

Liberty!

Equality!!

Fraternity!!!

THE WORD

To Rouse The People, To Combat Fascism, and To Speed Commonweal.

An Organ of the United Socialist Movement, Edited and Published by Guy A. Aldred, at The Strickland Press.
104 George Street, Glasgow, C.1. All unsigned matter is from the pen of the Editor. Annual Subscription, 3s. 0d.

Vol. II. No. 11.

JUNE, 1941.

Price: TWOPENCE

WAR, PEACE AND THE FUTURE

The Churches Attitude

The Council of the Baptist Union, in its 1940 report, referred its members to a letter which appeared in *The Times* London, December 21st, 1940. This letter offered a Christian Basis for Peace. Its text was as follows:—

"The present evils in the world are due to the failure of nations and peoples to carry out the laws of God. No permanent peace is possible in Europe unless the principles of the Christian religion are made the foundation of national policy and of all social life. This involves regarding all nations as members of one family under the Fatherhood of God.

"We accept the five points of Pope Pius XII as carrying out this principle:—

"1. The assurance to all nations of their right to life and independence. The will of one nation to live must never mean the sentence of death passed upon another. When this equality of rights has been destroyed, attacked, or threatened order demands that reparation shall be made, and the measure and extent of that reparation is self-determined, not by the sword nor by the arbitrary decision of self-interest, but by the rules of justice and reciprocal equity.

"2. This requires that the nations be delivered from the slavery imposed upon them by the race for armaments and from the danger that material force, instead of serving to protect the right, may become an overbearing and tyrannical master. The order thus established requires a mutually agreed organic progressive disarmament, spiritual as well as material, and security for the effective implementing of such an agreement.

"3. Some juridical institution which shall guarantee the loyal and faithful fulfilment of conditions agreed upon and which shall in case of recognised need revise and correct them.

"4. The real needs and just demands of nations and populations and racial minorities to be adjusted as occasion may require, even where no strictly legal right can be established, and a foundation of mutual confidence to be thus laid, whereby many incentives to violent action will be removed.

"5. The development among peoples and their rulers of that sense of deep and keen responsibility which weighs human statutes according to the sacred and inviolate standards of the laws of God. They must hunger and thirst after justice and be guided by that universal love which is the compendium and most general expression of the Christian ideal.

"With these basic principles for the ordering of international life we would associate five standards by which economic situations and proposals may be tested (see "The Churches Survey Their Task," pp. 116, 117):—

"1. Extreme inequality in wealth and possessions should be abolished;

"2. Every child, regardless of race or class, should have equal opportunities of education, suitable for the development of his peculiar capacities;

"3. The family as a social unit must be safeguarded;

"4. The sense of a Divine vocation must be restored to man's daily work;

"5. The resources of the earth should be used as God's gifts to the whole human race, and used with due consideration for the needs of the present and future generations.

"We are confident that the principles which we have enumerated would be accepted by rulers and statesmen throughout the British Commonwealth of Nations and would be regarded as the true basis on which a lasting peace could be established."

This letter was signed:—

COSMO CANTUAR, Archbishop of Canterbury.

A. CARDINAL HINSLEY, Archbishop of Westminster.

WALTER H. ARMSTRONG, Moderator, Free Church Federal Council.

WILLIAM EBOR, Archbishop of York.



W. M. TEAPE

in Taibot Wood, Wallisdown, Dorset.

FROM SCHOLAR TO SOCIALIST

WILLIAM MARSHALL TEAPE, M.A.

The Rev. William Marshall Teape, M.A., B.D., would not have identified himself with Socialism and the United Socialist Movement, but for three important facts: his intense religious sincerity, which demanded a fundamental truthfulness in the actual social living as well as the intellectual interpretation of Christianity; a natural love of scholarship which seeks expression in secular truthfulness and so leads to a fundamental integrity of living; and the second Great War, which horrifies the conscience of every thinking man and compels Christians to consider what is wrong with the world, and the place and attitude of the Church in the world. These factors have operated both to compel and impel our comrade Teape to take his stand by the side of strange companions like the editor of this journal, for peace, Socialism, and the reconstruction of society on the basis of social justice and liberty.

William Marshall Teape has been a seeker for a truth, and a keen student, from his early years. His academic knowledge is evidenced by his degrees, although such degrees are not, in themselves, always testimony to the real worth of this knowledge. In argument against an orthodox world they have their importance. In 1882 he became M.A. of Edinburgh University, and Medallist for Hebrew and English. Three years later he became B.A. of Durham University, and also B.A. of St. John's College, Cambridge. Nine years later he became B.D. of Cambridge.

Ordained priest at Durham, in 1886, Mr. Teape became Curate of Rainton, 1885-88; Priest-in-Charge, S.E. Missionary District of Australia, 1889-91; Stockton-on-Tees, 1892-94; St. Barnabas, Hendon, Co. Durham, 1894-1900;

Vicar of South Hylton (or Ford), 1900-22. He was licensed to officiate in the Diocese of Winchester in 1928. In 1930, he published a work entitled *Westcott's Fear*, and in 1932, his most important study, *The Secret Lore of India*. To this he issued, in 1934, a supplement, consisting of further translations from the Forest Fathers, with notes.

When William Teape was in his nineteenth summer, a venerable missionary from Bombay, the Rev. J. S. S. Robertson, came to spend his closing years near the Teape home, and entreated William's father to allow his son to be taught the Sanskrit letters. Missionary Robertson had brought with him from Hindustan a bundle of reed pens, which he carefully sharpened, taught William how to hold, and how therewith to form the letters simple and compound of the sacred tongue. So was the reading of Sanskrit made possible. Those were the days when no one thought of printing Sanskrit in roman characters.

The result of Mr. Robertson's zeal was not seen until some years after William Teape's ordination, with a missionary sermon he preached. In it he described the Final Conflict for Christ which he was confident was nigh, even the battle of Armageddon, when the sixth golden bowl of the wrath of God should be poured out and the war of the great day of God the Almighty should begin, foretold in the Revelation of St. John. Where should it be fought and with whom? Plainly in India and with Hinduism, Islam and Buddhism.

Such his mind, the preacher recognised that he must try to understand the forces with which the conflict should be.

As his studies went on and the character of the forces to be met was more clearly discerned, Hinduism stood forth as the one power that must be grappled with. That conquered, he saw the Victory of the Cross secure.

To gain knowledge of Hinduism, however, he must evidently be able to read Sanskrit. So he sought out a paper, long forgotten, on which he had in copy the quaint alphabet and certain letters parted into their detail with hints for their composition, laid by since the days when the venerable white-bearded missionary had volunteered to teach him. He realised now that he had then made a crossing that had brought him into the field where he should both fit himself for the conflict and meet with the foe.

Foe? Yes. At first a foe was this strange untoward power, of whose character he had had some superficial knowledge, and of whose might and temples and idols he had by this time seen something, when, as a traveller ever pushing on, staying a while here and there, he had passed through India, between the incident of the reed pens and the preaching of the missionary sermon. Yet never a bitter foe or regarded with bitterness; and when, as his first experience, again taking up Sanskrit, he found himself learning something of the Upanishads, the instructions given to pupils "sitting near" ("sitting near" being the literal meaning of the word "Upanishad") by the Forest Fathers in the distant past, a surmise seized him that this Secret Lore, as its name "Upanishad" implies, might contain much wisdom of living.

As his studies broadened, Teape discovered that many of the world's thinkers he had always understood to be worthy only of condemnation were really friends that were helping him to understand better what he was eager to know. Reparation was needed.

The master that opened the author's eyes to the worth of these Eastern teachings was Professor Deussen. With wonder Teape read through Deussen's *Philosophy of the Upanishads* in A. E. Geden's translation, mystified thoroughly, as a tyro, yet every now and then caught up by the thoughts there laid open. Further enlightenment as to Unpanishad thought was afforded by the perusal of Deussen's *General Introduction [to Philosophy] and Philosophy of the Veda up to the Upanishads*. That is the first volume of Deussen's monumental *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie*. Teape also found of great value Deussen's edition of the *Sechzig Upanishads* with translation analyses and notes.

Deussen brought to Teape a grasp of the message of the Forest Fathers. The learned Professor to whom he owed his first clear general view of the documents of their teaching was R. E. Hume in his translation published in 1921 of the *Thirteen Principal Upanishads*. There, at last, these lay before him in intelligible English, divided into sections, each with its caption. Hume's translation Teape took as the basis for his versification. He felt that versification was better than prose for the presentation of the Upanishad announcements. Rendering into verse demanded, he soon found, a more thorough sifting of the meaning of words than a colourless prose requires. Besides, the frequently wearisome repetition of the same word, which was the Upanishad teachers' custom, made it advisable to use different allowable renderings.

For the ascertaining of the significance of passages Teape turned to two Indian scholars, Professors Belvalkar and Ranade, the *Creative Period of Indian Philosophy*, written by them jointly; to Professor Ranade's *Constructive Survey of Upanishadic Philosophy*; and to Professor Belvalkar's *Lectures of Vedanta Philosophy*. Dr. Crespi's *Contemporary Thought of Italy* contained just the side-lights he wanted from the thought of to-day. Side-lights he also found in certain English mystic poets.

What of the exposition of Christian doctrine? For that the author has found as a congenial authority, giving just the exposition that facilitated the comparison of the doctrine of the Eastern sages with that of Christian teaching, Brooke Foss Westcott, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, and afterwards Bishop of Durham. Here, as side-lights, Teape discovered not only certain mystic English poets, but also the great astronomer, Sir James Jeans, and the inspiring thinker and statesman, General Smuts.

When Teape came to write his work on *The Secret Lore*, he divided the book into Three Parts. The First is an Introduction in which the progress of the Sacred Tradition is traced from its beginning among the original Indo-European stock, from whom the Aryans, the people of the eventual Sanskrit tongue, are descended, to its culmination in the Secret Lore. The Second Part consists of Specimens of the said Secret Lore, being a few chief passages and some passages that have taken the author's fancy, together with Notes thereon, chiefly modern illustrations, and a Vocabulary of certain important words. The Third Part is a Conclusion, in which he notes how, to his mind, with Westcott to help him in his analysis, the Upanishad fathers are like prospectors who have caught sight, in outline and with not a little mist obscuring their view, what has been revealed in greater fulness and clearness to the Christian. Revelation has a history. A waiting of the world has to be until the Fuller Light breaks in.

So here is not strife but a recognition of Fellow-seekers after Truth.

Yet a battle there is, and the enemies to be encountered are those mentioned in the Epistle to the Ephesians (Eph. vi, 12) "the principalities, the powers, the world-rulers of this darkness, the spiritual hosts of wickedness in heavenly places," which beset and hinder the understanding and the endeavours of all men in their pursuit of a life of devotion to the Highest. Important it is for India and the world that

India should have its due place, concluded Teape the scholar and student of comparative religion, as a civic entity, in the comity of nations, but how much more important for India and the world that India have its due place as a spiritual member in the wisdom of world thought, the living Church of God?

In studying and translating the Forest Fathers, our comrade Teape was brought to a very close study of the poetry of Walt Whitman. His poetry of Freedom and of Individualism expresses much of the thought of the Forest Fathers as though written by a disciple unconscious of the existence of the Masters. From a study of Whitman and a belief in his magnificent assertions of living, it is but a step to pause at the claims of the world, especially in war-time, and to realise that all one's scholarship, one's quest of knowledge, one's love of learning, has forced one into rebellion against the claims of false gods. And so William Marshall Teape, a scholar, sitting near the Forest Fathers, whilst living in the midst of Western Civilisation, has become a Pacifist, and Anti-Militarist, and a Socialist. Knowing that the editor of this journal styles himself an Atheist, he reaches out the hand of fellowship, and says:—

"Comrade, let us unite that war and want and oppression may be banished from the world for ever; that hatred may pass away; that the darkness of the night may end; and that the dawn may come of a day that will never end in gloom; a day of justice, peace, and social service. Let us unite, that mankind may dwell together for evermore in peace and fellowship."

We accept the hand of brotherhood. We welcome the Rev. William Marshall Teape, M.A., B.D., to the Socialist movement. Discarding titles, descriptions, and academic honours, we say:—

"In the struggle against war and all despotism and terror, to the army that believes militarism will never destroy militarism, that civil justice must finally conquer all authority of man-power and might, we welcome you, Comrade Teape. We are strange companions but we live in strange days and we are fighting a strange fight. The end of Commonweal may be accomplished in wondrous and strange ways. As equals, believer and unbeliever, yet also both believers in the triumph of Truth, Liberty, and Justice, let us unite. Comrade Teape, welcome!"

THE DUKE OF BEDFORD'S PAMPHLETS

Mr. Alexander Ratcliffe in *The Vanguard* for May, 1941, reviews the new editions of the Duke of Bedford's *Why Have This War?* and *Parliament and Peace*. Both these pamphlets are issued from our press, at 2d. each, post free, 3d.

Reviewing the first pamphlet, our contemporary says:—

"The second edition of this helpful brochure is timely and very necessary for the present time. This publication, first appearing some years previous to the present War, gives one furiously to think. Indeed, it is matter for the thinker. The disclosures it makes are startling and convincing. We leave our readers to procure copies for a full examination of the text of the Duke of Bedford's rare and reasoned discourse. Christians especially will benefit by its contents."

The reviewer reproduces the author's quotation from Mr. Duff Cooper's article in the *Daily Mail* for April 4, 1940, on the need to violate the neutrality of the smaller Powers. On this he makes telling comment.

Of the second pamphlet, *Parliament and Peace*, the reviewer says:—

"A digest of the Discussion in the House of Commons on proposed Peace Talks (5/12/40). A very helpful guide on the subject of the need for sane people considering every proposal that might hasten the end of the present War."

In a footnote to these reviews, the editor of our contemporary, says:—

"Note.—We are so much impressed by these two publications that we have taken over a quantity for sale. . . . The Duke of Bedford, be it noted, is a Christian Protestant."

The Duke of Bedford's other pamphlets will be reissued from the press, as rapidly as possible, duly revised, in addition to new writings from his pen.

THE COMMON MAN'S DREAM

Rev. H. J. Adlard's Radio Indictment of Capitalism.

