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Historians have long recognised that the Great War (1914-1918) was a crucial moment of changein British political history. To Arthur Marwick it damaged the Liberal Party and strengthened the Labour Party.[[1]](#endnote-1) To Trevor Wilson it ‘increased the importance of the trade unions and so stimulated their political consciousness that it correspondingly enhanced the position of the Labour Party’.[[2]](#endnote-2) Although the Conservative Party experienced a resurgence of influence during the Great War, the focus of debate has tended to be placed on the way in which war damaged the Liberal Party and strengthened the Labour Party. Yet at the same time the Great War initially led to deep divisions within the ranks of the Labour movement, between the pro-war and anti-war groups, which could have been as debilitating to Labour’s growth as it may have been for the Liberal Party had it not been for the fact that the Labour movement was largely pro-war, that the anti-war members saw themselves as patriotic defenders of civil liberties, and that introduction of military conscription of 1916 unified the Labour movement behind the War Emergency: Workers’ National Committee and its ‘conscription of riches’ campaign. [[3]](#endnote-3)

The Labour Party famously supported the government’s war effort from the 5 August 1914, the day after the outbreak of war, though the Independent Labour Party (ILP), which was affiliated to it, was institutionally opposed to war after its 1915 Conference. The ILP’s opposition to war was, however, tempered by the fact that the majority of ILP members who were eligible to fight did so even in the textile district of the West Riding of Yorkshire, a so-called hotspot of pacifism. The Clarion Movement, the cultural movement of ethical socialism which emphasised brotherhood and fellowship, was deeply divided on war for, whilst the majority of its members opposed war, Robert Blatchford, its founder, wrote his anti-German book *General von Sneak: A little study of war* and maintained a pro-war position in the *Clarion* along with and Edward Robertshaw Hartley, the Bradford butcher who was the organiser the Clarion Van movement, a member of the ILP and the British Socialist Party (BSP).[[4]](#endnote-4) Famously, the quasi-Marxist BSP, which had emerged from the Socialist Democratic Federation and the Social Democratic Party, was divided between the pro-war attitude of the old guard, including HenryMayers Hyndman, and the new guard of internationalists, led by Zelda Kahan, which favoured peace.[[5]](#endnote-5) Indeed, the BSP held five regional conferences in February 1915. In Glasgow and London the opponents of war held the upper hand but it was those in favour of the Great War elsewhere who prevailed. The situation worsened when, following the Conference of Allied Socialists in London, the Allied Internationalists met at Zimmerwald in September 1915 to reconstruct the Second International of reformist socialist groups, which had collapsed on the outbreak of war. The resulting Zimmerwald Manifesto blamed imperialism and capitalist greed for the Great War and advocated that all socialist nations should fight for peace.[[6]](#endnote-6) Hyndman rejected this but the internationalists accepted it, although Kahan was unclear about how this was to be achieved. The BSP pro-war sections then began to move into groups much as the Socialist National Defence Committee which became the British Workers’ League before becoming the National Democratic Party. These pro-war bodies attracted other patriotic socialists such as A. M. Thompson and Blatchford, from the *Clarion*, and Hartley, Dan Irving, Bert Killip, Ben Tillett, J. J. Terrett and Will Thorne of the BSP. Some members of the Labour Party also joined them. Hyndman gave his support, if not his membership to them, but he, like many other figures, eventually dissociated himself from the National Democratic Party.

Thus there is a conundrum: how was it that a divided Labour movement emerged from the Great War in better shape than a divided Liberal Party to dominate progressive politics in inter-war Britain? The frequently expressed explanation, exemplified by the work of Trevor Wilson, that it was the war alone that destroyed Liberal values and favoured the growth of the Labour Party is far too simplistic and does not allow for the difficulties that war clearly posed for a Labour movement which had increasingly been raised on the concept of international brotherhood. Indeed, it will be argued here, that the answer is problematic and nuanced but probably involves three main developments in the Great War which merged to favour the Labour movement’s post-war growth. The first is the blindingly obvious point that, despite deep divisions, the Labour movement as a whole was overwhelmingly patriotic and that even the membership of its officially pacifist and anti-war sections, and particularly the ILP, was clearly patriotic. This was the case in ‘pacifist Bradford’ and even the case in Huddersfield, which Cyril Pearce has dubbed a ‘community of conscience’ because of the number of conscientious objectors it produced in a town that was apparently sympathetic towards pacifists.[[7]](#endnote-7) Secondly, the introduction of military conscription in January 1916 through the Military Services Act re-united the fissured Labour movement in its desire to see the war brought to a speedy, possibly negotiated, conclusion, despite the differences in attitude towards the war. Thirdly, the Labour movement was galvanised by the formation of the War Emergency: Workers’ National Committee (WEWNC) which, as Royden Harrison, Paul Ward and J.M. Winter have noted, united more than a hundred Labour organisations to promote neutrality and peace on 5 August 1914 but which, with Parliamentary Labour Party immediately throwing its hand in with the Asquith wartime government, changed direction to work for the improvement of the lot of working-class families faced with enormous wartime rent and food rises.[[8]](#endnote-8) The one issue that unified these disparate and fractious labour and socialist groups in the WEWNC was the ‘conscription of riches’ campaign which promoted the initially vague, undeveloped, commitment to public ownership of the means of production which eventually became the major ideological and socialist feature of the Labour Party’s 1918 Constitution, the famous ‘Clause Four’. Collectively, then, a Labour movement, even though divided by war, was able to maintain some type of unity.

