

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. 1.

AUGUST, 1941.

Price: TWOPENCE

WORLD ANTI-WAR CONGRESS

GENEVA, JULY 28th, 1932

Office of British Delegation : 53 GRAY'S INN ROAD, LONDON, W.C.1

Provisional Secretary :
R. BRIDGEMAN

Provisional Treasurer :
JOHN STRACHEY

We learn from Paris that, acting upon the initiative of Romain Rolland and Henri Barbusse, an international committee is being formed to organise and unite all those men and women, groups and organisations, ready to resist the danger of a new war.

Amongst the members of the committee are : Maxim Gorki, Henri Barbusse, Upton Sinclair, Mrs. Sun Yat Sen, Romain Rolland, Theodore Dreiser, Professor Albert Einstein, Professor Paul Langevin, Heinrich Mann and John Dos Passos.

The committee intends to organise a Congress in Geneva on the 28th July, 1932. From the appeal which the Provisional Committee has issued, we quote the following :—

" The money spent on armaments is gradually reaching a fantastic height in all States ; the production of armaments is to-day surpassing all previous records.

The undersigned men and women are determined to do everything to hinder the crime of war and, deeply convinced that no right-thinking man or woman can remain passive in face of this new danger of a gigantic world war, desire to take their place with those who have started to organise and lead the struggle against a new war.

We call upon all men and women without distinction and without regard to their religious or political opinions, and especially all organisations, to unite against war at this critical moment. We ask all men and women of goodwill to support this Congress on the 28th July, 1932, and to join in the demonstration against those criminals who wish to provoke a new war.

Do not let us hear the reproach later that we did not understand in time the danger before us. Let us organise resistance."

We in Britain desire to associate ourselves with the proposed International Congress in order to rouse the determined resistance of the peoples against war, and we invite all men and women of goodwill in Britain to support the International Congress and to organise resistance to war.

Lascelles Abercrombie.
Richard Aldington.
W. Allen.
Alex. Andreae.
Joan Beauchamp.
Ernest N. Bennett, M.P.
Lord Berners.
Sir Lawrence Binyon.
Rutland Boughton.
J. L. Briery.
A. Fenner Brockway.
John Brotherton.
W. J. Brown.
George Buchanan, M.P.
Jack Bucknall.
Chapman Cohen.
G. D. H. Cole.
Percy Collick.
F. M. Cornford.
Maurice Dobb.
F. Lewis Donaldson.
John Downie.
Gladys Driver.
Olive Driver.

M. E. Durham.
A. Eddington.
Havelock Ellis.
Amabel Williams Ellis.
Clough Williams Ellis.
Geo. Gibson.
Alex. Gossip.
G. P. Gooch.
A. Herbert Gray.
Mrs. Haden Guest.
Norman Haire.
Miss Radclyffe Hall.
H. Lyn Harris.
E. Herdman.
J. F. Horrabin.
Bernard Houghton.
Lawrence Housman.
Zeph. Hutchinson.
J. Jagger.
C. E. M. Joad.
P. Kapitza.
J. M. Kenworthy.
David Kirkwood, M.P.
Rupert Kneale.

Emeline Pethick Lawrence.
F. W. Pethick Lawrence.
H. Levy.
Earl of Listowel.
J. E. Littlewood.
George Lumley.
Compton Mackenzie.
Thomas McKenna.
Tom Mann.
Ethel Mannin.
Kingsley Martin.
James Maxton, M.P.
D. S. Mirsky.
P. Chalmers Mitchell.
Abe Moffat.
John Middleton Murry.
Henry W. Nevinson.
Conrad Noel.
F. Norman.
Joseph Nuttall.
H. S. L. Polak.
H. Pollitt.
A. Pugh.
A. Maude Royden.

A. Russell.
Bertrand Russell.
Sh. Saklatvala.
P. Sargant Florence.
Frederick Soddy.
Joseph Southall.
Evelyn Sharp.
Will Sherwood.
Jack Tanner.
Mabel Tyleate.
Marquess of Tavistock.
Hugh Walpole.
Wilfred Wellock.
Ellen Wilkinson.
John Williams.
James Wilson.
Virginia Woolf.
Leonard Woolf.
Barbara Wootton.
J. J. Worley.
Sir George Young.

June, 1932.

Published by R. Bridgeman, c/o L.A.L., 93 Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.1
Printed by Leicester Co-operative Printing Society Ltd., Leicester, London and Kettering.

1932 ANTI-WAR MANIFESTO

Above we reproduce a photographic copy, same size, of an Anti-war Manifesto issued in 1932. The reader will see that the Duke of Bedford, then Marquess of Tavistock, name marked by us, is one of the signatories. It will be observed that the other signatories are men and women well-known in the Socialist and Pacifist movements or in the realm of radical literature. None are Fascist. Some have recanted their opposition to war. The Duke of Bedford maintains the position he upheld in 1932, on the ground that war must be opposed not less in war-time than in peace-time.

THE DUKE OF BEDFORD



Exclusive Interview

THE DUKE OF BEDFORD DEFINES HIS POSITION.

Consistently, Uncompromisingly, and Unhesitatingly Opposed to All Hate Campaigns.

SUPPORTS PACIFISM: NOT FASCISM.

Demands Responsible and Drastic Amendments to 188

UPHOLDS CIVIL LIBERTY IN WAR-TIME.

Has a Low Notion of All Parliamentary Placements, Irrespective of Label.

When Invited by the Working-Class Movement in Britain, is Prepared to Speak for a United Pacifist-Socialist Opposition to War, in the Country, and in the House of Lords.

"What Will Be—Will Be." This somewhat fatalistic slogan is the motto of several sections of the Russell family, as recorded in the peerage. It is the motto of Bertrand, Earl Russell, who is no longer a Pacifist. He has resigned himself to the motto and so accepts the fact of war. During the first Great War, Bertrand Russell made a stand for conscience and free speech. He did not believe in letting "what will be" reflections paralyse his power of protest. The first Earl Russell, born in 1792, was the third son of the then Duke of Bedford. His rebuke to Sir Francis Burdett, quoted in *Why Jesus Wept*, shows that "Finality Jack," as he was nick-named, was not moved by too great a respect for resignation to the fates.

"What Will Be—Will Be," is the motto of Lord Russell of Killowen; of Viscount Amptill; of Baron de Clifford; and of Sir Alec Charles Russell, Bt. It is the motto of the 12th Duke of Bedford.

Hastings, Duke of Bedford, is B.A. of Balliol College, Oxford. At one time he was a Lieutenant of the Duke of Cambridge's Own (Middlesex Regiment). For over twenty years he has been an ardent Pacifist, because he became convinced that a Christian ought to be a Pacifist. He is not prepared to resign the world to war without a protest, and so does not accept, without challenge or question, the family motto: "What Will Be, Will Be." He thinks that a great deal of what will be, if war continues, ought not to be. He considers the wholesale slaughter that belongs to war is immoral, an offence against God and man.

The Duke of Bedford has been denounced as a Fascist because he opposes war. He deems the charge mildly humorous, because a Fascist is a militarist, and he is a definite Anti-Militarist. As a Pacifist he not only cannot be a Fascist but he is an enemy of Fascism. He is a Pacifist and an enemy of all hate campaigns, no matter in what name they are inaugurated, no matter against whom they are directed. In order that we might make this issue clear, he granted us the exclusive interview which is summarised in this article.

The title, Duke of Bedford, was created in 1694. William, fifth Earl of Bedford, was then made Marquess of Tavistock and Duke of Bedford. The story of his son's execution was related in *The Word* for November, 1940. In that issue we told the story of how the fourth Duke of Bedford, supported by the famous Dr. Watson, Bishop of Llandaff, opposed the French war. On that occasion Dr. Watson added to the speech made by the Duke of Bedford, an excellent one on his own account. We recalled it when considering the views placed before us by the present Duke of Bedford.

Ever ready to turn to good account the opportunities which were offered him, Watson remarked that he was not a republican, and only welcomed the writings of Voltaire, Rousseau, Helvetius, and Diderot, because, by attacking and destroying the lamentable corruptions of Christianity, they were preparing the way for the founding of a higher and truer form of the religion itself. On the other hand, he was amused by those who asserted that our war with Infidel France was both just and necessary, since it showed how great was the presumption of certain miserable mortals, who imagined that the Almighty Creator and Conservator of the Universe needed the arm of flesh to secure the reality of his existence and the honour of his law.

Watson proceeded to warn those who were unwilling to give a seasonable attention to popular requisition, by a relaxation of the reins of despotism, that opinions were not subdued, but confirmed, by persecution; that, if they imagined that war could impede the progress of democratic principles, they were mistaken, since an unsuccessful war only accelerated them, and a successful one did not stop them.

This is very much the attitude adopted by the Duke of Bedford at the present time. Our interview with him was severely practical and the Duke made it clear that he would have preferred to have issued a widespread curt statement of his views, headed "A Personal Statement." We explained that this would not have permitted so many points to be covered as could be done in an interview. It is true that the interviewer makes only a digest of the conversation, but the digest, if properly arranged, can bring home vitally to the reader a clear and snappy understanding of the views held by the interviewed.

"THE 'PRO-FASCIST' DUKE."

The Duke explained his attitude towards hate-campaigns and repudiated the accusation that he is a "pro-Fascist."

"Since the outbreak of war," he declared, "persistent efforts have been made in political circles and in the press, apart from subtly behind the scenes, to represent me as 'pro-Fascist,' or even as a man whose extreme pacifism has betrayed him into being 'pro-Fascist'—rather a curious result, one would have thought, for extreme pacifism to produce, for *Fascism is essentially a militarist philosophy*. I am definitely an Anti-Militarist and am therefore opposed to Fascism.

"Many of my friends and colleagues have been subjected to interference and even persecution on account of their association with the 'pro-Fascist' Duke! A plain statement of my position may be desirable in order to clear the air. Such a statement will make no impression upon those who are so enthused with war that they are not concerned with the justice of the 'pro-Fascist' label. They use it as a slogan of abuse, without regard for sense or truth, as a means of creating prejudice against me for my criticism of, and opposition to, war. As time goes on, the foolish and disastrous consequences of the appeal to arms to settle the disputes of civilisation will become apparent not only to the thinking, but also to the most unthinking of human beings. Not only as a Christian, but also as a man, as a being who ought to be rational, I feel I must stand opposed to the horror and disaster of war. I cannot pay tribute to Mars.

"Apart from the wilful slanderer, there are many who feel that certain principles of liberty and democracy are menaced, and so honestly are puzzled or misled in regard to my opinions. Even after they have read your report of your interview with me, they may find it impossible to endorse my stand for pacifism. But they may, at last, and at least, realise where I stand. That is all I ask.

"I have not accepted, without question, all the denunciations of Fascism published in the newspapers, in Government publications, and in the careerist speeches of interested politicians. I have not done so because I do not believe always publications and because I do not believe always politicians. Long experience in the battle for monetary reform has taught me, I am sorry to say, that the Press is completely unscrupulous and unreliable, and that the great majority of politicians are lacking in intelligence and sometimes, and oftentimes, also in honesty. I am opposed to press and platform campaigns of hate because they are usually at once 'fashionable' and insincere. I am no more in favour of Fascism to-day than I was in favour of Bolshevism, when the entire press was attacking the leaders of Soviet Russia, and I defended the Soviets. I would like this fact to be made known, because it is a complete answer to the accusation that I am a 'pro-Fascist.'"

DEFENDED SOVIET RUSSIA.

The Duke handed over the article that we publish on another page in defence of Soviet Russia. In doing so, he said:—

"I see from *The Word* that you are rather interested in articles written many years ago. You might perhaps care to have this one of mine which I wrote in 1924, I believe. At that time, the Press and politicians were engaged in running a hate campaign against Soviet Russia, just as they now do it against Fascist Germany. You will notice that the arguments which I then used for sanity and fair play were very like those I have used in my later essays on 'Can we Trust Hitler,' and 'This Concentration Camp' Business."

THE EVILS OF FASCISM.

Returning to the question of Fascism, the Duke said:

"The objectionable features of Fascism may be summarised as espionage and acts of brutality by police agents; the imposition of vindictive and excessive penalties on those who have incurred the displeasure of the State; imprisonment without fair trial; absence of facilities for the democratic election of a free Parliament and of democratic control of the Government after it has been appointed; and a propensity to mili-

tarism. To all these evils of Fascism I am completely opposed."

The Duke pointed out that his Anti-Militarism was definite and well-known and accepted by the Labour and Progressive movement. In support of this statement he produced the leaflet, which we reproduce exactly, by photographic method, in another column. The Duke asked us to consider the signatories to that manifesto. So far as he knew there was not one Fascist signature to it. There were the names of Trades Union leaders, some now very much pro-war; Harry Pollitt, who had withdrawn so many pamphlets and recanted so many statements of policy and fact and called his activity "Marxist realism;" Saklatvala, at one time "Communist" and Labour M.P.; David Kirkwood, Chalmers Mitchell, the distinguished scientist and Anti-Fascist; Chapman Cohen, the Freethinker and Anti-Fascist; and so on. Not one "pro-Fascist" signatory. The Duke at that time was the Marquis of Tavistock and his signature was there. Why had it been requested? Because he was known to be a pacifist and an Anti-Militarist. This leaflet totally disproved the charge made against him of being "pro-Fascist," which, used as a term of abuse, meant that he was Anti-Labour, Anti-Progressive, and, above all, an enemy of civic liberty and an upholder of militarism.