[We have published two portraits of the Rev. H. J. Adlard—both taken at Duluth—in these columns. Also a picture of the First Unitarian Church, Duluth, of which he was minister for so many years. The interesting announcements of the many excellent lectures he delivered in Duluth and also in Sioux City were reproduced—texts and philosophies in themselves. Finally, we directed attention to Adlard's work at Bath. These records and Mr. Adlard's poems have roused much interest, especially in the United States. Mr. Adlard used to contribute to the columns of "The Labor World," Duluth. The present editor of that journal has typed from its pages for March 19, 1938, an account of Mr. Adlard's radio speech attacking Capitalism. This we reproduce gladly. Comrades should get in direct touch with "The Labor World," Duluth. We would like to see this lively and interesting Labour journal commanding a large circulation in Britain.—Editor.]

REV. HARRY J. ADLARD DECLARES MACHINE HAS BECOME WORKERS' TYRANT AND MASTER

PASTOR OF FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH AVERS SYMPATHY AND JUSTICE ARE NEEDED TO PULL AMERICA OUT OF SLUMP, TELLS RADIO AUDIENCE OF DREAM OF COMMON MAN.

The machines, which in the last analysis mean power, have been mismanaged. Instead of becoming man's servant, lightening human toil and giving man increased leisure, they have become his tyrant and master. This charge was made by Rev. Harry J. Adlard, Pastor of the First Unitarian church, Tuesday night, March 15, 1938, over the radio, speaking from WEBC broadcasting station under the auspices of the Federated Trades Assembly.

Mr. Adlard referred to America as once the "dream of the common man." "To-day that dream is in danger," he said. "The common man in the bitterness of his heart is beginning to wonder if it was all a mistake." He charged that want of sympathy and the denial of justice formed the base of social and economic mal-adjustment. He defended the unemployment insurance system of Great Britain, and declared the workers after all were more interested in employment insurance. The full text of the speech follows:

HUMAN FACTOR FIRST.

It is written in a very old and very wise book that the strong ought to bear the burdens of the weak. It is one of the oldest unwritten laws of humanity that the more fortunate shall help the less fortunate; that wherever there is power there is also obligation and responsibility and that in all desperate situations the human factor comes first.

The needs of Duluth are great enough to wring the heart of any man who loves his fellow man. Happily they are not nearly so bad as elsewhere. I am amazed and gratified at the fine morale and splendid behaviour of Duluth's jobless workers. It proves that we have sound material in our midst, and its very soundness is its own most effective plea that justice be done tho the heavens fall.

FIRST PRINCIPLES.

In looking at this time of depression and colossal unemployment, I want us to get back to one or two first foundation principles, principles to be found as far back as the Hammurabi Code, the Decalogue, the Sermon on the Mount or the Declaration of Independence.

Henry George, that great and fearless prophet of social righteousness, stated that the law of progress was "association in equality," that any sound society was held together by the twin principles of sympathy and justice.

Search wherever you will, and you will find

that whenever these two basic principles are disregarded chaos and misery ensue.

The ethical roots of all our economic ills, our periodic panics, our perennial poverty lines, our atrocious, inequitable division of wealth, our present millions of men who would work, and cannot find it, reveals a denial of these fundamental principles.

DREAM OF AMERICA.

Theoretically, those two principles lie at the very basis of the great dream of America. In a recent outstanding book, *The Epic of America* by James Truslow Adams, the author again and again emphasis the fact that America is the "dream of the Common man."

When I use that word "common" it is not one of disrespect. I mean the common people who, years ago, heard gladly the words of a carpenter prophet of Nazareth.

We need to think in terms of that dream once more. Jefferson first proclaimed it. He dreamed of the common man, and whilst our tremendous growth and vast industrial complications have produced a country utterly beyond Jefferson's conception, the dream still holds good.

Andrew Jackson, spite of all his roughness, again proclaimed the dream. Lincoln sounded it in homespun words. Whitman, the first typical American poet, sounded it in megaphone tones over the housetops of the world.

IMPERSONAL FORCES.

Woodrow Wilson in his inaugural address restated it yet again as he saw it endangered by the encroaching menace of vast, impersonal forces, which thought in terms of profit rather than in terms of men.

For 150 years, through all the breaking of new frontiers in America, over the Alleghanies, across the broad Mississippi, stretching away over the great and fertile plains of the west, scaling the Rockies, until the last frontier was reached, the Pacific Ocean—through all the struggles, hardships, unthinkable privations, there loomed this dream—"America and the common man."

INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION.

There came the Industrial Revolution. The machine age struck America. The wheels of a thousand factories hummed, great cities arose. Still, the dream of the common man persisted.

And what was the dream? What has it ever been for the millions who have battled with nature in order that they might build a home and live in happiness and safety? It was the dream of a fair chance. "Equal opportunity for all and special privilege for none." It was the dream of a just reward for work well done. It was the dream of a right to work, a right to be, to live; a full, round life. It was a plea for simple, human, inalienable rights.

My friends, that was, and that is, the dream of America. Through all the corruption, all the graft, the political trickery, the mammoth monopolies, the privileged franchise, in spite of them all, the common man, in some fashion or another, has held to that dream.

DREAM IN DANGER.

To-day that dream is in danger. The common man in the bitterness of his heart is beginning to wonder if it was all a mistake.

The machines, which, in the last analysis mean power, have been mismanaged. Instead of becoming man's servant and lightening human toil, giving man increased leisure, they have become his tyrant and master. The common man has been exploited by means of the machinery which should have increased his happiness and well being.

We stand aghast to-day at the spectacle of millions of idle men, millions of idle looms, millions of wheels not turning.

We stand aghast at the fact that in the most highly favoured, most richly endowed land, where there has been no shortage on nature's part, that men willing to work, men with families needing the common necessities of life, with nature ready to supply them, are barred from access to the means whereby they can supply them.

WORKING WITHOUT PLAN.

Until we have faced and given some sort of answer to that question we have not looked at it fairly. We have not got to the roots. But when we do we shall see that it is a denial of the fundamental principle of "association in equality."

The fact is we have had no plan. We have been planless. Our social and economic order has just grown up like Topsy. Our social organisation has not kept pace with our material advance, and the development of the machine age. The result is the situation in which we find ourselves, a situation well described by Goldsmith, "where wealth accumulates and men decay."

Whether we think of it or not, every bit of salvage work, every effort to find a man a job, rests on a philosophy of the dignity and worth of man. John Ruskin said in unforgettable words that, "there is no wealth but life," and by that he meant well, well-being; and no matter how much material wealth we are able to produce by marvellous machines, what a mockery it is of the real wealth, when men cannot buy what they have produced.

PENALTY IS UNEMPLOYMENT.

Rather the penalty they pay at such times as these is the dreadful one of unemployment. The whole thing is not only stupid, it is a crying iniquity. What we need to do is to see that fact to admit it, and with it the further fact that the whole basis of our present economic order is challenged.

We hear to-day not a little about unemployment insurance. There is a great deal of misrepresentation about it too. It is spoken of with contempt as "the dole." If it is a dole, it is a dole to which every man below a certain wage makes a contribution. Unemployment insurance is in operation in every important European country. It has gone beyond the experimental stage.

In England, where I have examined it, at some length first hand, it has been demonstrated beyond refutation. In spite of some minor errors in its administration, now being corrected, there is no division of opinion as to its necessity and permanency, so long as we have our present social order.

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE.

An expert American sociological friend of mine spent some time in England making a close survey of its workings. He interviewed over 90 employers, representatives of the four main branches of industry—coal, textiles, metal workers and shipping—not a single employer was opposed to it.

Such a plan would not of course help the immediate, pressing situation. The immediate task is human relief, every job that can be found, the utmost spending power on the part of those who have the power. And—still more important than unemployment insurance is employment insurance.

As a last word: While these remedial agencies in Duluth and elsewhere are working might and main to alleviate present distress, to find jobs, to restore broken manhood, to feed the hungry, let us remember that these are palliatives only.

NO MORE DEPRESSION.

Let us beware of one, great, insidious danger—and it is this: Let us not say to ourselves when these times are over, "Well, that's over, thank God, now we can go on in our old sweet way. We can resume our former, thoughtless, hit-or-miss way of running society."

To do so would be nothing short of a crime. Far from that, rather, as millions said when the last shot of the great war was fired—never again.

So of this depression through which we are bungling, muddling, never again! It need not be! It must not be! Brains and brotherhood must join hands. Sympathy, which is the cement of all society blended with justice, must plan now, with every ounce of human intelligence so that the age-long dream of America and the common man may become a glorious reality.

BAKUNIN

Bakunin: the Father of Communism: not Capitalist State dictatorship, but genuine or Free Communism: the rival of Marx; the stormy petrel of the International; cast out of that organisation because he really believed in it; cast out after a fierce struggle, because of his radical understanding, his directness of approach, and the fearful jealousy of Marx: *his story is told in*

Guy Aldred's Bakunin.

The only popular and thorough political appreciation of Bakunin in English. 72 pages. Price 6d. Post Free, 8d.

Bakunin: a gentleman and a scholar, a man of wide reading and cultivated tastes; educated at a Russian military Academy; graduates with high honours; receives his commission; then, in revolt, discards his uniform for a dressing gown and spends his garrison days reading and reflecting.

Bakunin leaves Russia as a student; studies at Berlin; sits with Turgenev at the feet of Schelling; translates Hegel and Fichte into Russian; listens to music; plays chess; sits up all night discussing philosophy; believes in God and authority.

Bakunin: spied on by Russian agents; recalled to Russia by the Czar's Government; declines to be ordered back; has his property confiscated; repudiates authority; denies God; praises the ragged proletariat; demands the unity of Russian and Polish workers against Czarism and tyranny. This is in 1847. Bakunin is 36 years old. Europe plunged into revolution. Bakunin plays his part, is arrested, sentenced to death twice by Court-Martials. First, by a Prussian Court-Martial. Second, by an Austrian Court-Martial. Reprieved, only to be extradited to Russia. Austrian handcuffs are removed and Russian handcuffs substituted at the frontier. Czar Nicholas declares: "*He is a smart young fellow, but he is dangerous. We must keep him under lock and key.*"

Bakunin: After a terrible imprisonment he is exiled to Siberia. He escapes. Reappears in Europe. Renews his quarrel with Marx. Is accused of being a Russian police agent. Karl Marx and Wilhelm Liebknecht back these charges. To destroy him, Marx destroys the International. The Russian Revolution, which discovered Bakunin's "Confession," has established the baseness of this accusation with which Marx and Liebknecht played, to their eternal discredit.

Bakunin defends the Paris Commune of 1871; writes a few essays; inspires Malatesta; influences Spanish Socialism or collectivism; develops asthma; dies at Berne, July 1, 1876. Dreams of Freedom and the Social Revolution to the end.

Guy Aldred tells the story of this colossal figure of the revolutionary struggle in his

BAKUNIN.

Order now. Special Terms for Quantities. Every *Word* reader must read Aldred's story of Bakunin.

TREAT A FRIEND!

How about a Regular Monthly Personal Greeting throughout the year?

Take out a *WORD* Postal Subscription and have it sent to that friend of yours every month.

It will cost 3/-.

Please send *The Word* for 12 months to:

Mr./Mrs./Miss

Address

BAPTISTS AND WAR

Baptist Pacifist Fellowship

The Baptist Pacifist Fellowship is an Association of members and adherents of Baptist Churches, who covenant together to renounce war in all its works and ways; and to do all in their power to make the teaching of Jesus effective in all human relations.

In 1932 the Rev. W. H. Haden, M.A., of Burton-on-Trent endeavoured to organise a Baptist Ministers' Peace Movement. This proved unsatisfactory. Two years later he founded the Baptist Ministers' Pacifist Fellowship. It had 80 members. Five more ministers had joined by 1935, when membership was opened to members and adherents of Baptist Churches. The membership has increased steadily since then and to-day its adherents number 1,724.

In April, 1940, the B.P.F. achieved a Federal Union with the Fellowship of Reconciliation. Two important points were:—

(1) An interchange of membership, i.e., all B.P.F. members to become members of the F.O.R.; all Baptists who were members of the F.O.R. to become members of the B.P.F.

(2) The Baptist Pacifist Fellowship to administer its own affairs, appoint its own officers, committee, and delegates and determine and formulate its own policy.

General finances were merged in the F.O.R.

In 1941 the Rev. E. K. Jones, D.D., of Wrexham, became Chairman of the B.P.F. Giving his report for 1940, he said:—

"Our lives are fallen in trying times, but we do not bemoan our lot. We should rather thank God for calling us to so high an enterprise. Times of ease are apt to lull our souls into ignorance of the mighty forces of evil that are operating around us. Gethsemane and Calvary exposed these in all their hideousness. Times of persecution are also times of revelation. Sin, vile and black, becomes better known. Truth and holiness shine forth all the more when tested in the fires. To-day our B.P.F. has a great opportunity. . . . History, Science and Philosophy give no glimmer of hope. History declares nothing but an incessant repetition of wars. Science with its wonderful gifts has no way of life of its own, but is ever subject to human control. The sin-laden human element decides all, and up to the present it is ruled by the spirit of war. Philosophy may reveal the way things are done, and may even show how things may be changed, but it has no dynamic or initiative. All three are helpless while this poor world of ours is floundering from one foul pit to another, from one terrible war into other wars more terrible still. And all this goes on in the very light of God's revelation and within hearing of His call to a better way. . . . But as members of the B.P.F. we dare not compromise. We must preach the Prince of Peace. We must either obey loyally or quit. It is testing time. We have undertaken a great task—the total suppression of war. The enemy is very old, bitter and strong, but wars must cease. . . . I would ask all the members of the B.P.F. to be faithful, patient and confident. Our divine cause must succeed sooner or later. Many are preparing for a new order of politics, economics and social life after the coming Armistice. As a Fellowship our objective is the rule of love and a world without war."

During 1940 there were 32 resignations from the Fellowship. Most of them came in the months of June and July, when tension was greatest. Six members left the Baptist denomination—two for the Friends, two for the Anglican Church and two for the Cotswold Bruderhof. The last two severed their connection with the church witnessing in the world against the gospel of war and power.

The following ministers have remained loyal members of the B.P.F. during the war-period, maintaining faithfully their opposition to war as to Fascism, and to the belief in the arbitration of violence:—

Rev. F. C. Bryan, M.A. (Bristol),
Rev. Humphrey Chalmers, M.A. (Warrington),
Rev. J. Ivory Cripps, B.A. (Birmingham),
Rev. D. Myrrdin Davies, B.A., B.D. (Cardiff),
Rev. W. H. Haden, M.A. (Sutton Coldfield),
Rev. A. H. Hawkins (London),
Rev. Gwenyth Hubble, B.A., B.D. (Kirby Muxloe),
Rev. H. Ingli James, B.A., B.D., B.Litt. (Coventry),

Rev. S. H. Wing (Reading),
Rev. D. Gordon Wylie, M.A., B.D. (Leeds).