**A divided nation and the Labour movement**

The anguish of the Labour movement over the Great War was part of a wider disquiet amongst the progressive movement. Only the Conservative and Unionist Party, bitterly divided about its future and leadership from 1911 onwards, seem to have benefited politically from the war. Overwhelmingly nationalistic, and thus indubitably patriotic, drawn into the Wartime Coalition Government of Asquith in May 1915, and partly responsible for David Lloyd George replacing Asquith as Prime Minister in 1916, it prospered politically from war. On the other hand, the Liberal Party was deeply divided. The likes of John Henry of Leeds and C. P. Trevelyan, Liberal MP for Elland in Yorkshire, were horrified at the outbreak of war and wanted an immediate cessation of hostilities. The Prime Minister, H. H. Asquith, wished for an international settlement, whilst David Lloyd George, the pacifist of the Boer War, wanted nothing less than outright victory and was depicted as a ‘war-monger’. From the start, the Labour movement very closely resembled the position of the Liberal Party with strong support for the war but with significant and voluble groups of opposition. On the one hand, many middle-class and working-class socialist activists joined with other progressives to oppose war. However, the majority of the trade-union base of the Labour Party, united by the Trade Union Congress, overwhelmingly supported the war effort through the Treasury Agreement of 1915, which guaranteed the return to their jobs of male workers who had gone to fight. Indeed, because of the labour shortage in war wages increased and, with better pay, were able to join unions and trade union membership increased from about six millions in 1916 to about 6.5 millions in 1918, and to eight millions by 1920. Initially, then, the Labour movement was, like other movements, unprepared for war.

The outbreak of war in August 1914 had come with startling suddenness, despite the fact that there had been considerable socialist opposition to war on the eve of war. Reverend R. Roberts, a Congregational Minister in Bradford and a member of the ILP, was not untypical of many socialists when he expressed his moral outrage against a threatened war in early 1914:

Alone amongst the parties of Great Britain the Labour Party is pledged against militarism… We must take up the Fiery Cross and carry it to the remotest hamlet in the country, call every man and woman to the colours. ‘Down with militarism’. That is our cry – as it also the cry of our comrades all over Europe. Blazon it on the banners. Write it on the pavements. Sing it in the streets.[[9]](#endnote-9)

As late as 1 August 1914 Continental socialist leaders were still convinced that war was not a possibility. However, as Georges Haupt suggests, they were captives of their own myths about their ability to prevent war and unaware of the depths of national chauvinism.[[10]](#endnote-10) Apparently, they were then cut short by the events, pushed on the defensive and became disorientated spectators, waiting to be submerged by the gathering wave of nationalism.

Very quickly both the political and economic sides of the wider Labour movement became divided. In addition, James Ramsay MacDonald, Secretary of the Labour Party and the most powerful of Britain’s Labour leaders, resigned when the Labour Party (actually the Parliamentary Labour Party) decided to support the Asquith government’s pursuit of the war on 5 August 1914, objecting to the secret treaties that had led to war. He was replaced by Arthur Henderson who took the Labour Party into the Wartime Coalition in May 1915 though Henderson was finally removed from his Cabinet position in the famous ‘doorstep’ incident, where he was asked to wait outside the office of the Prime Minister because of his more pacific views after his visit to Menshevik/Bolshevik Russia in 1917, before resigning.

The ILP, which was affiliated to the Labour Party, officially opposed the war at its 1915 Conference but quickly divided into four groups, a spectrum ranging from pacifists to patriots. The first group were the pacifists, and included Clifford Allen, J. Bruce Glasier, Arthur Salter, Fenner Brockway, and, on the fringe, Philip Snowden though he was not a fully committed pacifist.[[11]](#endnote-11) The second group felt the need to protect Britain and protect Belgium whilst opposing the secret treaties that led to war and supporting calls for peace. The third group felt that the need to prosecute the war was essential to the defence of the country and temporarily transcended socialist objectives. The fourth group, closely allied with the third group, felt that Prussianism was the real danger to the world and had to be defeated come what may. Such divisions were, as previously indicated, evident within the ranks of the BSP, where Hyndman’s nationalists conflicted with Kahan’s internationalists. The Clarion movement continued to be dominated by anti-war socialists who disowned Robert Blatchford.

 Yet at the same time one must bear in mind that reactions to the war were complex and refracted through an individuals’ racial, religious, class, gender and occupational identity. Thus, for example, an Irish Catholic’s support for the war was always going to be shaped and coloured by the ‘Irish question’ - the issue of Home Rule or independence for Ireland. Similarly, a labour activist who had sought to foster international bonds of solidarity with the working classes of other countries – including Germany – opposed the War through the prism of their own social and class position.

 Support for the war, was always likely to be complex – and while many felt a sense of duty to support the British Empire in times of crisis – this did not obliterate alternative loyalties; and many felt a conflict of these loyalties during the war. On the whole, however, even when the war situation appeared to be getting worse after the stalemates of the 1916-1917 offensives – the battle of Verdun, the Somme and Passchendaele - and the increased shortages of the home front, the British populace and wider Empire remained loyal to the war. There was not the revolutionary ferment of Russia or anything like the mutiny of French troops in 1917.