WORLD ANTI-WAR CONGRESS.

Actually, we had reminded the Duke of the Anti-War Congress. Commenting generally on the Congress, he said:—

"I had forgotten about the World Anti-War Congress. Looking back, the supporters seem a very mixed collection. A few of those who signed are really fine people, others have since abandoned the pacifist position."

It is interesting to note that the obverse side of this 1932 Congress Manifesto carried the following warning:—

FACTS TO REMEMBER!

World War, 1914-1918.

Killed	9,743,914
Wounded	20,927,914
Missing	3,000,000
Expenditure	£70,000,000,000

In 1931 the World was Spending £800,000,000 a Year (£2,000,000 a Day) on Armaments.

The leaflet proceeded to show that out of £1 of the British revenue, 12s. 11d. was spent on war, and only 7s. 1d. on peace, that is, health, education, unemployment, and old age. The leaflet quoted also from *Hansard*, May 30, 1932, Vol. 26b, No. 100, to show what exports permits had been issued by the British Government between February and May, for *war material intended for Japan*, to assist in the campaign of invasion against China.

The Duke defined his attitude towards the denunciations of Hitler; the failure to consider the evils of Versailles, reparations, and indemnities; the post-Armistice starvation blockade which caused such terrible suffering to Austrian women and children; the army of occupation; conditions of ruthlessness out of which Hitler and Nazism arose. He was prepared to consider all this as an explanation of Nazism before committing himself to a further campaign of hate that would but add violence to violence and so aggravate the evil.

The Duke of Bedford has dealt very thoroughly with this matter elsewhere and his plea for sane approach need not be dwelt on at great length in the present report. There is so much ground to cover; for the Duke's statement was exhaustive. One very clear point he made. The evils of Fascism, to which many politicians had paid no attention until to do so sowed the hatred propaganda which belongs to war, are domestic and have no necessary relation to the evils of war, which are the same whether those who fight are Fascists or Democrats, Capitalists or Socialists. *War is a positive evil in itself.*

however generated. Bombed cities belong to war, not to Fascism exclusively. Concentration camps and the destruction of civil liberties belong to Fascism.

"Let us grant Fascism the full reserve of these evils, and do not let us introduce them here," commented the Duke. "Yet this is exactly what has been done. War has reduced Democracy almost to the barbarism of Fascism." The Duke added that he took his stand unashamedly and definitely by the right of full civil and religious liberty, which included the right of conscience, and the right of political liberty, even in war-time.

"Hitler's persecution of religious leaders I understand, but I unreservedly condemn it," said the Duke. "The mistaken idea that religion should have nothing to do with politics, except to uphold the State, exists throughout the world. It is extremely common in Britain. I condemn it as thoroughly wrong. Religion ought to have a great deal to do with politics, and that by way of protest and example. Conscience is not the slave of the State but the great definer of individual right in society; and conscience cannot respect nor mark time at nominal Christianity."

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS.

This caused the Duke to discuss the question of conscientious objectors. He said:—

"We had a party of C.O.'s over to tea, who are working with a local Forestry unit; quite nice young fellows. Some of them came from Glasgow and knew about you or had seen you. One was a keen member of the I.L.P. and a great admirer of Maxton."

CREECH JONES.

We mentioned Creech Jones, and instanced the splendid stand he took as an absolutist during the last war. We commented on his desire to serve C.O.'s to-day and on his excellent and critical speeches on Colonial questions. But we added that Creech Jones felt that the war was one for justice and that he must support it.

The Duke replied to this statement by saying: "I quite appreciate your defence of Creech Jones since you feel that he was a splendid objector and a loyal comrade during the last war. I quite understand you commending his loyalties to-day and his memory of his past. But if he supports war, and becomes identified with the injustice of war, and cannot recover his stand against the barbarism of war, he must face the censure that one day will fall on all who participate in war. Politicians who urge war are really non-combatants who sacrifice the common people. He cannot escape that censure if he supports unreservedly the war measures entailed by the present conflict."

ALLEGED ASSOCIATION WITH FASCISM.

The Duke denied that he had associated with Fascism in Britain or had sympathies with its propaganda. He said: "If I have ever seemed to my critics to have 'associated' with any form of Fascism in Britain, I can assure them that it was not because I am a Fascist or have approved of the defects of Fascism, but because I desired to inform myself about it. When examined, what has been termed my 'association with Fascism' has been association with people who, after temporary membership of the British Union of Fascists, had left it. To regard this as 'association with Fascism' is just plain silly nonsense, for persons who have left a movement usually have less sympathy with it than those who have never belonged to it; because they know about it, and although they know about it, they have found it wanting."

18B PRISONERS.

This brought the Duke to discuss the case of 18B prisoners. Some of his friends and many ex-members of the British Union had been imprisoned under 18B Regulations. Although so much fuss was made about these regulations in

the House of Commons, and although they were withdrawn and altered, the alterations, in practice, made no difference.

"I have always strongly maintained that justice should be done to political prisoners. In the past, Anarchists have been prosecuted in all countries in the world, including the United States. There is the famous case of the Chicago Martyrs. At other times Socialists and Communists have been persecuted. I am opposed to such persecutions. And I am opposed also, even when the victims are ex-members of the British Union, or even members. I hold that neither members of the Left, nor yet members of the Right, ought to be persecuted.

"There can be no good reason, not even in war-time, why persons arrested should not receive a fair trial, at which those who have informed against them have to appear for cross-examination."

The Duke complained that argument against trial, and for Government by decree and prescription, was plausible, but dangerous. He gave the example of the development of the proscription during the struggle and the wars of French Revolution. This proscription, as historians have related, rose naturally out of war conditions. The important and interesting references to this historic analogy will be illustrated and detailed fully in our next issue.

JUSTICE FOR ALL.

Turning to actual Fascists or members of the British Union who are interned under 18B, the Duke said: "In so far as they are victims of injustice, I am out to demand that they receive fair treatment. I would make the same demand for Socialists, Communists, and Anarchists, if they were in a like position. I would even demand it for our ordinary Liberals and Conservatives. Of what value is a sense of justice if it is displayed only towards friends, and only in peace, and not also in war?"

SIR OSWALD MOSLEY.

"Sir Oswald Mosley is a militarist and an Imperialist who puts the interests of the British Empire first and those of the rest of the world second. I am a pacifist and I put the interests of the world first and those of the British Empire second because I believe that national selfishness is as fatal to the general welfare of humanity as individual selfishness. His policy is different, therefore, from my own on exceedingly important issues. To my mind that, however, is no reason why he and his followers should not be allowed a fair trial on *defined* charges, nor why they or any other people should be imprisoned as suspects on vague or false charges. In his speeches and writings, Sir Oswald Mosley has directed his followers to defend their country loyally against a foreign invasion. Naturally, if he wished to co-operate with Hitler in promoting an invasion, he would not announce this fact publicly. Neither would he advocate repeatedly armed resistance. Fairness and commonsense compel me to add that it is monstrous that, without proof, a man should be interned as a traitorous suspect, merely because some Minister of State pleases to think that way. I have no use for militarism, whether the militarism of Sir Oswald Mosley, or that of the Government, but I have a deep and genuine respect for justice, and the principles of civil and religious liberty. I do not see how Government can continue unless it respects those principles."

We pointed out to the Duke that the Fascist Movement had opposed the working-class and had organised strike-breaking. He said he was prepared to consider this indictment from the standpoint of the workers and that, in any case, he did not agree with the tone of Fascist propaganda. Strike-breaking was not confined to the Fascists and some members of the present Government, and certainly many members of the present House of Commons had been in favour of Emergency Powers and strike-breaking in 1926. The Duke made a later reference to this subject.

At this stage, the Duke handed to me letters he had received from relatives and friends of

victims of 18B all over the country since he became Duke of Bedford. We deal with these letters and complaints in a separate article. The Duke explained why he had done nothing in the way of taking his seat in the House of Lords.

AGAINST "THE UPPER TEN."

"Since I began to reflect on the problem of poverty, I have grown more and more apart from the so-called 'Upper Ten.' I have found more happiness since I broke with them than I knew before. My faith is in democracy and the common people. I did not see how I could reach the common people or make their will known by speeches at the present time in the House of Lords. If ever I can serve peace and justice, conscience in society, and the cause of civil and religious liberty, by taking my seat in the House of Lords, I will do so.

The Duke emphasised his opposition to "high society."

"For the last 25 years," he repeated, "I have been happier not in the company of the 'upper ten.'"

LOW NOTION OF PARLIAMENTARY PLACE-MEN

"I have developed a really low notion of parliamentary place-men. I see ex-conscientious objectors speaking of public security and upholding the imprisonment, without trial, of ex-Servicemen, men who are yet suffering from the wounds received in the last war, when they were told they were heroes, and conscientious objectors were threatened with political disfranchisement. What has become of the interested, worked-up political rage against objectors of that time? I was against that rage and hatred. I am even more against the cant that dictated it and then withdrew it and now assaults ex-Servicemen to whom that rage pandered. I believe in the need for honesty and sincerity in public life. I do not believe that the conditions of war are the best conditions for developing that integrity in public men so essential to true social progress and human happiness."

MCGOVERN AND OTHERS.

The Duke referred to the Socialists, and to one or two Conservative and Liberal members, who had raised the 18B question in the House of Commons. He commented on the excellent stand made by John McGovern, James Maxton, and Campbell Stephen. He commended the speeches of Rhys Davies. But he complained that they received little notice in the ordinary press. Without press reports, parliamentary speeches were futile, for they never reached the common people. Press censorship and boycott made Parliament useless as a sounding-board. It ought not to be so but it was. Nevertheless, if those who stood for Socialism and Pacifism in the House of Commons, and the section of the working-class movement they represented, desired it, he would take his stand as their spokesman in the House of Lords.

The Duke was somewhat diffident in this matter. He did not wish to impose himself on the people as a leader, but he was willing to lead, if no one else would do so, and if a considered working-class and pacifist opinion, felt that he ought to be the voice of that opinion in the House of Lords. If he could serve the cause of public usefulness, in that capacity, he would do so. He was willing, in fact, to stand completely alone for pacifism, if it would help the cause of peace and liberty, but he did not feel that he could do so usefully at the moment. He would prefer to be part of the great movement of democracy. In the end that movement must turn against both militarism and Fascism and outlaw the terrible appeal to war. He had faith that pacifism could conquer Fascism. He also believed that there must be established, in the interest of every section of the people, even of the soldiers and the war-workers themselves, a united Socialist and Pacifist Opposition to a "War unto Victory" Government in both Houses of Parliament. Either such an opposition must find expression in Parliament or else it would find expression in the country only. The Duke felt that the Government must decide this point soon. In time the people would. The

extension of the suffrage, the right of working men and women to sit in Parliament, the payment of members, all this progress of parliamentary democracy had done nothing to rid the country of the parliamentary place-men. It was as though democratic parliamentarianism had broadened the basis of militarism and corruption.

THE LABOUR PRESS.

The Duke thought that much could be done if the Labour and Socialist press took a vital stand. If it was felt that the stand for pacifism was worth while, and that a United Opposition of critical analysis and peace ought to function in both Lords and Commons, the few papers that expressed that view could say so, and so organise the movement in the country. The *Peace News*, the *New Leader*, and maybe Emrys Hughes in the *Forward*—his stand against war and for peace and his Court-Martials for war resistance in the War of 1914-1918 were well known—could make known his views and desire for coalition in this great struggle for the peace and citizenship of the world. The fact that the Duke had given this interview to *The Word* ought not to militate against a common alliance and approach.

THE RELIGIOUS PRESS.

The Duke said that he was a Christian, or, at least, endeavoured to be one. He felt that the fact that he had granted the interview to one who called himself an Atheist ought not to prove an obstacle to genuine Christian support. The ordinary press did not represent true journalism and evinced no desire to report a man who declined to denounce a strike of the workers, or in time of war, denounced campaigns of hate.

The Duke felt that the religious press could and ought to do something for the cause of permanent world peace. Apart from the Society of Friends, whose record was known to all, there were the Baptists and the Congregationalists. Both had records of steadfast standings for conscience and the rights of civil and religious liberty. If this press would grant some expression to his views, if the Churches would take their stand, at least principles of peace and social justice could be defined. War was not an inspiration in itself. The ideal of civil and religious and social justice was.

We promised to assist the Duke by seeing that this interview reached the leaders of the Pacifist and Socialist movements. We undertook that it should be placed in the hands of the Council Members of the Churches, especially the Baptist and the Congregationalists.

A CHURCHILL OPPOSITION.

The Duke was emphatic that there could be no useful public life until there developed a Churchill opposition.

"I am surprised," exclaimed the Duke, "at the working-class leaders rallying round Mr. Churchill. Like Hitler, he is one of the types that war brings to the front. Churchill was made by the Boer War. He attained eminence during the war of 1914-1918. He retired to obscurity, relieved only by a brief limelight performance to return our currency to the gold standard. Above all, he played his part in the 1926 attack upon the British workers. And now, another war has earned him forgiveness for 1926 and all its sufferings, and he is the idol of the Conservative and Labour Parties. Democracy requires a Churchill Opposition, an Opposition to the 'Victory only' slogan Government. I am prepared to oppose this Government with a demand for justice for Labour and the world, an enduring social peace of principle for Europe and for all mankind."