The Hon. Secretary of the B.P.F. is Rev. G. Lloyd Phelps, B.D., 21 Cambridge Drive, Denton, Manchester.

Members of the B.P.F. are also members of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland. The report of the Council of this Union to the Churches for 1940 contained the following important reference to conscientious objectors:—

"True to our Baptist tradition of maintaining liberty of conscience, the Union has protested against the penalising of conscientious objectors by businesses and public authorities which have dismissed them from their posts, and we are glad that in this we have the support of the Government. If men have satisfied tribunals of their sincerity and are competent for their tasks, it is plainly out of harmony with the will of the country, as expressed in the provision made for their honesty to be tested, for other bodies to arrogate the right to pass sentence upon them. We also expressed to the Government our deep concern when allegations were made of brutal treatment of objectors who maintained their position even though they were not given exemption from service, and we have secured the visitation in prison of some Baptist objectors whose names were brought to our notice. On the general question of the treatment of objectors we have received few complaints. The consensus of opinion is that, with few exceptions, the tribunals try to discharge their difficult and distasteful task with care and understanding. Judges, like the rest of us, are liable to error, and occasional miscarriages of justice are an inevitable part of the cost of having laws at all. The question must be faced in that wider setting, though vigilance must, and will be, exercised to ensure that cases are dealt with properly and the scales of judgment held even. It may be well to say here that, while one or two letters have been received regretting that the Union has not given more support to objectors by pursuing a pacifist policy, several objectors have themselves written thanking us for standing by them."

Under the heading "Foundations of Peace," the Council's report states:—

"The Council welcome a recent letter which has deserved and received wide attention, and do so the more readily as it crystallises opinion in the shaping of which during past years Baptists have taken an active and prominent part. It was signed by the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council as well as by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. . . .

"The Council accept, as the writers do, the Five Peace Points suggested by the Pope, but would add, as in their view essential, the right of all men and nations to full religious liberty."

"The Council also approve the 'five standards by which economic situations and proposals may be tested' put forward by the signatories, and give a general and cordial endorsement to the letter. . . ."

We reproduce that letter on the front page of this issue.

CONCHIES HAVE COURAGE

Last month we reprinted from the columns of the *Baltimore Sun* an excellent letter treating of the question of conscientious objectors. We now reproduce from the same paper for January 24, 1941, another letter on the same theme, addressed to editor of our contemporary:—

Sir,—Mr. Frederic Arnold Kummer apparently is not at all familiar with the courage of conscientious objectors. He has but to read "Is Conscience a Crime, by Norman Thomas; "We Won't Murder," by Paul Comly French, who is on the Selective Service Board under Clarence Dykstra, and many other books on this subject to verify the above.

In the last war the conscientious objector was subject to brutality and suffering which far exceeded the agony experienced by some of our own boys overseas only because they were not selfish enough to kill others for fear of their own lives. I think it requires more courage to decide for yourself when the majority is being swayed by propaganda, hysteria and fear.

Mr. Kummer says he has two sons who consider it not only a duty but an honour to serve their country if called. Believing this, they would be more respected if they voluntarily joined to aid their country instead of waiting to be called. Regardless of the consequences to himself; the conscientious objector is not only aiding his own country but all of humanity by refusing to shed the blood of others and in so doing preserving our great democracy.

MARTIN FRIEDMAN.

Baltimore, Jan. 22,

UNITARIANS AND THE HOLY WAR

By The Rev. Richard Lee, M.A.

(Minister, New Great Meeting House, Coventry)

The General Assembly of the Unitarian and other Liberal Christian bodies is the only religious organisation which, by a majority, has passed a resolution in favour of uncompromising pacifism. This was, however, before this war. Since the war, it has been agreed to pass a resolution expressing no opinion on the wisdom of this war but laying down pious principles as to the kind of peace we desire and the kind of Society which is to be built after the war is over. That was to have been the procedure at Oxford this year.

But it did not quite happen according to plan.

There was a rather stormy ruffle on the surface and beneath the surface there were distinct roarings and rumblings. Though no vote was taken there was raised the issue, quite clearly, between those who support this war as an instrument of policy and those who think this war, like the last, is a vain and futile struggle to achieve noble ends by ignoble means.

Three matters of supreme moment came before the members at the public and private sessions of the assembly and instead of a chronological account of the meetings I would like to set down the conflicting views on these matters. They are:

1. The Holy Innocence of Britain.

2. The Use of Force in War to lay the foundations of the New Jerusalem.

3. The wisdom of protest against the continuance of this foul, bloody struggle.

It was understood that as we all agreed with the pious abstract aims and principles of the resolution which embodied the manifesto of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, Cardinal Hinsley and other dignitaries, nothing controversial should be introduced.

The mover of the resolution in his address from the chair and the seconder acted far otherwise. One speaker spoke of the war as having its cause in a beer-cellar at Munich. The other questioned whether the Treaty of Versailles was not too lenient for the guilt of the Germans who made the last war.

As a considerable proportion of the audience resented this war-manufactured history these garbled versions were not allowed to pass without protest. One speaker of the pacifist group, among other arguments aroused a violent storm by pointing out that we were doing the same things as the Nazis in Bremen, Hamburg and Berlin and boasting about it.

We were not such Holy Innocents as the war-supporters pictured us. When another speaker got up to show how the post-war treatment of Germany had created Hitlerism, the British Nazis cried "Vote, Vote, Vote," and the closure was applied.

The Rt. Hon. H. A. L. Fisher in his *History of Europe* summed up the impartial judgment of history on the Versailles Treaty: "A great opportunity was missed. The statesmen made a peace which was no peace. Europe had not been made safe for democracy."

Even apart from the Versailles Treaty, the Black Troops in the Rhine, the re-arming of Poland, Czecho-Slovakia and Yugo-Slavia with the aid of France, the failure to disarm by the Allies, the scission of Upper Silesia by the clique of Nations, had far more to do with the growth of Hitlerism than what happened in the romantic beer cellar of Munich.

THE USE OF FORCE.

I was glad that this fundamental issue was raised in the Conference though it was raised in an unfair manner with no real opportunity for free discussion.

One official speaker put it plainly.

Only by force can we put down Hitlerism. The negative assertion "These things shall not be" is a *sine quo non* of the positive assertion,

"THESE THINGS SHALL BE."

The speaker went on to say that only by force could we dictate the kind of peace we desired. One would have liked five minutes to deal with the implications of this argument.

Mr. Liddell Hart could have dealt with the practical military and naval implications of this policy.

Events will show, as Poland, Norway and France have already shown, the easy optimism of these rose-coloured backers of war as an instrument of policy.

But leaving the concrete consequences alone, what the speaker calls force is cowardly foul murder and wanton destruction.

I do not meet one person in fifty who faces this use of force amid the mangled bodies, the ruined homes and the shattered churches of Coventry who believes for a moment that it can yield any spiritual result.

IAN MASARYK'S REPLY.

But a far more effective reply though an unconscious one, was given at the Conference by Jan Masaryk, the Czecho-Slovak Foreign Minister in his Essex Hall Lecture on "The Immortal Soul." It was not an easy lecture to follow, but its main theme was stated quite plainly:—

"The condition of Europe as a whole was due to the lack of ethical religion. Love was the supreme thing in the world and we had despised the principle of love in our economies, our politics and our religion.

"Only by a religion of love carried out in every part of life can we hope for a better world."

That the cowardly butchery and criminal destruction which the religious euphemist calls "Force" and the politician "war," and the way-faring man "murder" will prove an instrument for the triumph of love can anyone really believe?

SHOULD PEACE MEN BE SILENT?

This was the third issue discussed at the Peace Fellowship and also in private conversation.

Everyone agreed that we should bear our witness against this war. Some, however, like Brer Rabbit would "lie low and say nuffin" in war-time except a brief statement of one's position.

Our witness should be confined to meetings of small groups and the churches should confine themselves to questions on which there is general agreement, e.g.:—

- Better treatment of refugees.
- A just peace when the war is over.
- The keeping down of bitterness and hatred towards our foes, and such like.

By uniting ourselves to these matters we should keep our congregations together and avoid unhappy disastrous schisms in the Churches.

This moderating view was, I think, the view of the majority of the Peace Fellowship though there were inner searchings of heart among some as to its wisdom and its courage. The other view was stated that the continuance of this war is a menace to everything decent in civilisation and everything precious in religion. Even now it was destroying our freedom bit by bit and was carried on by methods without any shred of morality or humanity on both sides. Every other means of telling the truth about the ghastly business was closed to us, B.B.C., public meetings, press, cinema and parliament.

There should be some united attempt on the part of Pacifist ministers to bear the witness in public which in their inmost souls they felt as to the wickedness and futility of the continuance of this war.

In the final outcome, the Peace Fellowship instructed its Committee to explore ways and means of joining with other religious bodies in a little more peace activity.

In the meantime it should not be forgotten that every pulpit can be used for propagating the cry of "on to victory, victory, victory," in the name of the God of Love and for the sake of

that new Jerusalem in which both pacifists and Never-Endians believe.

One thinks that war, in spite of all its horrors, will hasten the new Jerusalem. The other is convinced that war, and especially this war, will make any better world a far-off age-long dream.

I wonder whether the war-dreaming romanticists or the peace-loving realists are right.

THE DUKE OF BEDFORD

The Duke of Bedford contributes a striking essay to the current issue of *The Hibbert Journal* on the 18B question, under the caption: *Do We Live in a Free Country?* The essay opens in a manner that the working man would consider pertinent did he read such quarterlies as *The Hibbert*. The Duke states:—

"A writer in a Scottish Socialist paper, in a pertinent if somewhat acid comment on the popular view that we are 'fighting for freedom,' enquired, Freedom for whom and to do what? There is more in the question than meets the eye. A British unemployed man living in peace time on a scanty dole may have liberty of speech and liberty of political association, but how much liberty does he really possess? How much better off is he than the German workman in regular employment with whom a friend of mine attempted to commiserate on the ground that he was not allowed to criticise his Government and had his opinions manufactured for him by the State?"

The writer proceeds to discuss the conditions of the 18B prisoners, the circumstances of their arrest, and the general menace to thought and social well-being of modern totalitarian war and the tendency towards totalitarian government. We hope to reproduce the full essay later.

In a recent issue of *Forward* the Duke of Bedford published a long letter criticising the capital levy. This letter will be reprinted as soon as possible. So will another very long letter on the question of peace, from the Duke's pen, contributed to the *Harrogate Advertiser*. In this letter, the writer analyses the case for and against war, and defends the pacifist conclusion that militarism cannot destroy dictatorship or cast out despotism. He emphasises his own opposition to all cruelty, persecution, and dictatorship. This is a very long and mild but effective letter.

UNITARIAN NOTES

BATH.—During the prolonged indisposition of the Rev. H. J. Adlard, the pulpit at Trim Street has been occupied by Free Church Ministers of the city, six of whom responded to an appeal to keep the pulpit going during Mr. Adlard's illness. In view of the definite Libertarian and Socialist character of Mr. Adlard's addresses, his outspokenness on all subjects, his belief that the pulpit must be the centre of thought, the action of these ministers was appreciated greatly by Mr. Adlard's friends and admirers.

GLOSSOP.—The Unitarian congregation at Glossop united with Whitfield Parish Church and St. Luke's Church in five Thursday evening services during April, on the theme of "Towards a new Christian Social Order." The choirs of the three churches were responsible for the music and the attendances were good and representative. Discussions were held in an adjoining room after each service on the preacher's address. The joint services argue that Trinitarianism is growing less intolerant of Unitarianism. It can hardly do this and maintain its insistence on the divinity of Jesus or the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead. If the Christian ethic is more important as a basis of unity than the Trinitarian theology, then clericalism and orthodoxy are finished.

NEWPORT, Isle of Wight.—On March 19th the Rev. Gordon Cooper, M.A., preached a Unitarian sermon at one of a series of interdenominational services held in Carisbrook Church. The invitation to Mr. Cooper from the Vicar was much appreciated by the Newport Unitarian Congregation.

PLYMOUTH.—After the destruction of the Unitarian Church and Schools by enemy action, the Rev. E. H. Kersley discussed the possibility of amalgamating in the circumstances with other churches. Admitting that economies in buildings and ministries might thus be effected, he stressed the importance of keeping alive the Unitarian spirit and outlook in religious matters. The Unitarian witness, which would still be needed in Plymouth as elsewhere, could hardly continue without separateness. Amalgamation with other churches would eventually lead to disintegration. Truth would be compromised by an alliance with superstition.

OUR LETTER-BOX

Dear Sir,—May I say I have enjoyed many of your addresses at Abertillery in days gone by, and incidentally last heard you in Hyde Park prior to the War. I have enjoyed the copies of the *Word* that I have received.—Yours Sincerely,

T. JONES.

Penarth, May 10.

Dear Mr. Aldred,—I send you my sincere thanks for publishing such a fine paper; it is a great pity that its circulation is not many times greater. I send you my very best wishes, and wish you every success in promoting Socialism.—Yours fraternally,

R. A. PICKERING.

Bryn, near Wigan.

Dear Aldred,—I think the *Word* is absolutely "great" in its fearless exposition of Pacifism, and the defence of Objectors to Militarism.

Would God all Christian ministers would only take the same stand with regard to the monstrous evil of war!

I was at Dyce Camp in 1916.—Best wishes, yours,

F. A. GILMORE.

Grays, Essex, May 2.

Dear Sir,—I have become acquainted with your paper, *The Word*, with its Socialist slogan: "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." For these three I might substitute the one word—Commonweal, for if you stop to think of the paucity of ordinary intelligence among the masses, I fear they would not know how to use this liberty; how to appreciate equality, nor how they and the more enlightened, cultured and highly evolved could possibly fraternise. We all know the causes of war. We know its devastating effects, yet the masses can still be conscripted into fighting armies more terrible than ever in our history, fighting wars by a handful of men who know what they want and go all for it. The notion Power—the power of wealth, of inherited properties in land and incomes, a handful of men owning this free England and exploiting its wealth—and with such gilded ostentation subduing and oppressing the crude and darkened minds of these same masses. Royalties with their blazoned, disgusting inherited deceitfulness, Popes and Cardinals, Bishops and Prelates with the pomp of robes and vassals—like the stage set for an act. These are the combined forces which make the laws that man blindly learns to kill and die for. Ignorance of the masses therefore is the chief medium of keeping kings on their thrones. Political chicanery as a governing state—popes and priests in the guise of spiritual leaders in their soft chairs. These are the dictators—the handful who, by their suggestion, play on the susceptibilities of the lower masses always susceptible to emotional values.

