

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. III. No. 6.

JANUARY, 1942.

Price: TWOPENCE

THE DUKE OF BEDFORD AFFIRMS

HOUSE OF LORDS.
WEDNESDAY, DEC. 3.

The Lord Chancellor took his seat on the Woolsack.

The Bishop of Ripon took the oath and subscribed the roll. His sponsors were the Bishop of London and the Bishop of St. Albans.

The Duke of Bedford signed the roll and made an affirmation, having a conscientious objection to taking the oath.

—Times report.

Describing the scene, the *Daily Telegraph* for December 4, says:—

The Duke of Bedford took his seat in the House. The Bishop of Ripon had just been introduced with two bishops at his side, and the customary bowings and raising of hats to the Lord Chancellor. The Duke, wearing a grey lounge suit, with a soft white collar, stood alone at the Clerk's table.

The Bishop had taken the oath with the words, "I swear by Almighty God . . ." The Duke declared his conscientious objection to that form and used the words, "I do solemnly and sincerely declare and affirm . . ."

Then he stepped to the Woolsack, shook hands with the Lord Chancellor, and passed out of the Chamber.

Actually, the Duke wore a dark blue suit.

The *Parliamentary Debates, House of Lords, Official Report* (Vol. 121, No. 7), for Wednesday, 3rd December, 1941, Col. 159, makes strange reading when read in conjunction with the above reports:—

The House met, The Lord Chancellor on the Woolsack.

LORD BISHOP OF RIPON.

Geoffrey Charles Lester, Lord Bishop of Ripon—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

The Duke of Bedford—Sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

Why the headline for the "Lord Bishop of Ripon?" Why "the usual manner?" Why no reference to affirmation? And why "sat" when the Duke of Bedford left the chamber at once?

The debate in the House of Lords on November 18, when Lords Ponsonby and Viscount Cecil of Chelwood defended the Duke of Bedford, and Lord Crewe and Lord Simon denounced him, will be reproduced at an early date, because of its great interest.

The Duke of Bedford is the first duke to affirm.

Commenting on the history of "the great house of Russell," *The Western Independent*, Plymouth, for November 23, remarks that the Duke of Bedford is its head. It recalls that the first Duke entered politics as M.P. for Tavistock in the Long Parliament. He fought for Parliament at Edgehill, changed his views, and changed them back again. He became Governor of Plymouth and a supporter of William of Orange. His son, Lord William Russell, was also M.P. for Tavistock. He was executed on Tower Hill for alleged treason against a regime that afterwards fell. The 6th Duke was also M.P. for Tavistock. He defended the French Revolution and was a member of the famous Society of the *Friends of the People*.

THE CHRISTIAN AND WAR

By RHYS J. DAVIES, M.P.

(Translation from the Welsh by
Mervyn Ll Turner)



[Block kindly lent by the N.U.D.A.W.]

[. . .] Born in 1877, in Llanguennech, Carmarthenshire, Rhys Davies was brought up in the Welsh tradition, and for the first fifteen years of his life, could speak but little English. During early years his health was indifferent, so that his attendance at school suffered. Three years spent on a farm, however, seemed to improve his physique, for he spent the next ten years of his life as miner in the Rhondda Valley.

He was dissatisfied with mining conditions and devoted himself to the cause of his fellows in the pits. At 22, he failed by two votes to gain election as a local official of the South Wales Miners' Federation. This led to a break-away from the colliery; he became cashier of the Ton Pentre Co-operative Society at 26/- a week, and married on that wage. None of his fellow-employees was in a Trade Union, and his success in organising them took him to the permanent staff of the National Union of Distributive and Allied Workers at Manchester, in 1907. His election to the City Council as Labour member eventually followed; he also served on the City's Education Committee.

In 1918, he was defeated as Parliamentary candidate at West Salford, but was returned for West-houghton for Labour in 1921. He was Under-Secretary of State for Home Affairs in the first Labour Government, in 1924. A serious illness prevented him from taking part in the 1920 election campaign.

Rhys Davies is now a member of the Opposition Front Bench in the House of Commons. It may be that it is his Welsh tradition that makes his opposition something real and refreshing to pacifists; his beliefs may not be popular with Members, but his sincerity and earnestness claim respect. Only a man of his courage could have spoken so fearlessly at the 1940 Labour Parliament Conference in London. His speech was so telling that the B.B.C. and the "Daily Express" thought it worthy of sarcastic and sometimes bitter attack. The West-houghton Labour Party still supports Rhys Davies faithfully.

He specialises in Social Insurance. He did pioneer work for widows' and orphans' pensions.

Rhys Davies is an eloquent speaker and an amateur singer and musician. He has acted as Sunday School teacher, a choirmaster, and a local preacher with the Welsh Congregationalists.

His social and political utterances may not have won for him general support, but his sincerity and thoroughness have secured for him the respect of men and women of all shades of opinion.

Our Comrade Davies was one of the 42 M.P.s who voted, last month, in opposition, for conscription of wealth. He also moved and spoke strongly against the conscription of women.—Ed.]

There is nothing like war for presenting the Christian with difficulty and perplexity; he knows where he stands on almost every question but this. There is no doubt in his mind concerning lesser evils; his judgment is unwavering on thieving, intemperance, adultery and untruth-

fulness. Indeed he is emphatic enough in his denunciation of war—until the holocaust comes. But once the massacre is begun, most Christians follow their national Government; they clamour for the defeat of the enemy as if Church and Chapel were non-existent and the rudiments of Christianity unborn. With the advent of war the funeral of Reason is announced, and Truth shares the tomb with Christian principles.

Every Britisher, German and Italian abhors the lesser sins and violently denounces any man who kills his neighbour. Though he may have just cause for complaint against the unfortunate whom he slew, yet the murderer is hanged. But in time of war, a man in soldier's clothes is decorated and carried shoulder high by the crowd because he has killed a dozen nationals of another country whom he had never seen. War is the most diabolical folly of all!

There is hardly a Christian prepared to justify any war when the conflagration is over. It is exceptional to find any Britisher justifying the South African War, or the last Great War. The reason is that every Government, on declaring war, so sublimates its appeal that it convinces the Churches that the fight is for Religion, Freedom, Morality, and the Higher Life. But mid-way through the catastrophe, the truth comes to light, and the unfortunate Christian who has eyes to see, realises that far baser motives than he anticipated drove his country into the chaos. This holds good all the world over. Even Hitler protests that the present war is a campaign for freedom for Germany. And for every success, he, just as we do, renders thanks to the same God.

Here are two example of what happens amongst present-day Welsh Christians. One man was for over twenty years treasurer and deacon of a dignified and important Church in the North. The members decided recently to loan £100 from Church funds to the Government to buy war weapons. As a protest he resigned from his positions, withdrew his membership, and no longer frequents any place of worship.

The treasurer of another important Church in the South severed all his Church connections for entirely different reasons. He was exceedingly enthusiastic that the flock should collect towards a war weapons fund. When the minister refused to contribute, he left in high dudgeon, and he too never attends a place of worship. Which of the two came nearer to interpreting the principles of Christianity in relation to war?

There are in Germany more than thirty million Roman Catholics, and millions of Protestants. It is said that almost a million copies of the Bible were sold there during the twelve months prior to the war. Why, therefore, do the Catholics of the various countries kill one another? And why do Protestants do likewise? That question confuses even those who never attend Chapel or Church, and creates a difficulty for thousands who profess Christianity.

Think of the millions of Christians who live in Italy and of the millions too in this country who profess the same faith. How is it that these people shed one another's blood? That is the problem which presents itself to every man of reason. It will be borne in mind, of course, that the Pope and the Vatican are in Rome, the metropolis of Italy.

It is obvious that no Government could, in a so-called Christian country, on any pretext, declare war if the Churches refused to support

the campaign. Unfortunately, however, although their consent on this important issue is never sought beforehand, the Church leaders are usually readily prepared to condone what is done by their Government. Even Members of Parliament are not asked to vote for or against war; it is also equally true that they are neither given the opportunity of voting for or against peace. Every Government, even in this country, arrogates to itself the sole right of declaring war, as well as arranging the peace afterwards.

As the Christian in time of peace is so unswervingly opposed to war, why is it that when his Government decides to shed the blood of its people he is so violently in favour of fighting? Do the principles of Christianity allow it? Or must it be confessed that those principles become impracticable? After 2,000 years of preaching and praying, is it premature in the history of man to translate Christian ethics into practice? Has man yet risen above his barbarity? The historian records that for the first three centuries of her history, the Church flatly refused to support any war in any country, and preached peace even when Governments persecuted her for it. Why the change?

The organised Church is guilty of rejecting the gospel that man is man wherever he dwells. She is not quite sure of the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," while she forgets the Golden Rule except when peace flourishes.

THE GOOD AND EVIL.

The Church has fallen into the error of spreading the fallacy that all Germans and Italians are devils, and all Britishers saints. But there are good and bad men and women in every country throughout the world. It is not geographical and racial differences that separate mankind; it is the good and evil on all Continents. That would be the Christian's standard if he understood the Gospel.

One of Hitler's failings is that he has pronounced judgment on all Jews, protesting that there is not one good man in their midst. But the amazing thing is that many Britishers too believe the same about all the people in Germany and Italy. They say that it is the Good and Evil that are at war, and, of course, all the Good must be on our side.

Such ideas are entirely contrary to the Gospel of Christ. That Gospel teaches us that the evil and the good, in various degrees, flourish in all countries alike. "Seventy million malignant Huns," declares the Prime Minister, "millions curable and millions killable." The stubborn fact is that Good and Evil are battling for mastery within each individual, wherever he resides.

It is hardly necessary to dwell upon the consequences of war—murder, famine, disease, lunacy. Think of some of the consequences for us of the Great War of 1914-18. The following are the most recent statistics, published at the end of March, 1939: 125,125 widows and orphans; 31,850 soldiers minus a leg or an arm; 5,600 in asylums; 28,900 suffering from neurosis; 24,700 consumptives; 2,730 paralysed; 1,935 blind; 1,900 not actually but bordering on insanity; 2,200 soldiers unclassified sufferers. In this country alone, apart from one million killed, there are still over 600,000 pensioners from the Great War.

We must therefore consider the all-important population problem. If we go to war every time our temper is ruffled, in another fifty years or so there will be hardly enough men left here to fight at all, nor to safeguard our homes. The problem France had to face recently was one of population as much as that of military strategy and morale!

War as a means of settling any dispute between nations is a complete failure: it leaves more problems at the end than it set out to solve. Had there been a negotiated instead of an imposed Peace at Versailles, it is quite probable that we would never have heard of Hitler or Mussolini, and might also have avoided this present war as well. In order to destroy Hitlerism we must eliminate the poison that created it.

It is said that Hitler made the present war; but the question is, who made Hitler? Some insist on beginning to write the history of Europe as from 1933 or 1934. That will not do; it is of no avail removing milestones thinking that by so doing you abolish all scales of measurement.

The Church lost ground in Britain because she supported the South African War. By supporting the Great War she lost still more. The statistics of our British Christian Churches suggest that this country is now almost pagan.

What will the position of the Church be at the end of this war? Her fate will be decided then by her behaviour now. The Pope alone ventures a counsel of reason to-day, and even he in his condemnation of war uses his words sparingly.

It is unfortunate that more Christians are ready to die for their Government than suffer for Truth. And let us remember that Truth is not the prerogative of any one nation or country; there is no chosen race. It is the Good that is universally chosen by the Almighty.

A "UNITED" FRONT.

What is most surprising in time of war is the boast made by Governments that all their people support them. They punish their critics; they bully newspaper editors; they cast their opponents into prison; only the sycophants may whisper over the Radio; and then they loudly proclaim a "United" Front in support of war.

There are those who declare that the only way to reach the goal of peace is to shed innocent blood. Such an assertion is as foolish as it is to say that the surest way to temperance is through inebriacy. It is not sufficient for the Church to exist merely for christening, marrying and burying people. It is not enough to create a desire for peace when all nations are of one accord, and then unsheathe the sword when Government calls.

Has the Christian Church in Europe to-day something better to offer the people than talk of final victory? When workers strike, sensible people insist that the best way of settling differences is for both parties to meet round the table, and if at all possible, to arrive at a compromise. Is this at all possible in time of war?

Some time ago the Pope submitted Five Peace Points which met with the unanimous approval of the leaders of the Churches in this country. The Pope was not asking for peace, but seeking to influence the rulers of the warring nations to eliminate malice, hatred, and jealousy from the peace terms when the day came to settle. He took that step believing that the present tragedy was engendered by the Versailles Treaty. That is at least one step that the Churches can take at the present time: to prepare the people to cease talking of "hanging the Kaiser" as was done in 1918. We wonder what is the reply of the Churches to the Five Peace Points. It is obvious that these are difficult times in the history of the Churches. What would be the Saviour's answer to the present challenge? If I am not mistaken, He would declare Himself a conscientious objector in whatever country He dwelt. And did I believe otherwise, I would not direct my steps to any Chapel or Church ever again.

It will be remembered that the Saviour lived under the Roman yoke; the laws of the Roman Empire were quite as cruel as may be found in any other country to-day. But He protested against them, and it is certain that He would never join the Forces of His country to fight for any cause, whatever the attitude of the Government of His day.

Everybody is agreed that bombing civilians is of the devil; but as is the custom in war, each party blames the other; it is always the other side that offends. And both sides, through their clergy, pray to the same High Power for victory; and God laughs when He beholds their childishness.