The Duke discussed the dangers of an unbalanced, unopposed Government. Considered opposition was essential to all sane progress and well-being. It was more imperative in war-time than in peace-time, and that in a thousand and one ways, connected even with the conditions of the war effort, apart from the imperative issues of peace and social development during and after the war. He added: "I am quite prepared to lead opposition to another Versailles;

but to be a leader one must have followers."

TOTAL DISARMAMENT.

After discussing the results of Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union, the Duke replied: "Hitler's attack does not alter the fact that the German people are no different from any other people in that most of them are opposed to war and wish to live peaceably with their neighbours. It is very important that the working people of Britain should not allow their Imperialists and non-combatant politicians to stampede them into the idea that all Germans are a peculiarly evil race, differing from all other races or large sections of humanity, needing special treatment, and unresponsive to all suggestions of peace and social justice. The common people everywhere are the same. They are opposed to war, but trapped. The Germans, like all other people, by this time have learned the bitter lessons taught by the destructive power of modern warfare. Whatever its result, the slaughter on the Eastern Front is bound to be so great, that it will leave both the Russian and German peoples heartily sick of war. It will only need an enlightened leader to arise somewhere in the world to suggest total disarmament as one of the conditions of an all-round peace settlement. I think, therefore, that people's minds should be directed to the opportunity for securing support for total disarmament throughout the world which this extension of the war should provide."

In concluding this statement of the Duke of Bedford's position, it may be fitting that we should define our own position. We believe that the Socialist and Pacifist movement should conclude an alliance to end war and should invite the Duke of Bedford to be the national voice of such an alliance. We would have him the leader of the opposition to the present Government, and so the next Prime Minister.

The Duke is unspoiled by the education he has received, and so endeavours always to get at the truth of things without quibbling. Unlike so many of our public men, he is no hypocrite. His words, and his manner of expression, define a belief in character as distinct from its counterfeit, reputation. He is an indefatigable propagandist and possesses a patient singleness of purpose. This enables him to dispense with his ancestors as with the applause of his contemporaries, and so to address himself straight to the reason or logic of the question without distraction of fear or interest. He has dignity without solemnity. He is a democrat and is handicapped by his own democracy of approach, for he has a sense of retirement, and a modesty that does not belong to the mad world of politics. He believes in Truth and he knows that Truth is unancestried, unprivileged, and alas, as yet, practically unknown.

We would prefer that the Duke of Bedford had been born in the gutter, but we do not hold it against him that he was born in another place. Some have ascended from the gutter to the Lords. He would return to the common people. A law of opposites that distinguishes a revolutionary era from a parliamentary careerist one.

We do not ask too much of any one. We accept the Duke of Bedford as a man, a comrade, and a colleague, so long as his strength permits him to travel the road of anti-militarist heresy in time of war and social crisis. He is prepared not merely to address himself to the common people in the market place if required, but to court martyrdom, if by so doing he can ease the agony now being endured by the workers of the world in this terrible conflict of capitalism. No one can do more than bear such witness.

In his stand against war, militarism, and social confusion, we pledge the Duke of Bedford our loyal support. We believe the end will mean a complete liquidation of his aristocratic rank in the movement of the common people of the world towards a new order of Socialism and peace; a true order of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity.

BLAKER, M.P.!

A STUDY IN TORY MENTALITY!

Sir Reginald Blaker, Bt., M.P., is the Tory member for the Spelthorne division of Middlesex. He is a Barrister-at-Law, so cannot plead illiteracy as an excuse for ignorance.

Sir Reginald was born in 1900 and succeeded to the baronetcy in 1926, the year of the so-called General Strike. We wonder what his attitude was towards the working-class at that time. His father was Mayor of Brighton and received the O.B.E. He was made a baronet in 1919, possibly a war honour. We must enquire.

Blaker's speech to the Annual Meeting of the local Conservative Association was reported in *The Surrey Comet* for June 21. Here is an extract:—

"I am not one of those who believe that when this war terminates it would be our duty to forgive and forget. For me no Versailles. I believe that our war is not against Adolf, that grotesque figure, but against the whole German people, even women and children, and I believe that we shall never have peace in Europe until we have ground them down with a severity which will be 100 per cent. more brutal than the severity they have meted out to the nations they have conquered. If you don't like that you can turn me out. For me no truck, no forgiveness, but a bitter hatred against the whole German people."

"These words," added the *Comet*, "were greeted with enthusiastic applause from the audience."

Neither Blaker nor his admirers seem to have heard of the great Tory lawyer, the late Lord Parmoor; or the "Fight The Famine Council," of which Parmoor became chairman. Obviously, they know nothing about the Versailles Treaty and still less about the principles of humanity to which every person in the world is answerable finally.

RICHARD CARLILE

The following comment on the 1923 edition appeared in the "Workers' Monthly," Guildford, the local organ of the Labour Party, for September-October, 1927:—

"A man is not honest who is not bold enough to be honest, and active enough not to neglect that which he ought to do. Everything in human action may be resolved into right or wrong, and even to neglect to do right is to do wrong."

These are words written by Richard Carlile, who during the 19th century played his part in the struggle for the freedom of the individual. Those who are prepared to have their complacency shaken, who admire those who, regardless of cost, are prepared to strive for that which is to them right, will find "Richard Carlile—Agitator," by Guy Aldred, a stimulating book.

They may not agree with all that Carlile wrote or with Aldred's comments thereon, but they cannot fail to benefit by reading the thought-challenging statements and actions of Carlile. The sentences quoted above deserve to be written in letters of gold in every public meeting place and private abode, though we cannot imagine any harder precept to the really thoughtful person.

Chapman Cohen's friendly comments on the 3rd edition, published in *The Freethinker*, will be reproduced later.

EDITOR TO READER

Last month our deficit stood at £1,836 14s. This means that since November, 1940, comrades have contributed less than £150 towards the special appeal we issued then for £1,971 11s. 3d. Every month this paper faces a loss and we are engaged also in pamphlet propaganda. This journal is *not* subsidised and personally we are now without funds. During July we have received only £11 3s. 3d. towards the deficit. This leaves the amount required: £1,825 10s. 9d. If every reader makes a *real* effort this deficit can be overcome within a month. If the effort is not made we must stop publishing. This is too great a disaster to contemplate at the present stage of the struggle for social freedom. The workers have to conquer bread, peace and freedom. *The Word* is the voice of their struggle.

THE SCOTTISH SECRETARIAT

THOMAS JOHNSTON'S EVOLUTION

(Continued from page 137)

At the trial for swindling of the founder of the Anti-German League in London (13/5/16), it transpired that Mr. Horatio Bottomley, the editor of *John Bull*, had received 50 guineas for a patriotic anti-German speech. The vice-chairman of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Pension Committee (Mr. Cyril Jackson) walked off smiling with an annual salary of £1,750.—(*Glasgow News*, 1/3/16.)

In their spare time they added insult to injury; they preached economy and thrift to the working classes. Mr. Mason, Tory M.P., in the House of Commons (27/6/16) declared that the working classes "are probably eating far more than is good for them." The Lambeth Poor Law Guardians cut off the Christmas egg hitherto supplied to poorhouse children, in order to give them "an opportunity of appreciating the position of national affairs." The Lord Mayor of London initiated a great Food Economy campaign with a banquet (November, 1915) where the cost for food and drink was £850—the champagne cost 12s. per bottle, and the turtle soup 2s. 6d. per plate. In February, 1916, Sir George Paish and Mr. C. J. Stewart did not hesitate to take a special train from Edinburgh to Dundee, to attend an "economy" meeting.

Thus has Capitalism, naked, undisguised, and unashamed, ruled and ravaged us during three years of the great war. May the humiliating experience bring a million recruits to the Socialist Army.

Thus ended the pamphlet. At the end, set out boldly, followed by the imprint, was an advertisement of *Forward*. This read as follows:—

Most of the facts given in this Pamphlet have been already published in "The Forward."

No Democrat in Scotland can afford to be without "THE FORWARD."

ALL NEWSAGENTS IN SCOTLAND EVERY FRIDAY. ONE PENNY.

EDITORIAL AND PUBLISHING OFFICES: 164 HOWARD STREET, GLASGOW.

Printed by the Socialist Labour Press, 50 Senfrew Street, Glasgow.

The facts collected by Johnston were valuable. His pamphlet was a grave indictment of *The Huns at Home*. The facts stand. When he wrote it, he did not expect to be, twenty years later, a member of a War Cabinet.

V.—"ENLIGHTENING THE HOODWINKED."

In *Forward* for September 26, 1914, the main article, on the front page, taking precedence over Thomas Johnston's famous war points that had occupied the front page formerly, was headed as follows:

THE UNDERWORLD OF EUROPEAN DIPLOMACY.

THE REVELATIONS OF DR. GRAVES, THE GERMAN SPY.

By The Editor.

"The Editor" means Thomas Johnston. It was explained that this was a review of a book by Dr. Armgard Graves, published by McBride, Nash & Co., of New York, at \$1.50. The book was entitled *The Secrets of the German War Office*.

Johnstone commences his review:

"Everyone in Scotland will remember the sensation caused by the arrest in the year 1912, at the Central Station Hotel, Glasgow, of a man called Dr. Armgard Graves."

This man was sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment. His later mysterious release was the subject of a question in the House of Commons by Joseph King, M.P., who made himself famous by his questioning during the first Great War. McKinnon Wood, who was then Secretary of State for Scotland, and never imagined that Johnston would be one of his successors, compelled King to silence by taking refuge behind the Royal Prerogative (11/6/13).

Johnston states that this book was in the hands of the American publishers on June 1, 1914, and "forecasts the war." Johnston continues:

"and gives us some of the missing links in our chain of indictments against Sir Edward Grey and Mr. Winston Churchill as large shareholders in the cause of the current massacres of the working folk of Europe."

One must confess that Johnston cannot be

said to have earned promotion by his flair for elegant writing. Perhaps he owes his success to his capacity for political forgetfulness.

Johnston is writing at a time when the alleged violation of Belgium was the pivot of British war propaganda. Johnston extracts from Grave's book evidence that France, Britain, and Russia were preparing war against Germany years before the war actually took place. It does not matter whether Johnston's allegation was correct. It does matter that, to this propaganda he owed his later status in the Labour movement in Scotland, and therefore, his present position in the War Cabinet. Aware of these machinations the Germans convened a secret conference in Germany. This was attended by Churchill and Haldane. It was proposed that Belgium and Holland should become part of a German Federation, and that Britain should control French North Africa and the Dutch East Indies.

Johnston concluded his article as follows:

"I for one, to begin with, hereby declare that I know of no mark in the bodies of Sir Edward Grey, W. C. Goschen, De Bunsen, or any of their under-studies or satellites, which entitled them to gamble with the liberties and lives of me or mine."

We do not like this style of writing. It is melodramatic and insincere, the writing of a pretender. But it reads definitely. The declaration still applies for every man and woman who reads it, even though Thomas Johnston dare not make it any more, since he has become one of the satellites.

This article proved so popular among the stupid parliamentary Socialists of the nicknamed "Red Clyde," that it was issued in leaflet form at 1s. 5d. for 100 copies. It was advertised in the columns of *Forward* from October 10, 1914, to February, 1915, under the heading "Enlighten the Hoodwinked" q

On March 20, 1915, this advertisement gives way to one of his pamphlets, *Secret Diplomacy, Capitalism, and War*. This was announced as ready at the week-end. Obviously, this pamphlet was inspired by the success of Johnston's "Hoodwinking" leaflet.

VI.—"SECRET DIPLOMACY, CAPITALISM, AND WAR."

"*Secret Diplomacy, Capitalism, and War*" by Thomas Johnston, Editor of *Forward*, was published at One Penny by the "Forward Printing and Publishing Coy., Ltd.," 164 Howard Street, Glasgow, in 1915. The pamphlet does not carry the date. It was an excellent propaganda pamphlet, consisting of between 5,000 and 6,000 words. It abounds in quotations. Unfortunately it served to advance the fortunes of its author rather than the emancipation of the working class.

Johnston prefixes five quotations to his pamphlet, one from a speech made by John Bright, at Glasgow, December 1858; another from a speech made by Lord Rosebery, at Glasgow, January 13, 1913; another from *The Times*, November 23, 1912; another from Morley's *Life of Cobden*; and the last from the Report to the Balkan Commission of Enquiry, by Baron D'Estournelles de Constant, Senator of France.

John Bright described how our "armies were perishing in every clime, and the precious blood of our country's children" was "squandered as though it had no price" for "some miserable intrigue" to be found hidden "in the innermost recesses of" the Foreign Office, while we "are recommended not to enquire" into Foreign Policy, because we are too common to understand it.

Lord Rosebery denounced the "vast and unknown liabilities" of Foreign Affairs, upon which "armaments must depend."