 For the minority who opposed the war, religious, gender, race, class and occupational identities clearly shaped their ideas and associations. The pacifists, those who opposed all war, drew in socialists, such as Sylvia Pankhurst, intellectual pacifists such as the authoress Virginia Wolff, Bertrand Russell, Ottoline Morell and the Garsington set, who operated closely with conscientious objectors, and activists such as Norman Angell, who was later to win the Nobel Peace Prize for his book pacifist book *The Great Illusion.* In addition,many members of the ILP, like James Keir Hardie and Fred Jowett, opposed the Great War specifically because of the secret treaties that had led to war. They intermingled with organisations such as the Union of Democratic Control (UDC) and the League of Nations Union who reflected an upswing in the belief in future arbitration to prevent war and drew upon the support of serving men and women fighting in the ‘war to end all wars’. Many of these people and groups were derided as cowards or as traitors – Bertrand Russell was, for instance, dismissed from his post at Cambridge. After the war, however, many of them had their reputations rehabilitated – the general feeling after the losses of the war was one of a need to find peaceful solutions to conflict in the future through international arbitration – and there was a groundswell of support for the new League of Nations. Most of these groups contained fascinating individuals with complex responses to war. However, the focus here is targeted at Labour and socialist groups and in order to illustrate these divisions within the Labour movement it is instructive to look particularly at the Bradford Labour Movement, which was inaccurately presented by the large sections of the press and some politicians as being anti-war.

**War and the Labour Movement in Bradford: Pacifist, Anti-War and Pro-war views before and after Military Conscription in 1916.**

Bradford was a centre of Labour growth from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries following the bitter and protracted nineteen-week Manningham Mills strike of 1890-1, out of which the Bradford Labour Union/ILP emerged. It was in Bradford that the National ILP developed to dominate the early Labour movement, even after the Labour Representation Committee and the Labour Party emerged. It was here where a Workers’ Municipal Federation (WMF), formed at the turn of the century to establish a Labour presence on the local city council, linking the ILP and the Labour Party, with the Bradford Trades and Labour Council (who established it). By 1913 the ILP/Labour/WMF group were receiving 43.1 per cent of the municipal vote, though their political ambitions were checked by a Conservative-Liberal anti-socialist alliance, and had one of Bradford’s three MPs – Fred Jowett who was returned for Bradford West in 1906.[[12]](#endnote-12) It was at St. George’s Hall in Bradford (the birthplace of the national ILP) that the 21st ‘Coming of Age Conference of the ILP was held in April 1914. Bradford was thus a centre of Labour growth in the quarter of a century before the Great War.

Between 1912 and 1914 there were many articles in the *Bradford Pioneer,* the local Independent Labour Party newspaper, representing the views of the burgeoning Bradford Labour movement on the Armaments Trust, the secret diplomacy, and the need to foster international unity. These exhibited a commitment to internationalism rather than steps to stop war. On the eve of war the Bradford Labour movement vehemently expressed its opposition to conflict and called for a simultaneous stoppage of work in those countries where war was threatened. In the midst of a period of national ultimatums, the ILP held a mass meeting on 2 August 1914 which deplored the threatened war but which did not advocate immediate working-class action to avoid it. In his speech to this meeting, Fred Jowett ILP MP forBradford West, and a once prominent member of the Trades Council, spoke of the need to bring peace through a common socialism and quoted from Bradford Trades Council’s anti-war resolution of 1912

…of the proposal for a general stoppage of work in all countries about to engage in war, and further we urge upon all workers the necessity for making preparations for a simultaneous stoppage of work in those countries where was is threatened. [[13]](#endnote-13)

He argued that war was ‘a crime against humanity’ but made no calls for strikes or mass demonstrations to oppose war. Rather he closed his speech with a note of resignation: ‘Let us who are socialists keep in our minds calm, our hearts free from hate, and one purpose always before us – to bring peace as soon as possible on a basis that will endure.’[[14]](#endnote-14)

Such sentiments became rarer after the declaration of war. Very quickly both the ethical and trade-union elements of the Bradford Labour Party divided into anti-war and pro-war factions, though this was far more obvious within the ILP, which dominated the local Labour Party. The impression was given by the local, as well as national, press that the ILP, in particular, was opposed to war and unpatriotic. Indeed, shortly after the National ILP had passed a resolution opposing war, in 1915, the *Bradford Weekly Telegraph* wrote of the ILP’s inability to ‘raise a single finger to help the country to prosecute the war successfully’. Jowett replied to this by stating that ‘In proportion to its membership the ILP had more adherents serving in the army and navy by far than either of the other two political parties.’[[15]](#endnote-15) Nonetheless, the *Bradford Weekly Telegraph* continued with its criticism in July 1915 stating that

Considering how bravely our manhood is serving the state of Flanders, if these demagogues [ILP] lack the spine to fight the least they should do would be to remain silent and inactive whilst others do the nation’s work.[[16]](#endnote-16).

However, local censuses of the Bradford ILP membership confirm that Jowett was right. One census conducted in February 1916 indicated that of 461 young men, in the local ILP party membership of 1473, 113 were in the trenches, four had been killed, one was missing, nine had been wounded, three were prisoners of war 118 were training in England, six were in the navy and 207 were attested under the Derby scheme as necessary home workers.[[17]](#endnote-17) Another census in 1918 found that of the 492 members liable to service 351 were serving in the forces whilst 48 were conscientious objectors or were in national work.[[18]](#endnote-18)

The impression that the Bradford ILP was a party of pacifists was simply an illusion created by a press which failed to understand that, despite the ILP Conference’s pacifist resolution of 1915, the ILP, like the Quakers, acknowledged individual conscience and was equivocal on the war. Jowett himself, indeed, opposed the war at the same time as he honoured those of the ILP who fought or died in war – a position also assumed by James Keir Hardie, the national Labour leader who in August 1914 had said that ‘the lads who have gone forth to fight their country’s battles must not be disheartened by any discordant notes at home.’[[19]](#endnote-19) There were complex reasons and associations operating within the socialist and Labour movement in Bradford refracted in the light of personal experiences. Almost all of the Bradford ILP men of an eligible age fought for their country though many did so in the hope of winning a lasting post-war peace. Indeed, the *Bradford Pioneer* offered a further insight into this relationship between the so-called pacific ILP and the boys at the front by publishing a letter to Jowett from a soldier in France.