It is strange celebrating Christmas, the festival of the Prince of Peace, in the midst of war. We

sing carols to cherish the memory of the Angels' Song with its thoughts of "Peace on earth and goodwill to men" when the greatest and the most absolute Conscientious Objector of all times was born. The European Continent is too wicked to welcome the dove of peace, whilst the statesmen Europe has produced are ill-suited to receive the Gospel of Him who rejected the philosophy of Force. The angels weep to witness men killing one another; they are sad when starvation looms in the distance. Fortunately they may not read our Press; theirs is a different tongue. But they are familiar with our spirit and our way of living. What, we wonder, do they think of our Christian Churches in these dark days?

There is no reason for the existence of the Church unless it has something better to offer mankind than Spitfires, Messerschmitts and Capronis. And why is it that we find the clergy, who themselves are not expected to fight, supporting their Governments in all wars? It is impossible that all Governments can be right; if it were so, they would not be at war.

That is the problem the Christian has to face to-day, and it is on his attitude now that he will be judged when the catastrophe is over.

THE NEW AGE.

By the New Age, we do not mean the German, Indian, Russian or British systems of politics or economics. You may have more than one system in any one age; systems depend on the mind and spirit of those living at the time. Naturally it is the people who are responsible for the age in which they live, and not the Governments.

We need not unravel the past with its mistaken ideas and its shame, but rather to look into the future to catch a glimpse of what might well happen when the present brutish war is over.

Let us hope that the black-out, the gas-mask and the ear-plugs will be superfluous in that new age. Everybody then will be able, we presume, to buy and eat cheese and butter freely. That will be an age when it will be possible to sleep in bed rather than in an Anderson shelter; an age when the church bells will ring once again, calling the devout together as of yore.

With that New Age will come great changes. Some foresee cottages of stone and brick being built again; houses far better than the old are promised. Then will new bridges cross streams and rivers great and small, and aeroplanes will transport the millions to the end of the earth through cloud and mist and clear sky, without showering fire-bombs on innocent women and children on their flights. Then, too, man shall be free to express his opinion on the problems of the day without fear of being tripped up in the niceties of the law. And then, we hope, the Radio will be accessible to those whose voice for a time has been silenced.

Perhaps in this New Age every infant shall have his fill, every child a better education than his parents, and every adolescent his fair and just rights from Authority. Some will have it that no-one will be idle in that age; mechanical power will pull every cart on the highway, and the plough will turn the furrows by the same process. It will no longer be necessary to work eight hours a day for six days a week; everyone will have enough and plenty if he works for four hours on four days out of seven, and every worker shall have leisure to do as he will, as if he were a gentleman of means. And no more will be heard

*"Dwyn ei geiniog dan gwynaw;
Rhoi angen un rhwng y naw."*

(Winning his pence through suffering;
Sharing the needs of one between nine.)

Has the Church a mission for the common man everywhere to hurl at the oppressor and all who love war? Or is it content to believe that peace is but a slumber between wars; that it is no longer possible for nations to live in amity and friendship? In the New Age it is to be hoped that war is obsolete. It will not be possible to attain a New or a Golden Age until humanity is ready to sacrifice and work as much for peace as it does for war. To live in that Age would indeed be a joy.

POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

By The Right Hon. LORD SNELL C.B.E.
(Deputy Leader of The House of Lords)

[Summary of An Address Delivered before The South Place Ethical Society, Conway Hall, London, W.C.1, on September 14, 1941.]

It should be understood that this summary is a reporter's condensation of a lecture that took 50 minutes to deliver. The report is disturbed in its sequences, but it represents what Lord Snell said. It adds nothing: only condenses.

[. . . The following report was reproduced from the "Monthly Record" of the South Place Ethical Society by "The Literary Guide" for December, 1941. It seems to us to be a reasoned and pacific approach to the tragic situation of the world from the standpoint of one who believes the war to be right. If peace is to come to the world, militarists and anti-militarists have to enter into discussion; men of all races must confer and put aside antagonisms and hatreds: even Social Revolutionists and Social Reformers must meet and consult in some spirit of fellowship. We welcome Lord Snell's statement as a basis of discussion and consideration, in the progress towards wisdom that humanity must make.]

The South Place Ethical Society has given permission for this report to be reproduced in "THE WORD," after consulting Lord Snell, who raised no objection. The reference to Lord Snell as deputy leader of the House of Lords is added by us, to emphasise the importance of his views. He spoke at Conway Hall, naturally, as a private individual, but his views are not inconsistent with his position.—Ed.]

Whenever and however the war may end, we shall be face to face with a world that is economically, politically, socially, and even morally, disorganised. There will be a clamour for the immediate solution of problems at present insoluble. This will include territorial, imperial, and diplomatic problems, and the consequences of wrong decisions will be so grave that everybody should even now be thinking about the shape of the new world. Civilisation cannot again afford to lose by the peace. Let us beware of the national vices of complacency and drift, and neither under-estimate the importance of the problems which await solution nor delay such preparations as we may have to make for them. The mind of the nation has to be made aware of the dangers of any mistaken action. Certain steps are already being taken. The British Cabinet has set up a special department, with Mr Arthur Greenwood at its head. Learned societies are undertaking detailed examination of these problems. Each of the three major political parties has set up a special Committee, and Chambers of Commerce have also got busy. The other Governments now established in London—the Polish especially—have research committees. All this is immensely to the good, but not sufficient. The responsibility must be shared by the people as well as by the experts and the Governments.

When the war is over we shall find ourselves living in a new psychological world, with new and intensified problems and prejudices. It is almost inevitable that there will be a kind of automatic desire on the part of languid people to return to old ways and thoughts. It is natural to feel that you can go back to things as they were. We tried to do that in 1918, but we have learned much since then. We must endeavour to get a true understanding of the mind of the German people and of their future place in the world. We dare not misapprehend a second time. We are inclined to think that other people are just like ourselves; but the German people regard themselves as different and superior. They never conceive that a position of equality with other nations would be entirely satisfactory, and they take a deliberate pride in this deeply-rooted prejudice. From Fichte to our time this difference has been asserted. Western standards of culture and righteousness have been denied. They repudiated the cosmopolitanism of Adam Smith and the English economists, and proclaimed a national State based on racial community; they also believed that war was better than peace because it led man to be most like himself. Now, if we are to co-operate with the German people we must really try to understand the philosophy which shapes their minds. It is not democracy, for Germany never was a democracy, and to that extent may therefore be

excused at the present time. We have had hundreds of years of preparation; but the Germans have been taught and have followed a philosophy which extols the virtue of power and success. They held they could get all they desired by force, which is their first principle of State. That philosophy is quite different from our own; we have felt that our good would be most assured through the good of others. We have never felt that it could be obtained by trampling down other people. It is dangerous to assume that Germany, after the war, would be willing to approach the world in our way; there is nothing in her history or present temper to justify that belief. The Germans are intelligent, industrious, courageous, aggressive, and at times highly sentimental, but they have the souls of slaves. They are obedient to authority, and willing to do wretched things when ordered to do so. That represents a difference from our own outlook on the world. When Hitler says, "Do that," all the people say "Amen." We must learn that he is the personification of the German philosophy. There has always been a noble minority in Germany: Goethe, Hegel, Kant, Lessing, Bach, and Beethoven did not accept the Nazi philosophy; those great spirits knew the weakness of their own people. We must try to solve this difficulty. It is necessary to assume that the Allies will be successful in order that we may be able to plan the future. The problem is whether we can get psychological unity between Germans and the rest of the world.

One proposal is that Germany should be split up into small principalities. That is purely repression, and we must not waste time in examining it. Then there is the pacifist view that we must risk everything for pacification. If that should prove wrong our children will suffer just as we are suffering. There is the problem of disarmament. It must take place, as it is essential for the security of the world. We must ask whether our Allies will stand by us in the re-shaping of a new Europe. That would depend in part on the peace proposals, and we must devote our minds to the realisation of the facts and of the work before us. We must hope that the present understanding with the U.S.A. will continue after the war, and that until the world can be re-shaped there may be a peace guaranteed by the almost invincible combination of the English-speaking world. That would give us time to think out the form in which a new Europe can be started. While we must try to understand the Germans, the fact remains that we have got to live in the world with them, and if we can shape a world in which they will co-operate it would be better than to suppress them; but we dare not take any risks on this occasion. There must be nothing like revenge, but there must be precaution.

Our problem is what is going to happen to Germany itself. Order must be kept there or chaos may result. Perhaps there would be danger if Germany were handed over to the Army leaders. There is the possibility that the Nazi party and Hitler might remain in power after a military defeat. I am not saying that these things will happen. I am trying to paint a picture of a possibility we may have to encounter. Another problem is whether a sufficiently strong opposition movement with staying power can be created in Germany. It takes years to build such an organization even in an atmosphere of freedom, and it is a question whether an improvised opposition could stand without outside help. Remember the submissive character of the German people—physically brave, but not mentally brave in standing up for individual rights. There can be no spontaneous ideological revolution in Germany as in Russia in 1917; the tendency will be to do as they are told and to bow to authority. It may be that in Germany and elsewhere there will be a party of lawlessness to encounter, and our choice may be to leave Germany to the torment she has prepared for others. The difficulties of outside responsibility for order may be great, but if we can get the goodwill of the German people for five years, during which they can re-shape their institutions, it might be a blessing to the world.

Then there are the economic and commercial problems. Are we ready to face them in our

of Europe as a whole. Men will be demobilized and available for industry in millions far in excess of the supply of raw materials, most of which will be in the wrong place. We should, therefore, already be preparing to bring people and raw materials together. In many materials there will be a world shortage. There may have to be international rationing, and perhaps a scheme of priorities. Old factories will have been destroyed, or have become out of date. There will be a house shortage, although camps may afford some measure of relief. European credit will have gone, food production will have own country? Reflect on the probable condition been decreased, land will be spoiled, inflation will threaten, and almost certainly vitality will be lowered. Unemployment may be great, and we cannot exclude the grim possibility of famine. How do we stand as a nation? Notice the enormously increased capacity of the U.S.A. and of the Dominions during this war. Each has built up vast secondary industries and productive power.

Is it to be supposed that when the war is over America will abandon this increased power, or that the Dominions will abolish their secondary industries? Shall we attempt to defend ourselves by industrial tariffs and intensify economic nationalism? There is the problem of India, with three hundred and fifty million people being brought into industry at a very low level of social life. Our duty is to preserve our standards as far as we can. If we could satisfy the demand which exists in Africa, the West Indies, and in India for an improved standard of living a demand for our exports may be created. That would help. We must have increased efficiency as to new processes, and be ready to start new industries. We must beware of a return to an era of cheap sweated products in order to be able to undersell Asiatic goods. The way out is to secure economic security on an international scale. We must preserve our standards through the International Labour Office. Not only is this the best of the instruments created after the last war, but it still exists. State control will have gradually to be extended during the reconstructive period. Then there is the question of finance and debt. It represents a staggering burden. The loan services may frighten many of us. Do not despair. Look at what really happens. A nation lives on its current production, and if we can so organize our production as to meet day-by-day expenses, colossal as the burden is, capital debt will then be manageable, and I think we can emerge without any serious deterioration in our standard of life. Much depends on the quality of leadership. The forces of democratic society cannot survive unless our leaders are enlightened and enduring. The influence of leadership may be seen to-day in Britain, China, South Africa, and America. We must encourage men with creative gifts whose attitude towards life will be progress without disorder or reaction.

I believe, though the times are dark, that we need not despair. We do not always see the coming light, but it will surely come. The leaders, too, will appear if we desire them. Who knows in what school or in what society to-day young leaders may be receiving their strength? One of our chief duties is to prepare the way for them, and to know them when they come.

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY

Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, London, W.C.1
Founded in Bishopsgate 1793. South Place Chapel opened 1824; Closed 1927. Conway Hall opened 1929
Past Ministers—Rev. Elhanan Winchester, Rev. William Vidler, Wm. Johnson Fox, Dr. Moncreu D. Conway, Dr. Stanton Coit.
Past Lecturers—Herbert Burrows, John M. Robertson, John A. Hobson, M.A., S. K. Ratcliffe.
"The Objects of the Society are the study and dissemination of ethical principles and the cultivation of a rational religious sentiment."

SUNDAY MORNINGS AT ELEVEN ADMISSION FREE

A collection is made at each Meeting to enable those present to contribute to the Society's expenses.

JANUARY MEETINGS.

- 4—Professor J. C. Flugel, D.Sc.—"Wishful Thinking: Its Use and Abuse."
- 11—Lord Snell—"The Outlook for the New Year."
- 18—Professor G. W. Keeton, M.A., LL.D.—"The Meaning of Christendom."
- 25—C. E. M. Joad, M.A., D.Litt.—"Goodness and Freedom."

IN THE COPPERBELT

CREECH JONES V. GEORGE HALL

(Concluded from page 55.)

[... Creech Jones's Commons speech (April 10, 1941) in defence of the native workers engaged in the Northern Rhodesian Copperbelt has been reproduced in these columns for November and December, 1941. In the November issue (page 40) we detailed the trade unionist and political career of Mr. George Henry Hall, the present Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State to the Colonial Office. Below we summarise the discussion that followed the speech made by our comrade. Then came Hall's apology, which almost resolved itself into a debate between Creech Jones and George Hall. Space difficulties has compelled us to reduce Hall's apologies largely to his factual statement. This is a pity, for his qualifying phrases and modes of approach spoke volumes. Hall revealed himself as an apologist for Government, functioning as the executive committee of the absentee financial exploiting class, and its agent on the spot. Creech Jones challenged from the standpoint of the workers' rights, and the need for useful administration and development.—Ed.]

Mr. Ernest Evans (University of Wales) followed Creech Jones. He defended the Governor of Northern Rhodesia, and declared that its policy was liberal. He spent some time in the Copperbelt in 1938.