The Times wrote well. We reproduce the full quotation:

"Who, then, makes war? The answer is to be found in the Chancelleries of Europe, among the men who have too long played with human lives as pawns in a game of chess, who have become so enmeshed in formulas and the jargon of Diplomacy, that they have ceased to be conscious of the poignant realities with which they trifle. And thus war will continue to be made until the great masses, who are the sport of professional schemers and dreamers, say the word which shall bring, not eternal peace, for that is impossible, but a deter-

mination that wars shall be fought only in a just, and righteous, and vital cause."

Morley's *Life of Cobden* makes "a frank exposure of the Anti-Democratic and Cabalistic nature of the way in which British Foreign Affairs are conducted," comments Johnston. He quotes Lord Palmerston's words to Cobden:

"You and your friends complain of a Secret Diplomacy, and that wars are entered into without consulting the people. Now, it is in the Cabinet alone that questions of Foreign policy are settled. We never consult Parliament until after they are settled."

Baron D'Estournelles declares that, according to the War Trade, "the main duty of Diplomacy"

"is the struggle as to who shall carry off from a great rival nation, such and such a contract for guns, cannon, or ironclads, and who shall subordinate political interventions, or loans of money to army contracts."

Johnston then opens his pamphlet. He writes boldly and no one would imagine that the writer was destined twenty-six years later to be a Secretary for State in a War Ministry. He says:

There are those who believe that Secret Diplomacy is one among the prime causes of the present European carnage. . . . There are people who believe that had the foreign affairs of all European countries been conducted openly, and had they been guided and controlled by public opinion, peace would still have reigned in Europe. I believe this to be true. Had the people of Germany and Britain and France and Russia known all—all, mark you!—that was going on in the Chancelleries: had they known that their lives, their liberties, their social aspirations were being gambled with: had they known that treaties with secret clauses were being signed: that rival groups of financiers and concessionaires were quarrelling continually over the spoil of undeveloped lands, and that time and time again the powder magazines were almost exploded and Hell let loose, Europe to-day would not have rocked as with an earthquake, nor would the lurid flames of a million burning homesteads have licked upwards to the heavens, nor death and disease and sorrow have come so unexpectedly and so unbidden into the lives of common men.

Look at Europe to-day! Torn with shell and explosive mine, men, women, aye, and children, dying of wounds and starvation, ships and sailormen blown to atoms without a moment's warning, workshops and machinery wantonly destroyed, stored art treasures burned, Gothic piles become rubbish heaps, human liberty crushed back in some respects to pre-Magna Charta times, frenzied priests spitting upon the teachings of the founder of their Church, the Press (in shackles) vomiting little but hate and mendacity, and the picked strong men whom the working class mothers bore in travail, go off in the prime of life to die!

And how, pray, have these evils and these terrors come? Had some supernatural power, some great dynamic force brought this red ruin to Europe, as those who declare the war to have been "inevitable" would have us believe?

Look over Europe! Twenty nations, half-a-dozen big Powers armed on a colossal scale—armies, navies, armament factories in full blast, borrowing and lending of money for gain, merchants ever on the prowl for trade, financiers looking for cent. per cent.! Profits, profits upon profits, invested abroad wherever there be profusion in minerals or cheap raw material in cotton or labour; the agents of one set of investors running into conflict with the agents of another set of investors; and then "delicate situations," "diplomatic pressure," threats, bluff, movements of gunboats, and, occasionally, war. I do not say that all wars have been or are directly due to the clash of rival financial interests. There have been wars in the past, theological wars and dynastic wars, over Dogmas and Kings, but the day is long gone when nations of men will murder one another for the Love of God or for Bonnie Prince Charlie; nowadays they will organise murder for nothing less than fair interest upon investment and more opportunities for extending that investment, and even so the preliminary stages in the quarrel and its rather squalid and sordid aims must be carefully disguised; we must first be taught that the enemy is a scoundrel bent upon doing us an ill-turn, and that our rulers have exhausted themselves in efforts to avoid strife. Then the flag is waved: the Bible is produced: the band plays. We are off to the war!

SECRET DIPLOMACY IN THE PAST.

Secret Diplomacy, of course, is Secret Diplomacy. The tricks of the trade are hidden from the Un-initiated, but occasionally in historical literature we get a fleeting glimpse of real diplomats at work. Let us take, for example, the description given by Lord Macaulay, the historian, of the Congress of Ryswick, held in 1697, to settle the war between France, on the one side, and Holland, Britain, Germany, Spain, and the remaining members of the League, known as the Grand Alliance, on the other. The war in question had begun in 1688.

Johnston retells the story of "week after week of pompous foolery," quoted and summarised from Macaulay. The reader can consult the historian direct or obtain Johnston's pamphlet for himself. Johnston turns to "*Modern Diplomats*," and says under that sub-heading:

But the real Kings are the great Financiers and Capitalists, and the gentlemen who conduct the delicate financial and concessionary operations for our great Banks or Brokers at foreign headquarters receive salaries which range to £11,500 per annum. We pay the salaries: but we do not select the Ambassadors or the Consuls. The Secretary for Foreign Affairs nominates them; Parliament knows nothing of them or their qualifications. It is public knowledge, of course, that they are always selected from the ruling caste in society, and the recent report of the Royal Commission on the Civil Service (Cd. 7748, 1914) recommends no alteration in that respect, the "*Glasgow Herald's*" thankful comment being that the Diplomatic Service will rightly remain "the domain of the sons of families of position."

It is only fair to state that Eden has announced in the House of Commons that, henceforth, the posts of Ambassadors and Consuls shall be open to all. We do not believe that this concession alters materially Johnston's main argument. He explains how the modern diplomat engineers war:

"If you will turn to Morley's "*Life of Gladstone*" (Vol. II. pp. 330-335), you will find the story of how the Franco-Prussian War was diplomatically engineered. Bismarck gets a telegram from the Emperor of Germany—the famous Ems telegram—replying in a pacific manner to certain representations from France. He (Bismarck), is dining at the time with Generals Moltke and Roon, and their dejection is great when they hear read the contents of the telegram. But Bismarck "doctors" the telegram, striking out the pacifist sections: he communicates the abortion to the Press and to the German Embassies: it is to be 'a red rag upon the Gallic bull'; and then, says Bismarck, Roon and Moltke 'recovered their pleasure in eating and drinking, and spoke in a more cheerful vein. Roon said: 'Our God of old lives still, and will not let us perish in disgrace.'

"In Paris, on the other hand, declares Lord Morley: 'A vital document was suppressed, and its purport misrepresented. Thus in point of scruple, the two parties to the transaction were not ill-matched.'

But, as a result of their joint endeavours, thousands upon thousands of peaceful working men were imposed upon, and marched off beneath patriotic flags and to martial music, to disease, mutilation, and death!

THE CASE OF EGYPT.

"Turn with me to Egypt in the early seventies of last century. Mr. Brailsford in his "*War of Steel and Gold*," tells us how the European irrigation contractors overcharged the Khedive's Treasury anything from 80 to 400 per cent. For floating loans to meet his expenses, the Khedive had to pay as much as 25 per cent. in interest. Of the National Debt of 88 millions, Egypt only received 44 millions, and while the nominal interest was 7 per cent., it in reality was 12 or 13 per cent. Of a loan of 32 millions raised in 1873, only 20 millions reached the Exchequer. Finally, the Rothschilds, who were behind the bondholders, foreclosed, a proceeding that Diplomacy obligingly described as Protectorate for the good of Egypt. In 1877, a year of famine, taxes were actually collected in advance from the peasants, to pay the interest on the Rothschild bonds. Sir Lucas Malet, British Ambassador, set out to organise, or at any rate to hasten, "some complication of an acute nature" that would rivet our "protection" more firmly upon the poor Egyptians, and Gladstone's Government proceeded to crush the Nationalist patriot Arabi, who is now known to have been an "honest, popular and tolerant" man, but who was then diplomatically painted as a cross between a mad Dervish and a negro cannibal; our Fleet bombarded Alexandria; we "temporarily" occupied Egypt, and Cecil Rhodes offered to subscribe funds to the Liberal Party on condition that there should be no further nonsense about evacuation. Lord Rosebery, a Liberal Premier, married a Rothschild, and we are—or rather our financiers are—bleeding Egypt still, French Finance, with all its Marchand-Fashoda complications, being bought off the field as a result of the Entente Cordiale."

In a footnote to this reference, Johnston writes:

"How delicately Diplomacy can gloss this Rothschild-Rosebery-Rhodes decision to settle permanently for spoil in Egypt, may be seen in the recently issued historical narrative by Lord Cromer (himself a Financial Diplomatist), entitled *Abbas II*. Thus:—

"Lord Rosebery had deserved well of his country and of Egypt. . . . He had scattered to the winds the idea that a speedy evacuation, regardless of the consequences was contemplated. He had let all concerned know that a great nation cannot lightly

throw off responsibilities which it has solemnly assumed in the face of the world."

The main narrative continues:

This Entente Cordiale, of which our Capitalist Press is so proud, has a little history of its own. It dates from April, 1904, when the Anglo-French Agreement regarding Morocco was signed and published to the world. France was to recognise British predominance in Egypt and Britain was to recognise French predominance in Morocco. Germany growled through her Diplomacy because she had not been consulted, and because a German firm, the Mannesmann Brothers, had obtained an exclusive concession to work all the mines in Morocco from a Sultan, to whom it had lent money to suppress a rebellion. But on the face of the Treaty, there was nothing very objectionable to Germany, since all trading rights were to be respected by the French, and the Mannesmann ores would still go from Morocco to the Krupps' works at Essen. Yet, seven years later (see London "*Daily News*," 27th November, 1911), it was suddenly disclosed by a Parisian Journal, "*Le Temps*," that there were secret and hitherto unpublished causes in the Anglo-French Agreement. In articles 1, 2, and 3 of the secret Treaty, France and Britain bound themselves, if "force of circumstances" compelled either Government to change its policy with regard to its new protectorate, to support one another; i.e., to get its working class to fight if necessary, and Morocco was definitely partitioned between France and Spain. (See Dr. Holland Rose's "*The Origins of the War*," pp. 70, 71, and Mr. Fenner Brockway's Pamphlet "*Was Britain Blameless?*") This dirty piece of manoeuvring, of course, excited German Capital. . . .

The Germans are Huns to-day. But they were brave and chivalrous Allies only a few years ago, when the Allied German and British fleets were conducting a naval demonstration against President Castro's Government in Venezuela, because bondholders in Britain and Germany were not receiving their dividends regularly. . . .

In the Far East we have Tibetan missions, opium wars, seizures of Wei-Hai-Wei and Kaio Chao seized from China by Germany on the pretext that two German missionaries had been murdered, but in reality because one Skertchley, a mining prospector, had discovered that the district was rich in minerals; and Wei-Hai-Wei, seized by Britain because Germany had seized Kiao-Chao, though, of course, Diplomacy did not state the case so bluntly.

... We saw thousands of poor Japs and Russians murdered, not for any cause of liberty or honour, but in a struggle for the ownership of the valuable Yalu timber forests, between a Japanese Company and a Russian Syndicate in which the Tsar was a large shareholder. We saw Britain "supporting" the "bully wee Japs" because she was weakening Russia at no expense to us in the Far East, and because our financiers had floated a Japanese loan at 9 per cent. interest. Incidentally, we knocked something out of Russia in the process, because "we" sold 300,000 tons of coal at high prices to Rogdestvinsky's fleet.

And then, finally, to cap the whole business, we have it on the authority of Mr. Isaac N. Seligmann, the great New York Banker, that:—

"The Russo-Japanese conflict of 1904-05 was halted in a large measure because the bankers refused to float further loans at anything like ordinary terms, after probably 1,500,000,000 dollars had been wasted in the contest.

You will note that Mr. Seligmann says nothing of the lives wasted.

CHINA TO BE PLUNDERED.

See what is happening even now in the Far East. Germany has been smashed at Kaio-Chou, and immediately and secretly Japanese Capitalism tabled its demands, not upon Germany, but upon China. For a month and more Diplomacy keeps the demands secret; not a whisper about them appears in the British Press until 12th February, when the "*Times*" discloses the fact that there is great commotion in China over the claims made by Japanese Diplomacy on behalf of Japanese Capitalism.

Johnston sets out the demands "*made by our Ally Japan upon a people who have offended them in in no conceivable way*" and continues:

When Germany, last August, took forcible right-of-way through Belgium, our Diplomats and Capitalist pressmen set up a shrill crescendo of denunciation; we heard daily about Scraps of Paper, International Honour, Violation of Treaties, Brute Force, the Denial of a Moral Law, and all the rest of it, so that many simple-minded men were deceived into believing that the only lying and unscrupulous Diplomat was he who was born beyond the Rhine, and the only vicious, brute-force Capitalist knave was he who floated his Syndicate in Berlin. But what, pray, are our "Remember Belgium" Press Directors and Diplomats saying about this shameless Japanese piracy?

The London "*Times*" frankly declares that:

"In view of our relations with Japan, it would be ungracious for Britain to put obstacles in the way of Japan's reasonable enough ambitions."

The London "*Daily News*," after asserting that British, French, Russian and American Diplomacy

knew of these Japanese demands a month ago, goes on to say that "There is no suggestion of provocation on the part of China. . . . The war is Japan's opportunity, and denied expansion in the Pacific, she turns upon China. This is hardly the time for enlarging upon the ethics of such enterprises." The "*Scotsman*" thinks it is "important" to draw attention to the fact that M. Sazonoff, in the Russian Duma, has announced that the Japanese claims "contained nothing contrary to Russian interests," and "*Le Temps*" of Paris obligingly vouches for the fact that French interests are not affected and that "the Japanese Government will have need of both the London and Paris Markets in order to profit by the advantages which it will obtain. Bases of agreement will therefore not be lacking. . . . It is only a matter of economic competition."