Dear Mr. Jowett,

As one of the Boys’ allow me to thank you personally for your efforts for peace during the past four years. I am quite sure that when ‘the Boys’ come home they will give you the TRUTH, re the terrible wastage of lives, inhuman conditions, filth and immoral environment, and thus you will live in the memories of YOUNG men as being a MAN of whom we can be justly proud. I hope that you will be returned at the head of the poll on the 14th December. [This was a reference to the coming 1918 General Election.]

 A Boy from France.[[20]](#endnote-20)

The fact is that the Bradford ILP, and the Bradford Labour movement as a whole, divided into numerous positions on war, although the vast majority were pro-war but tolerant of to the views of others.

There were, indeed, few ILP pacifists at the national level but they did include Clifford Allen, Bruce Glasier, Arthur Salter, Fenner Brockway and Philip Snowden, from Keighley They were largely middle-class members of the ILP and were frequently involved in the formation of the Union of Democratic Control (UDC) in 1914, which was not a pacifist organisation but sought a reasoned foreign policy, free of military influence (though it later also opposed military conscription). The UDC formed by E. D. Morel, supported by Sir John Simon and many of his Liberal colleagues, and many of its members, both Liberal and Labour, were later in the war drawn into the No-Conscription Fellowship. The main Bradford pacifist was Willie Leach, an employer who had joined the Bradford ILP in 1895. He wrote for *Bradford Labour Echo* (in the mid 1890s) and *Forward* (from about 1900 - to 1906) and took over from the pro-war Joseph Burgess, the man who called the socialists together to form the National ILP in Bradford, as editor of the *Bradford Pioneer.* In October 1915, Leach articulated the paper’s policy

We hate all war especially the present one. This is a pacifist and peace journal conducted among other purposes with the object of stating as well as we can, the ILP position on the hideous tragedy now being enacted in Europe…. Human life is the most sacred thing we know and its preservation, its development, its best welfare, must therefore be our religion on this earth.[[21]](#endnote-21)

However, the Bradford pacifists saw themselves as a beleaguered group led by William Leach who, through the *Bradford Pioneer,* reported extensively on the No-Conscription Fellowship andthe UDC ( the No-Conscription Fellowship caught on well West Yorkshire as indicated in Table 1)**,** and the speeches of pacifists and anti-war figures who spoke at the New Picture House in Morley Street. It described E. D. Morel who lectured there as that distinguished war bird…now a member of the ILP and of the Bradford Branch.’[[22]](#endnote-22) Leach, through the *Bradford Pioneer*, was also concerned at the attack on the ILP in Bradford, most Germanized town in Britain with its middle-class families of German origin such as the Mosers, the Wolffs, the Behrens, the Steinthals, and the Delius family.

Leach’s pacifist views were supported by a small group of trade unionists and political figures in Bradford, including Walter Barber, Secretary of the Bradford Trades Council, and his son Revis Barber, who became one of the estimated 59 Conscientious Objectors (COs) (look at Table 2) in Bradford who refused to be conscripted from 1916 onwards, though we now know that there likely to be more.[[23]](#endnote-23)

At the end of the war William Leach stood for Bradford Central, where he was comprehensively defeated by the Conservative Coalition candidate. Yet he reiterated his commitment to pacifism:

I have never felt so pugnaciously right in my life. I still disbelieve in war. As long as I am in public life I will not support bloodshed for any cause, whether that cause appears right or does not. It looks as if this victory fervour has swept us out. But it will pass. Liberalism is defunct, Socialism is deferred, and the Coalition will be defeated.[[24]](#endnote-24)

Such sentiments were not shared by the majority of the Bradford ILP/Labour Party, nor by many contributors to the *Bradford Pioneer*.

The majority anti-war ILPers in Bradford were not pacifists and were prepared to see the war through. Fred Jowett was amongst them and though opposed to the-secret treaties that led to the Great War, favoured the Defence of Britain, opposed Prussianism but as the *Standard* wrote ‘His fad was the democratic control of foreign policy’, and he wanted the ‘restoration of Belgium to complete sovereignty’.[[25]](#endnote-25) This was something akin to James Keir Hardie’s, ‘We must see the War through, but denounce Secret Diplomacy.[[26]](#endnote-26) Jowett was opposed to the secret treaties and he combined this with the idea of National Defence being votes upon by Parliament. Indeed at the 1915 ILP Conference, when the ILP passed a resolution opposing the war, he stated that ‘Now is the time to speak and ensure that never again shall the witches’ cauldron of secret diplomacy brew the broth of Hell for mankind.’[[27]](#endnote-27) As Chairman of the ILP Conference in 1916 he reflected on the ILP anti-war resolution (of 1915) that there was a difference between the commitment of a movement and the commitment of an individual:

I believe that the war would never have arisen if the government had carried out an open and honest foreign policy and disclosed to the people who had most to lose in the relations between themselves and foreign governments with whom they are acting in collusion. [….] The ILP resolution to which you refer only expressed the view that Socialist Parties as organised bodies should support no war. It did not attempt to lay down such a policy for individuals. If it did I should be opposed to it in principle.