Let your paper propagate the truth, repudiate an autocracy bearing the name of a democracy. Have the moral guts to stand up to such dictators and humbugs whoever and wherever they are. Think in terms of the dignity, the unbounded strength of each man, woman and child in the making of a new order. Use this consciousness as a power linked up with the power of the hemispheres. Instil into the minds of your readers a belief in their individual importance, in the sacredness of their charge, by the power of each suggestion we might build on the stars.

But while we wallow in petty differences, in selfish lusts, in fear of losing a job, so surely will we create the Mussolini's with their warring "heilers" out to smash us up.

What has man made of London, of Manchester, of Birmingham, of any of the cities of this country. Places intolerable to live in; noise-wracked shrieking, looting. The very earth trembling under us. Eyes and nose assailed on every side with sights and smells that sicken. And the children of the poor begat in dark fetid slums of these cities of cathedrals and gross commerce to the utter destruction of the race, for such environment spells moral death to a finer evolution. With the total destruction of those who have built upon such a fabric, Hitler has shown the power of bluff in his propaganda; he knows how the minds of the masses are played upon. These masses are ready to receive other impressions. This large consciousness is unfolding. The time is propitious to the awakening of these emotional bodies. Your mission is clear.—Yours faithfully,

FLORENCE RENYARD.

Farnham, 3/5/1941.

TO POSTAL SUBSCRIBERS.

Postal Subscribers are requested to note that "The Word" Subscription is 3/- for twelve consecutive issues and 1/6 for six consecutive issues. Six or more copies are sent post free to any address in Britain at the rate of 2d. per copy.

A X against this paragraph indicates that your Subscription Renewal is due. Please send us the Renewal Subscription without delay to assist the struggle.

THE SCOTTISH SECRETARIAT

THOMAS JOHNSTON'S EVOLUTION

(continued from page 116).

[We have hoped to conclude this study in this issue. But the instalment would be too big to publish in one number. The essay will conclude in August.—Ed.]

IV.—"THE HUNS AT HOME."

In Chapter I, we reproduced Johnston's 1927 advertisement of his *Tory Profiteers* pamphlet. The reader will recall that this advertisement refers to his *The Huns at Home* pamphlet and boasted that 200,000 copies had been circulated. It claimed that this pamphlet contributed to the Labour victories at the General Election of 1922. This advertisement dates the pamphlet, which bears no year of publication on its title page.

The pamphlet consists of 16 pages. There are two pages of 10 point and 13 pages of 6 point. Roughly, it amounts to about 8,000 words. The extracts date the pamphlet, which now belongs to history rather than to propaganda. The data makes very valuable history from the Socialist standpoint.

The title page reads as follows:—

THE HUNS AT HOME

During Three Years of the Great War

By THOMAS JOHNSTON
(Editor of "THE FORWARD")

PRICE ONE PENNY.

"The Forward" Printing and Publishing Company,
Ltd., 164 Howard Street, Glasgow.

There was no preface and there were no chapters. The pamphlet opened in 10 point, and this was the introduction. The pamphlet was divided by eight cross-headings.

The introductory section indicted Capitalism in terms that can be considered to-day:—

"Capitalism can have no notion of commonweal; it can have no patriotism, since its very nature is to suck, leech-like, for profit—irrespective of any national or social consideration, and a nation's hour of distress and extremity is Capitalism's hour of greatest opportunity. During a war in which the nation is fighting for its life, Capitalism will raise its rate of interest upon money loans; it will increase its freight charges; it will raise its land rents; it will increase its charges for coal, iron, and food; it will hold up supplies of vital commodities; it will, in short, exhibit itself even more nakedly than it does in times of peace, as the real enemy of the people."
The italics are in the original.

Johnston proceeded immediately to define the purpose of his pamphlet:—

"The purpose of the following citations and extracts from the admissions in the Capitalist Press during the three years of the Great War is to supply in accessible form a massed, unanswerable case against the Capitalist system—an arsenal of authenticated fact and figure, to which every Socialist may turn in his daily task of sweeping the scales from the eyes of his fellows."

In view of Johnston's present position in the Cabinet no one will venture to question the authenticity of his quotations. These were presented by their compiler—for Johnston compiled rather than wrote, since he is not a great original writer or theorist—under suitable headings as follows:—

HIGH FINANCE: THE PRESS TURNS KING'S EVIDENCE.

The first War Loan in 1914 was at 3½ per cent. interest to the moneylenders. The second War Loan was at 4½ per cent., and those patriotic investors who held the first 3½ per cent. War Loan Stock were allowed to transfer into the new 4½ per cent. Loan—a clear gift of 4 millions a year in extra interest to the moneylenders. Then when, in January, 1917, the third War Loan at 5½ per cent. was issued, the 4½ per cent. were raised to the profits on the new and higher level. The *Glasgow Herald* mildly criticised this ramp by saying it "does not help us at all to prosecute the war," and the *Daily Telegraph* openly declared that investment in the War Loan was no sacrifice but a golden opportunity, and "a certain gain."

At least three writers have dealt with the money position at the outbreak of war—Mr. John A. Hobson, Mr. Oswald Stoll, and Mr. Frederick Temple. Each tells us that the banks had no money to lend the Government, that they were afraid of a panic, and that the bankers interviewed Mr. Lloyd George, then

Chancellor of the Exchequer, and "he did everything we asked him to do." The banks were shut for four days. Mr. Lloyd George got millions of pounds' worth of Treasury notes printed (£1 notes in black and 10s. notes in red colours), and handed over this money, backed by the credit of the State, to the banks upon terms that have never been disclosed. But, curiously enough, the banks were soon lending back at interest to the State, the credits which the State had so obligingly found for the banks, and Mr. Temple, in his "War Finance and the Worker," relates how he is in possession of a circular sent out by the banks to private individuals, advising them to borrow credits from the banks at 3 per cent. and lend them to the Government at 4 per cent.

"Money," declared the *Financial Times*, "is at last coming into its own."

In March, 1916, the Bank of England was issuing advertisements in the press as follows:—

"IF YOU CANNOT FIGHT."

"If you cannot fight, you can help your country by investing all you can in 5 per cent. Exchequer Bonds. Unlike the Soldier, the Investor runs no risk."

Johnston quotes the leading article from the *Glasgow Herald*, for Monday, May 29, 1916, complaining that war investment was regarded "not as a patriotic duty, but as a profit-making medium;" McKenna's statement as to the power of the banks in the House of Commons, *Hansard*, August 15, 1916; *Manchester Guardian's* complaint against the bankers, September 9, 1916; *Glasgow Herald*, October 4, 1916, on the investing public; and the *Nation*, June 1917, denouncing war loans and inflation. These quotations make amazing reading.

Johnston turns to coal in these terms of analysis and indictment:—

COAL: SINGING THE NATIONAL ANTHEM, THEY RUSHED AT THE NATION'S THROAT.

According to Mr. Smilie, the coalmasters declared that their costs of production had been raised 50 per cent. between December, 1914, and February, 1915. But there was no increase in wages during that period. The 50 per cent. increase was bogus, and was merely an excuse to raise prices.

Welsh Coal Shares have risen since the outbreak of war by 60 per cent.—(*Edinburgh Evening News* 13/3/15.)

The Board of Trade Committee to enquire into the rise in the cost of coal reported (p. 7, Cd. 7866) that, whereas the total increase in the cost of production and distribution was at most 3s. per ton, the owners and distributors had raised prices by from 7s. to 11s. per ton.

The coalowners refused for 3½ months even to confer nationally with the miners over a demand for increase in miners' wages, and the *New Statesman* (April, 1915) estimated that "Every week the employers can delay the inevitable increase of wages means in the agreeable something like a quarter of a million pounds sterling in addition to their profits."

A coalowner, Sir Arthur Markham, stated in the House of Commons, that before Italy joined us in the war, British owners were selling coal to Italy at 17s. 6d. per ton. The day after war was declared, and Italy became our Ally, the price was jumped to 34s. per ton.

The Cabinet bided its time until 85 per cent. of the colliery output had been contracted for a year in advance at high prices before it announced its farcical scheme of limiting profits. The colliers had reached the limit of endurance. South Wales went on strike. Under the Government's Bill, coal for the Navy, for the Mercantile Marine, for export abroad, for the making of patent fuel, in addition to coal already contracted for, was exempted from price control (Clause 4, Sub-section 3). Finally the Government agreed to the men's term, and when the trouble was over the *Glasgow Herald* (20/7/15) commenting on the whole knavish business, declared that "The tender mercies of the coal rings are cruel."

Mr. Jonathan Samuel, M.P., estimated (*Manchester Guardian*, 23/7/15) that the new "Limitation of Prices Act" would increase the coalowners' plunder by £70,000,000 per annum; Sir Arthur Markham, M.P., said the new limitation would increase his profits by 1s. per ton; and Mr. Runciman, in introducing his Bill, said that "within the past year the coalowners of Great Britain had increased prices to the British people to the extent of £20,000,000." Mr. Wm. Le Queux, in his volume "The Deadly Peril," declared that "Coal delivered in London at 16s. per ton before the war is now delivered at nothing less than 40s. per ton."

But when the owners' profits were limited to an increase of 4s. per ton over pre-war rates, there were many loopholes left. An owner could start a coal-factoring business and sell to himself usually under another name; and although the coal factors were limited to a profit of 1s. 6d. per ton, they frequently sold to each other, and as the *Evening Citizen* hinted (31/5/16), each transaction added another 1s. 6d. per ton to the price. Then the Welsh coal kings demanded an extra 2s. 6d. profit (July, 1916). The Government gave them permission to take it, and on September 23rd, 1916, the *New Statesman* told us why:— "... it became necessary, for diplomatic reasons, to restrict the price charged for coal

going to France and Italy; and the South Wales coalowners insisted on being allowed to charge the home consumer what they had to be prevented from charging to the French and Italian importers." Two shillings and sixpence a ton is 1½d. per cwt.; consumers who burned two cwt. a week had therefore to find an extra tribute to the coalowners of three-pence a week, or 13s. per annum.

In 1916 the United Collieries Coy., Ltd., raised 156,000 tons of coal less than they had raised in 1914, yet their profits had increased by £206,000.

SHIPPING: THE PATRIOTIC SEA PIRATES.

How the shipowners have plundered the public is, since Mr. Bonar Law's admission about his own investments in shipping shares (see Press, 4/7/17), a matter of common notoriety; but the student of Capitalism knew about it long, long ago. After five months of war—in January, 1915—the *Co-operative News* indignantly referred to the increase in freightage from the Argentine (11s. 3d. to 50s. per ton) thus:—

The somewhat long excerpt declared that, since the British Navy had swept German shipping off the seas, British shipping companies were able to wring extortionate profits out of British consumers. Johnston proceeds to quote the *Journal of Commerce*, November 27, 1914, the shipowners' journal, which stated precisely: "German ships being swept off the seas, we have now no serious competitors in the carrying trade of the world." He quotes the *Western Mail*, as stating that new shipping companies are being formed, one with "Lord Rhonda, the Food Controller, at its head." The same journal said: "A state of war exists, and with it the chance of enormous profits."

Johnston collected a vast amount of data showing how the war increased shipping profits. Space does not permit quotation of these interesting details. He continued:—

The *Statist* gave the net shipping profits for 1915 as 250 millions as against 20 millions in 1913. Even after deduction of their excess profits tax of 50 per cent. this was an increase of 543 per cent. Much ingenuity was shown in the methods by which the excess profits tax was evaded. One such method (see *London Times*, 27/12/15) was for shipowners to charter their ships to friends in neutral countries at very low rates, yielding the shipowner a nominal profit of, say, 6 per cent. for the year; he thus escaped the excess profits tax, and the friend, being a neutral and not subject to excess profits tax, made a fortune; at the end of the year the shipowner and the friend quietly shared the booty.

Shortly after the outbreak of war, 247 ships were sold to freight owners. The Government admitted that two fleets of ships had been transferred to the American flag (*Glasgow Herald*, 28/7/16). The Japan Mail Steamship Company transferred itself to the Japanese flag, and now calls itself the Nippon-Yusen Kaisha. For the six months ending 31st March, 1917, it reaped £2,215,524 in profits.

The Government secured 52 interned German ships from Portugal, but instead of using them to break shipping ring prices, obligingly handed them over to Messrs. Furness, Withy & Company, the shipowners, to "manage." (*Hansard*, 23/8/16).

Mr. Henry Maelver, chairman of the Liverpool and North Wales Steamship Company (*Liverpool Courier* report, 4/11/16) told his shareholders, at their annual meeting, that shipowners could not "justify their action in taking advantage of the present position in order to benefit themselves at the country's expense."

Shipowners and others, for their own individual benefit, had quite unnecessarily increased and were still further increasing the cost of foodstuffs to the consumer. . . .

The *Dundee Telegraph and Post* (16/6/17) says—"Freight rates have been increased more than tenfold, and the entire cost has fallen on the consumer."

The *Daily Express* (16/11/16) described how shipowners were charging depreciation at current war prices on their ships before paying excess profits tax.

Sir John Ellerman, whose "recreation is looking out for investments," is rapidly acquiring a monopoly of what shipping is left. Already he owns £35,000,000 worth of ships, over one-eighth of British liner tonnage of more than 1,000 tons—more than the tonnage of the entire mercantile marine of Italy.—(*Daily Chronicle*, 30/4/17).

You understand now what the British Capitalist means when he refers to "The Freedom of the Seas!"

Under the caption, "Weevils in the Wheat," Johnston next dealt with the war cornering of wheat. He proceeds to indict the bakers as follows:—

In August, 1914, the Glasgow Master Bakers' Association proposed to raise the price of the 4-lb. loaf by a penny. The United Co-operative Baking Society refused, saying there was no need for the increase. The Master Bakers' Association quietly dropped their proposal.