Johnston tells the story of the Kaiser as a pilgrim:

In 1898, the German Kaiser visited the Holy Land. It was diplomatically given out that he was a Christian Pilgrim. He said so himself. "Not splendour," he declared, "not power, not glory, not honour, no earthly blessing is it that we seek here; we pine, we pray, we strive alone after the sole, the highest blessing, the salvation of our souls." But our Diplomats had been at the same game themselves and they promptly smelled out the fact that this German pilgrim had secured from the Sultan, a verbal promise that German Capitalists would be allowed to build the Baghdad Railway. Then Britain and Russia concluded an agreement to "protect" Persia—Russia collaring control of the northern and Britain of the southern portion of that country.

Look where you will over the surface of the earth, and similar struggles on similar lines will be seen, however skillfully Secret Diplomacy has obscured the issues and suppressed the salient facts. Germans acquire Dynamite and Spirit monopolies for cash bribes in the Transvaal. British Capital organise a Jamieson Raid. It fails. Then comes the Johannesburg plot of May, 1899.

Johnston proceeds to quote Lord Lansdowne's letter to General Wolsley, dated August 27, 1899. He describes the robbing and plundering of Turkey; the reorganisation of Turkish Naval Dockyards by the Armstrong-Vickers group, mentioned in the London *Times*, December 3, 1913; the German loan to Bulgaria and its meaning to the peasants; the conspiracies between Krupps, the armament kings of Germany, and Schneider, the armament kings of France; the false statements made by Sir Edward Grey and Mr. Asquith in the House of Commons, "time and again"; and finally the resignation of Messrs. Morley, Burns, and Trevelyan "as a protest against Secret Diplomacy and open deception of the British public."

Johnston is not likely to follow the excellent example set by Morley, Burns, and Trevelyan, who became, for five minutes, honest men. Even that is too drastic a sacrifice for our modern Labour placemen to make.

Johnston adds:

Nor can we even place implicit trust in the White Papers which profess to give us the diplomatic pre-war correspondence.

Johnston proceeds to expose certain falsehoods which he alleges are to be found in the British White Paper explaining the outbreak of the first World War.

Johnston concludes his pamphlet with these words of denunciation:

Money kings ever on the prowl—according to Mr. Joseph Burgess, in his "*Homeland or Empire*," £3,000,000,000 of British owned money invested overseas, raking in an annual tribute of £200,000,000; armament trusts seeking whom they may exploit; money talking loudest in every Parliament; aristocratic bureaucrats operating in secret, pledging your lives and mine as stakes in the game. Whichever party is in power, the doctrine of continuity in Foreign Policy—the doctrine first announced by Lord Rosebery, who married a Rothschild, and whose son is now Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs—is taken for granted. Everywhere, docile and ignorant masses, drilling, toiling, taxed—pawns on the board!

There is no hope, no way out; no remedy possible until Democracy bestirs itself and demands democratic control of every department of social activity. Mere protests against the unscrupulous international operations of the financial sharks are as old as Cobden, who clearly saw the flagrant folly of a nation allowing its financiers to lend Foreign Powers money for armaments—armaments which in turn impose the creation of "counter preparations to meet them,"—the dastardly and often murderous operations of the Colonial expansionist traders, and the knavish and lying system of secret diplomacy which disguise the deceptions and the robberies from the common people. Mere protests are useless; they

are but a beating of the air. What must be if civilisation is to be saved, is complete and open Democratic control of Foreign and Home Affairs, and that complete Democratic control means Socialism.

Will Johnston explain how Socialism is served by his present position in the Churchill Cabinet?

[We have considerable data concerning Johnston's career; but we will publish this, from time to time, in separate essays.—Ed.]

BURNBANK OBJECTORS ANTI-PARLIAMENTARIANS BEFORE GLASGOW No. 2 TRIBUNAL

Two of our Burnbank Comrades, Leigh Fisher and Robert Lyle, have been rejected as conscientious objectors by the Glasgow, South-West Scotland No. 2 Tribunal. Fisher's appeal to the Edinburgh Appellate Tribunal was rejected, and the decision of the Glasgow Local Tribunal affirmed.

Fisher's case was heard on December 6, 1940, by the Glasgow Tribunal. The Chairman of this Tribunal is Sheriff J. M. Hunter, K.C., and the members are: W. Boyd, M.A., B.Sc., D.Phil.; J. Dougherty; E. Greenhill; and R. C. Reid.

Fisher stated that he objected to all forms of Military Service as well as work of National Importance. His objections were based on ethical grounds. They were also practical and political. He had held the views since 1928, when he first associated with Guy Aldred. He had belonged to the Anti-Parliamentary Communist Federation and, later, passed on to the United Socialist Movement.

The Tribunal recorded their decision in writing, after questioning Comrade Fisher at some length:—

"The Tribunal found that the applicant would be willing to fight if this country had a Social System and Government of which he approved, and a Capitalist nation attempted to subvert it by force of arms. The Tribunal accordingly found that he had no conscientious objections to military service as such but only to fighting for a Government and a cause of which he disapproved."

The Appeal was heard at Edinburgh on May 22, before the Lord Elphinstone, K.T., LL.D. (Chairman); Alexander Maitland, K.C., and Thomas Barrow, J.P., Hon. A.R.I.B.A. The Appellate Tribunal upheld the local decision.

Robert Lyle is a miner and ought not to be appearing before a Conscientious Objectors' Tribunal. He appeared before the Glasgow No. 2 Tribunal on May 30, 1941. The Tribunal summarised his evidence in writing as follows:—

"Objects to all forms of Military Service as well as work in Agriculture, Forestry, or Land Reclamation. Objects because it is in the interests of Capitalism, THAT IS HIS OBJECTION, and also that it is murder. Objections based on Socialist grounds. Views held for 12 years. Views formed by Socialist propaganda. Member of the Anti-Parliamentary Communist Federation. Would protect himself against attack. Would be justifiable to kill in self-defence, if that were the alternative. Would be prepared to defend by force of arms a social system of which he approved, if that system were attacked. A Socialist for 12 years, has held meetings and has been actively engaged in Anti-War propaganda. Would have fought in war against Franco had he been a Spaniard."

As we go to press, Lyle is waiting on his Appeal Tribunal.

Fisher and Lyle both put forward splendid fighting cases. They are entitled to the fellowship and solidarity of the working class movement.

Comrades who wish to join the United Socialist Movement should send penny stamp to Ethel MacDonal, Secretary, U.S.M., 106 George Street, Glasgow, C.1.

SOVIET RUSSIA: A SANE OUTLOOK BY THE DUKE OF BEDFORD

The following article was written by the Duke of Bedford in 1924, when he was Marquis of Tavistock. It was a plea for sanity and answers fully those who consider that the Duke of Bedford is "pro-Fascist" because he pleads for a sane understanding of the German question to-day. The Duke is a pacifist and an enemy of all hate campaigns. When he wrote this essay, a hate campaign was being directed against the Soviet Union. The essay was published in 2 papers at the time. It was entitled: "A Sane Outlook on the Russian Problem." The essay is reproduced from the original MS.—Ed.

The fact that I have never been to Russia and cannot even speak the Russian language might, under ordinary circumstances, cause me to hesitate to write this article. I do so, however, without the slightest hesitation because the voice of those who are in a position to speak with authority about Russia is never being heard in this country; whereas countless people whose ignorance is as great as my own are laying down the law in the most dogmatic fashion and are aspiring to guide public opinion along very dangerous paths.

We are told by people who should be well-informed that one of the two greatest dangers in the world at the present time is the widespread belief in Russia and the Near East that England is preparing an attack on the Soviet Republic. From such dark fears, however ill-founded, the spirit of conflict is bred. There are fools enough in both countries to light the fuse if only the powder be dry and, by the hoary lie of national honour at stake and need for self defence, fling the people of the British Empire who desire aggressive war as little as they desire the moon, against another nation whose rank and file, more perhaps than those of any other country in the world, dislike fighting beyond their own boundaries.

Let us examine the sources from which we get the information upon which our opinions are based. More than ninety per cent. of what appears in the Press is not worth the paper it is written on: it is the purest (or impurest) propaganda, often consisting of those half-truths which are the most pernicious form of lying. The only views about Russia that are worth sixpence are those expressed by level-headed people who are recent visitors to the country and have gone there in a friendly spirit and yet with noses free from the incubus of rose-coloured spectacles; people, for choice, who can speak the language and who knew Russia before the Revolution. A man whose experience of Russia is confined to one brief and recent visit is likely to make the mistake of comparing conditions in present-day Russia only with those of present-day England and of failing to understand and rightly interpret much in the character and conduct of the people. The few properly qualified witnesses to whose reports I have had access all agree that the leaders of the Revolution are for the most part sincere men, and the use of the power of office for personal gain is regarded by them as disgraceful. Many in the past have suffered persecution for the sake of their principles, including the terrors of Siberian exile.

While there may be little hope of a return to foreign owners of money or property confiscated during the actual Revolution, the Soviet Government and firms trading under its aegis are in their commercial dealings singularly honest, and bad debts are almost unknown.

Although greatly handicapped by lack of money owing to the war, to internal upheaval and to disastrous seasons in the agricultural districts brought about by abnormal weather, the Soviet Government is attempting to do, and has already done, much for education, for agriculture, and for industry. The virtual transfer of the land to the peasants has been warmly welcomed and has rendered them on the whole willing to submit to a good deal of restraint and control.

Of political and personal liberty, as we understand it, there is very little, and religious bodies are regarded with disfavour and are subject to many restrictions. Finally, the occurrence of serious cruelty during the Revolution is not to be disputed.

Assuming that this summary of the position in Russia is substantially correct, what conclusions should we draw and what should be our line of conduct?

We are told that the Russian leaders are possessed of sincerity and freedom from selfish ambition. Whatever faults may accompany them, these are two great virtues, not over common among the politicians and statesmen of Western Europe. We are also told that the Soviet leaders have in the past suffered for their principles; they are therefore likely to have been rendered harsh, bitter and obstinate, more especially as they have grown up in an environment where liberty was wanting, education was largely unknown, and social injustice was rampant.

The present rulers of Russia are denounced in this country because they were cruel; because they refuse to recognise financial obligations entered into under the Czar's régime, because they have substituted one tyranny for another and failed to secure prosperity for their nation; because they are anti-religious; and because they send foolish and inflammatory propaganda into foreign countries.

These objections might be answered in one brief and homely sentence, "Why the dickens should you expect anything else?" It is the height of unreasonable folly to judge and condemn the Soviet leaders as though they had been brought up with all the advantages of English education and English political liberty. Of course the Soviet leaders were cruel: men brought up as they were brought up, men who have suffered as they have suffered, always are cruel and violent and extreme when at last the tables are turned upon their oppressors. It may be very sad and shocking, but unfortunately it happens that way and always has happened. It is simply cause and effect and human nature.

To expect them to recognise financial obligations entered into under a system they detested and despised is to expect too much. How could one hope for such consideration from ill-educated men sore and angry, embittered by the armed expedition sent against them, and flushed with new power and their heads filled with wild schemes for the social reorganisation of an impoverished country?

That they failed to establish political freedom is again only natural: men who have never known freedom, except in theory, always, when power comes to them, yield to the very strong temptation to assume the role of benevolent autocrats, protecting the rank and file of their fellow-countrymen, so they believe, from subtle hostile influences and from the effects of their own ignorance of what is good for them.

To expect the Soviet Government to create prosperity in Russia in so short a period is to ask more than is reasonable. The reports of distress are often exaggerated or unfair in so far as they represent as universal troubles which are really local. No allowance is made for the effects of the war; for the phenomenally bad seasons already alluded to; for the rather low intelligence and conservative habits of the Russian peasants; nor for the fact that even under the Czar's rule the standard of living was extremely low and, in spite of the great export trade in grain, the wolf was often at the door.

That the Soviet Government is bitterly anti-religious is again the most natural thing in the world, as some of our worthy clerics might more easily realise if they cultivated a bit more of their Master's generous spirit and balanced outlook. The Orthodox Church in Russia, before the Revolution, was appallingly

corrupt. Religion there was in plenty, Christianity it was hard to find. Mighty churches, richly decorated, towered above the hovels where the people dwelt. The leaders of the Church were on good terms with the ruling class; never a word of protest against Siberia, nor any clear direction that privilege carries with it a duty of service. The Soviet leaders saw in the religion around them a great organised hypocrisy, and it is not unlikely that Christ's judgment may have tallied remarkably with their own. Jesus Himself they regarded as a poor figure; an unpractical visionary, dangerous if He were taken seriously; that, too, was natural: only those who have had close personal experience of really Christian individuals can be expected to understand the truth and power that lie behind the startling paradoxes on which our religion is largely based. I have known many a Communist and Socialist in my own country whose heart is perhaps better than his head; who, coming across, in his rather limited experience, much false religion and hardly any true, has thrown the baby away with the bath water and pronounced all religion "the opium of the people."