Jowett was acknowledging that the majority of the ILP members in Bradford were committed to the Great War on the grounds of National Defence and in the belief that Prussianism had to be destroyed. Also, by the middle of August 1914 the Rev. R. Roberts, who had, two weeks before, taken up the ‘Fiery Cross’ against war had totally changed his position and was now stating that

…the hour of reckoning had come. The legend of ‘blood and iron’ has to be shattered. Either it must be smashed or civilisation must go under. Its victory would be the enthronement of the War God in the centre of European civilization and the crushing of Socialism for generations.[[28]](#endnote-28)

Two months later he added that he had fought for peace for forty years in public life but that

We are threatened with the ruin of civilised society’ and that ‘At whatever cost of life and treasure we must fight. I cannot tell the pain it cost me to write that sentence. I never thought I should live to do it.’…Better to die than be Prussianised. Better to be wiped off the face of the earth than to exist squealing and squirming under the Prussian jack boots.[[29]](#endnote-29)

This type of view was strongly held by many other members of the ILP.

The two leading pro-war figures in Bradford Labour politics were Joseph Burgess and Edward Robertshaw Hartley. Burgess was a newspaper man who had had a long association with the ILP. It was his newspaper, *The Workman’s Times*, which had called together delegates from Labour societies to meet at a conference in Bradford in January 1893, at which the National Independent Labour Party had been formed. He was a member of the Socialist Sunday School movement, editor of the *Yorkshire Factory Times,* was later editor of the *Bradford Pioneer* until the summer of 1915 and was elected President of the Bradford ILP in 1915. At first a critic of war he proclaimed that ‘We have no quarrel with Germany … Stand firm workers to those who would appeal to you in the name of patriotism.’ However, he changed his position in 1915, joined the Socialist National Defence Committee, whose motto was ‘Britain for the British’ a slogan coined by Robert Blatchford, in June 1915 and was threatening to stand as a parliamentary candidate for the National Socialist Party in Blackburn (against Philip Snowden) although he never did so. There was a flurry of critical letters in the *Bradford Pioneer,* and responses by Burgess, in what wasdubbed the ‘Burgess Comedy..[[30]](#endnote-30) He influenced the Bradford Socialist Sunday School and, in association with the Leeds Armley Socialist School, even attempted, albeit unsuccessfully, to overturn the Yorkshire Union of Socialist Sunday Schools anti-war position.[[31]](#endnote-31) He left the Labour movement and later moved to Scotland to edit newspapers before making his return to Labour politics in the late 1920s.[[32]](#endnote-32)

 Edward Robertshaw Hartley’s patriotism was similarly divisive. He was a butcher by trade and in the 1890s and early twentieth century, because of his singing activities, was frequently described as ‘a butcher who gave renderings’He was member of the SDF but its powers was weak in Bradford, rarely having more than about 25 members or so in the 1890s and swinging in and out of existence, and so he joined the ILP in the mid 1890s. He was a Bradford City councillor and was ILP candidate in East Bradford for the parliamentary seat in 1906 and 1910. He was also a prominent figure in the Clarion Movement and is often seen in photos on the seat of the Van or orating from it at the side of his daughter, Gertrude. Having travelled abroad in 1913 he was, on his return, immediately parachuted into the Dewsbury parliament by-election in 1913 for the British Socialist Party. The ILP objected to this but Hartley retained some ILP support in his old Bradford Moor ward. At the beginning of the Great War he had adopted a pro-war stance, anticipated the introduction of military conscription, and became the pro-war British Workers’ League (BWL) in the Bradford area.[[33]](#endnote-33) At its inaugural meeting at Whetley Lane, Bradford there were about 1,000 people present three-quarters of whom, it was reflected, were hostile to his stand.[[34]](#endnote-34) A. Howarth of the BWL, stated of the Bradford ILP and the war ‘Bradford has disgraced itself more than any other town in the country.’[[35]](#endnote-35) Victor Fisher –an old SDF/SDP/BSP figure, who had become secretary of the BWL, stated before a Bradford audiencethat ‘Sinister pacifism is more rampant in your midst than in any other part of the United Kingdom with the exception of perhaps the Clyde and South Wales.’[[36]](#endnote-36) However, sinister or not, the opposition to the war, if not pacifism, was about to increase.

**The position of the Bradford Trade Unionists, Conscription, and the War Emergency: Workers’ National Committee from 1916 onwards**

On January 1916 the Military Services Act brought military conscription to Britain for the first time. Six months after that, on 1 July, 57,000 British soldiers were killed or injured on the first day of the Battle of the Somme, a battle which eventually cost 1,000,000 deaths or injuries to the horror and all and further raised issues in Britain about the settlement of the war.[[37]](#endnote-37)It has been described by Max Hastings as ‘the great betrayal of innocents – and of the old working class in khaki – by Britain’s ruling classes in breeches and glossy riding boots.’ in his sweeping attack upon incompetent general who sent brave and naive soldiers to their deaths.[[38]](#endnote-38) Field Marshall Haig’s suggestion that this five-month battle would be the ‘decisive’ battle proved to be futile and one of indiscriminate slaughter which shook the foundations of pre-war British society and may have contributed in a significant way to loosening the bounds which constrained class politics. Centrally, however, the introduction of conscription transformed the young men of military age who opposed the war into criminals or ‘prisoners of conscience’. Many of them were from the same ideological roots and organisational communities which had driven Labour on to become a party of government.

Most trade unionists in Bradford were initially supporters of the war effort – though that dominance declined as the war progressed. Trade unionists such as Jessie Cockerline, also a member of the ILP, wrote an article ‘My Country Right or Wrong’ in the *Bradford Pioneer,* 14 August 1914. Other supporters of the war included J. H. Palin and A. W. Brown, both prominent members of the ILP. The fact is that the Bradford Trades and Labour Council (BTLC) was just as divided over the war as the ILP and the Labour Party.