In the House of Commons Mr. Runciman admitted that "4 lbs. of wheaten bread were selling in Paris for 7d., whilst in London the price was just half as

much again." (*New Statesman*, 11/11/16.) Sir Francis Webster, at the Arbroath Chamber of Commerce, said the American Relief Committee were selling the 4-lb. loaf to the Belgians at 7½d., and making a profit of 10 per cent. on the business, while "the same loaf was being sold in London at 9½d." (*Arbroath Guide*, 4/11/16.)

By September, 1915, the Board of Trade Labour Gazette was announcing that the retail price of working class food had increased 40 per cent. since the beginning of the war. By July, 1916, it had increased by 65 per cent. The *London Times* (14/8/16) declared that "the supply of wheat on passage is fair, but the stocks are in speculative hands."

The *Statist* discussed the "London Wheat Corner," and asked dispassionately whether "the present withholders of imported wheat" would get "home with their 7s. or 8s. per quarter profit," or would they hold on too long and be "caught with some 200,000 quarters" on hand when the new supplies came in; and the *Times* (17/8/16) said that there were 120,000 quarters of wheat more in the country than there had been in the spring, yet the loaf had risen to 9d.

While British bread was being diluted owing to flour scarcity, cargoes of wheat were being sent to Sweden (*Daily News*, 10/5/17), and the *Yorkshire Telegraph* (21/5/17) reported that three large steamers with grain from England to Sweden had been torpedoed by the German submarines. Yet Sweden, they told us, was a pro-German country.

(To be continued.)

ISLE OF MAN ACT

The official text of this Act is as follows:—

Isle of Man (Detention) Act, 1941.

4 & 5 GEO. 6 CH. 16.

CHAPTER 16.

An Act to enable persons detained under powers conferred under the Emergency Powers (Defence) Acts, 1939 and 1940, or the Aliens Restriction Act, 1914, to be removed to and detained in the Isle of Man. [10th April 1941].

PREAMBLE.

Removal of detained persons to Isle of Man.
4 & 5 Geo. 5, c. 12.

1. A person detained in pursuance of powers conferred under the Emergency Powers (Defence) Acts 1939 and 1940, or under the Aliens Restriction Act, 1914, may, in accordance with directions given by the Secretary of State, be removed to the Isle of Man and detained, for the whole or any part of the period for which the order or direction for his detention remains in operation, at any place in that Island, and while so detained, and while being removed from the United Kingdom to any such place, or from any such place to the United Kingdom, shall be deemed to be in lawful custody.

2. This Act may be cited as the Isle of Man (Detention) Act, 1941.

"THE NEW LETTRE DE CACHET."

The *Spectator*, London, under the heading, *The New Lettre de Cachet*, has published some correspondence on the subject of *Isle of Man Detention Act*, which received the royal assent on April 10.

We reproduce two letters: one from the pen of Commander Geoffrey Bowles, R.N., which appeared in our contemporary for March 28 last; and the other from the pen of Captain Arthur Rogers, O.B.E., Hon. Secretary, Liberty Restoration League, which was published on April 11.

Commander Bowles writes:—

Sir,—Parliament was invented to curb the Executive in defence of Englishmen's liberties. The right of trial before prolonged imprisonment is one of our most cherished liberties. The guilt or innocence of suspected persons ought to be quickly established in open court. Exercising its true function in 1679, Parliament strengthened the Common Law by passing the most famous of the four Habeas Corpus Acts to enforce the right of personal freedom by preventing prolonged imprisonment without trial. Lord Clarendon had previously been impeached for sending persons in custody outside England, where they could not be tried. The 1679 Act forbade Englishmen to be sent prisoner to Scotland, Ireland, Jersey or any place beyond the seas. It made the commit-

ting of any man to prison out of the realm the one praemunire unpardonable even by the king. This was expressly to prevent persons from being removed from the jurisdiction of English courts.

The present Parliament has already been called the "Suicide Parliament" from its having abolished its own privileges on December 11, 1940. The present Government is now asking Parliament to plumb still lower depths of infamy by passing a Bill, with the short title of the "Isle of Man (Detention) Bill," to reverse the Act of 1679 by giving the Executive power to send prisoners out of the jurisdiction of English courts, to the Isle of Man, where the Executive could imprison them indefinitely without trial. Although this Bill has only two sentences, they are enough to destroy our liberties. The Home Office is trying to rush this Bill through Parliament. If Parliament passes this Bill, it would enable the Government, under pretext of fighting Hitlerism, to get rid of persons inconvenient to it, without the possibility of their being brought to trial—a practice which led to our Civil War nearly 300 years ago. If Parliament still further abdicates its function by passing the two fatal sentences of this Bill, it will have denied a natural right of man, older than Magna Carta, which did not invent the right, but only affirmed it. Is it possible for even this Parliament to sink so low?—Yours faithfully,

GEOFFREY BOWLES.

25 Catherine Place, S.W.1.

Captain Arthur Rogers wrote:—

Sir,—In your issue of March 28, Commander Geoffrey Bowles's letter, under the heading "The New Lettre de Cachet," criticised the Isle of Man (Detention) Bill, which is to reverse the vital provisions of the Habeas Corpus Act of 1679 by authorising the Executive to transport unconvicted British subjects out of the jurisdiction of the English and Scottish courts. In your last issue, under the same heading, Mr. H. P. Garwood's letter avers that "the normal processes of the courts" are insufficient protection against Fifth-columnists, &c., and defends the "locking up of all those against whom there is even the least suspicion." It does not reply to Commander Bowles's objection to the transportation of unconvicted subjects into what must amount to outlawry.

I have not heard of any argument for the retention in full of the "normal processes of the courts" where suspected traitors or enemy-agents are concerned. All are agreed that the Executive must be empowered to act promptly in apprehending such persons. The granting of special powers, however, calls for some safeguards against injustice to loyal British subjects. The issue raised by Commander Bowles is, clearly, whether the Executive, particularly the unidentifiable denizens of the Home Office, should be encouraged to break, or evade, the law.

The original Defence Regulation 18B authorised detentions of suspected persons for an unlimited period by order of the Secretary of State "if satisfied . . . that it is necessary so to do." This Regulation was repudiated by Parliament. The revised Regulation, now in force, states that "if the Secretary of State has reasonable cause to believe any person to be of hostile origin or associations or to have been recently concerned in acts prejudicial to the public safety or the defence of the realm or in the preparation or instigation of such acts and that by reason thereof it is necessary to exercise control over him, he may make an order . . . that he be detained." The Secretary of State, in the first place, must have reasonable cause to believe certain specified facts concerning the person; secondly, he must have reasonable cause to believe that those facts make detention necessary. The Advisory Committee set up by the Regulation does not merit discussion. It is in no way a judicial tribunal, and it is admitted that its advice has been arbitrarily rejected by the Home Secretary in fifty-five cases, for reasons unknown.

As the reasonableness of the Home Secretary is not infallible, it is claimed that the Regulation does not debar its being called into question in the courts by means of the habeas corpus process; but, as this claim is now *sub judice*, I can say no more. It is certain, however, that a detained person who lacks considerable means cannot initiate habeas corpus proceedings in London if he is detained in the Isle of Man. It is remarkable, also, that the Bill under discussion was introduced while habeas corpus and other legal proceedings were pending, and that a Government spokesman, during discussion of the Bill, said: "It is a constitutional issue about which the Attorney-General has no very clear or definite views," the Attorney-General being one of the three sponsors of the Bill.

If Mr. Garwood would re-read his letter in the light of the above comments he would see that he is, no doubt unintentionally, arguing, first, that the King's Judges are not to be trusted, and, secondly, that nameless bureaucrats should be free to break the law instead of initiating, if need be, a further revision of Defence Regulation 18B.—Your obedient servant,

ARTHUR ROGERS.

38 Bedford Street, W.C.2.

SIR WALTER STRICKLAND—

WANDERER AND SCHOLAR

(Concluded from page 120).

AN INVETERATE WANDERER

The explanation of Walter Strickland is very simple. If he requires understanding it is because of dulled interests and vitality of the ordinary individual, living under capitalism. Strickland was an inveterate wanderer. That was because his mind was that of the wandering scholar, of the type that belonged to the Middle Ages and played such an important part in the social history of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In order to pursue this life of learning he found it was desirable to live and to travel third class and to identify his interests with those of the poor and of the politically weak and outcast rather than with the social ruling class. He felt that the rich were not too sympathetic towards real scholarship, and so gradually his ideas assumed a propagandist guise. He felt the truth was no respecter of parties, institutions, social orders, or governments. Hence his love of scholarship tended to make him a revolutionist.

EARLY WANDERINGS IN YORKSHIRE

Walter Strickland first adapted himself to this life of wandering scholarship in Yorkshire.

Although he was born in London and educated first at Harrow and spent much time in London during both his Harrow and Cambridge days, he passed a great deal of his early years studying the natural history of Yorkshire. It is easy to understand how he came to take up this pursuit.

Strickland was devoted to his mother, who died when he was a boy of thirteen. Two years later his father married again and Walter Strickland was opposed to the second marriage. From that time on he reserved himself from his family and plunged into a variety of intellectual pursuits. During his student days he returned a great deal to Yorkshire for the purpose of studying conchology, otherwise the science of shells, which has fallen rather into disrepute because modern science maintains that the entire mollusc must be studied. He also took up the more important study of mycology, or in plain words the science of fungi. An article contributed to the *Naturalist* for June, 1889, enables us to follow his wanderings through Yorkshire; from early November, 1874, to late October, 1888, a period of fourteen years. Some part of this period must have been spent in company with Freethinkers. When I stayed with him in France in 1912, he told me a great deal about the old Freethought movement in Yorkshire.

In his *Naturalist* article Walter Strickland makes a list of the fungi that he presented early in 1889 to the British Museum. Before presenting them he went through his specimens carefully and compared them with those to be found in the classified collection at the South Kensington Natural History Museum. His collection was made for self-instruction, and consequently contained many extremely common and widely diffused species. It represented a fairly general scheme of mycology, but also included some rare and curious specimens, some of which he felt were peculiar to Yorkshire. At that time, mycology was viewed as a recent branch of natural history. The specimens presented by Strickland to the British Museum covered thirty-one different orders of fungi. In presenting them he listed the place where he had discovered the specimen and the date of discovery.

We find that during these fourteen years Walter Strickland returned again and again to the Pond Wood at Boynton, to the Low Wood, to the Grove, to the Saw Mill, to the North Wood, to the Third Ridge, to the Grindale Plantation, to the Meadows and to the Botanical Gardens. We discover also that he collected peculiar fungi at the cliff beyond Scawby, the Meadow between Ayton and Scarborough, the Meadows by the Esk, above Egton, the Fir Plantation between Flockton and Seamer. We see him exploring the Pine stump, above Robin

Hood's Bay and delving into the fish-ponds at Hildenley. He finds fungi in the cliffs above Carnelian Bay, and again at the cliffs at Filey. Occasionally he goes into Lincolnshire and explores the Walcot Hill Top or the Vicarage Garden at Appleby. These names are mentioned not in order to list the places explored by Sir Walter Strickland at this period, but to show the part played in developing his roaming interests in natural history during this period in Yorkshire.

His first essay was published during this period. It consists of notes and observations of the forms of sand he observed at Redcar during the years 1882-3. This essay is a most interesting study in the symmetry of nature. The author does not content himself with mere scientific observation, but plunges into a great deal of philosophy and writes of the behaviour of the wind, and the part it plays, with the force of poetry. When one considers his later folk-lore translations and then turns back to his observations on the form of sand at Redcar one realises that his early work contained the promise of his later ambitious studies in the appreciation of folk-lore.

HARROW'S ADVENTURERS

Walter Strickland was sent to school at Harrow in the same term as R. B. Cunninghame Graham, who died in 1936. During a part of his life Graham was also a poet, a socialist, rebel, traveller, etc. Generally he was a character who must have had very much in common with Strickland. At Harrow they must have influenced each other. In 1914 Cunninghame Graham became a rabid patriot and denounced in very abusive terms the socialists with whom he had been associated formerly.

Strickland also supported the war for a short period and then repented of identifying himself with its horrors. He never abused, however, those who were opposed to war for the great characteristic of his thought during the whole of his student days and right on to the end of his life was a tremendous hatred of violence and of those who engaged in violence. This is made very clear in his eulogies of Buddhism.

It is the boast of Harrow that although her traditions are conservative, the conservatism is largely superficial. This school claims to have produced very many "adventurers," intellectual as well as actual, among whom is included Byron.

The headmaster at Harrow was Dr. Butler, who later was appointed Dean of Gloucester and became Master of Trinity College at Cambridge. At Harrow Strickland lampooned the headmaster in the monthly magazine, called *The Tyro*. At Cambridge he came to understand Butler differently and largely sympathised with the uncomfortable situation in which the distinguished pedant found himself. Dr. Butler was not entirely orthodox in his theology, and he had to serve up orthodoxy in the Public School to retain his position. He effected a kind of satiric compromise. Strickland became his correspondent and they retained correspondence to the day of Dr. Butler's death.

During 1888, whilst studying the fungi of Yorkshire and the sea shells of Durham, Strickland found time to pour ridicule on Professor James Stewart, M.P., who was Trinity lecturer in Elementary Physics at Cambridge. For a short time Professor Stewart found it impossible to pursue his work as a professor at Cambridge properly because of his firm support of Mr. Gladstone. He plunged into politics at the expense of everything else. The attack on Parnell and the sacrifice of that distinguished Irish politician to mean political interests caused Professor Stewart to return to his educational work and to find solace for his shattered political illusions in the laboratories at Cambridge.

Down to 1892 Strickland was settled in London or the neighbourhood. During his Harrow and Cambridge days he was for many years a constant visitor to the smoky Metropolis. In that year he left England with the intention of settling permanently in Italy. He stayed in Italy eight years and then proceeded to Australia and New Zealand, Java, Singapore and Ceylon.

BUDDISM: THE DUKE'S STRICTURES

By A. A. MORTON

[Mr. Morton wrote his defence of Buddhism in the form of a letter, but we thought it was better to publish it as an essay.—Ed.]

I feel I cannot let the Duke of Bedford's strictures on Buddhism pass without comment.

His Grace recommends a book by a Christian priest to an enquirer as to the respective values of Christian and Buddhist approaches to Truth. Naturally, the Christian must have a bias in favour of his own form of religion, looking through the Christian spectacles of his father, his heredity, his church. The result is inevitable, and we get a repetition of the exoteric explanation of the sublime teaching of Gautama the Buddha on the one hand, and on the other the old Christian emphasis on the conception of an anthropomorphic, extra-cosmic God to whom the lazy thinker can turn when he finds the Greek philosopher's advice "KNOW THYSELF" puts too hard a task before him.