Lastly there is the propaganda grievance. Well are not we continually issuing propaganda ourselves when we send Christian missionaries to foreign lands? Do not the Anglo-Israelites and the Mormons and various other earnest but more or less misguided people issue propaganda? Granted that Bolshevik propaganda is often partly mistaken in aim; almost wholly futile in suggested methods; and supremely fatuous in expression, we must remember that it is the religion and honoured gospel of those who send it forth and that there is abundant excuse for their errors of belief.

The Soviet leaders may talk wildly, as it is customary for men in their position to talk, but their bark is likely to prove worse than their bite. Their hands are more than full with the administration of a great but none too wealthy country, whose people are constitutionally averse to war outside their own dominions. The hard discipline of experience in the handling of men has very much to teach them, and we can well afford to wait quietly while their lessons are being learned. When you are dealing with courageous and embittered men the acme of stupidity is to answer threat with threat, or to try and send them to Coventry. The policy of the late Government has been disastrous in its effects and the mischief done will take many years to undo. They acted like a man who, when some powerful and highly strung animal has to be tamed, loses his nerve, hits the creature and bolts out of the cage leaving it ten times more suspicious than before and ten times harder to handle.

When a great country is going through a difficult crisis the last thing to do is to try and make her feel an outcast. It will delay the time when her leaders begin to act more sanely. Without being foolishly confiding you should take every opportunity of establishing contact, partly that there may be an infusion of wiser ideas, partly that it may pay the Government less and less to be on bad terms with England.

The religious situation in Russia is also nothing to get excited over. While we may sympathise with suffering fellow-Christians and pray that, if it be compatible with the advancement of God's Kingdom, their time of trial may speedily be ended, it is well to remember that few things are so good for the quality of a Church as persecution. It was persecution that made the early Church a living power during the first three centuries of its existence, and it has been lack of persecution that in the ensuing 1600 years have done so much to spoil it.

The moon is not disturbed by the dogs that howl at her; indeed, did she possess an aesthetic sense, she might even be grateful to

them for removing some of the floating carrion that mars the purity of her reflection in wayside pools. In the same way, God is not likely to be inconvenienced by atheist propaganda, and if a few simple minds are temporarily led astray, they will be brought back when fuller truth is revealed in the Hereafter. Even the prohibition of the teaching of religion to children in classes is far from being an un-mixed evil. I have sometimes thought that we might have more true Christianity in England if a similar rule were enforced here. Young people would come to the faith far more freely if their minds had not been poisoned by the lamentable activities of bad teachers utterly unqualified in mind and character.

Reform your casual wards and your treatment of the unemployed; remove your slums and do not be unfair to native races, and propaganda will then only appeal to the selfish and the crafty, who can be ignored, because they do not possess the qualities necessary to secure a following of men sufficiently numerous to constitute a danger to the State. By trying to exclude propaganda you not only encourage the Russian Communist Party to believe that there is something very formidable and very wise about its ideas, but you also produce among discontented minds in your own country that thirst which exists for every kind of literature that is banned, either on moral or on political grounds. If you wish to take the heart out of a propaganda campaign in the shortest possible time there are two sure ways of doing it: the first is ridicule and the second is indifference.

UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP

The question whether allegiance to conscience, when that conscience dictates war resistance or anti-militarism, is secondary to allegiance to the State, was considered by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals at the end of June, 1930, in connection with two applications for naturalisation.

The Court reversed the decisions of the Connecticut and New York District Courts and ordered that the two persons concerned should be admitted to American citizenship. They were:—

Miss Mari Deverill Bland, of Canadian birth who nursed American soldiers in France during the war. Her father, the Rev. E. M. Bland, was, at the time of application, the Rector of Kirkby Underwood, Bourne, Lincolnshire.

Dr. Clyde Macintosh, a Canadian Professor of Theology at the Yale School of Religion.

The lower courts rejected their applications for naturalisation because of their pacifist views, which prevented them from taking the oath to bear arms against an enemy of the United States.

Dr. Macintosh, during the Great War was a chaplain with the Canadian troops. He maintained that he could not promise to bear arms unless he felt the cause was just.

Miss Bland said that her conscience as a Christian would not permit her to swear to bear arms. She was willing to go to the front to nurse the wounded.

The Court of Appeals pointed out that Dr. Macintosh apparently was willing to give the United States all the allegiance **he ever gave or could give to any country**; but "he could not put his allegiance for the government of any country before his allegiance to the Will of God."

The Court emphasised that there was a distinction between morally justified and unjustifiable war as recognised by international law.

Its decision, which was to its credit as a juridical body, meant the right of the individual to decide the matter for himself, even in war-time.

OUR LETTER-BOX

Dear Mr. Aldred,—I am interested to see that in the June number of "The Word" you have given so much space to some of our Baptist doings.

I am glad you put in the bit about our addition to the five points in our Report, when we insisted on full religious freedom. We felt at our Assembly that it was worth emphasising that, and I was authorised to strengthen that paragraph, which in the final form now reads:—

"The Council accept, as the writers do, the Five Peace Points suggested by the Pope, but would add as in their view essential the right of all men and nations to full religious liberty. The reference to 'the real needs and just demands of nations and populations and racial minorities,' while it may be taken to imply religious freedom and respect for the rights of religious minorities, is not in our opinion sufficiently explicit and we desire to emphasise the need of such liberty as essential for any real and lasting peace."

In view of your own strong line on the subject of civil and religious liberty, I thought that you might like to know of this amendment.

You are certainly making up for any lack of understanding in that first reference to us to which I made a mild demurrer and it is generous of you to do so.

With my good wishes,

Yours very sincerely,

M. E. AUBREY

(General Secretary, The Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland).

The Baptist Church House,

London, W.C.1.

June 19, 1941.

Dear Comrade,—I have just finished reading "Richard Carlile;" and I felt I must write and express my appreciation of this stimulating and vigorously written work; to which I have looked forward for some months. It fully comes up to my expectations, and I must congratulate you on the detailed and factual treatment of the subject.

The chapter "Jail Wisdom," is a veritable treasurehouse of virile and thought-provoking statements. So is the chapter summarising Carlile's speech from the dock. The illustrations, though not always germane to the subject, help to create a period atmosphere.

I was very interested to learn that Carlile and Eliza spent some seven years at Enfield; if possible, should like to make a pilgrimage to the spot; as it is quite near I wonder if you have any further information as to the exact locality as to whether the "fine spreading yew" still survives: as to whether there is any memorial, etc.

One more point, I am well acquainted with the works of Paine, but have not yet come across Palmer's "Principles of Nature." Can you tell me where this is obtainable?

One minor mistake: First Forward, penultimate line. Is it not, "Rationalist Press Association?"

Thanking you once more,

Yours fraternally,

C. C. SIMMONS.

East Barnet, Herts.

July 8, 1941.

GLASGOW ANARCHIST OBJECTOR

Refused A.R.P. Battle Dress.

Because he refused to put on the battle-dress issued to the A.R.P., a Glasgow conscientious objector, Lewis Gordon, 7 Dryburgh Gardens, Glasgow, N., was suspended from A.R.P. duties as a driver.

The local Tribunal removed his name from the roll of conscientious objectors. On July 17, the Edinburgh Appellate Tribunal upheld this decision.

Gordon told the Appellate Tribunal that he was an Anarchist and totally against war, but had joined the A.R.P. to help people hurt in raids. When he was issued with battledress, he refused to wear it. Battledress was a symbol of compulsion and not service.

To our mind the decision against Gordon cannot be defended, and ought to be recalled.

18B. PRISONERS



JOHN BECKETT, Ex-M.P.

Sketch made by a fellow-detainee at Huyton. Beckett is now detained in the Isle of Man.

The question whether, even in time of war, citizens should be imprisoned without charge or trial, is one of supreme constitutional importance. Its urgency is obscured by the fear that is manufactured by war. The fear is a dangerous anti-democratic weapon in the hands of the Executive. It is amazing that persons claiming to be Socialists—even political placemen and parliamentary careerists, who use the term merely as a cover behind which to advance their personal mean and sordid ambitions—should acquiesce tamely in such a state of affairs. For Socialism means justice. Socialism really stands for Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. Socialism does: not the penny-a-line professional journalists and parliamentary self-seekers.

The constitutional question interests us as a Socialist, and concerns us as a citizen. It intrigues us as a student of law and jurisprudence, and as one who loves the study of political struggle. From every angle—law, scholarship, and the moral feeling of the rights of man—we hold such detentions to be wrong and indefensible. As wrong as the persecution of Socialists, Communists, Anarchists. We are opposed as much to the persecution of real or alleged reactionaries as we are to the persecution and oppression of open or avowed revolutionaries. Our study of history, and our years of imprisonment, have taught us that all persecution of man by man is wrong. Some day it must cease.

Within this persecution, called protective custody, is another issue: that of treatment. Our information is not too clear on this matter. Many complaints have reached us concerning the conditions under which the 18B Prisoners are detained. Some of the letters received give appalling and intolerable details. Making every allowance for exaggeration—and we know how to think as a prisoner, how to allow for the exaggeration of the prisoners' approach to conditions—we say that the complaints ought to be examined.

The detainees are not even political prisoners, in the sense of being convicted persons. They are merely suspects, against whom the Home Secretary seems to feel he could not maintain a charge. Their detention means the acceptance by the Executive, in the name of democracy, of the principle of pre-

ventive arrest and custody. This is an odious idea. Since it is in operation, the question of how the prisoners are treated arises.

In 1872, an International Prison Conference was held in the Hall of the Middle Temple, London. At that Conference, the representative of the Italian Government, Count A. de Foresta, proposed that persons guilty of political offences not implying great moral perversity, should be kept in simple detention, apart from common criminals. It was stated that Germany had already recognised this principal of *Custodia Honestas*. The resolution was carried unanimously.

It should be added that this principle was maintained by the Kaiser and honoured by the German Republic. Hitler and his colleagues benefitted under this principle, and then abolished it the moment they came to power. Their conduct, in this respect, prepared the way for the inconsiderate detention of 18B prisoners in Britain.

In a letter to Professor George Sigerson, M.D., Member of the Royal Commission of Prisons, 1887, and referred to by Professor Sigerson, Mr. James Bryce, Professor of Civil Law at Oxford, then Ambassador at Washington, says:

"We all feel the difference between the ordinary criminal and those whose treatment you describe . . . ordinary prison discipline is incomparably more severe and painful to the persons sentenced for offences of this nature than it is to the ordinary thief or forger."

Speaking in the House of Commons on March 1st, 1889, Mr. Gladstone said:

"I know very well you cannot attempt to frame a legislative definition of political offences; but what you can do and what always has been done is this: You can say that in certain classes of the imprisoned, a person ought not to be treated as if he has been guilty of base and degrading crime . . . Though sensitiveness to indignities of this kind may be a matter on which men will differ according to their temperament and their ideas, yet such sensitiveness is rather to be encouraged than to be repressed, for it appertains to that lofty sentiment, that spirit which was described by Burke in animated language when he said: 'The spirit which feels a stain like a wound.'"

We now pass to

PRISON REGULATIONS NUMBER 243A.

"In the case of any offender of the Second or Third Division, whose previous character is good, and who has been convicted of, or committed to prison for, an offence not involving dishonesty, cruelty, indecency, or serious violence, the Prison Commissioners may allow such amelioration of the conditions prescribed in the foregoing rules as the Secretary of State may approve in respect of the wearing of prison clothing, bathing, hair-cutting, cleaning of cells, employment, exercise, books, and otherwise. Provided that no such amelioration shall be greater than that granted under the rules for offenders of the First Division."

The effect of this clause was explained by Mr. Churchill, the present Prime Minister, in the House of Commons, on July 20, 1910. As Home Secretary, he informed the House:—

"That rule enables the Home Secretary, in virtue of the various Acts which he has to administer, to relieve certain prisoners not guilty of any acts involving moral turpitude. I propose to relieve them of the necessity of wearing prison clothing, of being specially searched, and of being compelled to take the regulation prison bath. I also propose to enable the offenders in the Second Division to be permitted, under certain circumstances, to obtain food from outside, to exercise freely, both in the morning and in the afternoon, to converse with other prisoners when taking exercise, and to have at their own expense, such books, not dealing with current events, and such literature as are in accordance with the public interests."

Replying to a supplementary question, he added:—

"By moral turpitude, I mean offences involving dishonesty, indecency, gross violations of morality, or cruelty."

The Prison Act, 1877, Section 40, provided that a person convicted of seditions, libel or seditious may not be treated as a misdemeanant of the First Division. This was amended by the Prison Act of 1898, 61 & 62 Vict. C.41, S.6(5). In Scotland the political offender of this category became a Civil Prisoner, and in England he became a prisoner of the 1st Division. Later Acts varied this, in event of the prosecu-

tion being made under Emergency Powers Acts.

If considered treatment, and honourable imprisonment, applies to the convicted political prisoner, surely it ought to be secured, by right, to the unconvicted political prisoner.

When the Duke of Bedford succeeded to his title it was expected that he would proceed immediately to take his seat in the House of Lords. At that time, he did not see what useful purpose he could serve by so doing. But the friends of a number of 18B detainees wrote to him and asked him to raise the question of their detention in the House of Lords. He communicated details of most of the cases to various members of the House of Commons, and some questions were asked, with little useful result. At the interview reported in another column, the Duke passed the correspondence over to us and requested that we make the facts known to our readers. As a disciple of Richard Carlile, and a believer in Freedom of Speech and of the Press, we cannot see what else there is to do.