Jessie Cockerline and J. H. Palin were keenly patriotic. Palin was chairman of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants as the time of Taff Vale, an ILP councillor and alderman in Bradford and trade union correspondent of the *Bradford Pioneer*, and had chaired the 21st Conference of the ILP held at Bradford in 1914. At the 1916 National ILP Conference he had bluntly stated that ‘We do not want Germans here. He then went off to France to help with war transportation, returned to continue his career in Labour politics and became Labour MP for one of the Newcastle seats in the 1920s.

The Trades Council was opposed to war before 1914. In November 1912, the BTLC passed a resolution committing it to a general stoppage in the case of a war. The ‘Anglo-German War’ or ‘European War, however, caught the Trades Council unawares, it did not call the general stoppage it had avowed to do, and it drifted into the Labour Party policy of working with the Government. In 1914 and 1915 it was dealing with the practical realities of war - anti-rent raising campaigns, checking on famine prices and food shortages, providing pensions to war widows as part of the duties of the War Emergency: Workers’ National Committee**.** But the BTLC was the litmus paper to the changing mood of the Bradford working class and the Left in Bradford as a whole.The silent majority gave their tacit support for the war but a small group of activists – George Licence, Charlie Glyde and J. W. Ormandroyd opposed it, supported by other ILP and trade-union and ILP activists such as Fred Jowett. There were clear divisions with the pro-war section predominating. However, with the risk of military conscriptionemerging in 1915, thingsbegan to change and conscription proved pivotal. In June 1915 the BTLC passed a resolution

…believing conscription in any form to be a violation of the principle of civic freedom hitherto prized as one of the chief heritages of British liberty, and that its adoption would constitute a grave menace to the progress of the nation; it believes that a recourse to a compulsory system is uncalled for in view of the enormous roll of enlistments since the war began and further; it is impossible to reconcile a national service in industry with private profit-making, and further protests against those employers who are dismissing men because they are of military age. It therefore urges Parliament to offer their utmost opposition to any proposal to impose upon the British people a yoke which is one of the chief concerns of Prussian militarism.[[39]](#endnote-39)

The concern expressed here was also just as much with the Munitions Act of 1915, which had suspended ‘Trade Union rights’ and prevented vital workers moving from job to job without a certificate of approval from their employer, as it was against military conscription. Yet the threat of military conscription caused the main reaction as it was discussed in 1915. Gradually, the BTLC found that it began to drift away from the TUC Parliamentary circular calling for trade union help in army recruitment and, in a series of votes, slowly moved to an anti-war position in 1915. A vote in November 1915 indicated a more or less equal split of opinion but another, following a BTLC circular in December 1915, responded to by a third of the affiliated societies, had 19 affiliated societies with 6,757 members voting against supporting army recruitment campaigns and 11 societies, with 11,157 wishing to continue to do so. Many small societies did not vote on the matter and three abstained.[[40]](#endnote-40) This measure of opinion changed nothing but the introduction of conscription in January 1916 led to a dramatic decision by the BTLC to withdraw from supporting the army recruitment campaign. Shortly afterwards BTLC organised a Peace Conference which decisively condemned the Labour MPs for joining the Government and pushed strongly for peace negotiations.

The ‘peace movement’ soon became prevalent within the Trades Council, though there was still a sizeable commitment to the war effort by many affiliated unions. However, it must be remembered that most of those committed to the Peace Campaign were not pacifists, nor opponents of the War, so much as opponents of the Government’s military conscription policy which challenged the civil liberties of the nation which they were so patriotically defending. The imprisonment of Revis Barber, the son of Walter Barber who was Secretary of the Trades Council, as a CO (Conscientious Objector) also did much to win over more support to the new ‘peace movement’.[[41]](#endnote-41)

The Bradford Trades and Labour Council pressured the Yorkshire Federation of Trade Councils to hold a No-Conscription Conference at the Textile Hall, Bradford, in December 1916 and it sent delegates to the ILP No-Conscription Conference held at Leeds. As the BTLC annual report indicated, there were still ‘differences of opinion on the Great War’ but it was clear that the anti-war position was burgeoning. In 1917William Leach, editor of the *Bradford Pioneer,* presented his pacifist views to the Trades Council, a peace conference was held on BTLC premises and the BTLC sent delegates to the national formation meeting of the Workers’ and Soldiers’ Council in Leeds in June 1917, to join the 1,000 and more delegates demanding peace and exclaiming ‘Hail the Russian Revolution’. In September 1917 the BTLC affiliated to the broadly anti-war UDC. Thus by 1917 Bradford had become one of the centres of the Anti-War Movement, although geared more towards an early settlement of conflict, and the BTLC had become one of its chief supporters. Indeed, by 1917 the Trades Council it was being dominated by what the pro-war Palin dubbed ‘militant pacifists’ though the majority of its members were driven on by anti-conscription feelings rather than pacifist ideas.[[42]](#endnote-42) Yet divided, though it was, over war in both political and industrial organisation, the Bradford Labour movement retained links and a common cause.