Mr. Evans is a K.C. and was Liberal M.P. for Cardiganshire from 1918-23. He has sat for the University since 1934. He is the son of a late Town Clerk of Cardiganshire and is B.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge. It is not surprising that he should be wanting in the proletarian realistic understanding of our comrade Creech Jones.

Mr. Edmund Harvey (combined English Universities) spoke next. His speech was a poor, compromising affair, full of pious good will that lacked any suggestion of translation into worth-while reality, and concluded by expressing every confidence in the Under-Secretary and the Secretary of State.

The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. George Hall, spoke next. We can only make extracts from this amazing speech, which ought to be read in full in the Official Report.

Hall referred to the death, the previous day, of Sir John Maybin, the Governor of the Territory since August, 1938; spoke of his capacity as an administrator, his 25 years experience of Colonial affairs, and added: "He had great charm of manner and his outstanding qualities of tact and sympathy and his sterling character won him the esteem and admiration of those who knew him."

Hall proceeded to pay a tribute to the Commission responsible for the Report that Creech Jones had discussed. Hall considered "the Commission, made up of Sir John Foster, Sir Walter Buchanan-Smith, and Mr. Dagleish, a well-balanced Commission."

This brings us to the passage of arms between Jones and Hall.

Mr. George Hall stated that "my hon. Friend, the member for Shipley, was perhaps a little critical." He developed his factual reply to Creech Jones' critical challenge:—

The Copperbelt was first discovered only in 1925. From then until 1929, there was progress. There was a setback owing to the world depression of 1931-32, but from 1934 there has been considerable progress. . . . In 1935 the copper exports from the Copperbelt were to the value of £5,000,000; in 1937 they had increased to £11,000,000; and during the first six months of 1940 the total amount exported was to the value of £6,000,000.

Seeing that my hon. Friend has raised the question of the contribution of this industry to the Territory, it is well that we should take note of the fact that, whereas in 1925-26 the revenue of Northern Rhodesia amounted to £370,000, it had almost doubled by 1939, while this year the revenue for the territory is estimated at £2,500,000. It is interesting to note that of that amount the Income Tax is expected to yield £1,500,000. In 1938 the Income Tax receipts from the mining companies alone amounted to no less than 79 per cent. of the total tax collected. There has been a tremendous development, not only with regard to output and

revenue, but in the number of people employed in the Copperbelt. In 1930 the number was 15,000. . . . In 1932 the number slumped to 7,000. At the present time the number is from 26,000 to 28,000. That, of course, does not include the Europeans employed. They vary between 3,500 and 3,800—in other words, at the rate of one European to every 10 Africans in the Copperbelt. The importance of this industry can be judged from the fact that the amount of copper at present being produced in Northern Rhodesia is about 300,000 tons a year. . . . The Territory has overtaken Canada, which was formerly the greatest producer of copper in the world. The reserves of this valuable high-grade ore in the Territory amount to about 750,000,000 tons, so the source of the Territory's prosperity may be regarded as permanent. . . .

It was because of the strike of 1940 that the Commission was appointed. My hon. Friend referred to the delay in the publication of the Report. The delay was largely due to communications having to pass between Northern Rhodesia and this country. I might add that had the Commission been appointed by the Colonial Office here there would have been a certain amount of delay, for the same reason. My hon. Friend will realise the difficulties of communication and of transport. We have the Report before us. The Colonial Office, in addition to submitting the Report, have submitted a statement, giving the recommendations and dealing with the result of the negotiations between the Northern Rhodesian Government and the mine managers.

. . . When you examine the changes which have taken place, you find that the companies have not only conceded almost everything asked for in the Report of the Commission, but in some cases have gone a little farther. The acceptance by the mining companies of the recommendations, and what they have done in addition, are, in my opinion, proof of their co-operation. My hon. Friend dealt with the cause of the dispute and also with the wages question and other attendant questions. . . .

I shall therefore not go back into its history, but come straight away to the question of wages. There was one thing to which my hon. Friend did not refer when he complained about the amount of wages paid in the compound. He did not mention the fact that, in addition to wages, houses were provided, and food, not only for the worker, but for members of his family, and also a certain allowance for the renewal of clothes, all of which, of course, are an addition to the wages which are paid to the African workers.

Mr. CREECH JONES: I took the allowances for granted; everyone knows that they are made. I was merely trying to get a contrast between the total cash wage bill and the other income from the industry.

Mr. HALL: I agree that people who know the conditions of the Copperbelt know that, in addition to the wages that are paid, there are other allowances given, and when one comes to balance the wages and the value of what is given in addition, I am not sure whether that which is given in addition to wages does not exceed the amount of the wages that are paid. But I want to put it on record that, in addition to wages, there are these other outgoings. Far be it from me to say that I am entirely satisfied with the amount of wages paid even in accordance with this recommendation, but I am sure that my hon. Friend, as the hon. Member for the University of Wales (Mr. Ernest Evans) has already done, will see that you cannot relate the wages paid to all Africans in the Copperbelt to the wages paid to Europeans, nor the wages paid to Africans in Northern Rhodesia with the wages paid to the people in this country. The only way in which you can relate wages is to relate them to those which are paid in the territory itself.

Mr. CREECH JONES: Not altogether.

Mr. HALL: I am not suggesting that they should be entirely related and kept down to the level of the wages which are paid, but we have to take into consideration the relationship as between the one and the other. I would call the attention of my hon. Friend to paragraph 26 of the Report, which points out that until 1928, when industrial development on a large scale commenced, there were very few Africans who had been employed in semi-skilled work, and a large number who had done nothing but rough labour, for which only 5s. per month, plus food, was paid.

Mr. CREECH JONES: Scandalous.

Mr. HALL: I agree, but even at the present time the Commission report that, relating the wages, previously given in the Copperbelt to those which are paid on the railways, in agriculture and in secondary industries, they are not excessive but are in excess. Let me take the wages as they have been fixed in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission. I am not going to say that substantial increases have been agreed to, but increases have been agreed upon. If my hon. Friend or any hon. Member in this House will look at the statement which was issued with this report, he will see that the maximum has been increased, in some instances, from 50s. per ticket to 100s. per ticket. The surface maximum has increased from 40s. per ticket to 80s. per ticket. The minimum

has increased by 2s. 6d. per ticket, which is not very much. As my hon. Friend has said, it is about a penny a day. That is so, but he himself got confused in connection with the payment of these wages, and I can understand it. I had for many years some experience in dealing with the pay tickets of South Wales miners, and the way in which these wages are assessed and arrived at is almost as complicated as was the case in South Wales. He said that the 2s. 6d. per ticket cost-of-living bonus was regarded as an efficiency bonus and was only paid in accordance with the wishes or at the discretion of the compound manager. May I assure him that that is not so. The cost-of-living bonus is paid because of the increase in the cost of living.

Mr. CREECH JONES: May I point out that the suggestion was very clearly made that the compound manager may deduct from that bonus in the light of his views as to indiscipline or inefficiency on the part of the worker.

Mr. HALL: I feel sure that my hon. Friend is under a misapprehension in connection with that bonus. It may be that, with regard to other efficiency bonuses the compound manager has the power which he has ascribed to him, but as far as that bonus is concerned, it is purely a cost-of-living bonus. I have stated that, in addition to wages, there are free rents, house accommodation for the married, with free rations for the family, and there is a bonus system for efficiency and other purposes, and then we come to the question of clothing.

Mr. CREECH JONES: This is purely on a question of fact. The Commission recommended the deduction from bonus for disciplinary purposes but this was unacceptable to the Northern Rhodesian Government.

Mr. Hall concluded the debate. The reader is referred to the Official Report for his apologies. Creech Jones's indictment and plea stand. They are unanswerable.

INTERN LORD VANSITTART

By GORDON STOTT

(Advocate; prospective Parliamentary Labour Candidate for West Edinburgh.)

[... The following short editorial by our comrade, Gordon Stott, appeared in the Edinburgh "Clarion" for November, 1941. It is interesting to note that the same issue of our contemporary publishes a letter of greeting from Herbert Morrison, dated October 27, 1941.—Ed.]

Imprisonment of a British citizen without trial is an odious business at best. The *Clarion* has always urged that wherever possible an internee should be furnished with a clear statement of the charges against him and have the right to answer them before a properly constituted court. But if people are to be interned we should see to it that they are the right people—not the innocent and harmless, but those who constitute a real danger to the community.

The *Sunday Times* is conducting a campaign for the internment of the Duke of Bedford. The Duke is a Christian pacifist. He believes that there is a spark of goodness in every man, even the worst. He believes that there may be some good even in Hitler—and he has been rash enough to say so. The Duke may be quite wrong. His opinion may be absurd. But it does no harm to anyone. There will always be room in the world for the expression of charity and loving kindness—even towards those who least deserve it.

But what of the *Sunday Times* itself? Week by week, this influential newspaper publishes an article by Lord Vansittart. Lord Vansittart has no understanding of the economic and social causes which lie at the root of war. He knows nothing of the struggle of the working people in all countries. His views are based on a fantastic racial theory, which is nothing else than inverted Hitlerism. They are backed up with half-truths and unsound generalisations. Even if he were right in his pretended "diagnosis," he has no remedy to offer, but is content simply to stir up hatred and bitterness and despair destroying the effect of the Russian propaganda of social justice for all, and doing Goebbels' work by implanting in German minds the certain fear of a peace worse than Versailles.

If there are to be internments at all, why not Vansittart and the editor of the *Sunday Times*? They and their like are far more dangerous than any pacifist Duke. They—however well-intentioned—are helping Hitler. They are prolonging the war.

THE STRANGE CASE OF MR. TOM JOHNSTON

By F. W. JOWETT

[Reprinted from the "Bradford I.L.P. News," Sept. 26. This essay will be read with interest by all Socialists living in Glasgow who recall Johnston's one-time "Socialist War Points," and his exposure of Lloyd George's Parkhead meeting.—Ed.]

In years which are now far away in the dim and distant past I read in one of the novels of Charles Dickens about a person of queer character who in the most appallingly distressing circumstances could always be cheerful. Mark Tapley was the name Dickens gave this perennially cheerful person. Mark had been led by alluring prospects to settle in a remote region of America but found when he got there he had to build his home in a swamp on the road to nowhere. But, in his mind's eye, Mark could see the sunny side when really there was no sun, so to speak, for there was absolutely nothing on which to base his optimism.

I remembered this queer character in the Dicken's novel when I read the report of a speech made by Mr. Tom Johnston, Secretary for Scotland, in last Monday's *Yorkshire Observer*.

Mr. Tom Johnston, formerly editor of the *Glasgow Forward*, and a merciless critic of all contentedly comfortable politicians, in or out of office, has now become the Mark Tapley of politics. He is no longer a critic but a purveyor of assurances in a world bristling with injustice and black with peril for the common people for whom he previously used his pen so vigorously.

Speaking last Sunday to Civil Defence workers in Stirlingshire, Mr. Johnston is reported (*Yorkshire Observer*, Sept. 22nd) as follows:—

"... it could be said beyond all doubt that any air attack on Britain would now be at least one-third less in intensity and strength as the result of the destruction of German aircraft on the Russian front. . . ."

"On the subject of food and this year's harvest, Mr. Johnston stated that for the first time in the history of Great Britain there were no empty stomachs in the land."

"From a financial aspect, too, there was reason for quiet satisfaction in that the worst perils of inflation had been avoided because we were now allied to two of the most important nations in the world."

Here are three statements, one of which is dangerously questionable: the other two are distortions, which, in my opinion, are clearly intended to give aid and comfort to the class of people which Mr. Johnston previously savagely opposed but with whom he is now in comfortable partnership.

To deal with the dangerously questionable statement first. On what ground does Mr. Johnston make the alluring, but, as I believe, *illusory* statement "that any air attack on Great Britain would now be at least one-third less in intensity and strength" than previous attacks? Because, he says, "of the destruction of German aircraft on the Russian front."

This statement, I affirm, is dangerously questionable. One cannot say more in challenging answer to it because the next and future air attacks on Great Britain have not happened yet. That Hitler's Nazi Germany has lost heavily in aircraft in the aggressive war against Soviet Russia is true. The loss may even be as much as one-third of its previous strength. This we do not know.

What we do know is that whatever Hitler's Nazi Germany has lost in aircraft, the vastness of its operations shows that it is still a force so formidable that if a large proportion of it can be swung over to renew the air attacks on Britain, the attacks may be expected to be greater in intensity and strength than before.

And, in this connection, there are two con-

siderations to be taken into account. One is that, whereas the series of attacks last year in which the German losses were so heavy compared with ours, were attempts at precision bombing at definite targets in daylight or bright moonlight, the change-over afterwards to night bombing was intended quite as much to destroy life and property with the object of destroying the morale of the civilian population.

To this latter form of air-warfare Prime Minister Churchill has challenged Hitler's Nazi Germany, and for months, whilst the German air force has been held in deadly combat by Soviet Russia (to our very great relief) the British press and the British radio have been *boasting of the losses of life and property inflicted by British night-bombing raids on German towns*.

There is nothing so sure as that the next great change in German war strategy, when the expected winter stabilisation of the battlefield far into the interior of Soviet Russia can be effected, will be that *Churchill's challenge will be answered* and reprisals in kind will follow.

If Mr. Tom Johnston had been the same man as he was in the last war, with the same outlook as he had then, he would have been warning the people of what is to be expected of this mad night bombing competition and indicating the Party leaders who lend themselves to supporting it instead of making every possible effort to stop it.

Nor would he fail to warn the people of the madness of political leaders who talk of *disarming Germany and keeping Germany forcibly disarmed for twenty years* or some undeclared period by means of *Anglo-American military domination*. Anything more sure to keep the war going for many more years yet could not possibly be imagined, for *it means the invasion of Germany with sufficient force to occupy it, at least for some considerable time*. An adventure that could only be regarded as a possibility by the most extravagant stretch of wishful thinking.