None of the Duke's correspondents, that is, the closest friends of the persons interned, or persons who had been interned, or released, denied the need for 18B legislation. This fact impressed us, because we do not believe in the necessity for such legislation. The Duke of Bedford seems to think that, even if persons were arrested without charge, the detention ought not to be indefinite, and some charges ought to be made at a later date.

The complaint of his correspondents may be set out as follows:—

1. Questionable mode of application.
2. Questionable Police methods, in some instances.
3. Punitive Treatment in Detention or Prison.
4. Delay in Formulating Charges.
5. Inequality of Treatment.

A number of the correspondents stated that the application of 18B Powers was left to the discretion of local Police Authorities for selection in too many instances, regardless of their qualification to judge political subjects. It was felt that this was contrary to the history, the traditions, and the experience of the first principles of law and justice.

The correspondence showed that there were many instances of courteous and considerate treatment by the police. But there were also numerous cases of lack of consideration.

The complaints may be summarised as follows:—

1. Arrested men and women given no opportunity to collect clothes or to inform relatives. Several days elapsed after arrest before most were able to inform their relatives of their whereabouts. Wives, children and other dependents were left destitute.
2. Handcuffed on arrest or when moved from one place to another.
3. Finger prints and photographs taken as in the case of convicted prisoners. Confined in Police Cells with only one blanket for several nights.

The complaints about the police methods was illustrated in the treatment of Lieutenant Evans and Captain Budd. Lack of consideration is alleged:—

(1) Lieut. Evans, taken from his regiment, put in local police cell in uniform; from thence transferred to prison in handcuffs.

(2) Bentinck-Budd. Captain and Adjutant, arrested at his military station. A private of the same unit was also arrested at the same time, and these two in uniform were taken to prison handcuffed to each other.

We do not follow entirely these complaints. The handcuffs could have been omitted. Whether the uniforms ought to have been exchanged for civvies we cannot say. This

complaint depends on the angle of approach and we do not think it matters. We have worn handcuffs on railway stations and been part of a chain-gang and so write from experience. This complaint does not move us unduly.

It is stated that in two cases, that of Foden of Manchester, and Rose of Norwich, faked evidence was produced. These charges call for investigation.

The conditions of correspondence mean that the detainees are treated worse than political prisoners of the First Division. Two letters per week, of one page, limited to 24 lines, with instructions to write large, under penalty of losing letter without notification, constitute an outrageous condition of uncharged detention. Visits are limited strictly to one per week. All this, added to the vague nature of the charges, means prevention of opportunity to obtain evidence in support of one's defence against charges.

Whether these conditions still obtain we cannot say. One correspondent described the daily routine of the detainee at Liverpool Prison and asked if it were not punitive.

6.0 a.m.—Bell rings to waken men.

7.0—Doors opened. Slop out basins, etc., at lavatory. (N.B.—one lavatory to each floor 36 cells.)

7.30—Breakfast. Tea and 2 slices of bread and margarine and a little porridge. Cells locked.

9.0—Walking exercise in prison yard. In pairs.

10.0—Sewing mail bags. Talking permitted but not too loudly.

Noon—Locked in cells.

12.30—Lunch. 1 dish of skilly or something similar, one slice of dry bread and water. Cells locked.

2.0—Walking exercise again.

3.0—Sewing bags again.

4.0—Back in cells and locked in.

5.0—Supper. Tea, bread and cubic inch of cheese.

From now till 6.30 a.m. locked up in cells alone.

Cells remained locked during air-raids.

Many of the complaints about prison conditions do not impress us. We have experienced prison conditions and understood this phase of the complaint. Actually, the complaints on this score were directed against the fact of imprisonment itself. Hardships belong to prison life that ought not to be tolerated in a decent society. Yet many of the folk imprisoned would have consented to their continuance without demur, had they not experienced them. Once released, what protest will they severally and collectively make against prison life? As we read this correspondence, we felt that many of the internees ought to have attacked imprisonment and the prison system in happier days, when the notion of suffering imprisonment personally was foreign to their thoughts.

This reflection does not apply to the letter that informed the Duke that no consideration was given to the ill-health of detainees. An aged man of 74 years, it is said, died in Liverpool Prison after 12 days of detention. One other over 70 was released because he was dying. **Cases of claustrophobia contracted through shell-shock in the last war were refused the relief of having a cell door unlocked in spite of constant appeals even during air raids.**

One detainee gave a "remand" prisoner a cigarette. Punishment awarded was: 1 day bread and water and 7 days "loss of privileges," which amounts to solitary confinement.

Nevertheless, this correspondent insisted that the conditions at Liverpool were a considerable improvement over those that obtained at Wandsworth Prison. The conditions here

were more punitive than those accorded to sentenced prisoners.

Another detainee talked to his fellows, while sewing mail-bags; and a third, while looking out of a cell window, saw his mother in the prison yard. He called out to her and waved. Punishment in each case was 2 days' bread and water, and 14 days' loss of privileges, which amounts to 14 days' solitary confinement. Sitting behind the Treasury Benches in the House of Commons are a number of men who complained about such conditions in 1916-1918. If they like, we are prepared to name every such member and to challenge each on his prison-punishment record. Inhumanity remains inhumanity, no matter what may be the religion or the politics of the victim.

As to the cruelty of excessive solitary confinement, that was exposed in the Labour-Co-operative paper, *Reynold's Illustrated News*, on Sunday, January 1, 1933. We draw attention to the *Reynold's* article because, when these conditions are mentioned in Court, the judges sometimes dismiss them with a shrug and a sarcastic comment. From this valuable exposure published by our contemporary, we make these excerpts:—

"Startling disclosures of a serious state of unrest in many local prisons, particularly in the London district, have come to light as the result of a special

"Not only is ugly bad temper spreading among the inmates—at some gaols it is stated to be at breaking point—but discontent is said to be sapping the morale of the prison officers themselves, whose duties under the best of conditions are often extremely trying and an acute strain. . . .

"Reports of hunger-striking are frequent. Three men are said to be following this extreme line of protest at Wandsworth Gaol, one of them having been forcibly fed during the last three weeks. . . .

"Conditions vary in different prisons, but in some districts the wretched men are spending, on the average, nearly 19 hours out of the 24 in the torture and misery of solitary confinement.

"Prison reformers, such as members of the Howard League, and the Commissioners themselves, are thoroughly disheartened at the turn of affairs. After years of steady progress from the cold inhumanity of Victorian days, the clock has been put right back. . . .

"In some prisons locking-up time is from 4.30 p.m. to 6.30 a.m., 14 hours at a stretch, with another two hours in the cell from 6.30 a.m. to 8.30 a.m. for cleaning-up and breakfast. Dinner means a further hour.

"Then there are the dreary week-ends. The warders must get their half-days off, and so, therefore, must the prisoners, which to them means more weary hours pacing up and down the narrow and bare little room.

"And, of course, our being a Christian community, Sunday is a day of "rest!"

"Apart from the brief spells for exercise and for the service, the prisoners have the whole of their time to meditate on the thrilling events of the week—pacing up and down! . . . Suffering is being inflicted on those who have broken the law, to a degree which a civilised State has no right to exert."

It is obvious that, since the 18B prisoners are only political suspects, the same suffering is being inflicted on those who are not accused of breaking the law, but are suspected of maybe inclining to do so under certain futuristic conditions that may never operate. Such prisoners, if such prisoners must be, are entitled to honourable political detention.

The Isle of Man Internment may remove some of the grievances on the score of health and close confinement. Much depends on the conditions. The best conditions are no reply to the sense of injustice.

Mr. Claude Hawks, B. Inst. R. A., Registered Architect, served as Sapper, Royal Engineer, 82036, France and Belgium, 1915-1919. His daughter, Mrs. Burdett, otherwise known as Olive Hawks, was arrested on May 23, 1940. She was accused of having spoken strongly in favour of a negotiated peace. When her father wrote the Duke of Bedford on December 27, 1940, she was interned still.

It is impossible to list all the cases. There is also the difficulty that some of the complainants may be released. One of the released is a man named Raymond Merriman. He was released in March, 1941, after seven months' incarceration, without explanation.

Frederick Bowman, of Liverpool, lived with his mother. She died whilst he was in prison. During her last illness he was refused permission to attend her, either on parole or with escort, and he was denied permission to attend her funeral. This consideration has been shown to convicted prisoners.

J. Thompson, of London, was not allowed to attend the funeral of his wife and child, who were killed in an air-raid.

Among the persons now interned in the Isle of Man is Albert Eugene Turner. He was arrested on June 17, 1940. He was kept at Bow Street Police Station, London, for 8 days. He was then removed to Brixton Prison. His wife was allowed to see him there for ten minutes after she had waited one-and-three-quarters' hours for the interview. That same week he was taken to Liverpool Prison. His wife was without word for fourteen days. Later he was removed to Ascot and then to Huyton Camp, near Liverpool.

In August, 1940, Turner appeared before a Tribunal in London. He was accused, according to his wife's statement, of being involved in an incident at the State Cinema, Croydon, when he is supposed to have said he was a Fascist. He denied this and offered to produce evidence to establish, beyond question, the fact that he had not entered that cinema since war began. He knew it was hard to prove a negative, but he offered to do so.

In a letter to the Duke of Bedford, Mrs. Martha Turner writes:

"There is no more loyal Englishman than my husband. He was a soldier in the 1914-1918 war. If he were an enemy of the country, would he have allowed our daughter to join the army? She has been in the A.T.S. since the day war commenced."

John Beckett is well known as the I.L.P. member who ran away with the mace. On another occasion, he shocked the House of Commons during an unemployment debate, by throwing down an ex-serviceman's medals. Labour M.P.'s complain that he is unstable politically. This hardly justifies internment. Some men have attained Cabinet rank through instability. At one time Beckett was a member of the Hackney Borough Council with Herbert Morrison. Both figure in *Who's Who*.

Beckett is interned now at the Isle of Man. Previously he was at Huyton, Liverpool. Here another internee sketched him. We reproduce the picture.

At Stafford Prison, Beckett made a strenuous fight for the application of 18B regulations. For this offence he was given three days bread and water and solitary confinement. He protested against this, and was sentenced to a further seven days' punishment. This punishment was inflicted, although he was sick.

During this period, his wife had travelled from London to see him, with a special permit. She was refused admission and had to return to London without seeing him.

New and Revised Edition.

RICHARD CARLILE, Agitator

(1790-1843).

HIS LIFE AND TIMES,

By

GUY A. ALDRED.

1s. 6d.

Post Free, 1s. 9d.

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.

CONSCIENCE AT THE BAR

NEWCASTLE SOCIALIST CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR FAMILY

FATHER AND TWO SONS-ATHEIST-SOCIALIST-ABSOLUTE RESISTERS



John Morley, his wife, and their Son, Robert. The dog is named "Ginger."

Our Comrade, John Morley, was arrested on Tuesday, July 1, 1941. He is at present in Durham Jail serving the sentence of 3 months' imprisonment imposed upon him on May 30 last.

In his statement, published below, Comrade Morley described the farcical attempt made to distrain on his home in June. A second attempt was made, prior to his arrest. The last word sent by him to his family is that he was able "to take it."

In the February "Word" we mentioned the case of Robert Morley, John Morley's son, who was arrested in December, 1940, for refusing to register, and also for refusing to attend Medical examination. Like his father, Robert Morley is an Atheist and

a Socialist. So also is Robert's brother, Alan, who has been called up for medical examination. He also refused to register and is waiting arrest. Meantime, Robert has served his sentence and is now home, waiting further developments.

John Morley published a short letter in the January, 1931 issue describing the strong anti-war attitude of himself and his family. They are Socialists and Atheists, and they hold that Socialism and Atheism should mean humanism, pacifism, resistance to war, and social revolution, not through war, but through the destruction of war.

Following is the statement of the absolute and uncompromising stand John Morley wishes to have made known to readers of this journal.

OPPOSING WAR ABSOLUTELY

BY JOHN MORLEY

I have no paper cuttings of my experiences as a C.O. during the last war because I made no public appearances, apart from the formal Police Court proceedings, when after arrest by the police, I was charged and remanded to await a Military escort.

I adopted the same attitude myself, as I have since argued is the only logical attitude a C.O. can take in regard to any Conscription Acts, that is, to ignore them entirely.

War is the greatest immorality that man has ever perpetrated on the world, and Conscription being the necessary means for procuring sufficient support of man-power possible it follows that a moral person must refuse to assist in any way in perpetuating this immorality.

War is immoral, not only from a strictly religious point of view, because it violates some sacred doctrine of religion, or even because it violates the sanctity of human life and robs man of his liberty and personality.

War is immoral because it violates the purely commonsense and realist view of morality as that which is good for society as a whole.

Modern war cannot possibly be good for society because it destroys all that should make for the benefit of humanity, both morally and materially, and it is utterly incapable of achieving any of the good that some of its supporters may desire to achieve. It follows, therefore, that a person with any real sense of morality

must oppose war and all its instruments, such as Conscription, A.R.P., A.F.S., fire-watching, etc.

