or any other proper means, to make whatever contribution I could to the maintenance and building of World Peace. Such “associations” before the war were perfectly legal; I reiterate and emphasise that it has never been suggested by the Government that we have done anything since the war except carry on a political propaganda. Is not two and a half years’ imprisonment for entirely legitimate proceedings at least sufficient for my supporters?

For well over two years now our organisation has been banned, and it has been made an offence in law to carry on our propaganda. Anyone continuing such propaganda can consequently be convicted in the courts and sentenced at the most to two years imprisonment. Our principle has always been to obey the law, as we have often stated. Under present law we can, in effect, be required to do whatever the Government of the day may desire.

Over 50 per cent, of our members, who were originally arrested, have since been released, and have performed various forms of national service without complaint against them. Those still detained are just the same kind of people; why keep them rotting in prison and camps?

In any case it is very wrong that our fellow countrymen should be given occasion to think that we have done something disloyal to our country during this war; while in fact, during the private inquiry of the Government, nothing of the kind was suggested against us. No one can show that I or my friends have ever done anything disloyal to our country, and, given the opportunity, I will defend myself at any time before the whole nation from any such suggestion, no matter from what quarter it may come.

To hold political opponents silent in gaol while a gross untruth is circulated against them is a procedure that cannot be justified to History, even if the moment permits it. Yet, that is the situation that has now been created. It should not have arisen, as our detention was frequently described by the Government as “Preventive”—in contradiction to the allegation that we have done something disloyal to justify imprisonment. Further, the Prime Minister has himself stated that <sup>44</sup> he was increasingly sceptical of the existence of a fifth column

**in this country.” But our prolonged imprisonment and the subsequent silence of the Government have since given the unscrupulous and the ignorant an opportunity of which full advantage has been taken.**

**If we, and through us our dependants, are to suffer not only the miseries but also the stigma of further imprisonment I suggest that, in honour the Government should state publicly whatever they have against us, and that I should at least have the right to make a public reply.**

**I take the entire responsibility for the policy of British Union. All my actions and principles I am prepared at any time to defend publicly before my fellow countrymen.**