Of Mr. Johnston's two distorted statements the one about food is not only misleading, but insultingly ridiculous. "*For the first time in the history of Great Britain there were no empty stomachs in the land*," said Mr. Johnston.

Under the heading "New Jap Note to Roosevelt," I read an account in the *Daily Herald* on Tuesday (Sept. 23rd) of the rapid decline in living conditions in Japan which are said to be inducing the Japanese Government and President Roosevelt to continue negotiations for peaceful agreement between the United States and Japan. This is the point chiefly stressed in the *Daily Herald's* report on the decline in living conditions in Japan:—

"Living conditions," reports the *Daily Herald*, "are said to be declining rapidly. There is a *shortage of fresh vegetables and other vital foods*."

Mr. Johnston himself may have no personal experience of what foods are just as completely out of reach of a large proportion of working class families by reason of the prices of them as if those foods were actually non-existent. One may reasonably assume, however, that at least Mr. Johnston reads his own Party's paper, the *Daily Herald*, in which Mrs. Ayrton Gould's articles have appeared, and in which unimpeachable medical evidence on malnutrition has been reported. He therefore ought to know that *here, as in Japan*, for ordinary working class folk there is a "*shortage of fresh vegetables and other vital foods*." And the Tom Johnston of the last war if he were using his pen as effectively now as he did then would be flaying mercilessly the Ministry of Food and everybody else bearing any share of responsibility for the prices ramps which fill the bank balances of the big profiteers (not forgetting the big business men in the key positions controlling supplies and prices) and keep lean the diet, and empty the cupboards of ordinary working people.

As for Mr. Tom Johnston's quiet satisfaction that the worst perils of inflation have been avoided. Here again he endeavours to create the impression that there is nothing to complain of in the matter of financial chicanery as there was

in the last war by making a comparison, very vaguely and insidiously, which is not only misleading but insultingly ridiculous, as his comparison was in his statement about food.

Of course we have avoided *the worst* perils of inflation. We are not yet in the position Macdonald and Snowden described at the 1931 election to frighten the people and help Montague Norman, as agent for the Bank of England and New York's Wall Street, to crucify the British people on the golden cross of the Gold Standard. But we are heading straight for a £20,000 millions debt and a large part of the debt already recorded is for the loan of bank created credit money—*counterfeit money—inflation*.

If Mr. Tom Johnston had been the same man with the same outlook as the Tom Johnston of the last war he would not only be attacking the thimble-rigging methods of the financiers but he would be exposing the share pushing speculators and the war munitions profits scandal. So far from encouraging people to hope for a financial tie-up with Wall Street as a guarantee of post-war security, he would be warning them that this tie-up is a danger to be avoided. The wealth and resources of this country will pass in pawn to Wall Street, with the Bank of England and British finance as agent and our ruling classes as bailiffs, if the British people can be induced to accept the complacent attitude of the new Tom Johnston, the contented and comfortable politician of to-day.

FROM NEW ZEALAND

We have received an interesting letter from our comrade, S. Wignall, Hon. Organiser of the Rationalist Association of New Zealand. The declaration of this Association states:

"The Rationalist Associations of New Zealand have similar objects to the Rationalist Association of Great Britain.

The headquarters of the Association are situate at 315, Victoria Arcade Buildings, Shortland Street, Auckland, C.I. Perhaps our New Zealand readers will note this address. From here they can obtain the writings or orations of Thomas Paine, Richard Carlile, Robert Ingersoll, etc.

Under date of October 14, Comrade Wignall writes:—

"Dear Mr. Aldred,—Very many thanks for the literature sent.

A Mr. Sam Anderson, a member of this Association, of Arapuni, says he knew you in the early days.

As a political paper I consider your "WORD" of very high standing, and the people of Britain are very fortunate in having such a paper available for the small sum of 3/- per annum. The quality of the paper is only exceeded by the reading material thereon. However, from this Association's standpoint it is necessary to avoid the political view and approach and consider from the religious aspect.

The Life of Mr. Thomas Paine is very ably written indeed and to one who, like myself, finds satisfaction and sources of emulation in biographies, it is highly appraised and appreciated. Have not yet read the Life of Richard Carlile, but I sometimes feel disgusted to find his name omitted from certain encyclopaedias while so much attention is devoted to Thomas Carlyle, who without a doubt is hopelessly behind the times notwithstanding a good command of English.

Of course, we have to face many difficulties as all struggling minority efforts have to; none will know this better than you. Still we are glad to report a steady trend in our direction and there can be no letting up on the struggle if the forces of progress are to triumph.

In conclusion please accept our admiration for the courageous stand, the unflinching determination and steadfast work you are doing, even though we may not all agree in every way with your viewpoint. The Rationalist outlook teaches us that all progress sprang from those, like yourself, willing to suffer imprisonment and persecution, in order that posterity might reap the benefit and follow in your footsteps.

Believe me, yours fraternally,

F. S. WIGNALL."

The Thomas Paine reference is to Richard Carlile's "life" of Paine, which is circulated at 2d., post free, 3d.

MONEY AND PROGRESS

SOME LESSONS FROM AMERICAN FINANCIAL HISTORY

By
THE DUKE OF BEDFORD

History provides no parallel, either in point of view of duration or extent, for the exploitation of the people of the world by international financiers operating an anti-social monetary system. The exploitation of labour by capital is mere child's play by comparison!

As the exploitation of nations by their financiers is still going on in most of the so-called Democracies; and as the methods employed are much the same in different parts of the world, episodes connected with the early history of Finance in the United States are neither devoid of interest nor out-of-date for the student of monetary reform.

In the early part of the eighteenth Century, Pennsylvania, then, of course, a British Colony, adopted a monetary system which, though not absolutely ideal from the point of view of modern progressive economists in that it did not effect a careful adjustment between the supply of money and the supply of goods, had nevertheless some excellent commonsense features and was attended by most satisfactory results.

The Pennsylvania Government created new paper money and lent it to settlers who were desirous of clearing land for productive purposes and putting up buildings. David Hume, an English Historian, describes the method as follows:—

"In Pennsylvania the land itself is coined. The planter immediately after purchasing land can go to a public office and receive notes to the amount of half his land, which notes he employs in all payments. No more than a certain sum is issued to one planter and he must pay back each year into the public Treasury one-tenth of the notes. When they are all paid back, he can repeat the operation. This caused a prosperity that Burke said was unparalleled."

Benjamin Franklyn wrote:

"Abundance reigned in Pennsylvania and there was peace in all her borders. A more happy and prosperous population could not perhaps be found on the globe. In every home there was comfort. The people generally were highly moral and knowledge was extensively diffused."

"In every home there was comfort"—some of us, before the war at any rate, were inclined to feel sceptical when references were made to "the good old times," thanking our stars that we did not live in what we were inclined to regard as an age of semi-barbarism! It is true that the "good old times" had their bad features. Savage penalties were inflicted for very minor offences; superstition was rife; medical knowledge was almost absent; and people seldom or never washed themselves! On the other hand, if we go back far enough in the history both of this country and of America, we really do reach a period when, in certain most important directions, the "good old times" were really good. Members of the weekly-wage earning class had far more comfort and security than many of them have been able to enjoy for many a long year and, if penalties for infringement of the law were foolishly severe, adequate protection by the law of the rights of the citizen was in certain directions better established. In some ways we have not progressed through the centuries but have actually gone back, various causes contributing, of which, in this country, the chief were the neglect of the old Common Law with its just fundamental principles and the substitution of frequently inferior Statute Laws put into operation by Acts of Parliament; the appearance of the financial tyranny; the increasing ignorance and corruption of Members of Parliament; and the failure of the people to take an intelligent interest in public affairs and maintain proper control over their elected representatives. Many of our modern social evils

have been attributed to mechanisation and the industrial era, but had it not been for the more fundamental factors already alluded to, the industrial system would have been properly directed and controlled and would have been a benefit to all instead of a curse to many.

Reverting to the American Colonies, the subsequent history of Pennsylvania was extremely sad and teaches a lesson from which we can well profit to-day. Peter Cooper, one of the early American patriots gives the following description of what took place. "When Franklyn was brought before the Parliament of Great Britain and questioned as to the cause of the wonderful prosperity growing up in the Colonies, he plainly stated that the cause was the convenience they found in exchanging their various forms of labour, one with another, by paper money which has been adopted; that this paper money was not only used in the payment of taxes; but in addition it had been declared legal tender. It rose to two or three per cent. above the par value of gold and silver, as everybody preferred its use. One of its advantages was its security against theft as it could be easily carried and hidden on account of its having no bulk, as all kinds of specie (coin) must necessarily have. After Franklyn explained this to the British Government as the real cause of prosperity, they immediately passed laws forbidding the payment of taxes in that money (!). This produced such great misery and inconvenience to the people that it was the principal cause of the Revolution. A far greater reason for a general uprising than the Tea and Stamp Act was the taking away of the paper money."

John Twells, of London, tells much the same story. In describing the Pennsylvanian experiment and its fate he says:

"This was the monetary system under which the American Colonists prospered to such an extent that Burke said of them 'Nothing in the history of the world is like their progress.' It was a wise and beneficial system and its effects were most conducive to the happiness of the people. Half the value of his land was advanced to the head of the family in notes which circulated as money. With these notes he could hire labour and purchase instruments of husbandry and cattle, and thus, where without these notes one acre could be cleared and stocked in a year, ten would, by the assistance of the paper money advanced, be reclaimed from the forest and rendered productive. In an evil hour the British Government took away from America its representative money . . . Now mark the consequences. Ruin seized upon these once flourishing Colonies: the most severe distress was brought home to every interest and every family."

After the United States became independent, the Government for a time issued its own paper notes which were known as "greenbacks." Although the plan was a sound one and was described by Col. Edward Taylor in 1864 as "the greatest blessing the people of the Republic had ever had," it aroused the determined opposition of the financiers, who obtained no tribute of interest from a kind of money which they were not able to issue for their own profit in the form of loans. The battle, unfortunately successful, which they waged to secure control of the issue of American paper money, produced some most revealing documents in the form of a correspondence carried on in 1863 between the London banking firm of Rothschild Brothers, and the firm of Ikleheimer, Morton and Vandergould which had its headquarters in Wall Street, New York. The following are quotations from the correspondence. Rothschild Brothers wrote:

"A Mr. John Sherman has written to us from a town in Ohio as to the profits which are to be made in the National Banking business under a recent Act of your Congress (an Act which had the ultimate effect of getting rid of the State Bank notes just referred to). Mr. Sherman declares that there has never before been such an opportunity for capitalists to accumulate money as that presented by this Act and that the old plan of State banks is so unpopular that the new scheme will, by mere contrast, be most favourably regarded, notwithstanding the fact that it gives the National Banks almost a complete control over the national finances. 'The few who can understand the system' he says, 'will either be so interested in its profits or so dependent on its favours that there will be no opposition from that class, while, on the other hand, the great body of the people, mentally incapable of

comprehending the tremendous advantages that capital derives from the system, will bear its burdens without complaint and perhaps without even suspecting that the system is inimical to their interests.'"

In the above, Mr. Sherman is using the term "capital" in the restricted sense of bankers' capital, as the system which he advocated was often to prove as inimical to employers in industry as to weekly-wage earners.

The reply of Ikleheimer, Morton and Vandergould, praising Mr. Sherman and drawing the picture of the perfect politician from the financiers' standpoint, is really a gem:

"The fact that Mr. Sherman speaks well of such an investment, or of any similar one, is certainly not without weight for that gentleman possesses in a marked degree the distinguishing characteristics of the successful modern financier. His temperament is such that whatever his feelings may be they never cause him to lose sight of the main chance. He is young, shrewd and ambitious. He has fixed his eye upon the Presidency of the United States and is already a member of Congress. He rightly thinks that he has everything to gain both politically and financially (he has financial ambitions too) by being friendly with men and institutions having large financial resources and which, at times, are not too particular in their methods, either in obtaining Government aid or protecting themselves from unfriendly legislation. We trust him here implicitly. His intellect and ambition combine to make him exceedingly valuable to us. Indeed, we predict that if his life be spared he will prove to be the best friend that the monied interests of the world have ever had in America."

With this letter Messrs. Ikleheimer, Morton and Vandergould enclosed a circular, describing the new banks they hoped to found and the profits they hoped to make thereby. Two items in this circular are worth quoting:

"The interest on the bonds, plus the interest on the currency which the bonds secure, plus the incidentals of the business ought to make the gross earnings of the bank amount to from 28 to 33 1/3 per cent. The amount of dividends that may be declared will depend largely on the salaries the officers of the bank vote themselves and the character and rental charges of the premises occupied by the bank as a place of business. In case it is thought best that the showing of profits should not appear too large, the now common plan of having the directors buy the bank building and then raising the rent and the salaries of the President and Cashier may be adopted."

"National Banks are privileged to increase or contract their circulation at will and can, of course, grant or withhold loans as they see fit. As the banks have a national organisation and can easily act together in withholding loans or extending time, it follows that they can, by united action in refusing to make loans, cause a stringency in the money market and, in a single week, or even in a single day, cause a decline in all the products of the country. The tremendous possibilities of speculation involved in this control of the money of a country like the United States will at once be understood by all bankers."

Readers may not be altogether surprised to learn that the letter ends: "Requesting that you will regard this communication as strictly confidential!"