Does not much of the controversy turn on the interpretation of such words as "God" and "desire"? If a man cannot interpret to himself the thing that is his SELF, how can he begin to approach the wider conception of an impersonal Deity, of the Law and Order that rule the Universe? May I paraphrase a text from I John IV, 20 and say, "If a man say I know God and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he that knoweth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he know 'God' whom he hath not seen?"

Again, Buddhism puts against "desire," "aspiration," a higher power of the same energy directing the WILL to search for that Knowledge which is his birthright, "the knowledge of his own identity and destiny," an inherent power born in each individual. Such knowledge is not easy of attainment, though intuitional flashes will certainly light the path of the earnest seeker and

"Deeds in hours of insight willed

May be through days of gloom fulfilled."

It is a spiritual science of a magnitude of which we have little conception until aspiration sets our feet on the beginning of the Path in intuitional certainty.

The Buddha's verbal silence on the Ultimate is natural when, realising that something other than a process of intellection is necessary to convey any conception of the INEFFABLE, man's brain-mind stops short in the adytum of Supernal Truth and he bathes in the great Silence in supreme realisation.

But indeed Buddhism has the most satisfying message for "the struggling soul who fails in the fight." In that priceless little book, "The Voice of the Silence," containing precepts put into the hands of mystic students in the East, we read "... if he falls, e'en then he does not fall in vain; the enemies he slew in the last battle will not return to life in the next birth that will be his," so that truly "each failure is success." For the doctrine is based on the scientific law of cause and effect, given in the New Testament in the sentence "as ye sow so ye shall reap,"—known in the east as Karma—and the necessity for the ego to return to the place of his sowing of good or bad deeds to reap their reward or punishment, seeing in one short life it cannot reap all the effects. Thoughtful consideration of any life story will convince one of this, and the doctrine of reincarnation be found the necessary corollary to that of Karma. For "rigid justice rules the world." As one cannot stop the ripples from a stone thrown in the water, so one cannot stop the effects resulting from causes set up in any medium, natural or spiritual, and NATURE being ONE her laws obtain on all planes. So man lets the past, over which he has no control, take care of itself and seeks perpetually to avoid

setting up the wrong causes, seeing injury to himself is injury to his brother, a part of the ALL and hence a part of himself.

And the goal? How put into words a magnificence beyond apprehension by the head though the true heart of man may have perfect vision. What power has a drop of water determined to maintain its spherical identity compared with the same drop united with its fellows in the crushing immensity of an ocean wave? The egotistic drop will start a long period of disintegration before it again gets a chance to augment the sum of divine-human power, for, "he who would save his life shall lose it," a truly occult saying. The immediate goal is therefore work for Brotherhood. "Live the life and ye shall know of the doctrine"—the life of personal service.

New and Revised Edition.

Ready Next Month.

RICHARD CARLILE, Agitator

(1790-1843).

HIS LIFE AND TIMES,

By

GUY A. ALDRED.

"As the worth of a man, so the worth of his trade, or vice versa. As the worth of his trade, so the worth of the man."—*Diderot*.

"Who is the more honoured to-day, Socrates or the magistrate who made him drink the hemlock."—*Ibid*.

"In candour, in independency of judgment, in perfect moral fearlessness of character, Carlile cannot be paralleled among the public men of his time."—*George Jacob Holyoake*.

Richard Carlile was the greatest public man of his time. No contemporary equalled him in courage, public affection, and libertarian impulse. Posterity will rank his fame higher than that of Thomas Paine even, no less for the part he played in the emancipation of the English Press and the enlightenment of the proletariat, than for his personal firmness of character. The present record is not merely an essay of historical interest, not a dead monument, but a live propagandist study. It is full of the eternal spirit of revolt, the fire of freedom and defiance. Carlile's jail wisdom—with its caustic criticisms of "law and order" methods of revolt—and the daring of his publishing—with its essays delineating the character of a soldier—are of special import at the present time. Knowledge of his work and message are a vital necessity to every toiler who thinks that he might be free.

1912 BIOGRAPHY.

Guy Aldred first wrote and published his "life" of Carlile in 1905-6. It was published serially in the columns of the *Agnostic Journal*. Revised and published in the *Herald of Revolt* in 1911, it appeared in pamphlet form the following year. Under the title: *Richard Carlile: His Battle for the Free Press*, it ran into 40 pages of close print and was published at one penny. The author also edited and compiled from *The Republican*, etc., a collection of Richard Carlile's *Jail Jottings*. This was a 48-paged pamphlet, produced on good paper, and published also at one penny. These two pamphlets had a large circulation. The "life" was banned from being sold in London in the L.C.C. parks. No reason was given. *Jail Jottings* was not banned. These two pamphlets gave the reader an insight into the work done by this greatly neglected champion of liberty.

The Truthseeker, New York, for July 19, 1913, devoted over two columns to a review of *Jail Jottings*. We excerpt the following:—

"A condensed but clear account is given of the succession of mock trials by which Carlile was robbed of liberty for some of the best years of his life for no crime whatever, his convictions being based solely on the publication and sale of Paine's works and other Freethought and Republican literature. The remainder of the pamphlet is devoted to selections from Carlile's writings during his incarceration. The following extracts will suffice to show the courage and intellectual capacity of this hero of Rationalism and progress, for whom the British government could find no better use than to clap him into a dungeon for using his intellectual attainments to enlighten and uplift his fellow men."

1923 BIOGRAPHY.

In April-June, 1923, Guy Aldred published a

new study of Carlile's "life" in the *Freethinker*. This study and the previous 1912 biography were combined and issued in book form during the same year. It embodied the reports of the "mock trials," as Carlile termed his prosecutions, previously prefaced to *Jail Jottings*. The contents of this biography were as follows:—

Dedication; Foreword; The Carlile Family; Early Years; An Epoch of Cant and Terror; Legal Biography; Earning a Judgeship; Carlile Turns Publisher; Iron Purpose and Espionage; Peterloo; Mock Justice; Judge and Prisoner; Carlile's Speech from the Dock; Verdict and Sentence; Christian Judges; Pious Polemics; Principles and Politics; Mental Evolution; Karl Sandt; Thomas Paine; The Instruction of Youth; Jail Wisdom; Struggle; Anti-Militarist Publisher; Exposing Freemasonry; With Robert Taylor; Further Trials and Imprisonment; Eliza Sharples; "The Christian Warrior"; Death and After; Epilogue; Appendices; Notes. 190 pp.

This work was not only a record of the struggle for the Free Press between 1790 and 1843. It related the economic struggle of the working class, the rise of corrupt judges and landed families, and traced the interests behind reaction. It was plainly written, and replete with valuable propaganda facts. From the reviews of the time, we make some extracts:—

The Literary Guide said:—

"A valiant fighter for free speech. . . . In this well-got-up and cheap volume our readers will find a fund of ill-arranged information concerning one of the bravest fighters in the ranks of heresy. Carlile justly takes high rank among the author's heroes, and he pays him unstinted tribute. With a candour which is commendable, Mr. Aldred mentions in his Preface that the publication of the work was declined by the R.P.A.—for reasons which will be obvious to every reader."

The reasons are more obvious to-day, in view of the speeches made in the House of Lords, and the House of Commons, respectively, by the leaders of the R.P.A.

The Freethinker said:—

"Those who read Mr. Guy Aldred's articles on Richard Carlile which ran through these columns, will be pleased to know that Mr. Aldred has very much enlarged these and has just published a biographical study of the great reformer. The volume extends now to 192 pages, and is being sold at 1s. 6d. in paper covers, and 2s. 6d. in cloth. It is well that the present generation should know something of one of the most heroic figures in the history of Free-thought, and in this work Mr. Aldred has judged well in his sketch of the environment in which Carlile moved and against which he reacted. The book is written clearly and without ostentation, and we wish it every success. . . . Freethinkers will appreciate the portraits of Carlile and Robert Taylor (the Devil's Chaplain) which the book contains."

George Lansbury, with all his faults, a man of instinctive kindness towards the struggles for liberty, wrote in the *Daily Herald*:—

"Guy Aldred, in 'Richard Carlile' has given us the life-story of a man whose one crime appears to have been that he loved freedom of thought and freedom of expression above everything else in the world. Again and again he suffered imprisonment, always for some offence against idiotic laws based on the belief that religion would be destroyed if any of its doctrines were challenged. We have not even yet fully emancipated ourselves from this folly. Guy Aldred himself has been in prison many times because of his championship of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. It is this fact which makes his life of Richard Carlile (a publisher and writer who lived from 1790 to 1843) so sympathetic and worth reading. He writes not only as a lover of freedom, but as one who himself has been willing to follow, at whatever the cost, in the footsteps of his teacher. All Christians should read this book and learn from the story of Carlile's life and sufferings what Christians should not do in order to defend their creed. All politicians should also read it because we also are very apt to think that all truth and learning resides with us, and that our actions and motives should be accepted without question. . . . Richard Carlile lived his life in his own way, followed the light of his own conscience to the end. Such a man we can and do respect, however much the light of our own conscience leads us to disagree with him as to what is truth. . . . amongst the clever and intellectual, and amongst those who have no book learning at all, there are to be found those who are great and who are worth remembering not for what they have written or said, but for what they have done, and amongst those are these two very dissimilar men, so far as creeds are concerned—Richard Carlile and Pastor John Smith."

The Socialist, Glasgow, organ of the Socialist Labour Party, treated the work to a lengthy review. We quote the following passages:—

"Guy A. Aldred has done well in setting out the life and times of Richard Carlile. The book is very well got up. The opening passages, in which Carlile is allowed to speak for himself, are most inter-

esting and inspiring, setting forth the outlook and the spirit of the agitator Carlile, whom Aldred looks to as his master in the struggle towards civilisation without superstition and society without misery. The period in which Carlile lived, the cant and terror which then prevailed, is portrayed vividly in the reproduction of passages from the examinations and cross-examinations of witnesses at a prosecution of a dissenting minister. Aldred no doubt had his mind set on the similarity of the methods of the prosecution of those days and those that exist to-day, particularly in relation to his own experiences in the Dock. Just to give the reader a taste of the many interesting episodes in the book, the following is quoted from some cross-examining. . . . From the beginning to the end it is thrilling. It gives an agitator's spirit, philosophy, persecution and achievement on behalf of the common people. To read of Carlile is to read of struggle. What better book can you read to instil within you that fighting spirit that the Revolution calls for you."

The Salisbury Times, a well-known local paper, founded in 1860 and still going strong, published the following notice of the book:—

"An interesting peep into the social life of this country a hundred years ago is given in a book which has just been issued entitled 'Richard Carlile.' It deals extensively with the career of that extraordinary but little-known character, who, in defiance of the law, insisted on publishing Thomas Paine's 'Age of Reason.' . . . Carlile was the son of an Ashburton cobbler but became a leading figure in the fight for freedom of thought which occurred at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The author of this biography, Mr. Guy A. Aldred, has a great admiration for the defiance of the policy of official repression which was displayed. . . . Another consequence of Carlile's courage was the abolition of the stamping of newspapers. . . . This is only a little book, but it will bring the curious into the company of a number of very outstanding characters in very tempestuous times. To their boldness and pertinacity, whatever one may think of the views expressed, the freedom of the Press of to-day is largely due."

Common Cause, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia, reviewed the book and emphasised the social aspects of the struggle, as follows:—

"Among the publications recently received in this office is G. A. Aldred's 'Richard Carlile.' This was a very remarkable man born towards the end of the eighteenth century, who endured much persecution because of his championship of opinions on political and theological matters that were not liked by the powers that were. A particularly notable thing in Aldred's biography . . . is what is said therein about the ferocity of the criminal law. The ruling class at that time had great contempt for what is called (in the words of Edmund Burke) 'the swinish multitude,' and consequently, men, women—and even children—were 'strung up' for quite petty offences. From 1805 to 1818 inclusive, seventeen persons were hanged for 'petty larceny,' which means the stealing of a sum under £40. For robbery from the person, 188 were hanged; for horse-stealing, 85; for sheep-stealing, 43; and for burglary, 199. The special consideration that was given to the money-power is, however, indicated by the fact that more persons (207) were hanged for forgery than for murder or any other felony. Out of the unfortunate 207 persons hanged, 176 were victims of bank prosecutions. These hangings were 'the direct consequence of the introduction of paper credit.' . . . From 1797 to 1818, no fewer than 313 persons were hanged for uttering or possessing forged notes on the Bank of England. This was during the suspension of cash payments, which enabled a profit of £29,280,826 to be made on the 1797 capital of £11,642,000. The British ruling class greatly increased its wealth by its control of the Bank, but its money was obtained by the callous taking of the lives of the unfortunate creatures whom it 'strung up' or 'turned off' (to quote the heartless terms that were commonly used at that time.) . . ."

1941 BIOGRAPHY.

This work is final. It embodies the 1923 biography. Some chapters are re-written. There is much new matter. A lengthy introductory essay deals with Carlile's contemporaries and their reactions to the social crisis, to prosecution by *ex-officio* information, and to the suspension of *habeas corpus*. An addendum discusses very fully the prison system in London, especially from 1790-1843 and a little beyond. Thus a complete setting is given to the "life" of Carlile. A new picture of Carlile is included, but the portrait of Robert Taylor is removed, as it is proposed to publish a separate biography of "The Devil's Chaplain" later. Many new illustrations of London between 1790 and 1843, lent by the Postmaster-General, are included, and also pictures of Newgate Prison, and of trials. The new work aims at picturing and describing faithfully an important chapter in the life of the common people of Britain, and even of the

English-speaking world.

Richard Carlile's selected writings other than those included in this volume, will be published as a separate work.

The price of this work will be 1s. 6d., paper covers. Post Free, 1s. 9d. Special terms for quantities.

FIRST WOMAN CONCHIE

The *Daily Express* for Tuesday, May 6, carried the story of Daphne Kiek, the first woman conscientious objector, written by Hilda Marchant. We have the Glasgow and London editions of the *Daily Express*. The story is varied slightly. Both editions print pictures of Miss Kiek. These vary also. We asked the editor to loan us the blocks or else to supply the prints, charging the usual copyright fees. This approach was turned down, apparently on the ground that, to publish a portrait of Miss Kiek in these columns would affect the course of the war or some such nonsense.