 The Tory and Liberal press attack upon the Labour ‘Peace Movement’ was clearly wrong. Bradford may have been a ‘hot-bed of pacifism and anti-war feelings’ led by the ILP and the Trades Council but there was overwhelmingly strong support for the war effort between 1914 and 1916 which did not evaporate until the Military Conscription Act of January 1916. Even then, there were deep divisions within the movement as evident in the debate in 1914 and 1915. Even after 1916, when military conscription had been introduced, the emphasis remained one of loyalty to the war effort whilst advocating moves towards peace, driven on perhaps by the decimation of the ‘Bradford Pals’, the two active volunteer regiments of about 2,000 men who fought on the first day of the Battle of the Somme, 1 July 1916, when 1,770 were killed or injured in what proved to be one of the worst days ever for the British army.[[43]](#endnote-43)

 From this scenario emerges the vision of a Britain, a British Left and a Bradford Left committed to the war and the defence of Belgium, in the first couple of years of the war. However, the idea of patriotism being replaced by cynicism by 1916, very much encouraged by some of the post-war memoirs and diaries that were published and most notably by Robert Graves’, *Goodbye To All That,* would appear to be exaggerated. Paul Ward’s article on women knitting for the war and with David Taylors’ various essays, and recent book, on Patrick MacGill, suggest the continuing faith of many and an underlying patriotism for a country called Britain at the time as there was a longing for peace.[[44]](#endnote-44) The evidence of the Bradford trade union movement tends to confirm this view. Conscription might have changed the balance of opinion amongst Bradford trade unionists towards a negotiated peace but it did still allow for the pro-war and anti-war groups to work in a harmony of types in a situation where it might first appear that the pacifists and anti-war sections were dominating.

This sense of cohesion and balance was also maintained by the fact that there had also been a Bradford branch of the War Emergency: Workers’ National Committee from 1914 onwards. Its meetings dealt with wage levels, price increases, food, rents and others issues and their records deal with the minutia of life in the Great War. It was organised by the Trades Council, and the ILP, Labour Party, and many other socialist organisations gathered to it.[[45]](#endnote-45) This, as at the national level, kept the various sections of Bradford Labour operating together and confirms the views of J. M. Winter, Paul Ward and Royden Harrison that there was an underlying unity within the Labour movement despite divisions over the Great War.[[46]](#endnote-46)

**Conscientious Objectors, Huddersfield and the Great War[[47]](#endnote-47)**

In the light of the Bradford Labour movement’s essential patriotism driven towards seeking a negotiated settlement of the Great War after 1916, where then does Cyril Pearce’s work on nearby Huddersfield as a ‘community of resistance’ or a ‘community of conscience’, fit into a picture of widespread labour support for the war? If Pearce is right, the pacifist and anti-war ideas were widely accepted by both the Labour movement and the wider community in Huddersfield, and reflected upon established networks between the Liberal elite, popular support and the Labour and socialist movement in Huddersfield.

Yet from the start, and despite Pearce’s insistence upon the preponderance of anti-war feelings in Huddersfield during the Great War, Huddersfield experienced many of the dislocating and extraordinary features of home front life: it sent volunteers, and later conscripts, to fight at the front – indeed up to about 98 per cent of those who could go to war. Those that died are commemorated on the war memorials in Greenhead Park. It nursed the wounded in newly-established war hospitals, including Storthes Hall, which was also a mental hospital. It employed large numbers of women in nursing and industry, although like Bradford there had always been a large number of women employed in textiles. The town took in Belgian refugees feeling from German occupation. It was also typical in experiencing diverse and complex attitudes to war in general and on this war in particular. Attitudes in Huddersfield ranged from full support of the British government’s declaration of war, to objection to war and especially conscription – but a willingness to serve out of loyalty, to, extreme hostility to war on principle, and a refusal to co-operate with the military or war industries at any level.

 In many ways, therefore, Huddersfield, like Bradford, serves as a microcosm of the complexities of national responses to the war with divided opinion and competing loyalties.. Yet the strength of the pacifist element also makes it stand out. This makes it difficult to use Huddersfield as a representative example, of national tends. The strength of opposition to war in Huddersfield thus means that one must be careful to draw any general conclusions on the extent of opposition to the war. However, Pearce argues that one has examine the ideals that motivated the expression of opposition to war and the links or networks that existed between different pacifist groups to reveal the picture of mutual support (and at times divergence) between different local groups that reflect the ideological and organisational alliances and splits that existed at national level. He thus dispenses with the notion of pacifists and conscientious objectors as lone individuals acting out the dictates of their personal conscience. Instead , Pearce offers us a view of opposition to the war arising from deep-seated social and political roots which appealed to a large number of people of traditional labour and liberal sympathies. It is these beliefs that Pearce feels largely accounts for the level of opposition in Huddersfield to the war and explain why in Huddersfield there was none of the beatings and public humiliations of pacifists that was a feature of life for the COs elsewhere in the country.

 Pearce sees three main areas of opposition to the Great War in Huddersfield. First, there were the traditional old Gladstonian Liberals who subscribed to the ideal of international relations based upon what Gladstone himself terms ‘moral’ foreign policy, which required conciliation rather than aggression, international arbitration in the case of a dispute between nations, and a ban on war purely to conquer territory. Only when Germany invaded – and by all accounts violated – neutral Belgium did Liberal support for the war emerge. Even then Arthur Sherwell, the Liberal MP for Huddersfield, could not find it in his way to remain within the Liberal wartime government and left the party to sit as an independent Liberal. The Liberal-dominated Town Council was loyal to the Liberal wartime government but this was tempered by a refusal to compromise its traditional Liberal stance including a refusal it suspend council workers to encourage them to ‘volunteer’ for the army.

 Secondly, Pearce feels that there was a broad based popular opposition which took in the ordinary Liberal voters, local feminists, Quakers, some Baptists and Methodists. They were drawn, with others, into the Huddersfield Council of Civil Liberties, the local branch of the Union of Democratic Control, and eventually the No-Conscription Fellowship. Thirdly, there was the local Labour movement, which, unlike the national Labour movement and the Bradford Labour movement, appears to have been overwhelmingly united in its opposition towards the war. The local BSP, organised by Arthur Gardiner, was totally opposed to the war as was the ILP and the majority of the Labour Party and the Trades Council.