On one occasion when, during their drive to financial power, the banks succeeded in getting a measure passed which subsequently aroused the resentment even of the ignorant American public and of their representatives in the Legislature, the banks adopted a very cute dodge when the time came for the enactment of another measure with the same objective. They opposed it, calculating that the members of the Legislature, being suspicious of their activities but too ignorant of Finance to understand the purport of the new law, would conclude that, as they opposed it, it must be in the national interests and should therefore be passed. The ruse succeeded perfectly and the American Legislature passed it!

One or two prominent American statesmen whose honesty exceeded their knowledge of the financial system, realised too late the evil character of the measures they had been induced to support. Mr. P. Chase, the Secretary of the Treasury, who had urged upon President Lincoln and upon Congress the passing of the National Banking Act which was instrumental in doing away with the State issue of paper money, is said to have made the following statement:

"My agency in securing the passing of the National Bank Act was the greatest financial

mistake of my life. It has built up a monopoly which affects every interest in the country. It should be repealed."

Abraham Lincoln who had taken Mr. Chase's advice, realised shortly before his death the evil effects which were to flow from the creation of the National Banking System. In a letter written, in 1864 he says:

"I see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves me and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country. As a result of the war, Corporations have been enthroned and an era of corruption in high places will follow and the money power of the country will endeavour to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until all wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the Republic is destroyed. I feel at this moment more anxiety for the safety of my country than ever before, even in the midst of war. God grant that my suspicions prove groundless."

Alas, subsequent history has proved that President Lincoln's fears were only too well grounded. An able American monetary reformer has written of the present Administration:

"President Franklin D. Roosevelt went into office vowing to drive the money changers from the temple; but instead of doing so, he turned the 'temple' almost completely over to them. He has given the usurers more tax-free securities than any President, during peace time, in history. He has printed Bonds instead of currency at a time when there has been as great a need for more currency than at any time in history, if not greater. (Bonds are pieces of paper issued by a government which give the holders the right to interest obtained from taxation. These Bonds, within the wide limits set by their loans and cash reserves, the banks can buy with new money created by merely filling-in cheques. In this extremely simple way they obtain a substantial income at the expense of the taxpayer.) It seems doubtful if the President was ever in actual sympathy with the legislation (legislation making possible the issue of more money.) To quiet those who sponsored the legislation he permitted it to be enacted, but reserved the power of making use of it and has then just failed to do so. His administration has made a record for producing one inconsistency after another. He has played the part of a typical politician who kids and tries to please everyone, but in the end, satisfied no one. He has temporised, qualified, and impotentized almost everything that held forth some real hope. Having been born with a gold spoon in his mouth and in a banker environment, it is difficult to see how much could have been expected from him which could have worked for the benefit of the masses."

Duke Defends His Peace Terms Move

IF the opportunity of investigating the chances of a many had been taken last on his "peace plan" visit, her Allies would be very was at present, declared the

"I AM NO QUISLING"
Says the Duke of Bedford

Evening Standard Reporter
The Duke of Bedford told me to-day that he resents as a "reflection on his loyalty" the statement about him made in the House of Commons yesterday by Mr. Herbert Morrison, the Home Secretary.

"I am no Quisling," said the Duke. "I am pro-British, and I am acting in all sincerity in what I believe to be the best interests of the country."

The Duke, who is one of Britain's richest landowners, has just issued a 7000-word peace-plan pamphlet called "What a Game!"

Mr. Herbert Morrison, in a debate in Parliament, referred to him

Duke of Bedford

Federal Union's Disclaimer

THE Federal Union, in a statement yesterday, disassociates itself "in the strongest possible terms" from the Duke of Bedford's letter to a Government official in Liverpool. The statement declares that



Peace duke may lose his railings

Express Staff Reporter
IN one square mile of Bloomsbury, London, there stand today enough useless iron railings to make 10 medium tanks for Russia—or the British Armoured Corps. Big beautiful railings of wrought and cast iron, enclosing quiet London squares with flower beds, plant

Duke Speaks of 'Peace' Letter

The Duke of Bedford said yesterday that the letter written by him which—Councillor George Beakes, former Mayor of Wallasey, had sent to Mr. Herbert Morrison, the Home Secretary, was probably one he had written to a Federal Union supporter in Liverpool.

PACIFIST DUKE AND HITLER

"Rather amusing," —SAYS THE DUKE

Express Staff Reporter
WHEN I told the Duke of Bedford yesterday that the statue of his ancestor, the fifth duke, who died in 1222, had been daubed with paint and covered with slogans during the night, he said, "Rather amusing."

'Traitor' Slogan On Duke of Bedford Statue

DUKE OF BEDFORD'S LETTER Crown & Legal Position A LETTER written by the Duke of Bedford to a Government official in Liverpool has been sent to

Evening Standard Reporter

Duke's Scots Tenancy to Be Terminated

Following the references to the Duke of Bedford by Mr. Herbert Morrison, Home Secretary, in the recent Commons debate, the Duke has been asked to terminate his tenancy of the Kirkcubrightshire

STATUE SPLASHED

Ancestor Of "Peace Duke"

THE statue of Francis Duke of Bedford, in Russell Square, London, was splashed on the face and chest with yellow paint during the night. Signs in paint and chalk had been printed all over it. On bronze figures on one side of the panels was written, "Melt me." On the pavement at the other side of the square was chalked, "Give us these railings."

PAINT ON DUKE'S STATUE

Demand: "Give Up These Railings"

The statue of Francis Duke of Bedford in Russell Square, London, was splashed on the face and State can take my railings, says duke

The Duke of Bedford writes to the Editor of the Daily Express concerning his railings round Russell Square.

"I am no Quisling"

-Duke of Bedford

"NEWS" LONDON SERVICE

'QUISLING' LEGEND ON DUKE'S STATUE

PAINTED SIGNS
"Y" signs and other inscriptions were found yesterday painted on the left statue of Francis fifth Duke of Bedford.

Duke Teets Moor

(By Our Lobby Correspondent)
The Duke of Bedford has been given notice to quit the grounds Moor and deer-forest of Ballyry.

Home Secretary and Duke of Bedford

Reference was made in the Daily Express by the Home Secretary in a lively speech in the Commons on Tuesday night. He was speaking on whether Members of Parliament should be allowed in any way to anywhere talked on what he deemed to be public duty.

THE DUKE OF BEDFORD

The Scots Socialist, Glasgow, for December, 1941, published the following editorial on the Duke of Bedford:—

The heresy hunt against the pacifist Duke has commenced, with all the swinish ferocity usually associated with Goebells. The hate and vindictiveness oozes out of the English press, and persons like Morrison, the pacifist of the last war, when he was of military age, use every opportunity to attack him with a display of savagery equalled only by Streicher, the Jew baiter. We note in passing, however, that no respectable Scottish newspaper has joined the heresy hunt; only the English fifth column press in Scotland has sunk to the level of the Nazi press.

We are glad that Lord Ponsonby has rushed to defend the Duke, at the risk of himself being included in the hunt, and his reference to Morrison and his gestapo was amply justified.

This display shows just how democratic England is and how much of the Nazi philosophy has been absorbed. That the Duke is entitled to his opinions and the right to propagate them is unassailable and any attempt to prevent him from exercising his fundamental rights as a free citizen will be strenuously opposed by all who still believe in and are determined to preserve real democracy.

We have been overwhelmed with letters concerning the Duke of Bedford's attitude. Also we have a considerable number of interesting press comments. These will be dealt with fully next month.

WHAT MADE ME A SOCIALIST.

By F. W. JOWETT.

Reprint of a Famous Pamphlet.

2d. Post Free, 3d.

MORE HEADLINE SENSATION

In last month's issue we reproduced some of the headlines from the sensational millionaire press. Above is another composite news mixture. The idea is to present the Duke of Bedford to the readers of the daily press as a person devoid of dignity and therefore an individual whose views must not be considered. He is a person to be shunned because heiligans have daubed a statue with yellow paint, etc.

REQUEST TO READERS.

We will make a report on our appeal against the heavy deficit under which we struggle next month. Despite last month's response, we are considerably short of the sum needed. Would every comrade really make an effort this month, and not leave the task of assisting as a burden on a few? Apart from the cost of printing our postal mission entails heavy expenditure. Your response means an end to this begging.

The Socialist Standard, organ of the S.P.G.B., in its issue for November 1941, publishes a letter from the Duke of Bedford on the question of monetary reform and cheap imports. Also an editorial reply. This paper can be secured (post free, 4d.) from A. Bowley, 64 Caverleigh Way, Worcester Park, Surrey.

The Duke of Bedford contributes a letter to "The New Leader," for December 13, 1941, replying to the I.L.P. veteran, William Stewart, entitled: "Should The Money Problem Be Solved First?" The N.L. can be obtained, post free, 3d., from 318 Regent Park Road, London, N.W.1.

The Duke of Bedford contributes an interesting article to "THE CHRISTIAN PACIFIST" for December, 1941, entitled "MEMORIES—AND A REFLECTION."

Comrades can obtain this paper direct from the F.O.R., 17 Red Lion Square, London, W.C. 4d. in stamps should be enclosed, when ordering.

By THE DUKE OF BEDFORD.
Why Have This War? 2nd Edition. New Foreword.
Parliament and Peace. Review of Peace Discussion in the House of Commons on I.L.P. Amendment. 2nd Edition.
Where There is No Vision. 2nd Edition. New Appendix.

Diplomacy and War Guilt. Bedford's new pamphlet, dealing with E. D. Morel's pioneer struggle.
What A Game! 3d., post free, 4d. Other pamphlets, 2d.; post-free, 3d.

THE EDITOR'S TRIALS IN THE DOCK

II.—GLASGOW SEDITION TRIAL, 1921

(Continued from page 53).

VIII.—"EVENING CITIZEN," GLASGOW.

The Evening Citizen, for Monday, June, 20, 1921, reported the trial beneath the following headings:—

SEDITION CHARGE.

3 Men and a Woman, PUBLICATION OF THE "RED COMMUNE." Chats on Philosophy.

The report detailed items of the charge and evidence not included in the reports quoted already as follows:—

Three men and a woman appeared before Lord Skerrington in the High Court of Judiciary to-day on a sedition charge. . . .

One article is alleged to have stated that the platform of Communism consisted of the following five planks, namely

It was also stated that the Glasgow Communist group takes its stand on a platform of constructive revolution.

The paper was also alleged to contain an article by G. L. Malone, M.P., in which he said—"The People's Army must have its own flag, and not deceitfully salute the flag of the enemy as a preparation for striking it. . . ."

Detective-Lieutenant McGimpsey, of the Central Division, Glasgow, stated that the Glasgow Communist group was founded about 1912. . . . He went to the house of the accused Jane Hamilton Patrick, whom he described as secretary of the Glasgow Communist group, and there he found 51 membership cards.

Cross-examined by the accused, Aldred, he said he had no personal knowledge of the date of the founding of the Communist group and its fusion with the Anarchist group, but had his information from an advertisement in the "Forward"

A girl of 22 years of age, one Menzies Scott Donaldson, who said she was at one time minute secretary of the Glasgow Communist

Cross-examining on what happened at the meetings of the group, Aldred asked: Did we not sit round and have cups of tea and talk?—Yes.

Is it not a fact that our conversation turned on philosophy?—Yes.

FLEMING'S DEFENCE.

Giving evidence for Fleming, the Rev. Mr. Strang, minister of Sandyhills U.F. Church, Shettleston, said he had known accused for over 12 years. . . .

Mr. A. M. MacRobert, advocate-depute, prosecuting—You say accused is a strong Christian. Would he be a party to printing a paper showing a picture of the Bible being smashed up? Witness (examining a picture on the front page of the "Red Commune")—No.

Cross-examined by Aldred—Could there be two interpretations of the picture, one the destruction of the Holy Bible and the other not the destruction of the Bible but only the destruction of the idea of making a fetish of the word "Bible"?

Witness—Possibly.

The Evening Citizen for Tuesday, June 21, in its headings merely contented itself with descriptive statements:—

DEFENDANT'S LENGTHY ADDRESS TO JURY. Great Public Interest.

In its final edition, the *Citizen* had a banner headline across the front page: "Sentences in Sedition Case."

Describing the final scene, the *Citizen* said:—

THE JURY'S RETURN.

After an absence of twenty minutes, the jury, by a majority of fourteen to one, returned a verdict of guilty against each of the accused. . . .

Aldred made an objection, relating to a previous conviction alleged in the indictment, and stated that the certificate of conviction was not produced. The certificate produced was of a different date from that of the alleged conviction. . . .

Aldred said that, as far as the other accused were concerned, he was the inciting person, and if there was to be any differences in the sentences, it should be passed on him.

Miss Patrick and McLeish said that they did not wish to shelter behind anyone else. . . .

As the prisoners were being taken down to the cells, Aldred was seen to kiss Miss Patrick. Miss Patrick afterwards waved her hand to some friends in Court.

IX.—"DAILY RECORD," GLASGOW.

The Daily Record, Glasgow, for June 21, 1921, reported the case beneath the headings:—

COMMUNISTS ON TRIAL. Glasgow Sedition Charge.

The report was full and fair and summarised the speech for the defence as follows:—

Aldred, in a lengthy address, said that in vain would the Crown look through the "Red Commune" for any suggestion of violence.

Aldred had not finished his address when the Court adjourned till to-day.

The following day, Wednesday, June 22, *The Daily Record* introduced considerable viciousness into its record. We quote its headings and part of the report:—

"RED COMMUNE'S" SPONSORS.

Sedition-Mongers Sentenced.

After a trial lasting ten hours, the jury in Glasgow High Court, yesterday, returned a verdict of guilty in the case of all four persons tried in connection with the charge of sedition arising out of the publication of "The Red Commune."

Lord Skerrington passed sentence as follows . . . Aldred's address to the jury lasted for over two hours.