Miss Kiek's attitude is described by our contemporary's special correspondent in the following study:—

The first woman conscientious objector is Miss Daphne Kiek, aged 21, who comes from Surrey. She is a shorthand typist, efficient at her job, and she will not register under the new call-up for work in munitions, the women's services, or on the land.

Miss Kiek is an attractive English girl. There is nothing odd about her appearance or background.

She just refuses to be part of the "war machine."

Her objections—which she has sent in a letter to Mr. Ernest Bevin—are not on the grounds of Christian faith.

She is living in the middle of a badly hit district in London, but remains a pacifist. What she has seen and what has happened around her do not shake her from the conviction that we should make a negotiated peace with Hitler. . . .

There are no tribunals for women, but they have the right of appeal to a hardship committee which will respect objection as a reason for application.

Miss Kiek has offered herself as the first test case for a woman conscientious objector.

I asked her yesterday if she would refuse to take down letters which would direct emergency services into a blitzed town.

"Certainly," was her reply. "I would not type anything which supported an organisation which prolongs this war."

I asked if she would help the injured in a bombed building.

She said: "Yes, if I were a civilian. But I feel A.R.P. and nursing are part of the whole organisation for war."

"I would not deliberately train as a nurse or a warden. I could not take on a uniform job of any sort or any first aid."

Miss Kiek is not in the least affected by any of the raids she has been through, and when I asked her: "Would you be prepared to accept a victory by Hitler?" she answered:—

"I do not believe that a victory on either side will solve any problem at all."

When I asked her if she would go in a munition factory she was most emphatic with her "No."

She said that these were the instruments of destruction which "to my mind would cause similar horrors to that which Britain is now experiencing."

On the question of defending our homes or working to defend them she said that she could not possibly undertake any work of that nature.

"It would be active participation in the war," she said.

So Miss Kiek went on with her typing in a room that has already had its windows blown out.

She insists that she can take no part in any of the women's organisations. "Even going on the land would be subscribing to the war effort."

UNITED SOCIALIST MOVEMENT.

A statement of the Socialist and Pacifist principles of this movement has been issued in leaflet form. Post Free, 1d stamp. 100 copies, 6d. Comrades are invited to become national members and to form local groups.

NATIONAL SERVICE ACT

SECOND READING DEBATE

(Concluded from page 110).

It reminds me of a story of the great perturbation which arose in one area over whether a certain Labour Member should be elected to the magistracy, because it was feared he would be biased in favour of the proletariat. It was decided to chance it, however, and this Labour Member, knowing that there had been this criticism, would pass a sentence of 60 days where another magistrate would have given only 30 days—in order to avoid any criticism from the ruling classes that he was biased in his attitude. This Bill is being presented by a Government of Tories and National Liberals and Labour Members—if there is any difference between them. Some of the Tories have served in the war, and here I would pay my tribute to every man, whether he is in Civil Defence or National Defence, who is fighting for the things in which he believes. But how many Labour M.P.'s have fought on the battlefield? How many trade union leaders? The first thing that was done was to get the Ministry of Labour to reduce the ages in certain reserved occupations from 30 to 25, so that every clerk in their offices should be in a reserved occupation. It was for the proletariat rank and file to die in defence of the freedom that they had decided they wanted to preserve. The average Labour Member of Parliament who is within the age is not prepared to serve, and yet is prepared to sit silent and not even defend the rights of individuals under this Bill. One would expect some generosity to come from them; but no, they are caught up in the trap completely, and they go on and penalise these other men.

Before I finish let me give an example of a man who was a conscientious objector but who succumbed and entered the Army. I had entered into correspondence with this individual. He was an absolutist. He would not serve. He asked me for advice. I said that I would give him information, but I would not give him any advice. On all occasions I have said to conscientious objectors, "You must make up your own minds; decide your course of action for yourself. I am not going to advise you one way or the other." After a time he wrote to me. He said that I should be amazed to see where the letter came from. It came from a military barracks. In it he said, "You know, McGovern, I am afraid you will think I have let you down tremendously, but I found that my whole social environment—in my home, in the district, amongst my companions—was so overwhelmingly anti-conscientious objector that I was compelled to succumb. I had not the necessary courage to be a conscientious objector, only sufficient courage to be a soldier." That was the confession of one man.

There is a large number of people in this country who take the view that conscientious objectors are cowards, simply people who are evading service. They are wrong in that. There may be some people who only try to evade service and are not against offering up other lives. I would say to this House and to Labour Members in the Government that the conduct of the Secretary of State for Scotland, the Minister of Home Security and the Hon. Member for Shipley—that they take this view that they are cowards because they wish to change the attitude of people like these. In one war they are absolutely against the war, and then in the present war, when they are over military age, they are backing the war and inviting repression of conscientious objectors. People say, "Is it not true that this conscientious objection business is only a racket because of these people who have been active in opposing war when they were of military age and are backing war when they

are over military age—and you cannot blame them for that.

I know many genuine men who are conscientious objectors. My own son is a conscientious objector. He would probably not come completely within the terms of the Act. He is a political objector; he makes no bones about it. At the tribunal every form of pressure was used against him. At the tribunal he was asked whether his father backed the Spanish Civil War or not. That is the type of mind that was on the bench. He was asked, "Is it not the case that your father backed the Spanish Civil War, and would you have backed the Spanish Civil War? Did you believe that the Spanish Government were right?"—all that sort of thing. On the Spanish position he was turned down—although the present Lord Privy Seal went out to Spain himself, and they all backed the Spanish Civil War. He was turned down because he said manfully that the Spanish Government were right in resisting Franco. It was on his paper. He did not say, and I have never stated, that I would fight for the Spanish people. All that I demanded was that the Spanish people had the right by international law to purchase arms for their own defence, if they wanted to. I opposed intervention, and his opposition was the same. (Interruption). I do not object to the hon. Member for Derby (Mr. Noel-Baker) believing that this is a thoroughly proper struggle and that he ought to take a rifle and go out to defend the people of this country.

I have never objected to Labour Members joining the Army, but I have said that they shelter themselves behind the fact that they are Members of Parliament. They were prepared to declare war and encourage the young people to go out to fight in order to keep them and their Parliamentary government going. One of the great arguments against Hitler is that he has oppressed trade unionism and Parliamentary government. It might be true that if he came here, Parliamentary government would have to be defended, and no doubt I should defend it in a concentration camp. That is no reason why I should ask the ordinary men and women to go out and keep me in a privileged position in this country. If I believed that, I ought to go out and defend it myself. Let us put an end to this humbug by people who are persecuting the conscientious objectors and by some of these people who are so versatile that they can change from one position to another in a very short space of time. There is the Noble Lady who is sitting there. (Interruption). I am sorry. I made a mistake when I said "Noble Lady." I was thinking rather of what she imagines than of what she is. One would expect people like her, according to her professions of a few years ago, to defend the rights of conscientious objectors of the present time. One would have expected her to oppose the Bill, because she has professed to stand for freedom, especially when she was a member of the Communist party.

The Joint Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Home Security (Miss Wilkinson):

For five years I fought against the Nazis while you people tried to excuse them. Why should I not fight against them now?

Mr. McGovern: Why are you not in the W.A.A.F.S.?

Miss Wilkinson: I am doing my job here.

Mr. McGovern: It is a damned good job. I can quite understand, when people climb into that kind of job at £30 or £40 a week, that they can ask the ordinary soldier to fight and do his job for 2s. a day. That is the kind of sacrifice we are getting.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Hon. Member is getting very near to personalities.

Mr. McGovern: Yes, but I must express myself. It is very difficult for anybody in my position to keep from personalities. The Labour movement has been built up on personalities.

Mr. Noel-Baker (Derby): May I ask whether it is in order for an hon. Member to attack the personal honour and courage of Members of this House who, throughout many months, have shown immense bravery in their constituencies by helping during the air bombardment which has taken place?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is never in order for an hon. Member to attack the personal courage or conduct of any individual Member by name. One can attack a group or a party. I endeavoured to restrain the hon. Member from attacking individuals.

Mr. Noel-Baker: If the hon. Member avails himself of the Ruling you have just given, is he not acting in a manner which is beneath all contempt?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. McGovern: I can understand the hon. Member being annoyed, because truth always annoys a considerable number of people. It was all right when they were lashing across at the Tories before the war began, but not when an hon. Member, who believes in his Socialism, has a conscientious objection and states what he believes to be true. I will stand up for my opinions inside this House, if it is in order to do so, or outside this House, according to my views and beliefs. In my estimation, the Bill is the culmination of a series of acts that have been designed to penalise those who have a genuine conscientious objection and who have failed to get recognition from the tribunals. The penalties it seeks to impose are very drastic, in our opinion.

Some people may be prepared to do work of a civilian character, but the fact that they are to be ordered to do so by a court and that penalties will be held over their heads will compel a large number of those people to resist to the end. In so far as they resist, our work has always been in their defence, whether in war or in peace. We will, therefore, oppose this Measure, as coming from a Government who, in our estimation, are travelling the Totalitarian road, and are destined in the end to embrace the things which they profess to be out to end. I refuse to believe, as some people do, that the Bill is necessary in order to conduct the war. I believe it is part of the industrial dragooning that has taken place in this country against the workers and against every person with principle and independence.

Mr. Silkin (Peckham): We have just listened to a speech which was interesting, abusive, irrelevant and muddleheaded. The hon. Gentleman has taken advantage of the Privilege which this House offers of making slanderous statements which I am certain he would not dare to make outside this House.

Mr. McGovern: I will make them in any part of the country you like, and I have made them outside. I will go further than that.

Mr. Silkin: It is obvious that the hon. Member has not read the Bill and does not know what is in it.

Mr. McGovern: I have read the Bill. As a matter of fact, not only have I read the Bill, but last night I went through it very thoroughly indeed. There was scarcely a comma that I did not look at.

Mr. Silkin: If the hon. Member has read the Bill, he has not understood it.

Mr. McGovern: Oh, yes I have. You cannot get away with that cheap stuff.

Mr. Silkin: The hon. Member cannot possibly have a grievance about the Bill, which improves the position of the conscientious objector and does not take away any of his privileges. If the hon. Member has a grievance, it may be against the original National Service (Armed Forces) Act, but the Bill sets right many grievances. The hon. Member made a speech which was irrelevant, and I do not feel moved to take up any of the points which he made; but I think it worth while to say one thing.

Mr. McGovern: Yes, you have to defend your

leaders.

Mr. Silkin: I would like the hon. Member to say whether he would have the House believe that he wants everybody who alleges that he has a conscientious objection to be taken as such, merely on his own word.

Mr. McGovern: The test of conscience must always be the personal evidence of the individual. The conscientious objector is compelled in many cases to supply evidence to the tribunal, and in spite of the overwhelming character of the evidence, prejudiced people refuse to accept it. I am defending these men, who are genuine conscientious objectors.

Mr. Silkin: The reply of the hon. Member is quite of the order of his speech. He did not give a categorical answer whether he would have the bare statement of the conscientious objector accepted without any question.

Mr. McGovern: Yes.

Mr. Silkin: If he would have it so—

Mr. McGovern: Just as in the case of the Minister for Home Security during the last war.

PACIFISM NOT IRRELEVANT

By The DUKE OF BEDFORD

[The following essay is a review of a small pamphlet by Mr. Alexander Miller, entitled *The Irrelevance of Pure Pacifism*. The editor will give his opinion of this pamphlet in a later issue. It is published by P. Wilson, 33 Townsend Drive, St. Albans, Herts.—Ed.]

Mr. Miller's criticism of the Peace Movement and discontent with what he feels to be its ineffectiveness and lack of policy—an ineffectiveness and lack of policy which he feels can only be remedied by peace-workers identifying themselves with Socialism—is somewhat in the nature of a curate's egg.

No doubt the peace movement would have accomplished more in the past and would be more effective at the present time if it were more united on a definite constructive programme. Mr. Miller, as already indicated, feels that this programme should be Socialism. I feel that it should be the reform of the monetary and foreign trade system as a preliminary to an effective survey of the position and further changes, which, when brought into being might, or might not, satisfy Mr. Miller's definition of "Socialism" but which must anyhow achieve those ideals of justice which are the goal of Socialism. Of the fundamental importance of the reform of the monetary and foreign trade system as a condition of peace and justice, Mr. Miller, like many pacifists and non-pacifists, Socialists and non-Socialists, appears to have little comprehension and, in so far as this is so, he, when attacking pacifists for their lack of a constructive programme, is a pot calling the kettle black. He also, I think, underestimates the value of the work and co-operation of those who can travel no further along the same path than in their common opposition to war. War, i.e., armed conflict, is not a mere unimportant sideline in the general conflict between good and evil, justice and injustice. It is a manifestation of evil of peculiar malignancy, power and destructiveness, as we can see all too plainly especially if we chance to live in bombed areas; and those who are united only in their opposition to war are not united on a merely negative basis, but in an active crusade to check or prevent a very definite and terrible evil.

Mr. Miller is, I think, also mistaken in assuming too readily that every pacifist, to be useful and worthy of the name, must have a definite political policy allied to his pacifism. Although I myself have such a policy and believe in having one, I realise that great respect is due to the work of those pacifists who take little interest in politics as the term is generally understood and who place their opposition to war on a purely spiritual and religious basis, regarding armed conflict as disobedience to God and an act of criminal injustice done to man.

I think that lack of a definitely constructive programme is, perhaps, more damaging to the efficiency of the peace movement in time of peace than in time of war because, when war is

actually raging, the war issue itself provides more for pacifists to get their teeth into—if I may be forgiven the use of such an aggressive phrase!—and an ever-present reason for not getting slack in mind or action.

Mr. Miller's booklet is weakest in its criticism of pacifists who, he suggests, defend Hitlerism or favour a negotiated peace. In his attitude towards the Nazi régime he shows that lack of imagination and capacity for fair judgment which is so characteristic of the mentality of the British politician and the British war-monger. His emotions are so outraged by the bad features in the German system that he cannot give honour where honour is due and recognise the good. He cannot really put himself in another's place and realise how the sufferings of the post-war Germans have given birth to elements of tyranny and cruelty in a manner characteristic of nearly all countries where the same conditions are fulfilled; and most of all he cannot distinguish between sympathising with wrong behaviour, and a broad-minded understanding of human nature which, while deeply grieved by an evil, is not shocked by it, because it realises how natural it is for the frailty of man to produce such results.