 This general opposition to the Great War, was strengthened by the introduction of military conscription in 1916. Resistance to the introduction of conscription in the autumn of 1915 brought out a solidarity in the West Yorkshire movement which the first year of the war seemed to have undermines. The machinery of conscription after January 1916 – Tribunal hearings, arrests, magistrates courts appearances, reports of Court Martial and the story of the ill-treatment of COs created a narrative of resistance around which the movement united, Many Huddersfield 117 COs (107 in Table 2 but raised to 117 in Table 4) were members of the ILP, BSP or trade-union activists. The most notable example was Arthur Gardiner, a member of the BSP and a trade union leader, who was brought before the Huddersfield Tribunal in March 1916. He became an overnight symbol of resistance to the Great War. Not a middle-class intellectual or a religious opponent of war he was an ethical opponent of the War. The *Leeds Weekly Citizen,* a Labour paper which had been scathing of religious and ethical COs passing through the Leeds Tribunal welcomes him as a genuine CO who was worthy of Labour support. [[48]](#endnote-48)

 Pearce might well be right that in Huddersfield we have an example of an area which was not divided on the war but united in its opposition to war. Nevertheless, the majority who were called up (about 98 per cent) to fight went and fought if they were accepted for the army, even though, as Huddersfield which had the highest proportion of COs related to the nominal manpower available to fight in the various in the textile areas of the West Riding of Yorkshire, the recognised hot-spot of resistance to the Great War, as indicated in Table 3, with 117 COs at the last count. Against this we have to accept that whilst there was less vilification of COs and opponents of war, the vast majority of the rest went and fought, died, and were memorialised in Huddersfield. Both conscience and patriotism were recognised in Huddersfield which, like the rest of the country, began to move towards the idea of a negotiated peace. Perhaps Huddersfield, and it Labour movement, was less divided over the Great War than Bradford and many other areas of the United Kingdom, but it is clear that the vast majority of those who conscripted fought for their country.

**Table 1 [[49]](#endnote-49)**

**No-Conscription Fellowship Branches in West Yorkshire 1915 and 1916**

Branch 6 May 1915 27 May 1916 1916

Bradford Yes Yes Yes

Bingley Yes Yes

Brighouse Yes Yes

Halifax Yes Yes Yes

Huddersfield Yes Yes Yes

Keighley & Dist. Yes Yes Yes

Leeds Yes Yes Yes

Mytholmroyd Yes Yes

Wakefield Yes Yes Yes

**Table 2**[[50]](#endnote-50)

**The Proportion of COs per 1,000 males eligible for war in some West Riding of**

 **Yorkshire towns**

**Local authority (1911 Census) COs FAU COS per 000 males**

Batley MB 2 1 0.12

Bradford CB 59 8 0.44

Brighouse MB 3 3 0.30

Dewsbury MB 6 4 0.24

Halifax CB 35 4 0.75

Huddersfield CB 98 9 1.96

Keighley MB 8 0.39

Leeds CB 125 44 0.59

Morley MB 3 0.26

Ossett MB 3 2 0.45

Pontefract MB 4 3 0.48

Wakefield MB 5 2 0.19

**Table 3 [[51]](#endnote-51)**

**Conscientious Objectors**

Arrested 6,261

Work of National Importance (Pelham Committee) 3,964

Friends’ Ambulance Unit (FAU) 1,200

Working directly with local tribunals 200

Non-Combatant Corps 3,300

Royal Army Medical Corp 100

Evaded the Act 175

Total 16,100

**John W. Graham, *Conscription and Conscience: A History 1916-1919* (London, 1922**

**Table 4 [[52]](#endnote-52)**

**Huddersfield COs by Motivation**

Socialists 45 15 BSP, 1 Fabian Socialist, 7 ILP, 7 SSS (Socialist Sunday School) and

 15 ‘Socialists’

Religious 44 1 Anglican, 18 Christadelphian, 1 Congregationalist,

1 Methodist 1 Primitive Methodist, 13 Quaker, 3 Wesleyan, 2 Roman Catholics 2 ‘Religious’

Other 10 1 Fellowship of Reconciliation, 7 No-Conscription

Fellowship, 2 Union of Democratic Control , 1 Moral and

 Ethical

Not known 18

TOTAL 117

**Conclusion**

War changed progressive politics in Britain and may have contributed to the subsequent decline of the Liberal Party. However, Labour was just as divided as the Liberals on the issue of war, even though there were exceptional areas, such as Huddersfield, where there may have been a ‘community of conscience’ generally opposing war What kept the Labour movement united was that the majority of the Labour movement, even the members of the ILP and the Bradford ILP, were pro-war and patriotic. Although the introduction of conscription in January 1916 changed attitudes towards war it did so more along the lines of the UDC demand for a negotiated peace and the various strands of labour opinion were bound together by the War Emergency: Workers’ National Committee which unified them further through fighting to improve the conditions of working people by attacking profiteering, encouraging the ‘conscription of riches ‘campaign *en route*to forming a vague policy on public ownership. The divided Labour movement was thus more fortunate than the divided Liberal Party as a result of the war and enhanced its position in the progressive politics of Britain during the inter-war years. However, the successful outcome for Labour was often achieved at the cost of great personal anguish as the Rev. Roberts, a leading Bradford Labour activist, found when he changed his position from taking up the ‘Fiery Cross’ against militarism at the beginning of 1914 to one, shortly after the outbreak of war, of it being ‘Better to die than to be Prussianised’ or under the ‘Prussian jackboot’. Attitudes towards war, in the Labour movement and Britain as a whole were refracted through religion, gender, racial, and social institutions and far more complex than ones of being pro-war and anti-war.
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