ALDRED'S ADMISSION.

Before sentence was pronounced, Aldred asked his Lordship to consider the fact that he had already been in custody for 100 days.

At the same time, he confessed he was mainly responsible for the production of the "Red Commune," and should receive a heavier punishment than the others. . . .

It would be obvious to any decent journalist or editor that we made no confession. We did not ask the court to consider the 100 odd days we had been jailed on remand. We complained of illegal arrest, without a warrant, which was a trickery of law by an act of legal violence, and we complained of a vindictive imprisonment, through being denied bail on a purely theoretical political charge. Our acceptance of responsibility was simply a straightforward declaration, the intention of which is clear to every thinking person. Such a statement is not confession in any sense of the term. We had nothing to confess. Note also the second day's headings. That was the *Daily Record* view of "Communism" and "the Reds" in 1921. That might still be its view of genuine Communist activity. But it would persuade its readers to-day that somehow, "the Reds" and the Capitalist Imperialists are united in a common democracy against Fascism. What were these 1921 headings but Fascism?

X.—"BULLETIN," GLASGOW.

The Bulletin, Glasgow, in its issues for Tuesday, June 21, and the following day, publish condensed but very clear factual reports, beneath sober and responsible headings.

On the Tuesday, the report was headed:—

"THE RED COMMUNE."

Sedition Charge Against Glasgow Communists. The text referred to "Mr. Aldred, who was undefended, in a long speech," etc.

On the Wednesday, the report was headed soberly:—

SEDITION TRIAL.

Glasgow Communists Sent to Prison.

The report was brief, impartial, dignified. But its factual details are embodied in the reports reproduced.

XI.—LABOUR SOLIDARITY.

We intercept the dry factual record to depict the solidarity evinced, or, at least, expressed on paper at the time, by all sections of the movement.

The useful and sympathetic attitude adopted by P. J. Dollan, then Glasgow correspondent to *The Daily Herald*, has been detailed. Later we shall refer to the *Herald's* news-items and short editorial comments. Influenced by George Lansbury, the Labour daily displayed magnificent solidarity.

In 1921, *The Daily Herald* was owned and controlled by the organised Labour movement. This movement was reformist, parliamentary, and orthodox. But it believed in discussion, thought and liberty. It exhibited breadth and showed sympathy for those who believed in

revolutionary activity. It classed them as hopelessly Utopian and visionary, but welcomed their propaganda as inspirational in the struggle and part of the workers' struggle: the culture towards developed and sustained struggle. George Lansbury suffered from many errors. As a parliamentarian, he did many wrong things. But he had much sympathy and many virtues. He could speak truthfully and directly. Few parliamentarians achieve such distinction.

In its issue for November 3, 1921, *The Daily Herald* published the following striking editorial, which we reproduce in full:—

BEGIN AT HOME.

Yesterday we called attention to the proposal by American "justice" to murder Saccho and Vanzetti for being Socialists, under the disguise of executing them for a crime which it is known that they did not commit.

But do not let us flatter ourselves that our English "justice" is very different. We are not in a position to throw stones at America. Our whole system of legal and judicial oppression, our system of courts and prisons, is as wicked and unjust as anything in the world.

John Maclean is in prison in circumstances which, for a man of his enfeebled health after a long hunger-strike, are only too likely to involve death. His crime is to have made speeches which even if they were what the prosecution alleged, would be no worse than the activities of the Ulster leaders in 1914. No worse, did we say? Why, at the worst John Maclean made a speech! But Galloper Smith, who is now Lord Chancellor, and Carson, who is now a Law Lord, organised an army to fight against the British Constitution!

It was admitted by the judge at the trial that Maclean did not desire violence. Yet the sentence inflicted upon him was as savage and vindictive as if he had been guilty of a serious crime.

Similarly, Guy Aldred, also in prison for exercising the traditional British right of free speech, was imprisoned for four months before trial, then sentenced to a year, but not allowed to count the four months he had already suffered as part of that imprisonment.

The brutality of these sentences is a disgrace to the country, and nothing can remove the disgrace except the organised power of Labour.

Sir Basil Thomson, whose Department was notorious for so many prosecutions, has gone. By his own assertion he has not voluntarily resigned, but has been compulsorily got rid of; and his somewhat nauseating Department, which he describes as "the most loyal, zealous, and competent body of public servants," is, perhaps, to be scattered. Would it not then be reasonable, as well as decent, to release simultaneously all those whom this business of spying and prosecuting has put into prison?

This copy of *The Daily Herald* was smuggled into us in Barlinnie Prison by a friendly warder, who resented the fact that we were denied access to Socialist and Labour papers. He had no other idea than that of being decent. We agreed with the tone of the editorial then. We agree with it to-day. Sir Basil Thomson's department never went. It is operating still. Although it is directed to-day, mainly against people who rejected at our imprisonment in 1921, who are too openly and avowedly anti-Socialist in some instances for a mean and despicably Anti-Socialist system of society upheld by some nominal Socialists, we cannot see that the Special Branch of Scotland Yard serves any more useful function to-day than in 1921. We are opposed to the spy system, no matter who may direct the spy, no matter who is the victim.

When the *Daily Herald* comment was penned, Herbert Morrison was putting aside his robes as Labour Mayor of Hackney. *Foreign Affairs* was fresh with his articles pledging the Labour movement against all future war. He was an active member of the I.L.P. and he endorsed this editorial. To-day he is Home Secretary and upholder of 18B and head of the Special Branch, so far as Parliament is concerned. We stand by the editorial which cheered us when we languished in Barlinnie.

In the *Daily Herald* for November 5, 1921—that is, two days later—George Lansbury honoured us with a special article treating of our imprisonment. Lansbury wrote of the Communist prisoners and continued:—

"Among these is Guy Aldred, editor of the 'Spur,' whose case is well-known to all readers of the 'Daily Herald.' He was born on November 5, 35 years ago. His life has been a strenuous one all

through, and during the past ten years he has spent more time inside prison than outside. His one crime in the eyes of Scotland Yard and the Government is that he has desired to serve his fellow men and women. To-day he is serving a monstrous sentence of 12 months imprisonment, with four months added, because of a refusal to grant bail, and the charge which has landed him in prison is the old one of sedition."

Knowledge that such recognition is being accorded to him means much to the political prisoner.

(To be continued)

UNITED STATES CONCHIES

On January 30, 1941, the *Baltimore Sun's* Washington correspondent, Dewey L. Fleming, announced in its columns that elaborate plans for the induction of conscientious objectors to military service into Federally supervised civilian work programmes were nearing completion.

Officials were working on an initial programme of twenty-five camps, with the prospect that possibly as many as seventy-five or one hundred camps would be required by midsummer. It was planned to distribute them as evenly over the whole country as facilities and feasible work projects would permit, in order to minimise the cost of transporting selectees to camp sites.

The Selective Service Act recognises two types of conscientious objectors. One is the group which objects only to service in combat units of the army. These men are assignable to non-combat groups. The second group includes those who object to participation in any form of military activity. These are the ones for whom Congress devised the civilian work camp.

The camps will be operated co-operatively by various agencies of the Government and an organisation of religious groups with tenets of non-participation in war.

This latter group includes the Society of Friends (Quakers), Church of the Brethren, Mennonites, Advent Christian Church, American Unitarian Association, Fellowship of Reconciliation, some branches of the Baptist and Methodist faith and various other religious sects. Co-operating with them is the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

The church group has organised a national service board for religious objectors to deal with the problem and has established offices for it in Washington. The officers of this board are:

- M. R. Zigler, Church of the Brethren, Elgin, Ill., chairman.
- Orie Miller, Mennonite bodies, Akron, Pa., vice-chairman.
- Paul J. Furnas, Society of Friends, Philadelphia, treasurer.
- Dr. Arthur Swift, Fellowship of Reconciliation, New York.
- Dr. Walter Van Kirk, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, New York.
- Dr. Charles Boss, Jr., Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church, Chicago.
- Paul Comly French, Philadelphia, executive secretary.

No new construction of consequences will be undertaken. Instead, use will be made of abandoned CCC camps, other Government-owned plants with barrack facilities, and some camps provided by the churches.

Roughly, the division of responsibility and activity in establishment and operation of the camps is as follows:—

- (1) The War Department to furnish or loan cots, bedding and other items of camp equipment as far as feasible and necessary.
- (2) The Agriculture and Interior departments to provide technical supervision for the work projects involved, such as soil conservation, erosion control, forestry, agricultural experimentation and other work which may be undertaken.
- (3) The Federal Security Administration to make available such abandoned camps and

equipment of the CCC as can be spared, together with certain tools and equipment.

(4) The Selective Service Board to furnish general administrative and policy supervision and inspection, and to pay the cost of transporting selectees to the camps.

(5) The National Service Board for Religious Objectors to finance and to furnish all other necessary parts of the programme, including actual day-to-day supervision, food and clothing, medical and hospital care, educational and recreational activities. The board to supply selectees with a modest, regular allowance of spending money.

Mr. French, executive secretary of the board, said that it would cost the church group about \$35 per man per month to carry out its part of the programme.

Major Guiton Morgan, the Selective Service Board's special representative on conscientious objector matters, pointed out that the Selective Service Act of 1917 made no specific provision for the service of conscientious objectors beyond recognition of their right to insist upon assignment to non-combatant units of the army.

This feature of the 1917 Act was a source of much difficulty for President Wilson, the War Department and the objectors until it was remedied to a degree by adoption of a policy of furloughing objectors to various kinds of approved work programmes. Before this solution was adopted, however, many objectors had been imprisoned.

The 1940 Selective Service Act specifically directs that persons who "by reason of religious training and belief" are conscientiously opposed to combatant military service shall be deferred from such service in the land and naval forces, but shall be inducted and assigned to non-combatant service for one year. It provided, further, that persons conscientiously opposed to both combatant and non-combatant military service shall, in lieu of induction, be assigned to "civilian work of national importance."

Another difference between the law's attitude toward objectors in 1917 and those of 1940 is that whereas it was necessary for the 1917 objector to show that he was a member of a church with non-military tenets, the objector of 1940 may assert his claim to special classification as an individual and without proof of church membership. The local selective service board decides upon the validity of his claim.

The character of this Selective Board was dealt with at some length in statements in Washington by Attorney General Jackson, on April 7 and 8.

On the first date Mr. Jackson designated William Palmer and Lamar Hardy, former Federal Attorneys in New York State, as hearing officers to investigate the claims of conscientious objectors to selective service within that State.

Mr. Palmer, former Assistant United States Attorney for the Western District, will handle the Northern and Western District of the State. Mr. Hardy, former United States Attorney for the Southern District, was assigned to the Southern and Eastern Districts.

These officials were appointed to operate under a section of the Selective Service Act which requires the Department of Justice to investigate the claims of conscientious objectors. Other hearing officers will act in other States.

The law provides that claims of conscientious objectors must be referred by appeal boards to the United States Attorneys in whose districts they are filed. They transmit the claims to the Department of Justice, which conducts an investigation through the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This report is sent to the hearing officer.

If exemption from selective service is requested on the ground of affiliation with a church or group which forbids military service, an investigation will be conducted to establish whether the claim is bonafide. For individual conscientious objectors, the hearing officer must hold an inquiry and report his findings on the

basis of individual claims.

On April 8 Attorney-General Jackson promised fair play to conscientious objectors. He said that the pleas of objectors would be heard by men chosen for their "patience, tolerance, and well-balanced judgment." The hearings would not be in the nature of a trial or a judicial proceeding. They would be human and informal. They would be non-legalistic and without ordinary rules of evidence. But they would seek to discover the truth. Mr. Jackson added:—

"The interest of the registrant may well require that the hearing, in view of its nature and object, be private. It should be so conducted that the rights of the registrant on the one hand and the rights of his country and fellow-citizens on the other are recognised and protected."

The same day the Federal Bureau of Investigation announced that an investigation was being conducted by the Department of Justice of the cases of 10,500 men thought to be Selective Service evaders. Seventy persons had been convicted of evasion.

We have received from our comrade, Jessie Wallace Hughan, Secretary, War Resisters' League, 171 12th Street, New York, N.Y., U.S.A., important statements and reports on the conscientious objectors' position in the United States, under the *Selective Training and Service Act*, 1940. The matter will be studied thoroughly and dealt with in these columns.

ADLARD'S LAST POEM

Last month we recorded the death of our comrade, the Rev. Henry J. Adlard, minister of the Unitarian Church, Trim Street, Bath. Below we reproduce his last poem, published in the *St Ives Times*, November 7, 1941:—

THE LIFEBOATMEN OF ENGLAND.

The lifeboatmen of England,
Who guard our rugged coast,
Who live in cot and hamlet,
And never heard to boast.

Their deeds, not words, their story tell,
Their praise is yet unsung.
Be mine one faltering pen,
To give their epic tongue.

Ready they stand by day or night,
To rescue human lives.
With hearts as brave as arms are strong,
And swift good byes to children, wives.

The lifeboatmen of England,
Defy the raging sea,
Daring the mountain billows,
Their cruel treachery.

The lifeboatmen of England,
Sometimes are seen no more.
They find a wandering grave,
By some deserted shore.

But "Man the lifeboat" goes the word,
And Englishmen are there.
As staunch and steady as of yore,
To bear their gallant share.

Bath, October, 1941.

We do not think that this is the best specimen of Mr Adlard's work. But it does bring out the importance of saving life, the bravery of such work, as opposed to the callousness and cruel stupidity of war.

Our comrade's American addresses will be reprinted from time to time, and finally collected in volume form.

By LORD PONSONBY.

FALSEHOOD IN WARTIME (reprinting).

DO WE WANT LIFE AFTER DEATH? 6d., by post 7 d.