Neither can one logically avail oneself of any privilege allowed under the National Service Acts, because of one's favourable environment or heritage, enabling one not only to acquire a conscientious objection to war (this must be inherent in most conscript soldiers, otherwise Conscription would not be needed), but also a faculty of self-expression capable of persuading a Tribunal that one is entitled under the Act to absolute exemption.

I therefore refused to appeal to a Tribunal for exemption, in spite of the fact that all the rest of Newcastle Branch of the N.C.F. agreed to do so.

(A) Because the Military Service Act was to my mind, immoral.

(B) Because it is immoral to ask for permission to be free when one is already free, and to ask for permission of any Tribunal to preserve that freedom is to surrender freedom itself in favour of a licensed liberty.

(C) Because to ask for a privilege for oneself which is denied to one's fellows is also immoral. (All men who are compelled by Conscription to join the Forces are *ipso facto* Conscientious Objectors, because they do not think it right that they should join the Army.)

(D) Because all Conscription Acts must be abolished before any liberty and freedom can be established, therefore, we must resist them for ourselves and attempt to make the Act unworkable for others.

Acting thus on the dictates of morality I found, as many others have found before and since, that the highest morality is also, in the long run, the greatest expediency.

I was not arrested until January, 1918, after most of my comrades had done long prison sentences already.

I refused to be medically examined and my papers were marked, "Refuses examination. Fit for General Service." Was taken to Barracks, refused all orders, was ultimately Court-Martialled, sentenced to 112 days' imprisonment, and sent to Wormwood Scrubbs. After a few days there I decided that the prison system was almost as immoral as the army and found that prisoners (C.O.'s in the majority) were carrying on the system themselves, so refused to participate even in prison tasks and spent remainder of sentence in solitary confinement for 14 day at a time with one day interval between. Unfortunately I received no support from my fellow C.O.s. After being escorted back to Newcastle on completion of sentence and taken back to Barracks, as there was no one attempting to prevent me I walked out and went to visit my wife and son (Robert). After a few days' liberty I was recognised by my Sergeant escort from London within a few yards of Depot from which I had walked away. He invited (?) me to accompany him back to depot. This invitation being refused, another Sergeant was called upon to add his weight to the invitation. Even then it was refused. So a dozen "liberty" men were called up to fall in behind me and the Sergeants. Then on the invitation being further pressed I fell in with their suggestion and marched under escort of Press Gang to Barracks and left my wife to push my infant son home up the hill.

Again at Barracks I refused to obey orders, was Court-Martialled again, and sent to N.C. Prison for 12 months' imprisonment.

Here, while still refusing to carry out any regulation I decided not to inform the Governor of this determination and found great support among my comrades in Newcastle Prison for such an attitude and suffered only rare periods of punishment during the following 12 months.

At the expiration of this sentence, February, 1919, I was again returned to Newcastle Barracks and left in charge of a sergeant, and was escorted to dining-hall for dinner (?). Sitting at the far end of the table from the server, I found there was nothing left for my dinner, so while they were busy eating theirs I came away and found some dinner elsewhere. After that I continued to find my necessary nourishment without applying further to Army authorities. They never invited me back again.

When my first son, Robert, was born, I was away from home in a Convalescent Home. The telegram announcing his birth was delivered by the matron when I was at dinner in the dining-hall. She interrupted a discussion on the war to present me with the telegram, and being a woman, prompted the tactful question of "No bad news, I hope?" To which I replied, "That is a matter of opinion, a son is born to me." "A son, good," she replied, "another little soldier." To which I replied, "Matron, if I thought my son had no future but to grow up to be a soldier, much as we are both delighted at his arrival, I think I would go home and strangle him with my own two hands." Thank God neither of these desperate alternatives have been adopted, either with him or my second son, who will take practically the same stand as his brother shortly.

I was summoned to the City Police Court on the 30th of May, 1941, for that I "unlawfully did fail to comply with the Fire Prevention (Business Premises) Order, 1941, made under Regulation 27A and 38 of the Defence (General) Regulations 1939."

I duly presented myself at Court and when my case was called, Mr. Barry Jones prosecuting

said I was charged with not notifying the authorities of fire-watching duties and for not making arrangements for fire-watching. He also went out of his way to attempt to prejudice the case by remarking that "here was a man who was living in this country and enjoying all the advantages won by the war, but was not willing to lift a finger to help in anyway, leaving it to others to protect his premises while he sleeps idly by."

"Oh no," said the Chairman of the Bench, "He would be safe at home, sleeping in his bed."

When the prosecutor finished, I asked if I could question him, but this was refused.

Police evidence was that I said, "I will have nothing to do with the war and its prosecution, and I will not employ a fire-watcher."

I was allowed to make a statement and expressed regret that I was not allowed to ask the prosecutor a question.

"What question did you wish to ask?" said the Magistrate's clerk.

"Just this," said I, "Can he tell me one advantage that I or anyone enjoys as a result of the war?"

"He cannot answer that," said the clerk.

"I know he cannot," said I, "neither can you."

I first explained that strange though it might seem my appearance there was due to my strong regard for law and order. "This regulation" said I, "was a war measure, and therefore must be resisted by one having any regard for law and order. For war, by its resort to the arbitrament of brute force, was the negation of law, and by spreading disorder over the whole world could not be said to support order."

"Hitler's law and order," interjected the chairman.

I was then told that I could not proceed on that line as my statement had nothing to do with the law. I claimed that if the prosecutor could make attacks on my personal character, I had an equal right to answer these charges, and if the chairman was at liberty to sneer at my selfishness, I claimed the same liberty to reply.

"I did not sneer," said the chairman.

"If your remark about me sleeping safely at home in my bed was not a sneer, it sounded very much like one to me," said I.

I then proceeded to point out amid unseemly interruption from the clerk and police that I had two supreme loyalties, Sanity and Humanity, and as these war regulations violated both I had no intention of assisting them in any way.

The Bench then asked the formal question of the Police: "Any record?"

The Police replied: "There is no record, nothing is known of him."

I then made a statement that I had a record. "A record of which I am proud. During the last war I served two long years of imprisonment rather than assist in that war, and I am prepared to serve as many as you gentlemen may consider necessary, rather than assist in this war."

The Bench then announced that I would be fined £50 and £5 5s. costs.

To this I made no reply, and turned to go out when the Police asked, "Are you going to pay it now?" "No," said I, "Do you want time to pay?" "No," I replied, "Then what are you going to do," said he. "I do not intend to pay it at all," I said.

This information was passed on to the Bench, who had already heard my statement.

"Then," said the chairman, after a brief consultation, "You will go to prison for three months." "Very good," I replied, "if that is your pleasure." "It is not our pleasure," said the clerk, "it is the law." "But you seem to enjoy it," said I.

I was then escorted down the Court and as I passed my friends and family in the public gallery I called out: "Good-bye, lads, keep the red flag flying."

I was then hustled into the "dock" and as

I passed through I looked over the top and waving, said, "Good-bye, gentlemen, I hope you will sleep as sweetly as I do." I was then pushed down below, searched, and locked up in the cells.

After about two hours they came and told me I was to go home as they were going to issue a distress warrant to collect the fine. I protested against this as being illegal, but did not object to go home.

I have since written the Magistrate's Clerk to the effect that while the alternative to the fine is at the discretion of the magistrates, yet having publicly declared in Court for the alternative of imprisonment and put it into operation by arresting me, they could not at a later time vary this. Therefore, if they attempt to execute a distress warrant, I should treat it as an illegal distraint.

I have had one visit already from an officer of the police, who said he had come to distraint on the building.

I read a copy of my letter to him and said that I could only act on that declaration.

He then said: "May I ask you two questions?" "As many as you please," I said. "I only reserve the right to answer them as seems most suitable to me."

"First," said he, "does the building belong to you?" "In view of my letter," said I, "there is no answer to that one." "Second," "Are all these cars yours or your customers?" "The same applies to that," said I. At which protesting that he was wasting his time, he departed. And there the matter rests at the moment. I shall do my utmost to prevent the collection of the fine and imagine they will ultimately issue a warrant to collect me. In which case, I suppose, I will have to submit to brute force.

They sent an A.F.S. man yesterday to interview my employees and get their names and ages for fire-watching, but I said that as they were holding me responsible I could not see why the men should be troubled and refused permission for him to interview them and also to tell him how many there are.

They are also after my second son, Alan, who is also a War-Resister, and he refuses to give any information to the authorities in spite of their repeated requests, so I suppose they will soon be hauling him before the Bench.

I am not a much photographed man, but I send a photograph for *The Word* since the editor asks for one. In it I was "taken" building my rock garden in 1940. With me is my son, Robert, and my wife.

This year the rocks are more beautiful, for I thought if I have to be "on the rocks," they will be pleasanter with a few flowers. So I shall always look for the flowers among the "rocks" of life, and will mostly be able to find some.

JOHN MORLEY PROTEST.

"John Morley, whom we know as a remarkable chairman and as a fearless speaker of truth, regardless of consequences, is in Durham Gaol," writes Douglas G. Maitland, acting Secretary of the Newcastle War Resisters Group of the P.P.U.

On behalf of this Group, Comrade Maitland addressed a letter to Herbert Morrison on July 10 last, in which he expresses the hope that the Home Secretary, as "a man who has some respect for individual conscience, will see to it that this injustice is ended."

Describing the circumstances of Comrade Morley's arrest and imprisonment, this letter asks Morrison to face the logic of his position:—

"I write you on a matter which seems to us, and may, on reflection, seem to you a serious one. . . . Can you, as a former conscientious objector, and as a present-day minister responsible for the carrying out of the penalties under this order, lend your support to the persecution of a man who, for conscientious reasons, cannot take part in war activities? John Morley's sincerity of objection is well proved by the fact of his having served two prison sentences during the last war and by his untiring activities in the pacifist movement as a public speaker."

Comrades who wish to swell the protest against John Morley's imprisonment should write to D. G. MAITLAND, 15 Beech Grove, Longbenton, Northumberland.

BOOK LIST

By The DUKE OF BEDFORD.

Are Socialists Right? Reprinting.
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.

By Sir WALTER W. STRICKLAND, Bt., B.A.
The March of Homicide. Strickland's last letter on the coming war. Written in 1937.
Imperialism in the Orient. Dealing with Japan and Buddhism.

By LEO TOLSTOY.

The Way to Peace.
On Socialism. Tolstoy's last essay.

By DOUGLAS JERROLD and ANATOLE FRANCE.
Glory. A discussion of **Martial Glory** and also **The Glory of War.** From the writings of these great humorists. One pamphlet.

By the Rev. RICHARD LEE, M.A.

The Political Objector.
All the above pamphlets by Bedford, Strickland, Tolstoy, Jerrold and Lee are published at 2d. each. Post free, 3d. In addition we have two works by Richard Lee: **Mussolini** (6d.), and **What Everyone Should Know About the War**, published at 2s. 6d., post free, 1s. 3d.

By RICHARD CARLILE.

Thomas Paine. With a contemporary account of Paine's imprisonment in France.

By GUY A. ALDRED.

Socialism and the Pope.
The Rebel and His Disciples?
John MacLean: Martyr of the Class Struggle.
To the Editor: 30 Years' Correspondence on Subjects of Varying Interest.
Historical and Traditional Christianity.
Dogmas Discarded. (Part I).
The above pamphlets are 4d. each; post free, 6d.

Dogmas Discarded. (Part II).
Studies in Communism. Six pamphlets collected.
Bakunin. Complete popular biography.
Why Jesus Wept. Twelve Essays on Social and ethical aspects of Christianity.
These four pamphlets are 6d. each; post free, 8d.

Pioneers of Anti-Parliamentarism. Price 1s. Post free, 1s. 2d.
Richard Carlile. Price 1s. 6d. Post free, 1s. 9d.
Essays in Revolt. Bound volume, cloth, containing all the pamphlets (9) published in **The Word Library**, 1st Series.

When Did It Happen? 200 year calendar. 2d., post free, 3d.

Armageddon Incorporated. Exposure Jehoval Witnesses. 3d., post free, 4d.
Catalogue. 24 pp. Describing books, Post free, 2d. Every comrade should circulate these pamphlets as aids to clear thought in a time of crisis. Special terms for quantities. Order now.

THE STRICKLAND PRESS

104 GEORGE STREET, GLASGOW, C.1

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

THE GOTAMA FELLOWSHIP

A Pacifist Fellowship for Buddhists and Theosophists.

CHAIRMAN: Vera Bingham, Sandhills Cottage, Wormley, Surrey.

SECRETARY: Norman Colgan, 172 Peckham Rye, London, S.E.22.

TREASURER: Matthew Chapman, 31 Dulwich Village, S.E.21.

The objects of the Fellowship is (a) to bring together Theosophists and Buddhists who are also pacifists and to help them to translate their convictions into terms of everyday life; (b) to afford them the opportunity of studying, working and meeting together for their common benefit.

MEMBERS are required to donate a subscription of not less than 1/- per month to cover the overhead costs of the Fellowship.

The Fellowship is founded in the name of Gotama or Gautama, known as the Buddha of Compassion, because of all teachers in the realm of Humanity he is the one who most stressed the idea of Universal Brotherhood.

Printed and Published by the STRICKLAND PRESS, at 104 George Street, Glasgow, C.1.