Mr. Miller has evidently obtained his information of European events from the time of Munich to the outbreak of the war from newspaper sources and has little conception of what was really going on behind the scenes. He does not realise that true appeasement means something more than grudgingly and grumblingly giving way when an opponent demands, with a threat of force, what justice should long ago have granted. He does not realise how much evidence there is that Chamberlain merely went to Munich to gain time for the speeding up of the rearmament programme, giving Hitler good reason to accuse him of bad faith when he promised to settle further problems peacefully, by the method of negotiation—a blunder none the less fatal even if Hitler himself were not sincere. Mr. Miller has also obviously failed to realise how weak was the case for the Polish war and how reasonable were the terms first offered by Hitler in the previous March, terms which our alliance encouraged the Poles to continue to reject. He, I think, mis-states and misunderstands the position when he represents the Polish war as one into which the Government was forced by public opinion. Talking to ordinary people at the outbreak of the war, I remember a very general feeling that Poland was *not* an adequate reason. The Polish alliance, moreover, was arranged, without consulting the nation, at a small week-end meeting of Cabinet Ministers. The Polish war, again decided upon without consulting the nation, was the result of the decision of the House of Commons, and public opinion in support of the war, in so far as it existed, was manufactured by the incessant propaganda of many of the leading newspapers. To this also may be attributed the popular fear—based, incidentally, on no reasonable foundation—that a negotiated peace must be the equivalent to "having Hitler over here."

In his opposition to a negotiated peace, Mr. Miller again shows little imagination, little grasp of human nature and, one might add, little awareness of the hard and obvious facts of the present situation. A lasting peace will depend, not upon the men who sign it, nor upon the nature of the Governments in power in Germany or this country; it will depend on the justice of its terms and upon the fairness and generosity of our foreign policy after the war is over. If this policy is what it should be, whatever the personal characters of the Nazi leaders, they will, after the terrible lesson which the peoples of all countries have received in the destructive power of modern warfare, never be able to secure popular support for another war on a weak and unjust issue. For this same reason—the destructiveness and natural unpopularity of war and also because, unlike ourselves at the present moment, Hitler has an economic policy capable of gaining prosperity for his country and popularity for himself in time of peace—there is good reason to believe that he would be willing to make very considerable concessions in the way of restoration of liberty to conquered countries in return for an opportunity of

abandoning war and starting on constructive work. Moreover, it should by now be apparent to any reasonable person that we have no chance of overthrowing the German Government by the method of war alone.

If we do not, or cannot, while war continues, put into successful operation an economic system obviously superior to Hitler's in the eyes of all the peoples of Europe; and if Hitler is not rash enough to reject very reasonable peace terms put forward by ourselves and left on permanent offer—with the result that he provokes revolution, the only alternative is for us to work for the elimination of the evil feature of the Nazi régime by those methods which, in peace time, are open for this purpose. If we can show the German people, and the peoples of the other European nations an example of a country whose inhabitants are happier and more prosperous and are making better use of their economic resources even than those of Germany, then, when fear of military attack and economic aggression can no longer be appealed to by the leaders of the totalitarian states, their restrictive regulations will become tedious and absurd and their power to oppress will melt and crumble like snow beneath the sun.

UNCONDITIONAL EXEMPTION!

Exeter's C.O.'s Fire-Watching Refusal

The Exeter Express and Echo, for May 8, and *The Western Morning News*, Plymouth, for May 9, give prominence to the case of Eric Strickland Randall, of 34 East Grove Road, Exeter, a 21-year-old window-dresser, employed by Messrs. Colsons, of Exeter. Randall was granted unconditional exemption from service under the Armed Forces Act when he applied to the local Conscientious Objectors' Tribunal in March, 1940.

Summoned at Exeter Police Court, on May 8, for having failed to perform fire-watching duties at his place of work on April 24th, Randall pleaded not guilty, and held that the exemption granted by the Tribunal applied not only to combatant duties but to civil defence work, of which fire-watching was a part.

The Court disagreed with his interpretation of the law, told him that the Fire-watchers' Order did not come into force until January of this year, and that he had rendered himself liable to a very heavy penalty. Randall was informed that the penalty would be deferred for a week, and that the only grounds upon which exemption could be obtained from fire-watching were those of hardship or physical unfitness.

The Chairman of the Bench, A. G. Guest, said to Randall:—

"In the meantime I strongly warn you to seek some advice."

We hold that the Chairman is in error and the Court's decision is wrong. Fire-watching is part and parcel of military defence. If a man has received unconditional exemption, and is opposed to fire-watching, he has no right to be menaced and threatened in this way. It was the first case of its kind to come before the local Court. It is the duty of the Ministry of Labour, and of the Ministry for Home Security, to see that it is the last case of its kind to come before any Court.

The Acting Chief Constable (A. E. Rowsell) stated that, when informed of the duties required of him, defendant sent a registered letter to one of his director's, declaring that he wished to draw the firm's attention to the fact that he was granted total exemption from military, non-combatant, and civil defence duties for the duration of the war. Therefore, the letter continued, he would not be on call for fire-watching duties on April 24th or at any other time.

Randall's letter concluded:—

"Will you, therefore, erase my name from the rota on which you have put my name without my consent or consultation?"

Robert J. Barton, director of Messrs. Colson's, Ltd., said Randall flatly refused to do fire-watching because he had a conscientious objection to performing the duty.

Inspector Reeve, who interviewed Randall, said defendant replied that he did not think the

Fire-Watching Order covered him, as he had total exemption. Randall also said that he had a conscientious objection to fire-watching on conscientious grounds as it was part of the war.

In answer to the Magistrates' Clerk (James Whiteside), Randall said his interpretation of the law was purely personal.

In evidence, Randall contended that fire-watching was in integral part of home defence. "You cannot break the law if you are above the law," he asserted. "The exemption granted by the C.O. Tribunal places me in that position."

The Magistrates' Clerk reminded Randall that the exemption was granted by a Tribunal set up under the Armed Forces Act and that there was a limit to the scope of its authority.

H. T. Michelmores, a member of the Bench (who is also a solicitor, and did not want the accused to forget that most important fact of status), told Randall that the only two grounds on which he could claim exemption from fire-watching were those of personal hardship and medical unfitness.

Randall: I disagree.

The Magistrates' Clerk: Your large experience as a window dresser of 21 years old hardly entitles you to disagree with the interpretation of the law given by the Magistrate concerned.

The Acting Chief Constable asked Randall what his position would be if the Court held that his interpretation of the law was wrong. What would be his reaction when next called upon for fire-watching?

Randall: I shall still refuse to perform this duty. I am prepared to put the matter before any authority and have it thrashed out one way or the other.

The Chairman (Mr. A. G. Guest) said the Bench found the case proved, but they would defer their announcement of penalty for a week. In the meantime he strongly advised Randall to obtain some advice on the subject.

We would like to know how the Magistrates' Clerk comes to play such a large part in the Court's proceedings, when he is purely an official, and not an administrator of justice. We would like to know also the grounds for Mr. Michelmores' impertinence. Since when have solicitors been entitled to assume the importance of Counsel as authorities on the interpretation of the law? Have not learned judges often been less well informed concerning the meanings of the law than window-dressers? We could list many learned decisions that rank as distasteful nonsense that wise men wish to forget. Yet their authors received huge incomes from the State, and paraded in pomp and ceremony at the expense of unlearned victims far wiser than their judges. The bumptious country Michelmores should know that many laymen are jurists where most solicitors remain but lawyers. Strike them off the rolls, take away their state trade union licence, and they express their personalities as begging clerks or letter-writers. Solicitors usually are to law and jurisprudence what schoolmasters and pedants are to the language, and to literature: authorised and licensed obstructionists and formal enemies. There are exceptions: but they do not address the lay youth in the impertinent terms of power employed by Mr. Michelmores and his friend, the Magistrates' Clerk, in this case.

The case came before the Court again on Thursday, May 15. The Chairman (Mr. Henry T. Michelmores) was accompanied on the Bench by Messrs. A. G. Guest and J. W. Tallman.

The acting Chief Constable (Mr. A. E. Rowsell) said he had consulted with a director of Messrs. Colson's, who, on his advice, had prepared a rota showing that Randall was wanted for fire watching duty on Monday last. A letter was written to Randall acquainting him of this. Randall replied, stating that until he had obtained the legal advice he was seeking he did not feel he could undertake the duties. He (defendant) still maintained that the Fire-Watching Order imposed upon him a duty which was a breach of faith, having regard to the unconditional exemption granted him from aiding the war effort.

Police Inspector Reeve, said the acting Chief Constable, went to Messrs. Colson's that night and found Randall was not on duty.

Randall said that he had written to the Chairman of the Conscientious Objectors' Tribunal which granted him exemption under the Armed Forces Act.

He produced a reply from Judge E. H. C. Wethered, chairman of the tribunal, which stated that the order was made by the South-Western Tribunal on March 28, 1940, did exempt him from the obligation of serving as a fire-fighter under the Fire Prevention (Business Premises) Order.

The Magistrates' Clerk (Mr. James Whiteside), to whom the letter was handed, commented that the opening sentence appeared to be a typists' error, in view of the subsequent paragraphs, which read:—

"The order of the tribunal exempted you only from military service; that is to say, you were registered as a conscientious objector to military service, and you were not required to undertake civilian work under civil control as a condition of the exemption. The order does not exempt you from complying with other duties which you may be called upon to perform. The Fire Prevention Order does not contain any provision for exempting a conscientious objector. The only exemptions are on the grounds of personal hardship or medical unfitness."

Randall said that he did not feel compelled to do fire watching duties. He had now applied to the Hardships Committee for exemption.

After a retirement, the Bench sentenced Randall to 6 days' imprisonment. The Chairman said that the Hardships Committee would sit on Tuesday afternoon, May 27. As Randall had refused to do fire-watching pending the sitting of that Committee, he would go to prison. The Chairman added:—

"You will be set free on Tuesday in order to appear before the Committee. If their decision is in your favour, you will be free. If their decision is against you, you will be served with a further notice to do fire watching. Then, if you still refuse to do fire watching, you will be brought before the court again. What is the position between now and Tuesday? Are you going to do fire watching or go to prison?"

Randall: Go to prison.

The Chairman: Very well. You will go to prison for six days.

Randall is a Christian objector and a Communicant of the Church of England. His statement to the Bristol Tribunal, and the evidence given at the Tribunal, will be published next month. He is a member of the P.P.U.

FROM AUSTRALIA

As a result of a notice of our work in a Unitarian contemporary, we received an enquiry from Australia. We sent a batch of pamphlets and papers to the correspondent and have received the following post-card from Melbourne:

"235 Esplanade Street,
Northcote, N. 16,
Melbourne, Victoria,
Australia.

"31/3/41.

"Dear Guy,—I trust you are safe and well at the present time. My brother, J. H. Costar, who attended High Myddleton School with you, lives at Croydon, Vic., which will find him.

"W. E. COSTAR."

This post-card takes us back to the years 1893-1901.

"PONTIUS PILATE" CORRECTIONS

Dear Comrade,—In my Article, entitled "The Return of Pontius Pilate," there are two corrections (apart from printers' spelling) which are important.

In the paragraph, beginning "To induce," tenth line, the word "obeyed" should read "disobeyed."

In the next paragraph, the curious word "follicon," which is a printer's masterpiece, should be "Gallican."

Yours,

C. H. NORMAN,

London, W.C.2. May 23.

BEN GREENE'S APPEAL

We have seen no newspaper report of Ben. Greene's *habeas corpus* appeal against his 18B detention. The Court advised that his case be re-heard by the Advisory Committee. Herbert Morrison informed the House of Commons that it would be re-heard.

A correspondent has sent a brief report of the proceedings. This report contains two items of interest to lovers of democracy:—

- (1) The Court ruled that it had power to bring the Home Secretary into Court and examine the grounds he claimed for detention.
- (2) The Court ruled that it was unwilling to hear any more applicants in their own behalf in these cases.

The first ruling is correct. In theory, it affords some legal protection against the executive. In practice, it might not operate to any great extent. The danger of a time of crisis and clamour is, that, quite honourable men may turn persecutors over night and reach indefensible conclusions, often feeling that they must do so. Wrong having been done, they fear to right the wrong.

The second ruling is absolutely undemocratic.

The most ardent Labour supporter of the present Government should protest against this ruling. The briefing of counsel is as unsatisfactory as it is expensive. Many of the 18B internees are poor people, very poor. Only a few are rich. The ruling is wrong in equity. It is also wrong in juridical principle. *It is the unwritten law of England, as it is the unwritten law of Scotland, that the citizen shall have the right to defend himself in person against the Crown in any of the King's Courts.*

This is the bold tradition of our law. It is the commonsense of all law. The chronicles of British history are rich with the names of fearless men and women, pioneers of democracy, who would not employ counsel, but defended themselves against the Executive. The present Government includes in its Cabinet and its Ministry persons who once called themselves comrades of the late John Maclean. Did he not speak in his own defence, and does Labour not circulate his famous Edinburgh speech? Could counsel have spoken for him as he spoke for himself? Ernest Thurtle, who, being a Rationalist, upholds 18B legislation, admires Richard Carlile. So does Lord Snell, Labour-Tory leader of the House of Lords. Carlile pled in person and actually inspired, in all, 900 men and women to do the same.

We urge simple democracy and uphold the canons of common law and the first principles of jurisprudence. *Internees must be secured the right to be heard in person in all habeas corpus proceedings.*

LIST OF BOOKS.

The Strickland Press has issued a 24 paged catalogue, listing and describing the pamphlets published in *The Word Library*, in the *Strickland Classics*, and also outwith any series. This pamphlet reproduces several press opinions. It will be sent post free to any reader on receipt of a 2d. stamp. 12 copies will be sent post free for 9d.

Although intended for free circulation, this pamphlet is not merely a list of books. It contains the history of The Bakunin Press and also of The Strickland Press, and of the Anti-Parliamentary and United Socialist movements. By purchasing several copies of this pamphlet and circulating it freely among their friends, comrades will be doing useful propaganda and also making a small donation towards the loss on our printing and publishing work.

Order this useful pamphlet now direct from
104 GEORGE STREET, GLASGOW, C.1
THE STRICKLAND PRESS

If you live in Glasgow, call at this shop, open daily,
9.30 a.m.—6 p.m., except Sundays.

Printed and Published by the Strickland Press, at
104 George Street, Glasgow, C.1.