REBELS AND REFORMERS (with Lady Ponsonby). 6d. Postage 7d. extra.

CATALOGUES: Strickland Press Catalogue, 2d pp. Also Allen and Unwin booklet sent on request. Send 1d. stamp.

THE STRICKLAND PRESS

101 GEORGE STREET, GLASGOW, G.1

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

ETHEL MACDONALD

The conscription of man-power and woman-power affects our comrade, Ethel MacDonald, who now has to take her stand as a conscientious objector. Comrade MacDonald plays a large part in the setting, printing, and circulating of *The Word* and the various Strickland Press pamphlets and leaflets. She is definitely Socialist and Pacifist, and she knows what war means, since she went to Barcelona to assist in the struggle against Franco, under C.N.T. auspices.

Ethel MacDonald joined the Bellshill I.L.P. when she was sixteen. This means she has been a member of the Socialist movement for sixteen years. In 1931 she joined the Anti-Parliamentary Communist Federation. After the split in that movement in 1933, she joined the Workers' Open Forum, which pioneered the United Socialist Movement, which was founded in June, 1934.

When the Franco rebellion, aided by Hitler and Mussolini, occurred in Spain, the U.S.M. issued the series of *Regeneration* leaflets, some of which have been reproduced in *The Word*. Contact was established with our Spanish comrades, and as a result comrades Jane H. Patrick (A.P.C.F.) and Ethel MacDonald (U.S.M.) proceeded to Spain. They left Glasgow on October 21, 1936, proceeded under circumstances of great poverty, and almost hitch-hiked across a part of France. Finally, they reached Barcelona, and were established in the C.N.T. headquarters. Some of Ethel MacDonald's radio speeches to Britain from the Barcelona station, calling for resistance to Fascism and help to Spain, have been published in leaflet form, and can be obtained still from this office. Comrade Patrick proceeded to Madrid, where she served for three months in the Committee of Defence. She went back to Barcelona. Then came the famous May Days, when the reactionary pseudo-Communists made war on the Anarchist and genuine Socialist elements. The first accounts of the May Days to reach the outside world were written by Jane Patrick and Ethel MacDonald, and were published in *Glasgow* in the widely circulated *Barcelona Bulletin*. Ethel MacDonald stayed on in Barcelona, and was arrested by the reactionary "Communist" junta. Her graphic letters, describing her experiences, were published in *The Evening Times*, Glasgow, between June and September, 1937. On the 3rd September of that year Ethel MacDonald left Spain, under escort. She made some European Socialist contacts, and reached Glasgow on November 7.

The fact that Ethel MacDonald lived and worked voluntarily in Barcelona for about ten months, during the bombardments and air-raids, shows that her opposition to war does not proceed from fear. She sees war as something wrong in itself, that leads inevitably to reaction. It is not the way of Socialist opposition to dictatorship and reaction. Also, in the present instance, she cannot forget that the present upholders of war in Britain favoured Franco in Spain, and permitted the wholesale slaughter of the working class in Spain by Nazi bombers without uttering one word of protest. She pleaded consistently over the air, night after night, from Barcelona in vain.

Militarism is not the way to freedom. Anti-militarism can conquer and can destroy utterly all dictatorship and all counter-revolution. Ethel MacDonald considers the production of *The Word* of real national importance.

Copies of *Save Spain! Act!* Ethel MacDonald's radio speeches, and *News from Spain*, describing the struggle in Spain, may be obtained still from this Office, each 2d, post free 3d. That is, 6d for the two publications.

WHAT A GAME!

By the DUKE OF BEDFORD

32 pages - - 3d. Post free, 4d.

NEW BEDFORD PAMPHLET DIPLOMACY AND WAR GUILT

16 Pages, Post Free, 3d.

CANADA'S CONCHIES

At Edmonton, on January 7, 1941, requests of adherents of the Christian Conventions, the Moravian Church, and the International Bible Students (Jehovah Witnesses) for exemption from compulsory military training on the ground of "conscientious objection" were denied by Chief Justice Horace Harvey, chairman of the Alberta War Services Board. He ruled that they were not entitled to exemptions because they are not religious denominations whose tenets of faith forbid the bearing of arms, as required under National War Service Regulations.

Speaking the same night, at Ottawa, the Hon. J. G. Gardiner, minister of National War Services, said that it would no longer be a requirement that a conscientious objector must belong to a religious faith the tenets of which forbid bearing arms.

The amendments, published that day in an extra edition of the *Canada Gazette*, provided that the applicant for indefinite postponement of military training must have a certificate from a minister of religion that he belongs to some religious denomination, not necessarily one that forbade the bearing of arms, and that he is a sincere conscientious objector.

The original regulations under which men are called up for the 20-day compulsory military training provided exemption from military training for Doukhobors and Menonites.

Although issued on January 7, the regulations were made to date from December 24, 1940. This would enable conscientious objectors, whose cases had been heard and dismissed, to make fresh application in the light of the changed regulations.

We consider the insistence on a minister's certificate nonsense. Why cannot an Atheist be opposed to taking life? Many Atheists are definite conscientious objectors and have the same right to consideration as those who profess to believe in God or in the Christian religion.

The following day Mennonite leaders at Ottawa informed the Government that young Mennonites had no objection to being conscripted for any type of non-combatant work irrespective of the danger involved. Mennonites were perfectly willing to go overseas to serve as firemen, or in bomb removal squads, or as stretcher bearers.

Mr. R. A. Irwin, Registrar for Military District No. 2, and Secretary to Canada's National War Service Board, in Toronto, intimated on January 14 that young Canadians who object to the military training in any form imposed by the National Mobilisation Act, will be placed under civilian jurisdiction and given civilian jobs for the same length of period as the training camps.

Two days later, Mr. Irwin stated that, in such jobs as ambulance driving, stretcher-bearing, and kitchen fatigue duties, the wearing of uniform as well as the bearing of arms would be unnecessary.

McGill University, through action taken by its senate, made provision for conscientious objectors in its compulsory military training programme, it was announced on January 28 by Dr. F. Cyril James, principal and vice-chancellor.

The action taken by McGill followed the amendment by the Dominion Government of the National War Service Regulations.

The provision for conscientious objectors made possible the returns of two students previously suspended for failure to take the military training required.

The two students agreed to return to the University, and to undergo the special course of non-combatant training. As this course includes trench-digging, we do not understand how the University Senate agreed to impose it, or the objectors agreed to accept it.

United Socialist Movement. National membership cards now ready. Statement of principles sent on request. Enclose 1d. or 2d. for particulars. Socialist and Pacifist comrades are joining throughout the country. Address: Ethel MacDonald, Secy., 106 George Street, Glasgow, C.I.

NEW ZEALAND C.O.'s

(Concluded from page 144, Vol. II., No. 12.)

Conditional exemption, subject to appellant's performing non-military service under the National Service Emergency Regulations at the direction of the Minister, was granted to Garnett Berry Thirkell, warehouseman, member of the Apostolic Church, and his cousin, Francis Richard Cooper, railways clerical cadet.

Thirkell did not consider farm or A.R.P. work war work. But he would not discharge either form of work under military control. He concluded:

"I am not prepared to assist the war in any circumstances whatever."

Pastor J. F. B. Thompson, president of the church in New Zealand, said the church was the outcome of the Welsh revival in 1904. Work started in New Zealand in 1934. The church was against taking up arms.

Cooper refused to take the oath and cited *Matthew v. 33-37*, and *James v. 12*, in support of his objection. The chairman, W. F. Sitwell, S.M., said:—

"That's strange. I did not know the Scriptures enjoined one to take no oath. However, I am willing to learn."

Mr. C. O. Bell said that the railways were contributing to the war effort by running troop trains and transporting ammunitions. The chairman told Cooper that he was working for the biggest munition workers in New Zealand, the Railways Department, and he ought to face the fact.

On Friday, February 7, the Chairman made an interesting statement, in rejecting the appeal of Stanley Gordon Field, a member of the body known as the Exclusive Brethren. This body does not claim that name, although known by it. The New Zealand membership is about 3,000. Field said that he could not kill people for whom Christ died. He would accept non-combatant service.

The Chairman said that conscientious objectors prepared to do non-combatant service did not come within the protection afforded by the regulations to proved conscientious objectors. The board was satisfied that appellant was sincere, but as he was willing to do non-combatant service his appeal must be dismissed, with a recommendation that, if it was possible, he be posted to a non-combatant unit of the armed forces.

Seven appeals against military service on the grounds of conscientious objection were dismissed in all on February 7. Four appeals were allowed, subject to obligation for non-military service at the discretion of the Minister of National Service, and two were adjourned, one *sine die* and the other for three months.

One of the dismissed cases was that of Norris Gilbert Smith, salesman, who said he was a Jehovah's Witness. He stated that in England Jehovah Witnesses had been granted exemption from military service.

The Chairman: You are aware, of course, that the Jehovah's Witnesses in New Zealand have been declared a subversive organisation?

Smith: Yes, sir.

Bell: Are you a New Zealander?—I was born in New Zealand, but I claim to be a foreigner. I do not consider myself to be of the people. My allegiance is to God, not to man. I am really a neutral in this world.

He added that if he were in the army he would be under Satan's control.

Another dismissed case was that of Alexander Wilson, grocer's assistant. He believed that no man had the right to kill or to injure another man. He was not prepared to engage in militarism to defend any country. He had held these views for twenty years and was a member of the Peace and Anti-Conscription League.

Walter Royce Stagg, garage attendant, asked the Tribunal:

"Why should I travel thousands of miles to kill a man I have never seen before, and whom I will not see while I am killing him?"

Charles Stewart, assurance agent, appealed on moral and humanitarian grounds. Killing was

never justifiable. To him there were no nationalities. It was merely an accident of birth whether a person was British or non-British. All men were equal in rights irrespective of this accident of place of birth and had the same rights to life, health, and happiness. The only steps he would take to preserve the happiness of the country would be peaceful steps.

Harvey Imandt, a cutter, sent in a statement, saying that he was of German descent, and that his parents were registered aliens. He would not bear arms against any worker, irrespective of nationality.

All these appeals were dismissed.

(To be continued)

LOVE NEVER FAILS

By GUY FANANI

Since the wisdom of this world plunged our poor humanity into a futile and ruinous war for the second time in twenty-one years, I have frequently been asked to name the probable winners of the present international conflict. My considered reply has never varied. "There are no victors in war, apart from the powers of evil. But if this war lasts long enough, Joseph Stalin will reap a huge harvest at the end—if he manages to keep out." However, other men, apparently, realised what the effects of a prolonged war would be, with the result that Stalin no longer is an interested spectator!

But the first part of the reply holds good. The powers of evil will be the only certain winners in this war if it be fought out, to use a phrase beloved of the bellicose patriot, "to the bitter end." *The end will be bitter for everybody*, as it has already been for thousands of innocent men and women in nearly all lands.

I am penning these words as one who firmly believes that the injuries which most deeply hurt us are of our own infliction—that no earthly power can really harm and defile us if we will that it shall not be so. But I also believe that there is a reason, or a variety of reasons, for everything and everybody under the sun.

Are there men of whole nations whose methods of establishing a New World Order appear to us, to put it mildly, rather odd? Very well; we should make it our business—indeed, it is our plain duty—not only to insist on the oddity of their behaviour, but, what is more important, to discover and remove its causes. The very last thing that will convert them to our alleged superior methods and higher standards of conduct is to copy their methods and conduct—and excel them in a devilish sense! Obviously, that will only confirm them in their present strange way of going about doing good!

Our commonsense should tell us that such a terrible affliction as is now visiting us is not just the work of one man or even one nation. We should constantly remember that no state of war can possibly exist between ourselves and others while *we* remain their friends. In other words, "it takes two to start a quarrel."

Whenever men, be they exalted statesmen or humble working-men, start talking about destroying, extinguishing and extirpating others (and the air is full of such *elevating* talk just now) we can safely assume that their motives are anything but altruistic! Usually, they want to get other people out of the way because they have either good or bad reasons for suspecting them of being a menace to their own existence.

Ordinarily, men want to "live and let live." If, therefore, it be a fact that any of our fellow-men anywhere on this globe are so evilly-disposed towards us as to seek our destruction or downfall, we should ask ourselves what we have done or left undone to create so deplorable a state of mind in them. And, having answered that question, we should retrace our steps and make the necessary amends.

Destroying, extinguishing and extirpating our "enemies" is not going to make the world any better if *we* remain what we now are. For we shall treat others as thoughtlessly as we have treated them. And where would our New

World Order be if these others—their successors—developed an even worse mentality than the "enemies" already destroyed?

It is, of course, quite foolish to imagine that the world will ever be a better place for us and our children to live in until *we ourselves* are better men and women.

We are none of us blameless for the unspeakable tragedy of war. Had we who can say with meaning that love never fails and have turned our backs on all other weapons to achieve our goal of a peaceful world—had we worked as hard for love and peace as others did for hatred and discord, men and women might have learned, without a second world war, that no one can live fully and truly unless we all live. Instead, they are learning through "blood, tears, sweat and toil," because that is their unfortunate choice, that the sword heals nothing, mends nothing, saves nothing, but only further divides and destroys men and women everywhere.

Nothing is more certain than that this wanton destruction of life and property will continue until either calm reasoning or much greater sufferings than we have yet endured shall have taught us to obey that law of life which the Nazarene Carpenter so plainly manifested in his life—unstinted love for all our kind, but especially for those whom our thoughtlessness or their own waywardness has caused to stray, for they need our love most.

Love is the only thing in life which, because it is the law of life, never fails.

OUR LETTER-BOX

Dear Comrade,—The reproduction in the October number of the statue of Edith Cavell, I prophesy, will meet with very great appreciation. It is so very beautiful. I notice that *Mr. Punch's History* of the last war only uses the tragedy of her death as a tag on which to hang war propaganda. It was simply splendid that F. W. Jowett managed to have such a pacific inscription placed on her statue. I heard at the spot where she was shot that no soldier of the firing party could fire, so great was his agitated trembling, and the officer had to fire the shot.

I feel that we should be indebted especially to *The Word* for the outline of Jowett's concept of a workable parliament, which you have included in the article on him. One comes up against that question all the time.

With best wishes and thanks,

Yours sincerely,

AGNES W. MACKAY.

Liverpool, October 9.

Dear Mr. Aldred,—My two winters in Glasgow were the worst in my experience, financially, but I can look back with some interest to the U.S.M. Albion St. Saturdays, the organ recitals at Kelvingrove, and the Mitchell Library.

I recall my first contact with the U.S.M. This was at Albion Street and my companion who was on his way to England to join the R.A.F. described the speaker (after listening for two minutes) as "another god damned wise guy" and hurried us along to some more "congenial" attraction. Johnston was killed in action early in the war!

Yours faithfully,

J. D. SMYTH.

Blackpool, September 19.

Dear Mr. Aldred,—I would like to recommend, very strongly, C. E. Montague's *Disenchantment* to your readers. It is the finest analysis of wartime and of war's stupidity that I know. Charto and Windus have brought out a shilling edition of it. Every Socialist and Pacifist student should read Montague's summing up on World War No. 1 as it affected England. As always.

W. A. RATHKEY.

London, N.W. 6, October 21.

UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN CHURCH,
62 Kingston Crescent, Portsmouth.

CHARLES H. COLE

Every Sunday, at 3-30 p.m.,
Followed by Tea and Social Hour.
Visitors Cordially Invited.

An Essay by Mr. Cole on Pacifism will appear
in an early issue.

CHRISTIANITY ACCORDING TO CHRIST

By Rev. H. J. DALE

(Assistant Minister, Baptist Church, King's Road, Reading).

How frequently in the course of history has it happened that movements which were launched with the sincerest motives and highest intentions, and in the hands of their founders bid fair to achieve something of the purpose for which they were intended, have lost much of the spirit and character that marked their early successes through the misrepresentation and insincerity of later adherents. Many instances of this failure to maintain the original glow will come readily to mind.

To this common experience Christianity can lay no claim to being an exception. Indeed, some would not hesitate to affirm that it provides the supreme example of a discredited hope. However unwilling we may be to associate ourselves with such a verdict, we have only to contemplate Christianity as it has been exemplified from time to time through the centuries, to realise how far from the intention and example of Jesus it is possible for those who bear His name to stray.

Nor can we claim that any better state of things is to be found to-day. What purports to be Christianity is in large measure little more than a caricature. Can we truthfully say that Christianity according to Christ is the most, or even one of the most, conspicuous features of the present day? What opinion will future generations form regarding our professed allegiance to the teaching of Jesus? Is obedience to the Master's way of life being acknowledged as the final authority, either in the lands that are nominally Christian, or in the conduct of Christians individually? Sadly and with shame it has to be confessed that too often such obedience is conspicuously absent. Instead, there is to be seen in all these spheres a spurious Christianity which is very far removed from the original. How far removed it is from the genuine commodity, perhaps we do not fully realise. It has been said that if Buddha could walk through China and Japan to-day and see the temples built to his glory, the ideas that prevail regarding him, the things done in his name, his comment would be, "If this is Buddhism, then I am not a Buddhist."

Is not the case very much the same with the Christian religion? In many respects its present-day character merits a like condemnation. Were Jesus to appear among us once again in bodily form, what would be His comment? Would He find faith on the earth? Would He recognise as the natural consequence of His teaching and example much that we are well content to pass off under His name? Would He see in the Church's attitude to the contemporary world-situation a spirit and purpose harmonising with His own? Would it surprise us were He to say, "I know you not?"

For this manifest failure to bear a faithful witness to the fundamental spirit of its faith, no small share of blame must be laid at the Church's door. Too long has official Christianity allowed itself to be a tool of the State. The acknowledgment of Christianity as the accepted religion of the Roman Empire by Constantine was by no means the unmixed blessing some have supposed. Ever and again through the centuries, as a consequence of the alliance of Christianity with the temporal power, the Church has found its hands to be tied, and therefore its freedom to speak its own specific message destroyed. The result is that whenever, in the spirit of unusual daring, the Church has attempted to make its voice heard, its appeal has been ignored.

Of this pitiful weakness, the Church's present servitude to the temporal power provides ample evidence. How can it proclaim in all its truth and fulness the message of the Gospel so long as it is committed to a policy of war? Once the Church has taken the perilous step of con-

promising with this supreme evil, its power and effectiveness in any plans of reconstruction and the building of a new order are to that extent undercut. Nor is its guilt solely a present one. For years the Church has failed to denounce a social and economic system which was all too plainly making war inevitable. By lending its support to the world's standards and methods, it has jeopardised its authority to interpret the spiritual character of the Kingdom of God.

"Come ye out from among them" is an exhortation every bit as imperative to-day as when first spoken. The spirit of the world is as strongly opposed to that of the Master as ever it has been. The Divine will can be done only in the Divine way. Jesus made it quite clear that to follow Him would mean rejection by the world, even as He had been rejected. The Cross is still an offence and a cause of stumbling to those into whose hearts its eternal message of love and forgiveness has never broken. It is those who are prepared to do God's will who shall know the true blessedness that He promises.

Never was there a day when more was known about Jesus than the one in which we live. As far as scholarship can help us, we are in possession of as many facts regarding Him, His teaching, His manner of life, and the conditions amidst which He lived and worked, as possibly we can be at this distance of time from them. Yet it is in this very knowledge that the root of the trouble we are considering is to be found. Religion about Jesus, an intellectual assessment of Him, has been allowed to crowd out the religion of Jesus. In short, greater interest has been awakened in an objective study of Him and certain details of His life than in the desire to live and act according to His teaching. Yet it matters far less whether Jesus wrought certain miracles or not, or that particular views should be held regarding the Atonement, than that His followers should try to act and live in humble obedience to the great ideals He set before them, and put His mind and spirit into practice. It is possible, says Dr. Fosdick, for a man to have a religion about Jesus and harbour bitter racial prejudice; to have a religion about Jesus and be a rampant militarist, a narrow nationalist, a hard-handed industrial autocrat; to have a religion about Jesus and be unfit to live with at home. But no one can have the religion of Jesus and be that. (*Adventurous Religion*).

Theory seldom carries us very far, especially where religion is concerned. What the world sorely needs just now is a practical demonstration of those basic realities of the Christian faith which are essential to a true unfolding of the power and possibilities of the Gospel. If Christianity is to possess any real value or significance for the future, it must prove itself capable of meeting those varied and complex issues with which men find themselves faced at the present time. All that concerns the social and economic structure of society, as well as the moral and spiritual aspects of its existence, will have to be brought within the range of its transforming influence, if mankind is to be saved from hopeless ruin. Nothing is more urgently necessary than the application of the Christian message of love and goodwill to all that affects the souls and lives of our fellows. For the accomplishment of this great hope nothing less than wholehearted obedience to Jesus Christ will suffice. Those who at present remain unaffected by the Christian appeal will be won to submission to its demands, not by the paying of lip-service to its ethical demands, but as they see its ideals exemplified in the spirit and conduct of men and women who profess to believe in it. Deeds, not words, are best calculated to produce this result. After all, Christlikeness is the criterion of Christianity, and to substitute anything else is not only to make our faith meaningless, but also to prejudice all our expectation of bringing to fulfilment the cause to which we have pledged ourselves as servants of the Master.

WAS JESUS A REBEL?

Many Freethinkers object to our biography of Jesus—*The Rebel and His Disciples* (64 pages, 4d)—that nothing is known about Jesus, and that, in point of fact, he never existed.

In *The Literary Guide* for October, 1941, Mr. K. Wilby writes:—

"Tacitus tells us in the famous passage in the 'Annals,' xv. 44, that Christ was put to death in the reign of Tiberius. I once asked the late Prof. W. C. Summers, whose knowledge of Silver Latin was probably unrivalled, and who was as thorough an Agnostic as anyone I have ever met, if there was any doubt that Tacitus wrote the passage. 'Only a blockhead could doubt it' was his reply. . . ."

J. B. Bury, in his "History of the Roman Empire," 27 B.C.—180 A.D. (p. 302), writes:

"The famous passage in which Tacitus notices the persecution of the Christian sect at Rome after the great fire is remarkable not only as the earliest detailed account of the facts, but also incidentally as containing both the earliest record of the Crucifixion in a classical author and the only mention of Pontius Pilate in a Roman historian."

The letter from Sir James G. Frazer which appeared in the "Literary Guide" for August, 1934, opens with the sentences:

"The doubts which have been cast on the historic reality of Jesus are, in my judgment, unworthy of serious attention. Quite apart from the positive evidence of history and tradition, the origin of a great religious and moral reform is inexplicable without the personal existence of a great reformer."

Under these circumstances we have no objection, as a Rationalist and Freethinker, to being ranked, through *The Rebel and His Disciples*, and our companion pamphlet, *Historical and Traditional Christianity*, as one of the biographers of Jesus.

In these works, we approach very near to Morrison Davidson's conclusions of Jesus's worth and character, as expressed by him in his *Son of Man and Gospel of The Poor*. We discard, and indeed resent, the superstitious adulation in what that famous but eccentric Scots scholar and writer indulged. We have much in common with F. J. Gould's *The People's Jesus*, but we would embody much Freethought criticism with our study of the political and ethical values of the Christian faith. We think the ethical and humanist value of the first Christian teaching cannot be overestimated.

We reject the myth theory advanced by scholars like the late J. M. Robertson but are not opposed greatly to the scholars who advance it as an explanation of the "received" or orthodox story of the "life" of Jesus. We seek to explain the myth school in the terms of the materialist conception of history, whilst gratefully availing ourselves of the scholarship of this school.

Renan's *Life of Jesus* is incompetent and actually unworthy of his scholarship. Renan lacked just that essential touch of social vision necessary to place and to understand Jesus.

Middleton Murry attracted attention in *The Life of Jesus*. He portrayed Jesus as a mystic but not as the Son of God, save in the sense that all men of vision are the sons of God. Murry explained away the miraculous also. This is an excellent work, although it could have been written with more passion. Twelve years after writing it the author became a Christian Pacifist and a member of the P.P.U. He developed the Anglican Faith and, just before the outbreak of the war, was thinking of becoming a priest of the Church of England.

Herr Ludwig has written *The Son of Man*, in which he discards boldly the miraculous elements.

Llewelyn Powers has pictured Jesus as a poor, bewildered leader, self-persuaded into dreams of throwing off the Yoke of Rome, in his wonderful work, *The Pathetic Fallacy*.

In 1938, the sensational press gave prominence to Sir Hall Caine's *Life of Christ*.

We write a "life" of Jesus, not of Christ. The difference between the use of the name, Jesus, and the office, Christ, marks the difference between reason, paying living reverence and tradition, paying servile tribute.

We are moved to recall these facts by an interesting essay, contributed by the Rev. H. P. Kingdon, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, and Editor of *The Way*, to *The Student Movement*, Leicester, for April, 1941, under the title: "*The Political Circumstances of The Crucifixion*."

Mr. Kingdon refers the reader for fuller evidences of the truth of his contention to his article published in *The Hibbert Journal*, for July, 1937. He opens his article in the *Student Movement* with these sentences:

"The crucifixion of freemen was the Roman penalty for treason, instigation to revolt, and the kindred crime of robbery with murder. Next to burning alive (crematis), it was regarded as the cruellest form of capital punishment, and it was not inflicted by the Jewish Sanhedrin. Had Jesus been executed by the Jews (who apparently did carry out several capital sentences during the Roman period) He would have been stoned, strangled, burned, or decapitated. Instead of this, He was crucified—presumably as a political rebel—by Pilate."

We object to Mr. Kingdon's capital aitches for the personal pronoun. His article remains interesting and he develops his theme with scholarship, logic, and commonsense. At a later date we hope to reprint the full essay. Meantime, we refer comrades to it and ask them to circulate our Christian studies as contributions to the understanding of the Christian message and the place of Jesus in the social struggle.

IN DEMOCRATIC FELLOWSHIP

This journal publishes no paid advertisements. The announcements made in its columns from time to time of Unitarian Churches, Secular societies, Socialist bodies, are published freely, because we feel that the bodies concerned are doing useful work, and because we believe in a broad democracy of culture. We have exact views, but no sectarianism. Readers are asked to note the announcements, because we object to publishing stereotyped notices, month after month. Organisations are functioning, even though their announcements disappear from our columns for a while. So preserve the references and make enquiries. This puts out columns to a continuous living use. Also, if you belong to a group whose activities have been overlooked, and you feel that the group is doing useful work, drop us a line. *The Word* is a living organ of democratic thought and activity, and does not propose to give up to party or to sect energy or service which was meant for mankind. We invite you to a feast of thought, truth, and discussion: a world of Free Thought and free gathering of humanity in the spirit of Truth, Fellowship, and Understanding. A great fellowship of seeking and adventure.

New and Revised Edition.

RICHARD CARLILE, Agitator

(1790-1843).

HIS LIFE AND TIMES,

By
GUY A. ALDRED.

1s. 6d.

Post Free, 1s. 9d.

THE CRISIS OF MODERN CIVILISATION

A Striking Anti-War Sermon.
By the Rev. W. BOTTOMLEY.

In Press, 2d.; Post Free, 3d.

12 Copies, Post Free, 1s. 6d.

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.